



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—Wednesday, September 27, 2017

The Senate met at 10:01 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Immortal and Invisible God, You continue to be our shelter in the time of storms. Thank You for being our Nation's protection.

Give our Senators the wisdom to place their confidence in You, instead of in national power and prestige. Lord, inspire our lawmakers with Your presence. Dispel all fear. May they remember that in the most turbulent and unpredictable of times, You are still in charge of our Nation and world.

Give each of our citizens the ability to know and do Your will. Lord, be in our midst so that we will experience peace even in the midst of a storm.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COTTON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1519, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 3354

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later today, I look forward to joining members of the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, and other congressional leaders in unveiling a unified framework for fixing our Nation's broken Tax Code. It is an idea that can bring much needed relief to middle-class families and small businesses and help keep more jobs right here in America. It is the result of a lot of hard work and input from Members, committees, staffs, and the administration, to name a few, and I want to thank them again for their continued diligence on behalf of our country.

This framework is focused on supporting American jobs, while making taxes fairer, and on growing families' paychecks. It is a refreshing change from our current outdated Tax Code, which for too long hasn't worked for many Americans.

The current code forces individuals, families, and small businesses to navigate a web of schedules, deductions, and penalties. Rates are too high. Incentives often make little to no sense. Some actually encourage companies to ship American jobs overseas. Moreover, for 8 years under the Obama administration, our economy grew at a sluggish rate—never living up to its real potential. Too many Americans struggled to get ahead, many living paycheck to paycheck. It is time for a significant change in favor of families and jobs.

This is our once-in-a-generation opportunity to fundamentally rethink our Tax Code. We can unleash the economy—promoting growth, attracting jobs, and improving American competitiveness in the global market. Instead of sending jobs overseas, we can modernize our Tax Code to help bring strong investment and good-paying jobs home and keep them here. Through this framework, we can lower taxes for individuals and families, so hard-working Americans are able to keep more of their hard-earned money.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a member of the Senate on the floor.

Later this afternoon, President Trump will bring our shared vision of tax reform to the people of Indiana and to Americans more broadly. He will explain his support for putting Americans across the country on a more level playing field, because when they are, they can win.

I thank the President and his team for their efforts to develop the framework. Together, we can continue that work to bring relief and growth to the people of our States, such as the workers, small businesses, and families of Kentucky, and promote economic growth in America.

Using the framework we will release today as a roadmap, the Senate Finance Committee, under Chairman HATCH's leadership, will continue to hold a series of hearings to discuss how to make taxes lower, simpler, and fairer for middle-class families and for small businesses. Like its counterpart in the House, the Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee will continue working to provide much needed relief to encourage jobs and investments to come back to the United States. The work of these committees will help build a stronger country.

Many of our Democratic colleagues have voiced support for overhauling our Tax Code. Throughout this process, I hope they will choose to work with us in a serious way.

A fundamental overhaul of our Tax Code is a daunting task. We have a lot of work ahead, but America deserves it—like the hard-working men and women of the middle class saving for retirement and the small businesses trying to expand and grow and the families hoping to send their kids to a good college. These Americans deserve real tax reform. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in working from this framework to deliver for them.

Here is the point: It is time to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more of it in the pockets of Americans.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Good morning, Mr. President. First, I would like to talk about taxes.

Today, President Trump and Republican leaders will announce several proposals as part of their tax plan. Accord-

ing to recent reports, that plan will include proposals to repeal the estate tax, lower the rate on passthrough entities, lower the top rate, and actually raise the bottom tax rate. Each of these proposals would result in a massive windfall for the wealthiest Americans and provide almost no relief to middle-class taxpayers who need it most.

It seems that President Trump and Republicans have designed their plan to be cheered in the country clubs and the corporate boardrooms. How does repealing the estate tax help middle-class people?

Only 5,200 of the wealthiest families in America, couples whose estates are worth \$11 million, pay the estate tax. Are there any middle-class families worth \$11 million? Is that the President's definition of the middle class?

The estate tax is skewed to the very wealthiest among us, and they are going to repeal it. This is not going to fly with the American people, let me tell you.

Our Republican colleagues tried to do something the public disliked on healthcare—taking away benefits, reducing healthcare. Now they are trying to do the same thing on taxes, helping the very wealthiest. They are going to be in for a rude awakening because the American people are going to rise up against this. Over 70 percent of Americans are against tax breaks for wealthy Americans and wealthy corporations.

Lowering the rate on passthrough entities would create a huge loophole, allowing very wealthy Americans, such as hedge fund managers, to funnel their income through a business entity in order to avoid the top bracket and pay a much lower rate. So the upper middle-class family making \$100,000 or \$200,000 or \$300,000 can pay 39 percent, but these wealthy hedge fund managers, lawyers, and whoever, through a passthrough, can pay no corporate tax and then a 25-percent rate on the rest of their taxes. Does that help middle-class Americans? Absolutely not. Does it help the wealthiest who have the lawyers to set up these passthrough entities? Absolutely.

By lowering the individual top rate, the top 1 percent, who make above \$490,000 a year, would get a tax break because their rate would be lowered. God bless them. They make a lot of money. Do they need a tax break? I don't think so.

President Trump clearly believes, despite his rhetoric, that the wealthy in this country deserve another tax cut while middle-class families at best get crumbs. Amazingly, the Trump tax plan will even include a proposal to increase the bottom tax rate—a punch to the gut of working Americans.

The American people should be able to see the principle behind President Trump's tax plan in this one fact. He proposes to cut taxes on the highest in-

come brackets and raise them on the lowest. He raises the bottom rate and cuts the top rate. This is "wealthfare"—"wealthfare"—helping those of great wealth with more tax breaks.

The American people should be able to see the principle behind President Trump's tax plan with little more than an across-the-board tax cut for America's millionaires and billionaires. God bless them. I am glad we have a lot of rich people in America. I don't begrudge them. Many of them have worked very hard to get their money. Some of them get it through an estate; so be it. But the wealthiest among us don't need a tax break. They are doing great.

All of the statistics show that those at the highest end are making more money than ever before and the middle class is flat or sinking. Who needs the break? The Washington Post-ABC poll showed yesterday that more than 70 percent of Americans say our tax system already tends to favor wealth more than the middle class. This bill makes it much worse.

One more thing to watch today is whether the President and his Republicans provide any details about how they intend to pay for these massive cuts. Without these details, I suspect Republicans will turn the age-old trick of promising that economic growth will make up for the entire difference. Some of them call it dynamic scoring, but that name obscures what dynamic scoring really is.

President Trump calls the media outlets fake news. Dynamic scoring is fake math. It is just made-up, fake math to hide another deficit-busting tax cut to benefit the wealthiest Americans.

No less of an authority than James Baker, a conservative Republican and former Republican Treasury Secretary who led the last successful tax reform effort under President Reagan, said:

We must not let tax revenues decline and worsen the deficit. In other words, tax reform must be revenue neutral and should be judged on its own merits.

Let's call it the Baker rule—the Jim Baker rule: Tax reform must be revenue neutral, judged on its own merits, with no dynamic scoring and no fake math.

I am amazed that President Trump, whenever he talks, says he wants to help the middle class, and his plan at best throws crumbs at some middle-class people. Some will get a tax increase, especially those in high-tax States like New York, but his plan benefits the wealthy.

Has the President read this plan? Has he been involved in creating this plan or is it the people around him—many of them from Wall Street—who came up with this plan, and the President doesn't even know what it does?

I will tell you, if he goes to Indiana today and says that his plan helps the

middle class rather than the wealthy, he has it backward. It helps the wealthy far more than it helps the middle class.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, yesterday the majority announced it would not be holding a vote this week on the latest healthcare bill, Graham-Cassidy. Every American should breathe a deep sigh of relief.

The majority has vowed to revisit ACA repeal, maybe even with this legislation. But President Trump and our Republican colleagues should have learned from these failures that the American people do not want to cut healthcare. If they try to do it a third time, they will fail again for the simplest reason in politics: The public is against what they want to do.

This administration, which campaigned it is for the people and populist, on healthcare is doing what people don't want and on taxes is doing what people don't want. What is going on?

I remind my Republican colleagues that continuing to threaten repeal is like hanging a giant sword of Damocles above our Nation's healthcare system. It causes great uncertainty in the healthcare market, and it leads insurers to raise premiums on average Americans.

Now, I understand that for political purposes Republicans don't want to ever admit that ACA repeal is off the table. They promised it to the American people for 7 years but deluded them on what it really meant. The average American thought that, if you took ACA off the table, premiums would go down and coverage would go up. The bills the Republicans have proposed do just the opposite, but I understand why they do it. They promised it so often. But those promises have a real human consequence in the form of higher costs for everybody. The responsibility and the blame for the rate hikes, should they occur—and they probably will—will fall squarely on the Republican shoulders. President Trump and the Republicans are in charge. Saying, gee, something in the past caused it, when they failed to correct it, is not going to work.

My Republican friends, you are no longer in the minority. You are running the show. It is your responsibility to help bring premiums down. We want to do that and, in fact, there are good bipartisan sprouts. Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY are very close to a bipartisan agreement. Now, we hope out of pique or anger that our Republican colleagues will not reject a good bipartisan compromise that helps the American people, put together by the chair of the HELP Committee and the ranking member.

I hope and expect the negotiations to pick up right where they left off because we Democrats want to work with our Republican colleagues to stabilize

the markets and lower premiums for millions of Americans. We hope our Republican colleagues will not just sit back, repeatedly threaten repeal, and watch as millions of Americans pay higher healthcare costs. That will be wrong substantively, and, politically, it will fall right on their shoulders.

So I hope we can have the negotiations pick up between Senators MURRAY and ALEXANDER right where they left off. Each of them said they were close to an agreement before Chairman ALEXANDER was pulled away by Republican leadership.

Insurers are about to set their rates for the next year, and whether we can come together or not could be the difference between a stable market and premiums that are hundreds of dollars more expensive. So for the sake of the American people, for the sake of turning over a new leaf on healthcare, let's work together in a bipartisan way to shore up and improve our Nation's healthcare.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Finally, Mr. President, on the crisis in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, Hurricanes Irma and Maria have left the islands—home to well over 3 million American citizens—hanging on for dear life. You have seen the pictures, and they are devastating. Water, food, diesel, power, cell service, medicine, shelter, security, the basic needs of human survival are limited and running out in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Diabetic patients who require insulin shots are unable to keep their lifesaving medicine refrigerated. Hospitals still lack power and running water. This was a catastrophe on an epic scale. It may have been one of the worst humanitarian crises within our borders.

Now, the President has a bully pulpit. More importantly, he is in direct control of the vast resources of our Federal Government—the military, the Department of Energy, FEMA, USDA, and much more. He can direct the attention of all Americans to important issues. Previous Presidents have used this platform to focus our attention on disasters that strike our country. Barack Obama did it, George Bush did it, Bill Clinton did it, George H.W. Bush did it, and Ronald Reagan did it. The President can direct resources—boots on the ground and a structure to coordinate it all. But a President needs to act aggressively, comprehensively, and urgently, and some of that has been lacking with this President unfortunately.

A cursory scroll of President Trump's Twitter feed and public comments from the past few weeks does not show him using the power of his office to focus our attention on the crisis in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. It has been a week since the storm hit and, as I said, his Twitter feed and public com-

ments don't show him using the power of the office. When he mentions Puerto Rico, President Trump promotes his own administration's efforts and implies that Puerto Rico was partially at fault for the devastation they have been suffering. The response from the administration needs to get a whole lot better fast.

I spoke to the Governor of Puerto Rico yesterday, and he gave me specific items that would provide immediate help. I spoke about them yesterday, and I hope the administration acts on them quickly. But most importantly, we need the administration to send us an emergency and interim aid package to pass, just as we did in the wake of Hurricane Harvey. Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands shouldn't have to wait a second longer for aid than any other American State or Territory. We should take up and pass this package here in the Senate before the week is over.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, first I want to join the Democratic leader in his comments about the devastation of these hurricanes. This has been truly a malign visitation on our country over the last several weeks. Florida, Texas, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico have really suffered and are suffering. I know that the administration is working hard on this, and I commend them for the efforts that they have made.

I think that now much of our attention is turning to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in order to mitigate what is really a humanitarian disaster. One difference between those islands and Florida and Texas is the fact that they are islands. It is harder to get there. It is harder to get aid there. I understand that just this morning the San Juan airport was open for the first time, and it has opened in a limited way.

So this is clearly a responsibility that we have as Senators, as Members of Congress, and as Americans to reach out to our neighbors in a situation such as this. When a crisis hits, it often calls forth the best of America, and I believe that is happening right now.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I want to talk about a different kind of hurricane, a slow-motion hurricane. It is a slow-motion hurricane that is sweeping our entire country, not just the Southeast. It is sweeping through our small towns, our cities, our families, and our schools. It is taking lives on a scale that is unprecedented and almost unthinkable.

I am talking about the hurricane epidemic of opioid abuse and overdose deaths. Many of us this week are watching with rapt attention Ken Burns' magnificent study of the Vietnam war. We are losing more people per year to overdose deaths than were

lost in the entire Vietnam war. That is one way to think about the magnitude of this catastrophe that is striking our country. The problem is that it strikes here and there. It strikes a family here and a family there, a community here and a community there, but it doesn't strike all in one place. So it is not so apparent.

If we were losing a small city in America of 63,000 people once a year, we would be turning ourselves inside out to solve the problem that was causing those deaths, and 63,000 people were killed last year through overdose deaths. It was almost 400 in my State of Maine. That is more than one a day. All indications are that it is increasing—one a day. Now, 63,000 is about 7 people an hour—24 hours a day, 365 days a year—who are succumbing to this plague. That is the right term for it. It is a medieval plague that is afflicting people all over our country.

Lives are lost, families torn apart, and our communities compromised. It is a huge cost. I hesitate to talk about things like dollars when you are also talking about lives, but it is a cost in both ways. Not only are lives being lost and families being torn apart, but the estimates are that it costs our society something over \$400 billion a year in everything from medical costs and criminal justice costs to lost economic and lost productivity in our society and our economy.

But I am here today because all hope is not lost. Contrary to what some people hear—and you hear sometimes that this is hopeless and that there isn't anything we can do about it—there is ample evidence that treatment can work. This is not a death sentence. Opioid abuse is terrible, and from talking to people who have suffered from it, it literally changes your brain, and it becomes almost impossible to escape. But it can be escaped. The reason we know that is that there is data from across the country, but the reason I know that is because of my friends in Maine—Andrew, Matt, and Chris.

These are people whom I know, with whom I have interacted, and with whom I have sat down. Andrew is a guy who is at the University of Southern Maine. He was trapped in the throes of addiction. He went through treatment, and now he is in recovery. Indeed, there are 25 million people in this country who are in recovery, and they will tell you that they will always be in recovery because they can never shake this disease, whether it is alcohol or the really destructive one that we are focusing on right now, which is opioids.

Andrew has made a new life. He is at school. He is at the University of Southern Maine. He has helped form a student-centered community to help people who are in recovery or who are working on getting there.

Matthew is a young man who, in 2009, again was trapped by this horrible

scourge. Now he is hoping to go to medical school.

Chris is a guy who sat in my office. He worked in the White House. He was in it up to his neck and above. He had criminal justice problems. He was in jail. He was convicted. But now he is a member of the Maine State Bar Association. He got himself through school, and he got himself through law school.

There was an important moment that I think all of us should think about when we think about people who are in this situation. When he went to apply to law school, the people at the law school said: Well, we don't know if we can take you because you have this record.

His question, which was brilliant and indicates to me that he is going to be a pretty good lawyer, was this: What was my sentence when I was convicted? The response was 3 years. He said: You are putting me in for life. If you don't let me move forward with my life, you are making that a life sentence, not a 3-year sentence. He was accepted to law school. He graduated, and this year he passed and was accepted in the Maine State Bar Association. He is making a contribution to his community.

Treatment can work. It doesn't always work the first time. Anybody that has been through this, whether it is alcohol or even quitting smoking or anything else, will tell you that it doesn't work the first time necessarily. Sometimes it does, and sometimes it doesn't. Sometimes it will take multiple trips through the recovery and treatment process, but it can work. We know it can work. I have 25 million reasons to tell you that it can work and 3 that I know.

I am going to be introducing a resolution later today—I hope the Senate can take it up and pass it—designating next month as National Recovery Month, honoring and recognizing the people who are in recovery. So if it works, what is the problem? Why is this hurricane still sweeping our country? Why does 2017 look like it is going to be worse than 2016?

Well, the sad truth is that, out of all of those millions of people who are addicted, who are stuck, who are trapped, only 1 in 10 has access to treatment—only 1 in 10. Now, what do we have to do to deal with this problem? Of course, it is like most other problems. There is no single answer. It involves law enforcement. It involves interdiction, and let me pause for a moment on interdiction. The Presiding Officer and I are both on the Armed Services Committee, and we have heard testimony in our committee that we only have the Coast Guard and Navy resources to interdict one-fourth of the drug shipments that we know of coming up from South and Central America by sea. In other words, we have intelligence where we know of 100 boats, and we can

only stop 25. There is no excuse for that. So, yes, law enforcement, at the source or along the way in our States, is an absolutely essential part of this process, but it is not the whole answer. We also have to work on prevention.

Frankly, I have been talking to groups around Maine and around the country on this. We are all still trying to figure out how to make prevention work. What will work? I haven't yet heard a really strong answer to that question. I guess it varies from person to person, but prevention has to be part of it. Treatment can work, but if only 1 in 10 people have treatment available to them or have access to treatment, that means 9 are sentenced to life and maybe to death.

Last year, a year and a half ago, we passed CARA, the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act. It is a great bill, with lots of good things in it, but no money. That is like sending the fire department to the fire and saying: Fight that fire, but we are not going to give you any water. We know this costs money, and it is something we have to commit to. It has to be part of it.

Whatever we do around here about healthcare and about budgets, we have to realize we are losing our people, and these aren't bad people. These aren't people over there. I sat at a roundtable in a small town in South Paris, ME. Next to me was a deputy sheriff. He lost his daughter. These aren't strangers. These are often middle-class people. These are people whose kids or sometimes parents—this is not age specific—are caught up in this scourge.

I guess I want to leave us today with two points. One is, treatment works. The second is, we need more of it. If we know something works, but only 1 in 10 people have access to it, shame on us for not remedying that situation. To me, the most tragic case—and I have talked to people in Maine about this—the saddest moment, the most tragic case is when someone who is in the throes of opioid abuse is ready to ask for help and they have to be put on a waiting list. That is tragic and inexcusable. It is hard to get to that point. It is hard to admit that you are trapped and that you are no longer in control of your life. Once you are willing to do that and say, "I need help," then it is up to us to be sure the help is there. That is what we are talking about today.

So this is a different kind of hurricane, but it is a hurricane, nonetheless, that is destroying our families, destroying our communities, and wrecking the lives of our friends, but it is no act of God. We can't stop the winds of Maria or Irma, but we can mitigate the effects, ameliorate the effects, soften the effects. That is exactly what we need to do for those who are victims of the hurricane of opioids that is sweeping our country.

I hope and believe we will respond to this challenge as we have at other

times in our history, and, indeed, as we are this week to the hurricanes of the Caribbean. I want to respond also to the hurricane that is sweeping America that we can, indeed, ameliorate, mitigate, and soften.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to strongly oppose the nomination of Ajit Pai to serve a second term as Chairman of the FCC.

Since taking over the FCC leadership in January, Chairman Pai wasted no time moving the agency away from its key mission to promote the use and deployment of communications in the public interest. For example, he has been involved in dismantling the rules that preserve the diversity of content in media ownership, potentially negatively impacting forever the number and variety of voices in the media market.

In addition, his confirmation to this important position will also have a negative impact on one of the most important issues, I believe, of our time; that is, preserving net neutrality. A strong and open internet is key to an economy of the future—to promoting an environment for innovation and facilitating the creative jobs that are going to come along with an open internet architecture.

Chairman Pai is poised to undo the bedrock principles that are already in place to protect an open internet. Even in the face of evidence that these rules are important to an internet economy and millions of jobs, he is determined to try to rewrite them.

On Monday, the Senate will vote on whether to confirm Ajit Pai for another term as Chairman of the FCC. As I have said, I think his leadership has shown that on net neutrality, he believes the rules should be changed. As long as he continues to hold that position, I cannot support his nomination.

As the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, he has demonstrated disdain for the important public interest principles he is supposed to be upholding. He shows a disregard for the innovators in America that are striving to build the economy of the future. The public interest mission of the FCC is encoded in the agency's DNA. The law that created the FCC clearly states that the agency's mission includes promoting equal access to communications networks for all people around the United States.

This means the FCC has the responsibility to promote the expansion of communications networks and to ensure they have the incentive and ability to compete fairly with one another in providing broadband services. The mission does not include letting a big telecom company or cable company run over small businesses or consumers and saying to them: Unless you pay me more, I am not going to give you essential services. Imagine if that happened to the telephone industry decades ago, if you couldn't get access because someone had decided, "I'm going to let the highest bidder rule the roost."

The President's nomination of Pai and his desire to have him continue as Chair continues to show a desire to undermine the internet and the internet economy. As soon as he was appointed, Chairman Pai announced his intention, as Chairman, to go against the demands of American consumers and reverse the rules that are already on the books to protect consumers. Chairman Pai wants to make it possible for those big telecom and cable companies to erect toll lanes that would further burden the nature of the internet and innovation that its economy supports. He plans to go against more than 10 million American consumers and innovators who have told him to keep the internet open and free.

Recent studies have shown that the internet economy is now over 7 percent of U.S. GDP, it employs 7 million people and is worth a trillion dollars. Our strong, robust internet rules, without question, have helped keep that economic growth. Our economy is in a massive technological transformation. It is in an information age, and in an information age, making sure you have an open internet is going to be key to continuing to grow business.

Every business plan of every startup relies on the ability of consumers to get equal access to content. Largely, as a result of the innovations, the open internet has created hundreds of thousands of tech jobs in the United States. The internet economy is almost a trillion dollars, and at 7 percent of GDP, it is growing faster and stronger than many other sectors, including construction, mining, utilities, agriculture, education, and entertainment.

It is disturbing to me that Chairman Pai has made it clear he wants to rewrite the rules that protect those businesses and create an artificial fast and slow lane and "if you want out of the slow lane, you better pay me more money." We can't afford to do that for all the internet applications and all the small businesses that are continuing to work on growing our economy. We need to make sure that instead of shedding jobs in the United States, as we did in the last economic downturn, that we are creating jobs and creating power for consumers.

We have seen what has been termed the "app economy," which consists of

everybody who makes money has a job thanks to a mobile app that was also powered by the internet. Today, 1.7 million Americans have jobs because of that economy. Nearly 92,000 of them are in the State of Washington. Over the past 5 years, that app economy and those jobs have grown at an annual rate of 30 percent. The average growth rate for all other jobs is 1.6 percent. So, literally, Chairman Pai is trying to clog the arteries of one of the fastest growing economic opportunities in America.

By 2020, the app economy is estimated to grow to over \$100 billion. This demonstrates that the internet economy is a dynamic, supercharged, job-creating engine, with economic growth that should not be artificially slowed down because some industries believe they have the right to do so.

These facts, and making sure we protect an open internet, are why we should not support Chairman Pai.

The slow lanes and the fast lanes are not like a highway where a consumer or business can take another route or plan another course. Here, you are creating barriers that are wedges between businesses and their consumers, between doctors and their patients, between industry solution providers and the customers they are trying to serve.

The growth of the internet platform for economic activity is something we do not want to see destroyed, and Chairman Pai's dismantling of that robust internet architecture and the support it gives to innovators is extremely troubling to me.

I think about all the internet applications that I have seen in my State, whether it is a business like McKinstry that provides building efficiencies to school districts all over our State and in Puget Sound. Let's pretend now that McKinstry, which is trying to tell North Shore School District that they are using too much power could reduce their costs by just doing three simple things—but now, all of a sudden, because the net neutrality rules go away, McKinstry has to charge that school district more if they want to get that information to them on time. A clogged artery will not get the information to that school district when it is needed in time to make an adjustment.

Let's talk about a doctor in a rural area who receives information about a patient who comes into their emergency room but wants a consult with a doctor in Seattle, and all of a sudden, now their connectivity is slowed down unless they pay more money.

I also think about this issue in the context of just some very everyday ways we experience the impact of an open internet. Like people going to get coffee. In my State, they will now preorder. They go online, and then they show up to get their coffee—all so they can avoid the long lines. But now,

all of a sudden, if net neutrality goes away, is that going to mean another charge or, an extra toll, just to get consumers connected to the coffee shop so they can avoid a long line? Are cable companies and internet service providers going to say to the consumer: You have to pay more if you want a fast lane.

What Chairman Pai doesn't realize is that the internet is now a full-blown ecosystem with many attachments; that the internet is like the artery system that connects it all and connects it in so many ways beyond even our imagination. Yet he is proposing to clog those arteries, to hold us ransom if only we will tell a cable company it is OK to charge the American consumer more.

We cannot afford to ruin the internet economy by doing this. We need to have an open internet architecture that allows everybody to access this information at the same time and the same rate so that we can continue to innovate.

There are ways to grow the internet and grow internet investment in the delivery system. In fact, during the time period of the open internet rules, we have seen just that—a continued investment. So we do not now have to rewrite these rules. We do not now have to throw a roadblock, a hurdle, a clogging of the arteries at the small business and internet economy that is growing so rapidly with all its devices.

God forbid that one of our colleagues would be on the other side of town and get a delayed message about when a vote started just because we in the Senate hadn't bought a higher, faster speed lane, and maybe they would miss a vote. It is hard to say what slowing down the internet artificially would do because it is so connected to everything we do today, and that is why we have to stop this from happening.

I would be happy to hear that Chairman Pai has decided to drop his insistence on trying to change the rules of an open internet. If he did that, I might think differently about his nomination. But until then I will continue to fight for my State's economy, which depends so greatly on net neutrality, and continue to fight for the millions of consumers around the United States who are trying to grow what are smarter, more intelligent, more cost-effective businesses.

Even the healthcare debate we just had is instructive on the issues of net neutrality—I believe in home healthcare. I believe we can implement it and drive down costs. But if you are telling a patient that they might not get the information back from their doctor for days because he can't afford a fast internet connection that the cable companies are charging, then I guarantee my colleagues we are not going to reduce our healthcare costs.

So, please, I say to my colleagues, you will not have another chance at

this. You will hear from your constituents about this issue, and you will not be able to take back this vote. Please make sure you understand that Chairman Pai is marching ahead on a very different anti-consumer road, and because of that, I am not going to vote for someone who is going to slow down and clog the internet.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on Chairman Pai's nomination.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today I would like to talk about a topic that most of us don't want to discuss, and that is taxes, except today is different. This time, you don't have to groan over spreadsheets and calculations or worry about how much of your hard-earned pay you are going to have to send to Uncle Sam. Today, leaders in the House and in the Senate will unveil their core principles for tax reform. The President will travel with our colleague Senator YOUNG to announce his support for these core principles.

Taxes can be confounding and complicated and painful to deliberate, but for folks back home, what I believe describes our tax principles is to say more take-home pay, and that works for everybody. In other words, you actually reduce your living costs because Uncle Sam takes less of your paycheck, meaning you get to keep more of it and take that home and spend it on things that you would prefer to spend it on. So more take-home pay is our bottom line.

I look forward to working with the chairman of the Finance Committee, on which I have the privilege of serving, and Speaker RYAN and Chairman KEVIN BRADY of the House Ways and Means Committee—another good Texan—on their ideas, which I know were born from many long hours and tough conversations.

But this is going to be a national conversation, starting with the President kicking this off this afternoon in Indiana. He is going to invite the American people to express their views on what tax reform should look like.

For me, in addition to more take-home pay, I am looking for a tax code which is shorter, simpler, and which makes us more competitive in the global economy.

It is a great relief, believe me, to have a President who understands how taxes and the uncertainty they place on job creators stifles economic growth. The reason economic growth is so important is that when the economy grows, more jobs are created, and for the jobs that exist, the people who have them will actually earn more money and be able to pursue their dreams.

Just as importantly, though, this President understands that the job cre-

ator is not the enemy. A former colleague of ours, Gordon Smith from Oregon, once told me that the problem with some of our Democratic friends is that they claim to love the worker, but they hate the job creator. To me, that sort of summarized it pretty well. I know he didn't mean "hate" in the traditional sense, but he did mean Congress—and particularly our folks on the Democratic side—likes to implement additional burdens, such as higher taxes or more regulation, more obstacles in the way of our job creators, when we should be tearing down those walls, reducing that regulation, and lowering taxes so that they can be successful, and in the process, we can all succeed. Well, this President understands that our economy, too, is crucial but extremely fragile, and he joins all of us in wanting to do everything he can, and everything we can, to ensure that we continue to be the strongest economy in the world.

Here is why tax reform is so important in the first place. In the words of Arthur Brooks of the American Enterprise Institute, the American Founders promised not just happiness but the pursuit of happiness. That is, of course, in the Declaration of Independence. I think Arthur is onto something. I think that is a good way of putting it. It means that all of us, based on our country's original vision, should be free to follow our dreams without government getting in our way or making our burdens heavy. We should be free to pursue happiness.

Average American citizens should not be numbed or stifled by mandatory participation in a system that depletes their energy and discourages them, and that is what our Tax Code does today. It exhausts people when it comes to fully complying with our arcane and convoluted and complex laws because they are so difficult. So many people simply outsource that by hiring some lawyer or some accountant to prepare their taxes because it is so complex. We can do better than that. We can make it simpler and fairer and flatter.

Today, many of the obstacles that exist prevent the average American from pursuing their dreams and reaching their full potential, which ought to be what joins us all together. One of those is an outdated and highly convoluted tax system that actually penalizes hard work, stymies ingenuity, and enriches the lawyers and accountants that people have to hire in order to just comply with all of its convoluted complexity—so-called compliance costs. Call this the terrible tedium of taxes. It zaps our energy rather than unleashing it. It erodes our work ethic, because if you work harder and harder only to see more and more money go to the Federal Government, what does that do to incentivize people to work harder? It erodes our work ethic, as we see less reason to labor for what ultimately gets taken from us.

The mission of the so-called Big 6 committee, which has been asked to put together a blueprint for reform, has been to protect American jobs and make the Tax Code simpler, fairer, and lower for average American families. In a sense, it is all about putting families first. Families build individuals, and families mold character. We have to give every opportunity to families who need to thrive. We have to keep the uninvited guest of government away from the front door, constantly begging for more money, more time, and more attention, and constantly throwing a wrench into their plans.

I also believe we should provide tax relief for small businesses because small businesses are literally the engine of our economy. It is not the Fortune 500 that creates the vast percentage of jobs in this country. It is small businesses, which often face an unyielding regulatory state. We should lower taxes for all American businesses so they can compete with foreign ones.

As the so-called Big 6 committee has said, the goal of any new plan should be, first and foremost, to reduce tax rates as much as possible. Let's make sure this "first cut is the deepest," as the song goes, but also to place a priority on permanence, to create a system that encourages American companies to bring jobs back from overseas, along with the profits they will not bring back because they will be taxed twice, and to put more money back in the pockets of all Americans.

As Ronald Reagan said, there is one simple fact you have to keep in mind when it comes to taxes: "The problem is not that the people are taxed too little, the problem is that the Government spends too much."

This is not just about sheer wealth we are after but about earned success—the ability of mothers, fathers, and families to work a long day and to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks to use as they please—to save it for their retirement, to spend it on their house, or even to dote on their children. When families get to keep more of the money they earn, they are more inclined to take advantage of or to create their own opportunities, including new businesses. Social mobility increases and so does room for charity.

The United States is the most charitable and generous country in the world. People don't just turn to government for help during times of need. We saw that in Hurricane Harvey and in Hurricane Irma and now in Hurricane Maria. Many, many Americans generously dip into their own resources to help provide for their fellow human beings in need during times of tragedy. It is our prosperity that comes from job creation—getting to keep more of what you earn and pay the government less—that makes that possible.

When Alexis de Tocqueville came to the United States, shortly after our

country's founding, in his book "Democracy in America," he pointed out that one of the unique things about America—certainly much different than Europe—was the organizing and voluntary associations. These often are charitable organizations—whether they are churches or synagogues or mosques or just community organizations—that as part of their good work provide charitable benefits for our fellow man and woman. We ought to encourage that.

Of course, none of us is an island. It is not that lower tax rates translate to everyone looking out exclusively for No. 1. Oftentimes, that is the way our friends across the aisle will depict lowering taxes. They say: You are lowering taxes for the rich.

We want to lower taxes for everybody—not because it benefits an individual but because it benefits the country and it benefits all Americans. It makes us more competitive globally. It creates more jobs and opportunities for Americans who are looking for those jobs and opportunities. It creates incentives for investment so that the entrepreneur can start a business, come up with a new idea, change the world, and create jobs and opportunities for other people at the same time.

We know that social obligations are still important. It is just that there are many ways of meeting them other than just cutting a big paycheck to the Federal Government every April. In fact, the higher taxes we pay, the easier it is for citizens to assume that, well, I have paid the Federal Government; so let the government take care of it.

That is not who we are. That is not who we have been. That is certainly not how we began. We began as a government that believed in the individuality and the importance of all individuals, and we all collectively benefit when each of us is free to pursue their dreams because that increases the prosperity and the opportunities for all.

We will never become, I hope and pray, a country that says: It is the government's job when it comes to taking care of a man or woman or a family in need. Yes, government has a role to play, but I hope we will always be the generous sort of country that we started out to be and that we still are today, with neighbors helping neighbors.

Middle-class Americans have experienced a decade of higher taxes, more regulation, and stagnant economic growth under the last administration. It is time to break out of that cycle, and this is our time to do that.

Every American knows we can do better. If you ask them: Are your taxes hard to prepare, is it complicated, are you confused, or do you feel like the Federal Government is getting a bigger bite out of your paycheck than it should, I think you would get near unanimity that the Tax Code is too com-

plex, the Federal Government is too voracious when it comes to taking a bite out of your paycheck, and people would welcome the ability to keep more of what they earn.

It is time for us to show that we understand the plight of hard-working American families and people of all economic levels, that we are hearing them when they say they want to keep more of the paycheck they earn and they want us to lower their cost of living by lowering the tax bite out of the paycheck they do earn.

Americans are wondering what our tax reform policies will be. For me, here are some nonnegotiable items. The Tax Code must be simplified. Job creators must be incentivized to keep well-paying jobs here at home in the United States. American competitiveness in a global economy must be increased by lowering business tax rates.

The result should be a new, retooled system that will put more money in the pockets of middle-class families and reenergize our economy. It will benefit Americans in every State across the country. It will also make it possible for us to meet our other priorities, as the Federal Treasury also will benefit from more people working, earning better wages, and helping to support their government. It will make it possible for us to spend more money on our priorities, like national defense, which right now is underfunded, or medical research or other priorities that the American people may have.

By delivering on these principles, we can restore prosperity for this generation and many generations to come, and we can keep the promise of the Declaration of Independence that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Ultimately, that is what we are talking about when we talk about tax reform. We shouldn't just be wearing green eyeshades, getting out our spreadsheets, and counting the numbers. This is about keeping the promise of the Declaration of Independence that we are endowed by our Creator with an unalienable right to pursue happiness.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, our Constitution begins with three simple words: "We the People." The Founders wrote that in supersized font to remind us that this is what our Nation is all about. It is not about power by the

privileged. It is not the elite. It is not to make the wealthy wealthier. It is not to add more to the abundance of those who already have much. It is to establish government that reflects the will of the people or, as President Lincoln put it, “of the people, by the people, for the people.”

In this age where vast sums are spent on campaigns by a few billionaires to basically substitute government of, by, and for the people with government of, by, and for the powerful, we have an enormous challenge to maintain the integrity of the mission of our Constitution and the responsibility of this Senate.

We probably haven't seen a challenge to “we the people” in years like the equivalent of TrumpCare. Certainly, it is designed to plan for massive tax giveaways to the wealthiest Americans of hundreds of billions of dollars and to rip healthcare away from 20 to 30 million ordinary working families.

What a travesty that is of our responsibility under our Constitution. What amazingly misguided effort to do damage, rather than to assist and provide a foundation for families to thrive.

A few years ago, a woman came up to me at a fundraiser for multiple sclerosis—a walk—and she said: Things are so different this year, Senator, than they were last year.

I asked her: How so?

She said: A year ago, if our loved one was diagnosed with MS and they had insurance, they were likely to have an annual cap or a lifetime cap and run out of coverage.

That was a terrible situation to be in because MS is a mysterious and expensive disease.

She said: If the individual didn't have insurance, they now had a preexisting condition, and they wouldn't be able to get insurance.

She said: Now, we have the peace of mind that if our loved one gets an MS diagnosis, that individual will be able to get the care they need.

Isn't that the summary of what we should be seeking in our healthcare system—the peace of mind that if our child or our loved one becomes ill, if our child or our loved one becomes injured, he or she will get the care they need? Shouldn't that be what we are fighting for?

Instead, we had the opposite. We had the TrumpCare bill that was designed to rip peace of mind away, destroy peace of mind, trample all over peace of mind so the wealthy could have more giveaways from the Federal Treasury.

We had that House bill, and it was estimated that 23 million people would lose healthcare over 10 years and that our hospitals and our clinics would have a lot less funding to be able to provide care to everyone. Yet it passed the House. Then President Trump got briefed on what was in the bill after he

held a champagne party at the White House and celebrated its passage. He said: Oh, wait. This bill is mean and heartless.

Over here in the Senate, the Senate's secret 13 went to work to try to produce a bill without holding any public hearings or having any discussions with stakeholders. They were secreted away in a room, and no one could find out where they were in order to be able to offer any insights. They did not hold any townhalls back home, and they had no meetings here. The public was totally blocked out. The secret 13, amazingly, came up with an almost identical bill to the House bill. Oh, the estimate was instead, maybe, of there being 23 million people who would lose insurance, 22 million people would lose insurance. Fortunately, the secret 13 bill was defeated—but just barely—here in this Chamber.

Then came another version of this called the fake insurance bill. This fake insurance version said: Hey, let's let the insurance companies put out policies that are really, really cheap but that do not actually cover anything. Won't that make us feel good that everyone in America will be able to afford a policy that only costs \$40 or \$50 a month.

Of course, fake insurance is fake; that is, when you go to the emergency room, it does not cover the visit. When you get a blood test, it does not cover the blood test. When you get an x ray or an MRI, it does not pay for it. Oh, don't even begin to think about its covering hospitalization or any other normal medical service because it is fake insurance. The fake insurance bill failed by a few votes on the Senate floor.

Then we had repeal without replacement, and that failed. Then we had the skinny bill, and that failed by a single vote.

How is it possible that we came that close to passing a bill that is completely the opposite of the vision of our Constitution—to legislate for the foundation, for the American people, not the American privileged and not the American powerful. Yet it came within a vote of passing.

This week, we have the block grant version—the block grant version that proceeds to destroy immediately the exchanges, the healthcare marketplaces. Of course, the great irony is, that was the Republican idea: Let's create a marketplace within which people can compare individual policies, pick the ones best for their families, and get tax credits to be able to buy them. So the Republicans came out against their own plan.

In addition, it wiped out Medicaid expansion. In my home State of Oregon, the exchange is responsible for roughly another 100,000 people getting access to insurance, the marketplace, and 400,000 people gaining access through Medicaid

expansion. There are a half a million Americans in just my State, my humble State of Oregon. Yet here was a bill that said: We do not care. We are going to wipe out healthcare for a half a million Oregonians and untold millions across the country—20 to 30 million across the country.

We owe a big thank-you to grassroots America. We owe a big thank-you to ordinary citizens who believe in the vision of this country. They proceeded to connect with Capitol Hill—to fill the streets and to flood the phones and to overflow our inboxes—saying: What are you doing? Please stop. Please stop trying to destroy the peace of mind of Americans. They said: Make healthcare work better, not worse.

Is that really too much for us to ask?

As we ponder how to make healthcare work better, those in grassroots America have expressed a lot of ideas. They have said: We have a really complicated system that creates all kinds of obstacles for ordinary families, for working families.

For example, consider whether you have a job that provides you with insurance and your family with insurance but then the company changes the policy and only covers you. How are you going to get your children covered? Are you going to be able to get them signed up right away in the Children's Health Insurance Program? How do you go about doing that?

Then your employer says: By the way, you now have to start paying us in order for us to provide you with healthcare.

You say: Wow. That is a huge chunk out of my check. Can I possibly afford that and still pay my rent? Am I going to have to choose between healthcare and homelessness? It is not a choice families should have to make.

Then, perhaps, people are working several part-time jobs, and their employers have no healthcare programs at all, so they sign up for the Oregon Health Plan or the equivalent Medicaid plan across the country. They might like that, but it is complicated to apply, and they have to reapply periodically. What happens if their incomes go up just a little, and now they are over the line for eligibility? As a result of being over the line, they now have to go back into the individual markets. How do you do that in the middle of the year when it is not an open enrollment period?

There is such complexity, such difficulty. That is why it is so appealing to think about the vision of a seamless, simple healthcare program that you have that will provide quality healthcare when you need it—portable healthcare—just by virtue of your being an American. That is a beautiful vision, and it is not out of reach. Every other developed country has found some version of that and made it a reality. We need to ponder as to how to

have that seamless, simple system down the road, but right now we have a more immediate task.

That immediate task is to stop the sabotage of the healthcare system we have. President Trump has engaged in many maneuvers to try to force the collapse of the insurance markets. One is to withhold the cost-sharing payments from insurers so they no longer have the funds they were promised. That uncertainty has caused many companies to say: Do not count on us to be in that market in the future if we cannot count on you, the Federal Government, to honor your obligations.

Why isn't the Senate body demanding that the President honor the obligations of those cost-sharing payments?

In addition, we have the President shutting down advertising during the open period so people will not know they can sign up. We have President Trump cutting the enrollment period in half. We have a plan now from the administration to cut the funds for consumer outreach and enrollment assistance, which enables folks who need to get healthcare to find out how they can actually get through the complicated application process.

Most recently, the administration announced it is actually going to shut down the website periodically on weekends during the open enrollment period, which is when people will have the time and effort and ability to apply. They are going to shut down the website so people will not be able to apply during portions of the weekend.

All of us should unite—100 Senators should unite—and tell President Trump: Enough of this sabotage. If you want to drive up insurance policies by 20 percent over any other increase they might otherwise have and if you want to be responsible for millions of people not gaining access because of your irresponsibility, then we are going to hold you accountable for it. Everybody in grassroots America is going to hold you accountable for it.

Fortunately, we have a bipartisan process that has been underway to remedy these conditions. I, profoundly, thank LAMAR ALEXANDER, chair of the HELP Committee, and PATTY MURRAY, the ranking Democrat on the HELP Committee, for saying: Let's have the normal, rational process that we go through to try to understand how we can improve the healthcare system.

They have held a series of hearings. They have brought in the experts, and they have brought in the stakeholders. They have done it in front of the public so the public can weigh in. They have consulted constituents and encouraged all of us to consult with our constituents and be part of that conversation. Pragmatic, experienced legislators are gaining expertise from those on the frontline so they can make the system work better. Isn't that the way the Senate is supposed to work?

Their work shows a lot of promise. There are some very straightforward things they have heard from those experts.

They have heard we need to lock down the cost-sharing payments. No insurance companies are going to be in the insurance markets if they do not know they are going to get paid what they have been promised or they are going to raise their premiums incredibly high to cover the risk that they will not get paid. Then, of course, people will not be able to afford that insurance.

They have heard from the experts that you have to have reinsurance. If you want to have this private marketplace in which people can compare policies and use tax credits to buy the policies, an insurance company will not enter that market unless it has its own insurance policy against getting the disproportionate share of the really sick people. Of reinsurance, they have heard.

They have also heard we must not suppress outreach to those who need insurance but increase outreach—outreach to younger, healthier people to make sure they are part of the exchange as well as outreach to those who are often working several part-time jobs and have little time to focus on this question unless someone reaches out and says: Here is your opportunity. We are now in the open period. Here is how you sign up, and we can make sure you get that done.

In that set of hearings, they heard other things. They heard we need to do more to take on the challenge of mental illness in America. They heard we need to do more to take on drug addiction, the opioid epidemic in America.

There it is—a list of a modest number of things we could do together to make our healthcare work better. Wouldn't that be a beautiful closing chapter to the nightmare, the repeated horror stories we have been playing in the Senate that threaten to rip healthcare from millions of people and simply awaken from that war over healthcare and work together to address these fundamental questions.

We actually have had public hearings in the HELP Committee, which we have not done before. We have actually listened to the experts, which we have not done before. We have actually encouraged people to consult with their constituents rather than to hide from their constituents. The result would be a significant strengthening of what we have—lower premiums as a result, more competition in the exchanges, more awareness of how to sign up, more and healthier young people getting involved in the exchanges, which means the premiums will come down.

I think, as we ponder the goal of our healthcare system—the question of peace of mind—that is our best immediate step forward to provide peace of

mind, to end the sabotage of the system we have, and address the shortcomings the healthcare experts and the people of America have pointed out.

Let us be that mission statement under this vision of a “we the people” government, in that we pursue healthcare that is designed for the people of America in order to create peace of mind, so when their loved ones become ill or when their loved ones are injured, they will get the care they need, and they will not end up bankrupt. We should be able to make that happen.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last week the Senate passed the bipartisan Defense Authorization Act. The world is a very dangerous place. This legislation is very important to keeping our country safe.

Another thing we need to do to keep America safe is to get the economy going and growing. We need a strong and healthy economy in this country, and we need it now. A strong economy means a strong country with enough money to pay for the defense needs that we have at this time.

Over the 8 years of the Obama administration, Washington doubled its debt. Why? Because our economy grew so slowly and the administration spent too much money. If this sort of thing continues, it is going to leave America in a much more vulnerable position.

America needs a stronger economy that grows faster. To get the kind of growth we need, we are going to have to provide real tax relief for America, for hard-working families, and for the economy. That means cutting tax rates, and it means simplifying taxes for everyone. If we get this right, we are going to be able to produce more jobs, Americans will have higher wages, more take-home pay, and we will have a stronger economy.

According to the Internal Revenue Service, Americans spend about 6 billion hours a year on taxes, just trying to prepare their taxes. Between businesses and individual families, we spend an average of 18 hours for every man, woman, and child in America, just trying to comply with Washington's complicated Tax Code. The National Taxpayers Union says that the total cost of all of this is \$263 billion a year. That works out to about \$800 for every person in America. This is not spending that does anything productive. It is just figuring out how much

tax to pay, and how to do it in a way to send it back to Washington so that the IRS will not come knocking at your door—how to get your numbers right.

The instructions for last year's standard 1040 tax form were 106 pages long. These are the instructions—15 different worksheets for people to fill out just to try to fill out the forms. The people who can deal with this level of complexity are the ones who basically can afford to hire expensive accountants and lawyers, who then take full advantage of a very complicated tax code. It penalizes hard-working Americans who can't afford the high-priced help that helps them fill out and take full advantage of a complicated tax code.

We hear a lot about people who talk about how millionaires and billionaires are gaming the system so that they can pay less in taxes. If that is their concern, then maybe we should try to make this system simple enough that there is no system to game and everyone can understand it.

Just think about how much we could save this country if we simplify things even a little bit. All the time we could save, all the extra money in the pockets of hard-working American families—that would really help to grow the economy and do it quickly. It would also make life a lot simpler for most Americans.

If we also, at the same time as simplifying the Tax Code, lower the tax rates, that keeps even more money in people's pockets. It gives them more money to decide what to save, what to spend, and what to invest—money they can spend going out to dinner if they choose. They can invest it if they want, and save for the future. If they actually choose to spend the money by going out to dinner, that helps the economy around the community where they live. People at the restaurants have to hire additional servers, and they will then have money to pay their own bills. That is how an economy grows. That is how providing people with more money in their pockets helps an economy become stronger and healthier.

There is another important part of tax relief we need to remember. We need to be sure we solve a big problem with the taxes that not just individuals pay but that businesses pay. The reason we need to do that is because many people think of businesses as big, faceless companies, but the simple fact is that these businesses actually don't pay the taxes personally. People have to pay the taxes. That is because businesses pay taxes with money they get from their customers.

If the government says it is going to put a big tax on some company, that basically gets passed on to the workers there and also to the people who buy that product. The Congressional Bud-

et Office looked into this. Their office looked into it, and they found that more than 70 percent of the cost of corporate taxes actually comes from the people who work for these businesses. Nearly 3 out of every 4 dollars they spend in taxes would have ended up going back to the workers to have that money—workers who are either buying products or workers working within the company. Maybe it would have been higher wages or better benefits or some other way that people would have gotten a benefit from the money that otherwise just gets collected and sent to the government.

Obviously, a big chunk of the money is from the workers, and another big chunk is from the consumers. If a family buys something, part of the price they are paying is to cover the taxes that business has to pay. The higher taxes mean higher prices for people who go to buy something.

The third way that people pay these business taxes is when they get paid by the people who own a share of the business. If you take a look, there are a lot of people on the other side of the aisle who like to talk about taxing the rich who own stock in companies that are all across our country. The only problem is, most of the people who actually own shares in these companies are far from rich. More than half of Americans actually own stocks in corporations that are paying these high taxes. Maybe they have an IRA, a retirement plan, a 401(k) through their work. Whatever it is, Americans who are investing for their future are also being taxed.

Some of the biggest owners of these corporations are actually the pension funds of public employees. That includes teachers, it includes firefighters, it includes people in every community around America. Taxes take away money that could make these pensions worth more. When the government takes taxes away, there is less money in the pension plans for our teachers, for our firefighters, for our first responders. So it is a real problem that the corporate tax rates are so high because high taxes hold back the entire economy and hold back the entire country.

If you look at the most developed countries around the world, the United States has the highest corporate tax rate of all of them. The average tax rate of all of these major countries around the world—across the globe—is 24 percent. In the United States, it is 39 percent. We are 15 percent higher in tax rates than the average of the major countries around the world. So that is the top Federal rate, and when you include the average for State and local taxes, it gets you to 39 percent—24 percent versus 39 percent. That is how far out of the ordinary American taxes have become.

It is a huge disadvantage for American companies that are trying to com-

pete on the world stage. Frankly, the reason we are at such a disadvantage is that other countries have been cutting their tax rates over the years. There was actually a time when the U.S. tax rates were fairly low, and other countries continued to cut theirs below ours. Now we are at a point that the average for developed countries around the world is at 24 percent, and the United States is at 39 percent. Places like Germany, Japan, and Canada have all cut their rates going back over the last 60, 70 years. We haven't done it here at all. Now it is time to do it.

It is one of the reasons our economy has been stuck with the slow growth rate that we had during the Obama administration. It is what we have seen over the last 8 years—a very sluggish economy with very little growth. If we can cut corporate tax rates, personal rates, that is going to really help stimulate the economy.

People pay taxes. It is the individuals who pay the taxes that in many ways run the government. Many people I talk to in Wyoming feel, rightly so, that the problem isn't that they are taxed too little; it is that the government takes too much.

We need to get the economy going, and we can do that by simplifying and lowering the tax rates. It is true that, with taxes, people actually struggle with trying to figure them out at the kitchen table. I have talked to those folks at home. It is continually a problem—the simplification, as well as how much money the government takes from them. Taxes raise prices. Taxes chip away at retirement savings that people have.

Tax relief and simplifying taxes makes sense for American families. It means more jobs. It means higher wages. It means a safer America and a stronger America. It is good for our economy, and it is good for all hard-working taxpayers and the families those taxpayers support.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. COONS. Madam President, yesterday we learned that, once again, my Republican colleagues do not have the votes to pass their latest effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act, even though the budget reconciliation process we are currently under requires only 50 votes. There are not 50 votes.

Many of my colleagues have spoken on this floor about the challenges, the problems, or the issues with the latest iteration of the Graham-Cassidy bill. We have also heard as a body from many organizations all over the country that represent Americans in healthcare: the American Medical Association, which speaks for America's doctors; the American Hospital Association, which speaks for our hospitals;

America's Health Insurance Plans; the American Cancer Society; many other patient advocacy groups; and the AARP, which advocates for seniors. All have weighed in about the challenges with this legislation.

But rather than continuing to bear down on that point, I would like to quote a colleague and hero of mine. Senator JOHN MCCAIN said on this floor:

We should not be content to pass healthcare legislation on a party-line basis. . . . The issue is too important, and too many lives are at risk, for us to leave the American people guessing from one election to the next whether and how they will acquire health insurance. A bill of this impact requires a bipartisan approach.

Senator MCCAIN also said:

I hope that in the months ahead, we can join with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to arrive at a compromise solution that is acceptable to most of us, and serves the interests of Americans as best we can.

Senator MCCAIN is right. Fixing and improving our healthcare system cannot be done on a partisan basis. When it has been attempted to turn big bills into law on a narrow party-line basis, the results are often not sustainable. That is why we have work to do together, because this issue of providing for America's healthcare is too complex, too big, and too important for us to do with only one wing or one party.

I was encouraged, as were many colleagues, Republican and Democratic, when Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY, the Republican and Democratic leaders of the Senate Health and Education Committee, held bipartisan hearings. They brought in Governors, insurance commissioners, healthcare experts, physicians, and hospital leaders from across the country to talk about what we need to do short term and long term to stabilize healthcare markets and to lay the foundation for improvements to our healthcare system.

So let's listen to Senator MCCAIN. Let's give that bipartisan effort another chance. Let's work together and do this the right way.

I ride the train back and forth almost every day from Wilmington to Washington, and the Delawareans I hear from on that train or at home in the grocery store or around my State are simply tired of Congress fighting endless partisan battles with their healthcare. And it is not just frustrating to hear about on television; we know for a fact that uncertainty in the healthcare markets is causing premiums to go up for Americans all over the country. The CEO of Highmark, which is the sole provider of individual market health insurance to the ACA market in Delaware now, conveyed to me that half of the rate increase for this coming year was due to uncertainty about whether the Trump administration would continue to enforce the individual mandate, to make the

CSR payments, and other things that are part of the ACA.

So today, recognizing that the only way this gets fixed in such a closely divided and partisan Senate is if we work together, I would like to commit again to my constituents and colleagues that I am willing to work to find bipartisan solutions to our healthcare problems.

Let's sit down together, and let's bring in organizations like the AMA, the AARP, the American Cancer Society, the American Hospital Association, and let's listen. Let's listen to them, to healthcare leaders, and to patient advocates, and frankly I think we should listen to thousands of faith leaders from across the country as well. We have received letters—all of us as a body—from leaders of the Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh, and Buddhist communities across our country. They jointly wrote a letter to Congress urging us to reject the Graham-Cassidy bill and to immediately address urgent matters that are right in front of us.

The next one is CHIP reauthorization. CHIP—the Children's Health Insurance Program—serves nearly 9 million American children, 17,000 in Delaware alone, and it is going to expire. There are a lot of Federal health programs that expire at the end of this week: the Children's Health Insurance Program, the Community Health Center Fund, which provides access to cost-effective primary and preventive care for 26 million patients throughout the country; the teaching health centers funding; the special diabetes program. There is a whole list of healthcare-related programs that expire at the end of this week. So I think we need a sense of urgency. We need a sense of urgency to finding ways to work together in the short term to stabilize the market, to extend these programs, such as CHIP, that have long enjoyed bipartisan support and to begin the steps needed to show flexibility and compromise by both parties.

First, as I said, we have to stabilize the individual ACA marketplace. Fortunately, we know how to do that. As I mentioned, there have already been hearings in which testimony was received from Governors, insurance commissioners, healthcare experts, and they said the No. 1 priority was funding the ACA cost-sharing reduction subsidies, or CSR payments. That is something the Trump administration can do today. The administration can simply announce that they will continue to meet the law and make those payments. At least in my State, that will reduce the rate of increase of individual insurance premiums by a significant percentage.

We can also work together to establish a reinsurance program, to support enrollment outreach activities, and to enforce the individual mandate. All of this would translate to lower premiums. As I said, the President is al-

ready authorized under the ACA to take a few of these steps and stabilize the marketplace.

From there, we are going to have to find bipartisan ways that we can make this a more workable system. I have introduced legislation in the past to make the ACA small business tax credits more appropriately sized for the small businesses I have heard from in Delaware, many of which can't afford the increased costs of the Affordable Care Act.

There are ways we can work together to reduce the reporting requirements so they are less burdensome to employers. I introduced a bill on that in the last Congress and would welcome a chance to work with a Republican colleague to introduce and pass that legislation now.

We could also look at ways to make the tax credits—or the way that subsidies are provided through the ACA—both more affordable and more sustainable, so that families who qualify aren't caught in a situation where they qualify for tax credits, but they are nowhere near enough to afford comprehensive health insurance.

We also have to take a hard, bipartisan look at what is driving up healthcare costs across this country. We aren't just challenged with resolving issues around health insurance; we also have to find a bipartisan path toward addressing healthcare costs.

The bottom line to all of this is that we must work together to return to regular order and to give these programs the stability and certainty they need to serve patients across the country and our constituents at home.

In my view, the Affordable Care Act has helped millions of Americans live healthier, safer, more secure lives. Repealing it and replacing it with one of the proposals we have seen in recent months would have been very harmful to millions of Americans. But that doesn't mean the ACA is perfect. There is hard work to do. Compromise is needed on both sides. And I think the call that Senator MCCAIN has issued to this Chamber is one we should hear.

So let's work together. Let's listen to our constituents. Let's listen to faith leaders. Let's listen to doctors and healthcare experts. Let's do the hard work and together improve, not tear down, our healthcare system.

Thank you.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO EMILY ENDERLE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I bid a public farewell to Emily

Enderle, who is here with me and who has served as the lead on my very active and busy environment unit for quite some time now. She is going on to another role in Washington and will continue to serve our cause. She has done an amazing job, and I want to be sure to say that on what will be her last appearance on the floor with me for one of our "Time to Wake Up" speeches.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, I have spoken before, as you know, about the fossil fuel industry's persistent effort to undermine public understanding of climate change and to confuse people about the actual effects of carbon pollution on our atmosphere and oceans.

I have mentioned Drexel University Professor Robert Brulles' follow-the-money analysis, which reveals the complex network of organizations and funding—what we have called the web of denial—that is designed to obscure the fossil fuel industry's fingerprints and to perpetuate the fossil fuel industry's climate denial.

Dr. Brulle calls this "a deliberate and organized effort to misdirect the public discussion and distort the public's understanding of climate." That is what this industry is up to.

One front group for that industry is called the Heartland Institute. It is a nice name, but they are not very nice people. For decades, the Heartland Institute has played a prominent role disseminating alternative facts and fake science at the behest of its industry funders. They have a long history of doing the bidding of industry funders. In the 1990s, it was teamed up with Philip Morris to challenge the facts about the health risks of tobacco. Using the same tactics—along with funding from the Koch Family Foundations, ExxonMobil, and other fossil fuel interests—it undermines public confidence in the established scientific consensus about climate change. Heartland is quite shameless in its methods, once sponsoring a billboard comparing those who accept the science of global warming to the Unabomber.

For my 180th "Time to Wake Up" speech, I would like to explore the Heartland Institute's latest gambit, which is to airdrop climate denial propaganda directly into children's classrooms.

This spring, Heartland delivered packages to hundreds of thousands of K-12 and college-level science teachers across the country. These materials were designed to have a veneer of credibility. Each one was stamped with the headline "Study: Science Teachers Giving Unbalanced Education on Climate Change." This intriguing story was attributed to something called Environment & Climate News.

Inside the package, the teachers found a report titled "Why Scientists

Disagree About Global Warming." It was issued by something called the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change. As a bonus, each teacher also received a DVD copy of the "History of Climate Change in Greenland," produced by Idea Channel.

A cover letter from Heartland's Center for Transforming Education—transforming education into propaganda, I assume—is how that sentence gets finished—asks teachers to "consider the possibility" the science of climate change isn't settled.

That is the package they got. Let's look behind that veneer. When you do, the smell gets pretty rotten. It turns out that the Environment & Climate News is not actually news. It is not a news outlet. It is the monthly newsletter of, guess who, the Heartland Institute. They are citing themselves, masquerading their newsletter as a news outlet. The foolishness goes on.

Their featured article, "Study: Science Teachers Giving Unbalanced Education on Climate Change" was written by a person named Bonner Cohen, who is a featured expert—guess where—with the Heartland Institute, who previously held senior positions in—believe it or not—Philip Morris front groups.

Their Nongovernmental International Panel On Climate Change sounds like a well-known actual authority: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The actual Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a United Nations-sanctioned, Nobel Prize-winning scientific body that reports the findings of thousands of climate scientists from hundreds of countries. The Heartland group—this so-called Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change—is a misleading decoy designed to mimic the real entity.

The three experts who wrote the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change report Heartland pushed out do not have degrees in climate change modeling, do not have degrees in climate science. All are paid by Heartland. All their claims have been repeatedly debunked by real science.

There is one faint hint of accuracy in this propaganda publication Heartland put out. There actually is a PBS series called Idea Channel. However, the Idea Channel DVD in the Heartland packet has nothing to do with that series. It was actually produced by something called the Free To Choose Network, whose funding, like Heartland's, is linked to the fossil fuel industry. It is another masquerade designed to mislead.

One of the tricks of Heartland's little scheme was to dupe legitimate scientists into participating. One of the experts interviewed, Rie Oldenberg, the curator at Greenland's Narsaq Museum, was told she was participating in

a video on Norse history for the Discovery Channel. When she found out what she had been duped into, she said: "I am somewhat horrified."

Other participants are frequent fliers in the climate denial circus, like Willie Soon, who received over a million dollars in funding since 2001 from the Koch brothers, the American Petroleum Institute, ExxonMobil, and other fossil fuel interests. The year the video was released, Willie Soon received nearly \$20,000 from Free To Choose.

The Heartland cover letter asked teachers to "consider the possibility" the science of climate change isn't settled. Even that is not new. This echoes the infamous Big Tobacco declaration, "Doubt is our product." The heart of the fossil fuel industry's scheme is to undermine legitimate science with false doubts. Because of the financial stakes behind industry science denial and because of the communications advantages propaganda has over real science—you don't need to waste a lot of time in peer review, for instance, you go straight to the networks—this scheme is a real problem for institutions like our schools that cherish and support real science.

All this masquerade and subterfuge by Heartland Institute looked a lot like fraud. Senators SCHATZ, WARREN, MARKEY, and I wrote to Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos to ask whether DeVos and her staff at the Department of Education helped or coordinated with the Heartland Institute on this scheme to pollute our classrooms with phony science.

That simple request drew quite the response from our friends at the Heartland Institute. "Your letter is a monumental misuse of your office and a betrayal of the trust of your constituents," wrote Heartland CEO Joseph Bast. He called our letter "defamatory" and "despicable." "Shame, shame, shame," he proclaimed in bold font—this, unironically, from that same classy group that put up the billboard comparing anyone who accepts climate science to the Unabomber, just to give you an idea of their level of shame.

Even that little outburst is considerably nicer than in 2015 when Bast called some of us "fascists" and "ethically challenged . . . mental midgets."

Why is the Heartland Institute so very touchy? We obviously hit a nerve. The lesson is, poke an imposter and the imposter gets very agitated. Fortunately, teachers are smart people who follow real science. Imposters like Heartland that pretend their stuff is coming through an Idea Channel that it isn't, that mimic the name of real organizations to try to fool people, that pretend their newsletter is real news and package the whole thing up as if it is intended to be helpful to teachers face an uphill battle against informed educators.

One example, Nebraska recently approved new State standards requiring climate change to be taught in schools. According to the Omaha World-Herald, Nebraska's new standards "challenge kids to think and act like scientists," which is exactly what our science classrooms ought to do.

One Omaha resident encouraged the school board to "do the ethical thing and tell the next generation what's going on with climate." A science professor at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln said the standards represented "good solid science, good solid science education."

This is what we need in science education—real-life scientists from real institutions of higher learning engaging and helping our children learn. What we don't need are fossil fuel front groups pumping out more phony science to pollute public education, just like they pollute our oceans and atmosphere.

I have been pretty heartened to hear about this from teachers working in classrooms in my home State of Rhode Island. Holly Emery teaches science to seventh and eighth graders at Exeter-West Greenwich Junior High School. Her students focus on solutions to climate change—something we could use a bit more of around here. They examined Germany's plan to significantly reduce its carbon emissions. Students were so motivated by what they heard, they requested to share their projects with other grades in the school. One of Miss Emery's students said: "This is important and the other kids need to know."

Students in Jane Ramos's eighth grade science class at Gallagher Middle School in Smithfield learn about climates around the world. They read, research, and make slides about the human contributions to climate change, including the carbon cycle, burning fossil fuels and the greenhouse effect, deforestation, livestock practices, and the production of methane. They discuss the effects of warmer oceans, expansion of water, melting ice, and rising seawater levels. These are important issues for Rhode Island, the Ocean State.

Science students from Brenda Dillmann's class at South Kingstown High School planted grass on the Narrow River salt marsh as part of a major unit on climate. During the lessons, the students learned about the role that salt marshes play as carbon sinks—absorbent carbon from the atmosphere. They went out and got dirty and planted by hand some 35,000 seedlings of 3 different types of salt marsh grasses.

Since 2007, more than 500 students have become climate experts in Kara Ratigan and Renee Hadfield's fourth grade class at James H. Eldredge Elementary School in East Greenwich. Ratigan and Hadfield have developed a

curriculum that integrates climate change across all subject areas. For the kids, the year begins with a visit to a local assisted living facility, where students pair up with a senior buddy. The students interview their senior buddies, asking how the climate has changed over time and looking for lessons that can be applied today.

In their math class, students learn how to read charts and graphs and how to frame a convincing argument through data. In social studies, the students learn about the regions of the United States, about their differing climates, and about how each is affected by climate change. In science, the students learn about erosion and weather patterns and the effects of human activity on rock, soils, and sediments. Students make observations about climate change all around them and delve into society's responses to the harms of climate change.

This past spring, the Norman Bird Sanctuary, in Middletown, hosted seventh graders for a beach ecology lesson at nearby Third Beach. The director of education, Rachel Holbert, and her staff led a discussion with the students about the greenhouse effect associated with burning fossil fuels. They explained how the excess heat trapped in the atmosphere puts stress on the oceans, undermining the oceans' ability to stabilize the global climate and, of course, leading, as we have seen, to a higher frequency and strength of extreme weather events, such as powerful hurricanes. The kids' lesson ended with a focus on solutions. If the oceans are the heart and lungs of the climate, what can prevent future damage?

Teachers like them play such an important and formative role in helping the next generation understand the world we live in. They teach our children to make observations, collect information, and use evidence to formulate conclusions. They are honest and they are decent.

The fossil fuel industry, on the other hand, is neither honest nor decent. The filthy hand of the fossil fuel industry has, regrettably, a firm grip on this Congress. There is a reason that we never do anything about climate change, and it does not involve the merits of the issue. It involves the politics of the industry. We have, perhaps, not yet plumbed the bottom of how low they are willing to go, but, surely, this is a new low to reach with their game of phony science, masquerade, and subterfuge into our children's classrooms, like Ms. Emery's, Ms. Ramos's, Ms. Dillmann's, Ms. Ratigan's, and Ms. Hadfield's. These honorable, decent teachers help their students gain a fact-based understanding of the changing world around them and the issues facing our society. Unfortunately, these Heartland Institute materials may require those teachers to teach about politics and propaganda as well.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, we are looking at an outline for tax reform that helps working families in ways that those families haven't seen for almost a decade now—a decade of buying power that didn't go up and obligations that did, with more government requirements and less take-home pay. So we are going to be here for the next few weeks talking about what we can do to reverse that situation so that the opportunity for those families is reversed and that eventually we also reverse our competitiveness so that we create better jobs.

There are two ways to get more take-home pay. One is for the government to take less out of it—and I am for that—and the other one is to do things in the Tax Code to make us more competitive so that there are better jobs with better pay to start with. If we combine those two things—better jobs and better pay—with the government taking less out of that higher paycheck, that is really where families would like to be. We are going to be here talking about this in a way that drives toward a result.

The Senator from West Virginia is here, and she is basically going to start that effort today, as we really now have enough specifics on what the Finance Committee is looking at in the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee in the House and what the White House is looking at. We can begin to explain to American working families why this is the right course for them and for our country.

I am pleased to be joined here by Senator CAPITO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator BLUNT, for your leadership.

I am excited about what we are talking about today. I am excited for my State of West Virginia. The main thing that people in West Virginia want is a good job. A good job, with more take-home pay and a higher wage, is exceedingly important to the families I represent, so tax reform and any other policies Congress could support will enhance growth and create more job opportunities around the country.

Let me focus on my State of West Virginia. According to the Economic Innovation Group, more than 34 percent of West Virginians are living in distressed communities. Unfortunately, that number is the third highest of any State in the country. At the

same time, only 3.4 percent of West Virginians are living in prosperous communities.

There are States that are prosperous and have done very well, but the vast majority of our States have really struggled. Only two in five communities have seen any job growth in the past 5 years during our so-called recovery. That is not the definition of a recovery. Since 2010, fully 50 percent of U.S. job growth has occurred in just 2 percent of our country's counties. Think about that. Economic growth has only occurred in 2 percent of the counties across this great country.

The truth is that most of our country has been mired in economic stagnation. We have been standing still. I saw Lou Holtz give a speech one time, and he said: If you are standing still, you are going backward. If you are not moving forward, you are going backward. There has been a slow recovery, but for many West Virginians, there has been no recovery at all.

But it isn't all doom and gloom in our State because we have an opportunity for change—the change we really need that helps our struggling, working-class families, that changes and revitalizes our distressed communities, changes that lead to economic growth and creates opportunity for future generations.

In fact, West Virginia, in the first quarter, grew by 3 percent. We were the second fastest in growth in the entire Nation. To be sure, one quarter of growth is not a trend, but it does demonstrate the potential that we have if we do it right here for our citizens. The potential of capital growth is there, but one of the biggest drags on our economy in recent years has been excessive regulations, which we have addressed quite a bit here in the first 9 months of President Trump's term. We have worked hard to bring reason into the regulatory environment and also our burdensome Tax Code.

What can we do? We can reduce taxes that impede our growth. Let's think about our small businesses. In many States, they are the major economic driver of our economy. In my State of West Virginia, 95.6 percent of the businesses are small businesses. They employ nearly half of the West Virginia private sector workforce, so nearly half of West Virginians are working in what is defined as a small business. Yet they can face a tax rate as high as 39.6 percent. Think about that. If you own a bakery or an accounting firm, in a 5-day workweek, you have to work Monday and Tuesday just to pay the government. It is no wonder that small businesses have found it difficult to open, let alone succeed, in many parts of our country.

The United States has the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. A lot of people are asking, how does that influence me? It is influ-

encing the working American because the working American is bearing the brunt of that tax. Because of our outdated Tax Code, real wages for most workers have barely increased over the years. West Virginians understand that, as hard as they work, the government is taking more money from them. It costs them more money every time they go to the grocery store, every time they buy clothing for their children, every time they try to buy a new car. It is just more expensive with no growth in their wages to be able to bear that expense. It feels impossible to get ahead.

We see that all around our States and localities. We see people thinking, I can't get ahead, and I haven't been able to over the last 5 to 10 years. I am starting to think it is impossible.

But we can fix this. It is not impossible. We can create an environment in which there is more opportunity available and wages are higher by modifying our Tax Code. We can have a simpler system with lower rates, and families can see relief from the complexity of our Tax Code. I have seen it stacked up before. If you haven't, I am 5 feet 3 inches, and I think it is taller than I am when stacked up page to page.

Along with the complexities, people need to keep more of their hard-earned money. It will help our companies grow. When our companies grow, what happens? We have more jobs, fairer taxes, and best of all, besides more jobs, we have higher paychecks. With more earnings, companies can hire new workers, increase wages, and invest in new developments. These are changes that I think West Virginians are hungry for.

The time is now. The stagnation we have felt over the last decade has worn us down, has made us lose our optimism about being able to have a better life than our parents had or our children thinking they could have a better life than we had. You know, the American dream is sort of fading for a lot of people, so comprehensive tax reform can provide that kind of relief.

I am excited that we can create that environment of optimism, that environment of confidence in not just our companies and our ability to create more jobs and raise our paychecks, but that confidence that we need as a country that, yes, we can live in our communities in rural America, like West Virginia or North Carolina or Missouri, that we can live in those communities, have a great chance to move ahead, have a good retirement when we decide we are at the end of the line in terms of our working career, and also pass on to the next generation a competitive environment that can compete financially anywhere in the world.

We know we can compete anywhere in the world in a lot of different areas. Right now, we are on an uneven playing field. When we change this and

when we fix this—because we can fix this—that will change the playing field for every single American who gets up in the morning or goes to work in the evening, to have the confidence that things are going to be better for them.

I thank the Senator from Missouri, and I look forward to talking about this over the next several weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, when the Senator from West Virginia talked about the 40 percent that can come out of your hard work, the 2 days a week of a regular 5-day workweek—and many families are wishing they could get back to a 5-day workweek because they have really been stagnant in terms of the opportunities for their families for a long time. It is a good way to think about how hard families work just so the government can get more of their money.

This is a discussion about how the government can take less of your money. For everybody listening who wonders, "Well, if the government is going to take less money—I thought the government already had a deficit"—we need to work on that. One way to work on that and the best way to work on that is to have more taxpayers—not higher tax rates but more taxpayers. We are looking at some tax changes here that would allow more taxpayers to share the burden, hopefully paying taxes, as I said earlier this afternoon, on a bigger paycheck to start with. You can take less money out of that paycheck, and the government gets more money because we have more people paying those taxes and more growth.

The 70-year average on growth since World War II is 3.4 percent. Every year, the economy was that much bigger than the year before. That ought to be achievable. For 70 years, we achieved that. We should be able to get back to that again if we do the right things. But for the last 8 to 9 years, that growth has been less than 2 percent.

Our problem is with jobs that aren't growing as they should in terms of what they pay and the government is not having the money it needs to defend the country and do other things. A lot of that could be solved by an economy that is thriving again. There has been 10 years of not seeing that happen.

We combine good tax policy with good regulatory policy, which means the regulatory excesses of the last few years clearly are being brought back under control. The Federal Government is beginning to look at regulation and being sure it is commonsense regulation again. Consumer confidence is growing. Every single month we look at those numbers, and they generally have been better each month than the month before. They certainly have been better the last 7 months than they

were in any previous 7-month period of time for some time now. When we have a good tax policy and a good competitive policy, then before you know it, things begin to happen.

On stagnant income, you can see a study here that says, well, maybe the income hasn't gone up, but because things are a little less expensive and inflation has been so low and so many of the things families need are less expensive, they really have more money than they used to have. Try to explain that to mothers and fathers who are trying to buy five pairs of tennis shoes for five kids. You as a parent are trying to do something for your family every week or so that is a little bit extraordinary. If you don't have extra money, you cannot do any of that.

Over 75 percent of full-time workers in America say, when asked, that they are living paycheck to paycheck. Over 20 percent of Americans say they have zero savings. A much higher number says they have less than \$400 or \$500 in savings. These are people whose parents and grandparents worked hard to save whatever they could and would like to see that ability happen again.

We need lower taxes. We need better jobs. New jobs are impacted in Missouri, where 97 percent of all our businesses are small businesses. Most new job creation is created by small businesses. We ought to be sure that no matter what we do in the Tax Code, we do it in a way that allows small business to compete with big business in an effective way.

As for competitiveness, in the last 15 years, I think we are not as competitive as we used to be. Our corporate taxes used to be right in the middle. With corporations competing around the world, we were right in the middle. The middle in 2003 was 30 percent; our tax rate was 35 percent. The middle in 2015 was 22 percent; our tax rate was 35 percent. If you are going to compete, if you are going to create jobs, you are going to have to be sure you know how to compete.

Mr. President, you and I were able to see—at least I was able to see—for the first time yesterday, not being on the Finance Committee, the page that is generally agreed to as our starting point. There were lower rates for families, in fact, doubling the individual exemption. Today, if you are a couple, you start paying taxes after the first \$12,000 of income. Under this proposal that exemption doubles to \$12,000 each, so you would start paying taxes only after you have made the first \$24,000. It is sort of a new tax bracket here—the zero tax bracket. It is the tax bracket in which you don't pay income taxes on the first \$24,000, and then you start paying in a simpler system after that.

People would like the tax system to be simpler. People would like to have that postcard filing opportunity, where you say: This is how much money I

made, here is my W-2 form that proves it, here is my standard exemption, and here is whatever else I am going to be allowed to exempt—my contributions to church, other charities, my mortgage payment. Those appear to be exemptions that will be left in the Code, but everyone would understand those. Suddenly, you have about three lines, and maybe, by the time you get to those three lines, your tax obligation goes away.

The amount of money people pay to get their taxes figured out in America would be the gross national product of lots of countries. We need a system that is simpler than that.

The death tax—you know, if you are a family farm or a small business and someone has stayed on that farm with you from your family or stayed in that business with you from your family, it is very hard to figure out, when the mom or dad dies, who created what wealth as you work side by side to create the wealth. By the way, you don't have any wealth that you haven't paid taxes on already. You don't have anything you have accumulated that you haven't paid taxes on multiple times. There is an opportunity here to say that we are no longer going to go through that after trying to tax family farms and small businesses. The death tax is exactly that, and it doesn't work.

We are going to work to make America more competitive, American jobs more competitive. Again, one way to create more take-home pay—the best way to create more take-home pay—is better jobs to start with. We can have those better jobs if we work hard to be focused on competition, on regulation that makes sense, on tax policy that not only is simple but that everybody believes is fair. We have the greatest compliance of any country, I believe, in the history of the world, but people are less likely to comply if they don't think that the tax policy is fair and easily understood and means the same to everyone else. You shouldn't have to have the greatest accountants in the world to figure out what your taxes are or, frankly, to figure out what somebody else's taxes likely are. Fairness is important here, simplicity is important here, and competition and better jobs are important here.

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore assumed the Chair.)

We need better jobs for working families. I think that should be the flag that flies highest as we begin to look at how we reduce the tax burden and increase the opportunity for more people to be paying taxes because we have more people with better jobs.

I know two of the leaders here. That guy who just left the Chair, the Senator from North Carolina, and the Senator from Georgia have been real advocates for what we are trying to do now and also advocates for getting it done.

We not only need to have this debate; we need to get this done.

In my view, this needs to be done this year. It needs to be impacting our economy by the first quarter of next year. I would suggest that nobody in this body understands the importance of competition more than the Senator from Georgia, Mr. PERDUE.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I would like to echo what my esteemed colleague from Missouri has outlined in the last few minutes. His leadership on this issue is pronounced, and his experience on this floor is not to be underestimated. I appreciate his leadership on this, and I appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on this.

Before my remarks today on this historic opportunity before us right now to finally, after 30 years, become competitive again with the rest of the world, I would like to preface my remarks with a personal comment. My mom and dad were schoolteachers. We were middle class. I grew up working on our family farm. My mom and dad were really the first two in their extended families who had ever been to college. All of my relatives were farmers in the South.

I think the Tax Code that we have had for the last 100 years, since it was instituted in our country, has created an imbalance. We can see right now that we are losing competitiveness with the rest of the world. We have a growing disparity among income levels in this country, borne out somewhat by the derivative results of an archaic, out-of-control, out-of-date, and inappropriate tax policy.

Today, we have two crises in America. I have spoken on this floor a lot about this. We have a global security crisis that cannot be argued against. It is deadly. It is serious. We also have a debt crisis, and they are interwoven because of our inability to discipline ourselves on this floor over the last 30 years, particularly the last 16 years. We now have \$20 trillion of debt, and that is the result of an explosion in the size of our Federal Government.

In 2000, the size of our government—these are constant 2016 dollars. The size of our government in 2000 was \$2.4 trillion. “Trillion” is a big number, and it gets a lot of zeros out there. I have a hard time even digesting what that is. But 2.4—I can relate to the size that it is today, and it was \$4 trillion last year. So our Federal Government has grown over 60 percent in 16 short years. There was one Republican President and one Democratic President. My experience here in the last 2 years has been that there are no innocent parties in terms of this out-of-control spending on the part of the Federal Government.

One of the solutions to this debt crisis is a growing economy. President

Trump, from day one, has said that growing the economy is job one, but it was part of a bigger strategy in his first year.

There were four components to the strategy in the first year. One was that we had to get Neil Gorsuch confirmed to the Supreme Court, and that was done. Second, we had to roll back on some of the more onerous regulations that were stifling the very life out of the free enterprise system. To date, over 800 regulations have been removed from our government. Third was healthcare. We are still trying to fix a collapsing ObamaCare system that is hurting people back home. Lastly, we had to reform our tax package so that we could become competitive with the rest of the world and get our economy going again.

Job one this year was to get the economy going again. To some degree, it is beginning to move. Consumer confidence is at a 16-year high. CEO confidence is at a 20-year high. Why? Because they finally see rhetoric in Washington talking about the things they have been asking for for over 10 years, and that is relief from some of the pressure the Federal Government has put on the free enterprise system that keeps us from being competitive with the rest of the world.

I have lived around the world, and I have run businesses. I started my career working for an hourly wage in construction. I understand that America—and I can say this with some authority—has some of the best workers anywhere in the world and in the history of the world. On the back of that, we have innovation, capital formation, and the rule of law. That is what has created this economic miracle over the last 7 years, but we have taken it for granted. What we have done is allow other countries because of our immigration policy, because of our tax policy, and because of our regulatory policy, particularly of late—we have lost our competitive edge.

We believe that to get this economy going, President Trump is right. I am absolutely committed to the strategy President Trump has laid out. It really is only three things, and we have already started on two with his leadership.

No. 1 is regulatory reform, which I talked about.

No. 2 is that we have to get this energy policy going. What the President has already done with the Keystone Pipeline and the Clean Power Plan has set the stage to allow us to become the energy czar, if you will, of the next century right here in North America.

Lastly—and maybe most importantly—is to get this Tax Code so we can be competitive with the rest of the world. Let's talk about what competitive means. In 1986, the last time we actually made any real, substantive change to the Tax Code, the United

States, after those changes, had the third lowest corporate tax rate in the world. What that did is allow us to compete with the rest of the world and set the stage for the next 10 to 15 years of economic boom that is now part of history.

What has happened now, though, is that the rest of the world has caught up. They have lowered their corporate tax rates. They have simplified their regulatory environment and taken the burden off some of their people. Today we have absolutely the highest corporate tax rate in the world, and we are the last country of the major OECD countries—the 39 countries—to actually still have a repatriation tax. This is unbelievable. We have been so arrogant as a country that we have let the rest of the world outrun us to the next stop, and they are now outcompeting us.

How does this affect the average man and woman on the street? Well, this I believe—the repatriation tax and indeed the lack of competitiveness in our Tax Code—is an absolute tax on American workers. Why? Because right now, twice as many companies in the United States are being purchased by companies outside our country, as compared to companies that our U.S. companies are buying outside the United States. That is nothing but a reflection on the imbalance of our high tax environment here at home, and the people who suffer from that are the people who buy products in the United States and the people who work for companies that sell products in the United States. By companies, I am talking about friends of mine who have small businesses in South Georgia and have four employees. I am also talking about friends who run large corporations, multinational corporations. All of the above contribute to our economy.

We have unwanted acquisitions. Just look at recent history. Burger King was bought by a Canadian firm, Timmy's. Look at the beer industry in St. Louis. Today, most of those companies are owned by Brazilians and Belgians. These are not mean CEOs who decided to move their corporate headquarters, no. This is a reflection of a competitive disadvantage in which someone outside the country has used our Tax Code and our tax dollars to actually buy U.S. companies to the detriment of U.S. workers. How can anyone be against lowering our corporate tax rate and doing away with this repatriation tax?

The Business Roundtable in 2004 documents—and this is interesting—that if our corporate rate today were just 20 percent, over 4,700 companies that have been purchased over the last couple of years would still be in the United States. I think that is tantamount to a marching order for us here in the Senate to make this change.

The way forward is very simple. This is what is talked about in this tax

package that we are beginning to talk about publicly, and this is only after 9 months of regular order in committee with multiple hearings. We heard in the healthcare debate: Oh, this is not regular order. We didn't have the chance to talk about it and put amendments in and all this.

Well, this time, in tax, it will be by regular order. There will be amendments. There will be debates. There have already been multiple hearings. We are looking for input from all corners.

This strategy has three parts: One, we have to lower this tax on our American workers—lower the corporate tax rate to be competitive with the rest of the world. Two, eliminate this repatriation tax as every other country in the world has done. And, last, we have to simplify our individual Tax Code.

My mom and dad were schoolteachers. They were proud of their ability to pay their taxes, but they were burdened by that. Right now, we don't need to do that. We have to find a way to make this Tax Code more equitable for everyone.

Nearly 90 percent of Americans want the code changed. Over two-thirds think taxes are too high. Almost two-thirds say that lowering the corporate tax rate—again, they get the fact that this tax rate is lower in the rest of the world and that it is a penalty on the workers here in the United States.

Nearly every CEO surveyed by the BRT, Business Roundtable, said that delays on tax would damage our economy. Here is why. We just heard the Senator from Missouri talk about timing. We have to have a sense of urgency on this for one reason; that is, if you want to affect the economy next year, you have to get this done this year. Budgets are being finalized for next year right now. Capital investments have already been made in terms of determining how much and where and how soon they will be making it. More importantly, during the back half of next year, we will have the holiday season, which offers up a significant portion of our retail sales for the year, and those decisions are being made right now—before the purchases that are made next spring.

We have major CEOs weighing in on this. Randall Stephenson, CEO at AT&T, said that if we get the corporate tax rate lowered, "We will step it up"—meaning their capital investments. "Every additional billion dollars . . . is 7,000 hard-hat jobs putting fiber in the ground, cell sites up, and antennas on cell sites."

David Abney, CEO of UPS, said: "We'd like to bring some of those foreign earnings back, invest them into our network here."

Finally, Mark Weinberger is the CEO of one of the major accounting firms we have here in the United States. They are multinational, so they have

experience around the world in this with Ernst & Young. Actually, through these tax changes, they will stand to lose revenue because we are simplifying how people calculate what they owe in taxes. His quote is this: "I think it's truly a bipartisan issue"—I agree—"something everybody can rally around . . . it's urgent for our country."

To get this done, we have to move past partisan politics and Washington games. We saw how we disappointed the American people—both sides. The Democrats in 2009 crammed ObamaCare down the throats of America through a supermajority. We now know it has failed. Republicans were not able to fix it this year, so far. So we all need to look at this tax issue as a bipartisan issue to fix this once and for all for the people back home.

We can't get bogged down in this scoring—this financial modeling that is only done this way in Washington. People back home don't run their small businesses this way. They don't run big businesses this way. They sure don't run their personal finances this way. We can't get bogged down in bad numbers and bad timing coming from the Congressional Budget Office—not this time. It is too important. The only score that matters to me is GDP growth and the jobs that it creates—the change of lives that it can affect for the people back home.

I hear people talking all the time: I work part time; can you help me get more hours? Wages at the low-income level have not grown at all in the last 30 years. That is terrible in the United States. We can fix that. It is a function of the thing I am talking about right now—American companies that lost their competitiveness because of the rules here in Washington. This is a 1-percent increase in our GDP. Say we grow from 1.9 percent to 2.9 percent. That alone is \$3 trillion of revenue over the next 10 years. That is doable. Everybody in this room knows that.

But we have to change this Tax Code to put people back to work, to get our economy going again, and to become competitive with the rest of the world. The end result will be to address, finally, this debt crisis.

The reason we want this Tax Code changed is to put people back to work and to change lives here in America. But the long-term benefit of this is that it gives us more flexibility and more capital with which to solve this long-term debt crisis. Growing the economy alone will not fix this debt crisis, but we will not fix the debt crisis unless and until we fix this Tax Code.

We need to have a sense of urgency like never before in order to get this done this year. I echo the comments of my colleagues, and I thank you for this opportunity.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I was presiding when the colloquy started with my colleagues here to talk about tax reform. I had not intended to speak today, and I am sure my staffers are scrambling, wondering what the boss will say. I want to weigh in with this discussion mainly because of the personal perspective of a leader who has seen the positive impacts of having the courage, focus, and discipline to deliver on tax reform.

Back in 2011, I was in my third term. Republicans had the majority, and I became speaker of the house. When I came in February of 2011, it was reported to me that we had a \$2.5 billion structural deficit. We had the fourth highest unemployment rate in the Nation and we had 6 months to figure out how to balance the budget. So it was counterintuitive to a lot of people that we would spend time on regulatory reform and tax reform—particularly tax reform—reducing the amount of revenue coming in at the same time we were in a deficit ourselves. But in the first 6 months that we were in the majority, we cut the sales tax. Then we went over a 2-year period, even with that \$2.5 billion structural deficit, to make the changes in the corporate tax and the income tax. It took North Carolina from the 44th most taxed State—in other words, there were only 5 States ahead of us for the highest tax burden in the United States—now down to No. 12. It was one of the worst growing economies, and it now ranks in the top five in the Nation, and it is one of the fastest growing economies in the Nation. We created over 250,000 jobs and actually put North Carolina on the map by all references—CEO measures and by independent organizations. It is the State where businesses want to set up and do business.

We took the corporate tax from 6.9 down to 2.5. We took personal income tax rates from 7.75 down to 5.49. We got people back to work.

Along the way, we had our challenges. Everybody in Washington is for tax reform. They are for tax relief. They will come into your office and tell you: Let's get her going. Then on the side they will say: except for that one righteous exemption I may need. We have to have Members who have the courage to do tax reform that helps working families, that creates jobs, and that silences the people who want to take this exemption or that exemption away, so we do what is right for the generation that is about to look for jobs and the people who need a job today.

They want their businesses to grow. They want their economies to thrive. They want the United States to be the strong, great economy that it can be. It is going to take courage. It is going to take discipline. It is going to take time—but only so much time.

I believe this Congress, this Senate, over the course of a few months, if we focus on it and with the support of the President and in collaboration with the House, can get this done. We have to get it done. We promised the American people last year that if we had majorities, we would do what we had to do to deliver on this promise. It can be done. A lot of times, people ask me what keeps me up at night. I tell them two things: coffee and the national debt. Coffee is for the obvious reasons, but why the national debt? I will tell you why. Because when I have people on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the service chiefs come into the Senate Armed Services Committee and say the single greatest threat to our national security is our debt, we should take notice. These are people who are skilled in warfare. They are people who know how to take the fight to the enemy. When they think the greatest threat to this Nation is our national debt, we had better take that seriously.

How do you resolve the national debt? You grow the economy. How do you grow the economy? You create jobs and help businesses throughout. How do you do that? You do that through tax reform. You also take criticism that is going to be waged by some people on the far left when we talk about corporate tax reform. They are going to say: How could you favor the big guy over the little guy? I don't know about you all, but I worked for companies before in my life. When I was 19 and living in a trailer park, I was working for a corporation. I was a little guy working for that corporation. Fortunately, in the 1980s, we had a President who had the wisdom to know that, if you reduced the tax burden on corporations, more little guys like me—that 19-year-old living in a trailer park—could get a job—a better-paying job—and, ultimately, have enough money to put himself through school.

So when we get into this argument, don't take the bait by some people who will say that because we are focusing on corporate taxes and reducing the tax burden on businesses, that is somehow a guy in a suit trying to help out a business. That is a guy who has worked his way from that trailer park now into the U.S. Senate and benefited when Congress had the courage to reduce taxes and get the economy back on track. That is what we better do. That is what we promised. That is what we are here to do today. The time is now to get it done.

The President has shown wisdom in the blueprint—and our leadership here, in terms of the broad strokes about what tax reform needs to look like. Now it is our job—each and every individual Member of the Senate and the House—to deliver on the promise to produce tax reform to help the little guy and to get this economy going to be the great economy that it has been

in the past, and I have every reason to believe that it will be so in the future.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of Calendar No. 95, the nomination of Heath Tarbert to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Calendar No. 106, the nomination of Makan Delrahim to be Assistant Attorney General. I further ask that there be 5 hours of debate on the nominations, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed, with no intervening action or debate, and that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in the last 24 hours since I came to the floor to talk about Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, there has been progress but far less progress than is necessary at this critical time of humanitarian crisis, when the people of those islands literally face a chasm, a deepening canyon of needs and challenges.

Over the next 24 hours, over the next 24 days, over the next 24 months, this crisis must be met with a strategy, an overarching plan, a Marshall Plan for Puerto Rico that commits the resources unequivocally and unambiguously, making sure we match the depth of this crisis with a magnitude of resources and commitment that is needed and deserved. That kind of response, which has been lacking so far,

is absolutely necessary for the hope of Puerto Rico because as the threats of disease and contaminated water increase, not to mention the lack of proper medicine, healthcare, roads, transportation and communication, food, water, medicine, basic necessities rise on that island, the people of Puerto Rico will lose trust and confidence in fellow Americans that must do more. We need to give them the hope they deserve, and that hope has to be more than rhetoric and more than patting ourselves on the back as the President has done. It has to be a real commitment.

In fact, there is no reason for back-patting. The response so far has been inadequate, lacking the full attention and commitment that is needed. It has been a story of inattention and inadequate strategy so far to meet this deepening humanitarian crisis.

The people of Texas, Florida, and throughout the gulf coast and the Southeast who have been affected by the storms have received the full commitment of America. It is what we owe our fellow Americans. That same commitment is owed to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. We saw an immediate disaster response there that must also be devoted to Puerto Rico. The emergency aid and full funding made to the victims of those storms in the gulf coast and Florida must be given to Puerto Rico, and I am hopeful that a relief bill will be fashioned this week.

I am also hopeful that the financial control board that has responsibility for Puerto Rico's internal finances can be given the flexibility and that the Government of Puerto Rico will be given the flexibility that is needed to deal with this disaster—nothing less than a full court press, a full plan and strategy, and a plan that directly addresses the needs of Puerto Rico in so many areas.

On transportation, what is the plan to ensure that basic goods can move from one end of the island to another? Right now the roads are unusable. By all accounts, getting things across the island by road is impossible. Radar and navigation systems at the airports are down. The transportation mechanism of the island is literally ripped apart. So potable water, food, and fuel are impossible to move where they need to go. That state of affairs is inadequate and unacceptable in America in 2017.

Electricity and power are disrupted across the island. What will be done to restore power and electricity throughout the island? What will be done to make sure that diesel is available there and in the Virgin Islands? Many of the machines essential for lifesaving at the hospitals cannot be powered by generators alone. That state of affairs is inadequate and unacceptable in America in 2017.

All five of the hospitals in Arecibo, one of Puerto Rico's largest cities, are

without power. Many other hospitals are shuttered as well. Clinics are closed.

Mosquito-borne diseases are a real and present danger. Deadly ailments in contaminated food and water may cause serious and possibly deadly diseases. As these diseases spread, what is the plan to stop this kind of inequity? It is unacceptable in America in 2017.

As to communications, or the basic ability to talk to each other, to reassure each other, and to know what is going on with relatives and loved ones and friends—no wonder that angst and alarm are spreading beyond Puerto Rico to Connecticut, where those relatives and friends live now—this kind of lack of communication is unacceptable in America in 2017. What is the plan to correct it?

On public safety, looting and theft are becoming more prevalent. As the days drag on, law and order will deteriorate unless public safety is addressed more effectively.

There is another kind of challenge. A dam that is about to burst and could cause havoc in surrounding areas is a clear and present safety danger that illustrates again the weakness of Puerto Rico's infrastructure.

Towns throughout the island have suffered severe flooding. So housing and basic shelter are inadequate. What is the plan to rebuild?

Payment for medicines cannot be made unless cash is available, and the lack of electricity means that the ATM machines are not working. If there is no cash for residents to buy basic goods, including food and water, how does the administration plan to solve this problem? This kind of inadequacy is unacceptable in America in 2017.

Rebuilding will require a long-term commitment. It will require a plan and a strategy, not just over the next 24 hours or 24 days but 24 months and longer. It must deal with a financial situation that is a storm of its own.

As I described it yesterday, this storm is not a natural disaster. It is a manmade disaster, the result of healthcare and tax programs that are beyond any fault of the people of Puerto Rico. It is not of their doing.

Vast swaths of resources have been swept away in Puerto Rico, including many of the attractions important for Puerto Rico's tourist industry. The same is true, for example, on the island of St. John in the Virgin Islands. Tourism is a key component of Puerto Rico's economy. It may take years and possibly decades to restore. What is the long-term plan? What is the strategy for Puerto Rico and for the Virgin Islands? There needs to be a kind of Marshall Plan for rebuilding because the devastating damage done is no less than what Europe suffered as a result of World War II. We have an obligation—certainly, no less than rebuilding

our European allies—to restore and rebuild Puerto Rico.

All of these natural disasters and the financial manmade storm come as Puerto Rico continues to endure the struggles of its internal financial commitments that are necessary for the lifeblood of the economy. Jobs and economic progress must be the end goal.

With so many questions about the President's plan or lack of plan, I am struck by the need for this body and this Congress to take the initiative. I think we will need to begin action, begin hearings, and begin a process of building a plan if the administration fails to present it.

I believe, too, that we share so much with the island of Puerto Rico in people who have come to Connecticut and other parts of the country that we will find a ready and enthusiastic audience and support for such an effort.

In the past 2 days, after silence through much of it about Puerto Rico, the President seemed to blame the island itself, its financial struggle, other storms, and even the size of the ocean. There should be no excuses. There must be a call to action.

I thank the Coast Guard, our military, the first responders, the rescuers, and relief organizations—from Americans to the Red Cross to Save the Children—that have devoted so much and given so much in these times of crisis. They have been stretched thin. They have performed with courage and generosity and so have the donors who have come forward in Connecticut and around the country. People are calling my office asking what they can do for the people of Florida and the gulf coast and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. They are all fellow Americans, and we owe it to them to do more and do better to make sure that we keep faith with our fellow Americans.

I thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to talk about this subject.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Mr. President, I want to express as well my concern regarding the renomination of Ajit Pai to be Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I will oppose his nomination. As much as I respect his background and his achievements, his intelligence and ability, I believe that, during his tenure over the past year, he has taken one step after another that is contrary to the public interest. He has launched an attack on net neutrality, and he is working adamantly for undoing the open internet order.

The open internet order was established based on 10 years of evidence about how the internet has changed, and it was most recently fully upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit in June 2016. The most recent evidence shows that net neutrality has not inhibited network investment at all, in contrast to Chairman Pai's claim.

On broadband privacy, Chairman Pai forcefully advocated in support of efforts to rescind the FCC's broadband privacy rules, a blatant attack on consumer privacy rights—all the more striking in light of recent dramatic concerns about privacy. Signing up for the internet should not mean that you have to sign away your rights to privacy, and that is why it is so important to have baseline privacy and data security rules that our broadband providers subscribe to, observe, and follow.

Earlier this year, Senate Republicans gave broadband providers a green light to sell sensitive personal information to the highest bidder—a move that came with cheers of support from Chairman Pai. By supporting this measure, I think Chairman Pai raised severe doubts about his commitment to the average American consumer.

One of Chairman Pai's first actions after his designation as chairman was to direct the FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau to overturn an order designating nine wireless companies to provide lifeline broadband service through the USF Lifeline Program, despite the assertion that his foremost goal was to close the internet and digital divide. I strongly criticized this decision and led a letter to Chairman Pai expressing that this action not only forfeits and affects these providers consumers' interests, but it may also have a chilling effect on other broadband providers that were interested in participating in the Lifeline broadband program. This action would limit choice and increase the cost of service for the lifeline participants.

Finally, as Chairman of the FCC, Mr. Pai has a duty to review whether Sinclair's proposal to acquire Tribune Media complies with the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules and serves the public interest by promoting localism and diversity. Rather than scrutinizing this deal as closely and carefully as I believe he should, Mr. Pai has focused his efforts on loosening restrictions to enable the deal. This transaction not only blatantly violates existing rules, but it also abridges existing FCC policy. Those policies were just recently scrapped under Mr. Pai's watch.

This action can only be explained by interest in prioritizing the demands of Sinclair over the public interest. It also is no surprise that this decision happened just days before he had a meeting with the chairman of Sinclair.

Every market impacted by this megamerger would experience a reduction in responsive local news due to Sinclair's unresponsive, top-down approach—denigrating diversity, diminishing our already distorted civic discourse, and devaluing local voices of women and people of color. Today, I sent a letter to Chairman Pai to let him know that blessing a media behemoth such as Sinclair-Tribune would

reflect an abject failure on his part to protect the public interest and to uphold the FCC's duty to promote localism and diversity. Localism needs responsiveness to local interests, local news, and local voices. That is a trust the FCC has by its own rules and as a matter of public interest.

Today we rely more than ever on the internet for so many facets of our everyday life: freedom of expression, education, healthcare, housing, entertainment, and more. Consumers need a champion that will be their voice at a time when so often the public interest is drowned by moneyed interests and special interests.

Chairman Pai, far from our champion, seems to be more a servant of those interests. American consumers deserve better. My hope is, the President will nominate someone who can better serve those interests.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Massachusetts.

DELRAHIM NOMINATION

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, our economy is in trouble. In markets all across our economy, a few giant corporations hold all the power. It is everywhere. Four airlines control over 80 percent of all domestic airline seats in America. Five health insurance giants own over 80 percent of the health insurance market. Four companies dominate over 80 percent of the beef market. Three drugstore chains control almost all retail pharmacies in the country. Two companies sell more than 70 percent of the beer in America.

As competition has been snuffed out in industry after industry, big corporations have made out like bandits, and everyone else has paid the price. How do we pay? American families shell out more for lower quality goods. Small businesses find it harder and harder to compete against the big guys. Innovators and entrepreneurs struggle to promote new ideas that can change the world. Income inequality has left more American families struggling to make ends meet as the top 1 percent has grown even richer and richer. As fewer companies have seized more economic power, they have translated their economic muscle into political power—power they can use to elect the politicians they like, get the kinds of laws and policies they like, and run up even more economic power.

It is a nasty, self-perpetuating cycle, and it is exactly why Congress created antitrust laws over a century ago. Back then, like today, a few powerful companies were stifling competition in markets all across the economy and gaining extraordinary political power. Congress decided to create laws to break up trusts and protect competition.

Today the Justice Department's Antitrust Division is charged with protecting competition by blocking anti-competitive mergers and going after companies that engage in illegal conduct. For decades, though, antitrust enforcers have put their tools on the shelf instead of aggressively enforcing our antitrust laws, they have given the green light to megamergers after megamergers and allowed big corporations to misuse this power without a peep.

That problem is set to get worse in the Trump administration. Since taking office, President Trump has loaded his administration with a Who's Who of former lobbyists, Wall Street insiders, and corporate executives committed to tilting the scales even further in favor of his powerful friends and against American families.

Now, President Trump has nominated someone to head the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. His nominee, Makan Delrahim, will be in charge of determining whether there is someone to stand up for competition or let the big guys just get bigger and more powerful. Unfortunately, Mr. Delrahim's approach to antitrust enforcement is based on a hands-off economic theory that just leaves big corporations to do pretty much whatever they want to do. Case in point, just last year, when asked what he thought about the proposed merger of AT&T-Time Warner—a merger that would combine two of the most powerful companies in media—Mr. Delrahim said he didn't think it was a "major antitrust problem."

Mr. Delrahim spent over a decade working to convince government officials that other megamergers weren't antitrust problems. During the airline merger wave that left us with only four major carriers, Mr. Delrahim was lobbying the government to approve a merger between US Airways and Delta. Despite the fact that there are only a few large retail pharmacies, he lobbied to get government approval for CVS's proposed takeover of Caremark. Even though only five health insurers control the vast majority of the health insurance market, he tried to convince government regulators to approve Anthem's unsuccessful attempt to merge with Cigna.

Now he wants to take a spin through the revolving door and regulate the industries he worked to make even less competitive. For the giant corporations, wealthy individuals who want to amass more power and profits for themselves, Mr. Delrahim is a dream candidate, but he is also a dream candidate for President Trump. President Trump has not been shy about his willingness to use his power against individuals or companies he doesn't like, and he has made it clear that he expects his agency heads to carry out his orders.

Mr. Delrahim has been a loyal supporter of President Trump's since the campaign. He urged fellow Republicans to support President Trump because he correctly believed President Trump would appoint a pro-corporate Justice to the Supreme Court. He also served as legal counsel to President Trump after he was sworn in and as the President reversed rules that made it easier for families to pay their mortgages or reversed rules to prevent people with serious mental illnesses from buying guns or reversed rules to stop companies from dumping toxic waste into water. As head of the Antitrust Division, Mr. Delrahim will be in a position to make even more harmful decisions.

It is no secret that Americans don't trust Washington. They see politicians who care more about catering to corporate donors than fighting for the interests of hard-working people who are trying to figure out how to pay the bills and build a little security in their own lives. It is a real problem, but it is a problem we can solve. We can begin to solve it by fighting the economic concentration that is putting more money and more power into the hands of a few giant corporations. That means choosing enforcers who will hold companies accountable when they break the rules, and that means rejecting nominees like Makan Delrahim.

TARBERT NOMINATION

Mr. President, I rise to speak on the nomination of Heath Tarbert, who has been nominated by President Trump to be the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Markets and Development. If confirmed, Mr. Tarbert will be in charge of the Treasury Department's role on a multi-agency body called the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, or CFIUS, which reviews whether foreign acquisitions of a U.S. company would pose a threat to our national security and then makes recommendations to the President on whether the President should block the transaction.

This is not about whether foreign investment benefits our economy. Of course it does. The United States is the third largest recipient of foreign direct investment, and our markets attract the world's best talent and capital. Going back to the 1990s, only four foreign acquisitions of American companies have ever been blocked by a President based on a recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. This is about whether our national security is put at risk when foreign governments, foreign state-owned enterprises, and foreign investors acquire our companies and assets. This is also about foreign governments and the companies they own, trying to gain access to sensitive technologies that are important to our military and our national security.

The risk posed to the security of the United States is real. I want you to

consider just one example here. According to a news report last year, an internal Pentagon report found that China was making significant targeted investments in cutting-edge American startups, with expertise in areas like autonomous vehicles, artificial intelligence, and robotics. These can be transactions that don't necessarily result in foreign control over one of our companies, but they can give a foreign adversary access to technologies that could harm our strategic interests and erode our military advantage.

The risk is significant, but unfortunately CFIUS does not apply to these transactions. The problem is, CFIUS was created back in 1975. Since then, both technology and the nature of foreign acquisitions, mergers, and takeovers have changed substantially. The nature of the threats we face has also changed substantially. Our top military leaders—such as the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs—believe that CFIUS needs to be updated to fully address them, and I agree.

Another concern is that CFIUS does not focus enough on whether the benefits of foreign acquisition outweigh the costs when it comes to the competitiveness of American workers. While I recognize that CFIUS has historically focused on the national security impacts of foreign investment, I think Congress should consider elevating the Department of Labor to the group of agencies that are currently part of the core CFIUS review process. If we believe economic security and national security are intertwined, then I think we can both look out for the American worker and review the national security threats posed by foreign acquisitions.

Finally, the ethics problems that are everywhere in this administration come forward again in the area of national security. We all know President Trump, his family members, and other Trump administration officials have business ties in the United States and throughout the world, even if we don't know the full extent of President Trump's business ties because he will not release his tax returns.

Imagine a Trump administration official who has a financial stake in an American company, a foreign state-owned company or both. Now imagine that a foreign company backed by China, Russia, or another foreign adversary tries to acquire a U.S. company and a Trump official suddenly has financial ties to that transaction and then that transaction triggers a CFIUS review for national security concerns. If that scenario were to occur, I am deeply concerned about the conflicts of interests that could emerge. I would expect CFIUS to vigorously review such an investment as it affects our national security.

I raised all of these issues with Mr. Tarbert when I met with him today

and his answers improved from when I asked him about these issues earlier this year, but I remain concerned about his commitment to modernize CFIUS and to ensure that CFIUS does more to consider the impact of foreign acquisitions on American workers. I hope I am wrong, but I still have concerns about his nomination, which is why I will vote against it.

Mr. Tarbert promised me that if confirmed, he would work to ensure that no transaction is approved by CFIUS if national security concerns remain unresolved, and that is encouraging to hear. If he is ultimately confirmed, I will use my position in the Senate Banking Committee to hold him to that promise because the threats we face are growing in complexity, and the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States must be ready to confront them. We don't want to wake up one day and discover that our adversaries have access to key components of our national security technology because Congress and the White House were asleep at the wheel.

If confirmed, I will work in good faith with Mr. Tarbert to ensure that the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States is updated so it is in the strongest position to protect our national security—both from the threats we face today and the threats we will face in the future.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Mr. Heath Tarbert to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Markets and Development. This position is both a critical national security and international economic policy job.

A critical part of the Assistant Secretary's job—and the reason for which this position was created by statute and passed in the Banking Committee—is to marshal the procedures and processes of the interagency, Treasury-led Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, or CFIUS, which protects our Nation from hostile foreign transactions designed to undermine U.S. national security interests.

This is now a very time-sensitive post because Senators on both sides of the aisle are working to introduce legislation to change the CFIUS process for the first time in a decade.

Confirmation of Mr. Tarbert is critical so that he is available to provide necessary input on any proposed changes and to swiftly implement any new legislation.

Mr. Tarbert would also serve as the principal policy advisor to the Secretary on international economic matters, including serving as the Treasury's representative at the Financial Stability Board.

Finally, Mr. Tarbert has strong bipartisan support and was voice-voted out of the Banking Committee.

Mr. Tarbert has served in senior roles in all three branches of government and is an experienced lawyer and a recognized financial expert.

In short, he is an important asset whom the Congress and Treasury Department do not want to lose to further delay.

I urge all of my colleagues to support Mr. Tarbert's nomination today and to vote for his confirmation.

With that, I yield the floor.

DELAHIM NOMINATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, the Senate is voting to confirm Makan Delrahim to serve as the Assistant Attorney General for the Antitrust Division. When Mr. Delrahim was 10 years old, his family fled the tyranny of Iran and settled in the United States, knowing no English. Since then, Mr. Delrahim received his B.S. from the University of California in 1991, his J.D. from the George Washington University School of Law in 1995, and his M.S. from Johns Hopkins University in 2002.

Mr. Delrahim's professional career and broad range of legal experiences have prepared him well to lead the Antitrust Division. He has experience in both the private and public sectors. He has worked at various law firms and served in government, including as staff director to then-Chairman HATCH of the Senate Judiciary Committee, deputy counsel to the President of the United States, and Deputy Assistant Attorney General of the Antitrust Division at the Department of Justice. He also served as a Commissioner of the U.S. Antitrust Modernization Commission.

Mr. Delrahim will serve as the highest ranking Iranian-American official ever at the Department of Justice. His journey epitomizes the American dream. He is well known and liked by my colleagues and me. I am pleased to support his nomination today.

Mr. CRAPO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the confirmation of Makan Delrahim has been a top priority of mine. I know the man. He worked with us. He headed our Judiciary Committee staff. Amidst the

rising controversy over antitrust law in the 21st century, he is precisely who we need in that position. I commend the President for having picked him.

All of us, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, are going to make sure that our markets remain free and competitive. Cheap talking points are not going to cut it; only serious debate will.

I am pleased that recent efforts to rise above the partisan fray and treat this subject with the seriousness it deserves have paid off today.

I expect our colleagues to vote for Makan because of the high-quality lawyer he really is.

I thank my colleagues for joining me in this debate. I congratulate Makan, who is sure to make us all very pleased with the way he can run things and the way he can begin this important work that he knows is important. We know it is important; I particularly know it is important.

Makan has been an honest, decent, wonderful man. He is a good father. He has been a terrific staffer here on Capitol Hill. He has worked with both Democrats and Republicans in good faith. I think almost all of them, if they are honest, will say he was a very, very good person to work with and a wonderful person to fill this position.

It is a blessing that someone like Makan, who comes from a very humble family, could rise to the top in this particular position in antitrust, and I am sure he will do an honest, decent job within the antitrust laws as they are configured and written.

I am proud of him. I think the world of him. I hope everybody will vote for him. But if not, I will commend him, and I know he will do a good job in this particular position.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON TARBERT NOMINATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield back all time on both sides, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury?

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the

Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 204 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Baldwin	Fischer	Murray
Barrasso	Flake	Nelson
Bennet	Franken	Paul
Blumenthal	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Peters
Booker	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hassan	Reed
Brown	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Isakson	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corker	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Leahy	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Udall
Daines	McCain	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—8

Gillibrand	Markey	Schatz
Harris	Merkley	Warren
Hirono	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Menendez	Young
Donnelly	Strange	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON DELRAHIM NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Makan Delrahim, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Ex.]

YEAS—73

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Nelson
Bennet	Franken	Paul
Blumenthal	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Peters
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Brown	Hatch	Reed
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Capito	Heller	Roberts
Cardin	Hirono	Rounds
Carper	Hoeven	Rubio
Casey	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Shaheen
Coons	Kennedy	Shelby
Corker	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Durbin	McCain	Warner
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	
Feinstein	Moran	

NAYS—21

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Harris	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Cochran	Menendez	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Strange	Young

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the Erickson nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, one of the Senate Republicans' most important priorities for the rest of this year is passing comprehensive tax reform. Why? Because comprehensive tax reform is perhaps the single most important thing we can do to get our economy back on the path to long-term health. Comprehensive tax reform done right will boost jobs. It will increase wages. It will provide much needed tax relief for middle-income taxpayers and families. It will help businesses reinvest in their operations, employees, and new products. And most importantly, it will help us achieve strong, consistent economic growth.

Over the past few weeks, leaders from the House, Senate, and White House have been meeting to develop the framework for the tax reform bill we will take up later this year. This morning, they unveiled that framework. The framework supports Republicans' five principles for tax reform: providing tax relief for the middle class; increasing wages, jobs, and economic growth; keeping good-paying jobs here at home; increasing American competitiveness in the global economy; and simplifying the Tax Code.

The framework released today emphasizes tax relief for the middle class.

First and foremost, we are going to ensure that working families receive a much needed increase in take-home pay. Right now, 50 percent of families are living paycheck to paycheck, while one-third of people across this country say they are just \$400 away from a financial crisis. That is not acceptable.

Our tax reform plan will ensure that these families are no longer left behind. Our plan will increase the standard deduction, which will provide tax relief to those families who need it the most. It will also enhance the child tax credit, and I don't need to tell anyone that the important work of raising a family is getting more and more expensive. It is time for hard-working families to get a break with a larger child tax credit. Finally, we will be lowering the rates on middle-class families. By collapsing the seven income tax brackets to three, we will ensure that working families get to keep more of what they earn.

Second, our tax plan will increase wages, jobs, and economic growth by lowering taxes and improving cost recovery for American businesses and job creators. The framework released today lays out a goal of a 20-percent corporate tax rate. Right now, our corporate tax rate is the highest in the developed world. Our competitors pay an average rate of 22.5 percent, while U.S. companies face a 35-percent tax rate. That is a big problem. Our uncompetitive tax rate has driven companies to move their headquarters and jobs overseas and led to wage stagnation and a lack of opportunity for American workers. Lowering the corporate rate will create jobs and increase wages for working families across the country.

An equally important priority laid out in the framework is lower tax rates for small businesses, farms, and ranches. Like bigger businesses, small businesses—from partnerships to S corporations—currently face high tax rates, at times even exceeding those paid by large corporations. Lowering tax rates for these businesses and creating a new maximum passthrough rate will allow a business to reinvest more of its earnings in successful operations. In short, it will help these job creators thrive. The Republican tax plan will also allow for unprecedented

expensing. Allowing small businesses to recover their costs more quickly will free up capital and allow them to grow and to create jobs.

The framework released today also shows how we are going to meet our goal of making America more competitive and keeping those good-paying jobs here at home. A key part of keeping good-paying jobs here at home is making the United States an attractive place to do business by reforming our outdated worldwide tax system. Having a worldwide tax system means that American companies pay U.S. taxes on the profit they make here at home as well as on some or all of the profit they make abroad, once they bring that money back to the United States. The problem with this is that American companies are already paying taxes to foreign governments on the money they make abroad. Then, when they bring that money home, they too often end up having to pay taxes again on part of those profits and at the highest tax rate in the industrialized world. It is no surprise that this discourages businesses from bringing their profits back to the United States to invest in their domestic operations, new jobs, and increased wages.

Between 1983 and 2003, when the U.S. tax rate was much more competitive with those of other countries, there were 29 corporate inversions where U.S. companies moved abroad. Between 2003 and 2014, when other countries were dropping their corporate tax rates and shifting to territorial tax systems, there were 47 such inversions.

Our tax plan addresses this drag on our economy by moving from our outdated worldwide tax system to a territorial tax system. By shifting to a territorial tax system here in the United States—a move, I might add, that is supported by Members of both parties—we will eliminate the double taxation that encourages companies to send their investments and their operations overseas. Combine that with a reduction in our high corporate tax rate, and we can provide a strong incentive for U.S. companies to invest their profits at home in American jobs and American workers instead of abroad.

We will also simplify our Tax Code. Each year, Americans spend 2.6 billion hours filling out complicated individual tax forms. Not only is this a drag on our economy, it is an annual frustration and burden for hard-working families. The goal of our tax reform plan is to let American families complete their taxes on something as simple as a postcard.

Lower rates, fewer tax brackets, and a generally simplified code will end the complicated mess that too many families face every tax season.

We will continue to develop the details of this framework in the coming weeks as we work toward a final draft of our comprehensive tax reform bill. I

look forward to collaborating with my colleagues in the Senate Finance Committee as we work to put our country on the path toward long-term economic health and the jobs, increased wages, and opportunities that come along with it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I will be happy to.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks from my friend from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, that I be recognized for such time as I shall consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

CHRONIC CARE ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, often late at night when the Senate passes a piece of legislation by unanimous consent, people often don't get a chance to understand what it really means, and usually there is a sense of, well, this maybe won't be the most important thing coming down the road, and everybody just said OK, and so it passed the Senate.

Last night, the Senate took action on Medicare. At a time when 10,000 people will turn 65 every day for years and years to come, Medicare is something millions of older people rely on, and their kids and grandkids make plans to make sure their grandparents are taken care of, but also they want to know what their future is going to be all about.

What the Senate did last night—Democrats and Republicans coming together—is, in my view, transformational for seniors today and the beginning of an effort that is going to evolve in the days ahead for kids and their parents and their grandparents to, in effect, benefit from an updated Medicare guarantee that will stand the test of time for many years to come. The reason I say “updated Medicare guarantee” is that Medicare is not a voucher. It is not a piece of paper. It is not something you get and then, well, maybe it will do you some good, but if your healthcare costs go above your vouchers, you are going to get buried in costs. Medicare is a guarantee that vital services are going to be available to those over 65.

Last night, all Senators voted to send to the House of Representatives a bipartisan effort that was years in the making to update the Medicare guarantee to start focusing on chronic illnesses, such as cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and Alzheimer's.

Mr. President, I am going to make this a little bit personal. I am so grateful to Chairman HATCH, Senator ISAKSON, Senator WARNER—the bipartisan group in the Senate that has been working on this.

What I can tell the Senate tonight is that back when I was director of the

Gray Panthers and ran the legal aid services for older people, Medicare was a very different program. Back in the 1970s when we were getting the Gray Panthers off the ground, it was a very different program than it is in 2017. Medicare really consisted of two parts. There was Part A. If a senior broke their ankle or needed surgery for a broken hip, they went to the hospital, and Medicare Part A would be there to cover a senior's surgery. If a senior had an awful bout of the flu, he or she visited the doctor and they used Part B. That is not Medicare in 2017. Medicare in 2017 is not primarily about treating the flu or a broken ankle. It is there for those conditions, and we are very glad that it is, but more than 90 percent of the Medicare dollars go to treat older people with two or more chronic conditions. I will tell you, until the Senate Finance Committee, on a bipartisan basis, began to deal with this problem—and fortunately, we had a couple of colleagues in the House who picked up on it as well—my sense is that, basically, both political parties had missed it. They really missed the fact that most of the Medicare dollars—90 percent—go to seniors who have two or more of these chronic conditions. They might, for example, deal with diabetes and heart problems.

But today's seniors really face the kinds of conditions that didn't dominate the program back in the days when the Gray Panthers were getting off the ground. Today, seniors get their care in a variety of different ways. It is not just fee-for-service medicine. We have the Medicare Advantage Plan, Accountable Care Organizations, and other new systems under development.

So keeping up with those changes—updating the Medicare guarantee—ought to be a real priority for policymakers. That is why the Finance Committee has put so much effort over several years to get the bill that passed late last night across the finish line. There are still more steps before the policies reach the President's desk with strong bipartisan backing of the entire Senate. I am confident the job will get done.

The CHRONIC Care Act means more care at home and less in institutions. It will expand the use of lifesaving technology. It places a stronger focus on primary care. It gives older people—however they get their Medicare—more tools and options to receive care specifically targeted to address chronic illnesses and to keep them healthy. These, in my view, are a whole set of building blocks that you have to set in place to update the Medicare guarantee. Still to come is ensuring that every older person with multiple chronic conditions has an advocate to help them navigate through the Byzantine healthcare system in America.

I just want to highlight that point. If you have two or more of these chronic

conditions—I guess the physicians call them comorbidities—you can be drowning, especially if you are not part of a coordinated Medicare program or Medicare Advantage or something like that. You can just be drowning in forms and processes and procedures. Lots of times, over the years, I have gotten calls from a child who is a lawyer or an engineer and they said: RON, help me out in trying to get through all of this maze of bureaucracy to try to get help for my parents. So I want it understood that what the Senate has done as of last night is an extraordinarily important beginning, but there is a lot more to do.

I want to wrap up my comments on this subject and, then, turn briefly to one other, by handing out some very appropriate thank-yous. I think the Finance Committee has handled this bill, in my view, as a model to work on a bipartisan basis. I want to thank Chairman HATCH. He and I put together the bipartisan chronic care working group two years ago, and Senators WARNER and ISAKSON did a first-rate job of leading it.

There is an awful lot of sweat equity put in by staff. A lot of staff worked on these issues while they were dealing with weddings. We had three children born in the process, and there were job changes.

Big thanks go to Karen Fisher, Hannah Hawkins, Kelsey Avery, Leigh Stuckhardt, Liz Jurinka, Beth Vrabell, and Matt Kazan on our team.

Chairman HATCH and his team really stepped up to work with us and all the Senators: Jay Khosla, Brett Baker, Jen Kuskowski, Katie Meyer-Simeon, and the chronic care lead, Erin Dempsey. Big thanks also go to Senators WARNER and ISAKSON for lending us Marvin Figueroa and Jordan Bartolomeo.

I close this portion of my remarks by saying that I think what happened last night—while certainly not something everybody is talking about this evening—is something that is going to be extraordinarily important in the years ahead. It is an issue that I know the President of the Senate and I have talked about—this whole question of healthcare and Medicare and the like. This was an important step to take and an important step we can build on. I hope the other body in the House will take action quickly.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, let me turn now to this question of the Puerto Rico disaster. It has now been a week since Hurricane Maria made landfall in Puerto Rico, and 3.5 million American citizens are living amidst a horrifying state of devastation. When I was chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which has jurisdiction over the affairs of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and America's other territorial possessions, I got very

involved in the economic issues on the island.

But I come today to make a humanitarian plea to my friends and colleagues in the Senate. It is a plea not about economics. It is about people—fathers and mothers, children, grandparents, teachers, nurses, and thousands of veterans who served their communities and their country proudly. They are dealing with something that is almost unimaginable—this horrifying set of circumstances that they now find dominating their lives. The press accounts describe Puerto Rico as looking like a war zone. Millions of people on the island are without power, running water, and fuel. The few hospitals that are open—only 20 for the entire island—struggle to care for the injured and the sick. Many doctors and first responders are unable to get to their workplaces because their lives, too, are thrown into chaos, and 911 still doesn't work. Cell service and power are down. The airport in San Juan barely functions now, after days of being completely off the grid.

It is almost impossible for us here in this city to imagine this. We have the basic infrastructure and health and safety that we take for granted every day. Only one word sums up the state of the islands—demolished. It is almost impossible to gauge the full extent of the devastation. Nobody knows how many lives have been lost or how many homes and businesses have been damaged beyond repair, and how many lives have been shattered.

What is known is that this disaster has affected the lives of every single one of the 3.5 million individuals living on the island and the millions more on U.S. mainland, who have had sleepless nights worrying about loved ones. This is a humanitarian crisis on American soil. It is past time to step up and provide immediate aid to help these Americans—not only for Puerto Rico but also for the U.S. Virgin Islands, which has also been clobbered by these storms. It is not just the right thing to do. It is the only thing to do.

A few hours ago, I joined 35 of my colleagues in sending a letter to the President, and we requested a number of concrete actions. There are other additional steps in my view that are vital. So I want to just tick through some of them on the floor.

First, the President has to issue a full disaster declaration for all of Puerto Rico, not just parts of it. Currently, 24 municipalities in Puerto Rico have yet to receive individual disaster assistance. This means that people who have lost their homes in these areas are ineligible for Federal assistance. This is unacceptable.

Next, while the President rightfully revised his original disaster declaration so that the island will not have to split the cost of disaster relief with the Federal Government for 180 days, the

President should continue this assistance until the island is back on its feet.

The administration also needs to include funding and necessary emergency support for the Puerto Rico Medicaid Program in any emergency request. Medicaid in Puerto Rico doesn't work the way it does in the 50 states, where it is a guarantee of care for vulnerable, low-income people. Puerto Rico's Medicaid Program is built on a block grant, which means that in times of crisis, resources might not be there when it is needed most. Even before the disasters, Puerto Rico was close to depleting its Medicaid supplemental funding. When it does, it will have nowhere to turn to pay for medical care for many of its most vulnerable.

In my view, this is a perfect example of why block grants—as contemplated by the bill that we considered in the Finance Committee this week—Graham-Cassidy-Heller—and vital programs like Medicaid don't mix. It is a recipe for disaster.

In addition, there are expired tax provisions unique and vital to Puerto Rico's economy, and they ought to be extended with any disaster relief package in order to give workers and businesses certainty and predictability. This includes tax incentives for producing goods in Puerto Rico and rebates for taxes on exported rum. In my view, if this is done properly and laid out in a proactive way, it will give predictability for the future and make a difference—an important difference to a lot of people on the job.

It is also vital to get Puerto Rico's electric grid up and running and provide power generators in the meantime. This isn't simply a matter of recharging phones or turning televisions back on for news updates. Going without power is life-threatening. Perishable food goes bad. Those with diabetes can't refrigerate their insulin. Hospitals have a difficult time running essential medical equipment, like dialysis machines or heart monitors. Air conditioners are useless, which is especially dangerous for kids and seniors given the hot, humid temperatures and the limited supply of safe water.

Another necessary step is to help ensure that Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands receive assistance as quickly as possible, and that would include a short-term waiver of the Jones Act. The Jones Act is an important policy for ensuring a vibrant U.S. maritime industry and for our national defense. But in times of disaster it is more important to get supplies to the impacted areas as quickly as possible. The government has granted such a waiver in Houston and Florida, and it is, in my view, beyond comprehension that they haven't done the same thing for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Finally, the administration needs to mount a full-court press to rebuild the

islands' roads, ports, and airports. Once aid arrives, it is useless if you can't get it out to those who need it most.

As several of my colleagues and I wrote to the President today, our military is uniquely qualified to help Puerto Rico meet some of its critical recovery needs. That includes construction battalions that can repair power and surface transportation infrastructure.

I close by saying that the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are desperate for our help. This situation is extreme. Congress and the administration need to act as soon as possible. The cleanup from Maria and Irma is just the beginning. The fact is that these megastorms, fueled by global warming, are going to keep coming, even after the power is restored and the storm damage from Maria and Irma is repaired. There is going to be a lot of work necessary to reverse years of struggle and build up Puerto Rico's economy and infrastructure.

Coming to the aid of our fellow Americans at a time of crisis, in my view, is at the very core of being Americans. At home, I call it "the Oregon way." Our natural disaster this summer was wildfires. Recently, I was out visiting fire camps that stretched from our northern border with Washington State to our southern border with California and many points in between. I met people helping Oregon fight fire from all over the United States. I met Floridians who were there the weekend Irma hit Florida. They were there to help Oregonians deal with fire, when they and their families were worried about what Irma was going to do to Florida.

Colleagues, I close simply by way of saying that we should expect no less in our efforts here in the Senate to help our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The American people now have to be part of a mobilization to bring together the enormous resources in the Federal Government to help when disaster strikes. It is a matter of basic fairness and humanity to help protect and restore these American citizens and lands.

I yield the floor.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say to the Senator from Oregon that help is on its way. It is a very difficult thing because we don't have any idea how long this is going to last. When you stop to think about a land that is in the tropics not having electricity, it is something that is hard to imagination and to get arms around the devastation that takes place. I appreciate the fact that he has brought that up.

WORK OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, when I watch the news, I can't help but see that the

media is showing a kind of picture of Washington that really doesn't exist. The news would have the public believe that there is a lot of dysfunction in the administration, and nothing is getting done. But I can share some examples of how the government has been working to get America back in business.

In my former life, I participated for some 20 years or longer in a free enterprise business. I was making money. I was losing money. I was hiring people, doing what I thought Americans were supposed to be doing. All that time, the major problem I had was the obstruction of the Federal Government. One of the reasons I actually ran in the first place was to try to save the free enterprise system. I never dreamed that we would end up with an administration—as well-meaning as the Obama administration was—that would be putting people out of business.

During the last administration, the Obama administration, new rules were created that had no purpose but to hinder economic growth. In fact, President Obama is the first President since Hoover not to hit a 3-percent GDP growth in any year of his Presidency.

With every industry coming under scrutiny from every regulatory agency, President Obama added more regulations to the Federal Register than any other President in history. Businesses are complying with regulations, costing in the neighborhood of \$2 trillion. You have to keep in mind that when you hear the businesses and corporations are paying this, it is not the businesses that are paying it. It is the public—the people who are out there, and they, through increased costs of goods and services or through taxes, are paying it.

I heard an alarming figure the other day that some 65 percent of the people in America—this is a poll that is about a week old—are opposed to any stopping of regulations in corporations. Yet they are the very ones who are paying for this fun they are having.

This administration has tried to do something about all the overregulation, all the rules that the previous administration had put in place. There are two ways you can do this. One is through Executive orders. People know what those are; that is, the President coming along and giving an Executive order that will undo damage that was done by a previous Executive order imposing a new rule on America. That has been taking place.

At the same time, the other way of doing it is through a CRA resolution. Not many people know what a CRA resolution is. A CRA resolution is a Congressional Review Act resolution. It started about 20 years ago and has never been used until this administration. What it does is say that if you have up to 30 Members of the Senate, you can get a CRA resolution against a rule that some administration has put

in place in a certain time period. It is the way people who are elected to office, accountable to the people, can get things done and be answerable to the people, as opposed to an unelected bureaucrat who is out there imposing hardships and rules on the public.

Actually, this administration came in, and they passed 14 Congressional Review Act resolutions; that is, 14 in the first few weeks, actually. The savings from repeal of these 14 regulations were estimated to be \$3.7 billion in costs and 4.2 million hours of paperwork, the most expensive of which—this is kind of interesting because I introduced a CRA resolution. It happens to be that mine was the first one to pass. So I had the first signing ceremony with our new President Trump during the initial days of his administration.

The rule was imposed by the Obama administration. It was one that would force domestic oil and gas companies to release all of the information they had in formulating their estimates and their bids in competition with maybe China or other countries, and it was putting our domestic oil and gas companies at a competitive disadvantage. This was all part of the Obama war on fossil fuels. Everyone knows that fossil fuels are oil, coal, and gas, and this was an effort to do that. We introduced a resolution repealing that. It was a CRA resolution, and it was successful. We had our signing ceremony, and that was history.

That is 1 of 45—some Executive orders—and 1 of 14 successful CRA resolutions. In addition to the CRA resolutions, President Trump has signed 45 Executive orders with the goal of reducing redtape and cutting back on harmful administrative redtape.

Thanks to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for changing the Senate rules because, with their help, President Trump and a Republican-led Senate have been able to confirm one of the most conservative Cabinets in history, and they have been working to implement the President's pro-business, pro-jobs, pro-economic growth policy.

If you want to see the effect that this administration is having, you need only to look at the energy industry. Of course, that is to say nothing about the fact that we now have a great conservative judge. But when you look at the energy industry, it has been under attack for 8 years.

Within weeks after taking office, the Army Corps of Engineers under the Trump administration approved an easement for the Dakota Access Pipeline that had been withheld by the Obama administration because of nothing more than political pressure from the far left.

The next month, the State Department issued a crossborder permit for

the Keystone Pipeline. Again, the permit had been withheld purely for political far-left reasons.

Later the same month, the Department of the Interior lifted the coal leasing ban that the Obama administration had placed on Federal land. Federal lands have about 40 percent of the coal production in the United States, so that was just devastating to that industry. It was a killer.

Another notable win for energy came just last week out of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; that is, FERC. FERC was without a forum from February until mid-August, creating a backlog and delaying \$50 million of energy infrastructure projects from moving forward. The new forum has quickly gone to work to address that backlog, improving pipelines and power agreements.

However, a decision made last week has clearly sent a message that America's energy sector is open for business again. For years, New York State had been delaying consideration of water certifications that are required for FERC approval to allow construction of several federally approved pipelines.

The Millennium Pipeline, in particular, would take natural gas 9 miles from one pipeline to a natural gas-fired electric plant, providing clean, cheap, natural gas power in New York State. It was delayed and denied certification simply because, again, the radical left doesn't want it.

Last week, FERC took the authority granted to them under the Clean Water Act to override New York State's denial of certification because New York had waived their authority under the law.

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act says that if a State "refuses to act on a request for a certification within a reasonable time period (which shall not exceed 1 year) after the receipt of such request, the certification requirements . . . shall be waived with respect to such Federal application."

With environmentalists increasingly urging States like New York, New Jersey, and Virginia to block pipelines by delaying or withholding otherwise valid certifications, these States are interfering with interstate commerce, a role that is clearly within the purview of the Federal Government.

I applaud the administration for the progress they have made and the independent agencies for taking a stand against the gamesmanship of the radical left, environmentalist groups, and those who do their bidding by using loopholes and their official authority to block valid, compliant energy projects from safely transporting cheaper and cleaner energy across State lines.

When the government works with industry, not against it, we start to see companies unleash investments across the country. In fact, the economy has

picked up since Trump and his administration have come into office with the economy growing 3 percent in just the second quarter, which is the first full quarter under the administration, and the fastest pace of growth in 2 years, according to the website called CNN Money.

Each nomination, confirmation, or policy directive of President Trump and the Republican-led Congress signals to the business community and American workers that America is open for business again.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address our energy industry's needs so that private investors can be utilized to deliver American products to American consumers around the world. Just this week, I introduced a bill to address the known bottleneck issues that add unnecessary delays in the FERC permitting process by identifying participating agencies early in the process and providing contract reviews and providing transparency. This is something that is just common sense.

I thank very much Senator KING and his staff for working with me and my staff on this legislation, and I hope my colleagues will join us in getting these reforms into law.

I bring this up only because you would never know that this is progress that is being made in the economy through the Trump administration. Somehow that report has yet to get through.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID BOREN

Mr. President, I have another thing in mind. A lot of people who have been around in this Senate for a while remember the name of David Boren. David Boren is from my State of Oklahoma. He was a Senator here for quite some period of time. He went on to be the president of Oklahoma University.

I am kind of excited about recognizing him, especially because David Boren and I, in 1967—before any of you guys were born—were elected to the State legislature in the State of Oklahoma. This is kind of funny because, at that time, people thought of Oklahoma as being a red State. Let me tell you, it wasn't a red State then. We had a House of Representatives of 100 people, and only 7 of us were Republicans; the rest were Democrats.

The way it is set up in the House of Representatives in Oklahoma—it is still true today, I believe—you have two members per desk. They would have two Democrats at one desk, two Republicans at one desk. Well, it came out uneven, so the only integrated desk was ours, that of David Boren, who was a Democrat, and I, who was a Republican.

It is kind of interesting also that the first thing we did—keep in mind, this was right after we took office in January of 1967. We came to Washington. We thought we were really important

at that time. We were going to testify before a committee. That committee was called the Environment and Public Works Committee. I don't remember his name, but he was a very popular Democrat from West Virginia. He was, I think, the chairman of that committee.

I remember standing up and testifying before that as a junior Senator from the State of Oklahoma. I really thought I was something. I will tell my colleagues what I was testifying about. It was right after the Johnson administration, and I was protesting Lady Bird's Highway Beautification Act of 1965—taking private property away from people and all that.

It is interesting because David Boren and I were testifying before that committee way back in January of 1967, and I ended up chairing that same committee just a few years later. So that was the beginning.

Anyway, it was kind of interesting because David Boren being a Democrat and myself being a Republican and coming from a very strong, almost entirely Democratic State, we had an individual who is the—I can't remember his name—he was secretary of the treasury for the State of Oklahoma. So we started introducing the reforms. All the reforms in that decade were the product of David Boren, Democrat, and Republican JIM INHOFE. None of them ever passed, but we introduced all of these things.

So we put together a plan. We had a Governor at that time—it is not necessary to mention his name. He was a corrupt Governor, and he ended up in the penitentiary. We put together a plan of how to get him out of office. I would run for Governor as a Republican, I would win my nomination, and he would run for Governor as a Democrat, and of course he most likely would lose—he was running against a very popular Democrat. Anyway, as it turned out, he won. Coming from a solid Democratic State, I can remember calling him up and saying: What do we do now? I think I was best advised to just go out of town until the campaign was over.

Anyway, we spent time together, and we had a great time. David did a great job as the University of Oklahoma's president. He would actually teach classes. He always put students first. So he did a great job.

I would say that it is fitting that he announced his retirement this year because this is his 50th year of public service, and he leaves a legacy of dedication and hard work and public service. His influence has shaped Oklahoma more than I think he ever thought he could. His daddy was Lyle Boren, who was a very popular Democratic House Member for a long period of time, and we all at that time became very close friends.

I don't think there has been a man who loved Oklahoma more and served

our State more faithfully than David Boren.

God bless you, David Boren. Enjoy your retirement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE COLLEGE TEXTBOOK ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, textbook costs are one of the most overlooked barriers to college affordability and access, and they are continuing to get more expensive.

Over the last decade, 2006 to 2016, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index shows that consumer prices for college textbooks increased almost 90 percent. It means students have to spend more every year. In 2016 to 2017, the College Board recommended that students budget an average of \$1,250 for their books.

A survey released by the Student Public Interest Research Group reported that 65 percent of students decided not to buy a textbook because of the cost, and 94 percent of those students worried it would hurt their grade.

This week, I joined with Senators AL FRANKEN and ANGUS KING and Representatives JARED POLIS and KYRSTEN SINEMA to reintroduce the Affordable College Textbook Act. This bill would establish a grant program to encourage the creation and use of high-quality open textbooks which are free to use. Greater access to and widespread use of these open textbooks can save each student who uses one hundreds of dollars, and, long term, it puts pressure on the traditional college textbook market to come up with affordable alternatives.

My home State of Illinois provides an example of how this bill would work. The University of Illinois used \$150,000 in Federal money to pilot an open textbook project at its main campus. The university, working With faculty, developed an open textbook, "Sustain-

ability: A Comprehensive Foundation." This textbook was published electronically for free and open use. You can go online today and find it.

Instead of a student having to shell out \$150 or more for his or her introductory environmental sustainability class, he or she can use this free online book. That is a direct savings to a student every time a professor assigns this text in place of a traditional textbook. Today it is saving students money in Illinois, but also across the country at other colleges and universities where it has been adopted by faculty into their curriculum.

I would again like to thank my colleagues, Senators AL FRANKEN and ANGUS KING, for joining me in this effort I would also like to thank the wide variety of organizations that support this bill, including the U.S. PIRG, SPARC, National Association of Big Ten Students, National Association of College Stores, American Association of Community Colleges, United Negro College Fund, and others.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues in Congress will join us in supporting this bill to create a program at the Federal level to encourage the creation and adoption of these materials. In the meantime, I hope students across the country will reach out to their professors and have this conversation with them. Ask them to adopt these free, quality materials that are available today.

FUNDING FOR SAFE, PUBLIC LATRINES IN AFRICA AND ASIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in the year 2017, when some people live in extravagant homes with half a dozen or a dozen bathrooms with marble floors and the latest fixtures, an estimated 2.5 billion people live in squalor with no access to modern sanitation. One billion people have no access to latrines and defecate in the open, like our ancestors did thousands of years ago.

The United States spends about \$400 million a year on water supply and sanitation programs worldwide, pursuant to the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005. One of our late colleague's many public policy contributions was his focus on pressing issues such as the growing scarcity of clean water sources—even in our own country—and the preventable suffering that comes from poor sanitation. His book, "Tapped Out," is another contribution he made to greater understanding of these challenges. The law named for him requires the Secretary of State, in consultation with the U.S. Agency for International Development and other U.S. Government agencies, to develop and implement a strategy to provide affordable and equitable access to safe water and sanitation in developing countries.

For the past several years, the Congress has directed that \$14 million of those funds be used specifically to design and build safe, public latrines in Africa and Asia. Our purpose has been to help reduce the risk to woman and girls, particularly in rural areas in these countries, who are often assaulted at night or subjected to humiliation and harassment, due to the lack of safe and accessible latrines.

Unfortunately, USAID has not utilized these funds as effectively as we intended, and the fiscal year 2018 Department of State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill, which was reported unanimously by the Senate Appropriations Committee on September 7, specifies that not less than \$15 million shall be made available "to support initiatives by local communities in Africa and Asia to build and maintain safe, public latrines."

What we intend is not rocket science. Today communities in Africa and Asia, often with the assistance of small local or U.S. nongovernmental organizations like the Advocacy Project, are building low-cost, easy to maintain, public latrines. Something as basic as a latrine can transform a community, particularly for women and girls. Not only does it reduce their vulnerability to assault, it reduces the obvious health problems caused by open defecation. It also increases girls' access to education, if there are latrines for girls at schools. The cost of such projects can be as little as a few hundred dollars, particularly when members of the community volunteer their labor. Just as important as the design and construction is a plan for community members to regularly maintain the latrines and to educate the local population—men, women, and children—on their use.

Access to water and sanitation are fundamental to social and economic development. The lack of safe drinking water and proper sanitation, coupled with poor hygiene, are leading causes of sickness and death worldwide. Nearly 1,000 children under age 5 die each day from diarrhea caused by contaminated water and from poor sanitation and hygiene. There are few ways to safeguard a person's health and improve their dignity more basic than by providing them access to sanitation facilities for safely disposing of human waste.

There should be no confusion about what we intend for these \$15 million. We want USAID missions in countries where women and girls in rural areas lack access to safe, public latrines to identify communities for pilot projects, where local leaders want to address this problem and where a small investment can make a significant difference. Working with those leaders and utilizing the technical expertise of local or U.S.-based NGOs, we can help set an example for other communities to replicate.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 204, on the nomination of Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of International Markets and Development, U.S. Treasury Department. Had I been present, I would have voted no.●

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING LIVEREZ

• Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize an outstanding small business located in my home State of Idaho. Dedication, hard work, and the entrepreneurial spirit are some of the guiding principles that define us as Americans. It is these traits that have enabled so many of our fellow citizens to achieve the American dream. As our workforce moves further into the 21st century, new opportunities are created every day by the American people themselves to ensure that they can achieve a better standard of life, without reliance on others. My State of Idaho knows this and is proud to serve as an incubator for many small businesses that seek to expand these values through their unique entrepreneurial spirit. As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my pleasure to recognize LiveRez as the Senate Small Business of the Month for September 2017. LiveRez is one of a good number of software companies in Idaho, which provides services to American businesses nationwide and serves as a true example of hard work in pursuit of the American dream.

LiveRez is based out of Eagle, ID, and was founded by Tracy Lotz in 2008, after years of research and development within the vacation rental sector. Tracy started his journey with vacation rentals in 1994, when he launched First Choice Vacation Properties, one of the few early websites where managers were able to advertise their vacation rentals in cyberspace. It wouldn't be until 2002 that Tracy and his nephew Jeremy would start building websites for their clientele of professional vacation rental managers, and within a year, they were pioneering online bookings in real time. It would not be until 2005 that the Lotz's would shift from providing the service at an incremental level to designing software that would be 100 percent cloud-based. In January 2008, LiveRez was launched as the first all-in-the-cloud management system. From there, they have continued expanding and innovating with the establishment of the First Advisory

Board, mobile websites, and other technical applications that enabled their software to be one of the most sought after management systems for managers not only in the United States but also around the world.

Perhaps what makes all of this success even more incredible is that Tracy was able to do all of this organically, utilizing the revenue from the company's early days to continue to grow. He did not seek out venture capital for the company, nor did he take on debt. Today Tracy and the team at LiveRez host their annual partner conference, which includes classes, tech reveals, networking, and more amenities for members of the industry.

I would like to congratulate Tracy Lotz and the employees of LiveRez on their innovation and hard work and the commitment that they have to their partners and clients. I wish the best for LiveRez, and I am confident that they will continue to provide innovative services and ideas to their growing customer base.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:05 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 603 of the Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-323), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission: Mr. Matt Salmon of Mesa, Arizona.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 810. An act to facilitate construction of a bridge on certain property in Christian County, Missouri, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3354. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2923. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hurricane Harvey and Hurricane Irma Disaster Relief" (Notice 2017-49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2924. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2017-1011); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2925. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0512)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2926. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0481)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2927. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; ATR—GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0516)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2928. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0496)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2929. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0008)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2930. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turboprop Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0164)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2931. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems) Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0479)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2932. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0652)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2933. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adding the Polar Ship Certificate to the List of SOLAS Certificates and Certificates Issued by Recognized Classification Societies" ((RIN1625-AC35) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0880)) received during adjournment in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2934. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Rice Creek, Putnam County, FL" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0523)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2935. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Little River to Savannah River, Beaufort, SC" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0343)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2936. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Sarasota, FL" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0330)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2937. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Wando River, Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0348)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2938. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0543)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of

the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2939. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Delaware River; Dredging" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0811)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2940. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Dredging; Shark River, NJ" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0843)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2941. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Tombigbee River, Demopolis, AL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0786)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2942. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Great Lakes Pilotage Rates—2017 Annual Review" ((RIN1625-AC34) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0268)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2943. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Marine Event held in the Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0716)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2944. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Village of Sodus Point Fireworks; Lake Ontario, Sodus Point, NY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0718)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2945. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Frogtown Regatta, Maumee River, Toledo, OH" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0754)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2946. A communication from the Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and

Information Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Repeal of Regulations Governing the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program" (RIN0660-AA34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2947. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2016"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2948. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report on Disability-Related Air Travel Complaints Received During Calendar Year 2016"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Marine Corps nomination of Gen. Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., to be General.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1869. A bill to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. McCAIN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1870. A bill to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1871. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the role of podiatrists in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1872. A bill to authorize the programs of the Transportation Security Administration relating to transportation security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1873. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to

establish peer specialists in patient aligned care teams at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1874. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish certain demonstration grant programs relating to the demonstration of advanced distribution systems, smart water heaters, vehicle-to-grid integration, and granular retail electricity pricing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1875. A bill to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the flexibility, efficiency, and reliability of the electric grid, to increase the competitiveness of the United States economy, to protect consumers, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. REED):

S. 1876. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to advance energy storage deployment by reducing the cost of energy storage through research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1877. A bill to jump-start economic recovery through the formation and growth of new businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1878. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1879. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1880. A bill to reform our government, reduce the grip of special interest, and return our democracy to the American people by increasing transparency and oversight of our elections and government, reforming public financing for Presidential and Congressional elections, and requiring States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. COONS)):

S. Res. 269. A resolution designating September 2017 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 194

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 194, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes.

S. 364

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 364, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to exempt certain recipients of Department of Agriculture conservation assistance from certain reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 538

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 538, a bill to clarify research and development for wood products, and for other purposes.

S. 693

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 693, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 951

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 951, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, and for other purposes.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1144, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage business creation by allowing faster recovery of start-up and organizational expenses, to simplify accounting methods for small businesses, to expand expensing and provide accelerated cost recovery to encourage invest-

ment in new plants and equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1292, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes.

S. 1319

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1319, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a continuing medical education program for non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who treat veterans to increase knowledge and recognition of medical conditions common to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1358

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1358, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain direct primary care service arrangements and periodic provider fees.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 1505

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1505, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1531, a bill to require reporting by the Secretary of Education on the implementation of recent Government Accountability Office recommendations.

S. 1568

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1568, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of President John F. Kennedy.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Montana

(Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, *supra*.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1697, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens and United States Citizens.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1753

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1753, a bill to amend the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to provide a temporary license for loan originators transitioning between employers, and for other purposes.

S. 1754

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1754, a bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1767

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1767, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1774, a bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1816

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1816, a bill to amend the

Fair Credit Reporting Act to enhance fraud alert procedures and provide free access to credit freezes, and for other purposes.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1823, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1829, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program.

S. 1868

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1868, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 250

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 250, a resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy.

S. RES. 264

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 264, a resolution designating September 2017 as "National Kinship Care Month".

S. RES. 267

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 267, a resolution designating September 2017 as "National Workforce Development Month".

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 267, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1874. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish certain demonstration grant programs relating to the demonstration of advanced dis-

tribution systems, smart water heaters, vehicle-to-grid integration, and granular retail electricity pricing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a set of three bills that will lower the cost of energy storage, increase flexibility in the power grid, and create a comprehensive set of grant programs to advance development of renewable energy technologies throughout the country.

Currently, many energy technologies—like energy storage—compete in unfair markets, making it hard for new innovations to measure up to more established technologies like those of the fossil fuel industry. Congress and the Department of Energy can work hand-in-hand with industry to level the playing field, using a fair, tech-neutral approach when updating the electricity system, to benefit the American consumer.

My Reducing the Cost of Energy Storage Act will provide funding to the Department of Energy to research and develop ways to lower the cost of energy storage technologies. Ultimately, this bill will make it possible for renewable energy to be used on a more reliable and affordable basis.

To protect the power supply from disruptions caused by natural disasters, which can wipe out power to millions of homes, my Flexible Grid Infrastructure Act will require the Department of Energy to find and develop ways to make the power grid more flexible and responsive to these challenges. The bill will also connect displaced workers to training programs that will allow them to transition to high-skill clean energy jobs. Finally, this bill will provide states and utilities with resources to upgrade the flexibility and reliability of the power grid.

In order to ensure private sector growth in distributed energy technologies, my Distributed Energy Demonstration Act will create competitive, cost-share grant programs for new small-scale, grid-connected projects such as rooftop solar panels, hot water heaters, electric vehicles and modernized utility pricing technologies.

Together, or apart, these bills will promote a more flexible electricity grid that can respond to power disruptions from natural disasters and ensure reliable, low-cost electricity for consumers now and in the future. They will also lower costs for energy storage technologies that make renewable energy more reliable and cost-effective, boost funding for cutting-edge research and reward state and private sector innovations, which will make renewable energy more reliable and affordable for U.S. energy consumers.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1875. A bill to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the flexibility, efficiency, and reliability of the

electric grid, to increase the competitiveness of the United States economy, to protect consumers, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. REED):

S. 1876. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to advance energy storage deployment by reducing the cost of energy storage through research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 269—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2017 AS “NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. COONS)) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 269

Whereas over 2,900,000 families in the United States live with prostate cancer;

Whereas 1 in 7 men in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in their lifetimes;

Whereas prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed nonskin cancer and the third-leading cause of cancer-related deaths among men in the United States;

Whereas the American Cancer Society estimates that in 2017, 161,360 men will be diagnosed with, and more than 26,730 men will die of, prostate cancer;

Whereas 43 percent of newly diagnosed prostate cancer cases occur in men under the age of 65;

Whereas the odds of developing prostate cancer rise rapidly after age 50;

Whereas African-American men suffer from a prostate cancer incidence rate that is significantly higher than that of White men and have double the prostate cancer mortality rate than that of White men;

Whereas having a father or brother with prostate cancer more than doubles the risk of a man developing prostate cancer, with a higher risk for men who have a brother with the disease and the highest risk for men with several affected relatives;

Whereas screening by a digital rectal examination and a prostate-specific antigen blood test can detect the disease at the earlier, more treatable stages, which could increase the chances of survival for more than 5 years to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas only 29 percent of men survive more than 5 years if diagnosed with prostate cancer after the cancer has metastasized;

Whereas there are no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer in the early stages, making appropriate screening critical;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2017, the Director of the National Institutes of Health supported approximately \$274,000,000 in research projects focused specifically on prostate cancer;

Whereas ongoing research promises further improvements in prostate cancer prevention, early detection, and treatment; and

Whereas educating people in the United States, including health care providers, about prostate cancer and early detection strategies is crucial to saving the lives of men and preserving and protecting families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2017 as “National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month”;

(2) declares that steps should be taken—

(A) to raise awareness about the importance of screening methods for, and treatment of, prostate cancer;

(B) to encourage research—

(i) to improve screening and treatment for prostate cancer;

(ii) to discover the causes of prostate cancer; and

(iii) to develop a cure for prostate cancer; and

(C) to continue to consider ways to improve access to, and the quality of, health care services for detecting and treating prostate cancer; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interest groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of prostate cancer;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end the devastating effects of prostate cancer on individuals, families, and the economy; and

(C) to observe National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1106. Mr. INHOFE (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1106. Mr. INHOFE (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES IN CERTAIN JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

(a) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES AUTHORIZED BY THE BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2005.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judges authorized for the following districts by subsection (b) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) are extended until the applicable vacancy specified in paragraph (2) in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the respective district occurs:

(A) The district of Delaware.

(B) The southern district of Florida.

(C) The district of Maryland.

(D) The eastern district of Michigan.

(E) The district of Nevada.

(F) The eastern district of North Carolina.

(G) The district of Puerto Rico.

(H) The eastern district of Virginia.

(2) VACANCIES.—

(A) SINGLE VACANCIES.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), the 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for each district specified in paragraph (1)—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(B) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(i) occurring 5 years or more after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(C) DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.—

(i) The 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Maryland—

(I) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(II) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(ii) The 2d and 3d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Maryland resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(D) SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.—The 1st and 2d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the southern district of Florida—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of subsection (b) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of bankruptcy judges referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES EXTENDED BY THE BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2005 AND THE TEMPORARY BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP EXTENSION ACT OF 2012.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judges authorized by section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and extended by subsection (c) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and further extended by section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) for the district of Delaware and the district of Puerto Rico are extended until the applicable vacancy specified in paragraph (2) in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the respective district occurs.

(2) VACANCIES.—

(A) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 5th vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(B) DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO.—The 2d vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Puerto Rico—

(i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note), subsection (c) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note), and section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of bankruptcy judges referred to in paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGE AUTHORIZED.

(a) APPOINTMENTS.—The following bankruptcy judges shall be appointed in the manner prescribed in section 152(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, for the appointment of bankruptcy judges provided for in section 152(a)(2) of that title:

(1) Two additional bankruptcy judges for the district of Delaware.

(2) One additional bankruptcy judge of the middle district of Florida.

(3) One additional bankruptcy judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

(b) VACANCIES.—

(1) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 6th and 7th vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under paragraph (1) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(2) MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.—The 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the middle district of Florida—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under paragraph (1) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.—The 2d vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the eastern district of Michigan—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under paragraph (1) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

SEC. 4. BANKRUPTCY FEES.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(6) In” and inserting “(6)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) During each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, if the balance in the United States Trustee System Fund as of September 30 of the most recent full fiscal year is less than \$200,000,000, the quarterly fee payable for a quarter in which disbursements equal or exceed \$1,000,000 shall be the lesser of 1 percent of such disbursements or \$250,000.”

(b) DEPOSITS OF CERTAIN FEES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 THROUGH 2022.—Notwithstanding section 589a(b) of title 28, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022—

(1) 98 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of such title shall be deposited as offsetting collections to the appropriation “United States Trustee System Fund”, to remain available until expended; and

(2) 2 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of such title shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to quarterly fees payable under section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this section, for disbursements made in any calendar quarter that begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. CLARIFICATION OF RULE ALLOWING DISCHARGE TO GOVERNMENTAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE DISPOSITION OF FARM ASSETS UNDER CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation

“(a) Any unsecured claim of a governmental unit against the debtor or the estate that arises before the filing of the petition, or that arises after the filing of the petition and before the debtor’s discharge under section 1228, as a result of the sale, transfer, exchange, or other disposition of any property used in the debtor’s farming operation—

“(1) shall be treated as an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition is filed;

“(2) shall not be entitled to priority under section 507;

“(3) shall be provided for under a plan; and

“(4) shall be discharged in accordance with section 1228.

“(b) For purposes of applying sections 1225(a)(4), 1228(b)(2), and 1229(b)(1) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated in a case under chapter 7 of this title shall be the amount that would be paid by the estate in a chapter 7 case if the claim were an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition was filed and were not entitled to priority under section 507.

“(c) For purposes of applying sections 523(a), 1228(a)(2), and 1228(c)(2) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the claim shall not be treated as a claim of a kind specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 523(a)(1).

“(d)(1) A governmental unit may file a proof of claim for a claim described in subsection (a) that arises after the date on which the petition is filed.

“(2) If a debtor files a tax return after the filing of the petition for a period in which a claim described in subsection (a) arises, and the claim relates to the tax return, the debtor shall serve notice of the claim on the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for the collection of the tax at the address and in the manner designated in section 505(b)(1). Notice under this paragraph shall state that the debtor has filed a petition under this chapter, state the name and location of the court in which the case under this chapter is pending, state the amount of the claim, and include a copy of the filed tax return and documentation supporting the calculation of the claim.

“(3) If notice of a claim has been served on the governmental unit in accordance with paragraph (2), the governmental unit may file a proof of claim not later than 180 days after the date on which such notice was served. If the governmental unit has not filed a timely proof of the claim, the debtor or trustee may file proof of the claim that is consistent with the notice served under paragraph (2). If a proof of claim is filed by the debtor or trustee under this paragraph, the governmental unit may not amend the proof of claim.

“(4) A claim filed under this subsection shall be determined and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 502, or disallowed under subsection (d) or (e) of section 502, in the same manner as if the claim had arisen immediately before the date of the filing of the petition.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1222(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “unless—” and all that follows through “the holder” and inserting “unless the holder”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) subject to section 1232, provide for the treatment of any claim by a governmental unit of a kind described in section 1232(a).”;

(B) in section 1228—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(aa) by inserting a comma after “all debts provided for by the plan”; and

(bb) by inserting a comma after “allowed under section 503 of this title”; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “the kind” and all that follows and inserting “a kind specified in section 523(a) of this title, except as provided in section 1232(c).”; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting “, except as provided in section 1232(c)” before the period at the end; and

(C) in section 1229(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) provide for the payment of a claim described in section 1232(a) that arose after the date on which the petition was filed.”

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) any bankruptcy case—

(A) that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) in which the plan under chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, has not been confirmed on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) relating to which an order of discharge under section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, has not been entered; and

(2) any bankruptcy case that commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Hearing on Forest Management to Mitigate Wildfires: Legislative Solutions."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 2017 at 10:45 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 2017 at 2:15 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, at 10 a.m., in order to conduct a hearing titled "Threats to the Homeland."

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an oversight hearing on "The GAO Reports on Human Trafficking of Native Americans in the United States."

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate Wednesday, September 27, 2017 at 3 p.m., in 428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "An Early Review of SBA's Response to the 2017 Hurricanes."

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, at 10 a.m., in SR-418, to conduct a hearing titled, "#BeThere: What More Can Be Done to Prevent Veteran Suicide?"

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Jessica Rosenblatt, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Caroline Normile, an AAAS fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Scott Litzelman, a legislative fellow in my office, be given floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2017

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3819, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3819) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3819) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2266 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2266) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley substitute amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1106) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 2266), as amended, was passed.

NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 269, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 269) designating September 2017 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 269) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 349; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in

order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for reappointment as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 152 and 601:

To be general

Gen. Joseph F. Dunford, Jr.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER 28, 2017

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 28; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Erickson nomination, with the time until the cloture vote equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before

the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:23 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 28, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 27, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

HEATH P. TARBERT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MAKAN DELRAHIM, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 27, 2017

The House met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Pastor Dennis Jokela, Kalamazoo County Sheriff's Department, Kalamazoo, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Father God, we are grateful to be able to come into Your presence in a free country such as ours.

I ask that You bless this great Nation.

I ask You to pour out Your wisdom and revelation knowledge into everyone hearing the sound of my voice.

I ask You to let Your glory shine like a light emanating from this place, filling our entire country.

I speak unification of our country in our original, can-do, American spirit.

I speak life into those dead and dying places in our land, Lord.

For those places that are in need of Your restoration power, I ask that You pour it out on them.

I ask that You bless these proceedings today and bless the work of our hands.

I ask all of this in Jesus' mighty name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING PASTOR DENNIS JOKELA

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a proud son of Portage, Michigan, Pastor Dennis Jokela

of the Kalamazoo County Sheriff's Department.

He has been a pillar of our community through his work as a small-business owner, a judge for the Michigan Vocational Education Society, and as a corporal and chaplain at the Kalamazoo County Sheriff's Department as well.

I know I speak for many as we thank, in particular, our first responders all across the country, sheriffs, and police officers, and pray to keep them and their families safe.

Pastor Jokela's dedication to public service runs deep as a seven-time decorated veteran of Vietnam and Cambodia—overdue medals my team was able to help him obtain—a pastor with the Michigan Boot Camp for Troubled Teens at Fort Custer, and his work with the homeless. His commitment to community and country are unquestionable.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Pastor Jokela for his service here and at home. We are all so honored to be with him today. I thank him for his kind words.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING ERIEZ MANUFACTURING ON 75 YEARS IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Eriez Manufacturing on 75 years in business in Erie, Pennsylvania. Eriez has grown exponentially since the early days when Orange Fowler Merwin—or O.F., as he was known—sold equipment to grain millers.

His customers often complained about stray pieces of metal that found their way into the grain that the farmers brought to the mills for grinding. In 1942, O.F. devised a permanent magnetic separator in the basement of his home and sold it to a grain miller. Eriez was officially on its way.

Since those humble beginnings in that Erie basement, Eriez has expanded into the world authority in separation technologies with operations all over

the world. Of course, it has always been headquartered in Erie and on Asbury Road since 1962.

Mr. Speaker, today, Eriez employs more than 300 Erie residents, between its two locations on Asbury Road and at its facility near Belle Valley.

The story of Eriez Manufacturing truly is a classic American Dream tale, and it has maintained local family ownership throughout its history. I congratulate them on this milestone.

PUERTO RICO NEEDS OUR ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Hurricane Maria hit the island of Puerto Rico. The damage on the island has been described as apocalyptic: buildings destroyed, a major dam at risk of collapse, and millions of American citizens looking for help. But 1 week later, we still have not addressed this extraordinary crisis. Congress is not planning to vote on providing aid until next week.

President Trump tweeted about Puerto Rico owing money to Wall Street, as if that should be a priority right now. President Trump and my friends on the other side of the aisle who control Congress need to start treating this with the urgency it demands.

My district is home to more than 20,000 Puerto Ricans. Over the last week, they have told me that they don't understand what is going on in Washington. Why is this taking so long?

This President talks a lot about putting America first, but why isn't he doing more to help our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico?

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, bring a bill to the floor. Let's get this done, and let's address the humanitarian crisis that is besetting citizens in Puerto Rico.

THE 911 DISPATCHERS OF HARVEY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the inky darkness of night, during the hammering rain of Harvey, reservoirs released even more water with little

notice to people downstream. Meanwhile, hundreds of first responders battled the incessant rain, rising floodwaters, and raging currents to rescue people from homes.

Inside the dimly lit call center, 911 dispatchers answered call after call after call, racing to keep up as tense thousands dialed in. Dispatchers like 26-year-old Erika Wells worked 20-hour stretches, then trying to grab a nap or two.

With phones constantly ringing, the dispatchers sent rescue teams to homes packed with people in need of escape, a woman in labor, and families trapped on their roofs. As the 50-inch rain kept pounding and floodwaters rose, the dispatchers answered, calmed, and helped those in need.

As the morning Sun finally broke through the Texas sky, the dispatchers emerged from their stations and finally checked on their own families, many of whom had their own homes flooded. These dispatchers are some of the Texas Proud that helped save others in the floods of summer.

And that is just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING NESTOR GARCIA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, at about 2 a.m. this morning, our HPD, Houston Police Department, faced a tragic incident of one of our officers who was participating in a stop along with other officers on I-59 South. Unfortunately, a driver who paid no attention to the flashing lights and the work of these officers sped through and hit Nestor Garcia.

My last word was that he was in surgery, with his family, and that all of those who could be there—the chief and the mayor—were at the hospital with him.

So I simply stand to ask for prayers for Nestor Garcia and his family and indicate that we are well aware of the work of the outstanding police and fire departments during Hurricane Harvey and all of the time. I wish him the best and strongest recovery as a young man who just entered the police department and just graduated. I know that our prayers will help him and his family.

RECOGNIZING TANNER LEE JAMESON

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Tanner Lee Jameson, was just 13 when he died from cardiac arrest during a basketball game. His school had an automated external defibrillator, or AED, in a nearby office, but it was inaccessible when Tanner needed it most.

Since Tanner's passing, his mother, and my constituent, Rhonda Harrill, who is in the gallery today with her husband, has been a passionate advocate for increased AED access.

Early this year, I introduced the AEDs resolution, H. Res. 35, which would encourage schools to have AEDs and to provide annual AED training.

In 1998, I introduced, and Congress passed, the Aviation Medical Assistance Act, the law that requires, among other things, passenger airplanes and airports to have AEDs and flight crews to receive additional first aid and AED training.

Today, I am pleased to participate in this year's AED Hunt on the Hill, sponsored by my friend, Dr. PHIL ROE, and hosted by the Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to remember Tanner Jameson's life, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H. Res. 35 to hopefully help save lives in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman that references to occupants of the gallery are not permitted.

SICKLE CELL AWARENESS

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a topic very near and dear to my heart: sickle cell anemia.

Sickle cell disease is an inherited blood disorder that affects red blood cells and rapidly destroys sickle cells in the body. During an attack, victims can experience acute chest pain, stroke, and damage to vital organs like the kidneys and liver.

This disease is personal to me because, growing up, I watched my sister suffer from it. She was always in and out of the hospital. Oftentimes, the only resources we had to treat her were our family's love and support. This was devastating. My sister lost her battle at age 26.

But this doesn't have to be the story of others. While medical treatment and research for sickle cell anemia has evolved, it is imperative to support Federal funding for additional research and treatment opportunities.

I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 2410, the Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sickle Cell Awareness Day by not only supporting community efforts to treat patients with this disease, but by cosponsoring legislation that provides Federal resources to advance medical treatments for this disease.

FALLEN HERO BANNER DEDICATION

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I participated in the unveiling of the Bucks County Home-town Heroes Banners at Freedom Square in Doylestown. These banners hold the names and faces of the brave women and men of Bucks County who gave their life in service of our Nation after the terror attacks of September 11 and as part of the global war on terror.

It was a humbling experience to be surrounded by friends and families of those warriors, as well as a community committed to honoring their legacy. Even Freedom Square—a community-built memorial supported by the Travis Manion Foundation, the local chapter of the American Gold Star Mothers, and the Goldman Family—signifies our commitment to remember those who have served and sacrificed for our freedom. As always, I am proud of the patriotism and support shown by our community in Bucks County.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the 25 names of these fallen heroes in honor of their sacrifice, the sacrifice of their families, and in support of the Bucks County community.

Specialist Kristofer T. Stonesifer, U.S. Army.

Corporal Patrick R. Nixon, U.S. Marine Corps.

Specialist William J. Maher, III, U.S. Army.

Captain Brian R. Faunce, U.S. Army.

Specialist Tamarra J. Ramos, U.S. Army.

Specialist Maurice J. Johnson, U.S. Army.

Specialist Edward W. Brabazon, U.S. Army.

Corporal Barton R. Humlhanz, U.S. Marines Corps.

Lance Corporal Robert T. Mininger, U.S. Marine Corps.

Specialist Kurt E. Krout, U.S. Army.

Private First Class Nathaniel E. DeTemple, U.S. Army.

Captain Scott E. Craven, U.S. Air Force.

Staff Sergeant Jae S. Moon, U.S. Army.

First Lieutenant Travis L. Manion, U.S. Marine Corps.

First Lieutenant Colby J. Umbrell, U.S. Army.

Sergeant Allen James Dunckley, U.S. Army.

Private First Class Robert H. Dembowski, Jr., U.S. Army.

Sergeant First Class Shawn M. Suzch, U.S. Army.

Staff Sergeant Mark C. Baum, U.S. Army.

Special Operations Chief Eric F. Shellenberger, U.S. Navy.

Corporal Elliot D. Teisler, U.S. Marine Corps.

Master Sergeant Kenneth B. Elwell, U.S. Army.

Sergeant First Class Liam J. Nevins, U.S. Army.

Sergeant Daniel J. Warriner, U.S. Army.

Specialist Nicholas D. Roberts, U.S. Army.

URGE PASSAGE OF THE DREAM ACT OF 2017

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with the DREAMers, and I urge the passage of H.R. 3440, the Dream Act of 2017.

I know what it is like to leave your country of birth as a child through no choice of your own, and I know that those kids have grown up to become just as American as each and every one of us here.

Despite what their immigration status might say, this is their country; this is their home. We cannot stand by and allow their lives and well-being to be put in jeopardy. The country is on their side. Don't let petty politics get in the way of good policy.

The DREAMers are courageous young men and women who came forward to register in the DACA program, and now they are more vulnerable than ever. Mr. Speaker, I urge every one of my colleagues to support H.R. 3440. The clock is ticking. We must act to protect the DREAMers.

□ 1515

PUERTO RICO AND HURRICANE RELIEF

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it has been 8 days since Hurricane Maria slammed into Puerto Rico and impacted the lives of Americans there, who are now in dire need. Power and communications remain down; food, water, and fuel are scarce; infrastructure continues to crumble; and Americans are dying. Tackling recovery is urgent.

I was pleased to see that President Trump has asked Brigadier General Richard Kim to go to the island and seek to lead. Because of the island's topography and isolation, this isn't a Houston, this isn't a New Orleans or a Florida. Rescue and relief isn't as easy as moving a convoy of power company trucks down the interstate highway. Logistically, this is much more difficult.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time to set up a joint task force, with one person in charge, able to make decisions and not get "stuck on stupid," as one Army general famously said. That general, Russell Honore, turned around the government floundering after taking charge of Joint Task Force Katrina.

On the ground, the joint task force can coordinate all public and private relief efforts, starting with putting our National Guard to work, reopening the air tower, clearing the roads, and opening a chow hall.

I continue to pray for Puerto Rico, but each of us must understand our beloved island's crisis is very different.

IN SUPPORT OF DREAMERS AND THE DREAM ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, I also want to join my colleague from Houston in prayers for Houston police officer Nestor Garcia and his family, but I rise today in support of the 68,000 DREAMers that are in Houston, Harris County, Texas, and throughout our country, and call on congressional leaders to bring up the Dream Act for immediate vote.

DREAMers and young men and women who were raised in America know no other country and are an integral part of our schools, our colleges, our workforce, and our communities.

During the worst days of Hurricane Harvey, DREAMers helped rescue neighbors and save lives throughout Houston and the Texas Gulf Coast. DREAMers are now and will continue to be serving a key role in rebuilding our city.

President Trump's announcement this month to end the DACA program was a gut punch to DREAMers who are helping their families and communities recover from Harvey's destruction.

Congress has a moral obligation to honor the hard work and aspirations of the current and earlier generations of immigrants and DREAMers, and bring up the Dream Act for our immediate consideration.

IN SUPPORT OF 800,000 DREAMERS

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of 800,000 DREAMers abandoned by this administration. Any doubt about the administration's senseless cruelty was put to rest on September 5, when they chose to end DACA.

Immigrant youth and their families fuel our economy and help create a more dynamic society.

Terminating DACA is a heartless and vile act that will upend lives, ruin families, and disrupt local economies.

DREAMers are the embodiment of America's promise, the idea that no matter where you are from, the color of your skin, or the God you worship, if you come here, believe in our values, work hard, and contribute to our country, then you deserve a place here in the United States of America. That is what we are fighting for: to keep the promise of this great country.

To my Republican colleagues: you can't profess to support the DREAMers

yet fail to support the Dream Act. It is time to put up or shut up. I call on my colleagues to sign the discharge petition and support a clean Dream Act.

IT IS TIME TO VOTE ON THE DREAM ACT

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition to force a vote on the Dream Act. I believe this legislation would pass today if the Speaker would put it to a vote.

Survey after survey confirms that a vast majority of Americans support DREAMers and believe they should be allowed to stay in the United States, the only country they have known since childhood.

Let's be clear: DREAMers' lives are not bargaining chips, DREAMers' future is not a real estate deal. DREAMers have started businesses, they have bought homes, they have mentored high school students, they have found work in nonprofits.

They give back to their community every day. They are teachers, they are nurses and doctors, they are our neighbors, our friends, and, for some of us like me, they are family.

Failing to extend legal protections for DREAMers would be a historic betrayal, a permanent stain on our country. If you have yet to sign the discharge petition, I urge my colleagues to do so now.

THERE IS MUCH CONFUSION ABOUT IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that there is much confusion about something that is near and dear to me. There is much confusion about impeachment, and so as to give some degree of clarity, I have, in this hand, an article that is styled, "The Overcriminalization of Impeachment." It is dated August 7, 2017, by Gene Healy. He is with the Cato Institute.

I commend it to all who have any interest in impeachment, because this will give you a summary that will spare you a lot of reading in the Federalist Papers, reading many other articles. I commend it to you, and I will say more about it at a later time.

MUSLIM BAN 3.0

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage toward the latest travel ban proposed by the Trump administration again late on September 24. The administration issued a proclamation with new discriminatory travel restrictions on eight countries.

Let me be clear: no matter how many times this administration tries to repackage it and sell it, a Muslim ban is a Muslim ban. It remains hateful, discriminatory, and goes against our American values. We won't be fooled by the inclusion of North Korea and Venezuela.

This Muslim and refugee ban continues to be part of a dangerous and immoral agenda against a religion, people of color, and immigrants.

This administration and this ban is fanning the flames of fear and anger against groups of Americans and immigrants, with policies that clearly undermine the Constitution that I love and our American principles.

Dressed up or dressed down, this ban must not stand.

We must address terrorism, and it is not restricted to the Muslim population. We must address it here on the ground in homegrown terrorism as well.

PROTECTING AND DEFENDING OUR DREAMERS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protect and defend our DREAMers.

Now that President Trump has failed all of us by rescinding DACA, Congress must now move immediately to protect these courageous, patriotic DREAMers like my constituent and aspiring cardiovascular surgeon, Cinthya Moran.

Cinthya just wants an opportunity to contribute to her community, and in her own words: "We are only here to contribute to this amazing country."

Like Cinthya, all DACA recipients are our friends, they are our neighbors, they are soldiers on the battlefield, they are new homeowners, they are entrepreneurs, they are students.

I urge my colleagues to support our DACA constituents and pass legislation that protects these brave young people, and I ask you to do that as soon as possible.

AMERICA'S IMMIGRATION SYSTEM IS BROKEN

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I have been saying for years that the American immigration system is broken, and it is

about time we fix it. We must pass comprehensive immigration reform. This will obviously require bipartisanship and a deliberative policy process to make it happen.

In the meantime, we ought to do what we can where we can agree to do it, and that is why I am working towards this effort to protect our DREAMers now. This is why I signed the discharge petition to bring to the House floor a bipartisan, bicameral Dream Act which will permanently protect these people who were brought here as children, who are in school, who are serving in our military, who are working and contributing to our economy, that will permanently protect DREAMers and offer them a path to earned citizenship.

At Fresno State University, we have 1,200 DREAMers who are enrolled; at UC Merced, we have 600 DREAMers who are enrolled. We have thousands of young people in the San Joaquin Valley who are impacted, and that is why we must change this law and that is why I am here today, calling on the House leadership to bring the Dream Act to the floor. It is the right thing to do. It is the American way in which we solve problems.

I will continue to do everything in my power to bring the Dream Act to the House floor to vote and to work for a comprehensive and a longer term immigration policy so that we don't have to continue to have the political posturing and the fight that has endured way too long. Let's fix this for the DREAMers now.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 27, 2017, at 1:35 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1866.

That the Senate passed S. 1028.

That the Senate passed S. 504.

That the Senate passed S. 1057.

That the Senate passed S. 870.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3823, DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 538 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 538

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House, without intervention of any question of consideration, the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 28, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3823, the

Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the whole world is aware of a series of storms that have hit not only America's shores but those shores of so many of our territories, including the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

□ 1530

A series of these hurricanes over the past few weeks has caused great devastation in Texas, Florida, Georgia, Puerto Rico, and, of course, again, the U.S. Virgin Islands. These are people who are American citizens, and they are in these territories, and they are suffering from loss and devastation, and we have never seen an occurrence like this with two storms in succession.

While there remains much to be done and evaluated, this legislation takes important steps, I believe, that are necessary to begin providing relief to those individuals. We have had a lot of debate not only on this floor and not only at the Rules Committee, but certainly in the U.S. House of Representatives and the public media about what steps need to be taken, who needs to be there first, what FEMA's responsibility is, what the responsibility is for HUD, what the responsibility is for States, and what the responsibility is for citizens and their local communities. But the bottom line is that much of the evaluation, the undertaking of saving of lives, trying to work to save more property and to be there in support of people, is an ongoing project that will take a long period of time.

Specifically, this underlying legislation helps to address five targeted and meaningful tax provisions that provide relief and make it easier for people to recover and to return to their homes and to make long-term decisions from a money and tax perspective.

It will allow hurricane victims to keep more of their paychecks, deduct more of the cost of their expensive property damage, and provide more affordable and immediate access to retirement savings should people decide that they would choose to go that direction at this difficult time in their life.

This legislation also encourages more Americans—Americans who see what is happening—and companies to be able to donate, to donate to those who are in need by temporarily suspending limitations on the deductions for charitable contributions for hurricane relief efforts this year. This is an important step, and it removes obstacles that might be in the way for the public to get involved and to help their fellow citizens.

Taken together, these five tax provisions go a long way, we believe, in helping these people recover from these storms.

The rule also makes clarifications to ensure Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin

Islands are treated equitably in all tax sections of this bill.

I spent time this week speaking with the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) in talking about not only their immediate needs, but also the long-term needs. Both were vigorous in not only their request for help, but also, equally, I think, balanced in their request for the legislation that would take place today.

They represent so many hardworking people, people who are proud people in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and they are looking for a way to work through not only where they are, but, in looking forward over the long term, about how they are going to put their islands back together.

I have had many phone conversations with both of them over the last 48 hours. They have asked for our prayers, they have asked for our help, and I have pledged to do both. But I told them that I believe this House of Representatives would very carefully understand their special request at this time because the islands are under increased pressure simply to get planes that would land to allow not only the bringing in of emergency supplies, but also taking out people who would need to come ashore, for those that might be children, elderly people, or the sick.

In addition to the tax provisions of H.R. 3823, which addresses some of the frailties of the Flood Insurance Program, we have included important reform pieces that are pro-consumer and increase competition at a very difficult time now that these hurricanes have landed on our shores. This provides options for all Americans.

The language that passed out of the Financial Services Committee 58-0 and on the floor of the House last year 419-0 has now been placed in this bill, also. We believe it is another example of bipartisan support, not only by the gentleman from the Financial Services Committee, JEB HENSARLING, but also his ranking member, MAXINE WATERS, who very carefully, last year, in preparation probably for what would lie ahead in the future, to provide a free market opportunity for more people to receive flood insurance. It is part of this package. It passed here last year 419-0. It is an integral part of what might be an answer maybe only for a few people, but it is an option and an opportunity, and I appreciate Chairman HENSARLING and MAXINE WATERS for being a part of passing that last year out of the Financial Services Committee 58-0.

This bill also reauthorizes the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration, for 6 months, their funding levels, which would, I believe, be most important to all areas of the country. This is a bipartisan bill.

This is an opportunity for people who live in rural areas and people who live

in urban areas to note that the FAA, day in and day out, 24 hours a day, is a vital part of the important transportation component of landing planes, bringing people to and from work and back safely. It also is a part of our families who travel the system, and the Federal Aviation Administration, the FAA, needs this money and needs the operational capacity to move forward.

It also comes at a critical time when the radar system that is in Puerto Rico has failed, and it is necessary that we continue to fund the programs at the FAA so that they can get these systems back up and online to increase traffic to meet the needs of the islands and to make sure that this is done safely.

Now is not a time to play games with an essential program, and I believe that this is very important for each of the Members to understand. This is a vital part of this package.

Finally, the underlying legislation extends several expiring health programs that would be finishing at the end of the year, including the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education program and the Special Diabetes Program for Native Americans.

I do want to note that this package is focused on health programs that are expiring, and Chairman GREG WALDEN from Hood River, Oregon, who is the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, has every intent to make sure that he will move legislation extending funding for CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, because we know that it expires soon. The chairman has looked into this and certified back to me that the money that is necessary to keep this program going is not in jeopardy and that he looks forward to a time when he can move CHIP not only to where it is considered on the floor, but to the Rules Committee, where it can be equally and fairly debated.

Before concluding my opening statements, I just want to affirm to the people in my home State of Texas and other areas affected by these disasters that this is the second of a series of responses to these natural disasters. On September 8, this body, the United States House of Representatives, passed initial emergency response legislation, providing \$15.3 billion in aid.

To provide some historical context, in 2005, Hurricane Katrina hit the United States in August, followed by Hurricanes Rita and Wilma in September and October. The House responded by passing an initial response in September to provide immediate emergency relief; then, after some evaluation, determined the actual needs on the ground, that is, by an analysis that took place, and that is when the House passed a more comprehensive package that included many of the provisions that are in here that we are doing, but they did that in December.

There was some debate yesterday at the Rules Committee about the timing, about delay, and I assured the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is a distinguished member of our committee, that, while I did not know the exact timing or delay, what might be a delay in that timing, that I believe that that is forthcoming; that, as there is a broader evaluation, as time moves on, as we go from saving people, trying to do recovery, to where we then move to the next phases of this opportunity, we will then know more specifically the needs of programs, the work that needs to be done by this Congress, and the help that we can provide to these areas.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) not only for his vigorous, what I believe, support of making sure that people—albeit they might be in Florida, but where they were a part of these storms, I felt Mr. HASTINGS' care and concern for them, to make sure that what the House of Representatives did was well managed, and I appreciate his feedback.

This body has every intention of providing further relief to our fellow Americans. We also understand that the Federal Government, while it has responsibilities, it does so by working with the States. It is done through FEMA.

I have been personally very pleased not only with the actions of President Trump and this administration, but I want to add that I am proud of the House of Representatives. I believe the leadership that PAUL RYAN has provided not only by being on the ground and looking at these areas, but also staying up to date on a day-to-day basis means that the House is nimble and able to move forward as we need to.

What we are talking about today is targeted tax relief for those in need, ensuring the FAA can continue its functions allowing planes to land in Puerto Rico, and continuing our emergency responses.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, extending the Federal Aviation Administration's authority is traditionally something that gets bipartisan support. That hasn't been the case this time, as we saw on Monday when a prior version of this bill failed on suspension. It contained several extraneous provisions, but it didn't include some of the most important priorities that we face.

September 30 is nearly upon us. That is the deadline to reauthorize programs that the American people depend on. That includes things like the Perkins student loan program, which helps low-income students to finance their education.

There are 500,000 students across the country, including nearly 50,000 from New York, relying on it right now, but the Perkins Loan Program isn't anywhere in this bill.

The bill also does nothing to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program created in 1997 with broad bipartisan support. More than 9 million children get their health insurance through this program. Without continued Federal funding, States are going to begin running out of money to take care of some of the most vulnerable kids, and they can't wait until the end of the year for us to act.

Community health centers have also been left out of the bill, and they have told us that they will have problems from day one. If we don't extend their funding, an estimated 9 million people would lose access to healthcare.

These are essential bipartisan programs, Mr. Speaker, and what does it say about the majority's leadership if they are not extended by the deadline? It does not bode well for our ability to fund the government later this year, to raise the debt ceiling, extend the Flood Insurance Program, or reauthorize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

This bill is an incredibly important one. No one in this Chamber or anywhere that I know of in the world wants the FAA program stopped and their employees furloughed or airport projects brought to a halt. We should work together and get it right.

This package, however, has not been negotiated on a bipartisan basis. It didn't go through regular order. Committees have been shut out of the process, and Democrats, who represent half the population in the United States, didn't get a say.

We are all glad to see provisions included here to provide some tax relief for victims of the recent hurricanes. With regular order and a more open process, this could be a more comprehensive package of extenders that provide more tax relief for victims to recover and to rebuild. After all, the Democrats did suggest 21 bipartisan tax provisions which were included in previous relief legislation after previous disasters.

□ 1545

But none of those, except five, I think, are included in this bill. That is a shame.

We have said it before. This is, I think, the 44th closed rule this session, and that is just about all the bills we have done. This bill could either have been bipartisan extending the FAA authorization, or a comprehensive package of extenders that provided the tax relief necessary for hurricane victims to recover and rebuild. The bill before us is neither. I doubt many of us have had time to review the changes that were made last night.

I have often said that a bad process leads to a bad product, and, Mr. Speak-

er, I am afraid that is what we see with this bill. Another opportunity for bipartisanship has been turned into another political fight.

I, regretfully, reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle press forward with their partisan gimmicks, 800,000 young people are still holding their breath. With time quickly running out, they are wondering what their futures look like without DACA.

Will they lose their jobs? Will they have to drop out of college after they have already paid tuition? Will they live in fear that ICE will be waiting for them at any corner?

All these fears could be eliminated if Republican leadership allowed a vote on the bicameral, bipartisan Dream Act. Instead of living in fear or losing their job, the Dream Act would allow them to continue working and add \$22.7 billion annually to our U.S. GDP. Passing the Dream Act will help our country reach the goal of 3 percent economic growth.

The Dream Act would allow them to continue improving themselves and their education. In the process, they would add \$728 billion cumulatively to our economy over a decade, due to an "education bump." The Dream Act would allow current teachers, nurses, soldiers, engineers, high school and college students, and hundreds of thousands of others to continue contributing to our economy and our country.

I call on my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and, instead, bring the Dream Act forward for a vote. We have the votes, and the urgency of passing the Dream Act is real.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the honorable and distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), my friend.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill has fundamental problems. Number one, the flood insurance provisions that are in this legislation are provisions that are related to

flood insurance. The current program expires on December 9.

Why are we dealing with this one component right now?

I agree that this bill passed the House unanimously previously, but it has fundamental problems advancing in a vacuum outside of the larger reform. And mark my words: this provision is going to result in the insolvency of the Flood Insurance Program much faster. It is going to increase the debt of the United States. Watch. I promise this is going to happen, and I am looking forward to talking about this more later.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, explain to me the difference between a flood victim in Texas, a flood victim perhaps in Florida, and one in Louisiana. Explain to me how those are any different.

We had a 1,000-year flood in my community just last year. We introduced legislation to provide this same tax relief to our citizens.

Why are Texans better?

I don't understand that.

Now, look, I want to be clear. I think that Texas deserves—the hurricane victims absolutely deserve tax relief, there is no question, as do the victims in Florida, Puerto Rico, and elsewhere—the victims of Harvey, Irma, and Maria. But I don't understand this discrimination, and I certainly can't go back home and explain it or defend it.

This is absurd. It is absolutely absurd that we have been waiting for 13 months for this exact same tax relief, yet the victims of the other hurricanes get it within weeks. I would love for somebody to explain or justify that to me. You can't do it.

Mr. Speaker, look, I will say it again. The FAA absolutely needs to be extended. If this Ross-Castor bill was so great, after it passed the House unanimously, the Senate would have taken it up; but they didn't because it shouldn't be done in a vacuum. It needs to be part of the larger reauthorization that expires on December 9, where we can incorporate it into there.

The reason this is being done is because it is trying to artificially increase National Flood Insurance Program rates. It is trying to artificially expedite the insolvency of the program.

Think about this for just a minute. We are getting ready to have one of the greatest demands upon the National Flood Insurance Program for claims from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, yet we are diverting the revenue stream.

Why in the world would you do that? Where is the money going to come from to pay the claims from people who flooded?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just want to say that there are some things in here that matter. The FAA needs to be extended. We need to provide disaster tax relief without question.

This is a fundamentally flawed piece of legislation. We should be sending a

clean FAA extension to the Senate and address these other things elsewhere.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the previous speaker made a very important statement, that we should treat all Americans alike.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to rescind DACA has brought fear to hundreds of thousands of DREAMers and their families.

They are DREAMers like Saul Jimenez, who teaches special needs students in Los Angeles, and is just one example of how DREAMers contribute and add value to our country and our communities.

DREAMers are American in every way except for their immigration status. To send DREAMers to a country they have never known would be tragic for them and our Nation, which will lose their valuable contributions.

The American people overwhelmingly oppose deporting our DREAMers, and our faith-based community and business leaders are imploring Congress to pass the Dream Act. Yet the Republican leadership is ignoring their wishes and refusing to allow us a vote on this bipartisan, bicameral bill.

To my Republican colleagues who say they want to protect our Nation's DREAMers: If that is true, this is your chance. Vote "no" on the previous question so we can vote on the Dream Act and put our DREAMers on the road to the security and future they have earned in the only country they know, the United States of America. The time to pass the Dream Act is now. Vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because there are nearly a million young men and women known as DREAMers who are depending on Congress to take action to protect them so they are not deported.

DREAMers were brought to this country as children. Many barely remember their birth country. They are our teachers, our nurses, and our doctors. They are our neighbors, our friends, and for some of us, like me, they are our family.

They also contribute to our economy. The Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce estimates that DREAMers in Los Angeles County alone contribute \$5.5 billion annually to California's economy. Across the country, DREAMers would add billions to GDP over the next decade.

Americans overwhelmingly want Congress to take action, and the vast majority of Members would support legislation to protect DREAMers.

Let's not wait another moment. Let's bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote so that we can protect these young men and women. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can bring the Dream Act to the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentlewoman, my colleague, that I have one more speaker left, so she may run down the time as she chooses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber must act to protect DREAMers now in limbo because of President Trump's decision to end the DACA program.

DACA recipients are rigorously vetted. They are high-contributing young people who were brought to this country as children. They are cherished members of communities across the country, and they are as American as any of us in all but their paperwork.

President Trump's decision to end the program means that these inspiring young people stand to lose their futures. Soon they will be forced out of work and school, faced with the specter of deportation to nations many of them have no memory of. The President has created a moral emergency for our country.

This House must allow a vote on a clean Dream Act. It is a bipartisan bill that gives these young people a real opportunity to get right with the law and earn a path to legal permanent residence.

We all know that if this bill were put on the floor, it would pass. The bill deserves a vote. There is no doubt about the public support.

Recent polls from CNN and ABC show that 82 to 86 percent of the American public supports Dream Act-type legislation; 82 to 86 percent. There is almost no issue we work on that has that much support from the American public.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with an urgent plea to my Republican colleagues. Not included in this legislation are the Children's Health Insurance Program, Community Health Centers, and Teaching Health Centers, whose authorization expires on September 30, this Saturday, after this House adjourns.

They have known for 2 years about this date, yet, with no time left, the Republicans spent precious hours today debating among themselves a plan to cut taxes for the richest of Americans.

Nine million children rely on CHIP for their healthcare. Twenty-three million Americans rely on Community

Health Centers. That is 1 in 15 Americans, and they rely on the doctors that are trained at those centers.

If making sure that every child in America has access to healthcare, if that is not a priority, what is?

This is a real crisis that still can be averted in just a few minutes of time now and not later. Families are waiting anxiously while their health security is hanging in the balance. It is time to vote now before it is too late.

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

I appreciate the distinguished gentlewoman bringing this up. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, she was not in the body on the floor earlier when I brought up what I believe is an answer to this CHIP—Children's Health Insurance Program—reauthorization.

I talked specifically with the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, GREG WALDEN, who is very excited about the opportunity to move the CHIP bill. The opportunity to do this is not dire or urgent. As a matter of fact, there is money in the bucket right now to fund, as it has been, the program to continue.

Chairman WALDEN indicated that, while he does understand that the program is scheduled to run through September 30, that the analysis from the nonpartisan Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission shows that States have enough funds remaining in their accounts through the end of this year.

□ 1600

Chairman WALDEN is interested in looking at it again and gaining information about it to see what sorts of changes, additions, or updates that we choose to do. He intends to do that in and through the committee providing information on a bipartisan basis. I trust not only what GREG WALDEN said, but I also know of his desire to deal effectively in this manner.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for bringing up this important question, and I want to provide a timely answer to her, and I appreciate her very much.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend.

I appreciate the information that the gentleman just gave us. We have been told the community health service will be in trouble from day one.

Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the gentleman whether he has the same kind of information about them?

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, responding to the gentlewoman, I do not, but I will talk to Chairman WALDEN

immediately, and I will come and find you during the vote, or as we end here, and I will let you know.

I appreciate, once again, Mr. Speaker, that the gentlewoman is very concerned, as is her committee, about children's programs, women's programs, and she would expect me to respond accordingly, and I will talk to Chairman WALDEN and get back to her with an answer.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that because millions of people use the community health services, and the children, we cannot let them go unattended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been 3 weeks since President Trump announced he would be ending DACA; 3 weeks of fear in homes, classrooms, and offices where DREAMers wonder if they still have a future here in the only home they have ever known; 3 weeks for Congress to answer President Trump's request for a bill that would stop him from executing his own cruel order.

Here is that bill. Members from both parties have said they want to do something to protect DREAMers. Here is that something. Over 80 percent of Americans believe DREAMers who live, work, contribute, and follow the law should stay here. Here is our chance to show we are listening.

We must pass the Dream Act because of people like Jose Antonio Vargas, an immigrant from the Philippines, who never knew he was undocumented until he applied for his learner's permit. But being undocumented didn't stop his pursuit of the American Dream. He worked hard and became a journalist, ultimately winning the Pulitzer Prize for his articles.

Let's act to bring DREAMers like Jose out of the shadows. Let act to encourage more to achieve what he did. Let's right this wrong, stop the cruel end of DACA, and finally pass the Dream Act today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is full of provisions that could pass in regular order, and I am afraid of using the FAA reauthorization, running out of time, again, because the planes can't fly if controllers are not in the air.

The FAA bill contains a lot of important provisions that our constituents

are crying out for. Among them, airplane noise, which is ruining communities across the United States. A study of the health impact of that noise is as important as DACA, which we should pass, and I think could pass. And there are other provisions which would pass on regular order.

The FAA reauthorization bill is not the bill to fool around with. We have had too many near misses by letting these short-term extensions pile up on us. Pass a straight FAA reauthorization bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership. I thank my fellow Texan on this effort.

I am not on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, but I do believe the FAA should have this extension. I do believe I should advocate for the many employees and consumers of aviation needs, that the air traffic controllers should not be privatized. And I understand that this particular bill does not have that provision.

The focus should be on extending a number of these health matters that are very important to us, and particularly, the inspiring health programs dealing with the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education Program, the Special Diabetes Program for Indians, and the Medicare Intravenous Immune Globulin Demonstration project, a number of these.

I do take concern with the diminishing of the Medicare Improvement Fund by \$50 million and, frankly, I believe that we should move forward on these emergencies, particularly as it relates to hurricane victims or areas.

Let me, however, focus on what is of devastating need in the areas of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, and make mention of the fact that the U.S. Virgin Islands is included in these tax benefits, and Puerto Rico, agreed to by the Members representing that area.

It is important that people do not have a penalty on their account tax provisions. I hope this can move quickly through the Senate. The employee retention credit for employees: the bill provides a tax credit for 40 percent of wages, up to \$6,000 per employee, paid by a disaster-affected employer to an employee from a core disaster area.

Charitable deductions: the bill suspends limitations on charitable contributions.

In our community, there are people who don't have the gap to survive. They are working. Their job is closed down because of Hurricane Harvey. I imagine in other areas they may be receiving charitable moneys. Those who give the charitable contributions need to be helped.

The disaster-related personal casualty losses and the special rule for determining the earned income tax credit is extremely important.

We want more. We are desperate, and we need more, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we will be able to work together to get more for those who are desperate from these hurricanes.

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

A good bit of the dialogue that is occurring today has been an active discussion for a long period of time in the Financial Services Committee—JEB HENSARLING from Dallas, Texas, the chairman of that committee.

One of our bright young stars is from Tampa, Florida, and his name is DENNIS ROSS. And Mr. ROSS has heard the debate going on and came down here. He has been an active part of not only understanding the needs of communities, but, more importantly, how we are going to have a fix and answer in a long-term way to look at this flooding problem and the Federal flood program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years, the only game in town for flood insurance has been the Federal Government through the National Flood Insurance Program. That means that for over 50 years, if you want flood insurance, your best bet is to go to the Federal Government, which, by the way, especially after these two successive storms that have just hit Texas and Florida, is going to be over \$30 billion in debt.

If we don't do something to save the taxpayers of this program that cannot actuarially support itself, we are doing a total disservice to our constituency and to our country. So what is part of the underlying bill that this rule will allow is the Market Parity and Modernization Act that will allow consumers to have a choice between the existing Flood Insurance Program, which is significantly in debt, or to have the private sector bring in their flood insurance programs to insure those risks.

In Florida, back in 2004, we had successive hurricanes that came through my district, and we had billions of dollars paid by FEMA, paid by NFIP, but we had \$39 billion paid by the private sector because we had private wind-storm insurance. The private sector does a much better job of doing business and managing risks than the Federal Government.

What I am asking for this body to accept, what the American people are craving for, is competition in the products they seek to have to protect them with their valuable assets. It is kind of like the Flood Insurance Program is a boat, and after 50 years of plugging holes, it is taking on water more and more.

One of the suggestions is, let's just keep bailing. I submit to you that to any logical person, the first step would be to plug that hole. We are going to continue to bail. We need to continue to bail, but we need to plug that hole so we don't get deeper and deeper in debt.

So the underlying bill, the FAA reauthorization, has the Ross-Castor bill in there for a reason, so that we can invite a private market to come to the rescue of those consumers out there who need to not only be able to have options greater than what the National Flood Insurance Program provides, because they don't provide business interruption. They don't provide temporary housing, but the private sector will. More importantly, the private sector will mitigate and will manage that risk.

There is no mitigation program that is effective in the Federal Government right now. It is a flowing of dollars to say: Here, do this; or, do that.

Private risk management will help consumers mitigate, lessen their risks, have more resilient homes.

What I am suggesting to you is that this is a paradigm shift for this country. That if we are going to say that the business of the United States should be left to business, and government should do what government should do, then this is a move in that direction because government should not be in the business of insurance. It is in the business of relief.

There is no question about that, but relief is post-event help. Insurance is pre-event. It is calculating that risk. It is managing that risk. And that is what the private sector does so well. We owe it to our consumers and we owe it to our taxpayers who are bailing out the NFIP, that we give consumers this choice.

I would just submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we have a chance to finally make a paradigm shift when we take the burden of bailouts off the shoulders of taxpayers and allow those who do best what they do best in managing capital and managing risk, do so for the benefit of the consumers, that this underlying bill and the FAA reauthorization allows for that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to the previous speaker that my understanding is the fallback provision on flood insurance came to the Federal Government because the private insurers didn't want to do it.

If we can get them to take it over, I think everybody would be relieved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say in the strongest possible terms that this body must do what the majority of the American people want and pass the Dream Act. The Dream

Act is smart policy that combines American values of compassion and humanity with what is best for our economy and our society. This bill will protect 1.5 million undocumented Americans from deportation.

Every day that we fail to act is another day that 800,000 DACAmented young people live with an unshakable fear that they will lose their ability to live without fear of deportation, be able to support themselves and their families, to know that they can plan for the future, whether that be attending school or buying a home, or a car, or starting a new business.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, this bill will help all Americans regardless of legal status. Nationally, the cruel end of this program will cost \$460 billion in GDP over the next 10 years; whereas passing the Dream Act would actually bring \$22 billion in income to our country every year.

Mr. Speaker, this is about more than economics. It is about human lives, and I urge my colleagues to do what is right. Pass the Dream Act. Let's help these young people.

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

Mr. Speaker, this discussion that we are having here on point that we have now had two speakers from my side, Mr. ROSS and Mr. GRAVES, who have come down to talk about the debate that has been well alive across the country, about how we deal with emergencies, how we deal with flooding, how we deal with the opportunity for States, and communities, and citizens, the free enterprise system, and what I would say FEMA, or the Federal Government, to get closer in understanding the needs of communities, and the answers to long-term decisions that take place.

What you heard Mr. ROSS talk about was a bill that he worked on with the gentlewoman, a Democratic colleague from Tampa, and they worked on this piece of legislation, got it passed 58-0 out of the Financial Services Committee, 419-0 on this vote. We need to pass—we need to include this. We need to put this as part of the options, an option that would be available for people back home, no matter where that is, to have a chance to have more control of their own lives, to work in their own communities.

□ 1615

I really appreciate the gentleman, Mr. ROSS, coming to talk to us today. The hard work that he and KATHY CASTOR, the gentlewoman from Tampa, did on a bipartisan basis comes to play. Even though they did it a year ago, it would be in play today, and it will be in play 1 year from now, when storms come back, as an option and opportunity. Instead of us searching for answers, it would be one of the answers available.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this is a country that was built on dreams. Our country was founded to protect not just the right to life and liberty but also to pursuit of happiness.

Sadly, the dreams of the thousands of young DREAMers who were brought here as children have been put on hold by President Trump's decision to end the DACA program and Congress' inaction to pass the Dream Act. These young DREAMers have created a life for themselves here in the U.S., and many know no other home other than the U.S.

Today, I want to tell you about one special DREAMer from my district. Jose is an extremely intelligent young man. He works 6 days a week and still finds time to volunteer in his community. His parents, unfortunately, did not tell him that he was undocumented, in an effort to protect him. He didn't find out about his status until it was time to apply for college. He was extremely upset, but he didn't give up. His dream is to go to college and study business. He has so much to contribute to our country.

These young people have become part of the American quilt, a quilt that reflects the diversity of our history, our culture, and heritage of this great country. We can't just throw them and toss them out of our Nation.

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

They say that success has many fathers, and you could say many mothers. Success is, many times, in the eye of the beholder. But when lots of people see it, they can get better prepared, and then people see that as a model.

I would like to take just a minute, if I can, and talk about a model of success that I use. Back home, I have an opportunity to meet with a number of subject matter experts on issues and ideas. One of them is a man named Bill Dewey. Bill Dewey is an air traffic controller at DFW Airport in Dallas, Texas. Mr. Dewey and I take time to sit down and understand the intricacies of his job, the FAA air traffic controller—safety, planes.

DFW is home to American Airlines. Mr. Dewey handles traffic that goes to Dallas Love Field, home for Southwest Airlines.

What Mr. Dewey has done with me is given me, from a working professional relationship that he has as not only a former member of the United States military as an air traffic controller but real live in the tower at DFW Airport, day after day, seeing how important the FAA is.

We should remember, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just money and time that we are doing here. We are patting the

employees of these agencies. The FAA has so many dedicated employees—just like Bill Dewey, my dear friend, who is at DFW Airport. This also is a support for those employees to let them know that we are going to fund their programs and we are going to take care of them. So we should, at the same time we do that, say “thank you” to the men and women who are there 24 hours around the clock to provide safety.

We have now been a number of years where we have not had a plane crash with a fatality, and we are lucky. Part of it goes to the safety of the system at the FAA.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0).

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's decision to end DACA was one of the most callous and cruel acts of his Presidency so far—and that is saying something.

Mr. Speaker, ending the DACA program means betraying our Nation's promise to protect 800,000 young people who are in America right now and American in every way except on paper, including many thousands who have served in the military. It means exposing them to deportation from the only home they have ever known and robbing our Nation of their exceptional talent, work ethic, and patriotism.

We cannot allow this President to play politics with so many young lives. Congress must pass the Dream Act now and as soon as possible to protect these outstanding young people, offer them the chance to become citizens, and empower them to give back to the country they know and love.

Vote “no” on the previous question so that we can end this Republican obstructionism and bring this critical bill to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are, once again, reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what a shock it is to see the President attacked when he is the one who is going to make sure, by challenging Congress, that we get this issue done.

Mr. Speaker, there was a question the gentlewoman, my dear colleague, Ms. SLAUGHTER, asked. The question is timely and important, and I would like to respond back to her. She asked about the health center program, and the answer I have gotten back from the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WALDEN, the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon, who is a phenomenal leader to this conference, is that it will not have to access mandatory appropriations until early December, and that Chairman WALDEN understands and appreciates that the gentlewoman, the ranking

member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, has asked a question, and he thanks you for asking that. He understands that we do have a timing issue and is preparing quickly to address this issue. He wanted me to thank the gentlewoman for bringing that up at this time.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN for that message.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the chairman for giving me that answer, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is our 44th closed rule for this session of Congress which prevents Members from offering amendments to the floor. This has put this Congress well on its way to becoming the most closed Congress in modern history. Democrats have been routinely unable to do the job we were elected to do and amend bills to represent the concerns of the people of the United States which we are both privileged and obligated to serve.

Despite his promises, Speaker RYAN has shown a complete disregard for regular order since assuming the gavel. Bills routinely come before the Rules Committee that haven't even been considered by the relevant committees. The majority even moved a healthcare repeal bill through this Chamber earlier this year without a score from the nonpartisan experts at the Congressional Budget Office.

This measure would impact one-sixth of our Nation's economy and tens of millions of people if it became law.

This is no way to run the people's House. The public expects more, and it is high time that we heed those calls.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question, the rule, and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank my colleague not only for this long week that we have had at the Rules Committee, but I also want to thank her other members, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), for not only their vigorous debate and conversations that we have had, but actually trying to prepare us at the Rules Committee for that which we believe would lie ahead.

Today, you heard the gentlewoman ask about several important issues. Part of our job is to kind of pitch and catch, and that is to catch the things that come our way. But she is using her vision to look ahead, and I admire that. I do owe her answers, and her background and experience would tell her, let's get moving on these things if we are going to get them done. I hope that I have provided her with feedback from the gentleman, Mr. WALDEN, saying exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, as the hurricane was still over Houston, Texas, dumping 50 inches of rain, I received a conference call from a number of people in Houston as they were preparing to reestablish not only their own communities within Houston, but also the livelihood of the business community, and to be prepared.

I got a conference call from a group of gentlemen, Mr. Tom Singletary, Mr. Kevin Hedges, Mr. Steve Kessling, Mr. Wallace B. Livesay, and Mr. Steve Raben from Houston. They called me and said: We need, as quickly as we can, to get information about taxes, about people pulling money out of their IRAs, and what the rules and regulations would be for that.

Mr. Speaker, part of my job is to respond to people, to listen to them, and to listen to their needs. I will tell you that the Houston delegation, on a bipartisan basis, up and down the coast, going down to BLAKE FARENTHOLD in Corpus Christi, all the way up to GARRET GRAVES who is in Louisiana, felt the fury of Mother Nature. But it didn't mean that it had to divide us or to defeat us.

I have seen nothing but resolve that has come from not only those in Texas but also those in Florida, our two colleagues, Jennifer Gonzalez who is located in Puerto Rico, and STACEY PLASKETT who is a fine young Delegate out of the Virgin Islands. They have asked for help. They have asked for the things that would be necessary.

But our ability to effectively listen and turn around in the form of legislation, our ability to be able to schedule meetings and, on a bipartisan basis, be able to talk and sometimes agree and sometimes disagree but to get our work done is an amazing part of this experiment that we are engaged in.

I, myself, Mr. Speaker, want to thank you for not only your hard work of being here today but being a part of this process. As all of us work together, we can make this process work and give confidence to the American people. That confidence is expressed with what we do today.

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

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 538 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order

against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

vious question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

FAIR ACCESS TO INVESTMENT RESEARCH ACT OF 2017

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 327) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 327

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fair Access to Investment Research Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. SAFE HARBOR FOR INVESTMENT FUND RESEARCH.

(a) **EXPANSION OF THE SAFE HARBOR.**—Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall propose, and not later than the end of the 270-day period beginning on such date, the Commission shall adopt, upon such terms, conditions, or requirements as the Commission may determine necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, and for the promotion of capital formation, revisions to section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that a covered investment fund research report that is published or distributed by a broker or dealer, other than a broker or dealer that is an investment adviser to the fund or an affiliated person of the investment adviser to the fund—

(1) shall be deemed, for purposes of sections 2(a)(10) and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(10), 77e(c)), not to constitute an offer for sale or an offer to sell a security that is the subject of an offering pursuant to a registration statement that is effective, even if the broker or dealer is participating or will participate in the registered offering of the covered investment fund's securities; and

(2) shall be deemed to satisfy the conditions of paragraph (1) or (2) of section 230.139(a) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor provisions, for purposes of the Commission's rules and regulations under the Federal securities laws and the rules of any self-regulatory organization.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFE HARBOR.**—In implementing the safe harbor pursuant to subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) not, in the case of a covered investment fund with a class of securities in substantially continuous distribution, condition the safe harbor on whether the broker's or dealer's publication or distribution of a covered investment fund research report constitutes such broker's or dealer's initiation or reinitiation of research coverage on such covered investment fund or its securities;

(2) not—

(A) require the covered investment fund to have been registered as an investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) or subject to the reporting requirements of section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)) for any period exceeding the period of time referenced under section 230.139(a)(1)(i)(A)(1) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(B) impose a minimum float provision exceeding that referenced in section 230.139(a)(1)(i)(A)(1)(i) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations;

(3) provide that a self-regulatory organization may not maintain or enforce any rule that would—

(A) prohibit the ability of a member to publish or distribute a covered investment fund research report solely because the member is also participating in a registered offering or other distribution of any securities of such covered investment fund; or

(B) prohibit the ability of a member to participate in a registered offering or other distribution of securities of a covered investment fund solely because the member has published or distributed a covered investment fund research report about such covered investment fund or its securities; and

(4) provide that a covered investment fund research report shall not be subject to section 24(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-24(b)) or the rules and reg-

ulations thereunder, except that such report may still be subject to such section and the rules and regulations thereunder to the extent that it is otherwise not subject to the content standards in the rules of any self-regulatory organization related to research reports, including those contained in the rules governing communications with the public regarding investment companies or substantially similar standards.

(c) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as in any way limiting—

(1) the applicability of the antifraud or antimanipulation provisions of the Federal securities laws and rules adopted thereunder to a covered investment fund research report, including section 17 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77q), section 34(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-33(b)), and sections 9 and 10 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78i, 78j); or

(2) the authority of any self-regulatory organization to examine or supervise a member's practices in connection with such member's publication or distribution of a covered investment fund research report for compliance with applicable provisions of the Federal securities laws or self-regulatory organization rules related to research reports, including those contained in rules governing communications with the public, or to require the filing of communications with the public the purpose of which is not to provide research and analysis of covered investment funds.

(d) **INTERIM EFFECTIVENESS OF SAFE HARBOR.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From and after the 270-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, if the Commission has not adopted revisions to section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as required by subsection (a), and until such time as the Commission has done so, a broker or dealer distributing or publishing a covered investment fund research report after such date shall be able to rely on the provisions of section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, and the broker or dealer's publication of such report shall be deemed to satisfy the conditions of paragraph (1) or (2) of section 230.139(a) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, if the covered investment fund that is the subject of such report satisfies the reporting history requirements (without regard to Form S-3 or Form F-3 eligibility) and minimum float provisions of such subsections for purposes of the Commission's rules and regulations under the Federal securities laws and the rules of any self-regulatory organization, as if revised and implemented in accordance with subsections (a) and (b).

(2) **STATUS OF COVERED INVESTMENT FUND.**—After such period and until the Commission has adopted revisions to section 230.139 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, and FINRA has revised rule 2210, for purposes of subsection (c)(7)(O) of such rule, a covered investment fund shall be deemed to be a security that is listed on a national securities exchange and that is not subject to section 24(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-24(b)).

(3) **COVERED INVESTMENT FUNDS COMMUNICATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), communications that concern only covered investment funds that fall within the scope of section 24(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-24(b)) shall not be required to be filed with FINRA.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—FINRA may require the filing of communications with the public if the purpose of those communications is not to provide research and analysis of covered investment funds.

(e) **EXCEPTION.**—The safe harbor under subsection (a) shall not apply to the publication or distribution by a broker or a dealer of a covered investment fund research report, the subject of which is a business development company or a registered closed-end investment company, during the time period described in section 230.139(a)(1)(i)(A)(1) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, except where expressly permitted by the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Federal securities laws.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "affiliated person" has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)).

(2) The term "covered investment fund" means—

(A) an investment company registered under, or that has filed an election to be treated as a business development company under, the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) and that has filed a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) for the public offering of a class of its securities, which registration statement has been declared effective by the Commission; and

(B) a trust or other person—

(i) issuing securities in an offering registered under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) and which class of securities is listed for trading on a national securities exchange;

(ii) the assets of which consist primarily of commodities, currencies, or derivative instruments that reference commodities or currencies, or interests in the foregoing; and

(iii) that provides in its registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) that a class of its securities are purchased or redeemed, subject to conditions or limitations, for a ratable share of its assets.

(3) The term "covered investment fund research report" means a research report published or distributed by a broker or dealer about a covered investment fund or any securities issued by the covered investment fund, but does not include a research report to the extent that the research report is published or distributed by the covered investment fund or any affiliate of the covered investment fund, or any research report published or distributed by any broker or dealer that is an investment adviser (or an affiliated person of an investment adviser) for the covered investment fund.

(4) The term "FINRA" means the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority.

(5) The term "investment adviser" has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)).

(6) The term "research report" has the meaning given that term under section 2(a)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(3)), except that such term shall not include an oral communication.

(7) The term "self-regulatory organization" has the meaning given that term under section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(26)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman

from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is considering S. 327 today, the Fair Access to Investment Research Act.

This is the Senate companion to my bill, H.R. 910, that I had the pleasure of working on with my friend from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) in this Congress and our colleague in the last Congress, now Governor Carney of Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, occasionally on this floor, we don't compliment our colleagues in the upper Chamber at the other end of the building, but we have to say today "thank you" to Senator CRAPO and Senator BROWN for advancing a number of securities-related bills in the last few days which we appreciate seeing coming back to the House, including S. 327.

□ 1630

This bill contains the same language as H.R. 910, which passed the House in May with overwhelming bipartisan support by a vote of 405-2.

S. 327 also includes some Senate amendments that add some additional clarifications to the bill:

First, it clarifies the conflict of interest provision by precluding dealers from issuing research on affiliated exchange-traded funds.

Second, it carves out closed-end funds, including business development companies.

Finally, it includes a specific definition of "affiliated person," which matches the definition of an "affiliated person" in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Since starting an investment firm back in the late 1990s, I have watched exchange-traded funds grow amazingly. ETFs have grown from about 100 funds, in the late 1990s, with over \$100 billion in assets, to now over 1,700 funds with over \$3 trillion in assets. Exchange-traded funds can average 30 percent of the trading volumes by value on any given day on our markets.

Yet, despite their growing popularity and increasing importance to retail investors, most broker-dealers do not publish research on ETFs. This is due to anomalies in our securities laws and regulations. S. 327 tackles those anomalies.

Given the importance of ETFs to investors, and particularly retail inves-

tors, steps to facilitate research on exchange-traded funds are long overdue.

The Fair Access to Investment Research Act is simple. It directs the SEC to provide a safe harbor for research reports that cover ETFs so that these reports are not considered offers under section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933. This allows ETF research to be issued just like stock research on a corporate issuer.

This commonsense proposal, which mirrors other research safe harbors implemented by the SEC, would clarify the law and allow broker-dealers to publish exchange-traded fund research, thereby allowing investors to access that very useful and needed information in this rapidly growing and occasionally complex market of choices.

This bill also holds the SEC accountable to follow Congress' direction. The bill requires the SEC to finalize the rules within 270 days, and if the deadline is not met, an interim safe harbor rule will take effect until the SEC's rule is finalized.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not unfamiliar to the Commission, as this proposal has been raised both by the Commission and by industry many times over the last two decades. With close to 6 million U.S. households holding ETFs, investors need access to this important research.

Having worked in the banking and investment industry for the past three decades, I appreciate Chairman HENSARLING and the Congress' efforts to promote capital formation, reduce unnecessary burdens, and grow jobs and the economy. S. 327 is another step in that process.

I also want to thank my friend, Mr. FOSTER of Illinois, for working on this legislation, and our colleague in the Senate, Senator HELLER of Nevada, for working with me on this bipartisan, commonsense fix that we worked on together for over 2 years.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for his years of bipartisan work that went into this bill.

I am proud to support this bill today because I believe that it will strengthen the ability of investors to make informed decisions. Exchange-traded funds are valuable and popular tools for investors to diversify risks and returns through a single security at low cost. This bill will help investors understand the various ETF choices on the market.

I was proud that the House passed our bill, H.R. 910, earlier this Congress by a vote of 405-2. This bill is essentially the same bill and incorporates, among other things, an amendment by Senator ELIZABETH WARREN to rei-

erate that the safe harbor will not be available to affiliates of the ETF, including the fund's registered investment adviser. I am really proud of the bipartisanship that went into this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I do appreciate the work in the Senate that improved this bill.

I think it is important to note that this will make this research flow, and in no way will it, I think, confuse investors; in fact, it enhances their investment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for working with us on this bill over the past years and look forward to it now being sent to the President's desk and signed into law.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 327.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REDACTION AUTHORITY CONCERNING SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3229) to protect the safety of judges by extending the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact sensitive information contained in their financial disclosure reports, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3229

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF REDACTION AUTHORITY CONCERNING SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION.

Section 105(b)(3)(E) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking "2017" both places it appears and inserting "2027".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3229, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As chairman of the Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet Subcommittee, I recognize the importance of judicial security needs.

Federal judges hear cases involving hardened criminals on a regular basis. Although not everyone threatens a Federal judge and not everyone is a gang member, many are. Federal judges and their families should not be at risk for simply doing their jobs.

Congress provides funding for a variety of judicial security needs by building secure court houses, staffing metal detectors at entrances, and so on, but there is a simple way to address security needs without extending taxpayer dollars. One method is to redact specific information from judicial financial disclosure reports done by the judges and other key employees. If they are to be targeted, we cannot have a judge's home address or other information that allows tracking by a criminal to, in fact, be a source of their demise.

The redaction authority has been in place since Congress began, in 1998, to allow for this, and it has been extended and expanded, in a number of cases, to include family members. The redaction process requires input and agreement from the U.S. Marshals Service.

The legislation that my colleague from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) and I introduced would extend the redaction authority for an additional 10 years, until December 31, 2027. There is no financial impact from this, and it serves to put judges and their families in a position they have historically been in since 1998: less at risk by this information being disclosed.

I not only urge the House to support this legislation, but after careful consideration and research, we find that this authority has not been abused, it has been properly used, and the Federal judges have earned the absolute right to this limited redaction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3229, which will extend for 10 years the soon expiring authority for Federal judges and judicial officers to redact from financial disclosure forms sensitive personal information that, if re-

vealed, could compromise their safety and security.

An independent judiciary that is free of coercion is fundamental to our constitutional democracy, fundamental to the principle of liberty and justice for all, and fundamental to the principle of equal protection under the law. Unfortunately, in this country, there are some who seek to compromise the integrity of the judicial branch through threats, harm, and harassment.

According to the U.S. Marshals Service, in fiscal year 2017, there has been an increase in every major recorded statistical category regarding the targeting of members of the Federal bench and judiciary employees. Failure to extend this authority will create grave security risks to judges, judiciary employees, and their families.

Each year, only a very small percentage of the financial disclosure reports filed contain an approved redaction of information. Redaction only occurs if there is a clear nexus between a security risk and the information for which redaction is sought.

Federal judges and other employees of the judicial branch routinely interact with disgruntled litigants or dangerous defendants and others who may seek to do them harm.

For example, in 2016, a disgruntled defendant was convicted of a diabolical plot to kidnap, torture, and murder U.S. District Judge Andrew J. Guilford, who presided over that defendant's wire fraud conviction.

In March of this year, the FBI reported that U.S. District Judge Derek Watson, who issued a temporary retaining order against the President's travel ban, has subsequently been the target of repeated violent threats.

In April, Jason Springer, an ISIS sympathizer, was indicted on a charge of threatening to murder U.S. District Judge Elizabeth Kovachevich by flying an explosive drone into her window.

The need to extend the redaction authority is a time-sensitive security matter, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, Subcommittee Chairman ISSA, and Ranking Member NADLER of the subcommittee, for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3229, which would extend an important tool in protecting the safety of judges and their families.

Each year, Federal judges and certain other judicial employees are required to file financial disclosure reports which are made available to the public. These reports serve a vital func-

tion in promoting transparency, particularly of any potential conflicts of interest.

By their nature, however, they also disclose sensitive personal information like a home address or family member's place of business. In the hands of a disgruntled member of the public seeking retribution or of an otherwise disturbed individual, this information could put judges and their families at great risk.

□ 1645

Under current law, the Judicial Conference may redact information from a financial disclosure form if publishing such information could endanger the safety of the filer or a member of the filer's family. Unless Congress acts, this redaction authority will expire on December 31 of this year. This commonsense bill simply extends the redaction authority for 10 years.

Unfortunately, many Federal judges face threats to their safety merely for doing their jobs, and according to the Judicial Conference, the number of threats against them are increasing. For example, an Ohio man recently pleaded guilty to arranging a murder-for-hire plot against a judge; an alleged ISIS sympathizer who was attempting to learn a judge's address was indicted a few months ago for threatening the judge; and last year, a California man, who was already in prison, was convicted of plotting to have the Federal judge, prosecutors, and FBI agents killed as revenge.

Sadly, earlier this year, we also saw threats against several judges who ruled against President Trump's Muslim ban. After the President himself launched a verbal assault against the judges and against the Federal judiciary more generally, the judges faced a cascade of online threats and they required heightened security measures. Even without such irresponsible and dangerous behavior by the President, Federal judges regularly face threats, and this legislation is an important tool in protecting their safety.

Although disclosure forms should only be redacted in the most extreme and limited circumstances, the Judicial Conference has used its redaction authority sparingly and wisely, and it should continue to have this authority available to it when circumstances warrant its use.

I appreciate Mr. JEFFRIES' leadership in introducing this legislation. I want to recognize Ranking Member CONYERS for the work he has done to champion this issue over the years as well. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Mr. ISSA for moving this bipartisan bill forward.

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished champion of safety of Federal judges.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New York for a very thoughtful and, really, a crucial element to justice.

Allow me to acknowledge Mr. JEFFRIES for his leadership, Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GOODLATTE for working in a bipartisan manner, and the manager of the bill for his support, and indicate that this has evidence that we wish we did not have to see or could not document.

I know that in my own State just a couple of years ago, the Federal judge in San Antonio was attacked and, in my recollection, lost his life. So we realize that justice requires us to eliminate impediments of fear and danger that may come to the Federal judiciary.

This thoughtful legislation to redact addresses and other personal information from financial disclosure forms of all of the judiciary, magistrates, and appeals courts, district courts, obviously, and the Supreme Court, is crucial for the courts that represent the third branch of government and really represent a need of the kind of stovepipe to allow them to render justice.

So on the financial disclosure forms, they are important for transparency, but I want to acknowledge that, unfortunately, there are individuals who would take out their disgust or contempt for the Federal Government and take that contempt out on the courts.

For that reason and for the reason that it has been reported that there are terrorist cells in every State, that we don't know from where that threat will come, and the fact that we have this very important bill, I want to congratulate the author of the bill. I hope that we will pass this bill as quickly as possible, which protects our Federal judiciary by allowing their personal information and that of their family members to be redacted because justice has to be kept safe and secure.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would close by urging my colleagues to support this well-thought-out, well authored, and in regular hearings by the committee, universally accepted as necessary and reasonable for a 10-year extension.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3229, a bipartisan, commonsense measure intended to protect the safety of federal judges and judicial employees.

The bill accomplishes this critical goal by extending the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact sensitive information con-

tained in the financial disclosure reports filed by these individuals pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978. Specifically, H.R. 3229 would extend this authority for 10 years, that is, until December 31, 2027.

I am an original cosponsor and strong supporter of this bill for several reasons.

To begin with, absent a further extension of this authority, the Judicial Conference's ability to redact sensitive personal information from the financial disclosure statements filed by judges and judicial employees would cease and thereby create potentially serious security risks to these individuals.

Judges and judicial employees are often the subject of threats, harassment, and violence. Like probation officers, these individuals routinely interact with disgruntled litigants and convicted criminals who may hold grudges against them.

A resentful litigant seeking to take revenge for a judicial decision can learn of a federal judge's home address, his or her spouse's place of employment, or a child's school, among other types of sensitive information, by requesting a copy of the judge's financial disclosure report.

During 2016, for instance, a federal judge was shot in front of his home, a murder-for-hire plot against a federal judge was uncovered, and threatening letters were sent to other judges.

Fortunately, section 105 of the Ethics in Government Act grants the Judicial Conference the authority to redact certain limited information from financial disclosure reports when the release of such information could endanger a judge, a judicial employee, or a member of their family.

Congress has extended this redaction authority on 5 previous occasions, most recently on January 3, 2012.

Another reason why I support H.R. 3229 is that the Judicial Conference has exercised its redaction authority with demonstrated restraint.

As required by the Ethics in Government Act, the Conference has promulgated regulations requiring a clear nexus between a security risk and the need to redact sensitive information.

In addition, the Act requires the Judicial Conference to report annually to Congress on the number and nature of redactions as well as the reasons for them.

Based on a review of these reports, it is clear that only a small percentage of the financial disclosure reports filed contain an approved redaction of some information in the report.

For example, less than 3 percent of financial reports contained an approved redaction of some information over the past 5 years.

Finally, the need to extend this redaction authority—which will expire in just over 3 months—is a time-sensitive security matter that requires prompt consideration of H.R. 3229.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3229, which will simply extend the Judicial Conference's current redaction authority for an additional 10 years.

In closing, I want to commend Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES for his leadership on this important legislation. We share his com-

mitment to protecting the security of those public servants who serve in the federal judicial branch.

Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3229, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 538;

Adoption of House Resolution 538, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 311.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3823, DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 538) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 187, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

YEAS—223

Abraham
Aderholt

Allen
Amash

Amodei
Arrington

Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

NAYS—187

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal

Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españolat

Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

Bishop (UT)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchson
Clark (MA)
Granger
Grothman
Gutiérrez

Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond

NOT VOTING—23

Hanabusa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Long
Messer
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen

Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Roskam
Rush
Scalise
Tiberi
Walorski
Walz
Yoho

□ 1713

Messrs. COSTA and SHERMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated for:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 538.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 538.

Stated against:

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Nay” on rollcall No. 538.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 190, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

YEAS—223

Abraham
Adenhardt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crist
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs

Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes

O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—190

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.

Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

DeFazio	Kind	Polis
DeGette	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)
Delaney	Kuster (NH)	Quigley
DeLauro	Langevin	Raskin
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Demings	Larson (CT)	Richmond
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Rosen
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Lee	Ruiz
Doggett	Levin	Ruppersberger
Doyle, Michael	Lewis (GA)	Rush
F.	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Loeb sack	Sánchez
Eshoo	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Espallat	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Esty (CT)	Lowe y	Schiff
Evans	Lujan Grisham,	Schneider
Foster	M.	Schrader
Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott (VA)
Fudge	Lynch	Scott, David
Gabbard	Maloney,	Serrano
Galleo	Carolyn B.	Sewell (AL)
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Shea-Porter
Gomez	Massie	Sherman
Gonzalez (TX)	Matsui	Sinema
Gosar	McCollum	Sires
Gottheimer	McEachin	Slaughter
Green, Al	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Green, Gene	McNerney	Soto
Grijalva	Meeks	Speier
Hastings	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Heck	Moore	Takano
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Himes	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Titus
Huffman	Neal	Tonko
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Torres
Jayapal	Norcross	Tsongas
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Vargas
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Veasey
Jones	Panetta	Vela
Jordan	Pascrell	Velázquez
Kaptur	Payne	Visclosky
Keating	Pelosi	Wasserman
Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Schultz
Kennedy	Perry	Waters, Maxine
Khanna	Peters	Watson Coleman
Kihuen	Peterson	Welch
Kildee	Pingree	Wilson (FL)
Kilmer	Pocan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Bishop (UT)	Hanabusa	Rooney, Francis
Bridenstine	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Scalise
Crawford	Lieu, Ted	Tiberi
Ellison	Long	Walorski
Granger	Loudermilk	Walz
Gutiérrez	Messer	

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

□ 1722

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 539.

RECOGNIZING THAT FOR 50 YEARS THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH EAST ASIAN NATIONS HAS WORKED TOWARD STABILITY, PROSPERITY, AND PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 311) recognizing that for 50 years the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has

worked toward stability, prosperity, and peace in Southeast Asia, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

YEAS—413

Abraham	Comstock	Gibbs
Adams	Conaway	Gohmert
Aderholt	Connolly	Gomez
Aguilar	Conyers	Gonzalez (TX)
Allen	Cook	Goodlatte
Amash	Cooper	Gosar
Amodei	Correa	Gottheimer
Arrington	Costa	Gowdy
Babin	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Bacon	Courtney	Graves (LA)
Banks (IN)	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Crawford	Green, Al
Barr	Crist	Green, Gene
Barragán	Crowley	Griffith
Barton	Cuellar	Grijalva
Bass	Culberson	Grothman
Beatty	Cummings	Guthrie
Bera	Curbelo (FL)	Handel
Bergman	Davidson	Harper
Beyer	Davis (CA)	Harris
Biggs	Davis, Danny	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Heck
Bishop (MI)	DeGette	Hensarling
Black	Delaney	Herrera Beutler
Blackburn	DeLauro	Hice, Jody B.
Blum	DelBene	Higgins (LA)
Blumenauer	Demings	Higgins (NY)
Blunt Rochester	Denham	Hill
Bonamici	Dent	Himes
Bost	DeSantis	Holding
Boyle, Brendan	DeSaulnier	Hollingsworth
F.	DesJarlais	Huffman
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Huizenga
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Brat	Dingell	Hunter
Brooks (AL)	Doggett	Hurd
Brown (MD)	Donovan	Issa
Brownley (CA)	Doyle, Michael	Jackson Lee
Buchanan	F.	Jayapal
Buck	Duffy	Jeffries
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Budd	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (WV)
Burgess	Dunn	Johnson (GA)
Bustos	Ellison	Johnson (LA)
Butterfield	Emmer	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Engel	Jones
Calvert	Eshoo	Jordan
Capuano	Espallat	Joyce (OH)
Carbajal	Estes (KS)	Kaptur
Cárdenas	Esty (CT)	Katko
Carson (IN)	Evans	Kelly (IL)
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	Kelly (MS)
Carter (TX)	Faso	Kelly (PA)
Cartwright	Ferguson	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Khanna
Castro (TX)	Fleischmann	Kihuen
Chabot	Flores	Kildee
Cheney	Fortenberry	Kilmer
Chu, Judy	Foster	Kind
Cicilline	Fox	King (IA)
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	King (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Franks (AZ)	Kinzing
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Cleaver	Fudge	Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn	Gabbard	Kuster (NH)
Coffman	Gaetz	Kustoff (TN)
Cohen	Gallagher	Labrador
Cole	Galleo	LaHood
Collins (GA)	Garamendi	LaMalfa
Collins (NY)	Garrett	Lamborn
Comer	Gianforte	Lance

Langevin	O'Rourke	Shea-Porter
Larsen (WA)	Olson	Sherman
Larson (CT)	Palazzo	Shimkus
Latta	Pallone	Shuster
Lawrence	Palmer	Simpson
Lawson (FL)	Panetta	Sinema
Lee	Pascrell	Sires
Levin	Paulsen	Slaughter
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Smith (MO)
Lewis (MN)	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Smith (NJ)
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Smith (TX)
LoBiondo	Perry	Smith (WA)
Loeb sack	Peters	Smucker
Lofgren	Peterson	Soto
Loudermilk	Pingree	Speier
Love	Pittenger	Stefanik
Lowenthal	Pocan	Stewart
Lowe y	Poe (TX)	Stivers
Lucas	Poliquin	Suoizzi
Luetkemeyer	Polis	Swalwell (CA)
Lujan Grisham,	Posey	Takano
M.	Price (NC)	Taylor
Luján, Ben Ray	Quigley	Tenney
Lynch	Raskin	Thompson (CA)
MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Thompson (MS)
Maloney,	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Carolyn B.	Reichert	Thornberry
Maloney, Sean	Renacci	Tipton
Marino	Rice (NY)	Titus
Marshall	Rice (SC)	Tonko
Massie	Richmond	Torres
Mast	Roby	Trott
Matsui	Roe (TN)	Tsongas
McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Turner
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Upton
McClintock	Rohrabacher	Valadao
McCollum	Rokita	Vargas
McEachin	Rooney, Thomas	Veasey
McGovern	J.	Vela
McHenry	Rosen	Velázquez
McKinley	Roskam	Visclosky
McMorris	Ross	Wagner
Rodgers	Rothfus	Walberg
McNerney	Rouzer	Walden
McSally	Roybal-Allard	Walker
Meadows	Royce (CA)	Walters, Mimi
Meehan	Ruiz	Wasserman
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Meng	Rush	Waters, Maxine
Mitchell	Russell	Watson Coleman
Moolenaar	Rutherford	Weber (TX)
Mooney (WV)	Ryan (OH)	Webster (FL)
Moore	Sánchez	Welch
Moulton	Sanford	Wenstrup
Mullin	Sarbanes	Westerman
Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Williams
Murphy (PA)	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Schneider	Wilson (SC)
Napolitano	Schrader	Wittman
Neal	Schweikert	Womack
Newhouse	Scott (VA)	Woodall
Noem	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Nolan	Scott, David	Yoder
Norcross	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Norman	Serrano	Young (AK)
Nunes	Sessions	Young (IA)
O'Halleran	Sewell (AL)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—20

Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Bridenstine	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Scalise
Granger	Keating	Tiberi
Gutiérrez	Long	Walorski
Hanabusa	Marchant	Walz
Hoyer	Messer	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1729

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A bill reaffirming the 40 years of relations between the United States and the Association

of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the shared pursuit of economic growth and regional security in Southeast Asia.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 540 (motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 311), I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on this vote.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed a vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 540.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes Wednesday, September 27, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted “Nay” on rollcall votes 538 and 539, and I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall vote 540.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on 9/27/17 because I was in Indiana with the President of the United States on an official visit. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 538, “Yea” on rollcall No. 539, and “Yea” on rollcall No. 540.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on 9/27/17 because I was in Indiana with the President of the United States on an official visit. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 538, “Yea” on rollcall No. 539, and “Yea” on rollcall No. 540.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 538, I call up the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, the amendment printed in House Report 115-333 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3823

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—FEDERAL AVIATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 101. Extension of airport improvement program.

Sec. 102. Extension of expiring authorities.

Sec. 103. Federal Aviation Administration operations.

Sec. 104. Small community air service.

Sec. 105. Air navigation facilities and equipment.

Sec. 106. Research, engineering, and development.

Sec. 107. Funding for aviation programs.

TITLE II—AVIATION REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Expenditure authority from Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

Sec. 202. Extension of taxes funding Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

TITLE III—EXPIRING HEALTH PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Extension of certain public health programs.

Sec. 302. Extension of Medicare Patient IVIG Access Demonstration Project.

Sec. 303. Funds from the Medicare Improvement Fund.

TITLE IV—DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE MARKET

Sec. 401. Private flood insurance.

TITLE V—TAX RELIEF FOR HURRICANES HARVEY, IRMA, AND MARIA

Sec. 501. Definitions.

Sec. 502. Special disaster-related rules for use of retirement funds.

Sec. 503. Disaster-related employment relief.

Sec. 504. Additional disaster-related tax relief provisions.

Sec. 505. Budgetary effects.

TITLE I—FEDERAL AVIATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “and \$1,670,410,959 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.”.

(2) OBLIGATION OF AMOUNTS.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriations Acts, sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2018, and shall remain available until expended.

(3) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.—For purposes of calculating funding apportionments and meeting other requirements under sections 47114, 47115, 47116, and 47117 of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(A) first calculate such funding apportionments on an annualized basis as if the total amount available under section 48103 of such

title for fiscal year 2018 were \$3,350,000,000; and

(B) then reduce by 50 percent—

(i) all funding apportionments calculated under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) amounts available pursuant to sections 47117(b) and 47117(f)(2) of such title.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “September 30, 2017,” and inserting “March 31, 2018.”.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 47107(r)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”.

(b) Section 47114(c)(1)(F) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subparagraph heading by striking “FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017”; and

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking “for fiscal year 2017 an amount” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018 an amount”.

(c) Section 47115(j) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

(d) Section 47124(b)(3)(E) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and not more than \$5,160,822 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018,” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

(e) Section 47141(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(f) Section 186(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018,” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

(g) Section 409(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 41731 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(h) Section 140(c)(1) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (126 Stat. 28) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2018”.

(i) Section 411(h) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 42301 prec. note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(j) Section 822(k) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 47141 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(k) Section 2306(b) of the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 641) is amended by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS.

Section 106(k) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(F) \$4,999,191,956 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

SEC. 104. SMALL COMMUNITY AIR SERVICE.

(a) ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE AUTHORIZATION.—Section 41742(a)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$175,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017” and inserting “\$175,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and \$74,794,521 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.”.

(b) AIRPORTS NOT RECEIVING SUFFICIENT SERVICE.—Section 41743(e)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and \$4,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018,” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”.

SEC. 105. AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 48101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) \$1,423,589,041 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.”.

SEC. 106. RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) \$88,008,219 for the period beginning on October 1, 2017 and ending on March 31, 2018.”.

SEC. 107. FUNDING FOR AVIATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 48114 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking “2017” and inserting “2018”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2) by striking “2017” and inserting “2018”.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH FUNDING REQUIREMENTS.—The budget authority authorized in this title, including the amendments made by this title, shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of subsections (a)(1)(B) and (a)(2) of section 48114 of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on March 31, 2018.

TITLE II—AVIATION REVENUE PROVISIONS**SEC. 201. EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY FROM AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9502(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “or the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017;”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9502(e)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Section 4081(d)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Section 4261(k)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(2) PROPERTY.—Section 4271(d)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

(c) FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP PROGRAMS.—

(1) TREATMENT AS NONCOMMERCIAL AVIATION.—Section 4083(b) of such Code is amended by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “April 1, 2018”.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM TICKET TAXES.—Section 4261(j) of such Code is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “March 31, 2018”.

TITLE III—EXPIRING HEALTH PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS.**

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO TEACHING HEALTH CENTERS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—Section 340H(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and \$60,000,000” and inserting “, \$60,000,000”; and

(2) by inserting “, and \$15,000,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2018” before the period at the end.

(b) EXTENSION OF SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM FOR INDIANS.—Section 330C(c)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-3(c)(2)) is amended—

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

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

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

“(D) \$37,500,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2018.”.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Part D of the Public Health Service Act is amended by redesignating—

(1) the second subpart XI (42 U.S.C. 256i; relating to a community-based collaborative care network program) as subpart XII; and

(2) the second section 340H (42 U.S.C. 256i) as section 340I.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF MEDICARE PATIENT IVIG ACCESS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 101(b) of the Medicare IVIG Access and Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 1395l note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting after “for a period of 3 years” the following: “and, subject to the availability of funds under subsection (g)—

“(A) if the date of enactment of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 is on or before September 30, 2017, for the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2020; and

“(B) if the date of enactment of such Act is after September 30, 2017, for the period beginning on the date of enactment of such Act and ending on December 31, 2020”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new sentences: “Subject to the preceding sentence, a Medicare beneficiary enrolled in the demonstration project on September 30, 2017, shall be automatically enrolled during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 and ending on December 31, 2020, without submission of another application.”.

SEC. 303. FUNDS FROM THE MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “during and after fiscal year 2021, \$270,000,000” and inserting “during and after fiscal year 2021, \$220,000,000”.

TITLE IV—DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE MARKET**SEC. 401. PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE.**

(a) FLOOD INSURANCE MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) AMOUNT AND TERM OF COVERAGE.—Section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) is amended by striking “Sec. 102. (a)” and all that follows through the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 102. (a) AMOUNT AND TERM OF COVERAGE.—After the expiration of sixty days following the date of the enactment of this Act, no Federal officer or agency shall approve any financial assistance for acquisition or construction purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which the sale of flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, unless the building or mobile home and any personal property to which such financial assistance relates is covered by flood insurance: *Provided*, That the amount of flood insurance (1) in the case of Federal flood insurance, is at least equal to the development or project cost of the building, mobile home, or personal property (less estimated land cost), the outstanding principal balance of the loan, or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less; or (2) in the case of private flood insurance, is at least equal to the development or project cost of the building, mobile home, or personal property (less estimated land cost), the outstanding principal balance of the loan, or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less: *Provided further*, That if the financial assistance provided is in the form of a loan or an insurance or guaranty of a loan, the amount of flood insurance required need not exceed the outstanding principal balance of the loan and need not be required beyond the term of the loan. The requirement of maintaining flood insurance shall apply during the life of the property, regardless of transfer of ownership of such property.”.

(2) REQUIREMENT FOR MORTGAGE LOANS.—Subsection (b) of section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (7);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(C) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through the end of paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(b) REQUIREMENT FOR MORTGAGE LOANS.—

“(1) REGULATED LENDING INSTITUTIONS.—Each Federal entity for lending regulation (after consultation and coordination with the Financial Institutions Examination Council established under the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1974) shall by regulation direct regulated lending institutions not to make, increase, extend, or renew any loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located or to be located in an area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, unless the building or mobile home and any personal property securing such loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance: *Provided*, That the amount of flood insurance (A) in the case of Federal flood insurance, is at least equal to the outstanding principal balance of the loan or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less; or

(B) in the case of private flood insurance, is at least equal to the outstanding principal balance of the loan or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less.

“(2) FEDERAL AGENCY LENDERS AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE AND GUARANTEE AGENCIES.—

“(A) FEDERAL AGENCY LENDERS.—A Federal agency lender may not make, increase, extend, or renew any loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located or to be located in an area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, unless the building or mobile home and any personal property securing such loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance in accordance with paragraph (1). Each Federal agency lender may issue any regulations necessary to carry out this paragraph. Such regulations shall be consistent with and substantially identical to the regulations issued under paragraph (1).

“(B) OTHER FEDERAL MORTGAGE ENTITIES.—

“(i) COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Each covered Federal mortgage entity shall implement procedures reasonably designed to ensure that, for any loan that—

“(I) is secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located in an area that has been identified, at the time of the origination of the loan or at any time during the term of the loan, by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance is available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and

“(II) is made, insured, held, or guaranteed by such entity, or backs or on which is based any trust certificate or other security for which such entity guarantees the timely payment of principal and interest, the building or mobile home and any personal property securing the loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance in the amount provided in paragraph (1).

“(ii) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘covered Federal mortgage entity’ means—

“(I) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, with respect to mortgages insured under the National Housing Act;

“(II) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to loans made, insured, or guaranteed under title V of the Housing Act of 1949; and

“(III) the Government National Mortgage Association.

“(C) REQUIREMENT TO ACCEPT FLOOD INSURANCE.—Each Federal agency lender and each covered Federal mortgage entity shall accept flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under subparagraph (A) or (B), respectively, if the flood insurance coverage meets the requirements for coverage under such subparagraph and the requirements relating to financial strength issued pursuant to paragraph (4).

“(3) GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED ENTERPRISES FOR HOUSING.—The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall implement procedures reasonably designed to ensure that, for any loan that is—

“(A) secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located in an area that has been identified, at the time of the origination of the loan or at any time during the term of the loan, by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance is available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and

“(B) purchased or guaranteed by such entity,

the building or mobile home and any personal property securing the loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance in the amount provided in paragraph (1). The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall accept flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under paragraph (1) if the flood insurance coverage provided meets the requirements for coverage under that paragraph and the requirements relating to financial strength issued pursuant to paragraph (4).

“(4) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING FINANCIAL STRENGTH.—The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, in consultation with the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Government National Mortgage Association, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall develop and implement requirements relating to the financial strength of private insurance companies from which such entities and agencies will accept private flood insurance, provided that such requirements shall not affect or conflict with any State law, regulation, or procedure concerning the regulation of the business of insurance.

“(5) APPLICABILITY.—

“(A) EXISTING COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1) shall apply on the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994.

“(B) NEW COVERAGE.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) shall apply only with respect to any loan made, increased, extended, or renewed after the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994. Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any loan made, increased, extended, or renewed by any lender supervised by the Farm Credit Administration only after the expiration of the period under this subparagraph.

“(C) CONTINUED EFFECT OF REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the regulations to carry out paragraph (1), as in effect immediately before the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994, shall continue to apply until the regulations issued to carry out paragraph (1) as amended by section 522(a) of such Act take effect.

“(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except as otherwise specified, any reference to flood insurance in this section shall be considered to include Federal flood insurance and private flood insurance. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede or limit the authority of a Federal entity for lending regulation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, a Federal agency lender, a covered Federal mortgage entity (as such term is defined in paragraph (2)(B)(ii)), the Federal National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation to establish requirements relating to the financial strength of private insurance companies from which the entity or agency will accept private flood insurance, provided that such requirements shall not affect or conflict with any State law, regulation, or procedure concerning the regulation of the business of insurance.”; and

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

“(8) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(A) FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term ‘flood insurance’ means—

“(i) Federal flood insurance; and

“(ii) private flood insurance.

“(B) FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term ‘Federal flood insurance’ means an insurance policy made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

“(C) PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term ‘private flood insurance’ means an insurance policy that—

“(i) is issued by an insurance company that is—

“(I) licensed, admitted, or otherwise approved to engage in the business of insurance in the State in which the insured building is located, by the insurance regulator of that State; or

“(II) eligible as a nonadmitted insurer to provide insurance in the home State of the insured, in accordance with sections 521 through 527 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8201 through 8206);

“(ii) is issued by an insurance company that is not otherwise disapproved as a surplus lines insurer by the insurance regulator of the State in which the property to be insured is located; and

“(iii) provides flood insurance coverage that complies with the laws and regulations of that State.

“(D) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.”.

(b) EFFECT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE ON CONTINUOUS COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) EFFECT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE ON CONTINUOUS COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of applying any statutory, regulatory, or administrative continuous coverage requirement, including under section 1307(g)(1), the Administrator shall consider any period during which a property was continuously covered by private flood insurance (as defined in section 102(b)(8) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)(8))) to be a period of continuous coverage.”.

TITLE V—TAX RELIEF FOR HURRICANES HARVEY, IRMA, AND MARIA

SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

(a) HURRICANE HARVEY DISASTER ZONE AND DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this title—

(1) HURRICANE HARVEY DISASTER ZONE.—The term “Hurricane Harvey disaster zone” means that portion of the Hurricane Harvey disaster area determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(2) HURRICANE HARVEY DISASTER AREA.—The term “Hurricane Harvey disaster area” means an area with respect to which a major disaster has been declared by the President before September 21, 2017, under section 401 of such Act by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(b) HURRICANE IRMA DISASTER ZONE AND DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this title—

(1) HURRICANE IRMA DISASTER ZONE.—The term “Hurricane Irma disaster zone” means that portion of the Hurricane Irma disaster area determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under such Act by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(2) HURRICANE IRMA DISASTER AREA.—The term “Hurricane Irma disaster area” means

an area with respect to which a major disaster has been declared by the President before September 21, 2017, under section 401 of such Act by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(c) HURRICANE MARIA DISASTER ZONE AND DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this title—

(1) HURRICANE MARIA DISASTER ZONE.—The term “Hurricane Maria disaster zone” means that portion of the Hurricane Maria disaster area determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under such Act by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(2) HURRICANE MARIA DISASTER AREA.—The term “Hurricane Maria disaster area” means an area with respect to which a major disaster has been declared by the President before September 21, 2017, under section 401 of such Act by reason of Hurricane Maria.

SEC. 502. SPECIAL DISASTER-RELATED RULES FOR USE OF RETIREMENT FUNDS.

(a) TAX-FAVORED WITHDRAWALS FROM RETIREMENT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 72(t) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not apply to any qualified hurricane distribution.

(2) AGGREGATE DOLLAR LIMITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the aggregate amount of distributions received by an individual which may be treated as qualified hurricane distributions for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess (if any) of—

(i) \$100,000, over

(ii) the aggregate amounts treated as qualified hurricane distributions received by such individual for all prior taxable years.

(B) TREATMENT OF PLAN DISTRIBUTIONS.—If a distribution to an individual would (without regard to subparagraph (A)) be a qualified hurricane distribution, a plan shall not be treated as violating any requirement of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 merely because the plan treats such distribution as a qualified hurricane distribution, unless the aggregate amount of such distributions from all plans maintained by the employer (and any member of any controlled group which includes the employer) to such individual exceeds \$100,000.

(C) CONTROLLED GROUP.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term “controlled group” means any group treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) AMOUNT DISTRIBUTED MAY BE REPAID.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who receives a qualified hurricane distribution may, at any time during the 3-year period beginning on the day after the date on which such distribution was received, make one or more contributions in an aggregate amount not to exceed the amount of such distribution to an eligible retirement plan of which such individual is a beneficiary and to which a rollover contribution of such distribution could be made under section 402(c), 403(a)(4), 403(b)(8), 408(d)(3), or 457(e)(16), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as the case may be.

(B) TREATMENT OF REPAYMENTS OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLANS OTHER THAN IRAS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, if a contribution is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) with respect to a qualified hurricane distribution from an eligible retirement plan other than an individual retirement plan, then the taxpayer shall, to the extent of the amount of the contribution, be treated as having received the qualified hurricane distribution in an eligible rollover distribution (as defined in section 402(c)(4) of such Code) and as having transferred the amount to the eligible re-

tirement plan in a direct trustee to trustee transfer within 60 days of the distribution.

(C) TREATMENT OF REPAYMENTS FOR DISTRIBUTIONS FROM IRAS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, if a contribution is made pursuant to subparagraph (A) with respect to a qualified hurricane distribution from an individual retirement plan (as defined by section 7701(a)(37) of such Code), then, to the extent of the amount of the contribution, the qualified hurricane distribution shall be treated as a distribution described in section 408(d)(3) of such Code and as having been transferred to the eligible retirement plan in a direct trustee to trustee transfer within 60 days of the distribution.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) QUALIFIED HURRICANE DISTRIBUTION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term “qualified hurricane distribution” means—

(i) any distribution from an eligible retirement plan made on or after August 23, 2017, and before January 1, 2019, to an individual whose principal place of abode on August 23, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(ii) any distribution (which is not described in clause (i)) from an eligible retirement plan made on or after September 4, 2017, and before January 1, 2019, to an individual whose principal place of abode on September 4, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Irma disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Irma, and

(iii) any distribution (which is not described in clause (i) or (ii)) from an eligible retirement plan made on or after September 16, 2017, and before January 1, 2019, to an individual whose principal place of abode on September 16, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Maria disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(B) ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLAN.—The term “eligible retirement plan” shall have the meaning given such term by section 402(c)(8)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(5) INCOME INCLUSION SPREAD OVER 3-YEAR PERIOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any qualified hurricane distribution, unless the taxpayer elects not to have this paragraph apply for any taxable year, any amount required to be included in gross income for such taxable year shall be so included ratably over the 3-taxable-year period beginning with such taxable year.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), rules similar to the rules of subparagraph (E) of section 408A(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply.

(6) SPECIAL RULES.—

(A) EXEMPTION OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM TRUSTEE TO TRUSTEE TRANSFER AND WITHHOLDING RULES.—For purposes of sections 401(a)(31), 402(f), and 3405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, qualified hurricane distributions shall not be treated as eligible rollover distributions.

(B) QUALIFIED HURRICANE DISTRIBUTIONS TREATED AS MEETING PLAN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a qualified hurricane distribution shall be treated as meeting the requirements of sections 401(k)(2)(B)(i), 403(b)(7)(A)(ii), 403(b)(11), and 457(d)(1)(A) of such Code.

(b) RECONTRIBUTIONS OF WITHDRAWALS FROM HOME PURCHASES.—

(1) RECONTRIBUTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who received a qualified distribution may, during

the period beginning on August 23, 2017, and ending on February 28, 2018, make one or more contributions in an aggregate amount not to exceed the amount of such qualified distribution to an eligible retirement plan (as defined in section 402(c)(8)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of which such individual is a beneficiary and to which a rollover contribution of such distribution could be made under section 402(c), 403(a)(4), 403(b)(8), or 408(d)(3), of such Code, as the case may be.

(B) TREATMENT OF REPAYMENTS.—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (a)(3) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(2) QUALIFIED DISTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “qualified distribution” means any distribution—

(A) described in section 401(k)(2)(B)(i)(IV), 403(b)(7)(A)(ii) (but only to the extent such distribution relates to financial hardship), 403(b)(11)(B), or 72(t)(2)(F), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986,

(B) received after February 28, 2017, and before September 21, 2017, and

(C) which was to be used to purchase or construct a principal residence in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area, the Hurricane Irma disaster area, or the Hurricane Maria disaster area, but which was not so purchased or constructed on account of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, or Hurricane Maria.

(c) LOANS FROM QUALIFIED PLANS.—

(1) INCREASE IN LIMIT ON LOANS NOT TREATED AS DISTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of any loan from a qualified employer plan (as defined under section 72(p)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) to a qualified individual made during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2018—

(A) clause (i) of section 72(p)(2)(A) of such Code shall be applied by substituting “\$100,000” for “\$50,000”, and

(B) clause (ii) of such section shall be applied by substituting “the present value of the nonforfeitable accrued benefit of the employee under the plan” for “one-half of the present value of the nonforfeitable accrued benefit of the employee under the plan”.

(2) DELAY OF REPAYMENT.—In the case of a qualified individual with an outstanding loan on or after the qualified beginning date from a qualified employer plan (as defined in section 72(p)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)—

(A) if the due date pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 72(p)(2) of such Code for any repayment with respect to such loan occurs during the period beginning on the qualified beginning date and ending on December 31, 2018, such due date shall be delayed for 1 year,

(B) any subsequent repayments with respect to any such loan shall be appropriately adjusted to reflect the delay in the due date under paragraph (1) and any interest accruing during such delay, and

(C) in determining the 5-year period and the term of a loan under subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 72(p)(2) of such Code, the period described in subparagraph (A) shall be disregarded.

(3) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “qualified individual” means any qualified Hurricane Harvey individual, any qualified Hurricane Irma individual, and any qualified Hurricane Maria individual.

(B) QUALIFIED HURRICANE HARVEY INDIVIDUAL.—The term “qualified Hurricane Harvey individual” means an individual whose

principal place of abode on August 23, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(C) **QUALIFIED HURRICANE IRMA INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “qualified Hurricane Irma individual” means an individual (other than a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual) whose principal place of abode on September 4, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Irma disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(D) **QUALIFIED HURRICANE MARIA INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “qualified Hurricane Maria individual” means an individual (other than a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual or a qualified Hurricane Irma individual) whose principal place of abode on September 16, 2017, is located in the Hurricane Maria disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(4) **QUALIFIED BEGINNING DATE.**—For purposes of this subsection, the qualified beginning date is—

(A) in the case of any qualified Hurricane Harvey individual, August 23, 2017,

(B) in the case of any qualified Hurricane Irma individual, September 4, 2017, and

(C) in the case of any qualified Hurricane Maria individual, September 16, 2017.

(d) **PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If this subsection applies to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract, such plan or contract shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan during the period described in paragraph (2)(B)(i).

(2) **AMENDMENTS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—This subsection shall apply to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract which is made—

(i) pursuant to any provision of this section, or pursuant to any regulation issued by the Secretary or the Secretary of Labor under any provision of this section, and

(ii) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2019, or such later date as the Secretary may prescribe.

In the case of a governmental plan (as defined in section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), clause (ii) shall be applied by substituting the date which is 2 years after the date otherwise applied under clause (ii).

(B) **CONDITIONS.**—This subsection shall not apply to any amendment unless—

(i) during the period—

(I) beginning on the date that this section or the regulation described in subparagraph (A)(i) takes effect (or in the case of a plan or contract amendment not required by this section or such regulation, the effective date specified by the plan), and

(II) ending on the date described in subparagraph (A)(ii) (or, if earlier, the date the plan or contract amendment is adopted), the plan or contract is operated as if such plan or contract amendment were in effect, and

(ii) such plan or contract amendment applies retroactively for such period.

SEC. 503. DISASTER-RELATED EMPLOYMENT RELIEF.

(a) **EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS AFFECTED BY HURRICANE HARVEY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of an eligible employer, the Hurricane Harvey employee retention credit shall be treated as a credit listed in subsection (b) of

such section. For purposes of this subsection, the Hurricane Harvey employee retention credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 40 percent of the qualified wages with respect to each eligible employee of such employer for such taxable year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of qualified wages which may be taken into account with respect to any individual shall not exceed \$6,000.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.**—The term “eligible employer” means any employer—

(i) which conducted an active trade or business on August 23, 2017, in the Hurricane Harvey disaster zone, and

(ii) with respect to whom the trade or business described in clause (i) is inoperable on any day after August 23, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, as a result of damage sustained by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(B) **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.**—The term “eligible employee” means with respect to an eligible employer an employee whose principal place of employment on August 23, 2017, with such eligible employer was in the Hurricane Harvey disaster zone.

(C) **QUALIFIED WAGES.**—The term “qualified wages” means wages (as defined in section 51(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, but without regard to section 3306(b)(2)(B) of such Code) paid or incurred by an eligible employer with respect to an eligible employee on any day after August 23, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, which occurs during the period—

(i) beginning on the date on which the trade or business described in subparagraph (A) first became inoperable at the principal place of employment of the employee immediately before Hurricane Harvey, and

(ii) ending on the date on which such trade or business has resumed significant operations at such principal place of employment.

Such term shall include wages paid without regard to whether the employee performs no services, performs services at a different place of employment than such principal place of employment, or performs services at such principal place of employment before significant operations have resumed.

(3) **CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.**—For purposes of this subsection, rules similar to the rules of sections 51(i)(1) and 52, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall apply.

(4) **EMPLOYEE NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.**—An employee shall not be treated as an eligible employee for purposes of this subsection for any period with respect to any employer if such employer is allowed a credit under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to such employee for such period.

(b) **EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS AFFECTED BY HURRICANE IRMA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of an eligible employer, the Hurricane Irma employee retention credit shall be treated as a credit listed in subsection (b) of such section. For purposes of this subsection, the Hurricane Irma employee retention credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 40 percent of the qualified wages with respect to each eligible employee of such employer for such taxable year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of qualified wages which may be taken into account with respect to any individual shall not exceed \$6,000.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.**—The term “eligible employer” means any employer—

(i) which conducted an active trade or business on September 4, 2017, in the Hurricane Irma disaster zone, and

(ii) with respect to whom the trade or business described in clause (i) is inoperable on any day after September 4, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, as a result of damage sustained by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(B) **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.**—The term “eligible employee” means with respect to an eligible employer an employee whose principal place of employment on September 4, 2017, with such eligible employer was in the Hurricane Irma disaster zone.

(C) **QUALIFIED WAGES.**—The term “qualified wages” means wages (as defined in section 51(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, but without regard to section 3306(b)(2)(B) of such Code) paid or incurred by an eligible employer with respect to an eligible employee on any day after September 4, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, which occurs during the period—

(i) beginning on the date on which the trade or business described in subparagraph (A) first became inoperable at the principal place of employment of the employee immediately before Hurricane Irma, and

(ii) ending on the date on which such trade or business has resumed significant operations at such principal place of employment.

Such term shall include wages paid without regard to whether the employee performs no services, performs services at a different place of employment than such principal place of employment, or performs services at such principal place of employment before significant operations have resumed.

(3) **CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.**—For purposes of this subsection, rules similar to the rules of sections 51(i)(1) and 52, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall apply.

(4) **EMPLOYEE NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.**—An employee shall not be treated as an eligible employee for purposes of this subsection for any period with respect to any employer if such employer is allowed a credit under subsection (a), or section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, with respect to such employee for such period.

(c) **EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS AFFECTED BY HURRICANE MARIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of an eligible employer, the Hurricane Maria employee retention credit shall be treated as a credit listed in subsection (b) of such section. For purposes of this subsection, the Hurricane Maria employee retention credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 40 percent of the qualified wages with respect to each eligible employee of such employer for such taxable year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of qualified wages which may be taken into account with respect to any individual shall not exceed \$6,000.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.**—The term “eligible employer” means any employer—

(i) which conducted an active trade or business on September 16, 2017, in the Hurricane Maria disaster zone, and

(ii) with respect to whom the trade or business described in clause (i) is inoperable on any day after September 16, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, as a result of damage sustained by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(B) **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.**—The term “eligible employee” means with respect to an eligible employer an employee whose principal

place of employment on September 16, 2017, with such eligible employer was in the Hurricane Maria disaster zone.

(C) **QUALIFIED WAGES.**—The term “qualified wages” means wages (as defined in section 51(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, but without regard to section 3306(b)(2)(B) of such Code) paid or incurred by an eligible employer with respect to an eligible employee on any day after September 16, 2017, and before January 1, 2018, which occurs during the period—

(i) beginning on the date on which the trade or business described in subparagraph (A) first became inoperable at the principal place of employment of the employee immediately before Hurricane Maria, and

(ii) ending on the date on which such trade or business has resumed significant operations at such principal place of employment.

Such term shall include wages paid without regard to whether the employee performs no services, performs services at a different place of employment than such principal place of employment, or performs services at such principal place of employment before significant operations have resumed.

(3) **CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.**—For purposes of this subsection, rules similar to the rules of sections 51(i)(1) and 52, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall apply.

(4) **EMPLOYEE NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.**—An employee shall not be treated as an eligible employee for purposes of this subsection for any period with respect to any employer if such employer is allowed a credit under subsection (a) or (b), or section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, with respect to such employee for such period.

SEC. 504. ADDITIONAL DISASTER-RELATED TAX RELIEF PROVISIONS.

(a) **TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF LIMITATIONS ON CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), subsection (b) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not apply to qualified contributions and such contributions shall not be taken into account for purposes of applying subsections (b) and (d) of such section to other contributions.

(2) **TREATMENT OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.**—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(A) **INDIVIDUALS.**—In the case of an individual—

(i) **LIMITATION.**—Any qualified contribution shall be allowed only to the extent that the aggregate of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer's contribution base (as defined in subparagraph (G) of section 170(b)(1) of such Code) over the amount of all other charitable contributions allowed under section 170(b)(1) of such Code.

(ii) **CARRYOVER.**—If the aggregate amount of qualified contributions made in the contribution year (within the meaning of section 170(d)(1) of such Code) exceeds the limitation of clause (i), such excess shall be added to the excess described in the portion of subparagraph (A) of such section which precedes clause (i) thereof for purposes of applying such section.

(B) **CORPORATIONS.**—In the case of a corporation—

(i) **LIMITATION.**—Any qualified contribution shall be allowed only to the extent that the aggregate of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer's taxable income (as determined under paragraph (2) of section 170(b) of such Code) over the amount of all other charitable contributions allowed under such paragraph.

(ii) **CARRYOVER.**—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall apply for purposes of this subparagraph.

(3) **EXCEPTION TO OVERALL LIMITATION ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.**—So much of any deduction allowed under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as does not exceed the qualified contributions paid during the taxable year shall not be treated as an itemized deduction for purposes of section 68 of such Code.

(4) **QUALIFIED CONTRIBUTIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “qualified contribution” means any charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) if—

(i) such contribution—

(I) is paid during the period beginning on August 23, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2017, in cash to an organization described in section 170(b)(1)(A) of such Code, and

(II) is made for relief efforts in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area, the Hurricane Irma disaster area, or the Hurricane Maria disaster area,

(ii) the taxpayer obtains from such organization contemporaneous written acknowledgment (within the meaning of section 170(f)(8) of such Code) that such contribution was used (or is to be used) for relief efforts described in clause (i)(II), and

(iii) the taxpayer has elected the application of this subsection with respect to such contribution.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Such term shall not include a contribution by a donor if the contribution is—

(i) to an organization described in section 509(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(ii) for the establishment of a new, or maintenance of an existing, donor advised fund (as defined in section 4966(d)(2) of such Code).

(C) **APPLICATION OF ELECTION TO PARTNERSHIPS AND S CORPORATIONS.**—In the case of a partnership or S corporation, the election under subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be made separately by each partner or shareholder.

(b) **SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED DISASTER-RELATED PERSONAL CASUALTY LOSSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If an individual has a net disaster loss for any taxable year—

(A) the amount determined under section 165(h)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be equal to the sum of—

(i) such net disaster loss, and

(ii) so much of the excess referred to in the matter preceding clause (i) of section 165(h)(2)(A) of such Code (reduced by the amount in clause (i) of this subparagraph) as exceeds 10 percent of the adjusted gross income of the individual,

(B) section 165(h)(1) of such Code shall be applied by substituting “\$500” for “\$500 (\$100 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009)”.

(C) the standard deduction determined under section 63(c) of such Code shall be increased by the net disaster loss, and

(D) section 56(b)(1)(E) of such Code shall not apply to so much of the standard deduction as is attributable to the increase under subparagraph (C) of this paragraph.

(2) **NET DISASTER LOSS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “net disaster loss” means the excess of qualified disaster-related personal casualty losses over personal casualty gains (as defined in section 165(h)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

(3) **QUALIFIED DISASTER-RELATED PERSONAL CASUALTY LOSSES.**—For purposes of this sub-

section, the term “qualified disaster-related personal casualty losses” means losses described in section 165(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(A) which arise in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area on or after August 23, 2017, and which are attributable to Hurricane Harvey,

(B) which arise in the Hurricane Irma disaster area on or after September 4, 2017, and which are attributable to Hurricane Irma, or

(C) which arise in the Hurricane Maria disaster area on or after September 16, 2017, and which are attributable to Hurricane Maria.

(c) **SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING EARNED INCOME.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a qualified individual, if the earned income of the taxpayer for the taxable year which includes the applicable date is less than the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year, the credits allowed under sections 24(d) and 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may, at the election of the taxpayer, be determined by substituting—

(A) such earned income for the preceding taxable year, for

(B) such earned income for the taxable year which includes the applicable date.

In the case of a resident of Puerto Rico determining the credit allowed under section 24(d)(1)(B)(ii) of such Code, the preceding sentence shall be applied by substituting “social security taxes (as defined in section 24(d)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)” for “earned income” each place it appears.

(2) **QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “qualified individual” means any qualified Hurricane Harvey individual, any qualified Hurricane Irma individual, and any qualified Hurricane Maria individual.

(B) **QUALIFIED HURRICANE HARVEY INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “qualified Hurricane Harvey individual” means any individual whose principal place of abode on August 23, 2017, was located—

(i) in the Hurricane Harvey disaster zone, or

(ii) in the Hurricane Harvey disaster area (but outside the Hurricane Harvey disaster zone) and such individual was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of Hurricane Harvey.

(C) **QUALIFIED HURRICANE IRMA INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “qualified Hurricane Irma individual” means any individual (other than a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual) whose principal place of abode on September 4, 2017, was located—

(i) in the Hurricane Irma disaster zone, or

(ii) in the Hurricane Irma disaster area (but outside the Hurricane Irma disaster zone) and such individual was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of Hurricane Irma.

(D) **QUALIFIED HURRICANE MARIA INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “qualified Hurricane Maria individual” means any individual (other than a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual or a qualified Hurricane Irma individual) whose principal place of abode on September 16, 2017, was located—

(i) in the Hurricane Maria disaster zone, or

(ii) in the Hurricane Maria disaster area (but outside the Hurricane Maria disaster zone) and such individual was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of Hurricane Maria.

(3) **APPLICABLE DATE.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable date” means—

(A) in the case of a qualified Hurricane Harvey individual, August 23, 2017,

(B) in the case of a qualified Hurricane Irma individual, September 4, 2017, and

(C) in the case of a qualified Hurricane Maria individual, September 16, 2017.

(4) **EARNED INCOME.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “earned income” has the meaning given such term under section 32(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(5) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

(A) **APPLICATION TO JOINT RETURNS.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), in the case of a joint return for a taxable year which includes the applicable date—

(i) such paragraph shall apply if either spouse is a qualified individual, and

(ii) the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year shall be the sum of the earned income of each spouse for such preceding taxable year.

(B) **UNIFORM APPLICATION OF ELECTION.**—Any election made under paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to both sections 24(d) and 32, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **ERRORS TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL ERROR.**—For purposes of section 6213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, an incorrect use on a return of earned income pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be treated as a mathematical or clerical error.

(D) **NO EFFECT ON DETERMINATION OF GROSS INCOME, ETC.**—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied without regard to any substitution under paragraph (1).

(d) **APPLICATION OF DISASTER-RELATED TAX RELIEF TO POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—

(1) **PAYMENTS TO UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS AND PUERTO RICO.**—

(A) **UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the United States Virgin Islands amounts equal to the loss in revenues to the United States Virgin Islands by reason of the provisions of this title. Such amounts shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on information provided by the government of the United States Virgin Islands.

(B) **PUERTO RICO.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Puerto Rico amounts estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury as being equal to the aggregate benefits that would have been provided to residents of Puerto Rico by reason of the provisions of this title if a mirror code tax system had been in effect in Puerto Rico. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to Puerto Rico unless Puerto Rico has a plan, which has been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, under which Puerto Rico will promptly distribute such payments to its residents.

(2) **DEFINITION AND SPECIAL RULES.**—

(A) **MIRROR CODE TAX SYSTEM.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “mirror code tax system” means, with respect to any possession of the United States, the income tax system of such possession if the income tax liability of the residents of such possession under such system is determined by reference to the income tax laws of the United States as if such possession were the United States.

(B) **TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.**—For purposes of section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, the payments under this subsection shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from a credit provision referred to in subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(C) **COORDINATION WITH UNITED STATES INCOME TAXES.**—In the case of any person with respect to whom a tax benefit is taken into account with respect to the taxes imposed by any possession of the United States by rea-

son of this title, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied with respect to such person without regard to the provisions of this title which provide such benefit.

SEC. 505. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) **EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—This title is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(b) **DESIGNATION IN SENATE.**—In the Senate, this title is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Irma's direct hit to the lower and middle Keys was devastating to my district. Many lost everything to the storm's 130-mile-an-hour winds and significant storm surge. Some lost their lives.

But fortunately, the Keys' recovery is well underway, and the resiliency and generosity of Conchs and other south Florida residents have been on display before, during, and after the storm.

While facing the prospects of receiving the full force of the storm, Key West police and fire departments decided to remain on the ground, risking their personal safety. They wanted to be there for their neighbors when the storm had passed.

Navy personnel, under the leadership of Captain Bobby Baker, who sacrifice for our country every day, once again answered the call to serve and stayed behind to ensure they would be there to get the runways open and ready to receive aid. Coast Guard Captain Jeff Janszen also stayed to make sure the Port of Key West could open.

Two days after the storm had passed, I visited with both of these leaders.

They were working tirelessly to stand up their bases and had not yet checked on the interior of their own homes.

Monroe County Sheriff Rick Ramsay rode out the storm at the Marathon shelter because he felt it was his responsibility to be there to protect his community. Officials from local municipalities from the city of Key West to Ocean Reef have been working around the clock with their teams to get utilities up and running, roads cleared, and government offices operational.

I am grateful to our first responders and all the public officials and employees who have been working hard to serve the people of the Florida Keys.

I also want to thank my office's Florida Keys director, Nicole Rapanos, who has dedicated long hours to assist our constituents and our neighbors in the Keys so that they can get the resources they need. I am grateful for her dedication to her neighbors and proud to have her on my staff.

Community organizations are also playing an instrumental role in the Keys' recovery. Nonprofit groups like Star of the Sea Outreach, Rotary Club of Key West, and the Florida Keys Outreach Coalition, just to name a few, have been volunteering their time, coordinating donations, and serving direct relief to the community.

Private companies and small businesses have also stepped up to help. Robert Spottswood, whose family owns the Marriott Beachside, opened up the hotel to first responders, Navy personnel, and others who chose to ride out the storm.

Baby's Coffee, which was left with its own damage from the storm, was providing their entire stock to residents of Key West, along with hot meals and coffee.

Ikon Builders and UDT have brought supplies to the food banks and donation distribution centers. The Marathon EOC, which has been operating 24/7 and where approximately one-third of employees had lost their homes, these people continued working to help in recovery and rebuilding, and the list goes on.

On the individual level, people have gone above and beyond to show their true Conch spirit. They have shared their own supplies and taken time to go help neighbors. The outpouring of support from local heroes in the Florida Keys has been so extraordinary, I could be here all day telling the stories of thousands upon thousands of acts of kindness. This powerful sense of community and humanity is one of the many reasons I am proud to represent these local heroes.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the Keys' recovery is well underway. Tourism will be opening up again next week, nearly 3 weeks earlier than anticipated. I have no doubt continued recovery efforts will make the Florida Keys an even

greater one-of-its-kind paradise Americans from across the country and people from all over the world have come to love.

But the truth is, the Keys' tourism-based economy has been stalled, and perhaps the greatest devastation is the financial strain on individuals, families, and small entrepreneurs. Many of those facing hardship are themselves working to assist their fellow survivors, putting their personal interests aside. This community is doing its part to help their own, Mr. Speaker.

Now it is time for Congress to do our part to help our fellow Americans in my district and in similar communities throughout my home State of Florida, in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

When we debated this bill on Monday, I told my colleagues about how the tax credit for wages would allow small business owners like Owen, a crab and lobster fisherman whose traps were destroyed in the storm, to claim a tax credit for 40 percent of employee wages, up to \$6,000 per employee, helping him get his team back to work as soon as possible.

This legislation would also allow up to 415,000 hurricane survivors in Miami-Dade and nearly 7,500 in Monroe County keep more of their paycheck by referring to earned income from the immediately preceding year for purposes of determining the earned income tax credit.

We are also making it easier for taxpayers to deduct more of the costs from the extensive property damage these storms left behind and allowing anyone struggling with initial recovery efforts to have immediate access to their retirement savings without penalty.

Lastly, this legislation will encourage more American businesses and individuals to continue generously supporting qualified hurricane relief organizations by lifting caps on charitable giving to these groups.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans in Texas, Florida, Louisiana, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico need Congress to act. On Monday, this bill was derailed by political games, posturing, and name calling. I hope that will not be the case today because my constituents and those in other communities like my district don't have time to wait. This tax relief package deserves bipartisan support from my colleagues.

I want to thank Chairman BRADY and the Ways and Means Committee staff for allowing me to shape this legislation for the benefit of south Florida residents, especially those in Monroe County who were hardest hit by Hurricane Irma. I want to thank Chairman SESSIONS and the Rules Committee for making in order my amendment that will provide additional benefits that are critical for our fellow Americans in

Puerto Rico and the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands. In the aftermath of Hurricane Maria, they are facing a terribly difficult uphill battle to rebuild their communities. I stand in complete solidarity with my friends STACEY PLASKETT of the U.S. Virgin Islands and JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and will work to get them everything they need to rebuild their communities. I hope for their sake we can finally get this done today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first I want to acknowledge those individuals that Mr. CURBELO pointed out and congratulate them for their courage and their kindness as they attempt to get southern Florida back on its feet.

But the key phrase here that my friend from Florida mentioned was the following: Now it is time for us to do our part.

"Our part" calls for a much more vigorous effort, a much more robust investment, and it could, it should, be done now. We don't have to wait to get this done. We don't have to parcel this out in the small amounts that are being suggested.

Now, earlier this week, I rose in opposition to H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act, as well. Today, I am disappointed to say that I am not going to support today's updated version of the legislation either, based on the word "more."

I take no issue with a clean 6-month extension of the FAA expenditure authority, but today's bill includes an extensive list of extraneous provisions.

If we are to include extraneous measures on this must-pass legislation, then the process of compiling the bill should have been done in a bipartisan manner. Instead, our Republican friends assembled their near-term priorities barely, if at all, consulting the Democratic minority, even though many of these issues are indeed bipartisan.

Worse, rather than work together to solve what is rapidly becoming an American humanitarian crisis, they chose to take most of the day off to unveil the tax cut for the wealthiest people in America.

The priorities at this moment are misguided. As I noted earlier this week, while I support the disaster tax relief in this bill, the package is plainly insufficient. I had hoped that we might work together in a manner on these provisions, but that has not occurred.

Traditionally, in this body, we honored and used to respect what is known as the national principle. It was a code of honor that bound us together when one part of the Nation was beset by disaster. Whether it was an earthquake in California, a hurricane in North Caro-

lina, a tornado in Massachusetts, floods in Missouri, or forest fires in Alabama, we did not ask about gender, race, geography. We simply said the national principle prevails and the Federal Government will offer a robust response.

□ 1745

We are failing in that respect to set the precedent today. Instead, unfortunately, this disaster relief package that we will consider does not provide the comprehensive package of incentives and relief that will drive investment and speed up recovery in American communities in Texas, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the devastation across Puerto Rico.

These hurricanes left massive devastation in their wake, and the ongoing situation in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are dire. The situation not only justifies but demands a comprehensive package of incentives and relief to help these communities and their residents get back to their feet.

Republicans will hide behind an amendment they added to the Rules Committee last night. It is really a fig leaf, amounting to \$68 per person in tax relief. We can do much more for our American brothers and sisters in the Caribbean, especially given that the administration continues to drag its feet in terms of sending an emergency supplemental request. That should be done forthwith. We can do better, and we must do better.

They are making vague assurances that we will get around to considering a more extensive package later, but delay and uncertainty will make the situation worse, not better.

Today's package should have included other powerful and proven tax incentives that we have extended in the past disaster recovery efforts consistently. I consider this a missed opportunity.

We need to do more to help our fellow Americans recover from these tragedies. Therefore, I intend to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Mr. CURBELO for his leadership in crafting this disaster relief package for our communities, and Chairman SHUSTER for his leadership on this bill as well.

I rise today not only on behalf of the people in my district in Texas who have been just hammered, but on behalf of everyone in Texas, Puerto Rico, Florida, and the Virgin Islands, who have been devastated by this fall's destructive hurricanes.

These are people who desperately need the support of our bill, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act. Hundreds of thousands of families have lost everything, even loved ones. This bill will help them begin to recover through meaningful, targeted tax relief they need now.

Earlier this week, as communities continued to be decimated by record-high wind gusts, flooding, and storm surges, regrettably, my House Democratic friends opposed this critical bill, putting politics above the very people they represent.

I stand here today to say we all have to do better. We have to show the Nation we can stand together in times of great tragedy to help each other and our neighbors, just as our people did in our district in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support for this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out, as all of us, to those impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. I am committed to providing the resources necessary for Federal response and recovery.

We all voted for the money a week and a half ago. That took 3 days. Other storms in the past took 3 months, so let's set the record straight.

I am pleased to support aid to those affected by Harvey, Irma, Maria, and I will continue to do so. We urgently need to deliver relief and assistance to those currently impacted by Hurricane Maria in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, where the entire island has lost power and many are without water.

I can't support a bill before us today which is not even close to providing the robust relief that Puerto Rico needs. You know it, and we know it. The Congress and this administration need to step up, help Puerto Rico recover.

I plan to reintroduce legislation to extend the earned income tax credit to residents of Puerto Rico, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

The bill before us today completely circumvented the committee process. I am not a process person, but this bill did not have any hearing, despite the fact that myself and my Republican colleague from New York, Mr. REED, have had legislation on comprehensive disaster relief for the last 5 years.

I want to address something my good friend from Texas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, put out yesterday in response to my position and others. He said that Democrats were using hurricane relief as a "bargaining chip" and "playing politics" to enact our own agenda. He also tweeted that we were "sick," which I can only

hope was tweeted by an overzealous staffer.

This is where I usually fly off the handle, but I am going to keep cool, I am going to keep calm, and I am going to make sure that I am a real American, not judging people on where they live. I promised myself I would stay calm for the rest of what I have to say.

My only agenda, Mr. Speaker, is to help those who have been hurt by disasters, regardless of where in the United States they live, regardless of what they look like, regardless of how they cook their food. If that is a political agenda, I don't know what world we are living in.

As for "playing politics," as I mentioned, the gentleman from New York and I introduced the National Disaster Tax Relief Act to take politics out of the process, to avoid having to have debates like these.

Congress shouldn't pick and choose who gets disaster relief and who doesn't based on political whims. Tax relief should not be reserved only for victims of a storm that happened to impact the home district—

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill needlessly pits residents of Texas and Florida against residents of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Louisiana, West Virginia, Utah, and other States. We should treat everyone fairly, and the Reed-Pascrell bill would do that.

Tax relief provisions would kick in automatically for federally declared disaster situations, even in Montana, even in Alaska. We should not play favorites when it comes to helping those in need.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, so let's be clear about who is playing politics here. New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut continue to feel the effects of Hurricane Sandy, just as Carolinians, Utahns, people from West Virginia and Louisiana still feel the effects of the major floods of 2015 and 2016. This is true in many other States.

So while this bill takes a few provisions from our bill, it does not get into the real meat and potatoes as to how we can help everybody. This bill doesn't do enough in the first place, and it doesn't include victims of other disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to demand robust and fair disaster tax relief. And if that is politics, so be it. I plead guilty. I want fairness.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the

chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3823.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear what is at stake if Congress fails to pass the FAA extension. Starting on October 1, no aviation taxes will be collected. Approximately \$40 million of revenue will be lost each day; the revenue that would have been used for airport infrastructure funding and the FAA's important safety, operational, and research functions.

No new Airport Improvement Program grants will be issued to airports in the communities across the country.

All FAA accounts funded out of the aviation trust fund—the Facilities and Equipment; AIP; Research, Engineering, and Development accounts—will be impacted.

Thousands of employees will be furloughed and some will be required to show up to work for no pay.

We must also be clear on the impact to hurricane recovery efforts currently underway by the FAA and funded from the Facilities and Equipment account, including those in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The FAA is currently trying to restore radars, navigational aids, and other equipment damaged during Hurricane Maria. This is happening while stranded passengers in the San Juan airport wait without air-conditioning and electricity for flights off the island.

The FAA technicians are working around the clock to restore services, but because of the extent of the damage and the challenges of the terrain where equipment is located, it is difficult to determine when full restoration will happen.

For instance, as we debate this bill, technicians are making their way to a long-range radar site on a mountain in Puerto Rico. The last two miles to the site through the rainforest are impassable, so the technicians are using chainsaws to clear a path for themselves and their replacement equipment. The radar and navigation equipment are critical for the safe operation of flights.

We will have plenty of time to debate aviation policy in the coming weeks, and I look forward to it. But the FAA extension we are considering this week is not a pawn in a Washington game of political brinksmanship.

It is time for Congress to ensure the FAA's authorities, funding, and disaster recovery efforts continue uninterrupted in order to help those impacted by the hurricanes that are desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who is the ranking

member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this would be the fourth FAA extension in 2 years. It didn't have to be this way. We had a bill come out of the committee in the last Congress and this Congress that was bipartisan except for one provision; that is the privatization of the Air Traffic Organization.

Now, there is a citizen group out there called Citizens for On Time Flights—actually, Airlines for America funds this—who are saying that we have to fly these old zigzag routes with 1950s' radar, and if only we, the airlines—the same airlines, by the way, that have had their dispatch and reservation systems go down 39 times in the last 2 years. The national air traffic system hasn't gone down in the last 2 years.

But, anyway, they could do better, they say—or Citizens for On Time Flights say. But, unfortunately, it is based on lies.

We have deployed a system where we could fly planes closer together. It is operational, actually, but the airlines haven't purchased the equipment to use it, and they are not going to purchase that equipment until 2020 or after.

So they are saying the FAA is dragging its feet; the FAA is over budget; the FAA is this, the FAA is that. No. Actually, it is the airlines that haven't purchased the equipment to use that system.

Now, the other most egregious part of this privatization proposal is the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman BRADY, has decided to give taxing authority to the private corporation. Now, they are not going to call it taxes. It is fees. Okay.

But right now we finance our Air Traffic Organization with a 7½ percent tax, a progressive tax; the more expensive your ticket, the more you pay. That is how we finance, predominantly, our Air Traffic Organization.

Well, this bill repeals that ticket tax. First thing that happens is the airlines raise their tickets by 7½ percent. They already did that once 5 years ago when there was a temporary lapse. Only two airlines didn't, Spirit and Alaska. Everybody else grabbed the money and ran, \$400 billion.

So Congress repeals the ticket tax. They raise prices 7½ percent, and then they would get three seats on the board. Three seats will go to direct airlines interests to decide what passengers and how people will pay to use the national airspace. So they, in all probability, will come up with a head tax.

So, in addition to paying \$7 billion a year for baggage fees, now we are going to start charging people to use the national airspace with a flat tax. So, hey, that is a big, great win for the people with first class tickets. The people, of

course, who have got a \$100 coach seat are now going to be paying more like 20 percent or 25 percent. And the person with a \$2,000 ticket is going to pay, basically, 3-point-something percent.

So this is all really unfortunate because we could have passed already out of this House a bipartisan bill, sent it to the Senate. Instead of trying to jam them with this bill that is loaded down with riders, we would be jamming them with good, long-term policy for the FAA and the traveling public and the aviation industry in America.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have already heard from the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is a member of the committee, who is going to oppose the bill because of provisions regarding private flood insurance. He thinks it will cause Federal flood insurance to collapse. And the two Senators from Louisiana who they are attempting to jam with this bill are saying they are going to oppose the bill and block it in the Senate. So we may end up with no continuing authorization for the FAA because they wanted to put these flood insurance provisions and other riders on this bill instead of passing them as separate legislation.

□ 1800

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the distinguished chairman of the House Republican Conference.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017. It also includes a 3-month extension for the Special Diabetes Program for Indians. This is an important program for many of the Tribes that I represent in my district.

It is also a 3-month extension of the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education program that is set to expire at the end of this week.

It is estimated that we could have a national doctor shortage of 23,000 by 2025, and when you look at the rural areas like mine in eastern Washington, it is especially stark. We know primary care saves lives, and that is why it is so important to include these provisions in the long-term reauthorization of the THCGME program.

This program specially trains residents in some of the larger shortage areas; and when you compare it to the traditional Medicare program, the Teaching Health Center residents are 3½ times more likely to practice primary care, twice as likely to work in

rural areas, and 2½ times more likely to work in the underserved areas.

It is a part of the solution in solving our primary care crisis, but it must be funded. That is why it is so important to continue this funding and this legislation. Without the funding, the program will unravel. The centers could be forced to ramp down. Residents could be terminated, and some centers may be shut down and their programs eliminated altogether.

I encourage my colleagues to recognize the importance of this program and encourage them to continue working with me on a long-term solution that ensures the future success of this vital program.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership. He has been particularly helpful in thinking through how we can work together on the multiple crises that Texas, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico are facing.

Let me thank the manager of the bill for working on these issues as well.

Let me first of all indicate, as I have done earlier today, that I understand that the FAA extension is a clean extension which I will support, recognizing the international airport that is in my district. But again, I will seek the important leadership on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and particularly, the ranking member, when it comes to dealing with not supporting privatization of air traffic controllers.

I want to speak specifically to the hurricane tax relief. As I do so, let me particularly make mention that I had hoped this bill would have an extension of the CHIP program and the community health centers. Maybe we can work on that, because I know in many of our communities impacted by the hurricanes, those elements are important, community health centers, and, certainly, the Children's Health Insurance Program.

I do want to make a point to say that I wish we could have gone further. I know that there were at least 21 different tax credits or exemptions that we could have had to help those who are impacted by the hurricanes, but these, I want to cite and say that I appreciate them being utilized for my constituents now.

The bill would provide tax credit deductions and other relief to taxpayers in disaster areas affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. Most measures would apply to taxpayers in parts of Florida, Puerto Rico, Texas, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

In particular, access to one's retirement funds, the bill would waive the 10 percent penalty on each distribution from retirement accounts for taxpayers

in affected areas. Individuals will be eligible to make the withdrawal if their primary residence was in one of the disaster areas as of the date of the storm and they sustained an economic loss.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the bill would increase the size of a loan an individual can take from their employee retirement fund under the retirement plan loans. It would also provide a credit for businesses that were rendered inoperable by the hurricanes but that retained employees, and on the charitable deduction for those who are giving dollars between the 23rd and December 31.

What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is to look at some form of a disaster relief tax scheme, if you will, to enhance what we are doing now and to listen, where we can do this in a bipartisan way, working with Mr. NEAL, working with the chairman of the committee, and really making sure we have a long-term response to the journey that my constituents and others will have to take.

I close by saying that now we are up to 185,000 homes that have been severely damaged or damaged. We have got problems with mortgage deductions and a number of other issues, and, therefore, I am hoping we can work together.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017, which provides additional time to debate the future of our Nation's air traffic control system.

Earlier this week, I visited Charlotte Douglas' air traffic control tower and learned firsthand from the controllers about the importance of modernizing our traffic control system. Fortunately, Chairman BILL SHUSTER exercised leadership through spearheading H.R. 2997, the 21st Century AIRR Act, that does just that, by shifting the current bureaucratic and broken air traffic control to a stakeholder-managed, not-for-profit corporation. With NextGen projected to ultimately cost \$120 billion, it is imperative that we fix our air traffic control in this Congress.

Importantly, the 21st Century AIRR Act also strengthens air service in rural communities through ensuring that general aviation will have full access to U.S. airspace. It advances the remote air traffic control tower program, which means that rural communities are fully integrated into our Nation's air traffic control system.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on this critical

issue facing the Fifth District of South Carolina.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), and I must tell you that anybody who has witnessed her heartfelt advocacy on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico in the last 24 hours would be moved. I also would say that nobody in this Chamber knows more about what has happened in Puerto Rico right now than the gentlewoman from New York, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I really appreciate those kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill. As we all know, many people are hurting in the areas affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. Sadly, the response by the administration has been bumbling, inexcusably weak, and inadequate.

While some of the proposals in the bill are needed, these measures are necessary, but far from sufficient to help Puerto Rico recover. If anything, these half steps are an insult to the American citizens living in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Puerto Rico is hurting. They do not need legislative lip service passed just so that the majority can claim they are helping. Instead of taking real and meaningful steps to provide much-needed relief for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, this bill ignores the challenges they face.

Providing personal casualty assistance and penalty-free withdrawals from retirement accounts is commendable, but not for Puerto Rico. Just under half the island is living in poverty, and the average median income is under \$20,000. In fact, 67 percent of workers have no money left to save for retirement after paying bills, and only one in five workers is contributing to retirement savings.

So I ask you, what savings will they pull from, and how and when will this happen? American citizens in Puerto Rico cannot even get cash out of an ATM without waiting hours in line. Providing funds based on the assessed value of those provisions for Puerto Rico is insufficient. It is a fig leaf offered by Republicans so that they can check it off their list.

In order to truly help the many victims affected by the hurricanes, Congress needs to start by providing the economic support required to recover.

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

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this bill is unworkable for Puerto Rico as it stands now. I applaud the effort and speed with which this was drafted, but it must be strengthened to truly address the needs of Americans in these disaster areas.

Even today, I got a call from the most important medical institution, and they are running out of antibiotics. The veterans hospital that treats 200,000 soldiers who have participated in every war, they do not have access to healthcare. This is how we honor their service? No, Mr. Speaker.

Vote down this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, you just heard the eloquent testimony from Ms. VELÁZQUEZ about what the people of Puerto Rico are facing right now.

I wish that the majority would have approached this process differently. The reauthorization of the FAA could have been a simple, straightforward exercise. It could have and should have been a bipartisan effort. They saddled the FAA with unrelated partisan priorities, incorporated with little input from Democrats, and presented a weak tax package to address the recent major national disasters.

As I said when a version of this bill came up earlier this week, I wish the disaster tax relief section were better designed and more extensive. This updated bill still doesn't provide adequate relief to the affected families and communities who desperately need it. You just heard from Ms. VELÁZQUEZ on that basis.

While waiving penalties on the withdrawal of retirement savings and expanding EITC and child tax credit provisions are helpful, the majority inexplicably left out some of the most economically powerful tax incentives on the shelf, including those that would be helpful to rebuild devastated infrastructure.

Given this damage and the needs of hard-hit areas, especially the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, I cannot understand why we are not including proven assistance contained in previous disaster tax packages as we did to our family and friends in places like Texas and Louisiana.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I truly deplore the way some colleagues have decided to politicize such a sensitive, urgent, and important issue.

There are people in my community who are suffering, who lost their homes, yet they are still working hard to help their neighbors rebuild. For them to find out that this institution would oppose a measure to help them because some colleagues think it is just not good enough—now, you heard them. They recognize there is a lot of good in this package, but it is not enough.

I am the Representative of the district that was hit the hardest by Hurricane Irma. Chairman BRADY was here. He has been working hard back home to help his community recover while managing his responsibilities here as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He is calling for passage of this legislation that he sponsored.

Also putting their names on this legislation, JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, the Resident Commissioner elected by Puerto Ricans on the island to this Chamber, she has added her name to this legislation.

Also, STACEY PLASKETT, a member of the minority who represents the Virgin Islands, she has added her name to the amendment we filed to make this legislation even stronger.

So the Members representing the districts that were hit the hardest, where people are suffering—and the gentlewoman from New York is absolutely correct; the suffering in Puerto Rico cannot be compared to anything else that we are seeing here on the mainland—their representatives want to see this legislation pass, but some of our colleagues say it is just not good enough. So because this is not good enough for them, people should get nothing.

We wonder. We wonder why so many Americans don't trust this institution, why so many Americans are frustrated with the politics in this country: because if it isn't perfect, if it isn't exactly what I want, then I am against it.

□ 1815

Now, fortunately, not all of the Members of the minority agree with this. When we first had this vote on Monday, 26 Democrats voted in favor of the legislation. And I thank them—not just for me, but on behalf of all of my constituents, the people of the Florida Keys, south Florida, and, of course, the people of Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands. I thank my Democratic colleagues and all of my Republican colleagues that supported this package. I invite more Members from both parties to support this package today because this is not the time to play political games.

Now, I understand some people here are frustrated about what may have happened in the past. I wasn't here, and I belong to a new generation of Members of this institution. Quite frankly, I think none of us on either side is interested in relitigating the old fights and the old debates. We want to see the solutions for today and tomorrow.

The people of Florida—Monroe County, the Florida Keys, and Miami-Dade—the people of Texas, Louisiana, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, they need us now. They need this solution now.

Can we do more later?

Absolutely. Everyone knows that this Chamber and the other will soon

consider additional funding for FEMA—much-needed funding. I will support a robust package for FEMA because the agency is strained and it is working hard to help people all over this country and out in the Atlantic.

But to say that this is not good enough, so instead we will do nothing is just unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider because I think it is important that we send a message of national unity to help those who are hurting. If we can do more in the future, we will and we should.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just thank all of my colleagues that understand how urgent this situation is, how much pain and suffering are being experienced in these communities, and I ask them respectfully to please support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for the Committee on Ways and Means has expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the terrible tragedy and suffering from Harvey, Irma, and Maria. We have seen the shattered homes, and we have seen the shattered lives. I have been to Houston and my native Texas to visit with a number of the victims.

There are many tragedies, Mr. Speaker, out of these hurricanes and flooding, but one of the tragedies—one of the tragedies—is that in Harris County, where Houston is, 80 percent of the homes that were flooded didn't have flood insurance.

Now, why didn't they have flood insurance, Mr. Speaker?

I believe one of the reasons is because we have a government monopoly called the National Flood Insurance Program. Many people don't even know of its existence. Many people think they were safe because they were 3 feet outside of the government designated 100-year floodplain. Many thought that somehow this was simply rolled into their homeowners' insurance policy, but it wasn't.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to make sure that people have more affordable options for flood insurance.

Wouldn't it be wonderful that for every time you saw a life insurance commercial or an auto insurance commercial, you saw something about flood insurance to help educate the American people about the need for this basic insurance policy?

We could see the savings occur as people rolled this into their homeowners' policy.

In the very small portion of the market, Mr. Speaker, where there is competition, people are saving not just hundreds of dollars, but thousands of dollars.

We have heard from the Megoulas family in Pennsylvania: "NFIP insurance would have cost me \$2,700 a year, but I was able to find private coverage for only \$718. . . ."

We heard from the Cyr family, also of Pennsylvania: "I have benefited from switching to private market flood insurance from FEMA. I save about \$1,000 per year."

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a piece of legislation known as the Flood Insurance Market Parity and Modernization Act, also known as Ross-Castor. I want to thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. Ross) for his leadership on this issue. It is very simple. It simply clarifies congressional intent that people ought to have more options.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, as people begin to rebuild after these hurricanes, they need better options for flood insurance, particularly with the NFIP \$30 billion in debt, facing another bailout, and facing an uncertain future. Now we need to take care of that.

That is why I have proposed, along with Chairman DUFFY, a 5-year, long-term reauthorization. We are currently operating under a temporary 90-day authorization. But as we do, let's work on something that we can all agree on. The last time this bill came up in the House, Mr. Speaker, 419-0. It has recently come out of the Financial Services Committee 58-0.

I am not sure you can get that kind of vote tally for a Mother's Day resolution. It is bipartisan. It is the very definition of bipartisan.

So let's take one important step today to help the victims of Harvey, Irma, and Maria as they begin to rebuild their homes, to have more flood insurance options, more affordable insurance options. As we work through what we might disagree on in the NFIP authorization, let's pass today what we can agree on and help the victims today.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill, which began as a must-pass reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration but has now become a Christmas tree for unrelated Republican priorities.

Puerto Rico is on the brink of a humanitarian crisis following Hurricane Maria that is being exacerbated by Trump's and Congress' failure to adequately respond. Tens of thousands in Texas and Florida are just beginning to pick up the pieces following Hurricanes Harvey and Irma. Yet, other than the small initial down payment of disaster aid we passed—which I might add Chairman HENSARLING voted against—Congress has yet to pass a single policy reform that will actually improve the lives of any of those who found themselves in harm's way.

This is the first time in this Congress that we are debating a flood insurance policy change on the House floor. However, this is not a policy change that would address the resilience of the Flood Insurance Program, help families to recover, or improve our country's response to natural disasters. No. The Republican response to the catastrophic storms of these last 2 months is to muscle through the expansion of private flood insurance, which has long been sought by the insurance industry.

Now, let me be clear. I don't oppose this policy. I voted for it last Congress and I voted for it when we marked it up in committee this year. But moving this bill at this time, while ignoring all the other policy responses needed but the Flood Insurance Program and the ongoing natural disasters in our country, is simply irresponsible.

The NFIP will expire on December 8 of this year, and we still lack a credible plan to ensure that it is reauthorized for the long term. Therefore, I will oppose any and all efforts to break apart the debate on substantive reforms to the NFIP from the reauthorization debate we should so desperately be having.

The bill before us today does absolutely nothing to address the stability of the NFIP, which is in jeopardy following a devastating series of catastrophic hurricanes across several States and U.S. territories. We know that we will need to increase the NFIP's borrowing authority so that policyholders from Harvey, Irma, and Maria can be made whole, but the chairman has no plan to deal with the debt, frequently telling those of us who have urged him to consider debt forgiveness to just forget about that idea.

I have long called for Congress to forgive NFIP's debt, particularly because of the unsustainable burden placed on policyholders paying hundreds of millions of dollars a year just on the interest for the government to pay itself back. Flood insurance is already unaffordable.

So why are we continuing to make it worse by saddling policyholders with interest on a debt that will never be repaid?

We need thoughtful, comprehensive solutions to a long-term reauthorization that addresses the debt, affordability, mapping, and mitigation. That is not what we have before us today.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Ross), who is the author of the bipartisan Flood Insurance Market Parity and Modernization Act, which passed this body in the last Congress 419-0. He is the vice chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee and the real leader for affordable private flood insurance.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this desperately needed legislation.

Included in this bill are two provisions that are particularly important to my constituents in central Florida. One is tax relief for families and small businesses recovering from the destruction of Hurricanes Harvey, Maria, and Irma. The other is language taken from my legislation, the Private Flood Insurance Market Development Act, which will allow private sector insurers to compete with the National Flood Insurance Program.

The catastrophic impact of the three major hurricanes is heartbreaking and tragic. However, it has been inspiring to witness the outpouring of charity and goodwill from our communities in response.

Now it is time for this Congress to rise to the occasion. The tax relief for disaster victims in this legislation is a great first step.

This bill will help individuals in the disaster areas keep their jobs, support retirement savers paying for recovery, encourage charitable contributions to help victims, and put more money in the pockets of families trying to get their lives back on track after having lost everything.

To deny our constituents this relief because it is not enough is simply irresponsible. To be sure, I agree that more aid will likely be needed.

But is that really a good excuse to do nothing?

I certainly don't think so.

Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't just about providing immediate relief. Thankfully, it also provides some measure of long-term relief to communities vulnerable to floods—the most costly of all natural disasters.

Thanks to the inclusion of my legislation, H.R. 1422, this bill will provide consumers with more options and lower costs in the flood insurance marketplace as well as help to reduce the unacceptable number of homes not insured for flood losses.

Last Congress, this House passed nearly identical legislation by a vote of 419-0. That is why I was so disheartened to hear some characterize this reform as a long-time Republican priority. This isn't a Republican priority, and it is not a Democratic priority. This is a national priority.

The NFIP is more than \$25 billion in debt and runs an annual deficit of \$1.4 billion. Folks, this is an insurance company on the brink of being unable to pay out claims to policyholders without another taxpayer bailout.

The NFIP desperately needs to offload some of its risk, and we can help by allowing the private sector to do what it does best: compete for customers by offering better service, lower prices, and more comprehensive coverage.

I understand some of my colleagues think competition will destabilize the NFIP. First, we need to be clear that the NFIP in its current state is beleaguered, it is not stable, and it is not sustainable. Reforms must be made.

Second, I would urge my colleagues to recognize that by forcing nearly all of the flood risk in this Nation into a single, government-run insurance program, we contribute to the NFIP's bloated and unstable risk portfolio.

□ 1830

So the NFIP needs some help, and consumers need competition. More coverage options will help make flood insurance an attractive investment for everyone, thereby reducing the number of uninsured homes.

With the NFIP alone, our constituents are severely limited. For example, an NFIP policy only covers up to \$250,000 of damages.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ROSS. In addition, NFIP policies do not cover homeowners displaced by living expenses.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has an untold number of supporters. I include in the RECORD a letter from 15 major insurance, housing, banking, and trade associations in support of the private flood insurance provisions in H.R. 3823.

SEPTEMBER 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned trades and organizations strongly support the "Development of a Private Flood Insurance Market" title of H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017. This package includes bipartisan, clarifying language, introduced by Representative Dennis A. Ross (FL-15) and Representative Kathy Castor (FL-14), to increase acceptance of private flood insurance products. This will increase flood insurance options for consumers, thereby providing more competition and coverage options to families and businesses.

The Ross-Castor language passed the House last year by a vote of 419-0, and it was ordered reported out of the House Financial Services Committee in June by a vote of 58-0. The bipartisan fix clarifies what is already in federal law (following the passage of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 and reinforced in the Homeowners Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014) intended by Congress to allow lenders to accept private flood insurance in lieu of federal coverage to satisfy the mandatory purchase requirement.

The undersigned trades and organizations strongly support inclusion of the bipartisan Ross-Castor language in the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 that allows consumers the choice of government or private flood insurance coverage. We ask for you to vote in favor of this

important legislative package when it is considered by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

Property Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCI)

Reinsurance Association of America (RAA)

National Multifamily Housing Council (NMHC)

National Apartment Association (NAA)

American Bankers Association (ABA)

Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers (CIAB)

American Insurance Association (AIA)

National Association of REALTORS® (NAR)

National Association of Professional Insurance Agents (PIA)

Financial Services Roundtable (FSR)

Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America (Big "I")

Mortgage Bankers Association (MBA)

National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC)

Independent Community Bankers of America (ICBA)

National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions (NAFCU).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me start off by letting the America people know fully why we Democrats on this side of the aisle are opposed to this bill.

Nobody has worked as hard as Democrats on this bill, Mr. Speaker, but the reason we object to it is that the flood insurance part of this bill was a result of cherry-picking items that they wanted. The American people deserve better than that. Then they attach it to an FAA bill with a 6-month extension. That is no way to treat the issues that we have today.

All you have got to do is click on the television and look at what is happening to American citizens in Puerto Rico, Florida, Texas. And you are going to put something where they cherry-picked this together to solve this particular problem?

There is no sense of urgency here, Mr. Speaker.

Another reason is that, unlike all of our other disaster tax credit relief packages, every time we have had an expansion added to the bill, we expanded these tax credits for low-income people, expanded the tax credits for the new markets area for people to immediately come in and invest. Not in this bill. There is no expansion in this bill.

My friends over there talk about bipartisanship. My middle name is bipartisanship. There is nobody on that committee who works harder for bipartisanship than DAVID SCOTT.

But the one piece of bipartisanship—our amendment that I worked feverishly on with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), in which we were able to address the issue of the penalties of expense on those poor people who chose to have their monthly in-

stallments there and not be punished for it.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. We worked together on that and cut that cost in half. That one bipartisan piece of endeavor in our Financial Services Committee is not even included in this bill. That is why we are opposed to it.

Let's treat the American people the way they deserve. There is no better time. You are talking about expanding the help. Our people, American citizens in Puerto Rico, Florida, and Texas, deserve for us to have a complete flood insurance program, not piecemeal.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 3823.

First, I would like to mention I have deep concerns over Republicans' failure to extend vital healthcare programs that expire this Saturday, including important bipartisan programs like CHIP, Community Health Centers, and the National Health Service Corps. If we fail to act, access to affordable and quality care for children and vulnerable populations nationwide will be jeopardized.

However, I want to focus on another issue that is extremely important to my constituents: flood insurance.

This bill would undermine efforts to comprehensively reform the National Flood Insurance Program by allowing the development of a private flood insurance market while not confronting challenges to NFIP, like increasing affordability, investing in mitigation, and ensuring transparency and accountability. It would not even reauthorize the flood insurance program, which is due to expire on December 8; or raise its borrowing authority, which is due to run out in the coming weeks and could impact claims from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

When Superstorm Sandy devastated New Jersey 5 years ago, some of the hardest hit communities were in my district, and the NFIP did not help them the way it should have. Too many of my constituents are still dealing with high premiums, inaccurate flood maps, or still waiting for their Sandy claims appeals to be decided.

That is why I helped introduce the bipartisan SAFE NFIP Reauthorization Act, which would reauthorize the program, cap premium rate increases, authorize funding for more flood mapping, reform the appeals process, and cap the compensation of flood insurance companies. These are changes

that we must pursue. The legislation we consider does none of this.

Mr. Speaker, we should be working together to comprehensively improve the NFIP. Doing anything less is an abdication of our responsibility. I encourage all of my colleagues to oppose this legislation and work towards meaningful flood insurance reform.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), a true expert on flood insurance issues.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk during this discussion about the flood insurance program, about making sure we are providing for the hurricane victims. There is talk about the FAA.

Let me be clear: we support the FAA. We support making sure that we provide all the resources necessary for the hurricane victims, from Hurricanes Irma, Harvey, and Maria. Where things are getting distorted is that this bill includes extraneous provisions that will actually undermine these very objectives.

I want to explain.

Under the legislation that has been attached—the flood insurance legislation—it does allow private insurers to come in, which all of us support, but not in a vacuum. What is going to happen when you do this in a vacuum is that you are going to cause premiums to be diverted from the program.

This is the program where these people have been paying premiums for years, and the program is not going to have the resources to pay their claims, which means it is going to have to borrow more money, which is going to make the premiums go up even greater.

You are going to see the private insurers come in and cherry-pick low- and moderate-risk policies, which is only going to leave the high-risk policies in the program trying to pay a debt and not having a diverse portfolio of low-, moderate-, and high-risk policies.

This is a flawed approach. It needs to be addressed on December 9, when this current program expires. We should be addressing this holistically.

I want to say it again. Those of you who have hurricane victims are undermining their very recovery by supporting this legislation.

One of the other major flaws is this, Mr. Speaker. This shows flooding in Louisiana last year, flooding in Texas this year.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the

gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee and a leader on flood insurance in the House today.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment and thank Ms. CASTOR and Mr. ROSS for their hard work on this legislation.

There are some here in this body who have said: if we let free markets into the National Flood Insurance Program that is run by the Federal Government, you are going to undermine the premiums that come into the national flood insurance pool.

It is \$25 billion in debt and is structured in a way where premiums can't rise. This doesn't undermine the program.

What we are doing is saying: Listen, if you are in the National Flood Insurance Program right now, the way it is structured, there is only one place you can buy insurance. But this is a provision that will open up the market and let private companies come in and offer families better policies at better prices. If they don't, you can stay in the NFIP. You don't have to go private. You can stay government. But you give people a choice.

It is like saying: Listen, you have to keep the United States Postal Service as your one carrier. You can't have FedEx or UPS. You don't get those choices.

People want a choice. In Houston, instead of having only 20 percent of the people who had coverage, you might have had 40, 50, or 60 percent of the people who would have had coverage. More people would have had protection.

I have got to tell you, I am disappointed in the partisanship.

I am going to quote a person I rarely quote, but a person I truly like. She once said in the process of this bill: "This is an example of real compromise."

Then, on the substance of the bill, this fine woman from California said: "We can have the opportunity for our constituents to have some choice. I think that is real compromise, that is substantive compromise, that is meaningful compromise, and that is the kind of compromise that reasonable people can engage in."

Mr. Speaker, that was the gentlewoman from California, who is now in opposition to this bill.

When this came up by itself—the same bill—last Congress, everyone voted for it. When it came up in committee, everyone voted for it. Democrats and Republicans voted for this bill because they knew that it was going to offer more choice and better prices to American families. That is why it was bipartisan.

I think this is a moment where our Congress can stand together on behalf of the American people who don't have flood insurance, who don't have a reasonably priced policy. Let's stand with

them today and pass the Ross-Castor bill. By the way, ROSS and CASTOR are both from Florida. Two Florida Members, Republican and Democrat, came together.

Let's get it done, Mr. Speaker.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017.

Hurricane Harvey flooded the Houston region with 21 trillion gallons of water causing tragic and catastrophic results in my district.

Hurricane Harvey destroyed 185 thousand homes in the Houston region, displacing my constituents and harming their livelihoods.

Hurricane Harvey has created an incredible need for enhanced assistance in rebuilding efforts.

My principal focus is to do what is best for my constituents and that is why I support the underlying bill.

H.R. 3823 grants individuals and businesses in areas affected by hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria a tax relief in addition to extending the authorization for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) through March 31, 2018, without privatization of air-traffic control.

Although I support clean reauthorization of the FAA, which is long overdue as a result of the inability of those responsible to craft legislation that obtains bipartisan majority support, I do not support the attached partisan package of extraneous provisions added to the reauthorization.

I also do not support a reauthorization of the FAA that would privatize air-traffic control.

My Democratic colleagues had 21 tax relief provisions to add to the reauthorization.

H.R. 3823 only contains 7 of those provisions; however, they are very important hurricane relief provisions.

On health care, H.R. 3823 extends just three of the many programs set to expire at the end of the month, leaving out bipartisan priorities like CHIP and Community Health Centers extenders.

Additionally, the tax provisions concerning disaster victims were assembled without bipartisan input and leave out important items that were included for victims of prior disasters like Hurricane Katrina.

And finally, this bill blocks the path for any DREAMers legislation to be considered.

Going forward, I would like to see the items just mentioned to be added to the reauthorization bill.

H.R. 3823 would provide tax credits, deductions, and other relief to taxpayers in disaster areas affected by hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Most measures would apply to taxpayers in parts of Florida, Puerto Rico, Texas, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, where the president declared a major disaster zone warranting federal assistance as of Sept. 21.

The budget effects of the tax provisions would be considered emergency spending for budgetary purposes and not count against the spending caps.

The provisions are similar to relief provided after hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma.

The measure specifically helps hurricane victims keep more of their paycheck, deduct

more of the cost of their expensive property damage, and have more affordable and immediate access to money they have saved for their retirement.

The legislation will also encourage even more Americans to donate generously to help those in need.

The bill would waive the 10 percent penalty on early distributions from retirement accounts for taxpayers in affected areas.

Individuals would be eligible to make the withdrawal if their primary residence was in one of the disaster areas as of the date of the storm and they sustained an economic loss.

The withdrawn amount would be included in the taxpayer's gross income, and would be spread over three years unless the taxpayer opted to claim it in a single year.

If the taxpayer repaid the distribution within three years, it would be considered a rollover for tax purposes and they could claim a refund for their previous income tax payments.

The withdrawal would have to occur by Jan. 1, 2019, and wouldn't be subject to withholding.

An individual could withdraw as much as \$100,000 as hurricane distributions over their lifetime.

Plan sponsors would not be in violation of the Internal Revenue Service's retirement plan rules unless they distributed more than \$100,000 to an individual.

Individuals could return withdrawals they had made for a home purchase in a disaster area between Feb. 28 and Sept. 21 if the home wasn't purchased or constructed because of the hurricanes.

The bill would increase the size of a loan an individual can take from their employer retirement fund. Loans could be for as much as \$100,000—less other outstanding loans—or half the present value of the vested balance of the plan.

The bill would delay repayment deadlines for individuals with outstanding loans as of the date of the disaster.

The repayment date for loans due on or before Dec. 31, 2018, would be delayed for one year.

Individuals who took out loans after the hurricanes would not receive the extension.

The bill would create a credit for businesses that were rendered inoperable by the hurricanes but that retained their employees.

Employers could receive a credit for 40 percent of each employee's wages.

The credit amount couldn't exceed \$6,000 per employee.

The employee's principal place of employment would have to be in one of the disaster zones.

Businesses would receive credits for wages on each day they were inoperable after the date of the hurricane and before Jan. 1, 2018.

The credit would be for wages paid each day until significant operations resumed, even if the employee returned to work or worked at a different location.

The limit on the deduction for contributions to charitable organizations would be suspended for donations made between Aug. 23 and Dec. 31 to relief efforts in the hurricane disaster areas.

Taxpayers wouldn't have to itemize their tax return to claim the deduction.

The deduction is normally limited to 50 percent of adjusted gross income (AGI) for individuals and 10 percent of taxable income for corporations.

The bill would allow individuals to contribute as much as their AGI, less any other charitable contributions.

Amounts greater than AGI could be carried over to other tax years.

I would allow corporations to contribute as much as their taxable income, less any other charitable contributions.

Donations in excess of taxable income could be carried over.

The charitable organization would have to provide written confirmation that the funds would be used for relief efforts.

Partnerships and S corporations would each have to elect the deduction.

The bill would allow taxpayers to deduct uncompensated casualty losses related to the hurricane even if their losses didn't meet the minimum threshold for the deduction, currently 10 percent of AGI. The deduction would be net of any personal casualty gains.

Taxpayers wouldn't have to itemize their return to claim the deduction.

The taxpayer's standard deduction would be increased by the net disaster loss, including for purposes of calculating whether they are liable for the alternative minimum tax.

The bill would establish a special rule for determination of the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and Child Tax Credit.

If a taxpayer had received one or both of the credits in the previous tax year but their earned income was too high to qualify in 2017, they could substitute their 2016 income to claim them.

Individuals would qualify if their principal residence was in the hurricane disaster zone, or in the surrounding disaster area and they had been displaced by the hurricane.

Puerto Rican taxpayers' eligibility for the child tax credit would be based on their Social Security earnings.

The child tax credit is only available to Puerto Rican families with three or more children.

The EITC is not typically available to residents of Puerto Rico, according to a report from the Congressional Research Service (CRS).

The bill would direct the Treasury Department to provide funding to the government of Puerto Rico for the estimated amount of tax relief for residents who would be eligible under the bill.

The Puerto Rican government would have to promptly distribute the funds.

Puerto Rico would have to have a plan for disbursing the funds approved by the Treasury before the money would be provided.

The Treasury Department would reimburse the U.S. Virgin Islands, which has a "mirror" tax system, for any reduction in tax revenue caused by the bill.

Residents of the U.S. Virgin Islands are also generally ineligible for the EITC but can claim the child tax credit, according to CRS.

For the reasons mentioned above I support H.R. 3823.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 538, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3823 is postponed.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our fellow Americans who know what it means to give the ultimate sacrifice to the Nation: our Gold Star families.

This past weekend, we observed National Gold Star Mothers and Families Day, a solemn reminder of our sacred obligation to hold dear in our heart and to never forget those in uniform we have lost. Psalm 34 says: "The Lord is close to the brokenhearted and saves those who are crushed in spirit."

I believe this was on President Lincoln's mind when he wrote to Mrs. Bixby, a mother who lost five of her sons in the Civil War. President Lincoln wrote: "I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only with the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

Like many in this Chamber, I have presented and saluted too many flag-draped coffins of our fallen warriors. As we remember them, let us also recommit ourselves to the task of caring for the families they leave behind who forever carry the pain of their loss. As they gave to the Nation, the Nation must give to them.

Today, I urge my colleagues to join me in renewing our obligations to our Gold Star families, a commitment for life.

□ 1845

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

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

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, September is National Preparedness Month, and I rise today to offer prayers, condolences, and encouragement for those impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Also, I rise to thank the thousands of first responders, neighbors, and volunteers who have come out in droves to respond to these disasters. I stand with those residents now recovering from storm and flood devastation.

This Nation stands behind you ready to make you stronger and more resilient in the face of disaster. As a resident of a city that faced many disasters, I can attest to the fact that Americans across this Nation are resilient and only grow in strength in the face of a challenge.

In the wake of these disasters and as we remember the 16th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks and prepare to mark the fifth anniversary of Superstorm Sandy next month, we are reminded of the critical importance of preparing for the disasters that our communities may face. We cannot always control whether a disaster will strike our communities, but we can take every opportunity to prepare ourselves, our loved ones, and our communities.

We are a resilient nation in the face of disasters. As a resident of Staten Island and chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I urge all Americans to take time this month to make a plan, sign up for alerts and warnings in your area, check your insurance coverage, and make sure that you have an evacuation plan. We cannot plan on disasters ahead of time, but we can certainly prepare ourselves for when they come.

POLLS HAVE BUILT-IN BIAS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, both the Washington Examiner and Washington Times recently have reported on a practice that is resulting in overly low approval ratings for President Trump. Pollsters are not necessarily rigging their questions to get a desired result; instead, they are creating a biased result by how they select people to poll.

Frequently, the pollsters contact more Democrats than Republicans. Unsurprisingly, the results tilt anti-Trump. The Examiner pointed out that this "robs Trump of about 8 points in his approval ratings, from 46 percent to 38 percent."

The Times noted that in polls including Presidential approval questions, the Economist relied on a sample that used 58 percent more Democrats than Republicans, which "gave Democrats a 14-point edge, while Reuters and Gallup gave Democrats an 11-point and 7-point edge in their samples."

Mr. Speaker, as the 2016 election taught us, we shouldn't rely on biased polls if we want accuracy.

SEPTEMBER IS SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention Month, a time for our Nation to raise awareness about the recurring tragedy of suicide.

This epidemic is too common for the men and women who wore our country's uniform and put their lives on the line to defend our freedom. An estimated 20 veterans lose their lives to suicide each and every day.

A new VA report shows the risk for suicide is 22 percent higher among veterans than civilians, and 250 percent higher amongst female veterans than female civilians. This is unacceptable.

Twenty veterans a day lost to suicide should be a call to action for our country and for this Congress. We must take action, and we must do it now.

Typically, the time in this Chamber is split. Republicans have 1 hour and Democrats have 1 hour, but we believe this issue is too important to be overshadowed by partisan politics. That is why, tonight, Congressman TIM MURPHY and I have brought together Members from both sides of the aisle to show our commitment to solving this problem together and finding real solutions for our veterans.

This is the fifth year that we have assembled this team to raise awareness and send a clear message that the epidemic of veteran suicide must end. We have so much work left to do. So tonight we demonstrate our ongoing support for individuals, organizations, and agencies devoted to preventing the epidemic of veteran suicide. We challenge the VA, the Department of Defense, and our fellow lawmakers to do more. We are failing in our obligation to do right by those who have sacrificed so much for our freedom.

Finally, we stand here tonight, unified, for the military families who have experienced this tragedy, and we say to you: Your family's loss is not forgotten. We work for the memory of your loved ones, and we will not rest until every veteran has access to the care he or she needs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who understands the importance of addressing this epidemic, a colleague and friend of mine.

Thank you for being here this evening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and giving me an opportunity to speak on such a critically important topic.

You know, I served for 26½ years, Mr. Speaker, in the United States Air Force. I pinned Purple Hearts on the chests of some of my troops that had gone into harm's way. I know the stress and strain on military families and on military members. I represent a district that arguably is one of the largest, if not the largest, veteran-populated districts in the State of Ohio, with nearly 50,000. And yet today, in 2017, we see 20 veterans per day, 1 every 72 minutes, committing suicide.

What does that say about us as a nation when we send our young people off in uniform to stand in harm's way, to

protect our freedoms, to protect our liberties, to protect our values and way of life, and then when they come home we can't get them the help that they need when they are down?

One of the saddest days since I began serving the people of eastern and southeastern Ohio was the day I got a call from a young wife of a military member. She said she had been dealing with the VA for quite some time to get her husband an appointment with a mental health counselor, all to no avail. He couldn't get in, couldn't get in, couldn't get in.

I stopped by the VA center one day. I asked to speak to the director, gave the young man's name, and I said: I would like to see the status of his appointment.

They looked him up in the system, and they said: Well, you will be happy to know, Congressman, that he has got an appointment next Wednesday.

I said: Well, I am actually here to tell you that you can cancel that appointment because he committed suicide last week.

He had been waiting for weeks and weeks and weeks to get in to see a mental health counselor, struggling with PTSD and the emotional and mental battle scars that came back with him from combat overseas. You know, it is one thing that we send our young people away to fight for us on foreign soil. Imagine for a second what their families go through when they are gone day in and day out, not knowing if they are going to get that call or that knock at the door to tell them that their loved one has been injured or, worse, killed in action. And then we bring their loved one home, and they are helpless in terms of getting them the care and the treatment that they need.

I agree with my colleague: we need to do more. The agencies, the VA, the Department of Defense, mental health counselors all over the country, Congress, families, communities, we need to do more to help our veterans get back on their feet after they have participated in that inhumane, disastrous, catastrophic event known as war.

Mr. Speaker, it almost leaves you speechless to think about the millions of families that are impacted by this, 20 per day—20 per day. One per day is unacceptable, but yet we are seeing 20 per day.

I urge my colleagues and I urge our agencies in the Federal Government—the VA, the DOD—let's get behind an effort, and let's turn this trend in the opposite direction.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time to speak.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude to Congressman JOHNSON. Not only is he an amazing Representative for the people of Ohio, he is also a veteran who served our country ably and proudly,

and his story of a veteran in his district lost to suicide should be a call to all of us around the country to take care of the veterans in each of our districts.

We have made some progress since last year. I have often shared the story of a young veteran in my district, Sergeant Daniel Somers. Sergeant Somers was an Army veteran of two tours in Iraq. He served on Task Force Lightning, an intelligence unit. He ran over 400 combat missions as a machine gunner in the turret of a Humvee. Part of his role required him to interrogate dozens of terror suspects, and his work was deemed classified.

Like many veterans, Daniel was haunted by the war when he returned. He suffered from flashbacks, nightmares, depression, and additional symptoms of post-traumatic stress, made worse by a traumatic brain injury.

Daniel needed help. He and his family asked for help, but, unfortunately, the VA enrolled Sergeant Somers in group therapy sessions, which Sergeant Somers could not attend for fear of disclosing classified information. Despite requests for individualized counseling or some other reasonable accommodation to allow Sergeant Somers to receive appropriate care for his PTSD, the VA delayed providing Sergeant Somers with appropriate support and care.

Like many, Sergeant Somers' isolation got worse when he transitioned to civilian life. He tried to provide for his family, but he was unable to work due to his disability.

Sergeant Somers struggled with the VA bureaucracy. His disability appeal had been pending in the system for over 2 years without resolution. Sergeant Somers didn't get the help he needed in time.

On June 10 of 2013, Sergeant Somers wrote a letter to his family. In the letter he said: "I am not getting better, I am not going to get better, and I will most certainly deteriorate further as time goes on."

□ 1900

He went on to say:

"Thus, I am left with basically nothing. Too trapped in a war to be at peace, too damaged to be at war. Abandoned by those who would take the easy route, and a liability to those who stick it out—and, thus, deserve better. So you see, not only am I better off dead, but the world is better without me in it.

"This is what brought me to my actual final mission."

We lost Sergeant Somers that day.

No one who returns home from serving our country should ever feel like he or she has nowhere to turn. I am committed to working on both sides of the aisle to ensure that no veteran ever feels trapped like Sergeant Somers did,

and that all of our veterans have access to appropriate mental healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) a freshman representative and a great addition to our Congress.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention Month, and I rise to bring awareness to the pressing issue of veteran suicide.

When our servicemembers go overseas, they bravely and selflessly risk their own lives for the greater good. But when they return home, our veterans face new adversities. Many are confronted by intense emotional distress, including depression and post-traumatic stress. Others struggle to readjust to civilian life or to reintegrate into their families and their social networks.

Unfortunately, too many veterans succumb to their mental anguish. America loses 20 Americans every day to suicide. It is time we step up and be there for them and provide them the support they deserve.

I encourage anyone who knows a veteran—whether a family member, a coworker, or a friend—to reach out. A simple gesture of kindness can make all the difference in the life of a veteran going through a difficult time.

I will do my part in Congress, fighting for more and better resources to support our veterans. Veterans fought for us. Now it is time we fight for them.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Somers' story is familiar to too many military families. Sergeant Somers' parents, Howard and Jean, were devastated by the loss of their son, but they bravely shared Sergeant Somers' story and created a mission of their own. Their mission is to ensure that Sergeant Somers' story brings to light America's deadliest war—the 20 veterans that we lose every day to suicide.

Howard and Jean are working with Congress and the VA to share their experience with the VA healthcare system and to find ways to improve care for veterans and their families. We worked closely with Howard and Jean to develop the Sergeant Daniel Somers Classified Veterans Access to Care Act, and ensure veterans of classified experiences can access appropriate VA mental healthcare services.

After more than 3 years of work, I am proud to say that the Sergeant Daniel Somers Classified Veterans Access to Care Act is now law. But this is just one small step forward, and our work with Howard and Jean doesn't stop here. We have so much work left to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), who has served veterans bravely in Congress and home in his district for many years.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. SINEMA for that very nice introduction.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Nation who are listening or watching us on C-SPAN, I want to impress that we have exactly, right now, 40,000 soldiers—veterans—who are committing suicide each year.

This is a national crisis, but it is more than that. It is a national tragedy, but it is more than that. It is an American national shame.

These soldiers go where they are commanded to go. They go into a hail of bullets. They go and they fight and they die. They leave an arm, they leave a leg, they leave so much of themselves on the battlefield, and so many leave their minds there because of the devastation. And when we bring them back home, the level of treatment that many of them are getting, and even not getting, is, again, a national tragedy and a national shame.

It is my home that the plea that America will hear this day from these Members of Congress will awaken us to what I believe is, and should be, the number one issue facing this Nation: take care of our veterans.

Twenty a day, 40,000 every year, is terrible.

Now, myself, what am I doing?

Each year, I put on a jobs fair. But I don't put on that jobs fair by myself. Partnering with me is the VA, where we have, in Atlanta, Georgia, at that convention and trades center, a jobs fair each year with the VA, and we are averaging about 450 jobs each year.

But we don't stop there. We have a health fair because it is the PTSD—post-traumatic stress syndrome—that is this archenemy that we are not examining. The reason for that is that there is a severe shortage of psychiatrists in the VA and there is a severe shortage of primary care physicians in the VA.

So right here in this legislature, my good Republican friend, LARRY BUCSHON from Indiana, and I—and he is a doctor—have worked together. We put together legislation 2 years ago, in 2015, for the special appropriations for veterans that we would pay the tuition, pay the loan forgiveness, for those physicians who are psychiatrists and who will go and work in the VA.

But we didn't stop there. Knowing how the vagarious income levels are structured and the pay scales are structured according to where you live in the United States—and we have VA hospitals, VA centers all over this country, and the salary levels vary—we made sure that an added incentive would be to those graduating psychiatrists who will go and help our veterans and go help us fulfill this shortage, that we would make sure that their incoming salary would be at least 2 percent higher than that average.

My only heartbreak in all of this is that we were only able to get 12. And I can tell you how much that broke my heart by this Congress. But it is a start.

This bill will be replenished. And if you in the public can help us, if we want to do something right now about cutting down on the number of suicides that our veterans are having, help us get more psychiatrists into the VA system, help me and LARRY BUCSHON and many Democrats and Republicans who voted for the initial piece of legislation—we only got 12 the first time, but we should get 300, 400, 500. We should be willing to make that appropriation.

We can talk, we can sympathize, we can do all of that, but we need to get better treatment, psychiatric treatment, for our veterans. That will not happen, ladies and gentlemen, if we don't get more psychiatrists into the VA system.

So give LARRY BUCSHON from Indiana, my Republican friend, a call. My office, give me a call. But better than that, call your Congressman and say: Let's get this bill expanded so we can get more psychiatrists.

The Congress will move if the American people say move.

Now, finally, I must say this. There is no one that embodies the final words of Jesus Christ before he was crucified. Those final words that he spoke to his disciples 24 hours before he was crucified were: "Love one another as I have loved you."

And there is no greater love than that one who will lay down his life for his friend. That, ladies and gentlemen, is our veteran.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCOTT for being here and for his passion for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) to talk about this important issue we have been working on together.

Mr. MURPHY has been serving in Congress since 2002. He is our only practicing psychologist serving in Congress, and he is the co-chair of the Mental Health Caucus. In addition, Congressman MURPHY is a commander in the Navy Reserve and provides services to veterans at the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center specializing in treating those individuals who are suffering from traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder. It is a privilege to serve with him in Congress and work on this important issue.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for her dedication to helping veterans.

It will be often cited that 20 veterans a day take their own lives. It is important that we take a deeper dive into why that is because, as a society, we want to know.

There will be upwards of 40-some thousand suicides this year in our Nation. Even one is too many. And I know that organizations that deal with suicide prevention want to see that drop considerably. But there is some understanding that is important for us to

know what we can do and what stands in the way.

I want to note that those who serve in the military are about 1 percent of the population. Those who have served in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam are dying off fast from natural causes. But a great many of those veterans who do take an act of suicide are above age 50. Many of them have never served in combat.

Characteristic groups, such as the Army National Guard and reservists are among those who do have some higher rates. It has been interpreted that perhaps one of the reasons for that is that they do not stay with their cohorts after combat. They go back home, come back on weekends, but don't have that same day-to-day support.

We also know the military, very much so after Vietnam, when you were done with your time, when you got your points, you were gone.

□ 1915

You could be in the middle of a battle, and you would be picked up by helicopter and taken home with encrusted blood still on your uniform from your friends, but you were sent back to the States—no chance to recover, no chance to develop from that, no chance to even get a checkup from the neck up, and, as a matter of fact, that was not even done. So for those who did serve in Vietnam and Korea and World War II, you just went back to life.

We have learned it is important to do more for people, and we do try and understand what is it, the characteristics among those who have taken their own lives, or tried to, that causes that to happen.

First of all, it is worth noting that about 70 percent of those who have taken their own lives who were veterans have not been involved with the VA hospital system. That is extremely important to know. They are not involved.

Now, that could be a number of reasons. It could be veterans who were not eligible for involvement at the VA. Many reservists and guards are not unless they served Active-Duty time, and even that is a limited timeframe. They also may have not been early identified when they came out of the military that would make them eligible for services. And, quite frankly, in many cases, it just is not near their home.

A study that was done with people at Fort Carson, Colorado, of 70-some folks who had attempted suicide, found that the number one reason that they gave, out of a list of 33 possibilities, was they wanted to end emotional distress. They simply wanted the pain to stop, and they ran out of ways to make it stop.

I reflect on the life of my father, who is now gone for other reasons, but one day when I was at home from college—and he himself was a World War II vet-

eran—I heard his soft voice calling from the bathroom, and to see him there with a lot of blood on him, because he had just attempted to cut his arms and kill himself. Luckily, he did not. We got him care. But I believe for him, he certainly would have been in this category. He just wanted the pain to stop.

I don't think it was PTSD or his old signs of war. I think it was, perhaps, other distress as he dealt with his own alcoholism, or did not deal with it very well at that time, and the financial distresses of raising a family, and we just didn't have money, but it was enough to affect me—lifetime—in terms of trying to understand and dedicate my life to helping those in psychological need.

I should mention, on September 11, I got my honorable discharge, so I am no longer in the Navy. I miss it every day, because I loved that time working with servicemembers who had traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress and a wide range of other problems, but here are a few things that I learned from them that are very important.

One is, if you want care in mental health, you just can't get it, not only because there may not be a VA near you, but even if there was, many persons who are dealing with panic and anxiety and depression don't want to leave the house; many with post-traumatic stress disorders do not want to go onto a bus or into traffic or into congested areas, because that can bring back some terrible memories for them. The very thing they need is to get treatment, but the very problems they have prevent them from getting treatment.

Now, we have passed legislation here that deals with choice to allow veterans to get that care closer to home. But can they get it? Well, tragically—not just sadly but tragically—in the area of mental health services, half the counties in America have no psychiatrist, they have no psychologist, they have no clinical social worker, they have no psychiatric nurse practitioner, and they have no licensed drug treatment counselor. In other words, it is not available.

If you just look at those, for example, with a substance abuse disorder, of the 22 million, about 75 to 80 percent of them also have a mental health problem and they are at higher risk for suicide. And certainly if we have a veteran who has substance abuse and depression, they are at higher risk.

But look at this group. For every 1,000 people with a substance abuse disorder—for every 1,000 people—900 do not seek treatment. Out of the 100 who do seek treatment, 37 have got nothing available to them. Of the 63 who have something available, only six get evidence-based care.

So it is no wonder when we talk to veterans, and they say, "I tried getting

help, but this person didn't understand. I couldn't get help. It was a problem that was ongoing," at some point they reach that point where they want to just end their emotional distress.

I remember visiting the house of a veteran. The mother had called me and said: "Can you help him? He won't go to the VA. He won't get help."

I made a house call. The VA doesn't do that, but I made a house call. And without revealing too much, I will just say that it was pretty clear he had a lot of medication around his house. His apartment was pretty unkempt, food lying around, bottles, dozens and dozens of bottles of medication unopened, each one from the VA, because probably each time he went to the VA, they said: "How are you doing?"

"I am not doing well."

"Here. We will just increase your dosage," or, "We will give you a different medication," but the system was not set up to say, "How are you doing? What else can we do to care for you?" It simply was not set up to go to his home and help him out when he missed his appointments, when he was no longer employed, when he had isolated himself from society, when, like so many people, covered the windows of their bedroom with camouflage or some other dark thing so the light doesn't get in, don't watch TV, just stay away from the world, this shrinking world that constricts you like a snake around the throat until they see no more reason to live.

I remember going to the VA hospital and mentioning, "You know, I know the Marines are famous for not leaving anyone in the field. What do you do about some of these other folks with mental health problems?"

They said, "We don't go out to their homes."

I said, "Why not?"

"We just don't do that."

"Why not?"

"We just don't."

I agonize over that as being a Navy healthcare provider to know this doesn't sound like the Marines. The Marines don't leave someone out there.

Are we so constricted and tied up by rules that we can't even go and reach out to them? But that is part of the problem, that we need easier access to local care, we need care that reaches out to veterans, and not just say, "Hey, listen, if you really want to get help, why don't you suck it up, pull up your bootstraps and go out and get help," because some of them are not able to do that yet.

Many of them feel, as a veteran, "I have faced tougher battles. I can't let people know I am weak or I am struggling."

Many of them have addiction disorders, and they don't want people to know that they are weak and they are struggling.

To those veterans, I say this is not a sign of failure. It is like if you are in

the battle and bullets are coming at you and grenades are coming at you and incoming fire is coming at you, the last thing you want to do is deny it is happening. You have to acknowledge it is happening. What do you do? You get on the radio and you call for help. That is what we have to make sure veterans understand, that that is what this is about, depression and panic and anxiety as well.

We need more providers. I have had legislation on a mental health bill to get more providers. We recently voted on some things in amendment to the Labor-H bill here to get a little bit more, but we need thousands of more providers, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, licensed drug treatment counselors. We don't have that.

If Congress really wants to help, we have to do more of that, but part of the problem is this, too: they oftentimes, in the field, have such massive student loans. And relative to other areas of medicine and healthcare, they get paid so little, they may choose not to go into these areas of mental health care. So for those who are the most vulnerable, we make it the most difficult for them to get care.

Add to that the idea of, who among those who are mental health providers actually have training and understanding of military healthcare, understanding military medicine, understanding military life?

I was commissioned 8 years ago, and I know that when I went on to officer school, and I went to training, you have got to learn a lot. The Marines say, "I learned to shoot a gun, and I can polish my shoes better than anybody," but there is more to it than that. It is understanding the words, the acronyms, the lifestyle, what a person goes through.

We could certainly do much better, if not just saying let's hire people at the VA, but have a program for civilian mental health professionals, one, to recruit more; two, to pay for more reimbursed student loans to get them in the workforce; but also, quite frankly, to give them more regular orientation of what it is like to be a member of the military. Let them observe boot camp. Let them understand this.

I will give you an example. Once a soldier who I was treating, he said he had given up getting care for a while. He said the third time he had to explain to his therapist what an MRAP was, he said, "Give it up." The MRAP is a military vehicle, commonly known vehicle.

Now, every branch of the military has their own acronyms, and I don't pretend to know them all, but if a person doesn't even know the basics, you lose that sort of connection with the patient, and they give up.

The other issue here is that we need to be able to have a system that monitors the medication closely. It is very

common that if someone is on medication, they are a polypharmacy event; that is, they are taking so many medications, and then they will take other medications that counteract the effects of those medications, and then they will take other medications to deal with the side effects of those medications.

It was not uncommon for us at Walter Reed to have a patient on 8 or 10 or 15 or more meds that they were on. We found that we reduced them down to one or two.

But with medication comes weight gains, comes increase for diabetes, comes other problems, comes stresses in the family, comes situations where they are estranged from their spouse, difficulties with children, episodes with anger. These aren't bad people, but they see their life deteriorating, they see questions with regard to what is happening through their employer, they wonder about their future, they may have taken poor medication, but sometimes they just give up.

There is a quote by author Steve Goodyear, who had quite an inspirational quote. I hope, Mr. Speaker, if there are veterans listening tonight, they take this to heed.

Mr. Goodyear said: My scars remind me that I did indeed survive my deepest wounds. That in itself is an accomplishment. And they bring to mind something else too: they remind me that the damage life has inflicted on me has, in many places, left me stronger and more resilient. What hurt me in the past has actually made me better equipped to face the present.

That is a message I want veterans to hear, that having moments of depression or anxiety or worry are as normal as feeling tired or hungry, but we know when you get in a downward spiral, it gets worse.

I don't want veterans to give up. I don't want veterans or members of the military feeling that they have so much emotional distress, this is the only way to end it.

I understand the feeling, but I also know that, as members of the community and members who are veterans, we wrap our arms of hope around those veterans to say there is help out there, and we as Congress Members have an obligation to make sure we are providing those services.

It pains me when I think that sometimes we can come up with funding for all sorts of programs, but for this 1 percent who say, "I am willing to take a bullet for you, I am willing to die to defend my country, its Constitution, and its flag," we as Congress ought to be able to say we are willing to put some money in to help you get more services.

Also some advice for those veterans who may be listening: It is extremely important to follow a few guidelines in your own life, too, besides not giving

up, but physical fitness that you were forced to do in the military and boot camp, and all those pushups and sit-ups and running and pullups we did, they had a reason; because when you stay physically fit, it affects your brain functioning and it improves it, and it is one of the things that is used to fight off depression and other problems.

Two, you have to have an attitude that is focused on positive things. You can make it. Many times, part of that attitude, an essential part, is a strong faith in God, a strong belief there, which gives you that attitude to say, "I can do it." Navy SEALs talk about the way you eat an elephant is one bite at a time; the way you temper steel is with fire; that pain is weakness leaving the body; that courage is something that is built through experience and focus. It is not something that just comes, but you build that attitude. So you have fitness, you have attitude.

Another part is sleep. Many studies I have seen—I think it was Dr. Germain at the University of Pittsburgh who did studies that said perhaps sleep is a greater factor with post-traumatic stress, anxiety, and depression than anything else, and a big part of this is just getting enough sleep.

Members of Congress, we deal with this a lot in terms of our own hectic lifestyle, and we know many constituents, because of their workload, their anxiety in the family, they don't get enough.

It is essential. It doesn't necessarily mean you are crazy, you have problems, but that is an important part.

Further, training, knowing what you can do, whether it is in the workplace or the military, we know it is essential.

Making sure one eats right. It sounds obvious. I don't want to make this in any way sound small, but making sure one is actually eating a healthy diet is an important part of fighting off suicide, fighting off depression.

Then making sure that people are paying attention to relax, to rehabilitate themselves, to do their own personal checkup from the neck up to make sure they are dealing with these things.

None of those things I just mentioned require help from a doctor. All of those things are essential to healing and getting better.

When one reaches the point where you say, "You know what, I need a little help here; I need to call in support on the radio; I need a quick response team; I need to pop some smoke; get some help in here," that is okay. I want veterans to know not only is that okay, that is what we are supposed to do.

□ 1930

You call in help. We don't need dead heroes on the battlefield. We certainly don't need them in the streets or the

homes. We need people who are saying: Understand, that even though it may be tough to get help, there is help out there. There is help out there. People want to facilitate and help you get better.

I don't want anybody to feel that this is the way to end emotional distress. It is a permanent solution to a temporary problem, and even if that problem seems to have been going on for years, I know people can and do get better. I have seen it time and time again. The soldier or veterans that thought: I can't go on; I have to give up. They can turn that life around and become a contributor.

One has a few choices. One can be a victim and say: You know what? I am under this giant boulder. I will never get better. The weight is too great. I am too weak. I cannot move on. There's no hope.

Or you can move on to another stage and say: I am going to be a survivor.

On the first part, you say: I am helpless because of what is happening. When you are a survivor, you say: You know what? I am going to move on despite what is happening. I will pray more. I will engage more. I will do more. But every day I will wake up and commit more to get through that day to do something that is important and meaningful. I don't need to set up a goal of 10 years from now, but let me get through that day. Let me find some things I can do and focus. It is extremely important.

But beyond that, beyond being a victim or a survivor, is a third stage, and that is being a thriver, someone who says: I am going to make sense out of what I have done, and it is going to make me a stronger person.

What I said here in the quote from Steve Goodier where he says, "What hurt me in the past has actually made me better equipped to face the present," if I am in a tough situation, if I am in a situation where I, myself, look at it and I have despair and I lack hope for my own future and I turn towards someone, give me someone who has been there before. Give me a veteran. Give me a soldier who understands boot camp and what it is like to be yelled at and lack sleep. Give me a veteran who has been on the battlefield. Give me someone who has been out to sea and understands what it is like to be months without seeing your family. Give me someone who has been there and says: I made it; so can you.

I want veterans to have that sort of hope. We have our obligations in Congress: get more providers, make sure the VA is responsible. But since most people aren't near a VA, we can do a lot to help them.

I hope that this Veterans Suicide Recognition Month is something that sometime in the future we can put behind us and make it a thing of the past. We can do that if veterans themselves

make those decisions to get help, and if we as the Congress make some decisions to get them that help, and society itself says: Stop having pity on them. Give them help out of affection and love and respect.

And, by the way, that respect also includes a lot of people who play professional sports, who have no idea what it is like to have someone shoot at you and try to kill you. Stand up. Have a backbone instead of a wishbone. A lot of veterans don't really want to hear that life is tough for you when you make more money in 15 minutes than they will make in a lifetime. Show some respect for those folks.

And then as we as a society recognize what they have given to the last full measure, we will be able to provide the kind of things they need and save some lives.

Too many times I have gone to a ceremony. You fold a flag 13 times and hand it to a grieving widow or widower. How much worse it is when they take their own life, because the stigma among the family is there was nothing else you could do, and all of us feel helpless when that happens. Let us make sure we are not part of that problem and, instead, we are part of the solution to celebrate and help our veterans so these things don't continue to happen.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congressman MURPHY, and thank you for partnering with me on this important effort this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from New York, THOMAS SUOZZI, who serves on the Armed Services Committee and has been a great addition to our caucus this year.

Thank you for joining us.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking Congresswoman SINEMA and Congressman MURPHY and all of my Democratic and Republican colleagues for trying to bring attention to this very important issue.

I also want to thank Secretary Shulkin, who has announced his Get to Zero initiative to try and address this problem of 20 veterans every day committing suicide in our country.

Just today, as on many days, I saw a veteran who had lost both of his legs. It is common here in Washington, D.C., but it is common throughout every city and every town throughout our country that we see more and more veterans who have injuries. After 16 years at war, there are more and more veterans in our country who have been disabled.

With 20 veterans committing suicide every day, we know, however, that there are many injuries that we cannot see, injuries that veterans carry around by themselves at home, alone, in the dark of night, with nothing but their pain.

As Congressman MURPHY pointed out, 70 percent of the veterans of the 20

per day that commit suicide in our Nation—70 percent, 14 of the 20—do not have access to veterans benefits at the current time and do not utilize those services.

In fact, in our Nation today, there are 21 million veterans, approximately, and of those 21 million veterans, only 7 million have access to veterans benefits.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill, H.R. 2736, to suggest that what we need to do in our Nation is provide mental health benefits to every single veteran in our country, regardless of whether they were Active Duty, whether they were in the National Guard or in the Reserves, whether they were honorably discharged or less than honorably discharged. It is estimated that, since 2009, there have been 22,000 veterans with mental illnesses that have received other than honorable discharges. Arguably, most of those discharges were because of the same mental illness that they now carry around with them today.

Think of a veteran who is in crisis, a veteran who is contemplating suicide, a veteran who, as Congressman MURPHY described, is at the end of their rope and feels that there is no help and the only way to escape their pain is to commit suicide. Think of that veteran who reaches out for help at the VA.

Could you imagine going through the bureaucracy to figure out whether or not you were even eligible for services if you weren't currently enrolled? You are seeking help, you are in the middle of a crisis, and you have got to fill out a form. You have got to determine whether or not you meet the criteria.

I am an attorney and a certified public accountant and a Member of the United States Congress. I read the requirements, and I couldn't figure them out. We need to make it much easier for anyone who has ever worn a uniform in any capacity whatsoever: in battles that we won, in battles that we lost, whether they were in combat or whether they worked on a truck, whether they were Active Duty, whether they were Reserve, whether they were in the National Guard. Every veteran should have access to mental health services during a crisis. We have to make it much simpler.

We heard a story tonight from Congressman JOHNSON, who talked about a veteran who was trying to get an appointment to get mental health services in the midst of a crisis, and the time was put off and put off and put off, and he finally got the appointment. And the Congressman was informed when he called the VA: Oh, we have good news; the appointment has been scheduled. The Congressman advised the VA that the veteran had already committed suicide.

So we have got a couple obligations, I believe. Number one is for those veterans who are currently utilizing VA

services. We have to, as has been suggested by some of my colleagues, make sure we have the resources in place so that those veterans receive the services that they need on a timely basis, especially when they are in crisis, to make it as easy as possible for them to navigate the bureaucracy and get the help that they need.

Additionally, we need to make sure that those veterans who are not currently enrolled for veterans services and veterans benefits are made eligible for mental health services, certainly in crisis conditions, so that when someone reaches out to them, they are embraced with the loving arms of their country, as manifest in the VA, and they are brought in and cared for and helped to navigate through that crisis in their life.

There will be talk about how much it is going to cost. There will be a challenge as to whether or not we can afford to take care of these men and women who have served our country and are now facing this crisis in their life.

But I would guarantee you that any American in this country would say that we have to expend any cost for every veteran because there is no higher obligation in this Nation than taking care of the men and women who have worn our uniform, no greater obligation in this country. We can never forget the vet.

I want to thank Congresswoman SINEMA for inviting me here tonight to talk about my bipartisan bill, H.R. 2736, and for helping to bring attention to this very serious crisis in our country.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congressman SUOZZI, for your commitment to taking care of veterans in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from California, Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY.

Congressman JULIA BROWNLEY has served on the Veterans Committee for 5 years now and is the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee for Veterans. She has been doing a yeoman's amount of work to help ensure that our veterans get the care they need when they return home.

Congresswoman, thank you for joining us again.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding to me and for organizing this Special Order hour and bringing attention to this very, very important topic.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today, both Republicans and Democrats, because addressing this epidemic of veteran suicide is the highest priority for Members of both parties.

Congressman SUOZZI talked about the fact that Dr. Shulkin, the VA Secretary, has made this his top clinical priority; and by shining a clear light

on this topic, I hope we can finally reduce the stigma around mental health issues and be clear about the significant work that still needs to be done to address this devastating epidemic.

We need to do more because 20 veterans commit suicide each day, veterans like Sara Leatherman and Linda Raney and Katie Lynn Cesena. As Congressman Murphy already pointed out, it is also estimated that only 6 of those 20 veterans were receiving VA services.

The VA provides some of the most comprehensive mental healthcare and resources in the Nation, and we need to encourage more veterans to seek care that is available, and we must be ready for them.

We do need more providers, and I support Congressman MURPHY and Congressman SCOTT and others who are advocating for more providers within the VA.

But, unfortunately, whether it is a lack of providers, long wait times, or not enough resources devoted to outreach, we face a serious issue with getting veterans set up with the care that they need. The VA took an important step forward earlier this year by expanding access to its mental healthcare for veterans with other than honorable discharges. That was the right thing to do and the right step, but much more must be done.

One important component of reducing veteran suicide is to better understand which programs have been most successful. The Clay Hunt Act and my bill, the Female Veteran Suicide Prevention Act, required an independent analysis of the VA's suicide prevention and mental health programs to find out what works.

It is critical to break this data up based on gender because, tragically, recent VA data indicates that women veterans are 2½ times more likely to take their own lives than civilian women. Actually, that is a better statistic than last year, because last year it was 6 times more than civilian women. But the reason why that has been reduced, tragically, is because the number of suicides amongst civilian women has increased.

As the population of female veterans continues to grow, the VA needs to recognize their unique experiences and provide the quality healthcare that will address this suicide epidemic. It is clear that women on the battlefield experience the same kind of trauma that men experience on the battlefield, and that may be a very similar experience, but we know that women's experience in the military serving our country can be very, very different, and we need to understand how best to treat both women and men.

□ 1945

In closing, please let me remind veterans and those who love them that the VA operates a confidential call line

that is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Please call. If veterans are listening tonight, please call and have the courage to, if you need that support, make that call your first step. And any veteran and any family member can call.

That phone number is 1-800-273-8255, and then you press number 1. You can also send a text message at 838255. Please, please, if you are in need, please reach out and make this call.

Please know that we are here for you. We are fighting for you. Give us a chance to help you.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman BROWNLEY for her dedication not just to this event every year, but to taking care of veterans at home and here in Washington.

I thank all of the colleagues from both parties who joined us this evening. Our thoughts are with all the families who have lost a loved one to suicide. But our efforts to end veterans' suicide do not end today or even this month. We are committed to continuing this fight to ensure that our veterans always know that they have a place to turn.

We can do more. We need a VA that provides real and meaningful help to veterans in need; a VA that puts veterans first and works aggressively with community providers to improve the quality and accessibility of care. We need a VA that is transparent and open to restore the trust and credibility it has lost. The VA can and must do better. No one deserves our gratitude and respect more than those who put their lives on the line for our freedom. And when the VA fails, our heroes suffer.

We, who enjoy freedom every day, thanks to the sacrifices of our military servicemen and -women, must all step up to end the epidemic of veteran suicide.

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

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (during the Special Order of Ms. SINEMA). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without

amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3819. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

REQUISITES FOR IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to make one point. That one point is that a President need not be convicted of a criminal offense to be impeached; in fact, need not be charged with a criminal offense; need not be charged with a statutory offense; need not be charged with a codified offense to be impeached.

But before I make this point, Mr. Speaker, I have to acknowledge that I am always in awe of this well, and I don't take for granted this great opportunity that has been accorded me to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I believe that those of us who have been so blessed should acknowledge our blessings. This is a blessing.

Mr. Speaker, there are many people who don't have this opportunity, so I am going to take one liberty before going into my message. I just want people to know what I see as I stand here in the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

As I look forward, Mr. Speaker, I would have those who have not had the opportunity to stand here to know that there is above the doors at the second level a depiction of Moses the Lawgiver.

I would have people know, Mr. Speaker, that behind me, of course, is the flag of the United States of America.

And I would have persons know, Mr. Speaker, that we have these two podiums, and that, typically, Democrats will occupy this side and Republicans the other. We can go to either side. There is no requirement that I stand where I am standing. I can stand at many other places in this room.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want people to know that this is a special place, and I am honored to have the opportunity to stand here tonight and to speak to the issue of a President not having the necessity of committing a crime to be impeached. There is no requirement that a crime be committed. There is no requirement that a statutory offense be violated.

Let's take, for a moment, a look through the vista of time. Let us go back to the Constitutional Convention, and let us hear now the words of George Mason. George Mason reminded his colleagues that no one should be above justice. His words were: "Shall any man be above justice?"

These words were put before his colleagues because, at the time, they were considering what they could do to deal with the possibility of a runaway Presidency. What could they do? How could they stop it? What would be the methodology by which a President could be extricated from his position?

And they had good reason to give consideration to this, Mr. Speaker. They had good reason because the President was probably the most powerful person in the country. The President would be the most powerful person in the country. The President is the Commander in Chief of the military. The President has the awesome power to pardon anyone, saving himself.

So the question becomes: How do you remove a President from office?

This is what they had to grapple with. And, of course, they considered a judicial process. They considered persons who might be a part of a jury. They considered these things.

The Federalist Papers, if you would care to read, will give you a rendition of what their thoughts were. Start with Federalist Paper No. 65.

But they considered these things, and they concluded that the process should not be judicial. They concluded that if a President is to be removed from office, it should be by persons who are in the political arena. They concluded that this should be something that would be, in fact, political, not judicial. They concluded that a President need not commit a crime to be removed from office.

I am emphasizing this, my dear friends, because there is a lot of confusion about this question. And if you would care to read something that could summarize what I am saying, you might look at an article that was written by a person with the Cato Institute, Gene Healy, August 7, 2017, styled "The Overcriminalization of Impeachment." I would commend it to you. Please read it if you want to read a good summary of what impeachment is all about.

So they had to grapple with this question, and they concluded that it would be a political one, not a judicial question. And in so doing, in concluding that it would be a political one, they incorporated into the Constitution Article II, section 4—Article II, section 4 of the Constitution—that addresses the question of impeachment.

And in so doing, at some point after the codification and ratification of the Constitution, there was a person to be impeached. The first person was a Federal judge, Judge John Pickering. Judge Pickering was not accused of committing a crime. There was not an allegation that he committed a crime.

If you read the Articles of Impeachment, you will find that Judge Pickering, once he was convicted, was convicted, generally speaking, for having

loose morals and intemperate habits, not a crime. But the questions did deal with morality.

Shall any man be above justice?

Not above the law. The law codified. Justice carries with it a certain amount of morality.

Shall any man—and today I would say "any person"—be above justice? Shall any person be above justice?

The Framers of the Constitution concluded that Article II, section 4 would address it, and they, themselves—a good many of them—were there when the first person was impeached in 1804, Judge John Pickering.

So for those of you who are believers in the original intent, the best way to ascertain the original intent of the Framers would be to look at what the Framers did when they had the opportunity.

What did Madison do?

Madison, the father of the Constitution, it is said, and other Framers who were actually there when Article II, section 4 was put in place, found that Judge Pickering, who committed no crime or no allegation of a crime being committed, with reference to his impeachment, should be impeached because of moral reasons and an intemperate habit or habits.

Mr. Speaker, I mention these things because it is important for us to understand that we have made a mistake. We have made a mistake in that we have outsourced—this is from Gene Healy, by the way—the responsibility of investigating the acts of a President to the executive branch itself.

Think for just a moment, dear friends. The Justice Department is an arm of the executive branch. We in Congress have outsourced the investigation to the executive branch by and through the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, that can give the appearance of impropriety. We live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right; they must also look right. It could look to some like that outsourcing has created a circumstance by which the chief executive, the President, could influence the Attorney General. That is the way it could look.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the intent is that we have in the Constitution, Article II, section 4. That is not the intent. The intent was for the Judiciary Committee in the Congress of the United States of America to investigate. That is where the power to investigate lies, because it is for impeachment.

By outsourcing it to the executive branch, such that the Justice Department might perform dysfunction, we give the appearance that impeachment requires the commission of a crime, because that is what the Justice Department is looking for, criminality, not morality. The Justice Department wants to know what crime was committed, under what circumstances.

And too many people believe that if the Justice Department does not find that a crime was committed, then there is no impeachable offense. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker.

Regardless as to what a Justice Department concludes, regardless as to whether a good lawyer would bring charges by way of something from what the Justice Department concludes, the Congress of the United States of America still has the power, the prowess, the potency, if you will, to impeach, notwithstanding any finding of a Justice Department, notwithstanding any conclusions of the Justice Department, because it is not the responsibility of the Justice Department to investigate and then pass it on to the Congress with some recommendation. That is not their responsibility. That is the Judiciary Committee and the Congress of the United States of America.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have given this false impression that somehow there must be an offense committed. But, Mr. Speaker, I assure you that it is not the case, and the evidence is there for those who care to read the article that I have called to your attention. It is a short read.

Or if you care to read the Federalist Papers, Federalist Paper No. 65, you can read some of the conclusions that Madison and others have presented.

□ 2000

This is something that is important to this country. So I am standing here in the well of the House tonight to make one point, a place that I am in great awe of, a place that I consider sacred. I am standing here in the well of the House tonight to make the point that a President need not commit a crime, a statutory offense, to be impeached. Impeachment belongs in one place, and one place only, and that is right here where I stand now, in the House of Representatives.

If the House of Representatives, upon receiving articles of impeachment, should vote to impeach, that means that a President would be indicted. It does not mean that the President—the 218 votes, assuming all persons in the House are present. It doesn't mean that the President is going to be removed from office.

Impeachment does not mean removal from office. Impeachment means that the President must now face a trial in the Senate, to be presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. That is what impeachment does. It moves it along.

And, by the way, there is no requirement that you assure anyone that you can get the votes necessary to impeach to bring an impeachment before the House. A privileged resolution to impeach does not necessitate your being

able to prove before you present it that you are going to prevail with it. That is not the case.

If you can think of it in terms of the real world, while this is real—we say that term loosely, I assure you. If you think in terms of the world beyond these walls where a person might be indicted, in this country, every day, people are indicted who are not convicted. So impeachment is not tantamount to conviction. Impeachment merely means that there is reason now for the Senate to take up this cause.

The Senate, upon taking up the cause, can find the President not guilty or guilty. If the President is found guilty, the President is removed from office. There is no other punishment. The President is removed from office. After the President is removed from office, if the Justice Department or some other agency, some other arm of the government concludes that the President has committed a criminal offense, then a President would be prosecuted.

Now, there is some debate amongst some constitutional scholars as to whether or not a President can be prosecuted while the President still holds office. I think most of them would agree that it would happen after the President leaves office, but that is a debate that I don't care to enter.

My point is the President would be removed from office. Now, that is important to consider because removal from office is not punishment. Criminal acts have punishment upon conviction. The President is not punished. The President is removed from office. That is not considered punishment. The President does not face punishment upon being convicted of impeachment. The President is removed from office.

Now, that, in and of itself, is not something that I believe we should take lightly. I think it is serious, but it is not tantamount to punishment.

For those of you who may just be joining us for this statement that I am making tonight, I have taken this position tonight in the well of the Congress of the United States of America for one reason: to make the point that a President need not be charged with a criminal offense to face impeachment in the Congress of the United States of America. The Constitution doesn't require it. The Framers did not make that an issue when they impeached the first person, Judge Pickering, and it is not an issue to the extent that most of the people who have been impeached have not been charged with a criminal offense—not, N-O-T, charged with a criminal offense.

I close with this. The Framers, very much concerned about a runaway President, runaway Presidency, very much concerned about the awesome amount of power that they were according one person: the power to be commander of all of the Armed Forces;

the power to send persons into battle; the power to send people, literally, in harm's way such that many might not return; the power to impeach, nearly with impunity—not with absolute impunity, but nearly with impunity. There are some opportunities for the President to provide a person not with impeachment, but with exoneration for a crime, and that President could be impeached for the way that exoneration took place, depending on the relationship that the person had with the President.

But the point is impeachment is there because it is an awesome power that we have given the President; and because we have given the President this awesome power, it is important that we have a check on the President that does not require the commission of a crime.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the generosity of this Special Order. I thank the leadership as much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 870. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to implement Medicare payment policies designed to improve management of chronic disease, streamline care coordination, and improve quality outcomes without adding to the deficit; to the Committee on Ways and Means; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1028. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 810. An act to facilitate construction of a bridge on certain property in Christian County, Missouri, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 26, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3110. To amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the term of the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

The proceedings held before the House convened for legislative business are as follows:

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2017 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Martin Frost, vice president of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress, at 8 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Lord God of history, we thank You for this day when former Members return to Congress to continue in a less official manner their service to our Nation and to this noble institution.

May their presence here bring a moment of pause where current Members consider the profiles they now form for future generations of Americans.

May all former Members be rewarded for their contributions to this constitutional Republic and continue to work and pray that the goodness and justice of this beloved country be proclaimed to the nations.

Bless all former Members who have died since last year's meeting, 33 in all. May their families and their constituents be comforted during a time of mourning and forever know our gratitude for the sacrifices made in service to the House.

Finally, bless those here gathered that they might bring joy and hope to the present age and supportive companionship to one another. Together, we call upon Your Holy Name now and forever.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Martin Frost led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

Mr. FROST. The Chair now recognizes the president of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress, the Honorable Cliff Stearns from Florida, to address the Members.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker and Father, thank you for those very welcome comments. I think all of us, when we come on the House floor, we feel keenly the fact of this beloved country and how much we respect our positions as former Members of Congress.

Thank you, Martin. It is always a distinct privilege to be back in this revered Chamber and to see so many of my good friends and former colleagues here. On behalf of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress, I appreciate the Speaker's invitation to return to this wonderful place and to present to the Congress Former Members of Congress' 47th annual report.

I will be joined by some of our colleagues in reporting on the activities, finances, and projects of our organization since our last report a little over a year ago. But first I would like to ask the Clerk to call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following former Members answered "present":

Mr. Alexander of Arkansas
Mr. Baird of Washington
Ms. Christensen of the Virgin Islands
Mr. Coyne of Pennsylvania
Mr. DioGuardi of New York
Mr. Edwards of Texas
Mr. Frost of Texas
Mr. Gerlach of Pennsylvania
Mr. Glickman of Kansas
Mr. Hertel of Michigan
Mr. Hochbrueckner of New York
Mr. Horsford of Nevada
Mr. Konnyu of California
Mr. Lancaster of North Carolina
Mr. Lungren of California
Mr. Maffei of New York
Ms. Morella of Maryland
Mr. Rahall of West Virginia
Mr. Roth of Wisconsin
Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut
Mr. Sarpalius of Texas
Mr. Skaggs of Colorado
Mr. Slattery of Kansas
Mr. Stearns of Florida
Mr. Tanner of Tennessee
Mr. Turner of Texas
Mr. Walsh of New York
Mr. Weller of Illinois
Mr. Zeliff of New Hampshire

Mr. FROST. The Chair announces that 29 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Frost, thank you very much, and I would also indicate the former members of the European Union are all accounted for and present here, and we welcome all of them here especially.

I want to thank all of you for joining us today. As I prepare for today's report, I want to give you a little quote from Aristotle that goes back 2,500 years. He was asked: What would be the best form of life one could live? He replied that "the best form of life, the Eudaimonia outcome, given all that, would be the life of the good lawgiver."

He didn't mention the richest person, nor the most spiritual man, but the legislator. For all of us, service in this remarkable building was the pinnacle of our professional lives, and I am very proud that through the Former Members of Congress we can continue, in a very small measure, the public service that brought us here to Congress in the first place.

My colleagues, our Association was chartered by Congress, and one requirement of that congressional charter is for us to report once a year to Congress about our activities.

Incidentally, in 2016, there were approximately 1.8 million not-for-profit organizations in the United States. Of that number, right around 100 are congressionally chartered, and those include such outstanding organizations as the USO and the Boy and Girl Scouts of America. Former Members of Congress, therefore, is in very exclusive and prestigious company, and we

take the mandate that comes with being congressionally chartered very seriously.

Our Association was founded in 1970 and chartered by Congress in 1983. It is a bipartisan, nonprofit, voluntary alliance of former United States Senators and Members of Congress standing for America's constitutional system, which vests authority in the people through their elected offices.

We work together to strengthen Congress in the conduct of its constitutional responsibility through promoting a collaborative approach to policymaking. We seek to deepen the understanding of our democratic system, domestically and internationally, and to encourage the citizenry through civic education about Congress and the importance of public service.

We are successful because Democrats and Republicans work together in a partnership for all of our programs and our many projects, including participation with current Members of Congress.

We are so proud to have been chartered by Congress, and we are equally proud that absolutely no taxpayer dollar is earmarked or expended to make all of our programs possible. Everything we do, and you will hear about many of our activities in a short while, is financed via grants and sponsors, our membership dues, and our annual fundraising gala. Our finances are sound, our projects are fully funded, and our most recent annual audit by an outside accountant confirmed that we are running the Former Members of Congress in a very fiscally sound, responsible, and transparent manner.

We are successful because former Senators and Representatives come together, across party lines, for the good of our organization. They all believe in our mission, and they continue to have the public servant's spirit at heart.

Former Members of Congress, in 2016, donated over 6,500 hours of energy, wisdom, mentoring, and expertise. All of these activities were donated pro bono. No former Member received any kind of honorarium to go on a Congress to Campus visit or participate in any Former Members of Congress' programs. Your only remuneration is the knowledge that you are giving back, that serving in Congress was a unique privilege, and that it comes with a mandate to teach the next generation.

Before I report on specific activities, as your Association's president, I want to thank all the Members who have contributed their time and expertise to make our organization such a success. So on behalf of the Former Members of Congress, thank you wholeheartedly for your participation.

Many of you have joined us for several years on this occasion. There will be numerous programs and projects which, by now, you have become quite familiar with. This is a sign of the Former Members of Congress' stability

and purpose. We are extremely proud of our 50-year history of creating lasting and impactful programs that teach about Congress and representative government, and our ability to take long-standing projects and expand them and improve upon them.

In addition to hearing about programs we have conducted for many years, you will hear from us about a new vision we have for this organization. For over a year now, our Association has engaged in a very detailed, in-depth strategic planning process which has set us off for a very exciting path.

This process was led by a strategic planning professional who has worked in this field for decades, has written extensively on management and organizational success, and has served clients, including many Fortune 100 companies. His name is Mark Sobol, and he made the service of his company, Longwave Partners, available to us pro bono, because he so strongly believes in our former Members organization, that it can play an integral and impactful role in reconnecting citizens with their government, and also showcasing that public servants, no matter what the party label is, are eager to work together for the good of this country.

Our work with Mark and Longwave included our board of directors, countless former Members of Congress, our excellent staff, and numerous other stakeholders. It resulted in a vision for Former Members of Congress that outlines the next 3 to 5 years and has, as its core, four strategic principles: We will provide forums for dialogue that will strengthen bipartisan relationships here on Capitol Hill; we will become recognized nationwide as an unparalleled resource for the United States Congress; we will be a champion for public service and an advocate on behalf of Congress; and we will create internal mechanisms for maximum impact.

Sincerely, I want to thank Mark for his invaluable leadership on this transitional, transformative undertaking, and I also want to thank my colleagues for being so engaged in this exciting progress.

I include the Former Members of Congress' strategic plan for the RECORD.

THE UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(Cliff Stearns, President; Martin Frost, Vice President; Tim Petri, Secretary; Karen Thurman, Treasurer; Barbara Kennelly, Past President)

INTRODUCTION

We are engaged in a strategic planning process to deepen the impact and shape of the future of the US Association of Former Members of Congress—FMC. We continue to believe that the current political climate and dysfunction is preventing Congress from functioning at its highest possible level. This condition has compelled FMC, a Congressionally chartered 501(c)(3) non-profit, to re-evaluate its mission and identify those op-

portunities that will deepen the positive contribution we are making toward a more civil and productive political discourse in our nation.

With the input of a bipartisan group of more than twenty former Members over the summer, as well as staff and "friends of FMC", we convened meetings in the fall of 2016 and early January 2017 to create a mission and strategic themes for FMC that would serve us and our country well into the future. Since that time, we have assembled staff to build the comprehensive strategic plan we will deploy this year and beyond.

Ahead, are the results-to-date of our collective efforts.

MISSION STATEMENT

FMC is a bipartisan, nonprofit, voluntary alliance of former United States Senators and Representatives, standing for America's Constitutional system, which vests authority in the people through their elected representatives.

FMC: Working to strengthen the Congress in the conduct of its Constitutional responsibility through promoting a collaborative approach to policy making.

FMC: Seeking to deepen the understanding of our democratic system, domestically and internationally, and to encourage the citizenry through civic education about Congress and public service.

THE 9 STRATEGIC THEMES DEVELOPED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SENIOR STAFF AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

- 1) Embrace the whole "Congressional Family"
- 2) Collaborative Partnerships
- 3) Community Outreach and Programming
- 4) Showcase Good Governance
- 5) Build our Brand
- 6) Elevate and Enhance Media Presence
- 7) Working Together for Congressional Success
- 8) Celebrate Bipartisanship
- 9) Build Bipartisan Relationships

THE 4 CORE STRATEGIES DEVELOPED BY STAFF TO TRANSLATE FMC'S MISSION INTO ACTION

- 1) Provide forums for dialogue that build and strengthen relationships in support of a healthy representative democracy.
- 2) Elevate and streamline our brand so that our accumulated wisdom and convening power is recognized as a reputable and unparalleled resource on the U.S. Congress.
- 3) Be a champion for public service that is based on respect and collaboration.
- 4) Develop FMC for maximum impact and efficiency.

CORE STRATEGY 1: PROVIDE FORUMS FOR DIALOGUE THAT BUILD AND STRENGTHEN RELATIONSHIPS IN SUPPORT OF A HEALTHY REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

Purpose: Strengthen and expand existing programs that build across-the-aisle relationships for current Members of Congress as well as Congressional staff; showcase good governance that is based upon bipartisanship and civility; reconnect citizens with their representative democracy by bringing Congress back into the community.

Specific Actions:

A. Programming. Redefine programming portfolios to fall into easily recognizable categories, for example group all exchange programs, group all Capitol Hill programs, group all non-DC programs rather than current labels.

- 1) Build partnerships with like-minded organizations that offer programs which align with FMC's mission.
- 2) Identify vital themes and streamline programming into consistent and recogniz-

able groups and develop cohesive schedule of events

3) Streamline staff responsibilities and portfolios to group programs in a more coherent way.

4) Expand Congress to Campus model to other constituencies by marketing events better, incorporating social media and modern technology such as an updated website, and using modern technology to keep constituencies involved.

5) Make more concerted effort to have Statesmanship Awards Dinner celebrate true bipartisanship and build coherent year-round programming around event theme.

6) Increase public service element of annual and regional meetings by incorporating FMC programming and telling FMC's story to our own membership in a more compelling and cohesive way, which will also aid in recruiting FMCs to be more active.

7) Expand programming impact and ability to keep constituents involved following a program by building a cohesive schedule of events so that participants from one event can continue their interaction with former Members via a follow up event, for example a Congress to Campus visit is followed up by a webinar.

8) Find ways to incorporate technology into every aspect of FMC events, from marketing to registration, from tweets during event to creating platforms for follow up.

B. Regional Outreach. Develop a comprehensive plan for regional outreach to reach new constituencies.

1) Increase regional outreach based on FMC's themes, for example bipartisanship or civics, and involve local media.

2) Incorporate as many FMC constituencies as possible into a regional program, for example by combining a Congress to Campus visit with a Congressional staff delegation, all involving local former Members.

C. Social Fabric. Broaden and enhance social activities to create relationships

1) Identify and create new forums by building collaborations and partnerships.

2) Enhance FMC presence by creating unique and inclusive events on Capitol Hill and at non-Congressional venues.

3) Bring together the different members of the "Congressional Family": former Members, current Members, Congressional staff, FMC partners, etc.

CORE STRATEGY 2: ELEVATE AND STREAMLINE OUR BRAND SO THAT OUR ACCUMULATED WISDOM AND CONVENING POWER IS RECOGNIZED AS A REPUTABLE AND UNPARALLELED RESOURCE ON THE U.S. CONGRESS

Purpose: Vastly expand our reach and our impact; be an advocate on behalf of the Congress and on behalf of the value of public service; unify our leadership, membership and staff behind FMC's core message.

Specific Actions:

A. Brand Identity. Unify and elevate FMC brand and marketing materials, both internal and external.

1) Decide whether "FMC" accurately describes the work of FMC.

2) Create consistent, unified visual brand for all FMC artwork, logos, letterhead, etc.

3) Create unified message and train everyone, including board and staff, to communicate the same points about FMC.

4) Develop cohesive schedule of events with same themes across programming.

B. Website. Have a more modern, dynamic and interactive site that better tells our story and is a more effective tool for staff.

1) Redesign current site.

2) Drive social media traffic to website and vice versa.

3) Make better use of partners and like-minded entities to expand outreach via social media and advertise FMC capabilities and programming.

C. Media. Build relationships with the media.

1) When appropriate, invite media to FMC events.

2) Train and deploy FMC board and senior staff to be issue experts and a resource for national, regional, and local media, while also telling FMC's compelling story.

CORE STRATEGY 3: BE A CHAMPION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE THAT IS BASED ON RESPECT AND COLLABORATION

Purpose: Celebrate bipartisanship that is the unifying driving force behind FMC's success; provide opportunities for an expanded number of former Senators and Representatives to continue their service to country via FMC programs; demonstrate the power of civility.

Specific Actions:

A. Involvement. Create a call-to-action on a national and regional basis to expand the present number of actively involved former Members, and create a pool of engaged Members in all regions of the country.

1) Focus on civic education to create a call-to-action that is regional and happens at the state level; raise Members' engagement in FMC by giving them a real issue with real action items and real deliverables that can be applied across the country.

2) Organize regional meetings to gather former Members who are no longer in DC, engage them in FMC as an organization, educate them on FMC projects, issue call-to-action on civic education, and use these relationships to build a more actively involved membership in all regions of the country.

3) Give broader group of engaged stakeholders an opportunity to benefit the organization by expanding notion of "Congressional Family" to also include current Members, current senior staff, former senior staff, etc. via partnerships and collaborative efforts across the country.

B. Recruitment. Expand the number of former Members of Congress, both in the Washington, DC area and in all other parts of the country, who actively participate in the call-to-action through FMC programming and are willing to donate their time, expertise, leadership and funding to FMC.

1) Increase the degree of former Senator participation and active engagement.

2) Make recruitment a core element of all regional meetings as well as the DC-based annual meeting, utilizing these gatherings to focus much more on FMC's programming and the need for membership support.

3) Showcase success by highlighting the impact specific former Members have made by participating actively in FMC programming.

4) Create regional hubs across the country where fully engaged FMC members can take a leadership role to recruit former colleagues in the area.

CORE STRATEGY 4: DEVELOP FMC FOR MAXIMUM IMPACT AND EFFICIENCY

Purpose: Streamline all of FMC's resources—staff, funding, leadership—for greater impact; modernize programs and processes to capitalize on new technology, thus expanding our impact, but expending fewer of FMC's limited resources.

Specific Actions:

A. Short-term resources. Refine our notion of where we spend our time and money in the short-term:

1) Develop a strategy specific to Congress to Campus visits that envisions an increased

number of visits, a Steering Committee composed of FMC board members, and additional funding via a corporate or foundation sponsor.

2) Decline participating in projects by outside organizations if project does not meet the following test: Does the project further FMC's mission? If no, decline. If yes, will we be compensated for FMC staff time and any other costs?

a. If yes, proceed only if staff time is available.

b. If no, is the project's purpose or potential for future FMC impact worth expending our own resources? If no, decline.

3) Communicate to outside groups that there is limited opportunity for short notice and ad hoc programming (it will emerge clearly after a 12 to 18-month calendar of events is created which time windows lend themselves for additional programming, and which do not).

4) Streamline program implementation procedures and create templates to eliminate redundancies across the organization.

B. Long-term resources. Refine our notion of where we spend our time and money in the long-term:

1) Examine benefit of hosting charitable golf tournament.

2) Examine benefit of hosting Life After Congress Seminar.

3) Eliminate current model of Congress Bundestag Seminar.

C. Organize. Create more effective and cohesive procedures:

1) Group programming into themes.

2) Streamline staff portfolios.

3) Elevate impact of board of directors.

4) Expand notion of "Congressional Family" and outside stakeholders.

5) Develop long-range calendar to implement cohesive message and common themes.

D. Review and Evaluate. Install an annual review process to evaluate implementation of this plan and whether the plan's objectives continue to be core strategies for FMC.

PLAN COMMENTARY

With current staffing and budget levels, we can:

A. Develop an across-the-organization unified visual brand to incorporate logo/look/marketing materials.

B. Via SKDKnickerbocker contract:

1) Develop consistent branding message.

2) Train board members and staff to communicate consistent message and deploy trained spokespersons to interact with local and national media outlets.

3) Develop social media strategy.

With additional funding, we can:

A. Redesign website.

B. Hire senior staff member as Director of Development to free other staff up for program creation and implementation instead of fundraising.

C. Develop recruitment strategy to incorporate regional outreach, DC-based former Member outreach, and marketing materials.

D. Develop new programs that are mission-specific, incorporate multiple themes we aim to address during a given year, can serve as a recruitment tool to bring additional former Members into the fold, and take advantage of the resources like-minded organizations offer via partnerships and collaboration; new projects could include:

1) Case studies of legislation that showcase across-the-aisle collaboration and resulted in high positive impact for the nation.

2) A national theme—civic education—that can be implemented regionally, thus creating a call-to-action and a common project for former Members and other stakeholders across the nation.

3) Programming focused on advocating on behalf of Congress and current Members, for example highlighting the need for Congressional Reform or shining a spotlight on the tremendous fundraising demands put on current Members.

4) Social events and travel for current Members and senior Congressional staff to build bipartisan relationships.

E. Hire junior staff member to assist with additional programming as well as support senior staff that service the needs of partners and collaborative projects.

F. Organize regional activities to recruit FMCs and to broaden the organization's national footprint/impact.

G. Offer additional programming in DC to build across-the-aisle relationships for current Members and senior Congressional staff.

H. Purchase hardware and software to make much better use of technology, for example to offer webinars, webcasts and podcasts; this could be an option for academic institutions (colleges, community colleges, high schools) to participate in a condensed Congress to Campus experience without the cost of travel or an administrative fee.

CROSSCUTTING THEMES FOR STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Communicate cohesive message.

A. Develop across-the-organization look.

B. Train staff and board to communicate unified message.

Create a stronger media presence by redesigning website and social media strategy.

A. Take advantage of technology to tell more compelling and interactive story.

B. Use technology to engage membership and program participants before, during and after an FMC event.

C. Make use of the SKDKnickerbocker opportunity.

Develop cohesion across the organization.

A. Sync programs into cohesive themes.

B. Sync long-range calendar of events.

C. Redefine staff portfolios.

D. Redefine deliverables and expectations of board of directors.

Build partnerships and opportunities for collaboration.

A. Expand successful programs to new venues.

B. Expand internal definition of "Congressional Family" and FMC stakeholders.

C. Build FMC footprint that goes beyond DC.

D. Serve partners by offering FMC as a resource, and take advantage of partners to utilize their projects to further FMC's mission.

Elevate FMC from a DC organization to a national organization.

A. Recruit former Members from all parts of the country to support the organization's mission and diverse range of programs.

B. Bring broad range of FMC programming together for a regional project.

C. Empower regional stakeholders—former Members, local media, local Congressional staff, etc.—to take advantage of FMC as a resource.

Mr. STEARNS. Already, this work has had a tremendously positive impact on us. I am extremely pleased to announce that, since our last meeting, as a direct result of our strategic plan, we have secured three new grants: the Democracy Fund; the Hewlett-Packard Foundation's Madison Initiative; and just last week, the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission. These outstanding

sponsors join our long-term partners with whom we have worked for many years, including the Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, and The German Marshall Fund of the United States.

In addition to this fundraising success, or more accurately because of it, we have added four additional staff members to the Former Members of Congress team, many of whom you will meet throughout the day.

We have also launched a new program aimed at connecting, on a bipartisan basis, current district directors from throughout the country with each other to work together on specific issues and benefit from hearing each other's best practices.

As you know quite well, district directors are at the very forefront of our representative democracy and tend to be the first interaction between a constituent and his or her Member. The district director functions as a mediator, bridging the gap between the national policy and the district's interest. But the very nature of being in the district means that the congressional professionals do not have the same opportunity their colleagues in D.C. have: to get to know their counterparts in other offices, to work collaboratively on issues of common concern, and to build a network of contacts among their peers.

Thanks to expanding on existing grants and winning new foundation support, we have conducted a number of district director specific staff delegation trips and now have brought together, under one umbrella, dozens of district directors from all parts of the country and, of course, on both sides of the political aisle. District director study tours provide an exciting opportunity to build bipartisan relationships, share best practices, and, with the international travel, build transatlantic relationships.

In March, a bipartisan group of 10 district directors from around the country traveled to Stuttgart, Germany, to study security issues, dual vocational education and apprenticeships, trade, and foreign investments.

In April, a bipartisan group of six district directors traveled to Houston to learn about the energy industry and workforce development.

In June, a bipartisan group of six district directors went to Boston and focused on the tech industry and education.

This October, another bipartisan group of six district directors will be going to Iceland to focus on alternative energy, the environment, and natural resources.

After all these trips, we can confirm that district directors greatly appreciated and found immense value in the opportunity to not only learn about the organized topic but to share the ex-

perience with other district directors, particularly from the other side of the aisle.

One statement heard again and again, "I have that same issue, what did you do about it?" These district directors through FMC have a chance to really bond, regardless of what party, where in the country they are from or what the demographics of their constituency is.

For 2018, we already have confirmed another district director trip to Germany and to Japan. We also plan for other activities to engage district directors, including possibly two more domestic trips and invitations to all Former Members of Congress regional meetings.

Regional meetings are another outgrowth of our strategic plan. One clear refrain of the strategic planning sessions that we had that resonated loud and clear was that we need to get outside of Washington more. If we are going to be supportive of Congress, we need to make sure we are not a voice just heard in D.C.

Former Members live outside of Washington. Current Members are spending much more time in their districts. It is, therefore, critical that we participate more outside of D.C. and with the congressional staff that is outside.

Since our last report to Congress, we already have hosted three regional meetings, with a fourth one planned for later this year. These meetings are a day long and not only provide an opportunity for former Members to come together, but we also provide them an opportunity to share their knowledge and expertise with the younger generation by building into our program outreach to a college campus, or a high school, for example.

We were in Los Angeles late last year and included a meeting with UCLA students. In April, we went to Chicago, where a group of former Members held a panel for Northwestern students. In July, we visited Boston, where a group of former Members and a visiting delegation of district directors met with interns in the Massachusetts State House.

We have a regional meeting in Orlando on the schedule for November 7th and have arranged for a mini Congress to Campus visit to the University of Central Florida. In addition to bringing together former Members from the region, we extend invitations to State Representatives, district directors, local academics, and others in the congressional family.

We plan to crisscross the country with regional meetings so that we can both engage our membership and meet their needs, as well as expand our mission to deepen the understanding of our democratic process and to engage the citizenry through civic education about Congress and public service.

Our last new development should be highlighted: we are issuing to our Members a call to action on the cru-

cially important aspect of civic education. We have formed a partnership with the Lou Frey Institute at the University of Central Florida. As you are surely aware, civic education has been one of the most important issues our dear friend Lou Frey has worked on since leaving Congress, and his institute has become a leading voice on this topic in my home State of Florida. Included in this partnership is the Civic Mission of Schools, which works hand in hand with the civic education initiative of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

We envision an extremely active role for former Members to play at the State level to be an advocate for civic education. Florida, of course, is a great example on how civics can be restored if there is a bipartisan consensus and commitment to make it happen.

In addition to this partnership, I am proud to share with you that we are in the process of taking our highly successful model of the international Congressional Study Groups and translating it for the first time to a domestic issue: the Congressional Study Group on Civics.

Our vision is to bring together, under our umbrella, the bipartisan congressional family—Republicans and Democrats; former Members and current Members; chiefs of staff currently working on the Hill and some who left the Hill and are now in communities all over the country; and our newest constituency, district directors for current Members—all of us working together under the umbrella of the Congressional Study Group on Civics to promote civic education and make a better understanding of our representative democracy and a much greater knowledge base when it comes to Congress and the work of Members of Congress. This new undertaking is in the very beginning stages, and I look forward to reporting to you next year on our progress.

One goal of this civic outreach is to remove the stigma that now is attached to the word "politician." John Buchan had a quote. He was an English scholar; he wrote 42 books; he had numerous publications; he was elected to parliament in England at the beginning of the 20th century; and he was appointed Governor General of the Assembly in Canada by the King.

This is what he said: "Public life is regarded as the crown of a career, and to young men and women, it is the worthiest of ambitions. Politics is still the greatest and most honorable adventure."

If our civic education outreach can reintroduce this appreciation of public service in this next generation, then we will have succeeded.

Civic education and this commitment to reaching out to students across the country are just two of the reasons we will honor our colleague David Skaggs later today. I hope you

all will join us during our luncheon in David's honor as we recognize his exemplary service to this country with our 2017 Distinguished Service Award.

As many of you know, David was an officer in the Marine Corps in Vietnam before seeking public office. He served in the Colorado State Legislature and, of course, here in the House of Representatives for six terms. He now serves with Martin Frost and Vin Weber on the board of the National Endowment for Democracy. He and his lovely wife, Laura, will be with us during lunch today.

Before I yield to David to report on our Congress to Campus and Civics projects, I hope all of you will join me in a round of applause for our 2017 Distinguished Service honoree, David Skaggs.

Mr. SKAGGS. Cliff, thank you very, very much for your very kind words. I am honored to receive this award. It is especially important because it comes from my peers, and I am humbled, given that prior recipients of this award included such giants as Amo Houghton and Lee Hamilton. My great thanks to you, the Executive Committee, and the board of directors.

I am here to talk a little bit about the Congress to Campus program that Cliff has already alluded to. It is our most impactful and important domestic program, and I am glad to report on it and also to add some thoughts about the state of civic education across America.

What a year Congress to Campus has had during 2016 and 2017. Under this program, bipartisan pairs of former Members visit college campuses for several days to speak to students from all disciplines in a variety of settings, large and small.

We have three goals: to promote public service in the next generation of Americans, to teach about Congress and the work of a Member of Congress in ways that political science doesn't often capture, and to engage students in a discussion about the issues of the day.

The format demonstrates that a Republican and a Democrat can have different points of view and opinions but still have a respectful debate looking for common ground and a path forward.

Last fall, during the election season, the Former Members of Congress sent teams to 16 campuses. We had an additional 14 visits during the spring term. It was the busiest academic year in the 35-year history of the program.

Former Members visited all over the U.S., from the University of Maine to Alcorn State in Mississippi and from the Naval Academy to Arizona State. There were also four international Congress to Campus visits.

Students come away with a better understanding of how Congress works and what the life of a Member of Congress is like. Sixty percent of the stu-

dents report that their opinion of Congress improves after hearing from a bipartisan pair of former Members.

After hearing from such a visit, one student observed that Republicans and Democrats aren't completely at odds and that they can work together. That is certainly very different than the way the media portrays things. Another student came away with a sense of how important it was to be involved in public service.

In 2016, over 50 Members gave their time to speak to almost 7,000 students, not just at colleges in the Congress to Campus program, but also students in high school and middle school. I want to thank my colleagues on behalf of the Association for their participation in these many visits.

Special thanks to the Former Members of Congress staff, particularly Sharon Witiw, who is here in the Chamber, for nurturing this important program, for getting on us to participate and expanding it in partnership with our friends at the Stennis Center. We have come a long way since the years when a busy Congress to Campus year consisted of two or three visits per semester.

For these college audiences, we don't talk about how a bill becomes law but, rather, examine issues deeply and look into the politics of today's Congress. The program is civic education in practice.

I also need to report that more and more, during these visits, we encounter a lack of civic literacy, a lack of basic understanding of our Constitution and the structure and practice of American representative democracy. It seems to be getting more pronounced every year.

Our Association shares with many others across the country a growing concern about the current state of civic knowledge and skill. Just last week, the Annenberg Center at the University of Pennsylvania found in its survey that only a quarter of Americans can name all three branches of government and more than a third can't name any of the rights protected by the First Amendment.

Lack of this sort of basic civic knowledge and skills probably has a relationship to the current level of distrust in government and officeholders. This has led the Association to look for possible solutions.

Building on the civic education admission of our Congress to Campus program, the Association now intends to play a larger role in addressing civic illiteracy by reaching younger audiences in middle and secondary schools.

A bipartisan group of our Association came together for strategic planning around this mission. Working with the Lou Frey Institute at the University of Central Florida, the campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools, and Tufts University and facilitated by Pete

Weichlein's wife—is she here today, Pete? No. Okay.—we developed a plan for how former Members could be more actively involved.

This work has generated some exciting developments. Cliff has already shared the idea of a Congressional Study Group on Civics, which we intend to have bring together current Members, district directors, and chiefs of staff, bring them into our undertaking to advance civic learning and practice.

Last week, the Association participated in a groundbreaking national symposium on civics organized by our two partners, the campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools and the Lou Frey Institute, where funders and many civic organizations exchanged ideas and renewed their commitments to improving our common efforts to educate for democracy.

Pete and I were there and had the privilege, on behalf of our Association, to commit us to making civic education the centerpiece of the Former Members of Congress' domestic programs, and Pete will be on each and all of us to make good on that promise.

We have a steering committee of former Members committed to the effort. My friends and colleagues, George Nethercutt, Jim Gerlach, Bill Sarpalius, Tom Coleman, Karen Thurman, Steve Horsford, and Mickey Edwards join me on that committee. We will convene soon to discuss what former and current Members can do together to make a difference and to issue a call to arms to our membership. Consider yourselves forewarned. I am looking at you, Dan Glickman.

By exemplifying bipartisanship and taking advantage of the networks we still have, former Members can make a tremendous contribution to addressing the core need of American democracy: preparing our young people for active citizenship. I look forward to reporting to you again next year on our progress.

More importantly, we need to engage all of you in this effort. Our people's lack of understanding of our own system of government has become pervasive, and it threatens the Republic. It explains much of what ails us politically.

Cliff, thank you very much for your leadership of the Association and for the opportunity to give this report.

Mr. FROST. Cliff, if we could suspend.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I have never spoken on this mike before, so I am going to give it a try. This is literally the first time I have spoken from this one.

Hey, Donna, how are you doing? Good to see you guys.

Greetings. Good to have you. Not much happening around here, pretty

easy going, you know, slow moving, nothing controversial whatsoever. It is an interesting time, I can tell you that, one of these deals.

I came here in 1998 with many of you. I see so many familiar faces.

Good to see you, Dan.

And I would say what has changed this place in the 19 years I have been here is the internet. The internet has changed society. It has also changed the way Congress works—some good, some bad, and some in between. You are basically out there seeing that.

All I would ask you to do is, in your walks of life, in your spheres of influence, just help explain to the country how this place really, actually works. Because you hear sort of the cartoon version of it when you turn on TV. It is actually a place where people care, where people work hard, where people think, where people study, where people interact, and where they get along more often than not and we actually get things done.

At a time where faith in civil society and in our government is not very high, we could use a few more ambassadors helping express to the country that the foundation here is solid, it is strong, it is enduring, and it is going to persist.

When these microphones are turned off or when the TVs are turned off, we all actually get along pretty well. About 80 percent of the things that we pass here, just like when you were here, are bipartisan. Now, clearly, we are going to have partisanship; clearly, we are going to have different viewpoints and passion. But at the end of the day, the system is strong; the system is going to work; the institutions are here; and the separation of powers is as valid and as potent as it ever was before.

I would just say: Welcome. It is great to see all these familiar faces. You look a whole lot happier than you probably did when you were here. Whenever I see Members of Congress after they have left, they look like they have degenerated like 5 or 10 years, and I think that goes for a lot of you.

I would say this: Help us be ambassadors for this institution, for this branch of government, to revive sort of civil respect for what we do here. I think we could all use a little bit of that, and it is just really nice to see you.

God bless you.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule. I know that you do have a few things to look after these days, and thank you for being here and recognizing the significance of this organization.

Mr. Stearns.

Mr. STEARNS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and we are just delighted that you took the time to come speak with us.

David, thank you very much for that excellent report. I very much look forward to your remarks during lunch today.

My colleagues, as all of you know, our most active programming involves current Members of Congress from both parties and from both Chambers and, of course, our Congressional Study Groups. We conduct programs focusing on Europe and Asia. We bring current Members of Congress together with their peers and legislatures overseas, and we work with our Department of State to talk about representative democracy with audiences overseas, also.

Via the Former Members Association, I have met with numerous groups of legislators from other democracies who come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government, our form of democracy, and what is going on politically in the United States and on Capitol Hill.

These conversations and meetings are always a two-way street, and I learn as much, if not more, from our visitors as they do from me. Our Association has a longstanding partnership with a great NGO called Legacy International, bringing young professionals from the Middle East and North Africa to the United States.

Our most recent group completed their 6-week D.C. stay earlier in the year and was composed of young professionals from Tunisia and Morocco. Most of these visitors worked in the NGO sector in their countries, and they came to the United States to learn about the interaction between government and the nongovernmental sector. It is truly a very enriching cross-cultural dialogue, and I am very pleased that FMC offers this opportunity to our Members and to their visitors.

As I stated earlier, the main international activity of our Association is housed with the Congressional Study Groups on Japan, Germany, and Europe. These are our programs that involve current Members of Congress as well as current senior congressional staff.

I now invite my good friend and predecessor, Connie Morella of Maryland, to report on this aspect of our international work.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Cliff, for the introduction and all of your comments, and particularly for your leadership of Former Members of Congress during this year. You have done a superlative job.

Well, as you know, Former Members of Congress works with all Members of the congressional family. Our network also includes current Members of Congress and their senior staff to promote a collaborative, bipartisan, and effective approach to policymaking both at home and abroad.

Our flagship programs for our colleagues who are still in office are the

Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, and Europe. The Congressional Study Groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges that strive to create better understanding and cooperation between the United States and our most important strategic and economic partners abroad.

Each study group has a membership roster of between 75 and 125 Members of Congress, and it is led by a bipartisan, bicameral pair of co-chairs who are currently in Congress. Our model celebrates active discussions among all participants, avoiding lengthy speeches or formal presentations, in order to create an atmosphere that promotes personal connections. We believe that the network of peers created via our programs have acted to renew and expand areas of mutual cooperation, especially in times of transition.

The Congressional Study Groups are not the only programs dedicated to this mission, but they are unique in their year-round outreach to Capitol Hill. Unlike other formats, we provide long-lasting staff support and maintain a well-respected reputation as independent and non-advocacy. As a result, our network attracts a large, diverse group of legislators and policymakers who are committed to international dialogue. What is most important for us is that they join the discussion.

A few highlights from the 114th Congress:

We hosted 62 roundtables in Washington, D.C., which are the foundation of our programming. Maintaining a year-round outreach ensures that we are developing meaningful relationships instead of having occasional encounters.

108 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate and 204 senior congressional staffers participated in at least one of those roundtables; most participated in multiple programs.

We also organized 12 study tours abroad for Members of Congress and senior congressional staff because we know that immersive travel experiences have immense value.

Each trip is an opportunity for mutual learning and sharing, as well as forming bonds, with meeting partners and within the bipartisan delegation itself, and we know that is important.

Already, our programming calendar in the 115th Congress has been busy. In the first 6 months of 2017, we have organized three study tours for Members of Congress and three study tours for senior congressional staff.

Our roundtables on Capitol Hill also recently welcomed several senior officials, including the German Federal Minister of Economic Affairs and Energy, the chairman and CEO of Luftansa, and a high-level delegation from the Japanese Diet.

I would like to acknowledge the service of all of our co-chairs for their hard work and dedication to these critical programs. Our co-chairs are true leaders, who not only serve in their role as official Study Group leaders, but are also called on by various embassies and

outside organizations to speak on panels, attend roundtables, and meet with countries who have visiting delegations.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany is led by Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, Representative CHARLIE DENT, and Representative TED DEUTCH. We thank the Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, for his service as a Senate co-chair until February 2017.

The Congressional Study Group on Japan is led by Senator MAZIE HIRONO, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Representative DIANA DEGETTE, and Representative BILLY LONG.

The Congressional Study Group on Europe is led by Senator JOHN BOOZMAN, Senator CHRIS MURPHY, Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY, and Representative PETER WELCH. We very much appreciate all their efforts in leadership.

I also want to mention that our work is not limited to the three main Study Groups on Germany, Japan, and Europe. For example, over the past 6 months, we have put a lot of energy into bringing Korea-focused programming to Capitol Hill. I don't have to tell you how important our relationship with South Korea is, and the many security and trade issues that shape this part of the world.

We, therefore, in addition to our ongoing focus on China, have commenced programming on Korea. We are very fortunate to have former Member Jay Kim chair this effort in Korea itself, and his leadership already has resulted in a number of incredibly informative Capitol Hill programs involving former and current Members.

The work of the Congressional Study Groups is complemented by our Diplomatic Advisory Council. Initially focused on European nations, the Diplomatic Advisory Council is now comprised of approximately 30 ambassadors from four continents who advise and participate in our programming. Their interest and commitment to multilateral dialogues is a very valuable addition to the Congressional Study Groups and provides a valuable outreach beyond our three Study Groups.

At the beginning of the 114th Congress, we also formed the Congressional Staff Advisory Council. As former Members of Congress, we know the value of good staff. I always say my rock and my staff, they support me. The Staff Advisory Council formally recognizes the mutually beneficial relationships we have in offices across Capitol Hill. We are as grateful for the staff who participate in and support our group programming as we are for the Members of Congress.

Finally, I would like to add a thanks to those individuals, organizations, and corporations whose patronage makes our work possible. In particular, I would like to recognize Ambassador Jim Zumwalt and Ms. Junko Chano of

Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, Dr. Karen Donfried and Reta Jo Lewis of The German Marshall Fund of the United States, and Ms. Paige Cottingham-Streater of the Japanese-U.S. Friendship Committee for their tremendous support as institutional funders of the Congressional Study Groups in 2017.

Companies that belong to the 2017 Business Advisory Councils are: Allianz, All Nippon Airways, Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ, BASF, B. Braun Medical, Central Japan Railway Company, Cheniere Energy, Daimler, Deutsche Telekom, DHL, Evonik Corporation, Fresenius Medical Care North America, Fresenius SE, Hitachi, Honda, Lockheed Martin, Lufthansa German Airlines, Marubeni America Corporation, Mitsubishi Corporation (Americas), Mitsubishi Heavy Industries America, Mitsui, Nissan, Panasonic, Ratner Prestia, the Representative of German Industry and Trade, Sojitz, Toyota Motor North America, UPS, and Volkswagen of America.

Because of their financial support, our activities not only help to build vital bilateral relationships between legislatures, but also build bipartisan relationships within our own Congress. Mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are crucial, as you know, to solving pressing problems, whether at home or abroad.

As former Members of Congress, we are proud to bring the important services provided by the Congressional Study Groups to our colleagues who are still in office, and are proud to play an active role in our continued international outreach.

So I want to thank you, Cliff. I want to thank all of the Members who are here. Continuing these very important programs is important, and we thank you for that.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Connie.

Mr. Stearns.

Mr. STEARNS. Thank you, Connie, very much for that report, and thank you also for the continued leadership that you have provided for the former Members of Congress. Your counsel is always appreciated and is invaluable.

I now will lead to another former president of our Association, Dennis Hertel of Michigan. Dennis, along with former Member Ken Kramer, has been the driving force behind a program that is incredibly near and dear to our hearts: our efforts to help severely wounded veterans returning from the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan.

We do so via our annual charity golf tournament called The Members—to avoid any confusion with The Masters—and we really have had a tremendous impact.

Dennis.

Mr. HERTEL. Thank you, Cliff.

Let me associate myself with Connie Morella's remarks. Your leadership of FMC has been exemplary, and your report today is a tribute to our great energy and commitment. On behalf of our Association, thank you very much, Connie.

I want to thank Speaker RYAN for what he said today about coming to visit us, but also talking about our being ambassadors to the Nation. I think we are, not only the Nation, but worldwide, about the Congress and how proud we are of the Congress and the democracy that we have here, and even with our great differences in today's world, how we carry on and represent the people and commend the Congress for doing so.

I am tremendously pleased to share with our colleagues an update on our charitable golf tournament. As Cliff mentioned, I, along with Ken Kramer, co-chair the event, which is now in its 11th year.

Back in 2006, we had low attendance. It was just a competitive match that we had between Republicans and Democrats out at Andrews Air Force Base and very private. We were dwindling in our attendance, and we thought maybe we could change this and make it into something effective for the community.

We were able to transform it into something that was fun but also, more importantly, inspirational, where the focus was not just on your golfing ability. I am the example. I am not a golfer. I have co-chaired this for 10 years with Ken now, but I am the worst duffer you could have out there, yet the Democrats still won even with me on their team this year.

It has become successful. As of today, the tournament has raised almost \$1.3 million to help veterans and their families deal with injuries sustained during the Afghanistan and Iraq wars.

The two beneficiaries of the money raised, Warfighters Sports, a division of Disabled Sports USA who helps with 120 different sports for their members across this Nation who have been injured in defending our country, and Tee it Up for the Troops, are two outstanding organizations that use adaptive sports as a way for severely wounded veterans to reengage with their families and communities and get a bit of their prewar activity back into their lives. These guys go skiing, they go mountain climbing, horseback riding. You name it, they do it. We are so proud of the men and women and what they have accomplished.

We are proud that for the last 3 years, we have shared this honor of co-chairing the tournament with Congressman JIMMY DUNCAN of Tennessee, who I am sorry to see is retiring now—he has just been an excellent chairman and a great friend to all of us all these years—and Congressman GENE GREEN of Texas, who has just been an outstanding leader and is going to continue with us, I hope. He is just so enthusiastic in getting Members out there.

They are the ones who recruit the current Members of Congress, and they bug them and hassle them every week

to get them out to our tournament. We have had more people, more Members at our tournament than other golf tournaments. There are so many different tournaments here in Washington that have Members play, but we have had the greatest turnout over the years.

It is unlike any other golf tournament. There is still a little friendly competition. As I said, the Democrats won this year. I can't say that enough, because we lost for the past 7 years prior. And, you know, Republicans belong to more country clubs than Democrats, anyway. I think they have more experience.

More importantly, we have had over 30 wounded veterans play this last year, and every year in our tournament, so many wounded veterans, and it is just inspirational.

I played with a veteran from Michigan, a young man who had been in Afghanistan 2 weeks on the Army police force there, and lost his leg in a bomb explosion. And he was out there playing golf. Just an outstanding golfer, outstanding American, and to share that day with him has just been an honor for all of us.

So we are already working now on the tournament for next year. It will be April of next year. We hope we get more former Members out. As I have said, we have done really well with current Members of Congress, but what we need is to get more former Members out. It doesn't matter our age or our ability. Even if you can just come out for the day and spend it with the veterans, you know, watching the match and having lunch and dinner and breakfast with the Members and, more importantly, the veterans, that is really worthwhile. If you bring your family out there too for a while, that is fine too. It is always at the Army and Navy Club, so it is convenient.

We finish early. We start early. We start at 8 and we finish about 4 in the afternoon, so we leave before the rush hour traffic so the Members can get back here for a vote. So we would love to have you come out even for a few hours if you have the time.

Ken Kramer, Pete Weichlein and I back in 2006 wondered whether we could change our existing tournament to something more meaningful, and decided to transform the golf event from a highly competitive Members only tournament to a fun and inspirational fundraiser, where the focus was not on your golfing ability, but rather on coming together, on a bipartisan basis, former and current Members alike, for a great cause. I think I can speak for Ken and Pete when I say that we have succeeded beyond our wildest dreams. As of today the tournament has raised almost \$1.3 million to help veterans and their families deal with injuries sustained during the Afghanistan and Iraq wars. The two beneficiaries of the money raised, Warfighters Sports, a division of Disabled Sports USA, and Tee it Up for the Troops are two outstanding organizations that

use adaptive sports as a way for severely wounded warriors to re-engage with their families and communities and get a bit of their pre-war activity back into their lives.

Both Ken Kramer and I have had the honor to be cochair of this tournament for the past 10 years, and we are proud that the last three years we have shared this honor with Congressman Jimmy Duncan of Tennessee and Congressman GENE GREEN of Texas. JIMMY and GENE are instrumental in recruiting current Members to the tournament. This tournament is unlike any other golf tournament. Although there still is a little friendly competition with the Speakers Cup, which the Democrats won this year after several years of losing to the Republicans, the day is all about the vets. Over 30 wounded veterans played in the tournament. It is quite amazing to see a wounded warrior, for example, someone who has lost a leg, drive the ball like a pro, out-shooting everyone in the foursome, or be inspired with stories of the courage you hear while playing a round of golf with a warrior suffering from traumatic brain injury. The tournament we hosted earlier this year was our most successful yet, with the greatest number of players and the largest dollar amount raised, and we already are working on the next tournament in April 2018.

Before I yield the floor back to Cliff, let me thank him and Martin Frost for their incredible leadership on our annual gala event, the Statesmanship Awards Dinner. Cliff is FMC's president and Martin is the event's chairman. They work tirelessly on making the dinner a signature event here in D.C., and, more importantly, a huge successful evening for all of us.

As you all know, we do not receive any funding from Congress, as Cliff pointed out again this morning. Not a single taxpayer dollar is earmarked for any of our programs, which, in my opinion, is exactly the way it should be. We are independent, we raise our own money, and our former Members donate their time pro bono for all the different programs that we have. As Cliff went over, we had former Members donate to us an astounding 6,500 hours of pro bono public service, even without the need to cover an honorarium. Running all of our outstanding programs does cost a lot of money and staff time. Therefore, in addition to foundation grants, the Statesmanship Awards Dinner is an incredibly important piece of FMC's budgetary puzzle.

Over the years, I have heard so many of our former Members talk about how much they appreciate our staff and how wonderful our staff is and how they accomplish what would take ten-fold another staff to do. We think it is the best staff in Washington. That is saying a lot, considering all the other competitive nonprofits that are successful here in Washington.

So the way that we can show our appreciation for the staff and what they have accomplished and what they are doing for us and what they are doing for our country is this dinner. That is

the one thing that we can all demonstrate our support at, because it pays their salaries. So if you appreciate what they do and you think they deserve a bonus, the best way to help them and to improve our Association is to help us sell tickets for this dinner.

Under Martin Frost's chairmanship this last year, our 20th annual dinner, we had the most successful event ever. It was getting to be kind of the same old thing, and Pete Weichlein, our executive director who spearheaded this effort, said let's change it up, let's move it to the Mellon Auditorium, which has been a tremendous, majestic setting, and let's have some outside awardees that we honor too. Let's not just have a boring program where we have people get up and receive an award and give a thank-you speech and then take pictures. Let's have a panel discussion instead so we can involve the audience and take some questions and we all stay awake and people don't sneak out early, because it is interesting to hear that panel discussion.

That is what Pete Weichlein has created now, and I think it is those two decisions that we now have the signature event here in Washington. We have something that we are proud of where we see more and more people come, more and more active Members come, people from the administration, past Members come. The Speaker has been supportive, the majority leader, minority leaders have been supportive in so many ways. I just think it is a way that we get to talk about what we do to a broader audience, and for them actually to say thank you to us by coming to that dinner.

We now have a dinner that has become a signature event here in D.C., a classy and substantive evening of which all of us can be very proud. The only thing missing is to make it a black-tie evening, and maybe that is something we can consider for the future. It is that sophisticated an event.

So Martin and Cliff have already put things in place to make the 2018 dinner even more outstanding. They should be commended for their efforts. I, along with the other former Members serving on the event's steering committee, are committed to helping them. I hope all the former Members here today will take a closer look at the dinner and decide to become more involved.

We are recognizing via this dinner the tremendous power of bipartisanship, something that Speaker RYAN talked about that is so important to all of us, and it really is exemplified in that dinner every year by the awards that we give, by the discussion we have, and by the people that attend.

So this year we are going to be honoring as honorees Senators LAMAR ALEXANDER and PATTY MURRAY, along with House Members DIANA DEGETTE and, my good friend, FRED UPTON from Michigan. We will host a conversation of our honorees on stage again so that

those in attendance can hear about their success reaching across the political aisle and working together for the good of the country. They are able to tell stories about exactly how they accomplish things and what they did and the kind of personal relationships that they have and why that makes a difference, the kind of thing that we know about, that we want to reach the larger world so that they understand that things are done by individuals working together, and not by speeches and by fundraising alone, but by Members of Congress being effective and caring about moving the ball forward.

The 21st Annual Statesmanship Awards Dinner is one of the most impressive in town. You will not regret becoming involved. You will see more of your former colleagues from both the House and the Senate, as well as ambassadors. Connie Morella has brought more ambassadors to that dinner and more administration officials and former officials than ever before.

I am thinking of Speaker RYAN. A lot of us served with his former boss, Jack Kemp. Jack Kemp was in the Reagan administration and was such a leader. It just flows down from people who have served before carrying that torch forward, and I think Speaker RYAN is a great example of that. So the dinner exemplifies that, and it has become an increasingly impressive event, showcasing our Association.

I hope all of you will join Martin and all the hard work he is doing. He will push us. He is really good at pushing us. He did that when he did it for the Democrats. He is a fundraiser. Now he does it, very importantly, for our Association. We would like that muscle to be used in a bipartisan way now.

Cliff's leadership is outstanding across the board and tireless. So thank you very much. We are looking forward to a great dinner in 2018.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Dennis.

We are now going to recognize Cliff again. As part of this meeting, we have to conduct some formal business, which is to reconstitute our board, to continue our officers. Cliff has some remarks about staff also, but this is the actual business part of the meeting that we are required to conduct.

Cliff.

Mr. STEARNS. Martin, thank you for that overview.

And, Dennis, thank you very much for that very impressive report. We appreciate your leadership. You and Ken have given so much over the years for this golf tournament. I can only echo your remarks about the Statesmanship Awards Dinner, which will be held next year on March 21.

All the programs we have described, of course, require both leadership and staff to implement. Our Association is blessed to have top people in both categories. I simply want to take this opportunity to thank our board of direc-

tors—over 30 former Members of Congress divided equally between the parties—for their active advice and counsel, and I really sincerely appreciate it.

I also want to thank the many partners and supporters we have to make our programs possible. We are truly lucky to have assembled a group of corporations and foundations that believe in our work and make our success possible, and we very much value our partnership with them.

Also, I would be remiss if I did not thank the other members of our Association's executive committee: our vice president, Martin Frost; our secretary, Tom Petri; our treasurer, Karen Thurman; and our past president, Barbara Kennelly.

You have all made this Association a much stronger organization and much better than it was before, and I thank you, of course, for your time and energy.

To administer all these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals. It is just amazing to me how much we get done with just a relatively small staff, and it is a testament to their dedication and their capabilities how successful we have been because of this.

Andy Shoenig and Rachel Haas left the Former Members of Congress after many years of tremendous service, and we wish them both all the best as they pursue their new opportunities. Andy is earning his master's degree at the University of North Carolina, and Rachel found a great new position with a firm much closer to home, though I am very glad to see that she is with us this morning.

As I mentioned earlier, we have added four new staff members, and I hope that throughout the day you will have an opportunity to meet them. They are: Alia Diamond, who is working on our communications; Kathy Hunter, helping us with development and membership; Patrick Egenhofer, focused on the Congressional Study Group on Germany and some of our domestic programs; and Paul Kincaid, who is our brand-new director of Congressional Outreach, and his first day is today. We welcome all of you.

The rest of our team that you have had a chance to work with over the years are, and let me simply mention their names.

Alexis Terai, who is part of our international team and runs our Congressional Study Group on Japan. She is fluent in Japanese, was educated in the United States and abroad, and has been the key component to making our Study Group on Japan the largest and most active international exchange we offer to current Members of Congress.

Lorraine Harbison is our International Programs Manager with main focus on the European Program. In addition, she makes the Diplomatic Advisory Council such a great success and

has grown it from just a handful of embassies to now over four dozen actively participating Ambassadors.

Sharon Witiw is our director of community outreach and oversees the smooth separation of projects such as the Congress to Campus program. She is also in charge of creating the vision we have for our Congressional Study Group on Civics, and you will be hearing from her as programming for their projects commences next year.

Sabine Schleidt is our managing director who spends most of her time on the current Member international programs, but also a lot of hours on implementing the strategic vision and fundraising goals of our Association. With our new hire of Paul Kincaid as director of congressional outreach, Sabine's role will be much more focused on development, strategy, and engaging our membership. She joined our organization over 6 years ago, and, thanks to her creativity and her simply can-do attitude, we have grown tremendously under her leadership.

And lastly, Pete Weichlein is our chief executive officer, who has been with the Association for over 18 years, first as a program director, then as international program director, and, since 2003, as our CEO. When you think about that, when he became the CEO, the Former Members of Congress was in a dire financial situation, and, over the years, he has taken this organization with his leadership to new heights, and I think all of us really appreciate his efforts.

So all of you, if you would, please give an outstanding group of professionals a big round of applause.

Hoorah, hoorah, hoorah.

I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome to Washington a large delegation of former members of the European Parliament. As you know, we have two incredibly meaningful and active global partnerships, with our colleagues in Ottawa and our colleagues in Brussels. We often coordinate programs, particularly democracy-strengthening projects, and we exchange best practices. We are so thrilled to have them with us today on the House floor. They are led by their president of the Association of Former Members of the European Parliament, the Honorable Enrique Baron Crespo. Thank you so much for coming, and we appreciate your attendance.

Every year at our annual meeting, we ask the membership to elect new officers and board members. I, therefore, now will read to you the names of our candidates for board members and officers. They are running unopposed; and I, therefore, will ask for a simple "yea" or "nay" as I present to you the list of candidates as our slate.

For the Association's board of directors, the candidates are:

Jim Coyne of Pennsylvania

Byron Dorgan of North Dakota

Steve Horsford of Nevada
Ken Kramer of Colorado
Jim Matheson of Utah
Jim Moran of Virginia
Karen Thurman of Florida
Ed Whitfield of Kentucky

All in favor of electing these eight former Members to our board of directors, please say "yea." Any opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by the membership.

Next, we will elect our executive committee. As president, I serve a 2-year term, which will end in 2018. However, the other three elected members of the executive board are up for reelection to a 1-year term. The candidates for our executive committee are:

Martin Frost of Texas for vice president

Tom Petri of Wisconsin for secretary
Karen Thurman of Florida for treasurer

All in favor of electing these three former Members to our executive committee say "yea." Any opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by the membership. The executive committee is completed by Barbara Kennelly, who is an unelected officer in her capacity as immediate past president. Thank you.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Stearns, if you would suspend for just a moment, we are honored to have with us the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. President Stearns and Vice President Frost, and Tom, who is going to tell you what to do, welcome back; although, I see a lot of you, from time to time, as you walk the halls and remind us of the good old days.

We have had quite a session so far, as I think you have noticed. You heard me talk before, and I am sure you have made this recognition already, we lost one of the great Americans with whom many of us have served, Bob Michel. Bob Michel passed away. Bob Dole is still with us, still with a great sense of humor, and, frankly, I miss those two Republicans dearly, and I miss a lot of you as well.

We can remember when we were much more collegial than we now find ourselves. We saw an election in Alabama which does not bode well for future collegiality in the United States Senate, I think. We will see what happens in that election. Obviously, that was the primary. We will see what happens in the general.

I think all of us have a responsibility to talk about the Congress that we have served in over the years. This is my 36th year in the Congress. I don't know that any of you served that long, and some people are asking why I am serving that long.

Nick Rahall, how many years did you serve?

Mr. RAHALL. Thirty-eight.

Mr. HOYER. Thirty-eight. So I have to run one more time at least. Right, Nick?

But in any event, I like to be with each of you every year that you come back here. As I say, I see some of you. And the Historical Society obviously does a wonderful job. I think that when I see you and we say "hello" to one another, it is in a different context in which we meet as people who have participated in a very important and historic way, have worked together, have respected the institution, have respected the process of the institution, and have differed, obviously, but, nevertheless, were able to come to a place where we agreed to disagree and to at least act on that on which we could agree.

I think that was very important for our country. As I have said before, and as you know, I continue to be very concerned about what we project to the country. The Congress now has single-digit approval. They don't believe the board of directors of the United States of America is working, and I think that is of great concern to all of us as citizens, as Americans, that we can't be successful as a nation if we have so little respect from the people who we represent, or confidence that we are doing the work that they want done.

I try to convey to them, and I want to tell you, as you know, the majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY from California, and I get along well. We don't always agree, obviously. ROY BLUNT, who is one of my best friends, as I think some of you know, is now a Senator from Missouri but was the minority whip, and was the acting minority leader and minority whip for a period of time. He likes to say, "Connie, Steny and I always agree when there are at least 420 other people voting the same way," which is to say unanimous consent essentially we agree.

Roy and I didn't agree, but when we agreed, we made things happen in a bipartisan way. KEVIN MCCARTHY and I do the same—not as often because we are more polarized than when most of you served in this Congress. When you served in this Congress, you remember, there were real confrontations. Some of us served in the Gingrich years, and they were pretty tough years, but even in those times when you served, there was an ability, I think, to work more closely together than now exists.

John Boehner is not in the Congress because he wanted to work together, and we did on some very significant things. And John finally said: Look, if I can't get 218 on my side, I am not sure I want to be Speaker. He wasn't pushed out. People who say John Boehner was pushed out are wrong. John Boehner decided to leave. He wasn't pushed out. He would have had the majority of support on his side of the aisle all the time. There was no doubt about that.

But I think John just got frustrated about his inability to galvanize a majority. I think MITCH MCCONNELL prob-

ably empathizes a lot with John Boehner right now. Probably all of you think so as well.

But I like to come here, and I thank you for staying engaged, staying involved—raising the institution, as opposed to the partisanship, but the institution and what its role is in our democracy.

People talk about: Every 2 years, you really ought to change that. I am not sure that we ought to change it. The Founding Fathers were undoubtedly right, in my opinion. Does it cause us problems? Yes, it does. I tell my colleagues on my side: You cannot solve America's problems in 24-month cycles. What I mean by that, of course, is if all we have is thinking that goes from election to election, we won't be able to solve America's problems because they are not just subject to a 24-month solution. We have got to think longer term.

I am very worried about the debt, as I am sure some of you are, but we continue to do either spending or cutting taxes, and both sides that do that talk about how we need to balance the budget. We are not there.

I thank you for staying engaged. I thank you for continuing to communicate with the public, with my constituents and your constituents, your former constituents, and your broader constituents as your fellow American citizens, to try to encourage them. When people say: When are you guys going to get together? My response to them is: As soon as you do. And they look at me quizzically. I say: As soon as you elect, on both sides of the aisle—Nick, have I talked too long? Is that my signal? What Nick is saying is: You junior Members need to get off the floor.

Mr. FROST. I would advise Mr. HOYER that there is no 5-minute rule here; however, we do have to vacate the floor in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. I am about to end.

My point to you is we need to work together to make sure that our citizens do not believe that if you make an agreement with the other side you have sold out. I don't care which side you are on. Democracy is about compromise. Democracy is about working together. Democracy is about the creation of consensus. If we can't do that, we won't succeed as a country. Forget about Republicans and Democrats, we won't succeed as a country. I know you continue to do that, and, very frankly, looking at so many of you with whom I have had the honor and pleasure of serving, I know that when you were here, you worked at doing that. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Frost.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Stearns.

Mr. STEARNS. I just want to thank Mr. HOYER, the Democratic whip, for his kindness in coming by to give his remarks, and we appreciate his leadership and serving.

My colleagues, it is now my sad duty to inform the Congress of those former Members and current Members who have passed away since our last report.

As all of you know, at the conclusion of our annual meeting later today, we will hold a memorial service in Statutory Hall starting at 6 p.m., where we will be joined by many of the families, as well as current Members of Congress, to pay tribute to the public servants we have lost.

In addition, it is altogether proper to recognize these Representatives and Senators this morning here in the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, to now rise as I read the names. At the end of the list, we will pay our respects to their memory with a moment of silence. We honor these men and women for their service to our country. There are 32 names. They are:

William Armstrong of Colorado
 Bill Barrett of Nebraska
 Anthony Beilenson of California
 Helen Bentley of Maryland
 John Brademas of Indiana
 William Carney of New York
 Eligio "Kika" de la Garza of Texas
 Pete Domenici of New Mexico
 Jay Dickey of Arkansas
 Vernon J. Ehlers of Michigan
 Eni F.H. Faleomavaega of American Samoa
 Robert Garcia of New York
 Benjamin A. Gilman of New York
 John Glenn of Ohio
 Ken Hechler of West Virginia
 Lawrence J. Hogan, Sr., of Maryland
 Clyde Holloway of Louisiana
 Bill Hudnut of Indiana
 Raymond P. Kogovsek of Colorado
 Melvin Laird of Wisconsin
 Steven LaTourette of Ohio
 Mike Lowry of Washington
 Dawson Mathis of Georgia
 Robert Michel of Illinois
 Abner Mikva of Illinois
 Robert Morgan of North Carolina
 Ralph Regula of Ohio
 Clint Roberts of South Dakota
 Mark Takai of Hawaii
 Burt Talcott of California
 Ray Thornton of Arkansas
 George Voinovich of Ohio
 We will now have a moment of silence.

Thank you.

My colleagues, this concludes the 47th Report to Congress by the Association of Former Members of Congress.

Let me leave you with one final thought as we exit this historic Chamber. David Hume, as you know, was a great political philosopher, and this is what he said: "Of all men that distinguish themselves by memorable achievements, the first place of honor seems due to legislators and founders of states who transmit a system of laws and institutions to secure the peace, happiness, and liberty of future generations."

We thank the Congress, the Speaker, and the minority leader for giving us the opportunity to return to this revered and beloved Chamber and to report on our Association's activities. We look forward to another active and productive year, and I want to thank all of you for your attendance. Please join us for coffee and danishes in Room H-122 as we leave the Capitol.

God bless America.

Mr. FROST. The Chair again wishes to thank the former Members of the House and Senate for their presence here today.

Before terminating these proceedings, the Chair would like to invite those former Members who did not respond to the roll when it was called to give their names to the Reading Clerk for inclusion in the roll.

I have noticed some of your presence and have handed a revised list to the Reading Clerk, but I may have missed a few of you. So, if you did not answer the roll, please stop by before you leave.

Thank you very much.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 28, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2666. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0503; Product Identifier 2017-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-19009; AD 2017-17-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2667. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adding the Polar Ship Certificate to the List of SOLAS Certificates and Certificates Issued by Recognized Classification Societies [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0880] (RIN: 1625-AC35) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2668. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0472; Product Identifier 2016-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-19002; AD 2017-17-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2669. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0337; Product Identifier 2017-NM-006-AD; Amendment 39-19006; AD 2017-17-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2670. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0479; Product Identifier 2016-NM-202-AD; Amendment 39-19004; AD 2017-17-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2671. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0502; Product Identifier 2016-NM-120-AD; Amendment 39-19016; AD 2017-18-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2672. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0475; Product Identifier 2016-NM-142-AD; Amendment 39-19017; AD 2017-18-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2673. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0559; Product Identifier 2017-NM-013-AD; Amendment 39-19014; AD 2017-18-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2674. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0247; Product Identifier 2016-NM-180-AD; Amendment 39-19015; AD 2017-18-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2675. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0164; Product Identifier 2017-NE-06-AD; Amendment 39-19008; AD 2017-17-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received

September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2676. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7270; Product Identifier 2015-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-19025; AD 2017-18-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2677. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0512; Product Identifier 2017-NM-031-AD; Amendment 39-19005; AD 2017-17-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2678. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9521; Product Identifier 2016-NM-061-AD; Amendment 39-19018; AD 2017-18-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2679. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0481; Product Identifier 2016-NM-196-AD; Amendment 39-19003; AD 2017-17-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2680. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9517; Product Identifier 2016-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-18984; AD 2017-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2681. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0128; Product Identifier 2016-NM-194-AD; Amendment 39-18999; AD 2017-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2682. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.; Canadair Limited) Airplanes [Docket No.:

FAA-2017-0474; Product Identifier 2016-NM-096-AD; Amendment 39-19007; AD 2017-17-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2683. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR — GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0516; Product Identifier 2016-NM-125-AD; Amendment 39-19000; AD 2017-17-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2684. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0496; Product Identifier 2016-NM-103-AD; Amendment 39-19001; AD 2017-17-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2685. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0638; Product Identifier 2017-CE-018-AD; Amendment 39-19019; AD 2017-18-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2686. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7264; Product Identifier 2015-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-18998; AD 2017-17-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2687. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9518; Product Identifier 2015-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-18989; AD 2017-16-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2688. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0652; Product Identifier 2017-NE-18-AD; Amendment 39-18997; AD 2017-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2689. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0627] (RIN: 1625-AA00) re-

ceived September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2690. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Assets for Independence Program Report to Congress: Status at the Conclusion of the Sixteenth Year, Fiscal Year 2015", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 604 note; Public Law 105-285, Sec. 414(d); (112 Stat. 2771); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2691. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Hurricane Harvey and Hurricane Irma Disaster Relief (Notice 2017-49) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2692. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Guidelines for Good Faith Determinations of Qualifying Public Charity Status (Rev. Proc. 2017-53) [IRB 2017-40] received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2693. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe Harbor for Inadvertent Normalization Violations (Rev. Proc. 2017-47) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3281. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3845. A bill to establish a grant program to incentivize States to reduce prison populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3846. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require payment to counties of a portion of certain revenues received by the United States under Federal oil and gas leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 3847. A bill to revise the Yurok Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3848. A bill to reform our government, reduce the grip of special interest, and return our democracy to the American people by increasing transparency and oversight of our elections and government, reforming public financing for Presidential and Congressional elections, and requiring States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 3849. A bill to extend certain provisions of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act until September 30, 2030, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 3850. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to establish labels that may be used as a voluntary means of indicating to consumers the extent to which products are of United States origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3851. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to provide for rewards for the arrest or conviction of certain foreign nationals who have committed genocide or war crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 3852. A bill to permit the waiver of Jones Act requirements for humanitarian relief efforts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3853. A bill to provide for nuclear weapons abolition and economic conversion in accordance with District of Columbia Initiative Measure Number 37 of 1992, while ensuring environmental restoration and clean-energy conversion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 3854. A bill to provide that the Executive order entitled "Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input" shall have the force and effect of law; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3855. A bill to require a report on significant security risks of the national electric grid and the potential effect of such security risks on the readiness of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3856. A bill to reinstate reporting requirements related to United States-Hong Kong relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. BARR, Mr. MESSER, Mr. TROTT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 3857. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish standards of conduct for brokers and dealers that are in the best interest of their retail customers; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. LEE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CORREA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HECK, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BASS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3858. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the TIGER Discretionary Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms.

HANABUSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. LEE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CORREA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 3859. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. JONES):

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from unauthorized hostilities in the Republic of Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 541. A resolution recognizing the achievements of Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions on the 10th anniversary of their establishment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H. Res. 542. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of October 1 through 7, 2017, as "Latex Allergy Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. Res. 543. A resolution congratulating Northeastern Illinois University on the sesquicentennial of the University; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

126. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 254, urging the President and Congress to expand access to afterschool summer meal programs and streamline the application process for summer meals; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

127. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 234, urging Congress not eliminate the property tax deduction allowable under United States federal tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 3849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 3850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. FOX:

H.R. 3851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 grants Congress the power to

“To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;”

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 3854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce

with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 3855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 16 of the U.S. Constitution (“To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces” and “To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress”).

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 36: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 66: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 299: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 377: Mr. NORMAN and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 392: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 502: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 535: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 644: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 664: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 721: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 747: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 785: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 790: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 795: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 807: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 866: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 927: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 959: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 997: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. BERA, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. FASO.

H.R. 1035: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1057: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1098: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1148: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1150: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1164: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COMER, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1200: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1225: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1253: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1270: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1276: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MENG, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1279: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1317: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1380: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1384: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1419: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1459: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1464: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1494: Mr. HUDSON, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1602: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1606: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1674: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1699: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1810: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1825: Mr. PETERS and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1865: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1889: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1953: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. LOBONDO.

H.R. 1957: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2069: Mr. PETERS and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 2095: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2121: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2201: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2219: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2232: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2264: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2319: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2401: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2405: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2418: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2436: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2499: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2501: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2625: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2640: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 2641: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2658: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2670: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2679: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2685: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2687: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2690: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2740: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 2788: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2790: Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 2840: Mr. CRIST, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 2856: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2862: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2871: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 2897: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2898: Mr. GOSAR.

- H.R. 2909: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2948: Mr. HIMES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 3042: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 3053: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 3079: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 3107: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3117: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3176: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3227: Mr. NADLER and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3272: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3273: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3274: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3275: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3281: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3320: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3329: Mr. PERRY, Mr. COLE, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3342: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 3349: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3378: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3380: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3383: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3395: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3525: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3545: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3552: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 3570: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3576: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3632: Mr. AMODEI and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 3641: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3692: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3696: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3699: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3721: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3733: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3758: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3759: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3761: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3775: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3782: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3792: Mr. WELCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3810: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3812: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3826: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3831: Mr. PETERSON.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.J. Res. 48: Ms. TSONGAS.
H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 128: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. YODER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 142: Mr. SIRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. FLORES.
H. Res. 161: Ms. ROSEN and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 220: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H. Res. 257: Mr. CORREA.
H. Res. 271: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H. Res. 274: Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 279: Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Res. 359: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 490: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 518: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LANCE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 529: Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 534: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. ABRAHAM.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF THE 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE MONTEREY COUNTY FARM BUREAU

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating the Monterey County Farm Bureau on the occasion of their 100th Anniversary. Throughout the last century, the Bureau has assisted ranchers and farmers with crop cultivation and production. Over time, the organization has grown to become one of the region's most important economic institutions. In 1951, the Bureau formed various committees such as the Dairy, Field Crops, Grain Improvement, Tomato Growers, Tax and Legislation, Farm Service, and Water Problems Committees to ensure that farmers had the support needed to overcome challenges in farming. Under the direction of William "Bill" Barker, who served as a leader for the Bureau from 1956 until his passing in 1999, Monterey County Farm Bureau continued to develop its ability to meet the needs of local farmers and ranchers. Throughout its history, the Bureau has invested time and effort into ensuring that local programs, such as Ag Extension, were available to the community. These local partnerships have been integral to the success of the agricultural industry in my district.

Behind the economic might of agriculture on the central coast of California are individuals that work on the farms and ranches. As an organization, Monterey County Farm Bureau supports local farmers and ranchers by serving as a collective voice for agricultural firms and by providing them with the information, benefits, and services they need to succeed. By collaborating with various agricultural institutions, the Bureau supports farmers by helping them deal with the complex issues facing the agricultural community such as labor, land use, and water policies. The group also provides a vital voice for local agricultural firms by advocating for them on the local, state, and national level. At the 2014 California Farm Bureau Federation's Annual Meeting, Monterey County received a County of the Year award for excellence in activities including membership, policy implementation, leadership agricultural education, and public relations. This is a testament to the hard work and tradition of excellence of the Bureau.

As the organization celebrates its centennial anniversary, I am proud to commend Monterey County Farm Bureau for its continued support of those working in agriculture in my district where crop cultivation is the cornerstone of the economy. Over the past century, Monterey County's agriculture industry has grown exponentially and now provides much of the nation's lettuce, strawberries, broccoli,

wine grapes, and over 100 specialty crops. Monterey County Farm Bureau's support of farmers and ranchers in my district has undoubtedly helped establish regions like the Salinas Valley as the uncontested Salad Bowl of the World. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Monterey County Farm Bureau on 100 years of excellence.

IN RECOGNITION OF BETHEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND ITS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY OF MEADVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church of Meadville, Pennsylvania, and the important contributions it has made to the Meadville area for over 160 years. Since its foundation in 1849 by the Reverend Jacob Parmer, Bethel AME has advanced a vision of outreach and engagement through its vibrant faith community.

The church's present location was constructed in Meadville. This site, according to Gary DeSantis writing in the Meadville Tribune on September 2, 2016, was once used by a former slave from Maryland named Richard Henderson to "provide shelter for 500 or more slaves escaping the Southern slave holders." This stop on the Underground Railroad gave refuge to escapees traveling through the northern states on their way to Canada.

As the challenges facing our country and our local communities have shifted over time, Bethel AME has been a constant presence in Meadville. Today its community outreach includes youth drama productions, a women's ministry, outreach to senior citizens, and many other valuable programs and ministries in Meadville.

I am proud to represent the clergy and parishioners of Bethel AME in the House of Representatives. Their history and their present contributions to the community are a credit to the City of Meadville, to Crawford County, and to Pennsylvania's Third District.

CONGRATULATING CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT GARRETT EDMOND ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the retirement of Chief Mas-

ter Sergeant Garrett Edmond, who I have had the privilege of working with for many years.

CMSgt Garrett Edmond began career his with the United States Airforce when he enlisted in August, 1985 as an Airman First Class at Warner Robbins Air Force Base in Georgia. He deployed overseas and served our country during Desert Storm, Operation Allied Forces, and Operation Southern Watch. Throughout his career, CMSgt Edmond participated in numerous humanitarian projects in the Caribbean and Central and South America. He worked diligently protecting our country and achieved the rank of Chief Master Sergeant in 2005. This is the highest enlisted rank one can obtain as well as the ninth highest rank in the Air Force overall.

In recognition of his invaluable contributions to the Air Force, he has received numerous medals during his service, including the Defense Meritorious Service Medal with one oak leaf cluster. This Medal is awarded to those who display exceptional non-combat achievements or commendable service. He has also received the Air Force Commendation Medal and the Joint Service Achievement Medal with two oak leaf clusters. All of the medals and awards he has received an indication of his great service to our country.

I have worked closely with CMSgt Edmond over the years. He has been an instrumental addition to the Academy Day I host which provides information to high school students who have an interest in joining our Armed Forces. His dedication to our country and our youth is commendable.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Chief Master Sergeant Garrett Edmond for his tremendous service to our nation, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY PRIVATE FIRST CLASS (PFC) WILLIAM BRANDON DAWSON

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to rise today in memory of Army Private First Class (PFC) William Brandon Dawson who died while in service to our nation on September 24, 2010, during Operation Enduring Freedom. PFC Dawson was killed when an explosive device detonated close to his military vehicle near Combat Outpost Jaysville, Afghanistan. Private First Class (PFC) Jaysine P.S. Petree of Yigo, Guam was also killed.

PFC Dawson was assigned to the 17th Combat Sustainment Support Battalion, 3rd Maneuver Enhancement Brigade, Fort Richardson, Alaska. According to the Associated

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

Press, PFC Dawson served as a motor transport operator. He was assigned to Fort Richardson in February 2010.

PFC Dawson, a Tunica, Mississippi native, joined the U.S. Army in 2009 shortly after he graduated from Rosa Fort High School Reverend Willie Dawson, Jr., PFC Dawson's father, said his son was ambitious and talked about pursuing a career in politics. "He told me he wanted to be a senator. He could do so many different things," Rev. Dawson said. "He made a career choice and he had all the support of his family. He wanted to drive trucks and he wanted to serve his country."

A number of friends and family members posted a tribute to PFC Dawson on a memorial website. Pennie Smith, PFC Dawson's cousin, praised the soldier for his service. "Thank you, Brandon and all the brave and courageous soldiers that fight and die for our freedom," Smith wrote. "I hadn't seen Brandon since he joined the military, but he was family and I loved him. I pray everyone continues to remember, respect, and honor this fallen hero!"

In 2014, the Tunica County Education Foundation created the Private First Class (PFC) William Brandon Dawson Memorial Scholarship program in his honor. The foundation creators wrote a tribute to PFC Dawson that details the reasons for establishing the scholarship, "Private First Class William Brandon Dawson served in the United States Army in Afghanistan during Operation Enduring Freedom. He made the ultimate sacrifice for his country and his community on September 24, 2010, and this scholarship has been established to honor his memory, bravery, character, and commitment."

PFC Dawson is survived by his parents, Reverend Willie Dawson, Jr. and Quita Weeden-Dawson, his stepfather, Elton Tresvant; his grandparents, Marilyn Williams, Willie Dawson, Sr. and Shirley Dawson, Joe Dan Weeden and Julia Weeden; his four brothers, Joseph Dawson, David Dawson, Daniel Dawson, and Elijah Dawson; his three sisters, Gabrielle Dawson, Whitney Robinson, and Kelli Campbell; his uncle, Larry Williams; his aunt, Phillis Williams; his four cousins, Kashia Williams, Erving Nelson Williams, Pennie Smith, and Adam Williams.

PFC Dawson proudly served our nation to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. His service will always be remembered.

IN RECOGNITION OF DEBBIE WATROUS AND HER SERVICE TO NEW HAMPSHIRE HUMANITIES

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere gratitude for Debbie Watrous and her 24 remarkable years of service to New Hampshire Humanities.

Debbie's time and dedication to serve our state through this organization has been an invaluable contribution, and I congratulate and thank her on her tremendous achievements.

Through her role as the Development Director, Director of Special Projects, Associate Director, and most recently as Executive Director, Debbie helped make public programming more accessible. Her work allowed more Granite Staters to discover culture, history, and new ideas.

Now, Debbie will continue her career in service to others with a new position at FoodCorps, where she will work to ensure that children in every school have access to nutritious food so they can live healthier lives and reach their full potential.

On behalf of New Hampshire's Second Congressional District and all those who have benefitted from Debbie's work, I thank her for her many years of service to the Granite State, and wish her the best of luck in her new role.

IN RECOGNITION OF BYRON BUNKER FOR RECEIVING THE SAMUEL J. HEYMAN SERVICE TO AMERICA MEDAL

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Byron Bunker for receiving the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal. Mr. Bunker's work as Director of Compliance Programs for the Environmental Protection Agency was key to uncovering Volkswagen Group's automotive emissions evasion scheme and safeguarding public health.

Since 1999, Mr. Bunker has worked for the EPA's National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory in Ann Arbor, Michigan, which conducts tests to certify that vehicles and engines meet the United States' emissions and fuel economy standards. As Director of the NVFEL's Compliance Division, Mr. Bunker tests automobiles and their components to ensure that they comply with clean air regulations. Working in conjunction with academic researchers and other federal officials, Mr. Bunker helped uncover and halt a scheme by Volkswagen to evade emissions standards through the use of software designed to intentionally fool regulators about the true emissions levels of its diesel vehicles. This discovery eventually resulted in the largest penalty ever levied against a car manufacturer and helped lay the foundation for additional criminal investigations. These have resulted in \$4.3 billion in civil and criminal penalties, as well as indictments against Volkswagen executives.

Mr. Bunker's expertise and tireless efforts played a critical role in uncovering this wrongdoing and underscore the importance of the EPA's enforcement efforts. As a result of Mr. Bunker's work, the EPA was not only able to detect a sophisticated and widespread emissions evasion scheme, but also strengthen its testing procedures to prevent similar deceptions in the future. Through his rigorous work and collaboration with other officials in the EPA, Mr. Bunker has been an important driver of efforts to protect Americans' health and the environment, and it is my hope that he con-

tinues to effectively safeguard public health and safety in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Byron Bunker for being awarded the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal. Mr. Bunker's rigorous enforcement work has been important in protecting public health and safety.

IN RECOGNITION OF SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH AND THE NEED TO COMBAT VETERAN SUICIDE

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Suicide Prevention Month and to draw attention to the continuing fight against veteran suicide.

Sadly, approximately 20 veterans take their own lives every day. In August 2016 the Veterans Administration released a comprehensive report on veteran suicide. Among the disturbing statistics in this report, it was revealed that though veterans make up 8.5 percent of the U.S. population, they accounted for 18 percent of suicides in 2014. This report also showed that we lost more veterans to suicide in 2014 than soldiers to the battlefield during Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom combined. It is clear that for many veterans a more arduous battle with PTSD and mental illness arises after they return from combat.

That is why I am a proud sponsor of H.R. 411, the Veteran Suicide Prevention Act. This bill would require the VA to complete a publicly available review of the deaths of veterans who died by suicide during the preceding five-year period. The review would include key facts, such as the total number of veterans who have died by suicide, a comprehensive list of the medications prescribed to and found in the systems of such veterans, the percentage of such veterans with combat experience or trauma, Veterans Health Administration facilities with disproportionately high rates of psychiatric drug prescriptions and suicide among veterans, and recommendations to improve the safety and well-being of veterans.

This review would provide vital information for identifying risk factors for suicide and improving mental healthcare for veterans. It is through gaining this understanding of the needs of veterans that we can work to stop this terrible epidemic.

HONORING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF KSRO

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, to recognize the 80th anniversary of Sonoma County's KSRO radio station.

When the station first began broadcasting in 1937, KSRO was California's largest radio station north of the Golden Gate Bridge. Originally located in an old Navy Air Station, KSRO provided homecare, music, and news programs throughout the 1940s and 1950s. The station adopted several formats over the years to match the interests of the day, leaning more heavily into music programming by the 1960s before transitioning into a talk and news centered station in 1987, a format the station continues to maintain to this day.

As KSRO continued to grow in listeners and programming, so too did the station's broadcasting talent. Some of the region's most popular broadcasters built their careers at the station, including Jim Grady, Merle Ross, Reg Lester, David Wesley Page, Curtiss Kim, and Steve Jaxon, to name a few. Some of the station's current broadcasters have been radio mainstays across the region for over 30 years.

During KSRO's 80 years of broadcasting, the station has played a critical role in keeping the region informed of the most pressing local and national news. By providing a platform for debate and discussion the station has also been instrumental in shaping public discourse year after year. The station's weather reports and emergency broadcasts have helped to save lives in a region prone to flooding, wildfires, and sudden storms.

Today, KSRO serves as more than just a drive-time distraction during a morning commute, but rather a familiar voice to a diverse community of people from all walks of life. And at a time when our sources of information are increasingly fragmented and tailored for individual needs and tastes, stations like KSRO are that much more important for creating and maintaining a shared sense of community.

Mr. Speaker, KSRO has been a critical provider of pressing news and information to the public, while facilitating public discourse in the North Bay. It is therefore fitting to congratulate the employees, owners, and management of KSRO on their 80-year anniversary.

RECOGNIZING DYSAUTONOMIA AWARENESS MONTH

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to recognize the millions that fight each day against dysautonomia. Dysautonomia is a group of debilitating medical conditions that result in a malfunction of the autonomic nervous system. This system is responsible for "automatic" bodily functions such as respiration, heart rate, blood pressure, digestion, and temperature control, things that many of us have the luxury of taking for granted. Dysautonomia continues to significantly impact people of any age, gender, race or background across our nation, including many individuals living in Western New York.

As is, dysautonomia can be extremely debilitating and often accompanied by the unseen symptom of social isolation. Some forms result in death, causing tremendous pain and suffering for those impacted and their loved

ones. The stress on the families extends as well to the financial hardships that deserve recognition and better solutions. I am proud to affirm that the outstanding character and strong moral fiber of those in the Western New York community who have provided the much needed support for the victims suffering from dysautonomia. It remains especially crucial for the community to recognize, rally around and support those so affected as they continue their hard fought battle against this disease.

Dysautonomia awareness is monumental in the early detection of the disease due to the fact that most patients take years to be properly diagnosed. Dysautonomia International, a non-profit organization that advocates on behalf of patients living with dysautonomia, encourages communities to deepen their understanding and be mindful of this challenging condition especially during Dysautonomia Awareness Month each October.

The tireless efforts of the dysautonomia community to increase research and accessible services will be recognized on Sunday, October 1 in my Congressional District as the color turquoise will bathe Niagara Falls and the Peace Bridge in the light of care, concern and continuing the fight to improve the lives of individuals living with this chronic condition.

Currently, Dysautonomia International is funding research to develop more substantial treatments to help patients get diagnosed and treated earlier, save lives, foster support for individuals and families and hopefully find a cure for all forms of this condition in the future.

It is imperative that we also recognize the contributions of the professional medical community, patients, family members and advocates who are working to educate our citizenry about dysautonomia throughout Western New York. They are deserving of our gratitude, recognition, respect and greater understanding.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize Dysautonomia Awareness Month. I ask that my colleagues join me in support for those suffering from the devastating medical condition and encourage them to spread awareness across our nation throughout and beyond the month of October.

HONORING DORTHA SCOTT

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of Dortha Scott of Mount Ida, Arkansas. Ms. Scott may not be a household name across America, but chances are each American has held a piece of her art. Fifteen years ago, former Gov. Mike Huckabee selected Ms. Scott's design for the quarter honoring Arkansas' admission to the Union as the 25th state. Her design, recognizing the Fourth Congressional District's Crater of Diamonds State Park, along with some of our state's most recognized icons including a stalk of rice, forests, and a mallard duck, showcased the best of the Natural State. In all, more than 457 million Arkansas state quarters were minted, a wonderful honor for a talented

Arkansan. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. Scott for her vision, her talent, and her dedication to Arkansas.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SARCOXIE HIGH SCHOOL ARCHERY TEAM

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Sarcoxie High School archery team on their recent victory in the National Archery in the Schools Program (NASP) tournament in which they were named national champions.

The NASP tournament was held in Louisville, Kentucky. The tournament had almost 15,000 young archers competing from 670 different schools. Missouri alone had 857 student archers from 45 different schools.

Sarcoxie's team won the national championship and broke a few records in the process. Sarcoxie is also the smallest school to have won this prestigious national championship. This outstanding archery team also set the record for the highest NASP national tournament team score. The team achieved a score of 3,465 out of a possible 3,600. In addition to Sarcoxie's achievements, a total of five Missouri schools were in the top 10 of this competition.

I am honored to recognize the record setting achievements of the Sarcoxie High School archery team. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in wishing the Sarcoxie High School archery team many congratulations and best wishes for the future.

HONORING ANTHONY JAMES ANTONIOU

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anthony James Antoniou of Miller Place, a true American hero, who passed away at 93 years old on September 18, 2017.

Anthony was a highly decorated World War II Paratrooper of the 82nd Airborne Division, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment (PIR), who was a proud Silver Star recipient with two Bronze Star Medals, five Purple Hearts, two Presidential Citations and numerous other European Medals. In addition, Mr. Antoniou received the distinction of Chevalier, or Knight, of the Legion of Honor. He fought in six major campaigns, performed seven river crossings and 4 combat jumps. Additionally, Anthony had the privilege of fighting alongside General (slim Jim) Gavin, who personally decorated him.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony Antoniou is a true American hero of America's greatest generation who said the best time of his life was serving his country. His stories have been shared with his family for years, and I hope

his legacy and love for his country continues to be shared for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING DYSTONIA
AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of September as Dystonia Awareness Month. I also want to express my appreciation to the Farber family—Joel, Harriett and Beth—for their tireless work on behalf of those living with dystonia and those who care for them. Their work with the Dystonia Medical Research Foundation has made important contributions to our awareness of dystonia and the need for greater research, and I am proud to have them as my constituents.

Today at least 300,000 people in North America suffer from dystonia, a neurological movement disorder that causes muscles to contract and spasm involuntarily. Joel and Harriett's daughter Shari—Beth's sister—had dystonia. The Farber family not only advocated for her, they determined that they would advocate on behalf of the entire dystonia community. They reached out to me and so many others to explain what is known about the disease, its impacts, and the need for expanded medical research and support networks. Over the years, they have continued to come to my office and have travelled the country to push for action.

Dystonia affects men, women and children. For most people with dystonia, the cause remains unknown and there is currently no cure. Dystonia is not usually fatal, but it is a chronic disorder producing symptoms that vary in degrees of frequency, intensity, disability, and pain depending on the type of dystonia. The inability to predict or control the movements of the legs, arms, hands, neck, shoulders, face, eyelids, jaw, tongue, or vocal cords has a profound impact on an individual's life.

Dystonia may be inherited or caused by specific factors such as certain medications or traumatic injury, particularly traumatic head/brain injuries. Our men and women in uniform face a disproportionate risk of developing dystonia as a result of injuries sustained during their military service.

The Dystonia Medical Research Foundation, which works to raise awareness of dystonia, is a nationwide organization that has served the community for more than 40 years. The Dystonia Medical Research Foundation provides the dystonia community with support, education, advocacy, and the promotion of research into the causes of and care of dystonia.

I call on my colleagues to recognize the goals and ideals Dystonia Awareness Month by supporting federal activities that improve lives of patients impacted by dystonia including research programs at the National Institutes of Health. We need to improve medical research and we need to make sure that those living with dystonia receive the quality health and caregiving services they deserve.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NUCLEAR
WEAPONS ABOLITION AND ECO-
NOMIC AND ENERGY CONVER-
SION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Nuclear Weapons Abolition and Economic and Energy Conversion Act, a version of which I have introduced since 1994, after working with the District of Columbia residents who were responsible for the Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion ballot initiative passed by D.C. voters in 1993. This version of the bill now requires the United States to immediately begin negotiating an international agreement to disable and dismantle its nuclear weapons, to provide for strict control of fissile material and radioactive waste and to use nuclear-free energy.

The bill continues to provide that the funds used for nuclear weapons programs be redirected to human and infrastructure needs, such as housing, health care, Social Security, restoring the environment and creating carbon-free, nuclear-free energy. This conversion to a peace economy would occur when the President certifies to Congress that all countries possessing nuclear weapons have begun elimination under an international treaty or other legal agreement.

The bill is particularly timely with the ongoing nuclear threat from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Our country still has a long list of urgent domestic needs that have been put on the backburner. As the only nation that has used nuclear weapons in war, and that still possesses the largest nuclear weapons arsenal, I urge support for my bill to help the United States reestablish our moral leadership in the world by redirecting funds that would otherwise go to nuclear weapons to urgent domestic needs.

HONOR THE LIFE OF LESTER
MANDELL

HON. STEPHANIE N. MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Lester Mandell, who transformed countless communities in central Florida though his work as a builder and transformed countless lives through his generosity as a philanthropist. Lester passed away recently at the age of 96, leaving behind a large and loving family, but his legacy will live on.

Born in a hardscrabble Brooklyn neighborhood, and a veteran of World War II, Lester did not graduate from college. However, neither his lack of formal education nor the anti-Semitism he frequently faced could stop Lester from achieving his professional goals, because they were no match for his talent, tenacity and toughness. Lester's life was a quintessentially American story of success earned through hard, disciplined, joyful work.

As one of Lester's grandsons said about his grandfather. "He believed that, if you did things the right way, you would get the right result." This is the essence of character.

Lester was a master builder, in both the literal and figurative sense. The homes, neighborhoods, and public parks he developed throughout central Florida over the course of many decades are his most visible legacy.

Lester also built bonds of a more intangible nature. He donated generously to many causes he cared about, from scholarships for inner-city children to support for the Jewish community he loved so much. Lester often donated anonymously and rarely spoke about his donations, even to his own family.

As his grandson recounts, Lester was a serious man who did serious work, but he did not take himself too seriously. He had a sense of humor and light-heartedness that disarmed friend and stranger alike.

Lester's greatest legacy, of course, is his family. He leaves behind his wife and partner for life, Sonia. They were married for 70 years. Sonia and Lester had four children, eight grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren.

I know they miss Lester. But I hope their loss is eased by the knowledge that Lester was a great man and, even more importantly, a good man.

HONORING FREDERICK
LOCKEHART MAYS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to recognize Mr. Frederick Lockhart (Locke) Mays, a dedicated family man and distinguished member of the community. Locke was born in Columbia, South Carolina, on September 20, 1927 to Elizabeth and Fred Mays. He joined the Marine Corps in 1945, following graduation from Dreher High School. He served 18 months, then joined the reserves as a Sergeant. He was called back up during the Korean Conflict, training at Quantico and in Puerto Rico, although not being sent to Korea. Except for a brief stint in banking, Locke worked in the trucking industry, retiring after selling G&P Trucking Company to Southeastern Freight Lines in the mid-1980s. He now enjoys restoring old Fords to mint condition; with his favorite being a 1935 Phaeton. He has been active in First Presbyterian Church of Columbia for over fifty years, where he serves as an Elder Emeritus. A devoted husband, father, father-in-law and grandfather, Locke celebrated his 90th birthday last Wednesday, September 20th in Columbia, South Carolina, surrounded by his family.

IN RECOGNITION OF STEVE NORTON AND HIS SERVICE AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY STUDIES

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Steve Norton as he leaves the New Hampshire Center for Public Policy Studies after 12 years of remarkable service to begin a new chapter in his life.

As Executive Director of the Center, Steve helped raise new ideas and improve policy debates through quality information and analysis on issues that are shaping New Hampshire's future. In his previous role as director of Medicaid Services for the N.H. Department of Health and Human Services, Steve worked to ensure vulnerable Granite Staters had access to quality, affordable health coverage.

Through his commitment to public service, Steve has helped improve the lives of countless families and communities in need, and his vision has aided in creating a better future for the Granite State and its residents.

On behalf of New Hampshire's Second Congressional District and all those who have benefitted from Steve's work, I thank him for all he has done for our state. I look forward to our continued work together to make New Hampshire be an even better place to live, work, and raise a family.

THE OVERCRIMINALIZATION OF IMPEACHMENT

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following CATO article for the RECORD:

[From CATO.org, Aug. 7, 2017]

(By Gene Healy)

Trying to tamp down impeachment talk earlier this year, House minority leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) insisted that President Donald Trump's erratic behavior didn't justify that remedy: "When and if he breaks the law, that is when something like that would come up."

Normally, there isn't much that Pelosi and Tea Party populist Rep. Dave Brat (R-VA) agree on, but they're on the same page here. In a recent appearance on Trump's favorite morning show, "Fox & Friends," Brat hammered Democrats calling for the president's impeachment: "there's no statute that's been violated," Brat kept insisting: They cannot name the statute!"

Actually, they did: it's "Obstruction of Justice, as defined in 18 U.S.C. §1512(b)(3)," according to Rep. Brad Sherman (D-CA) who introduced an article of impeachment against Trump on July 12. Did Trump break that law when he fired FBI director James Comey over "this Russia thing"? Maybe; maybe not. But even if "no reasonable prosecutor" would bring a charge of obstruction

on the available evidence, that wouldn't mean impeachment is off-limits. Impeachable offenses aren't limited to crimes.

That's a settled point among constitutional scholars: even those, like Cass Sunstein, who take a restrictive view of the scope of "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" recognize that "an impeachable offense, to qualify as such, need not be a crime." University of North Carolina law professor Michael Gerhardt sums up the academic consensus: "The major disagreement is not over whether impeachable offenses should be strictly limited to indictable crimes, but rather over the range of nonindictable offenses on which an impeachment may be based."

In some ways, popular confusion on this point is understandable. Impeachment's structure echoes criminal procedure: "indictment" in the House, trial in the Senate—and the constitutional text, to modern ears, sounds something like "grave felonies, and maybe lesser criminal offenses too."

But "high crimes and misdemeanors," a term of art in British impeachment proceedings for four centuries before the Framers adopted it, was understood to reach a wide range of offenses that, whether or not criminal in nature, indicated behavior incompatible with the nature of the office. For James Madison, impeachment was the "indispensable" remedy for "Incapacity, negligence, or perfidy" on the part of the president—categories of conduct dangerous to the republic, only some of which will also constitute crimes.

The criminal law is designed to punish and deter, but those goals are secondary to impeachment, which aims at removing federal officers unfit for continued service. And where the criminal law deprives the convicted party of liberty, the constitutional penalties for impeachable offenses "shall not extend further than to removal from Office," and possible disqualification from future officeholding. As Justice Joseph Story explained, the remedy "is not so much designed to punish an offender, as to secure the state against gross official misdemeanors. It touches neither his person, nor his property; but simply divests him of his political capacity."

No doubt being ejected from a position of power on the grounds that you're no longer worthy of the public's trust can feel like a punishment. But the mere fact that removal is stigmatizing doesn't suggest that criminal law standards apply. Raoul Berger once illustrated that point with an analogy Donald Trump would probably find insulting: "to the extent that impeachment retains a residual punitive aura, it may be compared to deportation, which is attended by very painful consequences, but which, the Supreme Court held, 'is not a punishment for a crime.'"

Had the Framers restricted impeachment to statutory offenses, they'd have rendered the power a "nullity" from the start. In the early Republic, there were very few federal crimes and certainly not enough to cover the range of misdeeds that would rightly disqualify public officials from continued service.

Criminality wasn't an issue in the first impeachment to result in the removal of a federal officer: the 1804 case of district court judge John Pickering. Pickering's offense was showing up to work drunk and ranting like a maniac in court. He'd committed no crime; instead, he'd revealed himself to be a man "of loose morals and intemperate habits," guilty of "high misdemeanors, disgraceful to his own character as a judge."

As Justice Story noted in 1833, in the impeachment cases since ratification, "no one of the charges has rested upon any statutable misdemeanors." In fact, over our entire constitutional history, fewer than a third of the impeachments approved by the House "have specifically invoked a criminal statute." What's been far more common, according to a comprehensive report by the Nixon-era House Judiciary Committee, are "allegations that the officer has violated his duties or his oath or seriously undermined public confidence in his ability to perform his official functions."

The president's violation of a particular criminal statute can serve as evidence of unfitness, but not all such violations do. That's obvious when one considers the enormous growth of the federal criminal code in recent decades. Overcriminalization may have reached the point where Donald Trump, like everyone else, is potentially guilty of "Three Felonies a Day," but even in Lawrence Tribe's wildest imaginings, that wouldn't translate to three impeachable offenses daily. If Trump were to import crocodile feet in opaque containers, fill an (expansively defined) wetland on one of his golf courses, or misappropriate the likeness of "Smokey Bear" he'd have broken the law, but would not have committed an impeachable offense.

It's also easy enough to imagine a president behaving in a fashion that violates no law, but nonetheless justifies his removal. To borrow an example from the legal scholar Charles Black, if the president proposed to do his job remotely so he could "move to Saudi Arabia [and] have four wives" (as well as his very own glowing orb), he couldn't be prosecuted for it. Still, Black asks: "is it possible that such gross and wanton neglect of duty could not be grounds for impeachment?"

A more plausible impeachment scenario presented itself recently, with reports that President Trump had "asked his advisers about his power to pardon aides, family members and even himself" in connection with the special counsel's Russia investigation. The president's power to self-pardon is an open question, but his power to pardon others has few limits. There's little doubt Trump could issue broad prospective pardons for Don Jr., Jared Kushner, Paul Manafort, Mike Flynn, and anyone else who might end up in the Mueller's crosshairs—and it would be perfectly legal. It would also be impeachable, as James Madison suggested at the Virginia Ratifying Convention: "if the President be connected, in any suspicious manner, with any person, and there be grounds to believe he will shelter him, the House of Representatives can impeach him; [and he can be removed] if found guilty."

Some years ago, I put together a collection of essays on the expansion of the criminal sanction into areas of American life where it doesn't belong—published under the title, *Go Directly to Jail: The Criminalization of Almost Everything*. The idea that criminal law concepts had infected and weakened the constitutional remedy of impeachment wasn't quite what I had in mind with that subtitle, but it seems to fit.

Congress has made the problem worse by outsourcing its investigative responsibilities to the executive branch. As Princeton's Keith Whittington observes in a recent essay for the Niskanen Center "relying so heavily on prosecutors to develop the underlying charges supporting impeachment has come at a high cost . . . it has created the widespread impression that the impeachment

power can only appropriately be used when criminal offenses have been proven.”

It's important to get this straight, because confusing impeachment with a criminal process can be harmful to our political health. It may lead us to stretch the criminal law to “get” the president or his associates, warping its future application to ordinary citizens. And it can leave the country saddled with a dangerously unfit president whose contempt for the rule of law is apparent, even if he hasn't yet committed a crime.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI MARINE LANCE CORPORAL (LCPL) JOSHUA SCOTT OSE

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen Mississippi Marine Lance Corporal (LCpl) Joshua Scott Ose who gave his life while in service to our nation on September 20, 2010, during Operation Enduring Freedom. LCpl Ose was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 8th Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force.

LCpl Ose was killed by enemy gunfire while conducting combat operations in Musa Qala, Helmand Province, Afghanistan. The day after LCpl Ose's death was announced, a United States flag was flown over the U.S. Capitol in his honor. That same day, flags were flown at half-staff in his hometown of Hernando, Mississippi.

LCpl Ose enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps during his senior year at Hernando High School. He graduated in 2009. Sissy Fernandez Ose, LCpl Ose's mother, said her son began talking about serving in the military when he was in the sixth grade. “That was all he wanted to do,” Mrs. Ose said. “It was his choice. He was very proud.”

Reverend Robert A. Hatcher, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Hernando, delivered the eulogy at the funeral which was held at the Trinity Baptist Church in Southaven. According to the Associated Press, Rev. Hatcher praised LCpl Ose for his service. “Josh was fighting to keep terrorism away from American soil,” Rev. Hatcher said. “Some may question the philosophy of war, but do not question this young man's desire to put an end to terrorism. He did not shirk his duty to fight for America.”

Lee Caldwell, a family friend, said LCpl Ose set a great example for others to follow. “He was an exemplary young man,” Mrs. Caldwell said. “He paid the ultimate sacrifice. We will never forget him and all those who have fought for our country as he did.”

Retired U.S. Marine Corps Reserve Colonel (Col) John Caldwell was asked by the family to escort LCpl Ose's body from Dover Air Force Base to the First Presbyterian Church of Hernando where a visitation was held. Col Caldwell said LCpl Ose was a true hero. “He epitomized what it was to be a Marine,” Col Caldwell said. “He wanted to represent his country and fight. He and Marines like him are true heroes. We need to remember them every day. We need to remember them for paying the ultimate price.”

In 2011, the Mississippi State Legislature passed House Concurrent Resolution No. 49. The resolution commended LCpl Ose for his service. It further stated that LCpl Ose is counted among Mississippi and America heroes who committed to our nation's safety and security.

LCpl Ose is survived by his parents, Ross and Sissy Fernandez Ose, grandparents, Earl and Darlene Ose; aunts and uncles, Brenda and John Conrad, Sherry and Scott Fernandez, Dr. Dennis and Dr. Wendy Ose, and Paul and Sarah Ose.

LCpl Ose will always be remembered for his sacrifice to protect America.

125TH ANNIVERSARY ALLEGHENY COUNTY ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS, DIVISION 17

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Allegheny County Ancient Order of Hibernians Division 17, which is currently celebrating its 125th anniversary as a pillar of Irish-American heritage and charitable service in the Pittsburgh region.

The AOH has its roots in the efforts by the Tudor Kings and Queens of England to impose greater control over the Irish. These efforts affected most aspects of life, from language and religion to law and politics to land ownership—and even clothing. Secret societies formed to protect Irish Catholics from government excesses and extrajudicial violence.

Faced with centuries of English oppression, as well as a series of crop failures, many Irish emigrated in search of better opportunities. A great many came to America, but found they were forced to confront the same anti-Catholic prejudice that they had faced back home. In response to this discrimination, Irish Americans began forming fraternal organizations to combat anti-Irish prejudice, support each other, and keep their culture and religion alive. In May 1836, the first and largest of these groups, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, was founded simultaneously in New York City and Pottsville, Pennsylvania.

Through the rest of the nineteenth century, the AOH grew significantly, opening its first division in Allegheny County in 1859. Allegheny County Division 17 was established in 1892. During this time, in addition to working to preserve Irish culture, AOH members did their best to embody the Hibernian motto of “Friendship, Unity, and Christian Charity.” The Hibernians taught civics and English classes to help new Irish immigrants become citizens, and they provided much needed social programs to care for the sick and needy in their communities. At the same time, they worked to confront and eradicate harmful anti-Irish stereotypes.

Since then, the AOH's ranks have included notable actors, generals, and even a President of the United States—John F. Kennedy. All the while, the organization has continued its

mission to preserve Irish Americans' connection with their ancestral homeland and to care for the needy in their communities. For 125 years, Allegheny County Division 17 has been actively involved in this mission. Division 17 Hibernians donate time and money to three local parishes each Christmas, as well as food banks in Braddock, and a number of other charitable organizations, including Rosaries for the Troops, St. Vincent de Paul, and the Sisters of Charity. They have also endeavored to preserve their Irish heritage and lobbied the Pennsylvania state government to support Irish independence.

Today, the AOH stands as a testament to the tenacity of the Irish people, a celebration of our culture, and a monument to a people who helped build this country. I'm proud to be of Irish ancestry—and to be a member of Allegheny County Division 17 of the AOH. As we commemorate the AOH's legacy of faith and perseverance in the face of adversity, let us also take inspiration from its story and recognize the responsibility each of us shares to help make our nation as welcoming a land as our ancestors dreamed it would be.

I would like to congratulate Allegheny County Division 17 of the Ancient Order of Hibernians on the occasion of their 125th anniversary, I commend them for their service to the community, and I wish them the best in the years to come. Ireland Forever (Erin go Bragh).

CONGRATULATIONS TO DR. TRICIA DERGES

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Tricia Derges of Springfield, Missouri, on her recent winning of two prestigious awards.

Dr. Derges has been a resident of the Springfield area for 40 years and during this time she has contributed to the community in many ways. Dr. Derges has recently won both the National Jefferson Award for Southwest Missouri and the Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis Award. Both of these awards recognize individuals for their public service. The Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis Award is only awarded to five individuals per year across the United States. This clearly highlights the significant work Dr. Derges has taken over the years to help her community.

Dr. Derges set up the mission clinic named Lift Up in Springfield. This clinic provides a range of medical, dental and mental health services to veterans and the poor across Springfield. Dr. Derges and her clinic have helped thousands of people in the Springfield area.

I am truly honored to recognize the work by Dr. Derges and her dedication to improving the lives of others. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Derges on her recent awards and wishing her all the best.

IN RECOGNITION OF WESTERN
MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY RENAMING
RESIDENCE HALLS IN
HONOR OF DISTINGUISHED
ALUMNI

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of Western Michigan University recognizing a lifetime of work by three leaders who bonded in college and remained friends through life, by naming two residence halls within the Western Heights complex Hall-Archer-Pickard West and East. These dormitories are being renamed in celebration of three legendary Western Michigan graduates, and their legacy will inspire generations of university students to come.

Ronald Hall Sr., Dennis Archer, and William Pickard attended Western Michigan University in the 1960s and enjoyed membership in Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, America's first intercollegiate African-American fraternity. The three men's undergraduate experience at Western Michigan University instilled a desire to give back to the greater Michigan community and invest in meaningful educational and social change throughout the state. Hall, Archer, and Pickard are remembered for the close, meaningful friendship they cultivated at Western Michigan and their passion to make change after graduating.

After graduating from Western Michigan University, the three men remained in Michigan to influence change to the community they love. Ronald Hall Sr. served as president of the Michigan Minority Business Development Council and founded Bridgewater Interiors, LLC. He passed away in May 2016, and is remembered for turning Michigan's Minority Business Development Council into one of the country's lead minority business organizations. Dennis Archer served as Mayor of Detroit from 1994 to 2001, and has served as president of the American Bar Association and on the Michigan Supreme Court. William Pickard is an executive member of the NAACP Detroit Branch, and is the founder of the Michigan-based Global Automotive Alliance. Their post-graduate work has impacted countless lives and opened doors wider for students of color, and their friendship is a testament to the meaningful bonds forged during college.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Western Michigan University and their three distinguished alumni, Ronald Hall Sr., Dennis Archer, and William Pickard. Their influence and community engagement will make a difference for decades to come.

URGING CONGRESS TO ADDRESS
EPIDEMIC OF VETERAN SUICIDE

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I work

to ensure that our service members receive all the resources they need when they volunteer to defend the United States. But it is important that Congress not only provides them with support during their service, but in the years after they faithfully executed their duties as a member of the Armed Services. That is why I rise today to address the epidemic of veteran suicide in our country.

September is recognized as "National Suicide Awareness Month" and currently our veterans are suffering from a substantially higher rate of suicide than the general population. According to a 2014 report by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), 20 veterans take their lives every day, a rate that is 150 percent greater than the general population. Although the VA has dedicated a significant amount of effort and resources to address veteran suicide, the fact remains that of the 20 average veteran suicides that occur on a daily basis, 14 were not utilizing VA services. As the 2016 VA report "Suicide Among Veterans and Other Americans" explains, up to 22 percent of Post-9/11 veterans have depression disorders, and up to 43 percent of all struggle with symptoms of mental health issues, such as drinking excessively, smoking, and/or sleeplessness. In addition, female veterans and those living in rural areas face a higher risk of suicide and we must address the barriers to care for these populations.

It is clear that we must extend more resources to help our veterans and prevent the unnecessary loss of life. The VA's 2016 study and upgrading crisis hotlines are steps in the right direction, fully addressing veteran suicide remains a complex issue that will require a multi-faceted approach. But their suffering does not have to continue and we must reverse the trend of veteran suicide.

Raising awareness about the issue begins in Congress, but every day citizens can also join in the effort year-round. Moreover, the effort to raise awareness about veteran suicide will have benefits across our society as a whole, contributing to the de-stigmatization of mental health issues. It is no secret that the stigma surrounding mental health prevents many veterans from obtaining care for these issues, forcing our country's heroes and heroines to suffer in silence. De-stigmatizing mental health care is critical to open up dialogue about a pervasive issue and provides opportunities for treatment and prevention of suicide. In addition, Congress must provide the VA with additional resources so that they better serve the female and rural veteran population with child care services and extensions of specialized care to remote, rural areas. We must continue to support innovation within the VA so that the agency will be more willing to embrace new approaches to treatment, such as canine service animals, art and outdoor therapies.

It goes without saying that we owe our veterans a tremendous debt for their service to our nation in defense of the freedoms we all enjoy. In return, we must care for them as a demonstration of our nation's core values. Raising awareness of the suicide epidemic and de-stigmatizing care throughout society, in addition to embracing innovative modes of therapy and furthering the VA's outreach will go a long way to honoring the service of vet-

erans' to our nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring that we address the veteran suicide epidemic immediately.

HONORING HOMETOWN
NEWSPAPERS

HON. KRISTI L. NOEM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, in honor of National Newspaper Week, I rise today to recognize the 126 individual news organizations of South Dakota.

Living in the information age, data is constantly at our fingertips. It is the local newspaper, though, that tells the story of everyday America and documents community history in a way that will forever be available to future generations. The local news reminds us that the world is made of neighborhoods and shared experiences, that love of country still exists, and that diversity of opinion truly makes our country great.

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press must ever be protected, for it is only through a free system that democracy can thrive. As Thomas Jefferson said, "our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking local journalists, particularly those serving South Dakota, for giving a voice to the individual and cultivating the road to free speech for all.

INDIAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITY
FIGHTS HURRICANE HARVEY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since Hurricane Harvey hit our area last month, stories of Harvey Heroes continue to bring our community together and make us grateful for the incredible people that we call neighbors. There are many uplifting stories of those who grabbed their personal boats and set out in the waters to rescue individuals, many of whom they did not know. Our first responders answered the call time and time again. And so did so many people whose names we may never know. For all of them, we thank them from the bottom of our hearts.

So many people have opened their homes, their hearts, and their wallets to help Houston recover. One such community was the Indian-American community right in the greater Houston area. They have already raised over \$1.6 million dollars. 700 Indian-American volunteers have dedicated more than 24,000 hours to their city, and together, they have distributed over 28,000 meals to our neighbors in need.

One specific story I would like to highlight is that of a group of Indian-Americans, led by Houstonian, Jiten Agrawal, made their way through the unparalleled flooding after the Hurricane to reach a student apartment complex near my alma mater, the University of

Houston, that had been flooded and was without power. The president of the Indian graduate students' organization, Ravi Shankar, reached out to the community to help, and help is what they gave. These volunteer rescuers brought food and water to over 180 students and helped transport them back to their families or a safe location.

We are grateful to these volunteers, some of the many Harvey Heroes, for helping Houstonians get through a very difficult time. They are just one of the reasons why we are Houston Strong.

And that's just the way it is.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 28, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 3

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of John Marshall Mitnick, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Wells Fargo one year later.

SD-538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine international tax reform.

SD-215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the Every Student Succeeds Act, focusing on unleashing State innovation.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Administration's decision to end Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

SH-216

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine tax reform and entrepreneurship.

LHOB-1100

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the status of energy storage technologies, reviewing today's technologies, and understanding innovation in tomorrow's technologies.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Energy

To hold hearings to examine S. 186, to amend the Federal Power Act to provide that any inaction by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that allows a rate change to go into effect shall be treated as an order by the Commission for purposes of rehearing and court review, S. 1059, to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 relating to the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado, S. 1337, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to make certain strategic energy infrastructure projects eligible for certain loan guarantees, S. 1457, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out demonstration projects relating to advanced nuclear reactor technologies to support domestic energy needs, S. 1799, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to facilitate the commercialization of energy and related technologies developed at Department of Energy facilities with promising commercial potential, and S. 1860 and H.R. 1109, bills to amend section 203 of the Federal Power Act.

SD-366

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine combating kleptocracy with incorporation transparency.

SD-562

OCTOBER 4

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Equifax cybersecurity breach.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SH-216

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael Dourson, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, and Matthew Z. Leopold, of Florida, David Ross, of Wisconsin, and William L. Wehrum, of Delaware, each to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 146, to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, S. 1847, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure that the

needs of children are considered in homeland security, trafficking, and disaster recovery planning, S. 1281, to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, S. 1769, to require a new or updated Federal website that is intended for use by the public to be mobile friendly, S. 1305, to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with adequate flexibility in its employment authorities, S. 1791, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, S. 708, to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, H.R. 3210, to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, H.R. 70, to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, an original bill entitled, "TSA LEAP Pay Reform Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Direct Hire of Students and Recent Graduates Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Temporary and Term Appointments Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Voluntary Separation Incentive Payment Adjustment Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act", and the nomination of John Marshall Mitnick, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stephanos Bibas, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Liles Clifton Burke, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Michael Joseph Juneau, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, Tilman Eugene Self III, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, and John C. Demers, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Indian gaming, focusing on new issues and opportunities for success in the next 30 years.

SH-216

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law

To hold hearings to examine Equifax, focusing on continuing to monitor data-broker cybersecurity.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs		South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and David G. Zatezalo, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, both of the Department of Labor, and Peter B. Robb, of Vermont, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.		OCTOBER 18	
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Melissa Sue Glynn, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Enterprise Integration), Cheryl L. Mason, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and Randy Reeves, of Mississippi, to be Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs.		SD-430		10 a.m.	
SR-418		OCTOBER 5		Committee on the Judiciary	
3 p.m.		10 a.m.		To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice.	
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions		Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions		SH-216	
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Cheryl Marie Stanton, of		To hold hearings to examine the Federal response to the opioid crisis.		OCTOBER 25	
		SD-430		9:30 a.m.	
				Committee on Armed Services	
				Subcommittee on SeaPower	
				To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing naval forces and the Navy's current and planned capabilities to meet those threats.	
				SVC-217	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 28, 2017

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

PRAYER

Dr. J. Todd Mullins, Christ Fellowship Church, Palm Beach Gardens, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thank You for hearing our prayers today. We are humbled that today, as we call out to You, You listen to us. We ask that You bless the Members of Congress as they lead our great Nation. Grant them wisdom for the decisions they face, and may we remain dependent upon You, never forgetting Psalm 33:12 that says, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

We pray for those in Texas, in Florida, in Puerto Rico, and in the Caribbean, who are recovering from the devastating hurricanes. Give them peace and courage as they rebuild their lives. Bless the first responders and those serving the people impacted by these storms. Grant them Your strength for their assignments.

Guide our President. Give him clear vision to steer our Nation during these troubled days, and grant strength to the Members of this House as they represent the people across our land.

We ask this in the name of our Savior, Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING PASTOR J. TODD MULLINS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today especially pleased to have had my personal pastor, Todd Mullins, give our opening prayer this morning to the House of Representatives.

I am honored to welcome Pastor Mullins onto the floor of the House of Representatives as our guest chaplain this morning, and I thank him for sharing those very important words with our colleagues and that scripture as well.

Todd Mullins is the senior pastor of Christ Fellowship in Palm Beach Gardens, Florida, where he served since his father founded the church in 1984.

I can say a great deal about my friend, Pastor Todd Mullins, but the most important thing that I could say about him is that he is a man of God, and that he works every single day to try to help and change lives.

I think that is the most important thing any one of us can do. That is why I am so proud to call him a friend. He is a person who has devoted his life to working on the lives of others.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMER). The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SNAP: 40 YEARS OF PROVIDING NUTRITION TO AMERICANS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 40th anniversary of the Food Stamp Act of 1977, which was a landmark bill that

made the program more effective and more efficient.

Today, we no longer refer to it as food stamps, but as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. In 40 years, there have been numerous changes and updates, but the goal remains the same: to end hunger in America.

SNAP lessens the effects of poverty on some of our most vulnerable citizens. The results are proven. According to the Census Bureau, SNAP lifted 5 million Americans, including 2.2 million children, out of poverty in 2012 alone. SNAP generates \$1.80 in economic activity for every \$1 in new SNAP benefits.

In 2013, SNAP payment accuracy was 96.8 percent, which was a historic high. Participating in SNAP for 6 months decreased food insecurity up to 10 percent, including households with children.

Mr. Speaker, for over four decades, the program has become more effective, more efficient, and more modern. I look forward to continuing our work to improve SNAP, to serve those in need, and to provide pathways out of poverty.

SUPPORT THE DREAM ACT

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in calling for a vote on H.R. 3440, the clean Dream Act, a bipartisan, bicameral bill with 200 cosponsors in the House.

It builds upon the great success of DACA, which opened the door for nearly 800,000 DREAMers who had come forward, passed background checks, and have been granted permission to live and work legally in America without fear of deportation.

They kept their promise to the Nation they know and love, and our government must honor its commitment to protect them. The faith community and business leaders are imploring Congress to pass the Dream Act. Polling shows that the American people strongly believe and support the DREAMers. Eighty-six percent of Americans support a right to residency for undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children, according to a recent ABC News/Washington Post poll.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud nation of many immigrants from around the world, the Dream Act honors our history and our heritage. I thank my Republican colleagues who have signed

on, and I urge all others to join us. It is the right thing to do for our young people, especially our country. Support H.R. 3440, the Dream Act.

RECOGNIZING HOPE THAT BINDS

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hope That Binds, an organization based out of Carlisle County, Kentucky, that aids in domestic and international adoption services.

The organization was recently recognized as a 2017 Angels in Adoption honoree. Wendy Davis-Wilson, Jeff and Benita Davis, and Brooke Kelly have all dedicated their time to bridging the gaps in the complicated adoption processing. Wendy and Brandon, adoptive parents themselves, have a sincere passion for ensuring resources are available for families wishing to adopt.

Through Hope That Binds, a network of loving families is growing and expanding constantly. To date, more than 40 families have been assisted through the organization's fundraisers and grant programs.

In addition, I would like to recognize Josh and Mandy Thurman, who were also selected as Angels in Adoption honorees. After a 2-year adoption process starting in 2013, the Thurmans brought their son, Townes, home to Simpson County from Ethiopia. Families like the Davises and Thurmans make a major difference in the lives of children who need loving families.

On behalf of the First District of Kentucky, I congratulate both families in their efforts to make the dream of a family a reality for children in need.

ZERO MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, here we are 9 months into the year, and the Republican-led Congress has zero major legislative accomplishments to show for it. While Democrats continue to offer an agenda that gives Americans a better deal, really a better life, Republicans are continually obsessed with their Republican healthcare bill, this repeal and replace.

Recently, they have had to pull back again from their Graham-Cassidy approach to this. Why? Because it means less care, less coverage, higher premiums, higher copays. It is bad policy. We ought to be focusing on what we need to do to make it right to fix the problems we see in healthcare, not this obsession to check a political box and repeal healthcare for the American people.

Meanwhile, there is no infrastructure plan. America's roads and bridges are

falling apart. There is nothing on the floor of the House to address that—something the American people all agree we need to do. There has been nothing done to make sure that 800,000 DREAMers are not deported away.

They have a tax plan that rewards 5,400 American families with a quarter of a trillion dollars in tax breaks. This is the wrong direction for America.

RECOGNIZING BICENTENNIAL OF PETERSBURG, INDIANA

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a notable Hoosier milestone, the bicentennial of the city of Petersburg, Indiana. Located in Pike County, this southern Indiana community was settled on land donated by Peter Brenton in 1817, and was established just 1 year later after Indiana had become a State.

From its earliest days as a pioneer settlement near the Buffalo Trace and the White River, Petersburg is today a vibrant commercial and residential community and the seat of the county government. Blessed with an abundance of natural resources, it is a leader in Indiana's power generation industry.

While rightfully proud of its favorite son, baseball great Gil Hodges, Petersburg is squarely focused on a promising future. It boasts wonderful, new downtown housing, a new county public library, and just dedicated its new fire department. It looks forward to exciting development opportunities along I-69.

I proudly salute the city of Petersburg; its mayor, R.C. Klipsch; and its loyal citizens on this historic occasion.

SENIOR PROTECTION BILL

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of bipartisan, commonsense legislation to help protect our seniors from elder abuse, fraud, and neglect. The Senior Citizen Protection Act would create a national registry of convicted elder abusers that accredited healthcare providers, and the public could check before hiring employees who will work with seniors.

While some States already have created elder abuse registries, there is currently no nationally searchable database of the State-level data. As our population ages, the problem of those who seek to take advantage of vulnerable seniors continues to grow.

Families deserve the peace of mind that their parents and loved ones will receive the best possible care at senior

facilities and nursing homes from qualified staff.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) on this senior protection legislation; and I urge them to continue to support Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid programs that millions of seniors depend on to live out their retirement years with dignity and security.

RECOGNIZING MIDDLETOWN POLICE OFFICER MEGAN FREER

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, over the course of several weeks this summer, our Nation focused on my district as the tragic news of missing teenagers led the news.

My heart goes out to the families of those boys and our entire community touched by this tragedy. In that darkness, we saw the best of our community shine through: neighbors in prayer; local businesses engaged in investigation efforts; and through it all, the commitment and the dedication of our local law enforcement officers.

One such officer, Middletown Township Police Officer Megan Freer, was recently recognized at the National Liberty Museum in Philadelphia for her investigatory work. Middletown Police Chief Joe Bartorilla noted well: Megan exemplifies our law enforcement who are committed to doing the very best job they can, day in and day out to protect and safeguard our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Officer Freer and the entire law enforcement community in Bucks County, to include District Attorney Matt Weintraub, who committed to this investigation. Through their efforts, our community can begin to heal from this terrible tragedy that we suffered.

□ 0915

HEALTHCARE CRISIS

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, we are here, almost 10 months into this congressional session, and what has been accomplished? While TrumpCare supporters have gone back and forth on a plan that would take healthcare away from millions of Americans, raise out-of-pocket costs for people with pre-existing conditions, and force too many rural hospitals to close their doors, they have completely missed a real healthcare crisis that is coming tomorrow. That is when Federal funding runs out for thousands of community health clinics and for millions of low-income

children and for pregnant women across our country.

For years, community health clinics and the Children's Health Insurance Program have enjoyed strong bipartisan support from both sides of the aisle here.

So why aren't we voting to protect these critical programs right now? Mr. Speaker, we were sent here to help the hardworking families that we serve and offer them a better deal. Now that the TrumpCare package has thankfully failed again, I hope we can start doing that.

SUPPORTING DACA

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the decision to end DACA goes against the very core of our American values of the American Dream. The future of 800,000 young people who study, serve in our military, and contribute to our economy, and who serve and protect America is at risk.

DREAMers are understandably worried, anxious, depressed, petrified, and terrified about what will happen 6 months from now.

DREAMers like Juan in my district who was brought here at a young age is a medical student and wants nothing more than to be a doctor and save lives—even your life. For Juan and nearly 1 million DREAMers like him, we must act. That is why I have joined House and Senate leaders to demand a vote on the bipartisan Dream Act.

Mr. Speaker, put politics aside and bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote as soon as possible.

Rather than ending the DACA program and tearing families apart, instead, let's work together toward comprehensive immigration reform that will secure our Nation's borders, keep our citizens safe, help our economy, and fix our immigration system.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

HURRICANES HARVEY, IRMA, AND MARIA EDUCATION RELIEF ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S.

1866) to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1866

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. ALLOCATION AND USE OF CAMPUS-BASED HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFECTED AREA.—The term "affected area" means an area for which the President declared a major disaster or an emergency under section 401 or 501, respectively, of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191) as a result of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, Hurricane Maria, Tropical Storm Harvey, Tropical Storm Irma, or Tropical Storm Maria.

(2) AFFECTED STUDENT.—The term "affected student" means an individual who has applied for or received student financial assistance under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), and who—

(A) was enrolled or accepted for enrollment on August 25, 2017, at an institution of higher education that is located in an affected area;

(B) is a dependent student who was enrolled or accepted for enrollment on August 25, 2017, at an institution of higher education that is not located in an affected area, but whose parent or parents resided or was employed on August 25, 2017, in an affected area; or

(C) suffered direct economic hardship as a direct result of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, Hurricane Maria, Tropical Storm Harvey, Tropical Storm Irma, or Tropical Storm Maria, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(b) WAIVERS.—

(1) WAIVER OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding sections 413C(a)(2) and 443(b)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b-2(a)(2) and 1087-53(b)(5)), with respect to funds made available for award years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018—

(A) in the case of an institution of higher education that is located in an affected area, the Secretary shall waive the requirement that a participating institution of higher education provide a non-Federal share to match Federal funds provided to the institution for the programs authorized pursuant to subpart 3 of part A and part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b et seq. and 1087-51 et seq.); and

(B) in the case of an institution of higher education that is not located in an affected area but has enrolled or accepted for enroll-

ment any affected students, the Secretary may waive the non-Federal share requirement described in subparagraph (A) after considering the institution's student population and existing resources.

(2) WAIVER OF REALLOCATION RULES.—

(A) AUTHORITY TO REALLOCATE.—Notwithstanding sections 413D(d) and 442(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b-3(d) and 1087-52(d)), the Secretary shall—

(i) reallocate any funds returned under such section 413D or 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 that were allocated to institutions of higher education for award year 2016-2017 to an institution of higher education that is eligible under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) waive the allocation reduction for award year 2018-2019 for an institution of higher education that is eligible under subparagraph (B) returning more than 10 percent of its allocation under such section 413D or 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for award year 2017-2018.

(B) INSTITUTIONS ELIGIBLE FOR REALLOCATION.—An institution of higher education is eligible under this subparagraph if the institution—

(i) participates in the program for which excess allocations are being reallocated; and

(ii)(I) is located in an affected area; or

(II) has enrolled or accepted for enrollment any affected students in award year 2017-2018.

(C) BASIS OF REALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall—

(i) determine the manner in which excess allocations will be reallocated pursuant to this paragraph; and

(ii) give preference in making reallocations to the needs of institutions of higher education located in an affected area.

(D) ADDITIONAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary may waive or modify any statutory or regulatory provision relating to the reallocation of excess allocations under subpart 3 of part A or part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b et seq. and 1087-51 et seq.) in order to ensure that assistance is received by institutions of higher education that are eligible under subparagraph (B).

(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS DATE EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(A) any funds available to the Secretary under sections 413A and 441 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b and 1087-51) for which the period of availability would otherwise expire on September 30, 2017, shall be available for obligation by the Secretary until September 30, 2018, for the purposes of the programs authorized pursuant to subpart 3 of part A and part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b et seq. and 1087-51 et seq.); and

(B) the Secretary may recall any funds allocated to an institution of higher education for award year 2016-2017 under section 413D or 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070b-3 and 1087-52), that, if not returned to the Secretary as excess allocations pursuant to either of those sections, would otherwise lapse on September 30, 2017, and reallocate those funds in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).

(c) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—This section is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (title I of Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee

on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives information on—

(1) the total volume of assistance received by each eligible institution of higher education under subsection (b)(2); and

(2) the total volume of the non-Federal share waived for each institution of higher education under subsection (b)(1).

(e) SUNSET.—The provisions of subsection (b) shall cease to be effective on September 30, 2018.

SEC. 3. PROJECT SERV AND EQUITABLE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND TEACHERS IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

Section 8501(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7881(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and”;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:“(F) section 4631, with regard to Project SERV.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1866.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1866, the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, September has been a difficult month for many students and families in areas such as Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, and even my State of Georgia, just to name a few.

We have all seen the truly saddening images of families who have been impacted by the likes of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, and now we must come together as a nation to help our fellow Americans recover from these life-changing storms.

These storms have left many Americans with questions on how to continue living their daily lives as they try to return to a sense of normalcy, and students are no exception. Hundreds of thousands of students have been impacted by these storms, and the Federal Government must be ready to address the needs of students, as well as their institutions of learning, so that their education may continue.

The Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017 allows the Department of Education, as well as other Federal entities, to use the emergency tools at their disposal to immediately assist students im-

pacted by the storms of this past month without the need of additional appropriations from Congress.

First, the bill equips the Department of Education with temporary authority to waive certain rules governing campus-based aid programs for those institutions impacted by recent hurricanes.

Second, the legislation ensures students and teachers at private schools receive services under the Project SERV grant program. This program helps school districts and institutions of higher education reestablish a safe learning environment after a violent or traumatic crisis. The program has issued grants to school districts, State educational agencies, and institutions of higher education after natural disasters, including Superstorm Sandy. These funds have helped reopen schools or, in some cases, provided resources to operate a school at an alternative site while the original site is being repaired.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has the power to use its resources to help students and families return to a sense of normalcy after these terrible storms, and we should do everything within our authority to help students remain on a pathway to success even in the aftermath of these storms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support S. 1866, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1866, but I also stand concerned about the humanitarian crisis going on in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands in the wake of Hurricane Maria and also the other hurricanes that have been in the area.

More than 3.4 million people reside in Puerto Rico alone—U.S. citizens who are in need of full support of the Federal Government. This is more than the population of Wyoming, Vermont, North Dakota, and Alaska combined—U.S. citizens, yet they have no voting Members of Congress.

U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands serve in our military. In fact, Puerto Ricans serve in our military at a rate twice the general U.S. population, and they are hurting. They are fighting to survive, and they are in desperate need of food, clean water, medical supplies, and security.

Hurricane Maria essentially wiped out ports, roads, electricity, communications, water supply, crops, and many homes. Today, 97 percent of Puerto Rico's residents are still without power, and 40 percent do not have access to clean drinking water. So Americans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are now homeless, displaced, and without food, water, fuel, and medication.

Congress and this administration have an obligation to act swiftly and to

act boldly to ease the suffering of our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. This bill, the Hurricane Relief Act, is well-intentioned and a good starting point.

But make no mistake, the limited flexibility offered to those affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria in this bill will be helpful, but the bill does not go far enough to provide the kind of relief that is needed in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

These Americans do not have voting representation in Congress that allows their representatives to most effectively advocate on their behalf. Therefore, it is incumbent on all of us to stand shoulder to shoulder with our fellow citizens and provide them with the support that they desperately need.

This is a life-and-death situation, and any further delay for aid will lead to unnecessary tragedy. So I urge this body to bring a full emergency supplemental bill to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to a vote. The citizens affected by the hurricane are running out of time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we pass the bill, but, after we pass it, get right to work on a full relief bill for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that this legislation does not call for additional appropriations on the part of Congress and provides the Department of Education with limited authority to act until it has sufficiently assisted the students and families of these impacted regions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation for the people impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of S. 1866, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1866.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL UNLAWFUL FUGITIVE FELONS ACT OF 2017

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 533, I call up the bill (H.R. 2792) to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 533, the

amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2792

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. REVISIONS TO PROVISIONS LIMITING PAYMENT OF BENEFITS TO FUGITIVE FELONS UNDER TITLE XVI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.

(a) **FUGITIVE FELON WARRANT REQUIREMENT.**—Section 1611(e)(4)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(e)(4)(A)(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking “fleeing to avoid” and inserting “the subject of an arrest warrant for the purpose of”;

(2) by striking “the place from which the person flees” the first place it appears and inserting “the jurisdiction issuing the warrant”; and

(3) by striking “the place from which the person flees” the second place it appears and inserting “the jurisdiction”.

(b) **PROBATION AND PAROLE WARRANT REQUIREMENT.**—Section 1611(e)(4)(A)(ii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(e)(4)(A)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) the subject of an arrest warrant for violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law.”

(c) **DISCLOSURE.**—Section 1611(e)(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(e)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking “any recipient of” and inserting “any individual who is a recipient of (or would be such a recipient but for the application of paragraph (4)(A))”; and

(2) by striking “the recipient” each place it appears and inserting “the individual”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to benefits payable for months that begin on or after January 1, 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2792, the Control of Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017. In 1996, Congress and President Clinton worked together to reform welfare and reignite the American Dream for families in need.

Aligned with this goal was a provision prohibiting a range of welfare benefits—including Supplemental Security

Income—to fugitive felons and violators of probation and parole because safety net programs need to be protected from abuse so they can remain in place for those individuals who need them.

Individuals who evade justice violate the social contract that grants them this safety net. Simply put, it is incoherent and self-defeating that a nation of laws would pay a wanted person and prolong their flight from justice. Unfortunately, due to a number of factors involving the courts, these provisions have been watered down in recent years and rendered ineffectual.

Through the CUFF Act, Congress can stand up, once again, on behalf of our communities and affirm what every participant in our society should understand: if you have an outstanding warrant for your arrest, you have an obligation to face justice or clear your name.

This legislation not only stops benefits from going to those who are not following the law, but it also helps law enforcement apprehend those suspects. A 2007 report by SSA’s inspector general found that this policy aided law enforcement in apprehending almost 60,000 individuals who were evading arrest for outstanding warrants. In fact, law enforcement thinks this policy is so effective that the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs’ Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs’ Association have expressed support for the CUFF Act.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that this commonsense bill is endorsed by law enforcement and has a proven track record of success, I anticipate that my colleagues across the aisle may try to convince you otherwise.

I have heard many of their arguments when the Ways and Means Committee considered this bill and when the Rules Committee also considered this bill.

So let’s take each of those concerns in turn.

Some may say that this is an old, failed policy.

In reality, this policy has a long track record of success. In 2015, the Social Security inspector general said, at a hearing, that this bill would stop hundreds of millions of dollars in payments to individuals with felony warrants.

Some may say this bill targets people with outdated warrants.

In reality, SSA already has a wide authority to exempt individuals if the alleged offense is nonviolent and not drug related.

□ 0930

Some may say that this bill would throw beneficiaries off the rolls with no warning. In reality, the SSA provides beneficiaries advance notice of 35 days before suspending SSI benefits, and there is a robust appeal process for

recipients who have had their benefits suspended.

Some may say that this policy is burdensome to law enforcement. In reality, this bill is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs’ Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs’ Association because it helps them do their job to locate individuals.

Finally, some may raise concerns that it targets minority populations caught up in overcriminalization or overly harsh sentencing. To those concerns, I say that these issues are absolutely important, and I look forward to us having those conversations about criminal justice reforms here in Congress. However, that conversation is outside the scope of the legislation that we have before us today.

My legislation does not speak to the content of a warrant, just the fact that one exists. The decision to grant a warrant is made by a judge in a court of law, not by the Social Security Administration. It should not be the duty of the American taxpayer to subsidize individuals who are wanted by the police.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, if an individual has an outstanding warrant, it must be addressed and cleared. This bill does nothing to change that.

Under my bill, nobody will lose their SSI benefits because of misdemeanor offenses such as merely having a parking ticket, petty theft, or even driving under the influence. This bill stops payments to individuals who have outstanding warrants for felonies. These are crimes like murder, rape, and kidnapping. It also stops payments to individuals with probation and parole violations, limiting their ability to evade arrest.

Supplemental Security Income is a lifeline to those who are in need. We must ensure we are not further facilitating criminal activity in communities that are all too often already struggling.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time that we are spending to consider this important legislation, and I appreciate the opportunity to stand in support of my bill today.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my mother used to say: Right is right if nobody is right, and wrong is wrong if everybody is wrong. H.R. 2792 is wrong. It is cruel. It is discriminatory.

I strongly oppose this Republican effort to strip low-income seniors and those with severe disabilities of Supplemental Security Income benefits, or SSI. I join in opposition with over 110 civil rights, disability, and aging advocates who have warned that H.R. 2792’s harsh cuts will discriminate based on age, race, ethnicity, ability, income, and will further criminalize poverty.

I also strongly oppose the majority's decision to condition the reauthorization of our successful home visiting program on this bill's harm to the elderly and infirm.

SSI is only available to people who are elderly, who are severely disabled, and who have little or no assets. The typical SSI recipient lives on less than \$750 a month. So, by design, H.R. 2792, will only harm very poor, elderly, and disabled people. Within the population of adult recipients of SSI, approximately 83 percent are disabled, one-third are age 65 and older, and two-thirds are age 50 and older.

I reject proponents' claims that this bill will only target fugitive felons. In reality, current law terminates benefits for fugitive felons. This bill strikes the current restriction against fugitive felons and, instead, expands the benefit cutoff beyond those who are actually fleeing and encompasses everybody who had some unresolved run-in with the justice system based on allegation, not conviction.

I reject proponents' claim that only individuals charged with violent crimes or costly financial theft are affected by this bill. By undermining the constitutional presumption of innocence and depriving individuals of due process adjudication in a court of law, H.R. 2792 magnifies the deep inequities in our criminal justice system based on race, ethnicity, and income.

As an African-American man, I am very familiar with the decades of research documenting the racial-ethnic discrimination in our justice system. As an advocate for criminal justice reform, I know the dozens of studies documenting the faulty criminal justice data system on which benefit terminations will pivot solely because this bill removes due process by adjudication.

I reject proponents' claim that no one who has a misdemeanor or minor offense will be harmed. No uniform threshold for a felony exists. Indeed, four States—Florida, Massachusetts, Virginia, and New Jersey—have the lowest thresholds in the country, defining felonies as losses of \$300 or less, which is vastly different than the \$2,500 threshold set in Texas and Wisconsin. This bill cuts off an elderly or disabled person's lifeline benefits for a decades-old offense of \$300.

Also, we know that courts across the country are criminalizing poverty and raising revenue with fines and fees. Individuals on probation for misdemeanor offenses like vagrancy, shoplifting, and traffic violations get probation and fines or fees. When poor people can't pay these fees, arrest warrants are issued for a violation of their probation. As in the past, H.R. 2792 clearly terminates SSI benefits for such alleged violations without any due process.

I urge my colleagues to do what they know is right: stand up for our most

vulnerable citizens, honor their most fundamental rights, and oppose H.R. 2792.

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

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters of support. One is from the over 330,000 members of the National Fraternal Order of Police, and the other is from the National Sheriffs' Association.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2017.

Hon. KRISTI L. NOEM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. SAMUEL R. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES NOEM AND JOHNSON: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 2792, the "Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons (CUFF) Act."

In August 1996, President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act into law, which restricted the eligibility of fugitive felons, and probation and parole violators for Social Security benefits. The Social Security Administration's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) reported that this law has contributed to over 59,000 arrests since the inception of the program in 1996.

However, three different court decisions have eroded the law's effectiveness and the original intent of Congress, allowing fugitives to continue to collect benefits while on the run. This legislation will restore the original intent of the law by prohibiting an individual who is the subject of an outstanding arrest warrant for a felony or parole violation from receiving Social Security benefits.

The legislation will apply only to felony charges and amend the Social Security Act to make clear that the suspension of benefits is not just in cases of "escape, flight to avoid prosecution, or confinement, and flight-escape." The American taxpayer should not be forced to support those who are evading justice.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, thank you for your support for law enforcement. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or Jim Pasco, my Senior Advisor, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, June 20, 2017.

Hon. DAVE REICHERT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Trade, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN REICHERT: On behalf of the National Sheriffs' Association, I write today to endorse H.R. 2792, the "Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons (CUFF) Act." Too often, criminal felons receive federal benefits they are not entitled to collect. We believe this clarifying legislation will help remediate this recurring problem and strike the right balance.

The bill does a number of important things including: amending the Social Security Act to prohibit an individual who is the subject of an outstanding arrest warrant for a felony or parole violation from receiving Social Security Benefits; restoring the original intent

of the 1996 law, revising current law to discontinue benefits for individuals who are "the subject of an arrest warrant . . ." compared to the previous language of "fleeing to avoid" arrest, which was the main legal challenge; and applying only to felony charges, or a crime carrying a minimum term of one or more years in prison. This policy does not intend to punish individuals convicted of misdemeanors, such as outstanding parking tickets, as some have alleged.

Like you, I believe this is a commonsense bill that will give more Americans piece of mind in knowing that tax dollars aren't supporting criminal activity through continued benefits to those breaking the law. I applaud your efforts on this issue and look forward to working with you to ensure the passage of this key legislation.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN F. THOMPSON,
Executive Director and CEO.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is all about Republicans refusing to pay for an important public service that they know works. It is about their meager 6 percent solution, where they decline to extend services that empower families, that support young children and their parents, to extend that to the other 94 percent of eligible Americans, despite the fact that there is evidence-based indication that these services perform so well, and in one area, helped to prevent child abuse. It is about their refusal to respond in a fiscally responsible manner to support this program, despite what their own experts say about the effectiveness of the program.

So, instead of providing a reliable source of necessary funding for public services, Republicans insist upon being willing to remove life-sustaining resources from some of our country's most vulnerable citizens. It is really a punitive, mean-spirited effort to demonize the poor.

Let's look at who will be hurt by this retread proposal, because they tried this a few years ago and it was rejected.

SSI, or Supplemental Security Income, is an initiative to help some of our most disadvantaged Americans. The SSI program pays modest cash benefits that can be obtained only by, essentially, showing that you have got nothing—well, not exactly nothing. You can have total assets other than your home of \$2,000. You can't have more than \$735 a month in income. If you are younger than 65, you must be disabled, perhaps a victim of cancer, chronic heart failure, or blindness. There is strict enforcement of these standards, with over 70 percent of those who apply being denied.

What kind of person will they finance this child abuse prevention program

from? Well, the 50-year-old man who had an arrest warrant—this is a true case—that had been issued when he failed to show up for court.

Why did he do that? Shouldn't he be punished?

Well, it turns out he was in a coma at the time that the arrest warrant was issued. He was unable to breathe without a long plastic tube surgically inserted in his throat and connected to an oxygen tank on his wheelchair. By the time his case was resolved before a judge, the medical supply company was taking away the breathing equipment.

Or Rosa Martinez, who got confused with another Rosa Martinez, and she had to go to court even though she wasn't the person being accused.

Each of these people and so many others, like those suffering from dementia in a nursing home and who may never have been convicted of anything, are the type of people from whom they will take resources in order to fund a necessary program.

Republicans on our committee are so motivated by their rigid ideology that they would not even permit a discussion with our staff of how to move forward on this initiative unless we committed to funding every dollar by taking it away from some other vital social service program within our committee's jurisdiction.

It ought not be necessary to rob Paula in order to provide valuable services to little Pauline. Even when they know how much is at stake, such as child abuse and disadvantaged children, and even when we have a way to address those problems and prevent that abuse, they won't add a single dollar of additional revenue.

Mr. DAVIS and I offered a variety of different ways to pay for this program and to actually see it serve more than 6 percent of eligible people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. You don't have to raise taxes. For one of those different ways, just enforce our current law. If someone receives an alimony payment, require documentation so they will know and the IRS will know that that money is due. That will raise a significant amount of money that would fund much of this reauthorization.

But because they are so opposed to adding a dollar to serve even an effective program, they take from the person with dementia at the nursing home. It is wrong. It demonizes people who deserve to be treated fairly.

We should reject this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify exactly what this legislation does.

This legislation will take SSI benefits from individuals and stop those

payments to those who have felony arrest warrants or who have violated their probation and parole.

I want to go through the process so that everybody recognizes that there is plenty of time for individuals to go through the appeal process. Notice is given if there is a warrant that they need to get rectified with the jurisdiction that has authority. So let me step through this process.

Step one is through the Office of Inspector General. Law enforcement agencies give OIG information about individuals who have outstanding felony arrest warrants or who are violating conditions of probation or parole.

Then OIG compares this information to its computer files of individuals receiving these dollars or serving as representative payees. If there is a match, OIG verifies the identity of the individual, ensures that the warrants for the individual are still active, works with local law enforcement to attempt to locate the person, and then OIG refers the cases to SSA to begin the suspension process.

When this process gets to the Social Security Administration, SSA sends an advance notice to the individual. This notice proposes the suspension of benefit payments and informs the individual of their right to appeal the suspension decision, payment continuation, and the timeframe to take such actions after receiving the advance notice.

□ 0945

This notice includes why the SSA is suspending benefits and where, why, and when the warrant was issued. If SSA finds out, through a data match, 35 days is given for the individual to protest. If the individual protests, SSA will not suspend benefits until it figures out if the individual qualifies for a good cause exception. If the individual does not appeal his or her advance notice, then the SSA will suspend the benefits.

If the individual does appeal and gives his or her advance notice and provides evidence for the payment continuation, the SSA verifies the evidence and then continues the payments.

Other things that we should know about this legislation and what this includes is that warrants may only be resolved in the issuing jurisdiction. Grounds for dismissal of a warrant include identity theft, administrative error, and the individual's own move from the jurisdiction, especially if low income.

Warrants for misdemeanors remain warrants for misdemeanors and cannot become felonies. There is also latitude for the Commissioner to make decisions in special areas where there may be something to be considered, such as dementia or low-income abilities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been thoroughly vetted. We are making sure that the only people who are denied their SSI benefits are those who have felony warrants for their arrest or have violated probation or parole and have not gotten straight with law enforcement and rectified that past infraction.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), an icon for human rights.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. For many years, I have been a proud member to serve on the Ways and Means Committee, the oldest committee in the U.S. Congress. Our committee has a responsibility to put people before politics. We have a commitment to act in the best interest of all, not just a select few. Most importantly, we have a duty to protect and preserve the United States Constitution.

Today, Mr. Speaker, it hurts my soul that our committee will pass a bill that attacks the constitutional principle that you are innocent until proven guilty.

Where is the reason? Where is the compassion? What is the purpose? How can you gamble with the livelihood of those who are most in need? How can we punish the sick, the disabled, and the elderly? How can we pass a bill that targets Latinos, African Americans, and Native Americans? Mr. Speaker, how can you rob Peter to pay Paul?

Mr. Speaker, I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote "no" on this mean and spiteful bill. It should never have seen the light of day. The American people deserve better, much better. We can do better. This bill should not be on the floor of the House. It is not worthy of the paper that it is written on.

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

Mr. Speaker, I live in the State of South Dakota. I have some of the poorest counties in the Nation in my State, and they happen to be my Native American Tribes. They face 80 to 90 percent unemployment, poverty like no other place in the country, and they are isolated. They also have very high drug and crime rates.

In fact, we have seen a record number of murders in these communities, especially on the Pine Ridge Reservation, in this calendar year, and it is deeply discouraging and disheartening to me to think of someone who could have committed a murder in one of my communities in the State of South Dakota, that there is a felony warrant out for their arrest, and that we may not be able to find them. This bill will fix that situation.

If that individual is receiving SSI payments, that helps law enforcement

locate those individuals who have gone out and committed crimes against innocent people. Rape, murder, kidnapping, they all happen in my Native American Tribes, and this helps law enforcement find them and bring them to justice. It is one of the important things that this legislation will help us do in some of our most vulnerable communities.

I also recognize that the previous speaker talked about the fact that we need criminal justice reforms, and that is a very good debate that we should be having in Congress. But this is not the bill to talk about criminal justice reforms because this is not germane to the discussion that we are having today.

I wanted to speak for a minute on what is good cause because there is latitude for good cause within statute today, and I think there is some confusion as to exactly how this bill would be interpreted when it is signed into law.

In some cases, the SSI will not suspend or seek an overpayment of payments for good cause exceptions. There are two types of good cause exceptions that already exist in statute. The mandatory good cause exception is the SSA cannot suspend payments if a court has found an individual not guilty or has dismissed charges. If a court has vacated the warrant or issued any similar exoneration, then they cannot suspend payments. They also cannot suspend payments if there is a mistaken identity due to identity fraud.

The other exception in statute today is discretionary good cause exceptions. The SSA may suspend benefits for mitigating circumstances under two options:

Option A is the individual must prove that the criminal offense was non-violent and not drug related. We also have that the individual has not been convicted of a felony crime since the warrant was issued, and the other point is that the law enforcement agency that issued the warrant reports that it will not act on the warrant. That is other exceptions for good cause.

Option B, the individual must prove all of these factors: if the criminal offense was nonviolent and not drug related; the individual has not been convicted of a felony crime since the warrant was issued; the warrant is the existing warrant and was issued 10 or more years ago and the individual lacks the mental capacity to resolve the warrant, which includes those living in a nursing home or mental treatment facility.

So as we have listened to opponents of this bill talk, they have discussed all of these issues as to how these benefits could be taken away from individuals that are clearly covered by good cause exceptions that are already in statute, and those situations are not relevant to the debate that we are having today.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, MIECHV Program is an effective evidence-based program that I am proud to support because I know it results in healthier families and stronger communities, but I am shocked at the way Republicans are choosing to pay for it.

Instead of enacting commonsense tax changes that could easily raise the needed revenue, Republicans have reached to the bottom of the barrel to find vulnerable people to harm.

In order to come up with a way to pay for this important bipartisan program, they are choosing to take Supplemental Security Income away from vulnerable seniors, low-income individuals, or those with disabilities; and they are doing it by maligning them as fugitives and felons just because they have an outstanding warrant. But the truth is a very different story.

The people who will be hurt by this bill are not hardened criminals. They haven't even had their day in court yet. In fact, many may not even know about the warrant because the police have decided that it is not worth pursuing. That is because the warrants are for small issues like writing a bad check or failing to appear for a hearing many years ago.

Worse, these individuals are elderly, poor, or sick. They deserve support and help, not to be treated as a piggybank. Actually, piggybanks generally indicate savings. This is a policy equivalent of reaching into a couch cushion for change. We are talking about individuals who have a warrant from when they were a teenager or somebody with a mental illness who may not even remember the incident in question. This is cruel and unbecoming of this Congress.

I know because we have tried this before. The last time this penalty was used, it meant catastrophe for very low-income people with disabilities and for seniors. It hurt people like J.H., a Californian with an intellectual disability and other mental impairments. J.H. had his SSI benefits stopped because of an Ohio warrant issued when he was 12 years old and running away to escape an abusive stepfather. This 4-foot-7-inch-tall, 85-pound boy was charged with assault for kicking a staff member at a detention center where he was being held until his mother could pick him up. Many years later, he had no recollection of the incident or the charges, but his SSI benefits were stopped nonetheless.

Is that really how we want to pay for home visitations: Impoverishing one person to help another?

That is why I worked to curb this bill's negative effects, by offering

amendments that would protect those with dementia or keep it from increasing homelessness. Unfortunately, Republicans rejected both my amendments on a party line basis, so now we are stuck with this overly broad punitive bill that I cannot support.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers should not be subsidizing those who have felony warrants for their arrest or violating parole and probation.

I wanted to remind everyone today that in 1996, the same provision was amended into other programs that we have at the Federal Government level. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—cash welfare—has these same provisions included in that program.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—SNAP or food stamps—has these same provisions in the program. Housing programs, such as public housing, Section 8 vouchers, project-based Section 8, all have these same provisions in that program.

In addition, there are similar provisions added to Social Security disability and retirement programs, and the Department of Veterans Affairs benefits has this same provision that we are putting back into statute today when it comes to SSI payments.

Mr. Speaker, you can clearly see that this is bringing this program up to the same level of accountability to taxpayers and not subsidizing those who commit crimes against innocent individuals, and is an entirely appropriate debate here today.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from South Dakota has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792, the hopelessly misnamed Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act.

As has become sadly routine in this Chamber under Republican rule, this bill considers those merely accused of a crime as if they were convicted felons without bothering with little niceties like due process. Having dispensed with basic constitutional protections, the bill then cuts off vital government assistance to some of the most vulnerable people in our society.

Under current law, the Social Security Administration helps law enforcement track down individuals with an outstanding arrest warrant for an alleged felony or an alleged violation of

probation or parole. Those who are actively fleeing law enforcement can also have their Supplemental Security Income, or SSI, benefits terminated. Under this bill, however, SSI benefits, which serve as a lifeline for low-income seniors and people with disabilities, would be terminated, whether or not people are actually attempting to evade justice.

The mere issuance of a warrant or an alleged parole violation with no arrest, no trial, and no conviction would be enough to cut off vital benefits to the neediest among us. This is not just unconstitutional, it is inhumane. The bill would ensure that many low-income seniors and people with disabilities will lose their benefits unfairly and unnecessarily.

The vast majority of people affected by this bill have outstanding warrants that law enforcement chooses not to bother serving, often because they are for very old or minor offenses. Many people do not even know that an arrest warrant has been issued for them, but this bill would consider them as felons fleeing justice.

Many warrants are issued on the basis of mistaken identity, inaccuracies, or paperwork errors. It can take months to resolve such errors, which might involve traveling to a distant jurisdiction, hiring an attorney, and working through an overloaded court system.

And supporters of this bill expect people living on less than \$750 a month to do all of this: to go to a different jurisdiction, to hire an attorney, to do all of this while the benefits they rely on to subsist are cut off?

That is outrageous.

□ 1000

We heard from the gentlewoman from South Dakota about various exceptions to the bill, you can go through this process and that process. With what attorney? With what money? Does this bill have an appropriation in it to supply attorneys for people faced with this cutoff, people who, by definition, are the poorest people, who can't afford an attorney?

This legislation is a blatant violation of due process, and it will cause untold suffering to the people who need our help the most. At a time when Republicans are unveiling their proposal for massive tax cuts for the wealthy, this bill is a shameful illustration of the majority's priorities.

It is also a shameful illustration of something we have seen on this floor too often, and that is the assumption that anyone accused of something is guilty and that we don't have to bother with a trial, we don't have to bother with proof, and we don't have to bother with due process. That eviscerates much of the reason for the existence of this country, to vindicate due process, to give people rights and not to assume

that anyone who a judge or someone thinks may have committed a crime is automatically guilty. We believe in due process in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this bill's defeat.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources. I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2792 and to thank the gentlewoman from South Dakota for her tremendous effort on this piece of legislation.

This is a good bill which improves existing law and sends an important message: taxpayers should not provide benefits to individuals wanted by the police under outstanding warrants or parole violations for felonies or other serious crimes. Let me say that again. This improves existing, actually, bipartisan law, and it is not a new concept. It only applies to individuals with outstanding warrants for serious crimes.

The bill provides 4 years for the Social Security Administration to implement this law and to ensure benefits are not unfairly or improperly discontinued.

It also provides a process under which SSA notifies beneficiaries of issues with an outstanding warrant or parole violation and provides time for them to address the concern with law enforcement.

In addition, SSA is empowered to provide compassionate allowances for those with serious disabilities or medical concerns who are unable to clear their warrant in a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a narrow bill which protects both law-abiding beneficiaries and taxpayers. It is important that we have these funds to help the needy families who are benefiting from the MIECHV program, the home visitation program, a unique Federal program that actually shows that it makes a positive difference in the lives of young people and young families.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we look at the entire issue in a fiscally responsible way, where we have the funds through this bill to pay for the needs among needy families across America.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding and for his tireless leadership for families everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2792, the so-called Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act. This cruel and misguided bill would terminate Supplemental Security Income benefits for vulnerable seniors and people with disabilities who have an outstanding warrant.

Let me be clear. This is a horrible bill. It is mean-spirited and it is unfair.

Despite this bill's misleading title, Americans who would be harmed by this bill are not felons and they are not fugitives.

In reality, this bill would rip benefits from individuals who haven't been arrested, tried, or even convicted. They have only been accused. This violates the basic principle of innocent until proven guilty, and it would terminate benefits without due process.

What is worse, most of these outstanding warrants are decades old and involve minor infractions when people are unable to pay for court fines and fees. This is awful.

This bill criminalizes families living in poverty, and it disproportionately harms communities of color. One in five SSI recipients are African Americans. Without this critical program, believe you me, African Americans will struggle even more.

Make no mistake; cutting off SSI benefits would put all families at risk of being unable to keep a roof over their heads, put food on the table, and meet other basic needs. And for what? To pay for the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program.

We know that this is an important program and helps millions of struggling families, but we cannot afford to rob Peter to pay Paul. Lives are at risk here. This is as sinister as it gets.

Taking an ax to these lifesaving benefits is cruel and heartless. That is why 120 civil rights, disability, and retirement organizations oppose this, including the NAACP, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the National Council of Churches, and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this should really be a wake-up call to this Chamber to defeat this bill immediately. Instead of ramming through a bill that would push more people into poverty, we should be working to create good-paying jobs and expand opportunities for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this mean-spirited and heartless bill.

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

I just want to remind everyone that the bill we are debating here today would suspend SSI benefits for those who have felony warrants for their arrest and those who have violated probation or parole. That is the discussion that we are having here today. And let's go back over, in summary, what the policy actually does and says.

This policy should not be thought of in isolation. This is part of a larger effort to reauthorize the evidence-based,

outcome-focused Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program.

H.R. 2824, which passed this Chamber on Tuesday, will be joined with this bill upon passage. It helps to improve the lives of families in at-risk communities, focusing on the first years of a child's life.

Unlike most Federal social programs, MIECHV funding is tied to real results, which ensures limited taxpayer dollars are actually delivering the intended results and helping those that are most in need.

Under current law, the program is 100 percent federally funded, but H.R. 2824 introduces a Federal match similar to what States must already do in other social programs, such as foster care, Medicaid, child support enforcement, childcare, and others. The rest of the package ensures this program remains a shining example of evidence-based policy by expecting the program to continue to demonstrate effective outcomes. That reauthorization is fully offset by the bill that we are considering here today, H.R. 2792.

Instead of focusing on our Nation's debt, we should be doing more of what we are doing right here in these bills: prioritizing Federal spending and focusing on what works by improving the integrity of one program to provide funding for another.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding and the gentlewoman from South Dakota for managing this bill.

The crux of this bill, however, is, again, to support and fund the multi-trillion-dollar tax cuts that have just been introduced, that will give millions, if not billions, if not trillions, to the richest of Americans, and that is a very sad commentary.

I oppose the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act because it is not that. It will terminate essential benefits for poor people, deprive poor people of due process, and increase mass incarceration.

If the Rules Committee had simply taken my amendment, it would have remedied these criminal justice defects, which struck the arrest warrant language because it recklessly targets vulnerable people. This bill deprives citizens of due process, particularly where many poor individuals are completely unaware of a pending warrant.

Let me be very clear. What you have is a situation where you may have a mentally ill individual in a nursing home who now has a warrant that they are not aware of. You will then cut off their benefits.

What does that do to those families.

Prohibiting SSI payments to individuals with an outstanding warrant or parole or probation violation without due process is simply inhumane. This bill would terminate those benefits from very low-income seniors and people with disabilities. They may not even know that they have these warrants.

Now, I am a strong supporter of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program, and I tell you that the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee had an amendment to pay for a 5-year reauthorization of that program, doubling the funding, by closing a tax loophole. They were not allowed to even vote on that amendment.

What does that say? This is a conspiracy.

There are 110 organizations that are against this, including the Alliance for Retired Americans, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Hand in Hand: The Domestic Employers Network, and the Coalition on Human Needs.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a document with the names of all of these organizations.

JUNE 26, 2017.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the 119 undersigned organizations, we urge you to oppose efforts to cut Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to offset the costs of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV program).

H.R. 2824 would reauthorize the MIECHV program, which funds voluntary, evidence-based home visiting programs for at-risk pregnant women and parents with young children up to kindergarten entry. The current MIECHV program has demonstrated beneficial outcomes associated with improved maternal and child health, including increased access to screening and early intervention for childhood disabilities.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2824 proposes to pay to extend this valuable maternal and child home visiting program by cutting off SSI entirely for certain adolescents and adults with disabilities, as well as seniors.

H.R. 2824 would revive an old, failed policy that had catastrophic effects for many people with disabilities and seniors, employing procedures that did not withstand judicial scrutiny. The Social Security Act currently prohibits SSI payments to individuals fleeing from law enforcement to avoid prosecution or imprisonment. The existing system is already working to ensure that those who shouldn't be paid SSI benefits don't receive them.

The proposed cut, Section 201 of H.R. 2824, would bar payment of SSI benefits to people with an outstanding arrest warrant for an alleged felony or for an alleged violation of probation or parole. Most of the warrants in question are decades old and involve minor infractions, including warrants routinely issued when a person was unable to pay a fine or court fee, or a probation supervision fee.

Based on prior experience with SSA's failed former policy, the people who would be affected are those whose cases are inactive and whom law enforcement is not pursuing. Many people are not even aware that a war-

rant was issued for them, as warrants are often not served on the individual. A very high percentage of people who would lose benefits have mental illness or intellectual disability. Many are unaware of the violation, may not have understood the terms of parole or probation, or may have other misunderstandings about their case.

Warrant databases are notoriously inaccurate. Fourteen percent of the arrest warrants processed by the federal Warrant Information Network in 2004 were later dismissed by the court or returned unexecuted. The state of Alabama, even with an audit mechanism in place, reported a 13% error rate in its arrest warrant databases. Due to these kinds of inaccuracies, some people will have their SSI benefits cut off as a result of mistaken identity, or paperwork errors, which can take months or even years to resolve.

When this failed policy was previously implemented by SSA, many of those who had their benefits cut off had no arrest warrant outstanding against them. For example, Rosa Martinez, the lead plaintiff in *Martinez v. Astrue* was, in 2008, a 52-year old woman who received notice from SSA that she was losing her disability benefits because of a 1980 arrest warrant for a drug offense in Miami, Florida. Ms. Martinez had never been to Miami, never been arrested, never used illegal drugs, and is eight inches shorter than the person described in the warrant. Despite an obvious case of mistaken identity, Ms. Martinez was left without her sole source of income. It was only after filing a lawsuit in federal court that Ms. Martinez was able to have her benefits restored.

Resolving outstanding warrants can be very difficult and costly. People often must go before a judge in the issuing jurisdiction, and typically need counsel to assist them in navigating the process. Often, people have moved in the intervening years and live far away from the issuing jurisdiction. The proposed offset would cut off all SSI income. Losing this income will cause many people to become homeless and unable to meet their basic needs, much less resolve a warrant, a case of mistaken identity, or an error in the warrant database. Completely cutting off SSI benefits will leave people with little recourse to resolve an outstanding warrant, representing a step backward in bipartisan efforts towards criminal justice reform.

By relying on databases of outstanding arrest warrants, this proposal seeks to punish people by presuming their guilt, undermining the presumption of innocence that is the bedrock of our criminal justice system. The existence of an arrest warrant does not establish that any criminal conduct has occurred. Many arrests do not result in criminal charges, or the charges are eventually dismissed. Even if an individual is charged and subsequently prosecuted, he or she is presumed innocent until proven guilty.

The proposed offset also will have a disproportionate impact on people of color. People who are on probation are particularly susceptible to having an outstanding arrest warrant. Parolees and probationers are disproportionately people of color—in 2015, 13% of adults on probation were Hispanic, and 30% of adults on probation were African American.

Finally, the proposed offset could harm some of the very same children who we seek to help through home visiting. In any given month, approximately 2.7 million children are estimated to live with a family member who is a senior or adult with a disability who receives SSI. These children's families are overwhelmingly the same types of families

served by the MIECHV program: over 3 in 5 families with a SSI recipient age 18 or older have a total family income below 150% of the federal poverty level, and SSI makes up on average about 40 percent of these families' income. Cutting off SSI income would put families at risk of being unable to keep a roof over their heads, put food on the table, and meet other basic needs—including children's and mothers' health needs.

H.R. 2824 would also harm Social Security beneficiaries—since over half of SSI recipients who are elderly, and almost one-third of SSI recipients with disabilities, are Social Security beneficiaries.

In closing, we reiterate that although the MIECHV program has demonstrated beneficial outcomes, and reauthorization must be a priority, it should not come at the expense of cuts to SSI, which would harm seniors, adolescents and adults with disabilities, and their families, and should not be raided as a pay-for for an unrelated program. We urge the U.S. Congress to reject any proposals to offset the costs of reauthorizing the MIECHV program by cutting SSI benefits.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

AFL-CIO; AFSCME; Aging Life Care Association; Alliance for Children's Rights; Alliance for Retired Americans; American Academy of Pediatrics; American Psychological Association; Association of Jewish Aging Services; Association of University Centers on Disabilities; Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Center for American Progress; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Coalition on Human Needs; Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Social Security Task Force; Defending Rights and Dissent; Easterseals; Economic Policy Institute Policy Center; FedCURE; FORGE, Inc.; Gray Panthers.

Hand in Hand: The Domestic Employers Network; Harm Reduction Coalition; Institute for Science and Human Values; Justice in Aging; Justice Strategies; Latinos for a Secure Retirement; Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; League of United Latin American Citizens; Legal Services for Prisoners with Children; Lutheran Services in America Disability Network; NAACP; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; National Alliance on Mental Illness; National Association of Disability Representatives; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare; National Council of Churches; National Disability Rights Network.

National Employment Law Project; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Organization for Women; National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives (NOSSCR); National Women's Law Center; Paralyzed Veterans of America; People Demanding Action; PolicyWorks, Inc.; Polio Survivors Association; Prison CONversation; Rainbow PUSH Coalition; Resources for Independent Living; Root & Rebound; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Service Employees International Union; Social Security Works; StoptheDrugWar.org; The Arc of the United States; Union for Reform Judaism.

STATE/LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

2-1-1 California; ABD Productions/Skywatchers; ADAPT Montana; Alameda County Community Food Bank; Berkeley Food Network; BNICEH (Black Network in Children's Emotional Health); California As-

sociation of Food Banks; California Association of Public Authorities for In-Home Supportive Services; California Church IMPACT; California Council of the Blind; California Food Policy Advocates; California In-Home Supportive Services Consumer Alliance; California Office of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman; California OneCare; California Partnership; Californians for Disability Rights, Inc.; Californians for SSI; Center for Independence of the Disabled, NY; Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations; Columbia Legal Services.

Community Legal Services of Philadelphia; Community Service Society of New York; Communities Actively Living Independent & Free; Disability Law Center, Massachusetts; Disability Law Center, Utah; Disability Policy Consortium of Massachusetts; Disability Rights California; Disability Rights Idaho; Disability Rights New Jersey; Disability Rights North Carolina; Disability Rights Wisconsin; Empire Justice Center; Friends In Deed; GetTogether Adult Day Health Care Center; Homeboy Industries; Hunger Action Los Angeles; IMPRUE (Independent Movement of Paratransit Riders for Unity, Vehicles, Equality); Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles; Kentucky Protection and Advocacy; Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County.

Legal Council for Health Justice; Little Tokyo Service Center; MFY Legal Services, Inc.; National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter; Northern California ADAPT; Ohio Association of Local Reentry Coalitions; Personal Assistance Services Council; Public Counsel; PUEBLO People United For a Better Life in Oakland; Pushing Limits Radio (KPFA); Rubicon Programs; San Francisco Senior & Disability Action; Senior and Disabled Fund of San Bernardino County; Senior Services Coalition of Alameda County; Sonoma County Homeless Action; St. Anthony Foundation; St. Mary's Center; UC Hastings Community Justice Clinics' Individual Representation Clinic; Urban Justice Center; Western Center on Law and Poverty.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In addition, let me share with you the reality of this: Rosa Martinez. Yes, the Social Security Administration was doing this before, but they had to stop it.

We are now reigniting it because Rosa Martinez filed a suit in 2008. She was a 52-year-old disabled woman from Redwood, California, who received a notice from SSA last December that she was losing her only source of income, her disability benefits, because of a 1980 arrest warrant for a drug offense in Miami, Florida.

Ms. Martinez has never been to Miami, has never been arrested, and has never used illegal drugs. In addition, she is 8 inches shorter than the Rosa Martinez identified in the warrant.

Do you want this random, reckless cutting off of SSI benefits because of misidentification? Identity theft is rampant. So this bill is failed, it is a failure, and it has a number of Achilles' heels that will not work.

The bill will also increase mass incarceration. We should allow law enforcement to do their job. I don't mind giving them the tools that they need, but I refuse to allow individuals to suffer because of this very abusive bill.

I kneeled on this floor because of injustice. This is a bill that is full of injustices.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792.

I oppose this bill for the following reasons: SSI is a needs-based program for people with limited income and resources.

It will terminate essential benefits of poor people.

It will deprive poor people of due process.

It will increase mass incarceration.

My amendment would have remedied these criminal justice defects in H.R. 2792, which struck the arrest warrant language because (1) it recklessly targets vulnerable and innocent individuals; (2) this bill deprives citizens of due process, particularly where many poor individuals are completely unaware of any pending warrant, and (3) there have been cases in which warrants were either decades old or, in many instances, it was a matter of a mistaken identity.

The bill amends the Social Security Act (SSA) to make certain revisions that limit payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the (SSA), by prohibiting Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments to individuals with an outstanding felony warrant or parole or probation violation.

"Almost none of the individuals who would be affected by this provision are actual fugitives from justice and most of the warrants in question are many years old and involve minor infractions," the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities said in a letter to Senators who tried to implement this policy.

This bill is merely a continuation of President Trump's \$1.7 trillion budget cuts of programs designed to help the millions of poor and low-income families that need these programs for survival.

Plainly stated, this bill will terminate SSI benefits of very low-income seniors and people with disabilities, because SSI is granted based on financial need.

In creating this bill, the sponsors essentially agree that it is best to incarcerate economically vulnerable people in order to fund the Maternal Infant Early Childhood Home Visiting program (MIECHV).

As the Center for Law and Social Policy, a nonprofit group focused on low-income Americans, previously reported of the Trump's budget scheme, this bill would likewise, create an overall assault on a wide range of ordinary Americans for the purpose of providing tax cuts to the wealthiest.

My Democratic colleagues on Ways and Means offered amendments to fully pay for a 5-year reauthorization of the MIECHV program and doubling the funding by closing a tax loophole called the "stretch IRA". Republicans however, would not let my colleagues vote on those amendments.

My amendment and those of my colleagues would have made this bad bill a lot more palatable.

Instead, the Republicans have chosen, once again, to lock people up, and do so in a manner that deprives poor people of their sole source of income, while purporting to safeguard against fugitive felons that are recipients of these SSI benefits.

This bill is unnecessary because under current law, SSI and Social Security payments

are already prohibited to people fleeing prosecution or confinement.

Most alarming, this bill will terminate these benefits without any judicial determination of guilt, and thus, usurping recipients' rights to due process.

The presumption of "innocent until proven guilty" is the constitutional principle at the bedrock of our criminal justice system. This principle guarantees that the government cannot deprive citizens of their rights without due process of the law.

The bill maintains that payments could be immediately restored once the individual resolves any outstanding issues, a potentially lengthy and time-consuming process.

Ask the thousands of individuals swept under this broad policy if that is true. SSA already tried to implement this very ill-advised policy and it resulted in thousands of court challenges in 2009 forcing the agency to repay billions of dollars it had withheld from people deemed fugitives.

For example, Miami resident Joseph Sutrynowics' Social Security Disability Insurance benefits were halted in 2008 because of a bad check he'd written to cover groceries in Texas more than a decade earlier.

Under this policy, SSA agreed to repay \$700 million in benefits that were withheld from 80,000 people whose benefits have been suspended or denied since January 1, 2007 in the *Martinez v. Astrue* case. SSA could also, reportedly, repay close to \$1 billion in benefits to 140,000 individuals in the *Clark v. Astrue* case.

We have already tried this before and failed miserably. Let us not waste tax payers' money in litigation, while causing poor folks to go hungry. As the old adage says: "don't continue to do the same thing and expect a different result, that's insanity".

Past experiences proved that this policy was detrimental then, and it is so now. It will further exacerbate the epic tragedy of mass incarceration, and the attendant costs incurred by taxpayers, particularly in the well-documented higher cost of incarcerating the elderly and those in poor health.

Even conservative coalitions like Freedom Works, American Conservative Union Foundation, Generation Opportunity, and Taxpayers Protection Alliance agreed that mass incarceration is extremely costly to taxpayers.

In addition to tax dollars in litigation fees, incarceration cost taxpayers \$407.58 per person per day and \$148,767 per person per year.

Criminalizing poor individuals, depriving them of their social security income benefits, and increasing the incarceration rate in this fashion will NOT solve the fugitive problem this bill purports it will do.

In fact, this bill will expand existing problems of mass incarceration by increasing the likelihood for recidivism. Statistics show that incarceration does not serve as deterrence, nor does it keep our communities safe.

For the reasons stated above, I oppose this bill.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792, the misleadingly titled Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017, which would prohibit the payment of Supplemental Security Income benefits to anyone with an unresolved arrest warrant for an alleged violation of a condition of probation or parole or an alleged felony offense.

H.R. 2792's title falsely claims to target fugitive felons. In fact, fugitive felons are already prohibited from receiving benefits under current law. If this bill were enacted, some of our country's most vulnerable low-income seniors and disabled Americans, who are neither fugitives nor felons, would not be able to get their SSI benefits.

While proponents of H.R. 2792 continue to claim that the bill only targets violent fugitive felons, H.R. 2792 threatens many other individuals, like those who received arrest warrants because of an inability to pay court fines or fees. Just last week, the United States Commission on Civil Rights published a report, titled, "Targeted Fines and Fees Against Low-Income Communities of Color: Civil Rights and Constitutional Implications," which found that many local jurisdictions rely on court fees or other fines to support their municipal budgets, including fees charged to those under court supervision.

Some of the people charged with these fees are elderly or disabled SSI beneficiaries who are unable to work and have no way to pay court costs. When they cannot pay, a warrant is routinely issued for their arrest. If this bill were enacted, these people would lose their SSI benefits, which is the only source of income for many of these low-income disabled individuals.

During the markup of H.R. 2792, I offered a commonsense amendment which would have prevented SSI benefits from being cut off if the result would be the loss of benefits for individuals whose arrest warrants were issued for nonpayment of court costs. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues rejected the amendment, as well as all other Democratic amendments to this bill.

I stand united with over 119 national, State, and local organizations who oppose efforts to cut SSI benefits, and I urge opposition to the final passage of this bill.

Further, I would like to go on the record to say that we should have a clean reauthorization of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program, MIECHV, which expires on September 30. The majority's decision to tie home visiting to this harmful cut for our most vulnerable citizens only makes this harder to accomplish.

MIECHV programs are proven programs, evidence-based programs that work. We actually should reauthorize these programs, but we should not tie it to this horrible bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the bill.

□ 1015

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2792 is a harsh, unfair bill. It would undermine the foundation of American justice, innocent until proven guilty, and it would do so for Americans who are impoverished and already at a severe disadvantage because of age, disability, education, race, and ethnicity. It would strip people of basic income, in many cases all they have to live on, based on a mere accusation.

I reject the majority's contention that people in nursing homes, people with dementia and cognitive impairments, and others with nowhere else to turn will not be harmed by this bill because of the very limited authority current law gives the Social Security commissioner to issue good cause exemptions.

We know the good cause process is complicated and very difficult to navigate. Not surprisingly, the last time the policy was in effect, only a tiny fraction of the people who lost their basic income were able to follow the instructions in the six-page letter from SSA and apply for relief, the good cause process that the majority repeatedly touts, as few as 10 days before benefit termination. SSI recipients have extremely limited financial resources and are severely disabled, elderly.

Resolving errors within the criminal justice system is a long process that typically must be done in the geographic jurisdiction of the court and necessitates legal costs.

The goal of H.R. 2792 is the same: raise \$2.1 billion by cutting off benefits for tens of thousands of impoverished, elderly, and disabled people, be they cognitively impaired, victims of mistaken identity, facing homelessness, those who committed minor offenses, or those who are too poor to pay their court fees and fines.

Mr. Speaker, there are no protections in this bill. There is no reason, no rational benefit, but there are instances where individuals will be forced to suffer even more than they currently do, so let's not cut off their Social Security Income benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the CUFF Act is commonsense. The American taxpayer should not subsidize individuals who are fleeing from law enforcement.

Because the Social Security Administration already possesses in place

processes that will ensure due process and protect beneficiaries, claims about this bill are overblown and, quite frankly, they are wrong.

I am proud that this bill is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs' Association.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 533, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nadler moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3823 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 58, strike lines 6 through 13, and insert the following:

(1) PAYMENTS TO POSSESSIONS.—

(A) UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the United States Virgin Islands amounts equal to 400 percent of the loss in revenues to the United States Virgin Islands by reason of this title (determined without regard to this subsection and subsection (e)). Such amounts shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on information provided by the United States Virgin Islands.

(B) COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico amounts equal to the per capita equivalent of amounts paid to the United States Virgin Islands under subparagraph (A). For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term “per capita equivalent” means the ratio of—

(i) the population of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, determined on the basis of the most recent census estimate released by the Bureau of Census before September 4, 2017, divided by

(ii) the population of the United States Virgin Islands, as so determined.

(C) USE OF FUNDS.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall apply only to the extent that the United States Virgin Islands or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as the case may be, has a plan, which has been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, under which possession will use such amounts for one or more of the following purposes:

(i) Repair or surface infrastructure, including roads, bridges, and tunnels.

(ii) Repair of water and sewage systems.

(iii) Repair and replacement of electric transmission and distribution systems, telecommunications infrastructure, cellular networks, and broadband infrastructure.

(iv) Repair and replacement of hospitals.

(v) Repair and replacement of elementary and secondary schools.

(vi) Repair, replacement, and creation of residential housing.

(vii) Environmental remediation.

(viii) Health care costs of individuals.

The preceding sentence shall not apply to so much of the amounts paid to the United States Virgin Islands as do not exceed 100 percent of the loss in revenues described in subparagraph (A).

Page 59, line 10, insert “(and by reason of such possession having a mirror code tax system)” after “by reason of this title”.

Page 59, after line 13, insert the following:

(e) EXTENSION OF APPLICATION TO PUERTO RICO OF DEDUCTION FOR INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 199(d)(8)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “first 11 taxable years” and inserting “first 16 taxable years”, and

(B) by striking “January 1, 2017” and inserting “January 1, 2023”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2016.

(f) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ECONOMIC SUPPORT FOR U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS AND PUERTO RICO THROUGH LONG-TERM EXTENSION OF RUM COVER OVER.—It is the sense of Congress that, as soon as possible, section 7652(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be extended retroactively, and for no fewer than five years, to support the long-term economic recovery of the United States Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Page 59, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 506. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2018 shall be increased by 1.75 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any provision of law which is not included in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 507. EXPENSING OF QUALIFIED DISASTER EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 198 the following:

“SEC. 198A. EXPENSING OF QUALIFIED DISASTER EXPENSES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A taxpayer may elect to treat any qualified disaster expenses which are paid or incurred by the taxpayer as an expense which is not chargeable to capital account. Any expense which is so treated shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year in which it is paid or incurred.

“(b) QUALIFIED DISASTER EXPENSE.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified disaster expense’ means any expenditure—

“(1) which is paid or incurred in connection with a trade or business or with business-related property,

“(2) which is—

“(A) for the abatement or control of hazardous substances that were released on account of a federally declared disaster occurring during the period beginning—

“(i) after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2010, or

“(ii) after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016,

“(B) for the removal of debris from, or the demolition of structures on, real property which is business-related property damaged or destroyed as a result of a federally declared disaster occurring during any such period, or

“(C) for the repair of business-related property damaged as a result of a federally declared disaster occurring during any such period, and

“(3) which is otherwise chargeable to capital account.

“(c) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) BUSINESS-RELATED PROPERTY.—The term ‘business-related property’ means property—

“(A) held by the taxpayer for use in a trade or business or for the production of income, or

“(B) described in section 1221(a)(1) in the hands of the taxpayer.

“(2) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.—The term ‘federally declared disaster’ has the meaning given such term by section 165(i)(5)(A).

“(d) DEDUCTION RECAPTURED AS ORDINARY INCOME ON SALE, ETC.—Solely for purposes of section 1245, in the case of property to which a qualified disaster expense would have been capitalized but for this section—

“(1) the deduction allowed by this section for such expense shall be treated as a deduction for depreciation, and

“(2) such property (if not otherwise section 1245 property) shall be treated as section 1245

property solely for purposes of applying section 1245 to such deduction.

“(e) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—Sections 198, 280B, and 468 shall not apply to amounts which are treated as expenses under this section.

“(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 198 the following item:

“Sec. 198A. Expensing of qualified disaster expenses.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2011, in connection with disasters declared after such date.

SEC. 508. INCREASED LIMITATION ON CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF.

(a) INDIVIDUALS.—Paragraph (1) of section 170(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) QUALIFIED DISASTER CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Any qualified disaster contribution shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate of such contributions does not exceed the excess of 80 percent of the taxpayer's contribution base over the amount of all other charitable contributions allowable under this paragraph.

“(ii) CARRYOVER.—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation under clause (i), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(1)) as a charitable contribution to which clause (i) applies in each of the 5 succeeding years in order of time.

“(iii) COORDINATION WITH OTHER SUBPARAGRAPHS.—For purposes of applying this subsection and subsection (d)(1), contributions described in clause (i) shall not be treated as described in subparagraph (A) and such subparagraph shall be applied without regard to such contributions.

“(iv) QUALIFIED DISASTER CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘qualified disaster contribution’ means any charitable contribution if—

“(I) such contribution is for relief efforts related to a federally declared disaster (as defined in section 165(h)(3)(C)(i)),

“(II) such contribution is made during the period beginning on the applicable disaster date with respect to the disaster described in subclause (I) and ending on December 31, 2015, and

“(III) such contribution is made in cash to an organization described in subparagraph (A) (other than an organization described in section 509(a)(3)).

Such term shall not include a contribution if the contribution is for establishment of a new, or maintenance in an existing, donor advised fund (as defined in section 4966(d)(2)).

“(v) APPLICABLE DISASTER DATE.—For purposes of clause (iv)(II), the term ‘applicable disaster date’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster described in clause (iv)(I), the date on which the disaster giving rise to the Presidential declaration described in section 165(i)(5)(A) occurred.

“(vi) SUBSTANTIATION REQUIREMENT.—This paragraph shall not apply to any qualified disaster contribution unless the taxpayer ob-

tains from such organization to which the contribution was made a contemporaneous written acknowledgment (within the meaning of subsection (f)(8)) that such contribution was used (or is to be used) for a purpose described in clause (iv)(III).”.

(b) CORPORATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 170(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D) and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) QUALIFIED DISASTER CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Any qualified disaster contribution shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate of such contributions does not exceed the excess of 20 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income over the amount of charitable contributions allowed under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) CARRYOVER.—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation under clause (i), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(1)) as a charitable contribution to which clause (i) applies in each of the 5 succeeding years in order of time.

“(iii) QUALIFIED DISASTER CONTRIBUTION.—The term ‘qualified disaster contribution’ has the meaning given such term under paragraph (2)(F)(iv).

“(iv) SUBSTANTIATION REQUIREMENT.—This paragraph shall not apply to any qualified disaster contribution unless the taxpayer obtains from such organization to which the contribution was made a contemporaneous written acknowledgment (within the meaning of subsection (f)(8)) that such contribution was used (or is to be used) for a purpose described in paragraph (1)(F)(iv)(III).”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subparagraph (A) of section 170(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “subparagraph (B) applies” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C) apply”.

(B) Subparagraph (B) of section 170(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “subparagraphs (A) and (C)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disasters arising in taxable years ending after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 509. LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DISASTERS IN 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 165(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR LOSSES IN FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If an individual has a net disaster loss for any taxable year, the amount determined under paragraph (2)(A)(i) shall be the sum of—

“(i) such net disaster loss, and

“(ii) so much of the excess referred to in the matter preceding clause (i) of paragraph (2)(A) (reduced by the amount in clause (i) of this subparagraph) as exceeds 10 percent of the adjusted gross income of the individual.

“(B) NET DISASTER LOSS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘net disaster loss’ means the excess of—

“(i) the personal casualty losses—

“(I) attributable to a federally declared disaster occurring during the period beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2010, or during the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016, and

“(II) occurring in a disaster area, over

“(ii) personal casualty gains.

“(C) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.—The term ‘federally declared disaster’ has the meaning given such term by subsection (i)(5)(A).

“(ii) DISASTER AREA.—The term ‘disaster area’ has the meaning given such term by subsection (i)(5)(B).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 165(h) of such Code, as so redesignated, is amended by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”.

(c) LOSS ALLOWED WHETHER OR NOT INDIVIDUAL ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.—Section 62(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after paragraph (21) the following new paragraph:

“(22) DISASTER CASUALTY LOSSES.—Any net disaster loss (as defined in section 165(h)(3)(B)).”.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 165(i)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “major” after “means any”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disasters declared in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(f) USE OF AMENDED INCOME TAX RETURNS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT RECEIPT OF CERTAIN CASUALTY LOSS GRANTS BY DISALLOWING PREVIOUSLY TAKEN CASUALTY LOSS DEDUCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, if a taxpayer—

(A) claims a deduction for any taxable year with respect to a casualty loss to a principal residence (within the meaning of section 121 of such Code) resulting from any federally declared disaster (as defined in section 165(h)(3)(C) of such Code) occurring during the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016, and

(B) in a subsequent taxable year receives a grant under any Federal or State program as reimbursement for such loss,

such taxpayer may elect to file an amended income tax return for the taxable year in which such deduction was allowed (and for any taxable year to which such deduction is carried) and reduce (but not below zero) the amount of such deduction by the amount of such reimbursement.

(2) TIME OF FILING AMENDED RETURN.—Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any grant only if any amended income tax returns with respect to such grant are filed not later than the later of—

(A) the due date for filing the tax return for the taxable year in which the taxpayer receives such grant, or

(B) the date which is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) WAIVER OF PENALTIES AND INTEREST.—Any underpayment of tax resulting from the reduction under paragraph (1) of the amount otherwise allowable as a deduction shall not be subject to any penalty or interest under such Code if such tax is paid not later than 1 year after the filing of the amended return to which such reduction relates.

SEC. 510. NET OPERATING LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DISASTERS IN 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 172(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) CERTAIN LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.—In the case of a taxpayer who has a qualified disaster loss (as

defined in subsection (i)), such loss shall be a net operating loss carryback to each of the 5 taxable years preceding the taxable year of such loss.”.

(b) **RULES RELATING TO QUALIFIED DISASTER LOSSES.**—Section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (i) a subsection (j) and by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

“(i) **RULES RELATING TO QUALIFIED DISASTER LOSSES.**—For purposes of this section—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified disaster loss’ means the lesser of—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) the losses allowable under section 165 for the taxable year—

“(I) attributable to a federally declared disaster (as defined in section 165(i)(5)(A)) occurring during the period beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2010, or during the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016, and

“(II) occurring in a disaster area (as defined in section 165(i)(5)(B)), and

“(ii) the deduction for the taxable year for qualified disaster expenses which is allowable under section 198A(a) or which would be so allowable if not otherwise treated as an expense, or

“(B) the net operating loss for such taxable year.

“(2) **COORDINATION WITH SUBSECTION (b)(2).**—For purposes of applying subsection (b)(2), a qualified disaster loss for any taxable year shall be treated in a manner similar to the manner in which a specified liability loss is treated.

“(3) **ELECTION.**—Any taxpayer entitled to a 5-year carryback under subsection (b)(1)(G) from any loss year may elect to have the carryback period with respect to such loss year determined without regard to subsection (b)(1)(G). Such election shall be made in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary and shall be made by the due date (including extensions of time) for filing the taxpayer’s return for the taxable year of the net operating loss. Such election, once made for any taxable year, shall be irrevocable for such taxable year.

“(4) **EXCLUSION.**—The term ‘qualified disaster loss’ shall not include any loss with respect to any property described in section 1400N(p)(3).”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to losses arising in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011, in connection with disasters declared after such date.

SEC. 511. WAIVER OF CERTAIN MORTGAGE REVENUE BOND REQUIREMENTS FOLLOWING 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015 DISASTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (13) of section 143(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “before January 1, 2010” in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) of such paragraph and inserting “during the period beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2010, or during the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disasters occurring after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 512. INCREASED EXPENSING AND BONUS DEPRECIATION FOR QUALIFIED DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROPERTY FOLLOWING 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015 DISASTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subclause (I) of section 168(n)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “before January 1, 2010” and inserting “during the period

beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2010, or during the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016”.

(b) **REMOVAL OF EXCLUSION.**—Section 168(n)(2)(B)(i) of such Code is amended by inserting “and” at the end of subclause (I), by striking “, and” at the end of subclause (II) and inserting a period, and by striking subclause (III).

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2011, with respect to disasters declared after such date.

SEC. 513. INCREASE IN NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT FOR INVESTMENTS IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES SERVING 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015 DISASTER AREAS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (f) of section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) **INCREASED SPECIAL ALLOCATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES SERVING DISASTER AREAS WITH RESPECT TO DISASTERS OCCURRING IN ANY OF CALENDAR YEARS 2012 THROUGH 2015.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of each calendar year which begins after 2012 and before 2017, the new markets tax credit limitation shall be increased by an amount equal to \$500,000,000, to be allocated among qualified community development entities to make qualified low-income community investments within any covered federally declared disaster area.

“(B) **ALLOCATION OF INCREASE.**—The amount of the increase in limitation under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated by the Secretary under paragraph (2) to qualified community development entities and shall give priority to such entities with a record of having successfully provided capital or technical assistance to businesses or communities within any covered federally declared disaster area or areas for which the allocation is requested.

“(C) **APPLICATION OF CARRYFORWARD.**—Paragraph (3) shall be applied separately with respect to the amount of any increase under subparagraph (A).

“(D) **COVERED FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER AREA.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘covered federally declared disaster area’ means any disaster area resulting from any federally declared disaster occurring after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms in section 165(i)(5).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to calendar years beginning after 2012.

SEC. 514. SPECIAL RULES FOR USE OF RETIREMENT FUNDS IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS IN 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015.

(a) **TAX-FAVORED WITHDRAWALS FROM RETIREMENT PLANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (2) of section 72(t) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(H) **DISTRIBUTIONS FROM RETIREMENT PLANS IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS DURING IN ANY CALENDAR YEARS AFTER 2011.**—Any qualified disaster recovery distribution.”.

(2) **QUALIFIED DISASTER RECOVERY DISTRIBUTION.**—Section 72(t) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) **QUALIFIED DISASTER RECOVERY DISTRIBUTION.**—For purposes of paragraph (2)(H)—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘qualified disaster recovery distribution’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring in any calendar year beginning after 2011 and before January 1, 2016, any distribution from an eligible retirement plan made on or after the applicable disaster date and before the date that is 1 year after the applicable disaster date, to an individual whose principal place of abode on the applicable disaster date, is located in the disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of such federally declared disaster.

“(B) **DOLLAR LIMITATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this subsection, the aggregate amount of distributions received by an individual with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during in any calendar year beginning after 2011 shall not exceed \$100,000.

“(ii) **TREATMENT OF PLAN DISTRIBUTIONS.**—If a distribution to an individual would (without regard to clause (i)) be a qualified disaster recovery distribution, a plan shall not be treated as violating any requirement of this title merely because the plan treats such distribution as a qualified disaster recovery distribution, unless the aggregate amount of such distributions from all plans maintained by the employer (and any member of any controlled group which includes the employer) to such individual with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring in any calendar year beginning after 2011 exceeds \$100,000.

“(iii) **CONTROLLED GROUP.**—For purposes of clause (ii), the term ‘controlled group’ means any group treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 414.

“(C) **AMOUNT DISTRIBUTED MAY BE REPAYED.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Any individual who receives a qualified disaster recovery distribution may, at any time during the 3-year period beginning on the day after the date on which such distribution was received, make one or more contributions in an aggregate amount not to exceed the amount of such distribution to an eligible retirement plan of which such individual is a beneficiary and to which a rollover contribution of such distribution could be made under section 402(c), 403(a)(4), 403(b)(8), 408(d)(3), or 457(e)(16), as the case may be.

“(ii) **TREATMENT OF REPAYMENTS OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLANS OTHER THAN IRAS.**—For purposes of this title, if a contribution is made pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a qualified disaster recovery distribution from an eligible retirement plan other than an individual retirement plan, then the taxpayer shall, to the extent of the amount of the contribution, be treated as having received the qualified disaster recovery distribution in an eligible rollover distribution (as defined in section 402(c)(4)) and as having transferred the amount to the eligible retirement plan in a direct trustee to trustee transfer within 60 days of the distribution.

“(iii) **TREATMENT OF REPAYMENTS FOR DISTRIBUTIONS FROM IRAS.**—For purposes of this title, if a contribution is made pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a qualified disaster recovery distribution from an individual retirement plan (as defined by section 7701(a)(37)), then, to the extent of the amount of the contribution, the qualified disaster recovery distribution shall be treated as a distribution described in section 408(d)(3) and as having been transferred to

the eligible retirement plan in a direct trustee to trustee transfer within 60 days of the distribution.

“(D) INCOME INCLUSION SPREAD OVER 3-YEAR PERIOD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any qualified disaster recovery distribution, unless the taxpayer elects not to have this paragraph apply for any taxable year, any amount required to be included in gross income for such taxable year shall be so included ratably over the 3-taxable-year period beginning with such taxable year.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of clause (i), rules similar to the rules of subparagraph (E) of section 408A(d)(3) shall apply.

“(E) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—

“(i) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER; DISASTER AREA.—The terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

“(ii) APPLICABLE DISASTER DATE.—The term ‘applicable disaster date’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster, the date on which such federally declared disaster occurs.

“(iii) ELIGIBLE RETIREMENT PLAN.—The term ‘eligible retirement plan’ shall have the meaning given such term by section 402(c)(8)(B).

“(F) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(i) EXEMPTION OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM TRUSTEE TO TRUSTEE TRANSFER AND WITHHOLDING RULES.—For purposes of sections 401(a)(31), 402(f), and 3405, qualified disaster recovery distributions shall not be treated as eligible rollover distributions.

“(ii) QUALIFIED DISASTER RECOVERY DISTRIBUTIONS TREATED AS MEETING PLAN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of this title, a qualified disaster recovery distribution shall be treated as meeting the requirements of sections 401(k)(2)(B)(i), 403(b)(7)(A)(ii), 403(b)(11), and 457(d)(1)(A).”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to distributions with respect to disaster declared after December 31, 2011.

(b) LOANS FROM QUALIFIED PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (p) of section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) INCREASE IN LIMIT ON LOANS NOT TREATED AS DISTRIBUTIONS WITH RESPECT TO DISASTERS IN ANY CALENDAR YEAR AFTER 2011.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any loan from a qualified employer plan to a qualified individual made during the applicable period—

“(i) clause (i) of paragraph (2)(A) shall be applied by substituting ‘\$100,000’ for ‘\$50,000’, and

“(ii) clause (ii) of such paragraph shall be applied by substituting ‘the present value of the nonforfeitable accrued benefit of the employee under the plan’ for ‘one-half of the present value of the nonforfeitable accrued benefit of the employee under the plan’.

“(B) DELAY OF REPAYMENT.—In the case of a qualified individual with an outstanding loan on or after the applicable disaster date from a qualified employer plan—

“(i) if the due date pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2) for any repayment with respect to such loan occurs during the 1-year period beginning on the applicable disaster date, such due date shall be delayed for 1 year,

“(ii) any subsequent repayments with respect to any such loan shall be appropriately adjusted to reflect the delay in the due date under clause (i) and any interest accruing during such delay, and

“(iii) in determining the 5-year period and the term of a loan under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2), the period described in clause (i) shall be disregarded.

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘qualified individual’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during in any calendar year beginning after 2011, an individual whose principal place of abode on the applicable disaster date is located in the disaster area and who has sustained an economic loss by reason of such federally declared disaster.

“(ii) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—The applicable period is the period beginning on the applicable disaster date and ending on December 31, 2016.

“(iii) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER; DISASTER AREA.—The terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

“(iv) APPLICABLE DISASTER DATE.—The term ‘applicable disaster date’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster, the date on which such federally declared disaster occurs.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to loans made with respect to disaster declared after December 31, 2011.

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If this subsection applies to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract, such plan or contract shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan during the period described in paragraph (2)(B)(i).

(2) AMENDMENTS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract which is made—

(i) pursuant to any provision of, or amendment made by, this section, or pursuant to any regulation issued by the Secretary or the Secretary of Labor under any provision of, or amendment made by, this section, and

(ii) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2016, or such later date as the Secretary may prescribe.

In the case of a governmental plan (as defined in section 414(d)), clause (ii) shall be applied by substituting the date which is 2 years after the date otherwise applied under clause (i).

(B) CONDITIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any amendment unless—

(i) during the period—

(I) beginning on the date that the provisions of, and amendments made by, this section or the regulation described in subparagraph (A)(i) takes effect (or in the case of a plan or contract amendment not required by the provisions of, or amendments made by, this section or such regulation, the effective date specified by the plan), and

(II) ending on the date described in subparagraph (A)(ii) (or, if earlier, the date the plan or contract amendment is adopted),

the plan or contract is operated as if such plan or contract amendment were in effect, and

(ii) such plan or contract amendment applies retroactively for such period.

SEC. 515. ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR HOUSING QUALIFIED DISASTER DISPLACED INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN DISASTER-DISPLACED INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in any calendar year beginning after 2011, there shall be allowed an exemption of \$500 for each qualified disaster-displaced individual with respect to the taxpayer for the taxable year.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—The exemption under paragraph (1) shall not exceed \$2,000, reduced by the amount of the exemption under this subsection for all prior taxable years.

“(B) INDIVIDUALS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT ONLY ONCE.—An individual shall not be taken into account under paragraph (1) if such individual was taken into account under this subsection by the taxpayer for any prior taxable year.

“(C) IDENTIFYING INFORMATION REQUIRED.—An individual shall not be taken into account under paragraph (1) for a taxable year unless the taxpayer identification number of such individual is included on the return of the taxpayer for such taxable year.

“(3) QUALIFIED DISASTER-DISPLACED INDIVIDUAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified disaster-displaced individual’ means, with respect to any taxpayer for any taxable year, any qualified individual if such individual is provided housing free of charge by the taxpayer in the principal residence of the taxpayer for a period of 60 consecutive days which ends in such taxable year. Such term shall not include the spouse or any dependent of the taxpayer.

“(B) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘qualified individual’ means any individual who—

“(i) on the date of a federally declared disaster occurring in calendar years beginning after 2011 and before 2016 maintained such individual’s principal place of abode in the disaster area declared with respect to such disaster, and

“(ii) was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of the federally declared disaster.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms in section 165(i)(5).

“(4) COMPENSATION FOR HOUSING.—No deduction shall be allowed under this subsection if the taxpayer receives any rent or other amount (from any source) in connection with the providing of such housing.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 516. EXCLUSIONS OF CERTAIN CANCELLATIONS OF INDEBTEDNESS BY REASON OF 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015 DISASTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 108 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS FOR INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED BY DISASTERS IN ANY CALENDAR YEAR AFTER 2011.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), gross income shall not include any amount which (but for this subsection) would be includible in gross income by reason of any discharge (in whole or in part) of indebtedness of a natural person described in paragraph (3) by an applicable entity (as defined in section 6050P(c)(1)) during the applicable period.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS FOR BUSINESS INDEBTEDNESS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any

indebtedness incurred in connection with a trade or business.

“(3) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A natural person is described in this paragraph if the principal place of abode of such person on the applicable disaster date was located in the disaster area with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during any calendar year beginning after 2011 and before 2016.

“(4) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘applicable period’ means the period beginning on the applicable disaster date and ending on the date which is 14 months after such date.

“(5) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER; DISASTER AREA.—The terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

“(B) APPLICABLE DISASTER DATE.—The term ‘applicable disaster date’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster, the date on which such federally declared disaster occurs.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to discharges made on or after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 517. SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING EARNED INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED BY FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(n) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING EARNED INCOME OF TAXPAYERS AFFECTED BY FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified individual with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during any calendar year beginning after 2011, if the earned income of the taxpayer for the taxable year which includes the applicable disaster date is less than the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year, the credit allowed under this section and section 24(d) may, at the election of the taxpayer, be determined by substituting—

“(A) such earned income for the preceding taxable year, for

“(B) such earned income for the taxable year which includes the applicable date.

“(2) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified individual’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring during in any calendar year beginning after 2011 and before 2016, any individual whose principal place of abode on the applicable disaster date, was located—

“(A) in any portion of a disaster area determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by reason of the federally declared disaster, or

“(B) in any portion of the disaster area not described in subparagraph (A) and such individual was displaced from such principal place of abode by reason of the federally declared disaster.

“(3) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(A) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER; DISASTER AREA.—The terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

“(B) APPLICABLE DISASTER DATE.—The term ‘applicable disaster date’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster, the date on which such federally declared disaster occurs.

“(4) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(A) APPLICATION TO JOINT RETURNS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), in the case of a joint return for a taxable year which includes the disaster date—

“(i) such paragraph shall apply if either spouse is a qualified individual, and

“(ii) the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year shall be the sum of the earned income of each spouse for such preceding taxable year.

“(B) UNIFORM APPLICATION OF ELECTION.—Any election made under paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to both section 24(d) and this section.

“(C) ERRORS TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL ERROR.—For purposes of section 6213, an incorrect use on a return of earned income pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be treated as a mathematical or clerical error.

“(D) NO EFFECT ON DETERMINATION OF GROSS INCOME, ETC.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, this title shall be applied without regard to any substitution under paragraph (1).”.

(b) CHILD TAX CREDIT.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING EARNED INCOME OF TAXPAYERS AFFECTED BY FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.—For election by qualified individuals with respect to certain federally declared disasters to substitute earned income from the preceding taxable year, see section 32(n).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 518. INCREASE IN REHABILITATION CREDIT FOR BUILDINGS IN 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015 DISASTER AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR EXPENDITURES MADE IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN DISASTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of qualified rehabilitation expenditures paid or incurred during the applicable period with respect to any qualified rehabilitated building or certified historic structure located in a disaster area with respect to any federally declared disaster occurring in, subsection (a) shall be applied—

“(A) by substituting ‘13 percent’ for ‘10 percent’ in paragraph (1) thereof, and

“(B) by substituting ‘26 percent’ for ‘20 percent’ in paragraph (2) thereof.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER; DISASTER AREA.—The terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

“(B) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—The term ‘applicable period’ means the period beginning on the applicable disaster date and ending on December 31, 2015.

“(C) APPLICABLE DISASTER DATE.—The term ‘applicable disaster date’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster, the date on which such federally declared disaster occurs.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 519. ADVANCED REFUNDINGS OF CERTAIN TAX-EXEMPT BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 149(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) SPECIAL RULE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN NATURAL DISASTERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a bond described in subparagraph (C), one additional advance refunding after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and before January 1, 2018, shall be allowed under the rules of this subsection if—

“(i) the Governor of the State designates the advance refunding bond for purposes of this subsection, and

“(ii) the requirements of subparagraph (E) are met.

“(B) CERTAIN PRIVATE ACTIVITY BONDS.—With respect to a bond described in subparagraph (C) which is an exempt facility bond described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 142(a), one advance refunding after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and before January 1, 2018, shall be allowed under the applicable rules of this subsection (notwithstanding paragraph (2) thereof) if the requirements of clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) are met.

“(C) BONDS DESCRIBED.—A bond is described in this paragraph if, with respect to any federally declared disaster, such bond—

“(i) was outstanding on the applicable disaster date, and

“(ii) is issued by an applicable State or a political subdivision thereof.

“(D) AGGREGATE LIMIT.—The maximum aggregate face amount of bonds which may be designated under this subsection by the Governor of a State shall not exceed \$4,500,000,000.

“(E) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met with respect to any advance refunding of a bond described in subparagraph (C) if—

“(i) no advance refundings of such bond would be allowed under this title on or after the applicable disaster date,

“(ii) the advance refunding bond is the only other outstanding bond with respect to the refunded bond, and

“(iii) the requirements of section 148 are met with respect to all bonds issued under this paragraph.

“(F) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(i) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER; DISASTER AREA.—The terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).

“(ii) APPLICABLE DISASTER DATE.—The term ‘applicable disaster date’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster, the date on which such federally declared disaster occurs.

“(iii) APPLICABLE STATE.—The term ‘applicable State’ means, with respect to any federally declared disaster, any State in which a portion of the disaster area is located.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to bonds issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 520. QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA RECOVERY BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 146 the following new section:

“SEC. 146A. QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA RECOVERY BONDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, any qualified disaster area recovery bond shall—

“(1) be treated as an exempt facility bond, and

“(2) not be subject to section 146.

“(b) QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA RECOVERY BOND.—For purposes of this section, the

term ‘qualified disaster area recovery bond’ means any bond issued as part of an issue if—

“(1) 95 percent or more of the net proceeds of such issue are to be used for qualified project costs,

“(2) such bond is issued by a State or any political subdivision thereof any part of which is in a qualified disaster area,

“(3) the Governor of the issuing State designates such bond for purposes of this section, and

“(4) such bond is issued after the date of the enactment of this section and before January 1, 2017.

“(C) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF BONDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The maximum aggregate face amount of bonds which may be designated under this section by any State shall not exceed \$10,000,000,000.

“(2) MOVABLE PROPERTY.—No bonds shall be issued which are to be used for movable fixtures and equipment.

“(3) TREATMENT OF CURRENT REFUNDING BONDS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any bond (or series of bonds) issued to refund a qualified disaster area recovery bond, if—

“(A) the average maturity date of the issue of which the refunding bond is a part is not later than the average maturity date of the bonds to be refunded by such issue,

“(B) the amount of the refunding bond does not exceed the outstanding amount of the refunded bond, and

“(C) the net proceeds of the refunding bond are used to redeem the refunded bond not later than 90 days after the date of the issuance of the refunding bond.

For purposes of subparagraph (A), average maturity shall be determined in accordance with section 147(b)(2)(A).

“(d) QUALIFIED PROJECT COSTS.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified project costs’ means the cost of acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and renovation of—

“(1) residential rental property (as defined in section 142(d)),

“(2) nonresidential real property (including fixed improvements associated with such property),

“(3) a facility described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 142(a), or

“(4) public utility property (as defined in section 168(i)(10)),

which is located in a qualified disaster area and was damaged or destroyed by reason of a federally declared disaster.

“(e) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying this title to any qualified disaster area recovery bond, the following modifications shall apply:

“(1) Section 147(d) (relating to acquisition of existing property not permitted) shall be applied by substituting ‘50 percent’ for ‘15 percent’ each place it appears.

“(2) Section 148(f)(4)(C) (relating to exception from rebate for certain proceeds to be used to finance construction expenditures) shall apply to the available construction proceeds of bonds issued under this section. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the following spending requirements shall apply in lieu of the requirements in clause (ii) of such section:

“(A) 40 percent of such available construction proceeds are spent for the governmental purposes of the issue within the 2-year period beginning on the date the bonds are issued.

“(B) 60 percent of such proceeds are spent for such purposes within the 3-year period beginning on such date.

“(C) 80 percent of such proceeds are spent for such purposes within the 4-year period beginning on such date.

“(D) 100 percent of such proceeds are spent for such purposes within the 5-year period beginning on such date.

“(3) Repayments of principal on financing provided by the issue—

“(A) may not be used to provide financing, and

“(B) must be used not later than the close of the first semiannual period beginning after the date of the repayment to redeem bonds which are part of such issue.

The requirement of subparagraph (B) shall be treated as met with respect to amounts received within 5 years after the date of issuance of the issue (or, in the case of a refunding bond, the date of issuance of the original bond) if such amounts are used by the close of such 5 years to redeem bonds which are part of such issue.

“(4) Section 57(a)(5) shall not apply.

“(f) SEPARATE ISSUE TREATMENT OF PORTIONS OF AN ISSUE.—This section shall not apply to the portion of an issue which (if issued as a separate issue) would be treated as a qualified bond or as a bond that is not a private activity bond (determined without regard to paragraph (1)), if the issuer elects to so treat such portion.

“(g) QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA; FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.—

“(1) QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA.—The term ‘qualified disaster area’ means any area determined to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by reason of a federally declared disaster occurring during the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016.

“(2) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.—The term ‘federally declared disaster’ has the meaning given to such term under section 165(i)(5).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 146 the following new item:

“Sec. 146A. Qualified disaster area recovery bonds.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to obligations issued after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 521. ADDITIONAL LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT ALLOCATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 42(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to limitation on aggregate credit allowable with respect to projects located in a State) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(J) INCREASE IN STATE HOUSING CREDIT FOR STATES DAMAGED BY NATURAL DISASTERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of calendar year 2016, the State housing credit ceiling of each State any portion of which includes any portion of a qualifying disaster area shall be increased by so much of the aggregate housing credit dollar amount as does not exceed the applicable limitation allocated by the State housing credit agency of such State for such calendar year to buildings located in qualifying disaster areas.

“(ii) APPLICABLE LIMITATION.—For purposes of clause (i), the applicable limitation is the greater of—

“(I) \$8 multiplied by the population of the qualifying disaster areas in such State, or

“(II) 50 percent of the State housing credit ceiling (determined without regard to this subparagraph) for 2015.

“(iii) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this section, the applicable percentage with respect to any building to which

amounts allocated under clause (i) shall be determined under subsection (b)(2), except that subparagraph (A) thereof shall be applied by substituting ‘January 1, 2016’ for ‘January 1, 2015’.

“(iv) ALLOCATIONS TREATED AS MADE FIRST FROM ADDITIONAL ALLOCATION AMOUNT FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING CARRYOVER.—For purposes of determining the unused State housing credit ceiling under subparagraph (C) for any calendar year, any increase in the State housing credit ceiling under clause (i) shall be treated as an amount described in clause (ii) of such subparagraph.

“(v) QUALIFYING DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘qualifying federally declared disaster area’ means—

“(I) each county which is determined to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under a qualifying natural disaster declaration described in clause (vi)(I), and

“(II) each county not described in subclause (I) which is included in the geographical area covered by a qualifying natural disaster declaration described in subclause (II) or (III) of clause (vi).

“(vi) QUALIFYING NATURAL DISASTER DECLARATION.—For purposes of clause (v), the term ‘qualifying natural disaster declaration’ means—

“(I) a federally declared disaster (as defined in section 165(i)(5)) occurring during the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016,

“(II) a natural disaster declared by the Secretary of Agriculture in 2011 due to damaging weather and other conditions relating to Hurricane Irene or Tropical Storm Lee under section 321(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(a)), or

“(III) a major disaster or emergency designated by the President in 2011 due to damaging weather and other conditions relating to Hurricane Irene or Tropical Storm Lee under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 522. FACILITATION OF TRANSFER OF WATER LEASING AND WATER BY MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRIGATION COMPANIES IN DISASTER AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (12) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(I) TREATMENT OF MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRIGATION COMPANIES IN CERTAIN DISASTER AREAS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without taking into account any income received or accrued during the applicable period—

“(I) from the sale, lease, or exchange of fee or other interests in real property, including interests in water,

“(II) from the sale or exchange of stock in a mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization or contract rights for the delivery or use of water,

“(III) from the investment of proceeds from sales, leases, or exchanges under subclauses (I) and (II), or

“(IV) from the United States, or a State or local government, resulting from the federally declared disaster,

except that any income received under subsection (I), (II), (III), or (IV) which is distributed or expended for expenses (other than for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements) of the qualified mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization shall be treated as nonmember income in the year in which it is distributed or expended.

“(ii) **QUALIFIED MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRIGATION COMPANY OR LIKE ORGANIZATION.**—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization’ means any mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization that diverted, delivered, transported, stored, or used its water for agricultural irrigation purposes on its own or through its shareholders in a qualified disaster area during any of calendar years 2012 through 2015.

“(II) **QUALIFIED ASSET.**—The term ‘qualified asset’ means any real property or tangible personal property used in the mutual ditch or irrigation company’s (or like organization’s) system.

“(III) **MULTIPLE AREAS.**—Under regulations, if the qualified assets of any mutual ditch or irrigation company or like organization are located in more than 1 qualified disaster area, all such areas shall be treated as 1 area and if more than 1 federally declared disaster is involved, the date on which the last of such disasters occurred shall be the date used for purposes of this paragraph.

“(iii) **APPLICABLE PERIOD.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable period’ means the taxable year in which the federally declared disaster occurred and the 5 following taxable years.

“(iv) **OTHER DEFINITIONS.**—

“(I) **QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA.**—The term ‘qualified disaster area’ means any area determined to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by reason of a federally declared disaster occurring during the period beginning on January 1, 2012, and ending on December 31, 2015.

“(II) **FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.**—The term ‘federally declared disaster’ has the meaning given to such term under section 165(i)(5).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 523. EXCLUSION FOR DISASTER MITIGATION PAYMENTS RECEIVED FROM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (2) of section 139(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “, or any other amount which is paid by a State or local government or agency or instrumentality thereof,” after “(as in effect on such date)”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 524. NATURAL DISASTER FUNDS.

(a) **NATURAL DISASTER FUND.**—Subpart C of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 468B the following new section:

“SEC. 468C. SPECIAL RULES FOR NATURAL DISASTER FUNDS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If a qualified taxpayer elects the application of this section, there shall be allowed as a deduction for any taxable year the amount of payments made by the taxpayer to a natural disaster fund during such taxable year.

“(b) **NATURAL DISASTER FUND.**—The term ‘natural disaster fund’ means a fund meeting the following requirements:

“(1) **DESIGNATION.**—The taxpayer designates—

“(A) the fund as a natural disaster fund in the manner prescribed by the Secretary, and

“(B) the line or lines of business to which the fund applies.

“(2) **SEGREGATION.**—The assets of the fund are segregated from other assets of the taxpayer.

“(3) **INVESTMENTS.**—

“(A) The assets of the fund are maintained in one or more qualified accounts and are invested only in—

“(i) deposits with banks whose deposits are insured subject to applicable limits by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or

“(ii) in stock or other securities in which the fund would be permitted to invest if it were a capital construction fund subject to the investment limitations of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 7518(b)(2).

“(B) All investment earnings (including gains and losses) from investments of the fund become part of the fund.

“(4) **CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FUND.**—The fund does not accept any deposits (or other amounts) other than cash payments with respect to which a deduction is allowable under subsection (a) and earnings (including gains and losses) from fund investments.

“(5) **PURPOSE.**—The fund is established and maintained for the purposes of covering costs, expenses, and losses (including business interruption losses) resulting from a Federally declared natural disaster to the extent such costs are not covered by insurance.

“(6) **MAXIMUM BALANCE.**—The balance of the fund does not exceed the lesser of—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) 150 percent of the maximum deductible, and

“(ii) 100 percent of the maximum co-insurance (to the extent not taken into account in clause (i)),

that, in the case of a Federally declared natural disaster resulting in losses, the taxpayer could be expected to pay with respect to property and business interruption insurance maintained by the taxpayer for the line of business to which the fund applies and that would cover losses resulting from a Federally declared natural disaster, and

“(B) the maximum loss under any insurance coverage that the taxpayer could reasonably expect to occur for the line of business in the case of a severe natural disaster.

“(7) **FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.**—The fund or the balance of the fund is recorded in the taxpayer’s financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and not as a current asset and the footnotes to the taxpayer’s financial statements include a short description of the fund and its purposes.

“(8) **INSURANCE.**—The taxpayer property insurance maintained by the qualified taxpayer applies to 75 percent or more of the property used—

“(A) in the qualified taxpayer’s line of business to which the fund relates, and

“(B) in the United States.

“(c) **QUALIFIED TAXPAYER.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified taxpayer’ means any taxpayer that—

“(1) actively conducts a trade or business, and

“(2) maintains property insurance with respect to such trade or business that insures against losses in natural disasters.

“(d) **FAILURE TO MEET REQUIREMENTS.**—If a fund that was a natural disaster fund ceases

to meet any of the requirements of subsection (b) or a taxpayer who has a natural disaster fund ceases to meet the requirement of subsection (c), the entire balance of the fund shall be deemed distributed in a nonqualified distribution at the time the fund ceases to meet such requirements.

“(e) **TAXATION OF FUND.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The earnings (including gains and losses) from the investment and reinvestment of amounts held in the fund shall not be taken into account in determining the gross income of the taxpayer that owns the fund.

“(2) **NOT A SEPARATE TAXPAYER.**—A natural disaster fund shall not be considered a separate taxpayer for purposes of this subtitle.

“(f) **TAXATION OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM THE FUND.**—

“(1) **QUALIFIED DISTRIBUTIONS.**—For purposes of this chapter, qualified distributions shall be treated in the same manner as proceeds from property or business interruption insurance.

“(2) **NONQUALIFIED DISTRIBUTIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of any taxable year for which there is a nonqualified distribution—

“(i) such nonqualified distributions shall be excluded from the gross income of the taxpayer, and

“(ii) the tax imposed by this chapter (determined without regard to this subsection) shall be increased by the product of the amount of such nonqualified distribution and the highest rate of tax specified in section 1 (section 11 in the case of a corporation).

“(B) **TAX BENEFIT RULE; COORDINATION WITH DEDUCTION FOR NET OPERATING LOSSES.**—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 7518(g)(6) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.

“(3) **ADDITIONAL TAX.**—The tax imposed by this chapter for any taxable year on any taxpayer that owns a natural disaster fund shall be increased by the greater of—

“(A) 20 percent of the amount of any nonqualified distributions from the fund in the taxable year, and

“(B) an amount equal to interest, at the underpayment rate established under section 6621, on the nonqualified distribution from the time the amount is added to the fund to the time the amount is distributed.

“(4) **INTEREST CALCULATION.**—For purposes of calculating interest under paragraph (3)(B)—

“(A) all investment earnings (including gains or losses) in taxable year shall be treated as added to the fund on the last day of the taxable year, and

“(B) amounts distributed from the fund shall be treated as distributed on a first-in, first-out basis.

“(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

“(1) **FEDERALLY DECLARED NATURAL DISASTER.**—The term ‘federally declared natural disaster’ means a natural disaster that is determined by Presidential declaration under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to warrant individual or individual and public assistance under such Act.

“(2) **NONQUALIFIED DISTRIBUTION.**—The term ‘nonqualified distribution’ means a distribution from a natural disaster fund other than a qualified distribution.

“(3) **QUALIFIED ACCOUNT.**—The term ‘qualified account’ means an account with a bank (as defined in section 581) or a brokerage account but only if the investments of such accounts are limited to those permitted by subsection (b)(3) and no investments are

made in a related person (as defined in section 465(b)(3)(C)) to the taxpayer.

“(4) QUALIFIED DISTRIBUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified distribution’ means with respect to natural disaster fund an amount equal to the excess of—

“(i) costs, expenses, and losses (including losses of a type reimbursable by proceeds of business interruption insurance) incurred by the taxpayer as a result of the Federally declared natural disaster with respect to the line or lines of business for which the fund was designated, over

“(ii) the proceeds of property and business interruption insurance paid for the benefit of the taxpayer with respect to costs, expenses, and losses described in clause (i).

“(B) LIMITATION.—A distribution from a natural disaster fund shall not be treated as a qualified distribution if such distribution is allocated to a Federally declared natural disaster occurring more than 3 years before the date of such distribution.

“(h) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) NO DOUBLE COUNTING.—Any portion of any deductible or coinsurance taken into account under subsection (b)(6) in determining the maximum balance for a natural disaster fund shall not be taken into account in determining the maximum balance for another natural disaster fund.

“(2) EXCESS BALANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the balance of a natural disaster fund exceeds the maximum balance permitted by subsection (b)(6) by reason of investment earnings or a reduction in the maximum balance, the account shall not cease to be a natural disaster fund as the result of exceeding such limit if the excess is distributed within 120 days of the date that such excess first occurred.

“(B) TREATMENT OF DISTRIBUTIONS OF EXCESS BALANCE.—In the case of any distribution of the excess balance of a natural disaster fund within 120 days of the date that such excess first occurred—

“(i) paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (f) shall not apply to the distribution of such excess if distributed within such period, and

“(ii) the amount of such distribution shall be included in the gross income of the taxpayer in the year such distribution was made.

“(C) ANTI-ABUSE RULE.—Subparagraph (B) shall not apply in the case of any reduction in the maximum balance resulting from any action of the taxpayer the primary purpose of which was to reduce the maximum balance to enable a distribution that would not be subject to the maximum tax rate calculation or the additional tax.

“(3) CERTAIN ASSET ACQUISITIONS.—The transfer of a natural disaster fund (or the portion of a natural disaster fund) from one person to another person shall not constitute a nonqualified distribution if—

“(A) such transfer is part of a transaction—

“(i) to which section 381 applies,

“(ii) the transferee acquires substantially all of the assets of the transferor used in the line or lines of business for which the fund was designated,

“(iii) the transferee acquires substantially all of the assets of the transferor used in one, but not all, of the lines of business for which the fund was designated, or

“(iv) the transferee acquires substantially all of the transferor's assets located in a geographical area and used in a line of business for which the fund was designated, and

“(B) the transferee elects to treat the acquired natural disaster fund (or portion

thereof) as a natural disaster fund for the line of business for which the transferor had previously designated the fund and as a continuation of the fund (or pro rata portion thereof) for purposes of determining the additional tax imposed by subsection (f)(4).

“(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart C of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 468B the following new item:

“Sec. 468C. Special rules for natural disaster funds.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 525. INCREASE PROPERTY REPLACEMENT PERIOD TO 5 YEARS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1033(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of converted property that is located in the disaster area of a federally declared disaster occurring during a calendar year beginning after 2011 and that is damaged or destroyed by the federally declared disaster, subparagraph (B)(i) shall be applied by substituting ‘5 years’ for ‘2 years’.

“(ii) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER AND DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of clause (i), the terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1033(h)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “4 years” and inserting “5 years”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disasters declared after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 526. WAGE CREDIT FOR SPECIFIED DISASTER-DAMAGED BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 45S. WAGE CREDIT FOR SPECIFIED DISASTER-DAMAGED BUSINESSES.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of an eligible employer, the specified disaster-damaged business wage credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 40 percent of the qualified wages for such year.

“(b) QUALIFIED WAGES DEFINED.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified wages’ means, with respect to any covered employee, wages paid or incurred by the eligible employer to the employee who is not able to work at the disaster-damaged business of the employer during an inoperability period because of a federally declared disaster. Such term shall not include amounts paid or incurred for overtime compensation.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) LIMITATION ON WAGES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The amount of the qualified wages with respect to any individual which may be taken into account with respect to a federally declared disaster shall not exceed \$6,000.

“(B) INOPERABILITY PERIOD.—The inoperability period with respect to a federally declared disaster is the period beginning with the first day the trade or business is rendered inoperable due to damage from the federally declared disaster and ending on the earlier of—

“(i) the last day on which the trade or business is inoperable, or

“(ii) 16 weeks after the first day of such disaster.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible employer’ means, with respect to any taxable year, any employer which—

“(i) employed an average of less than 200 employees on business days during such taxable year, and

“(ii) has a disaster-damaged business.

“(B) DISASTER-DAMAGED BUSINESS.—The term ‘disaster-damaged business’ means a place of business within a disaster area which is rendered inoperable due to damage from the federally declared disaster.

“(C) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—For purposes of this section, all persons treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 414 shall be treated as a single employer.

“(2) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘covered employee’ means, with respect to an eligible employer, an individual—

“(A) whose principal place of employment is in a disaster area with respect to a federally declared disaster, and

“(B) who has been employed by the employer for more than 30 days before the first day of the federally declared disaster.

“(3) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER AND DISASTER AREA.—For purposes of clause (i), the terms ‘federally declared disaster’ and ‘disaster area’ have the meanings given such terms under section 165(i)(5).”

(b) ALLOWANCE AS GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Section 38(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “plus” at the end of paragraph (35), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (36) and inserting “, plus”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(37) the specified disaster-damaged business wage credit determined under section 45S(a).”

(c) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Subsection (a) of section 280C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “45S(a),” after “45P(a).”

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 45S. Wage credit for specified disaster-damaged businesses.”

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 527. DISASTER-RELATED MEDICAL EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) DISASTER-RELATED MEDICAL EXPENSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of expenses directly related to an injury caused by a federally declared disaster occurring during the taxable year or the preceding taxable year, there shall be allowed a separate deduction under this section, which shall be determined under this section (without regard to this subsection), except that—

“(A) subsection (a) shall be applied by substituting ‘zero percent’ for ‘10 percent’, and

“(B) subsection (f) shall be applied by substituting ‘zero percent’ for ‘7.5 percent’.

“(2) COORDINATION.—Any expense taken into account under paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an expense taken into account

under this section (without regard to this section).

“(3) **FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘federally declared disaster’ shall have the meaning given such term under section 165(i)(5).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to disasters occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 528. EXPENSING OF QUALIFIED DISASTER EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 198A(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 101 of this Act, is amended by striking “and before January 1, 2016.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 529. LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DISASTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 165(h)(3)(B)(i)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 103 of this Act, is amended by striking “the period beginning after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2016,” and inserting “any period beginning after December 31, 2011.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to disasters declared in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 530. NET OPERATING LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DISASTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 172(i)(1)(A)(i)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and before January 1, 2016.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to disasters declared in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 531. SPECIAL RULES FOR USE OF RETIREMENT FUNDS IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.

(a) **WITHDRAWALS.**—Section 72(t)(11)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 108 of this Act, is amended by striking “2011 and before January 1, 2016,” and inserting “2011.”.

(b) **LOANS.**—Section 72(p)(6)(C)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “and ending on December 31, 2016”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions with respect to disaster declared after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 532. ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR HOUSING QUALIFIED DISASTER DISPLACED INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 151(f)(3)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 109 of this Act, is amended by striking “and before 2016”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 533. EXCLUSIONS OF CERTAIN CANCELLATIONS OF INDEBTEDNESS BY REASON OF DISASTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 108(j)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 110 of this Act, is amended by striking “and before 2016”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to discharges made on or after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 534. SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING EARNED INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED BY FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 32(n)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 111 of this Act, is amended by striking “and before 2016”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 535. QUALIFIED DISASTER AREA RECOVERY BONDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 146A(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 114 of this Act, is further amended by striking “and before January 1, 2017”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to obligations issued after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 536. ADDITIONAL LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT ALLOCATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 42(h)(3)(J) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 115 of this Act, is amended—

(1) in clause (i) by striking “In the case of calendar year 2016,” and inserting “In the case of a calendar year beginning after 2015,”.

(2) in clause (ii)(II) by striking “2015” and inserting “the preceding calendar year”, and

(3) in clause (iii) by striking “substituting ‘January 1 of the calendar year in which the taxable year ends’ for ‘January 1, 2015’”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer this motion to recommit on behalf of Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. This is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

It is unfortunate that we are here today debating inadequate policies while our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are hurting.

While I do not doubt the underlying bill was made with good intentions, it is not just inadequate for all the victims of the hurricanes, and it is insulting to the people of Puerto Rico. They are hurting. They have no food, no water, no power. They need our help.

Estimates suggest the storm caused \$40 billion to \$85 billion in insurance claims throughout the Caribbean, with 85 percent of those losses in Puerto Rico. Nearly all of the island is without power, and 85 percent of cell towers were knocked out. The hurricane ravaged 80 percent of the crop value in Puerto Rico—a \$780 million loss. This will result in higher food prices at a time when Puerto Rico faces shortages.

These are only the initial estimates. Each day we learn more about the scale of devastation, and likely won't know the measure of damage for some time.

FEMA has indicated that it has “provided more than 1.5 million meals, 1.1 million liters of water, nearly 300 infant and toddler kits, and nearly 12,000 emergency roofing kits to the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico since Hur-

ricane Maria's landfall.” That is a quote from FEMA.

Yet the total population of American citizens in Puerto Rico is 3.4 million. The total in the U.S. Virgin Islands is over 100,000. It has been 7 days since the storm. The math simply doesn't add up, and neither does the bill as it is written.

This motion to recommit would do more for the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands than the underlying bill. Unlike the underlying bill, this motion will give them funds to help them rebuild. The dollars are directed for rebuilding and other economic support.

It considers specific provisions to ensure long-term growth is capable on the island, and it strives to treat disaster victims equally. By taking the politics out of natural disasters, all of our constituents, from New York, and Puerto Rico, to Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, will automatically have the necessary aid to rebuild. Giving them this peace of mind will give them the ability to focus on what matters: their families and communities.

Rather than putting forth a fig leaf to offer themselves cover, as the underlying bill does, this motion would provide immediate, greater benefits to the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. They cannot wait for assistance.

By voting for this motion, you would be voting to help our fellow Americans. I urge all Members to vote “yes.”

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I believe in bipartisanship, which means that oftentimes I am disappointed in this institution, but today I am not disappointed, I am shocked. I am shocked that some would politicize such a sensitive, desperate situation that so many Americans, from Texas to Puerto Rico, are facing at this hour.

My colleagues say they want to help the people of Puerto Rico, the people of the Florida Keys in my district, and others throughout the country. A lot of them have come here boasting about the fact that they have never opposed a disaster relief package, yet they are willing to do so today. Why? To try to attempt to score political points.

I think that is wrong, and I can't help but take it personally, because my constituents really need this help.

The people of Puerto Rico, by the way, the person they elected to this chamber, JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, supports this legislation; STACEY PLASKETT of the Virgin Islands, our colleague, put her name to this legislation as well; Chairman BRADY, whose constituents are trying to recover in

the Houston area, is asking for passage of this legislation, yet people from other parts of the country are coming to this floor saying: No, that is not good enough for your constituents.

So if my constituents get nothing, I should tell them: That is right. Someone from elsewhere said that because this wasn't good enough, you get nothing.

That is just wrong. This is an important first step that we have to take to help people in all of these jurisdictions, especially the people of Puerto Rico, because we know that the situation there is in no way comparable to anything that has happened on the mainland.

It is personal for me in that sense as well, because guess what? When my wife's family was exiled from Cuba, they went to Puerto Rico and they were welcomed there. My wife's two elder brothers were born in Puerto Rico. My wife still has family in Puerto Rico, and I know that this legislation would improve their situation.

Can we do more? Should we do more? Should we work together to do more in the future? Yes, we should and we will, but that is no excuse to vote against this legislation, that is no excuse to leverage the suffering of these people to try to achieve a political objective or even to advance different legislation.

I respectfully ask all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, and I thank the 26 Democrats who stood with us on Monday, and I ask them to do it again today and for more to join us, to send a strong message of national unity for the people of Florida, Texas, Louisiana, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and, yes, Puerto Rico.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered;

Passage of H.R. 2792; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 227, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—188

Adams	Barragán	Beatty
Aguilar	Bass	Bera

Beyer	Gomez	Norcross
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Blumenauer	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Blunt Rochester	Green, Al	Pallone
Bonamici	Green, Gene	Panetta
Boyle, Brendan	Grijalva	Payne
F.	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Brown (MD)	Hastings	Peters
Brownley (CA)	Heck	Peterson
Bustos	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Butterfield	Himes	Pocan
Capuano	Hoyer	Polis
Carbajal	Huffman	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Raskin
Cartwright	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rosen
Castro (TX)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Cicilline	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kildee	Sánchez
Cleaver	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kind	Schakowsky
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Conyers	Langevin	Schrader
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Correa	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Costa	Lawrence	Serrano
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Crist	Lee	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Levin	Sherman
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sinema
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Soto
DeGette	Lowenthal	Speier
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Suozi
DeLauro	M.	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Demings	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Titus
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Doggett	Matsui	Torres
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Tsongas
F.	McEachin	Vargas
Ellison	McGovern	Veasey
Engel	McNerney	Vela
Eshoo	Meeks	Velázquez
Españillat	Meng	Visclosky
Esty (CT)	Moore	Wasserman
Evans	Moulton	Schultz
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Napolitano	Welch
Gabbard	Neal	Yarmuth
Gallego	Nolan	
Garamendi		

NAYS—227

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Estes (KS)
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Farenthold
Allen	Chabot	Faso
Amash	Cheney	Ferguson
Amodei	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Arrington	Cole	Fleischmann
Babin	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bacon	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Banks (IN)	Comer	Fox
Barr	Comstock	Franks (AZ)
Barton	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Bergman	Cook	Gaetz
Biggs	Costello (PA)	Gallagher
Billrakis	Cramer	Garrett
Bishop (MI)	Crawford	Gianforte
Black	Culberson	Gibbs
Blackburn	Curbelo (FL)	Gohmert
Blum	Davidson	Goodlatte
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Brady (TX)	Denham	Gowdy
Brat	Dent	Graves (GA)
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Graves (LA)
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Griffith
Buck	Donovan	Grothman
Bucshon	Duffy	Guthrie
Budd	Duncan (SC)	Handel
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Byrne	Dunn	Harris
Calvert	Emmer	Hartzler

Hensarling	McCaul	Russell
Herrera Beutler	McClintock	Rutherford
Hice, Jody B.	McHenry	Sanford
Higgins (LA)	McKinley	Schweikert
Hill	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Holding	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Hollingsworth	McSally	Sessions
Hudson	Meadows	Shimkus
Huizenga	Meehan	Shuster
Hultgren	Messer	Simpson
Hunter	Mitchell	Smith (MO)
Hurd	Moolenaar	Smith (NE)
Issa	Mooney (WV)	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (KS)	Mullin	Smucker
Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (PA)	Stefanik
Johnson (LA)	Newhouse	Stewart
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Stivers
Jones	Norman	Taylor
Jordan	Nunes	Tenney
Joyce (OH)	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Katko	Palazzo	Thornberry
Kelly (MS)	Palmer	Tipton
Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Trott
King (IA)	Pearce	Turner
King (NY)	Perry	Upton
Kinzinger	Pittenger	Valadao
Knight	Poe (TX)	Walberg
Kustoff (TN)	Poliquin	Walsh
Labrador	Posey	Walker
LaHood	Ratcliffe	Walorski
LaMalfa	Reed	Walters, Mimi
Lamborn	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Lance	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Latta	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup
Lewis (MN)	Roby	Westerman
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Williams
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Love	Rogers (KY)	Wittman
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Womack
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Woodall
MacArthur	Rooney, Thomas	Yoder
Marchant	J.	Yoho
Marino	Roskam	Young (AK)
Marshall	Ross	Young (IA)
Massie	Rothfus	Zeldin
Mast	Rouzer	
McCarthy	Royce (CA)	

NOT VOTING—18

Barletta	Johnson, Sam	Scalise
Bishop (UT)	Long	Smith (NJ)
Bridenstine	Pascarell	Tiberi
Granger	Richmond	Wagner
Johnson (GA)	Rooney, Francis	Walz
Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (FL)

□ 1051

Messrs. NORMAN, DUNCAN of Tennessee, PITTENGER, LUCAS, MCCAUL, MCCLINTOCK, PALAZZO, and BRADY of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. SANCHEZ, Messrs. SERRANO and HUFFMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to mark the return to the Chamber of our dear friend and colleague from Louisiana, Mr. STEVE SCALISE.

Our prayers have been answered. His bravery and his family's strength have been such an inspiration to this House and to the people it serves. America is grateful for this moment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCALISE was allowed to speak out of order.)

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR SUPPORT DURING MY RECOVERY

Mr. SCALISE. Wow. Mr. Speaker, you have no idea how great this feels to be back here at work in the people's House.

As you can imagine, these last 3½ months have been pretty challenging times for me and my family. But if you look at the outpouring of love, of warmth, of prayer, my gosh, Jennifer and I have been overwhelmed with all of that outpouring. It has given us the strength to get through all of this and to get to this point today, and it starts with God.

When I was laying out on that ball field, the first thing I did once I was down and I couldn't move anymore is, I just started to pray. And I will tell you, it gave me an unbelievable sense of calm knowing that at that point it was in God's hands.

But I prayed for very specific things, and I will tell you, pretty much every one of those prayers was answered. There were some pretty challenging prayers I was putting in God's hands, but He really did deliver for me and my family. And it just gives you that renewed faith and understanding that the power of prayer is something that you just cannot underestimate. So I am definitely a living example that miracles really do happen.

The first place I want to go to thank true angels along the way starts with the United States Capitol Police. When I was elected majority whip, as you know, the elected leadership has a security detail, and if anybody ever wondered why we are assigned security detail, I surely found out that day.

Let me tell you, I want to specifically mention Crystal Griner and David Bailey. Crystal and David were assigned to my security detail that morning. Day in and day out, they are part of our family. Jennifer and I truly do treat them as part of our family because they are with us everywhere we go. On that day, it was no different.

On June 14, they came at 6:30 in the morning. We arrived at the baseball field just to play and practice for a game of charity baseball. Nobody would have suspected what ensued, and yet, as soon as those shots were fired—I will tell you, when I was laying on the ground, one of the things I prayed for was that David and Crystal would be successful in carrying out their duties.

Both David and Crystal are incredibly well-trained and incredibly professional. But when I was laying there, not long after the first couple of shots were fired, I could hear a different caliber of weapon. That told me that they had immediately engaged the shooter. Let me tell you, if they didn't act so quickly—even after being shot both themselves, they continued to engage the shooter and ultimately got him down, which not only saved my life, but saved the lives of a lot of other people that are here in this Chamber today.

Crystal couldn't be with us today, but David Bailey is with us. David, you are my hero. You saved my life. Thank you so much. Tiger blood.

I also owe thanks to a lot of the people who were on the field with me. Right after the shooter was down, a lot of my colleagues came and ran to come check on me. One I want to mention in particular is one of those things that Jennifer and I call the little miracles that happened that day and throughout the next few months of our recovery.

We happened to have BRAD WENSTRUP on the field that day, and he was one of the first to come to my side. As you know, BRAD is not only a doctor, but he is a decorated Army Ranger who served in combat. And one of his roles and missions was to take care of people that were wounded before they went off on the helicopter to go get prepared. Who would have thought that God would have put BRAD out there on that field with me because the tourniquet he applied, many will tell you, saved my life so that I could actually make it to the hospital in time with all of the blood loss. So, BRAD, where are you at? Right down in front.

Once I arrived at MedStar Washington Hospital Center, I was a little bit out of it at that point. But luckily, I ended up in the trusted hands of Dr. Jack Sava and his great team over at MedStar. They gave me a second chance at life. Through many, many surgeries, where my life was truly in the balance in a few of those, they did a wonderful job at making sure that I was well taken care of and, ultimately, made it through that point so I could get to Dr. Golden and his team who actually put me back together again, which was quite a task, to the point where I am actually able to relearn how to walk again. So, Dr. Sava, Dr. Golden, thank you for being here and thanks for your team's work.

Above all else, I want to thank my lovely wife, Jennifer. Those of you who know her know how strong Jennifer is. She is an incredibly warm and loving wife, and she is an incredible mother to our children. Somehow, through the late nights and the surgeries and all of the other things, she managed to hold our family together, to make sure that Harrison and Madison were cared for as well. Still, to this day, she is not only by my side, but she is also serving as a great mother. I am lucky to have you. Thanks for being here. I love you, Sweetheart.

While it has been a challenging time for my family, the thing that really overwhelmed us from the start was the outpouring of love and warmth and prayers. From southeast Louisiana, the district that I represent, we saw blood drives at St. Catherine of Siena Parish. We saw prayer groups at First United Methodist Church in Slidell.

But what we also saw were prayer groups and well-wishes being given from people that we never met before throughout all of your districts. You shared it with me, and it was one of those things that was hard for us to

completely comprehend that you had people from all walks of life that had never met me before, and yet, they saw what had happened and they just wanted to offer prayers.

Let me tell you, to each and every one of you—and please convey it to your constituents, and I sure convey it to my constituents back home—that warmth and love gave us just incredible strength that you can't imagine during some really, really difficult times. So that is one more example of the power of prayer.

Something else I saw firsthand wasn't a surprise to me, but it was the outpouring of love from you, my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat. I know right after the shooting—we were practicing on the Republican side and the Democrats were practicing too—my colleague and friend, and sometimes archrival in baseball from back home in New Orleans—unfortunately, the star of the game too many times—CEDRIC RICHMOND somehow figured out which hospital I was sent to, and he got there. He was probably the first person there on the scene, in his baseball uniform, to check on me.

So many others of you, again, both Republican and Democrat, reached out in ways that I can't express the gratitude and how much it means to me, Jennifer, and our whole family. It really does show the warm side of Congress that very few people get to see.

I want to thank each and every one of you for that. You don't know how much it meant to me. When I came back into this Chamber here today, just seeing the faces of all of you, it just means more to me than you can imagine. So thanks for all of that love and support.

A lot of people ask: Did the event change you? And I think those of you who know me know I am an optimistic person. I am just a fun-loving person. I am from south Louisiana, and we believe you work hard and you play hard and *joie de vivre*.

Is an event like this really going to change that? The first thing I can tell you is, yes, it changed me, but not in the ways you might think. It has only strengthened my faith in God, and it has really crystallized what shows up as the goodness in people. I got to see that goodness in people.

While some people might focus on a tragic event and an evil act, to me, all I remember are the thousands of acts of kindness and love and warmth that came out of this and kept me going through all of it and, again, just reemphasized just how wonderful most people are and how much compassion there is out there.

Finally, I want to talk about something that I guess hit me and probably struck me more than anything that I was not expecting, and that was the outpouring of love and support from world leaders, people I have met and

have known. Benjamin Netanyahu and I have had some incredible conversations from the hospital. And Theresa May, King Abdullah of Jordan—leaders that so many of us have met—reached out. But other world leaders also reached out, people I had never met before.

That touched me in a different way because each and every one of us, we come here and we fight for the things that we believe in. I have passionate beliefs. For some reason, some of you don't agree with all of those. But it is so important that we come up here. We are the people's House. This is the place where these ideas are supposed to be debated, and we fight through those issues. But, ultimately, we come together on whatever the board shows is 218. If you can put the majority together, that is what rules the day. It is so important that, as we are having those political battles, we don't make them personal.

One of the things I saw—and I guess this is the thing that really kept coming back to me—is I tried to make sense of all of this. In comprehending the outpouring of love that I saw, it kept coming back to those world leaders. Why would leaders from around the world that I had never met before reach out and say: "Steve, we hope you can get back to work. We hope you can come through this."?

And what it says is, sure, they cared about my wellbeing, but more than that, they saw this as an attack on all of us. They saw this as an attack on the institution of the United States Congress and our government. And they really count on us to be successful.

Look, we all know the United States is the leader of the free world. It is something that we have, frankly, had the honor as a country to hold as a distinction for generations. And yet, when you look at that title, what it really means is, is that there are people all around the world that want freedom, maybe that have freedom, but they know the United States being strong is critical to the rest of the world having the opportunity for freedom.

That is why I am so excited to be back because, as we are fighting through the issues of the day, let's just keep in mind that we rise above the challenges of the day and understand that it is not just us and our constituents and the country, the United States, that is counting on our being successful. People all around the world who believe in freedom are counting on us as well, and we will deliver for them. That is why I am so honored to be back here in the House serving with you.

God bless each and every one of you, and God bless the United States of America.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. PELOSI was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANSWERED PRAYERS

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I join you in thanking God for the return of our colleague, STEVE SCALISE, and to have him do so in such a strong way.

You were brief, Mr. Speaker, I will be even briefer.

Thank God, our prayers are answered.

I take great pride in STEVE because we are both Italian Americans, and I think that is a source of some of his strength.

I, too, want to say how proud we are of Jennifer, Harrison, and Madison, of your staff, and of our first responders—our Capitol Police—who took such good care of you.

But if it is, as you said, an attack on you is an attack on all, then we all came through this magnificently because of your strength. So it is the power of STEVE SCALISE.

The day we came to the floor when you weren't here, we were all Team Scalise. Today we are Team Scalise.

Thank you for being so wonderful.

God bless you.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 155, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

YEAS—264

Aderholt	Castor (FL)	Emmer
Allen	Chabot	Estes (KS)
Amodei	Cheney	Farenthold
Arrington	Coffman	Faso
Babin	Cole	Ferguson
Bacon	Collins (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Banks (IN)	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Barr	Comer	Flores
Barton	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bera	Conaway	Foxx
Bergman	Connolly	Franks (AZ)
Biggs	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Bilirakis	Correa	Gabbard
Bishop (MI)	Costa	Gaetz
Black	Costello (PA)	Gallagher
Blackburn	Cramer	Garrett
Blum	Crawford	Gianforte
Bost	Crist	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Gohmert
Brat	Culberson	Gonzalez (TX)
Brooks (AL)	Curbelo (FL)	Goodlatte
Brooks (IN)	Davidson	Gosar
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Buchanan	Delaney	Graves (GA)
Buck	Denham	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Dent	Green, Al
Budd	DeSantis	Green, Gene
Burgess	DesJarlais	Griffith
Bustos	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Byrne	Donovan	Handel
Calvert	Duffy	Harper
Carbajal	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Carter (TX)	Dunn	Hensarling

Herrera Beutler	McClintock	Ruppersberger
Hice, Jody B.	McHenry	Russell
Higgins (LA)	McKinley	Rutherford
Hill	McMorris	Scalise
Himes	Rodgers	Schneider
Holding	McNerney	Schrader
Hudson	McSally	Schweikert
Huizenga	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Hultgren	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Hunter	Messer	Sessions
Hurd	Mitchell	Shea-Porter
Issa	Moolenaar	Shimkus
Jackson Lee	Mooney (WV)	Shuster
Jenkins (KS)	Moulton	Simpson
Jenkins (WV)	Mullin	Sinema
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (FL)	Smith (MO)
Jordan	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)
Katko	Noem	Smith (TX)
Keating	Norman	Smucker
Kelly (MS)	Nunes	Soto
Kelly (PA)	O'Halleran	Stefanik
Kihuen	Olson	Stewart
Kind	Palazzo	Stivers
King (IA)	Palmer	Suozi
King (NY)	Paulsen	Taylor
Kinzinger	Pearce	Tenney
Knight	Perry	Thompson (PA)
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Thornberry
Kuster (NH)	Peterson	Tipton
Kustoff (TN)	Pittenger	Trott
Labrador	Poe (TX)	Turner
LaHood	Poliquin	Upton
LaMalfa	Posey	Valadao
Lamborn	Quigley	Vela
Lance	Ratchliffe	Walberg
Latta	Reed	Walden
Lawson (FL)	Reichert	Walker
Lewis (MN)	Renacci	Walorski
Lipinski	Rice (SC)	Walters, Mimi
LoBiondo	Roby	Weber (TX)
Loeb sack	Roe (TN)	Webster (FL)
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup
Love	Rogers (KY)	Westerman
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Williams
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Wilson (SC)
MacArthur	Rooney, Thomas J.	Wittman
Maloney, Sean	Rosen	Womack
Marchant	Roskam	Woodall
Marino	Ross	Yoder
Marshall	Rothfus	Yoho
Massie	Rouzer	Young (AK)
Mast	Royce (CA)	Young (IA)
McCarthy	Ruiz	Zeldin
McCaul		

NAYS—155

Abraham	DeGette	Kaptur
Adams	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Aguilar	DelBene	Kennedy
Amash	Demings	Khanna
Barragan	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Bass	Deutch	Kilmer
Beatty	Dingell	Langevin
Beyer	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Doyle, Michael F.	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	Ellison	Lawrence
Blunt Rochester	Engel	Lee
Bonamici	Eshoo	Levin
Boyle, Brendan F.	Espallat	Lewis (GA)
Brady (PA)	Esty (CT)	Lieu, Ted
Brown (MD)	Evans	Lofgren
Butterfield	Foster	Lowenthal
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	Lowe
Cardenas	Fudge	Lujan Grisham,
Carson (IN)	Gallejo	M.
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lujan, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Gomez	Lynch
Chu, Judy	Gotthelmer	Maloney,
Cicilline	Graves (LA)	Carolyn B.
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Matsui
Clarke (NY)	Grothman	McCollum
Clay	Gutiérrez	McEachin
Cleaver	Hanabusa	McGovern
Clyburn	Hastings	Meeks
Cohen	Heck	Meng
Conyers	Higgins (NY)	Moore
Cooper	Hoyer	Nadler
Courtney	Huffman	Napolitano
Crowley	Jayapal	Neal
Cummings	Jeffries	Nolan
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Norcross
Davis, Danny	Johnson (LA)	O'Rourke
DeFazio	Jones	Pallone
		Panetta

Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta
Bishop (UT)
Bridenstine
Granger
Hollingsworth

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Long
Pascrell
Rooney, Francis

Ros-Lehtinen
Tiberi
Wagner
Walz

□ 1124

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL UNLAWFUL FUGITIVE FELONS ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2792) to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 171, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)

Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren

Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows

Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise

Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—171

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro

DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españilla
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee

Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres

NOT VOTING—18

Barletta
Bishop (UT)
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Cramer
Garrett

Granger
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Larson (CT)
Long
Pascrell

Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Scott (VA)
Tiberi
Wagner
Walz

□ 1132

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WENSTRUP changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Nay” on rollcall No. 543.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 542 (passage of H.R. 3823), and 543 (passage of H.R. 2792) I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on both these votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 28, 2017, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. On September 28, 2017, had I been present, I would have voted “No” on rollcall No. 541, the Democratic Motion to Recommit; I would have voted “Yes” on rollcall No. 542, H.R. 3823, the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017; I would have voted “Yes” on rollcall No. 543, H.R. 2792, the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GOODLATTE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 115-335) on the resolution (H. Res. 488) of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to

transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the removal of former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1145

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader for the purpose of giving us the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield, however, to the majority leader, I want to join all of our colleagues in saying how very grateful we are and pleased we are with the return of the majority whip, STEVE SCALISE. All of us who sat here and heard STEVE, our friend and colleague, give his reaction not only to the hateful, vicious action that took place as he was practicing for the charity baseball game where Republicans and Democrats come together to raise funds for young people and people who need help, and they do so together in a spirit of good will and common purpose, I think STEVE SCALISE, our majority whip, spoke movingly, and I am sure all Members were impressed with his courage and with his comments about that which is important.

He talked about his prayers having been answered and the prayers of literally millions of people around this country. And in talking about some of the world leaders who called him and expressed their concern, because they knew, as he said and as Leader PELOSI said: An attack on STEVE SCALISE was an attack on us all, and it was an attack on our democracy and an attack on peacefully resolving differences, no matter how strongly they may be held—a lesson for all of us.

I want to congratulate and thank Jennifer, his extraordinary wife, who shouldered a responsibility and a burden that she did not expect and, as STEVE said, did it with great courage and great grace. His children, Madison and Harrison, and their entire family, I know, were responsible for STEVE being able to be back here with us, and so we thank them.

He is back with us today, and we look forward to him being a vigorous, as he was and is, part of the deliberations of this House and of reaching decisions in a positive, constructive way.

STEVE and I have a difference of opinion on whose crabs are better. We had a crab dinner not too long ago, my staff and his staff, and he brought some crabs up from Louisiana, I brought some crabs from Maryland, and it was a split decision as to which were the

best. It will not surprise you who was for which crab.

Today, we are filled with joy to see him back on the floor and on the road to full recovery.

We also continue to be grateful for the recovery of U.S. Capitol Police Officers Crystal Griner and David Bailey. I want to join STEVE, and I know all of our Members, as we rose and clapped to show our respect and our appreciation for those in the Capitol Police.

Some of us are privileged to, as STEVE pointed out, have a detail, and they become family. We are so impressed with their commitment, their talent, the extraordinary training that they have received and display every day; and, of course, Crystal Griner and David Bailey responded and, in responding, were injured themselves. They put their lives at risk for not only STEVE SCALISE but for all the Members who were on the field at that point in time.

I want to join STEVE, and I know all of our colleagues and the majority leader, in expressing appreciation and great respect for those who serve us in the Capitol Police.

I say to my friend, the majority whip—he has left the floor now—we are glad to have you back. I wrote him a note this morning saying whatever I could do to help him, I was available to do that. I am sure he took it that that did not mean I necessarily would vote the way he wants me to vote, nor did I think he would vote necessarily the way I wanted him to vote, but we will continue in this great institution we call the House of Representatives, but, as STEVE called it and I call it and so many of us call it, the people's House.

Every 2 years, they send us back here to try to make policy to make their lives better and our country stronger, and, more than the public knows, we work together to accomplish that objective. They see the confrontations, but they don't always see the cooperation.

Now, at this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, my friend—we cooperate more than people will see from time to time, I want to thank him for that—for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, before I give the schedule, I do want to say today was a day that was very good to see our dear friend, STEVE SCALISE, make it back.

As the gentleman said, an attack on him was an attack on the entire institution. I was there that day in the hospital, my wife and I, and waiting for Jennifer to arrive, and STEVE, going through those surgeries. The number of times we would go back to visit, he is the strongest man I have ever known. I thought his speech today was fantastic.

It is from the heart that he first would seek God's guidance. The strength of Jennifer—I watched Madison and Harrison spend their entire summer in that hospital for their father, and for him to be able to walk back here as soon as he did and the excitement in his face when he was able to cast that vote, I know STEVE is going to continue to get stronger as he goes, and he thanks everybody for the help they provided.

We should not forget the spirit that this floor had today. We should take that spirit into the days forward and continue it. We can disagree, but it takes an unbelievable terrible situation, at times, to remind us of the human spirit we have for one another, and I want to make sure, even for myself, that I remember those moments in times of the most heated debates.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

And on Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Now, in addition, the House will consider H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, also, as I like to call it, "Micah's Law."

Mr. Speaker, I spent some time on Tuesday with a young boy named Micah. Micah gave me this bracelet, "Miracles for Micah," and I wear it because Micah was born premature at 20 weeks. If you look at a picture of Micah, he was the size of a bag of M&Ms. Today, he is happy, he is healthy, he is 5 years old, and no one would know the difference.

Mr. Speaker, all life is a miracle, and we have an obligation here to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

I look forward to the House passing this compassionate bill next week that will protect the lives of countless others just like Micah.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will take up the FY18 budget resolution. Our Republican budget balances within 10 years, provides for a strong national defense, eliminates burdensome regulations, and cracks down on waste, fraud, and abuse. Passing this budget will also enable tax reform, which is the key to economic growth and seeing that Americans take home more of their hard-earned dollars.

I thank Chairman BLACK and the entire Budget Committee—and especially you, Mr. Speaker—for their hard work on this bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information on the schedule to come.

I want to speak to two things that are not on the schedule, Mr. Leader, but I know that both of us are focused on this and realize that we need to move and we need to move quickly.

First of all, I want to speak of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The leader and I, Mr. Speaker, were scheduled to try to go to Key West and to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands this weekend. I am not sure that that is going to be able to happen, given some of the logistics on the ground, but whether that happens or not, Mr. Speaker, I know the leader and I are going to work very hard on this.

There is a humanitarian crisis that has confronted Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Key West, at least you can drive to Key West still, and we can get relief to Key West and to Florida and to victims of Harvey. Obviously, our fellow Americans who are residents of two islands, or actually more than two islands, but that comprise Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, are in life-threatening distress.

I talked today to Dr. Price, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, about the availability of dialysis on the island. There are people who have already died because they were not able to get to dialysis centers, and those centers don't have all the electricity they need, so there is a humanitarian crisis, as I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, and I know the leader appreciates this.

Mr. Leader, I know we don't have anything on the floor with reference to additional resources that might be and are necessary to meet this humanitarian crisis in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but I would urge the majority leader, as I have done and I think he has done, to be in contact with the administration, be in contact with FEMA.

In particular, I was pleased to see that General Kim has now been appointed, as General Honore was for New Orleans and Katrina, to coordinate activities. We have extraordinary resources in the Armed Forces of the United States, and I would urge the President, as Commander in Chief, and the Department of Defense to allocate every resource necessary to get the American people who live in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to a point where communications, the availability of food, the availability of water, the availability of medical services are up and running, hopefully, full bore by the end of this weekend. This is a crisis.

And I know the majority leader shares that view, and if he wants to make a comment on that, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his

interest, and it is true, the gentleman and I were hopefully trying to go down to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and Key West to look at some of the damage, and, right now, the Coast Guard tells us, with the rescue attempts that are ongoing, that we probably would be taking some equipment away from doing that work, and we do not want to do any of that. We will be able to go a little later when the time is right.

We will continue to work with the administration. When you think what this country has gone through with Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Maria, I do want to give thanks to the work of the administration. I have seen some coordination like I have not seen in the past.

We know these are islands. The damage of the two hurricanes they have to go through, I have been keeping in constant contact, and just speaking with FEMA just recently, they are currently coordinating and establishing seven temporary hospitals. That was one of my concerns with dialysis and others, but there is so much more to do to be able to move through, and I will work with the gentleman, as we have in the past, to make sure whatever they need will be able to get there.

□ 1200

And I do want to thank Congressman CARLOS CURELO for his amendment to the bill that we just voted on, adding a little more resources there to make sure, knowing the tax code of Puerto Rico is a little different than the one we had voted on as we go through, to give them greater assistance, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Clearly, this is not a partisan issue when an American or a group of Americans or a large number—in this case, over 3.5 million people, all of them at dire risk. We want to act together, we want to act quickly, and we do not want to fail to deploy any resource that is necessary to help our fellow Americans.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring up an act, which although not the crisis that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, in particular, confront us with, as did Harvey and Irma in Texas and in Florida, but, Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Dream Act is not a part of next week's schedule.

The leader and I have discussed the Dream Act, along with Speaker RYAN. I know that the President has said, if we pass the Dream Act, he has said publicly that he would sign the Dream Act. He is obviously concerned with security at the borders. We share that concern about security at the borders. But this is an item that, now, one-sixth of the time that was available has run, and we have 5 months left to go.

I will tell the majority leader that I am very hopeful. I know the majority

leader and the Speaker have formed some task forces to look at this issue, but I am very hopeful, Mr. Speaker—and I ask the majority leader to perhaps comment on this—that before the end of this work period—there are another 14 days left after this week in this work period—that we might be able to bring the Dream Act to the floor.

A discharge petition has been filed. I would hope that the discharge petition not be necessary for either the rule or for the Dream Act itself. The discharge petition on the Dream Act itself will be mature as of October 5, and I expect a discharge petition to be filed on that, as well. But I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that that will not be necessary.

Given the fact that the President has said that he thinks DACA was issued beyond the authority of President Obama, we disagree with that conclusion. But whether that conclusion is correct or not, the President observed that we need to fix this legislatively.

So my question to the majority leader is: How soon does he believe that we could address this issue in regular order?

We continue to pursue a discharge petition, as we did, frankly, for the Ex-Im Bank, which, when it was called to the floor, had over 300 votes in favor of it, including the majority of the majority party voted for that bill.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, strongly, that if the Dream Act is brought to the floor, which over 8 in 10 Americans agree with, frankly, we believe large numbers on both sides of the aisle agree that these young people are not to be sent home.

Lastly, let me just quote Senator ORRIN HATCH, who is a senior Member in the United States Senate and the chairman of the Finance Committee. He said: "I've urged the President not to rescind DACA. . . ."

He did, and gave us 6 months to solve this, legislatively.

Senator HATCH observed that if DACA were rescinded, it would be "an action that would further complicate a system in serious need of a permanent, legislative solution."

He was referring then, Mr. Speaker, to a comprehensive immigration reform.

"Like the President, I've long advocated for tougher enforcement of our existing immigration laws. But we also need a workable, permanent solution for individuals who entered our country unlawfully as children through no fault of their own and who have built their lives here. That solution must come from Congress."

And I agree that that decision must come from Congress.

Rush Limbaugh said—and I don't usually agree with statements that Mr. Limbaugh makes: "Nobody's gonna win anything by deporting a bunch of kids that we let in, whoever did, Obama,

whatever. If we can get the strict enforcement of existing immigration law . . . then the DREAMer thing may be an acceptable payoff," he went on to say.

I don't think this is a payoff. This is responding. And that is why the overwhelming majority of the American people support the Dream Act. As I say, over 8 out of 10 Americans.

So I ask the majority—and I know that was a relatively long statement. This is a critical issue, however, as I have expressed in private to the majority leader, because we have but 5 months left to go.

Hopefully, we could do this in this work period to allay the fears that these young people have, who are making such a positive contribution to America, to their communities, and to their families. So I am hopeful that we could resolve this issue as soon as possible.

I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I first want to applaud Speaker RYAN for forming a working group on this important issue. The gentleman and I have met numerous times on this, and I have talked to the President about it, as well. He has been very clear, and I agree with the President's position, courts have shown that the past was unconstitutional, and that just means the House has to do their job and the Senate. The one thing I would hate to happen here is that we only do the job halfway, and then we have this problem come back to us.

The President has asked us about border security, as well. I believe we can find a solution here, together. I look forward to working with Mr. HOYER.

The President has challenged this Congress to find a solution, and I believe we can. We are going to work to make sure we get it done. I would like to do it sooner than the timeframe the President has given us.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the majority leader's thought that he wants to do it sooner rather than later. I will support him, of course, in that effort.

I would say on his comment, Mr. Speaker, with reference to a comprehensive solution, we are for a comprehensive solution. We would like to see that because that is the only way we will stop this from coming back.

The Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill 3 years ago. We have not seen that on the floor as of yet. Again, we think that that would have a substantial vote and, perhaps, I think, a majority vote. I am not as confident of that as I am with the Dream Act, which I think clearly would enjoy the majority of the House's support.

But I am glad that he wants to move this quickly. We will work with him to

get that, I would hope, as I said, by the end of the work period, to allay the great fears and anxiety.

Very frankly, we have had some young people thinking of going back to a land they do not know, a language they do not necessarily speak, and a culture they have, as adults, never been exposed to and don't know.

This, for all intents and purposes, in anything other than having the paper that says so, is their country. They have gone to school here, they work here, and they have been positive citizens here. And, hopefully—as the President said, he loved these children—we could relieve their fears and, in effect, redeem the American Dream for them.

There are other issues, obviously, with which we have to deal, and I would urge the majority leader, as well, at some point in time, to make a path forward for comprehensive immigration reform, because it is a system we all agree is broken and needs to be fixed and is part of the problem.

Two more issues, Mr. Speaker. The majority leader mentioned the budget would be coming to the floor. This is the 2018 budget. This is obviously late, but, nevertheless, it is being brought to the floor, and we will be able to consider it.

Can the gentleman tell me: Will this include reconciliation instructions and, if so, what those reconciliation instructions will deal with?

I yield to my friend.

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

I expect reconciliation in this budget. I leave it up to the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee when they produce it, but on this floor, I believe there will be reconciliation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, will it assume the repeal of the ACA in fiscal year '17 or fiscal year '18, either one of those years, which clearly has not seemed possible at this point in time?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

If the question is have I given up on repealing ObamaCare, the answer is no.

So, yes, this is the budget for the rest of the year. We know the harm that ObamaCare has brought to many Americans. The lack of insurance, when you look at the number of counties, 40 percent of all of the counties in America only have one provider, some have none. We watched premiums go up.

We want a healthcare system where people have choice, that, actually, the price is lower and the quality is better. That is something I will never give up on, so, yes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for that observation.

Obviously, we disagree, as he knows, on the success or failure of the ACA. As a matter of fact, every health organiza-

tion in America, every major health organization in America opposed the repeal, a bill that came to the floor.

Senator McCAIN, I thought, gave a very powerful exhortation to all of us when he said, on July 25, we ought to do this in a bipartisan way.

We found, now, three efforts to repeal by the majority party, who control all three—the Senate, the House, and the Presidency—an inability to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe—and I would hope the majority leader would pursue efforts, and we would do the same on our side. We believe the ACA has been working.

We believe that 20-plus million more people are insured under the ACA than were insured before the ACA.

We believe people with preexisting conditions were able to get insurance. We believe seniors saved substantial money in purchasing prescription drugs as a result of that.

We believe that people did not have—we know they did not have the specter of being canceled because their expenses in any one year were above a limit and that their lifetime limits would not be imposed when they get a serious critical illness.

So we think it worked.

The majority has tried to repeal it. They have not succeeded at this point in time, but they have created, Mr. Speaker, great anxiety and uncertainty in the marketplace.

And to the extent, for instance, that premiums have risen in our State, the head of Blue Cross/Blue Shield, the largest insurer in our State, said the reason for at least 50 percent was the uncertainty that had been created by the administration and by the debates that have occurred in this House and the proposals that have occurred in this House, which have undermined the market.

I talked to him the other day, and he said, in fact, if there were stability, he believes rates would come down significantly because insurance companies, providers, would have an opportunity to have a stable environment in which they could assess the cost of health insurance.

Did the majority leader want to say anything?

I yield to my friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, the only thing I want to say, and I know we have debated this many times—we can always put an endorsement somewhere and we can always go back and forth, but I will just tell you for my own district—I don't know why anybody would ever say they are making a decision based on something when our bill carries it out another 2 years even, so I don't believe that to be true.

But I know what is true. Currently, 30 percent of the people who are on the exchange in my district just had somebody pull out; and they had that health

insurance, Anthem, so now they don't. They have to go find something else. They had doctors who they loved, and they were promised that they were going to be able to keep them. Well, they couldn't.

I just look at numbers; and I take Republican, Democrat, I take whatever name is across from it. Almost twice as many people pay the penalty or take a waiver as actually make a payment for ObamaCare.

□ 1215

So, yes, this will continue not because you and I have a disagreement, but because people are hurting, premiums are going up, deductibles are going up, and people are losing their providers. And the providers are not leaving because it is staying the same way for another 2 years, they are leaving because it is staying there.

So, yes, I look forward to continuing this conversation because we cannot allow this harm to continue to go through this country.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on, I presume, all day, and our friends who want to do a 1-minute or a Special Order would not be happy with us, and they are maybe not happy now, but the fact of the matter is that this is a critically important issue to our country. When he talks about providers, the providers said they didn't like any of these bills.

We have had three opportunities: one that was offered but not put on the floor; then one that came to the floor and passed this House and then went to the Senate, and the majority of the Senate has not agreed with any of the three alternatives; plus the alternative that Senator GRAHAM brought forward along with the Senator from Louisiana.

The majority in the Senate has not agreed, and, Mr. Speaker, what that has done is provided the insurance industry, providers, doctors, medical authorities with total lack of confidence on what is going to happen tomorrow. Nobody in business believes that you can have proper pricing if you do not know the context in which you are pricing your product. So, yes, there has been a disruption.

What we ought to do, as Senator MCCAIN said, is come together and make sure a system works. We believe the ACA is working—not working as well as it should right now, it is not working as much for the small market or people on the exchanges as it should. It can.

Almost every medical provider and the majority of the American people over these last 8 months has changed from not liking the ACA and not thinking it is good for them, to where the majority of the American people now support it, and 7 out of 10-plus want the ACA fixed, not repealed.

So in that context, it seems to me it is both good politics and good policy for us to come together and to create a system that works for the American people. We believe that is by fixing the ACA, and to that extent, we reflect the majority of the American people.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the last issue I want to bring up are two items that were not included in the FAA bill, but which are important programs. One is the Perkins Loan Program for students. We know that the cost of education has skyrocketed and that we need to extend that act. That bill, by the way, Mr. Speaker, has 226 cosponsors, so it is not as if there is not a majority of the House that already supports that extension.

The second thing that needs to be done: we need to deal with a comprehensive health system in our communities, the Community Health Centers. We need to deal with the teaching hospitals. We need to deal with the disproportionate share of hospitals.

So there are many things that we did not include in the bill that we passed today that need to be addressed and need to be addressed immediately. They are not on the schedule for next week.

Can my friend give me some idea when we might consider those, which, of course, expire on September 30?

So September 30 will come and go before we start next week's schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

You raised a couple issues there. When it comes to teaching hospitals, that was in the bill you just voted against twice this week on the floor. So that has been taken care of.

When you are talking about SCHIP and the extension of that, Chairman WALDEN actually postponed a markup not because he wanted to, but because it was requested by the Democrats. So he postponed the markup this week in continuing bipartisan negotiations.

This is something I would like to get done. I know Chairman WALDEN has now scheduled a markup for next week, so I am very hopeful that we will get this done very soon. I am a big supporter of SCHIP and a lot of the work that they do and what it moves forward for our healthcare in the future, especially for the health clinics out there. So I look forward to working with you.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate that.

You mentioned SCHIP. Can you refer to the Perkins Loan Program? Does the gentleman know whether that is also moving forward?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

I apologize. You did mention the Perkins Act. I do not have that scheduled at the current time, but I will keep you abreast when I do.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that SCHIP is on the commit-

tee's agenda for next week. Hopefully, that can be brought to the floor before we leave in this work period, perhaps just before or just after the Dream Act is brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that today could be the very last time that Margarida Curtis provides a message to us on this floor.

We would like to thank Margarida Curtis. From a very grateful nation, thank you for your service. Many times the American people see your voice, but also the power of what you bring back and forth to make this democracy work. We want to thank you for your service, and we wish you all the happiness in retirement.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Margarida Curtis has been a longtime employee of the United States Senate and, as a result, an employee of the people of the United States.

Margarida, you have always done your work with great ability and clarity. We very much appreciate your service to the Senate, but also to this House, to the Congress itself, and to the American people. They are grateful for all you have done. God speed.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2266. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2017, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 2, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Suicide Prevention

Month to call attention to this tragedy that is so prevalent and important throughout our Nation.

Suicide is the tenth leading cause of death in the United States, and, on average, there are 121 suicides per day. Far too many Americans, about one in five, are suffering from some form of mental illness, a problem that has disrupted too many families, caused too much violence, pain, and cost too many lives.

In Congress, we are working together on a bipartisan basis to bring needed reform to our mental healthcare system through the passage of the 21st Century Cures Act and the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act.

The Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System, led by Dr. Margie Scott, is one of nine systems nationwide currently involved in the Clay Hunt pilot program.

This program gives our VA employees the necessary tools to reach out to high-risk veterans and offer guidance while providing essential suicide prevention services. Dr. Scott and Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System have made over 200 community connections throughout Arkansas to assist our veterans.

We all must work together and continue to move forward in addressing the issue of mental health and mental health access, and do what we can to save the lives of all American citizens and reverse this deadly trend of suicides.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM WILL EXPIRE ON SEPTEMBER 30

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe Congress has closed legislative business for the week without addressing a critical deadline that will impact the health of our country. On September 30, authorization for the Community Health Centers and the Children's Health Insurance Program—CHIP—will expire.

Well, it is September 28, and we just closed legislative business. That means funding for this critical program will lapse and the health of millions of Americans will be in jeopardy.

Our Nation's Community Health Centers have served low-income, rural, and underserved communities for more than 50 years. In that time, they have increased the number of patients they serve and the services they offer so that they are now the primary healthcare option for millions of people.

CHIP is another program that Congress will allow to lapse.

No matter how big the differences between Republicans and Democrats, when it comes to healthcare, we have always come together to ensure our Nation's children do not go without the care they need, yet here we are leaving D.C. and abandoning the 9 million children on CHIP and the millions more at the Community Health Centers.

I ask that we come back into session and that we extend these critical programs.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAJOR GENERAL TIM LOWENBERG

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and memory of Major General Timothy Lowenberg, former Adjutant General of the Washington State National Guard.

After attending law school, Tim served on Active Duty at McChord Air Force Base before joining the Washington National Guard as a Judge Advocate Staff Officer.

He was promoted to Adjutant General, honorably serving Washington State and our Nation. He stood up for our citizen soldiers, worked to ensure that the National Guard had the resources it needed, and oversaw multiple deployments to the Middle East.

In addition, Tim established the Washington Youth Academy, providing an education and opportunity for at-risk youth across the State.

As a member of the Washington legislature, I was pleased to work with him on this, a cause that he was very passionate about, and was able to see his vision become a success.

Upon retirement, he continued to serve his country and community. He will be missed by many, but his legacy of determination, kindness, and dutiful service to Washington and these United States lives on.

Please join me in remembering Major General Timothy Lowenberg, my friend.

HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the anniversary of the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

Tomorrow, the program we know as SNAP—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—turns 40. We also know that before the implementation of SNAP, families couldn't afford healthy meals and kids were going to school on empty stomachs.

Today, thanks to this program, over 18,000 families in my district on the

central coast of California count on SNAP benefits to put food on their tables at home and help their children feed their minds at their schools.

In my district, the number one industry is agriculture. We ship our many fresh fruits and vegetables all over the country and to even other parts of the world. As a representative of this area, it is my goal and it is my responsibility to make sure that the families in my district have access to the same nutritious produce that is grown in our backyard.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of Chairman CONAWAY, I look forward to working on the 2018 farm bill with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle so that we can support strong investments in SNAP. By doing that, we will support stronger families and a stronger future.

□ 1230

THE 2018 FISCAL YEAR

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this coming Sunday is new year's day, the start of the Federal Government's 2018 fiscal year.

Several weeks ago, Congress passed and the President signed a temporary spending bill to carry the government through December 8. This temporary bill was necessary because, although the House passed its spending bills, the Senate did not.

One of the more glaring problems with the CR is that it continues the years' long practice of shortchanging our defenses and the men and women in our military. Defense spending and defense policy are frozen, and the changes this House has insisted on in both the Defense Authorization Act and the Defense Appropriations bill are stalled, to the detriment of our defenses and our men and women in uniform.

Secretary Mattis has written, "Long-term CRs impact the readiness of our forces and their equipment at a time when security threats are extraordinarily high. The longer the CR, the greater the consequences for our force."

The risks are real, Mr. Speaker. We see threats growing daily from North Korea and Iran. The fight continues against ISIS and against terror in Afghanistan, and now we need to deploy urgently needed resources to Puerto Rico. There is no need to wait until December 8 to get a full-year Defense Appropriations bill. I call on the Senate to act promptly next week even and get our troops funded.

ASSETS NEEDED IN PUERTO RICO AND THE U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad President Trump listened to Secretary Clinton and deployed the U.S. Naval Ship Comfort to Puerto Rico, even though it was 7 days after Hurricane Maria destroyed the island. But President Trump must do more and do it now.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has a moral and legal duty to protect the well-being of our citizens. That is why today, right now, the President must order the Department of Defense to deploy all available assets to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to prevent this catastrophe from getting worse.

The thousands of Puerto Ricans and all of the Virgin Islanders I represent deserve to know that our Nation's priority is their well-being, their families', their friends', and their fellow citizens' as well—American citizens.

LETTER CARRIER DONTÉ COTTON IS A HERO

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to welcome STEVE SCALISE back to this House floor. The strength of his message shows why he is such a hero to us all.

I also want to tell the story of another hero, one from my congressional district in Dayton, Ohio.

On April 5, 2016, letter carrier Donte Cotton saw an overturned car that had collided with a pole. The driver told Donte her child was inside the car. Acting on immediate instinct, Donte crawled through broken glass to rescue the baby from the car. Both the mother and the child were taken to the hospital and treated for minor injuries.

In August of last year, Donte again found himself in the right place at the right time; again, on his letter carrying route.

While on his normal mail delivery route, an elderly woman, whose home had just been invaded, ran up to Donte seeking help. Donte drove the woman to a nearby police cruiser, ensuring her safety.

His courage is being rewarded this week by the National Association of Letter Carriers, which has given Donte its 2017 Central Area Hero Award.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Donte for his acts of true heroism in our community.

PASS THE DREAM ACT

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Josue Fuentes was brought to Hawaii from El Salvador when he was 13 years old, where he was escaping rampant gang violence and domestic abuse at home.

He went to high school in Honolulu, made friends, got a job. But no matter what he did, he couldn't escape the dark shadow cast on his future because of his immigration status.

Josue describes DACA as a weight lifted from his back. He was empowered to apply for college. He bought a home and pursued opportunities that any of us would want for our children.

Today, he is a small business owner. He owns a landscaping company, he volunteers at his local church, and continues to give back to the Kaneohe community that he calls home.

I urge my colleagues to sign a discharge petition to bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote so we can pass a permanent solution for Josue and millions of DREAMers across the country. Our Nation made a promise to these young men and women. We must uphold that promise.

CERTIFY THAT IRAN IS IN FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THE JCPOA

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon President Trump to certify that Iran is in full compliance with the JCPOA, otherwise known as the Iran nuclear agreement. To decertify at this time will destabilize the ability of the United States to engage in international agreements, especially those we initiated ourselves.

Our credibility is on the line, especially given the fact that the IAEA and the United Nations and the United States Government have certified that Iran is in compliance. It is in compliance on its centrifuges, enriched uranium, the production of the plutonium reactor itself.

We want to make sure that we don't have a second nuclear front by decertifying Iran. It is important to the United States' interests, to the security of the world, and the security of Israel that this agreement be certified as in compliance.

HONORING CHINESE GENERAL SUN LI-JEN

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Chinese General Sun Li-jen. He was known as the ever-victorious general, and fought with valor against Axis forces in Burma during World War II.

General Sun's strategies on the battlefield were a combination of traditional Chinese military theory and American military training. He was an important ally for the United States and a popular figure among his people.

He was born in Anhui, China, and was the son of a Confucian scholar. He moved to the United States to attend Purdue University on a Boxer Indemnity Scholarship, and graduated with a degree in civil engineering.

As China fell deeper into political upheaval and war, General Sun believed he could be more useful as a soldier than as an engineer. He went on to attend the Virginia Military Institute, where he faced prejudice from other cadets.

When he returned to China, he advanced to the rank of colonel. In one of his earliest battles in World War II, he led troops to the defense of Shanghai and was wounded while leading his own men to safety.

After recovering from his injuries, he established a military training camp in southern China. The men at the camp were trained in both Eastern and Western military strategy.

General Sun is internationally renowned for his extraordinary service during the Battle of Yenangyaung in 1942. He saved the British First Burma Division by leading a regiment in a flanking maneuver. His bravery protected Allied forces from encirclement by the Imperial Japanese Army.

During this battle, General Sun was also given command of a small group from the British Second Royal Tanks, making him the first Chinese officer to command British troops.

In recognition of his victory in Burma, he was knighted by the United Kingdom and awarded the Legion of Merit by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was a friend of American Generals MacArthur and Eisenhower.

In the report that recommended General Sun for the Legion of Merit, the U.S. War Department wrote the following: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service during the Burma operations in 1942. Under most trying conditions, General Sun displayed high qualities of leadership. The First Burma Division of the British Force at Yenangyaung was extricated by the attack of the 38th Division and saved from annihilation. General Sun held his unit together at all times during the retreat and brought it ready for combat to India. His example of courage and leadership reflect great credit on Allied Arms."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the FDR Library and the Congressional Research Service for finding this document. I include this document in the RECORD, along with a letter from the Virginia Military Institute.

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, DC, 20 September 1943.

Memorandum for General Edwin M. Watson:
Subject: Awards of the Legion of Merit.

Submitted herewith for the approval of the President are five awards of the Legion of Merit in degree of Officer to members of the Chinese Army.

Also enclosed are Certificates of Award for the signature of the President.

The State Department has been consulted and has no objection to the awards.

I recommend that the President give approval to these awards.

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

— W. D.,

Washington, DC, 11 September 1943.

REPORT OF DECORATIONS BOARD

Convened pursuant to Paragraph 47, S. O. 167-0, War Department, 1921, and paragraph 1, S. O. 64, War Department, 1942.

1. The board having been properly convened and organized, has considered the record in the case of Sun Li Jen.

2. By decision of a majority of the board, the above-named individual is recommended for the award of the LEGION OF MERIT, is degree of Officer, with citation substantially as follows:

Major General Sun Li Jen, Commander of the New 38th Division of the Chinese Army. For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service during the Burma operations in 1942. Under most trying conditions General Sun displayed high qualities of leadership. The 1st Burma Division of the British Force at Yananyang was extricated by the attack of the 38th Division and saved from annihilation. General Sun held his unit together at all times during the retreat and brought it ready for combat to India. His example of courage and leadership reflect great credit on Allied Arms.

Copy for: The White House.

Recommendation of the Board APPROVED By order of the Secretary of War: E.S. Adams, Major General, U.S.A., President.

Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1: * * *, Colonel, A.G.D., Recorder.

SUPERINTENDENT, VIRGINIA
MILITARY INSTITUTE,
September 22, 2017.

Congressman RO KHANNA,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KHANNA: Virginia Military Institute is pleased to join you in remembering and honoring General Sun Li Jen, VMI Class of 1927. The Institute takes great pride in the formative role it played in the leadership development of the "Ever Victorious General."

When General Sun returned to his native country, he implemented training practices that would assist in modernizing and preparing China for the challenges of the 1930s and 1940s. During those eventful decades, General Sun received international attention as a leader of the Chinese Nationalist Army during the Second Sino-Japanese War, the Chinese Civil War, and World War II. In the latter conflict, he has been credited with reclaiming Burma from the Japanese. For his leadership in the China-Burma-India Theater, Sun was knighted Commander of the Order of the British Empire by King George VI and awarded the Legion of Merit by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the general's uniforms and his official portrait are exhibited in the VMI Museum where they are seen by 40,000 visitors

annually. Over the years, generations of Chinese students have been inspired by the story of General Sun; many have followed his example and attended VMI.

Thank you for gathering to honor this illustrious member of the Class of 1927.

Sincerely,

J.H. BINFORD PEAY III '62,
General, U.S. Army (Retired).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read very briefly from that letter from the Virginia Military Institute, which recognized General Sun for his leadership in the China-Burma-India theater, and recognize that his story has inspired many other Virginia Military Institute graduates since then.

General Sun's legacy lives on through his family, including California Assemblyman Kansen Chu. I am pleased to recognize Assemblyman Kansen Chu and his wife, Daisy Chu, who have joined us here today with his family and our honored guests in the House gallery.

The district that Assemblyman Chu and I represent are some of the most ethnically diverse areas in our country. General Sun valued diversity. He found greater strength as a leader by combining Eastern and Western ideas. He led soldiers with different ethnicities and religions. His accomplishments demonstrate that we are better when we embrace diversity.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage Congress to remember the contributions and legacy of General Sun and their importance to the people of the United States, of China, and those of Chinese-American ancestry.

I want to end on this note. Several of us went a few days ago to the Library of Congress where Graham Allison was speaking. Graham Allison has this theory of the Thucydides Trap, which argues that two powers—when one power is rising and another power is established—often are likely to face conflict and war. He said that Xi Jinping in China is familiar with Thucydides Trap.

I would submit that General Sun's story is a reminder for why the United States and China can be allies and not adversaries. We often forget that China was critical in the United States' efforts in winning World War II, and General Sun's story is a reminder of that and an inspiration for us in this new century in finding common ground between the United States and China to help create a more peaceful world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid references to occupants of the gallery.

TRAVELING BY PRIVATE JET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) is recognized for

the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, is Donald Trump running a Cabinet or a country club?

Because every day it is getting harder to tell. Not only is the President spending vast sums to ferry himself to and from his various golf courses, but now it turns out that top leaders in his administration have developed a special fondness for traveling by private jet.

The Treasury Secretary used a taxpayer-funded plane to hop down to Fort Knox to see the eclipse, for example, and he has also asked to use one for his honeymoon in Europe.

Trump's EPA Administrator, Scott Pruitt, spent another \$58,000 on private jets. But the worst offender is HHS Secretary Price, who, in his brief time in office, has already chalked up an astonishing 400 grand in flights on private aircraft. He flew down to Tennessee for all of 6 hours, much of which was spent having lunch with his son. That is nice. He also jetted off to an island off the coast of Georgia for a trip that apparently featured far more recreation than government business. Clearly, when it comes to travel on the taxpayers' dime, the price does not matter to Tom Price. Ethics and personal responsibility doesn't matter to Tom Price. Doing what is right doesn't matter to Tom Price, and that is why he needs to resign immediately.

□ 1245

Now, don't take my word for it. Here is what President George W. Bush's top ethics official, Richard Painter, said about Price's travel habits: "To use a charter flight on something that combines personal and government business, I think, is highly unprofessional and really inappropriate." Those are strong words.

But, Mr. Speaker, you know who summed up best how terrible it is for someone to use private jets? Tom Price, himself. Let's see what Tom Price said. In 2009, he described government officials taking private planes as "just another example of fiscal irresponsibility run amok." I couldn't agree more, Mr. Speaker.

Price spent nearly \$25,000 to fly from D.C. to Philadelphia and back for one single day. He could have spent, at last minute, \$725 to get there on United Airlines, or \$133 to get there on Amtrak.

Mr. Speaker, I just checked, on my phone, that an Uber to Philly right now, back and forth, would have cost Mr. Price about \$450 round trip. That means that, for the price of his private jet, he could have ordered individual cars for himself and his 54 staff members. Every American who works and pays taxes should find this totally appalling.

Amtrak was good enough for the Vice President of the United States, Joe

Biden, but, somehow, it is beneath the Treasury Secretary and HHS Secretary to ride the train. Riding the train is apparently even beneath the EPA Administrator.

Here is a good rule of thumb, Mr. Speaker: If you are spending more on private jets than most American families make in 1 year, you are spending too much on private jets.

Tom Price has plenty of time to go jetting around the country, but not enough time, for example, to ensure that millions of kids won't lose their coverage when CHIP expires soon.

There is apparently plenty of money at HHS for private jets, but very little to help people sign up for health insurance. That is completely unacceptable.

Secretary Price says he needs to fly around on his jet to connect with ordinary citizens. I am not kidding. His press secretary told reporters that these outrageous junkets were about "getting outside of D.C., making sure he is connected with the real American people."

Mr. Speaker, here is how you really connect with your fellow Americans: don't take a private plane; fly a middle seat in coach.

Of course, we should have seen this coming. News reports earlier this year revealed that, when he was a Member of Congress, Price was guilty of introducing legislation to benefit his own personal investments. Even more egregious, he traded more than \$300,000 in healthcare industry stocks based on insider information.

There is no question Secretary Price needs to resign right now, and, if he doesn't, President Trump needs to fire him.

Donald Trump claims that he loves firing people. He once said: I love doing it if someone really, really, really deserves it.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Price really, really, really deserves it.

Then again, we all know Trump won't actually do anything. We are all familiar with the Trump way of doing business with its bad deals and bankruptcies.

Here's the Trump way of doing government.

Number one, hire people proven to be corrupt.

Number two, create an environment in which corruption and bad behavior are encouraged.

Number three, do absolutely nothing when the corruption and bad behavior is exposed.

This administration talks about putting America first. This administration talks about draining the swamp, but its Cabinet officials are more interested in traveling first class.

This administration talks about making America great again, but they are really only concerned about never ever having to wait at another airport gate again.

This administration talks about fighting for working families, but its top leaders are only concerned about lining their own pockets with taxpayers' hard-earned money.

I am fed up, and so are the American people. Let's bring back government to the people, for the people, instead of government for the powerful friends of Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman GALLEGOS for that terrific presentation. We are also joined today by Congressman RASKIN, who will be part of our dialogue as well.

Today is Thursday. That means we all need to ask: Why does Jared Kushner still have a security clearance? He already submitted two false ones. But I digress. We are actually going to talk about three other problems in the White House, one of which is Secretary Price.

To my left is a picture of the private jet that Secretary Price flew on at taxpayers' expense. But in addition to Secretary Price, we also have Secretary Mnuchin, who flew on a government jet with his wife to Kentucky in order to watch the eclipse. Now, I get that was a pretty cool thing to do, but you shouldn't be using taxpayer funds to do that.

And then we have got EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, which, according to media reports, spent \$58,000 on non-commercial flights to go to different places. With \$58,000, you can do a lot with that. VoteVets put out a release today saying that with \$58,000 you could hire a VA spinal cord specialist at the Syracuse VA, a nurse for 1 year. Then Secretary Price spent over \$400,000 of your money, and that is a lot of spinal cord specialists.

So we are talking about raiding the public funds and raiding the public trust. That is why I have introduced the SWAMP FLYERS Act, and what this act will do is stop this from happening in the future. It will prohibit senior Cabinet officials from using non-commercial flights, unless they certify, under penalty of perjury, that no commercial flights were available.

So in this case, you had Secretary Price, for example, flying from here to Nashville. I guarantee you there were lots of commercial flights. There was no reason he had to take a noncommercial flight.

In addition to what we are seeing with these three Cabinet officials, we do have sort of this culture of corruption that really needs to stop because this flows from the top. With the President, what we have now is the President staying at all these properties, private properties that are his or owned by his family, and then he comes with this massive entourage of Secret Service and other folks, and

they are paying money to these properties to stay there, to eat there, and all of that money flows back to the Trump organization. So the President is enriching himself and his family at taxpayers' expense. It is no wonder that we have got these three Cabinet officials doing these insane things with taxpayers' funds.

Now we have got a Republican Congress unwilling to do oversight on this. You have got Speaker RYAN recently going on TV saying that he thinks that the present administration is doing great. Well, you can't have this kind of taxpayer waste when you have got the public trust at issue.

We also have responses from these departments that are deeply troubling. So the Treasury Department, in response to what Secretary Mnuchin was doing, in addition to his noncommercial travel to Kentucky to watch the eclipse, he also asked if the Air Force could fly him and his wife on their honeymoon. The answer is no, you can't do that.

Now the response from the Department was, well, he needed to have secure communications. Well, that was the wrong response. I can guarantee you there are other ways of getting secure communications other than to have the Air Force fly you around on your honeymoon.

With Secretary Price, again, the Department gave the wrong response. They said, well, Secretary Price needs to go around meeting Americans, and he shouldn't be waiting 4 hours at the airport. Wrong response. Yes, he should be waiting 4 hours at the airport because that is what other Americans do. And I can guarantee you no American flies for \$25,000 to meet other Americans. Again, the wrong response from that Department.

What we need is to have these three Cabinet officials apologize. I joined with RUBEN GALLEGOS, as well as JAMIE RASKIN and other Members yesterday in a letter to ask for Price to resign, and all of us are also coauthors of the SWAMP FLYERS Act.

What we need now is really for the public to get engaged because what we are seeing is fraud, waste, and abuse with multiple members of the Trump Cabinet.

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the good gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this essential question of public integrity. I also want to salute my colleague from California (Mr. TED LIEU), who has been a leading voice in demanding real financial accountability in the administration.

I want to underscore some of the things that my colleagues have said, Mr. Speaker. If there are any Americans out there who love to fly wherever they want, whenever they want, at taxpayer expense, then we have got the

perfect job for you in President Trump's Cabinet. Now, of course, only billionaires and millionaires need apply for these jobs, but if you have a taste for fancy chartered air travel, paid for by hardworking Americans across the country, this is undoubtedly the job for you.

My friends, while millions of desperate Americans are suffering in the sweltering posthurricane conditions of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Florida, Texas, and Louisiana, we have got Cabinet Secretaries who should be doing everything in their power to save our people but are, instead, looking out for something far more important, apparently, than other Americans' mere survival. They are focused on their own first class, private charter, airplane flights to cushy destinations, paid for by hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money. We kid you not.

This comes out this week. It comes out that Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price is less interested in health and human services than he is in wealth and valet services. Despite the fact that he blasted the use of government-paid jet travel on CNBC just a few short years ago, he seems to have come down with a severe and chronic case of swamp fever, billing you and me and millions of other Americans for 26 customized, deluxe, premier, first class, private charter, plane flights at taxpayer expense, at an extraordinary estimated cost of more than \$400,000. That is just one Cabinet Secretary.

Now, I can't blame him for one of the trips that he took in August to the beautiful and secluded St. Simons Island in southern Georgia, and another trip that enabled him to get to his condo in Nashville and to have lunch with his son. You can hardly blame him for wanting to get out of town and to see the family. After all, it was hot here in Washington, D.C., as climate change sets in across America and the world. But as we say on Capitol Hill: "It's not the heat, it's the stupidity."

And look at what our Secretary of Health and Human Services did, and here I will read from Politico, September 26, an article entitled "Price's private-jet travels included visits with colleagues, lunch with son."

"The HHS Secretary sometimes combined official travel and meetings with friends and family. Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price took a government-funded private jet in August to get to St. Simons Island, an exclusive Georgia resort where he and his wife own land, a day and a half before he addressed a group of local doctors at a medical conference that he and his wife have long attended.

"The St. Simons Island trip was one of two taxpayer-funded flights on private jets in which Price traveled to places where he owns property, and paired official visits with meetings with longtime colleagues and family

members. On June 6, HHS chartered a jet to fly Price to Nashville, Tennessee, where he owns a condominium and where his son resides. Price toured a medicine dispensary and spoke to a local health summit organized by a longtime friend. He also had lunch with his son. . . .

"An HHS official said both the Georgia and Tennessee trips were for official government business and were paid for by the Department."

It is no problem getting out of town and going to see your family but, really, do the taxpayers have to pay for it?

If the taxpayers have to pay for trips like this, couldn't Secretary Price at least fly on first class commercial airplanes, rather than jacking up the taxpayers for tens of thousands of dollars to book a private airplane to do it?

Politico asked the same question. Here they said:

"Like some of the other 26 flights that Price took on corporate jets since May identified by a Politico review, the trip to Tennessee appears to have occurred despite the existence of multiple commercial flight options. The trip to Georgia, while less direct, also could have been accomplished with a routine connecting flight through Atlanta's busy international airport.

"On August 4, Price flew a Dassault Falcon 2000 twin jet from Raleigh, North Carolina, where he had given a speech to a flu vaccine manufacturer, to Brunswick Golden Isles Airport, which is about a half-hour drive from St. Simons Island. It was the same plane that had shuttled him between five States in four days, one that HHS had chartered through Classic Air Charter for more than \$86,000, according to Federal contracts.

"The plane arrived in Brunswick at 4:02 p.m. the afternoon before the start of the two-day Medical Association of Georgia retreat and roughly 40 hours before Price addressed the group, according to airport records. . . ."

□ 1300

"At about the same time, there were connecting commercial flights from Raleigh to Brunswick via Atlanta that would have gotten Price to St. Simons Island that evening."

My friends, you can go back and you can look. In all of these cases, for example, Secretary Price chartered a plane for \$25,000 of government money from Dulles Airport to Philadelphia, a distance of a mere 135 miles. That charter flight left 5 minutes after a regular flight flew, commercial flight flew, from Dulles for a few hundred dollars. So he paid \$25,000 and left several minutes later than he would have left had he just taken the commercial flight.

He also could have taken, of course, the Amtrak, which is what most people do when they are going to Philadelphia from the Washington area, for a mere \$72. Even the first class Acela would

have been around \$200. He could have taken the British Airways—they go there—whose slogan is: "To Fly. To Serve." I guess that is not quite right. Or he could have taken Southwest Airlines. Their slogan is: "Low fares. Nothing to hide." I see that wouldn't have fit. Maybe JetBlue, "You Above All." That could have worked.

But no, instead, he had to book the private jet and fly for \$25,000 from here to Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, this is an old Washington story. The people who say they are coming to drain the swamp have become the swamp. And this is not something that affects just one Cabinet Secretary. Several Cabinet Secretaries are doing this, as my colleagues have pointed out.

With Secretary Price, who seems to be the captain of the swamp flyers; Secretary Pruitt, who is a frequent swamp flyer himself; and Secretary Mnuchin, another swamp flyer, we have a serious staph infection spreading throughout the Trump administration.

And why not, the President seems to have evolved a whole new model of government in the 21st century. Government is a money-making operation for specific families and specific tiny groups in the society. And that is the message that pervades the Trump administration today.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass the SWAMP FLYERS Act, which is very simple. It says that those of us who have the honor and the privilege of coming to serve the American people here in Washington, D.C., should use regular commercial air flights unless it is a matter of national security, or unless there is not a commercial flight that will get them to where they need to go.

But the idea that you have Cabinet Secretaries who have already taken dozens of flights, paid for with hundreds of thousands, or millions of dollars, of taxpayer money when a commercial flight would have done is an absolute scandal. Now, it hasn't gotten much attention yet because on the scale of the scandals we have seen in this administration, I agree, it is a relatively small one. But it is a dramatic and vivid illustration of what is going on here.

The people who said they were going to drain the swamp became the swamp. And now, the swamp pervades everything. Every Cabinet member, all of the Secretaries, the entire government is engulged in this kind of corruption.

It begins right at the top, where President Trump has continued to collect hundreds of thousands, or millions, of dollars in foreign payments at the Trump Hotels, at the Trump office tower, and the Trump golf courses around the world from foreign governments, and has not once come to the U.S. Congress to ask for our permission

and consent as is required by Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution, which forbids the collection of presents, emoluments, offices, and titles from foreign governments by anybody who serves under the United States, who holds an office under the United States.

This President is not only collecting rampant, extreme amounts of money through his businesses from foreign governments, he is not even asking us for our permission or our consent. We have got to pass the SWAMP FLYERS Act.

I commend Mr. LIEU for writing this immediately when the news broke about this rampant abuse of current regulations. We need to take a stand as a Congress on a bipartisan level. Unanimously, we can pass this to say that government officials should not be flying at taxpayer expense for dubious reasons. We should be using coach like everybody else, flying commercial like everybody else.

If you have got to fly first class, fine, fly first class, but fly commercial unless it is a matter of national security, or unless there is not a commercial flight that will get you there. Is that something that we can agree on, on a bipartisan basis?

I just want to say, earlier today we saw a magnificent example of real public service and public dedication by our distinguished colleague, Mr. SCALISE, who has returned, thankfully, to this body. He demonstrates and embodies what is best in terms of public service. Unfortunately, we have also seen in Washington this week the personification of what is the worst in public service. We have got to stop taking the American taxpayers for a ride.

Let's pass the SWAMP FLYERS Act immediately.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. GALLEGO. Representative LIEU, how often do you fly back, and where do you fly back to?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. I fly about three times a month, and I generally fly from Dulles back to LAX in my district, and I fly commercial.

Mr. GALLEGO. How long is your flight?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. It is about 5 hours to 5½ hours, depending on the wind.

Mr. GALLEGO. You and I have been Members of Congress since 2015. At any point in any of your flights to and from your work—I am sorry—from here to your home, have you ever used a charter plane?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. No.

Mr. GALLEGO. Would you even be able to, by law, use a charter plane according to the funds we are allowed to expense?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. No. If I did that, I would be the subject of an

immediate congressional ethics investigation.

Mr. GALLEGO. So what makes Mr. PRICE think that he is somehow above the law, that he is allowed to do this, considering that he knew, as a Member of Congress, that was not allowed and that somehow he can just take advantage of the situation now that he has suddenly moved up after only just a few months of being in Congress, to be the Secretary of Health and Human Services?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a great point because what Secretary Price, and Mnuchin, and EPA Administrator Pruitt did was not only disrespectful to taxpayers, there were violations of the Federal regulations. So I am just going to read to you what the Federal regulation says. It says, "Your agency must select the method most advantageous to the government," when considering travel.

Advantageous to the government, not to Secretary Price, or Mnuchin, or EPA Administrator Pruitt. They violated that Federal regulation straight up. That is why Tom Price is under Federal investigation. That is why the IG is investigating Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, and now we call on an investigation of EPA Administrator Pruitt as well for violating the Federal regulations.

Mr. GALLEGO. While you were talking about that actual regulation, and to see how well and easy it is not to violate the regulation, I literally just typed into Google, "flights to Philadelphia." And there is a flight leaving in 46 minutes. And the cheapest I found right now—well, no, I found one for \$441. I found another one for \$447. If you want to connect to Philadelphia—which I don't know why you would—but if you want to do that, JetBlue will take you there for \$264.

So in Secretary Price's effort to live an extravagant lifestyle and basically void himself of all commonsense, he also violated ethics violations. And this is something that we consistently see within this Trump administration.

On the other flip of that, we consistently see a Republican-led Congress that is not doing their duty by the Constitution of oversight on the executive. Not one, not one movement has been done by any Republican, especially Republican leadership, to push back on this egregious waste of taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative LIEU.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Let me again conclude by thanking Congressman GALLEGO and Congressman RASKIN for highlighting this issue with me today. This really is an issue about the public trust. Taxpayer funds should not be used for luxury private jet travel. It is a very simple issue.

Please join us in supporting the SWAMP FLYERS Act. Please join Con-

gressman GALLEGO and us in calling for the resignation of Secretary Price.

As Abraham Lincoln said: "Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail. Without it, nothing can succeed."

Help us change public sentiment and help us tell the Trump administration: Please stop using taxpayer funds for luxury jet travel.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). The Chair would remind Members to direct all remarks to the Chair and to formally yield and reclaim time when under recognition.

DYNAMIC SCORING

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, my hope is that you find this as entertaining as I did putting some of this together. Actually, let's put these boards up. We are going to actually do something that, with the rollout of the tax reform mechanics—and I apologize to everyone. Some of this is going to be a little geeky. But I wanted to try to put some things in perspective because I have heard some and read some crazy stuff the last couple of days.

So we are going to actually do some dynamic scoring 101. And, actually, at that moment, I think I just heard thousands, if not tens of thousands, of C-SPAN watchers just turn their televisions off. But this is actually important, because every time we are heading towards working on major tax reform or other types of programs that actually have big, bold policy built within them, we get into this sort of debate.

What are the effects? What are the effects on society? What are the effects on tax revenue? What are the effects on labor participation? What are the effects on our entitlement programs? And there is sort of this intellectual duplicity around this body. I know that is a little harsh, but we have got to be honest about it. If it were the stimulus package from President Obama several years ago, we had lots of Members on this side who actually talked about, supported, and thought the dynamic scoring models were great.

But when we actually talk about something within the Tax Code, rewriting the Tax Code, well, then dynamic scoring is just unacceptable. So I am going to ask everyone to open up your minds and first understand, when we talk about scoring, what we really mean. And we are going to touch on a handful of things, and this is going to be very elementary, sort of basics. So we are going to walk through a number of these.

And then I have a number of slides that we will get to in a moment that are more about examples of what math means when looking at it. And the fact of the matter is, there are such things as tax cuts that do not pay for themselves, but there are also such things, actually, as tax policy that do pay for themselves.

You have to just choose and be willing to work through the math, and the history of math, and stop being afraid of data around this place.

I get behind this microphone quite often and run this joke that this is sort of a math-free zone. And I am working really hard to drag my brothers and sisters on both sides to understand that sometimes the folklore we believe in is correct, but a lot of times it just isn't.

First off, before we do some of the slides, I want to walk through some of the terms. How often do you hear us talk about the baseline? Okay, we talk about it all the time. The baseline is this—you do realize, the baseline actually does have a series of dynamic aspects when we build it. Why do you think, when we come out here every March, or like we did this last March and then again in June, all of a sudden the numbers have changed? That is a case where the world did not stay static. We didn't create a number a year ago, and that is what the world stayed.

Remember, we went through this really ugly, uncomfortable thing this year, where, in just a few months, the deficit actually grew dramatically to the point where we are almost borrowing \$700 billion this year. And if we went back a year and a half, we thought this year we might be as low as \$500 billion, \$550 billion. So if we had stayed static, we would still be just pretending that we were at that number.

We recalculate constantly. But it is not just calculating, hey, here are the tax revenues. It is also, hey, we see this trend in number of people taking jobs; hey, we see this trend in number of people signing up for entitlement benefits. So understand, we already, for years, and years, and years, have lived in a dynamic scoring sort of model right now, and we call it our baseline.

I also want us to try a couple other things. I want us to think about dynamic scoring as not that number that is given to us but as a way of ranking decisions. So if I came to you right now and said, "Hey, we have these things in the tax policy, and here are the effects we believe we see as we have the information today," think of it as a tool for making decisions, not that that number is the same number that it is going to actually produce 10 years from now.

□ 1315

With the best data and information we have today, if you as a policymaker—if you are blessed to be one of us who gets to be in this body saying,

well, it turns out if I spend the money on this type of tax change compared to the same money on this type of tax change, I get this different effect in the size of our economy, in the number of our brothers and sisters who have jobs and employment opportunities, but also in what it effects in tax revenues.

So I know that is culturally hard for a lot of us because we all like to beat up CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation. But in all fairness, a dynamic scoring model is a ranking model.

What is the real difference? If I asked you just to say in a single sentence we all had to agree upon a common definition of here is static, here is dynamic, the real difference is a dynamic score has calculations that reflect changes to the size of our economy, which is really important.

Now I am going to digress to one side. About once a month I get behind this microphone, and we do a series of slide presentations on how much trouble we are in. The fact of the matter is that in not that distant of a future, we will barely have the revenues to cover our entitlement costs. We are living in a society right now where about three-quarters of our spending is what we call mandatory spending—both earned and unearned entitlements—your Medicare is an earned entitlement. Your Social Security is an earned entitlement. But we also have other types that you get because you fell below a certain income or you may be part of a certain group.

But the vast majority of what we do in this body is not managing the three-quarters of our budget that is on autopilot. These are by formula. If you look at that sort of remaining 25, 27 percent of our budget, well, about a little more than half of that is defense, and everything else is what people think of as government—that is the FBI, that is the National Park Service, that is the FDA, and that is education and research. That will continue to shrink, and it is going to start shrinking fairly dramatically because baby boomers are retiring.

Remember, the peak of the baby boomer is only 60 years old right now. We have our brothers and sisters whom we have made promises to, and this body never sat down and did the hard math to be prepared for what happens when 76 million of our brothers and sisters move into their retirement benefit years.

So one of the critical reasons you do tax reform is economic growth, because without economic growth, it gets really ugly in about a decade.

I continue to be sort of shocked that my brothers and sisters, particularly on the left, who claim to be sort of evangelical advocates for a lot of this entitlement spending, aren't standing alongside of us and saying: We need to do a major rewrite of our Tax Code.

That does just a couple of things. It makes it fairer, and it makes it more simple, but it dramatically—over the next 10, 15, 20, 30 years—expands the size of this economy, because without that expansion, the math is just ugly.

A great example of this is when we talk about dynamic scoring. If you do actual dynamic scoring on what is about to happen over the next, functionally, 20 years of where we are demographically, the models don't work. The actual computer comes back to you and says: Doesn't work, doesn't work, doesn't work, because the math is impossible.

Functionally, the amount of debt to the size of our economy gets so big that the models basically say that society has collapsed. You can't float another bond, and you can't borrow money from anyone else. It comes to an end. When the computer tells you that, when the computer starts giving you a red flashing—maybe if you don't believe those of us who get behind the microphone, maybe they will believe the data.

Let's go ahead and start to walk through some of the slides. We are going to walk through a series of these ideas. I am probably going to say parts of this two or three times to have it sink in.

We have already had a number of our folks quoted in the press and others showing their cynicism towards dynamic scoring. But those are some of the very same people who actually stood in this same well and promoted the immigration reform and the dynamic scoring that was built into the immigration reform. They are the same folks who actually promoted the dynamic scoring that was built in the stimulus bill several years ago. But they are also the same folks who actually believe things like global warming mechanisms, which are built on a dynamic scoring model, are the absolute facts of math.

You can't have the intellectual duplicity of saying: I believe in this sort of modeling math for things I am ideologically comfortable with, but things I am ideologically not comfortable with is not true.

It is math. Let's try one more time because if we are going to come to policy decisions, we have got to stop living in sort of a math-free zone.

I am doing this as more of an example. None of this is actually policy in the tax reform that those of us on the Ways and Means Committee are so incredibly blessed to be working on. It has been the most interesting year of my life grinding out this math. I can't tell you the number of times that I thought I had a brilliant idea, you work it out, and you find out that the really smart people around you had all figured out all sorts of ways to get around your Tax Code changes.

So sometimes you have got to be humble and just understand that what

we are doing is tough. It is complicated. If you make one change over here in the Tax Code, then it turns out it affects over here and creates leakage over here. So that is why you have to do this unified theory.

Just so we see this conceptually, if I came to you right now and said, Hey, we have this much money—I think in this model it was \$70 billion or \$60 billion. The actual dollar amount isn't that important.

If I came to you right now and said, "You have this much money, you have got to make a Tax Code change with that money," if we did a static score, then the model says it costs you that much money. If you spent \$60 billion on this over the 10 years, then it costs \$60 billion. Then when we do the dynamic scoring, it turns out that not all tax changes produce the same amount of economic growth, even though it may promote fairness, it may promote simplicity, and there may be some things we haven't calculated.

So on this one, if we take a look over here, this was actually something we took from the Tax Foundation's website. I encourage you to go there. It is a nonpartisan group, and it has some really interesting modeling.

If we functionally doubled the child care tax credit to a couple thousand dollars, it turns out the model over 10 years functionally adds almost nothing to GDP growth. Now you will want to try to model it saying: Does it change birthrates? As you know, we are in a societal crisis right now where our birthrates are falling so low that mathematically, in about 20 years, we are going to have some real difficulties having enough taxpayers moving into society's workforce to actually pay for our pay-as-you-go entitlements.

Social Security and Medicare are pay-as-you-go entitlements. Today's workers are paying for today's retirees. If that population mix of workers moving in gets too out of whack, then the math gets really uncomfortable.

For the same costs, if I came down and in this particular model reduced marginal tax rates, or we have another one where you are going to see we are expensing, which is a type of sort of depreciation that you can take all at once, then all of a sudden this one gets me almost no GDP growth. But the same dollars at that get me well over a point of additional GDP growth.

If I am standing in an event back in Arizona and say, "We are going to spend \$60 billion, and we are going to double the child care tax credit," that helps me get re-elected. But if I come and say, "We are going to spend \$60 billion changing the marginal tax rates for corporations, or the exact same money for expensing so businesses, particularly smaller businesses, buy new plants and equipment so we get more efficient so we have more growth so more people have jobs," then intellec-

tually we know this is really important for everyone in our society. But this one down here is easier to talk about and easier to get reelected.

That is the tough thing here when we live in a world of these pithy, little sound bites, where we say these quick, little simple things then march off and the intellectual discourse of, hey, it is harder than that, we need to find a way to be simpler and fairer, but we also have to be rational on what creates the next generation of economic growth so our brothers and sisters actually have jobs, they have chances to save, chances to have money to put their kids through college, and even their own retirements.

We are going to walk through a few more of these examples, and then I have some actual data examples of where this is actually happening in our lives.

Now, this slide is a little bit on the geeky side, so forgive me, but this is dynamic scoring 101. All this slide I really want you to look at is, when modeling, it is not only where the money goes, but did it increase the capital stock, and, therefore, there is more capital in these businesses and in these organizations to expand and buy equipment and provide employment, or did it not?

But there is also: Did the tax change that creates that new capital stock stay in our Tax Code long enough that the next generation of new, more efficient equipment, new productivity moves in?

We actually have some really interesting examples that have been produced datawise on what happens if a Tax Code change phases out. We see this a lot where we have done these, hey, this marginal tax rate for business is for 5 years, and then it goes back to the old higher rate. Or what we are struggling through right now is how to get as much economic growth as possible if we create a type of expensing or accelerated type of depreciation, and what happens in the future of that? Does it phase out? And if it does phase out, what are the economic effects?

If you take a look at the green line, you can see what it actually meant both for GDP growth and also for attached within those numbers are revenues. Do you see the red line? So we both have a sympathetic curve here, and then the value of that actually fades away and actually falls, in some occasions, below what would have been a static score because you get the spike of people saying: We have to invest, we have to do this right now, and now we have to back off because of next year.

A good example is if I came to you right now and said: Today you have this tax rate, but 2 years from now we double it, what are you going to do with your life? We are going to work like crazy this year, and that 2 years from now, you are planning on taking

a vacation year. It is human nature, and I think we have to stop pretending that the Tax Code somehow operates just outside human nature.

We will grind through some of these a little faster. At the end, we are going to talk about where you can see all these different charts.

Why this is important is when you actually look at the effects of the deficit—and where this was interesting is this was just revenues taken out of society in the ACA, sort of the economic effects of what would happen when we actually did the microeconomic movement calculations, and you actually see if we did repeal those additional dollars—because, remember, this is costing, there is an additional special tax on capital gains and what it is actually doing in economic growth.

We have a lot of slides, so I am going to try to go through some that are a little more entertaining.

What we are trying to show here is what happens when you take, actually, the exact same functional cost with dynamic effects and static effects. This one is from the Tax Foundation.

The real difference is, remember that first slide we walked through where we talked about if we doubled the child care tax credit? Hey, here is our cost, and here is what it actually does. If we dynamically score it or if we actually static score it, oddly enough, it comes out almost identical because there is none of that macroeconomic change.

But if you actually dynamically score it, you will see they actually have tremendously that same spending if it were in corporate tax cuts. It has very different economic scores.

□ 1330

We have another slide. We will show on the one down at the end that, at the end of 10 years, we actually make revenue. The revenue line goes beyond its costs. In the 10 years, the first option does not expand. At the end of 10 years, it is actually scored as a loss. That static score is actually accurate.

There are a number of these sort of examples out there.

I am going to actually go back. This is not being mean. Remember, we are operating under a principle that the dynamic scoring is as much about the money as, hey, we think we are going to have this much tax revenue or this much tax loss at the end of 10 years or the end of the year, but it is also helping us rank.

These are important. From 2003 to 2008, we had a tax change, often referred to as the Bush tax cuts, that was going to be \$317 billion over 10 years. If you looked at the models that were generated back there, it was supposed to actually cost society, cost the government money. But when we actually got to the end of that time, the end of the phaseout, it actually produced \$77 billion more than that tax cut actually cost.

That is just in our recent memory, but I have a number of charts here that actually show over and over and over that, if the tax cut is actually put in the right place, we get economic growth and, therefore, additional revenue from it.

There are certain things out there that do not pay for themselves. That is why we have this whole discussion of how you find balance if you are working for fairness, if you are working for simplicity, but knowing we must have that economic growth if we are going to keep our promises here. This is just one more example.

When you actually see something like this, this first one is as if we were actually to change depreciation tables, that function. It ends up taking about \$308 billion out of GDP if we dynamically score it.

Each one of these tax policies costs \$32 billion. That is actually the idea. This costs \$32 billion to the taxpayers.

So, if I came right now and said we need to raise \$32 billion and we intend to do it in a change in the Tax Code, and then we go out there and say, all right, let's change depreciation tables to business and we take in \$32 billion of additional money, what did we just do to the economy?

In a static score, it says, hey, you just got \$32 billion. If you do a dynamic revenue estimate, which actually does have some macro effects in there, we actually just lost \$38 billion, because business slowed down.

But if you do the dynamic scoring of what it does over 10 years to the economy, that \$32 billion of hopeful tax revenue actually shrunk the U.S. economy by over \$300 billion. When they build this model, they are using data going back to the 1950s.

But we have an example on the other side. If you go to the far side, what if you were to disallow half of State and local taxes as a deduction? It turns out you would say that we are getting \$32 billion because that is what it is written at. You end up bringing in about \$29 billion, but you only shrink the economy by \$19 billion.

Policywise, staticwise, they both say \$32 billion in new taxes, but they both have dramatically different effects on the economy. When we actually talk about the dynamic scoring, it is both actually on the tax-raising side as much as the tax-cutting side.

The same sort of concept here, but what if we did it going the other direction? Actually, the same slide we just did, what does that mean in the percentage of GDP, if anyone is sort of thinking in that fashion.

The first one, where we actually changed the depreciation tables, we took away of the ability of businesses—particularly, smaller business—to depreciate. It ends up shrinking the U.S. economy almost two points over those 10 years. State and local taxes are ac-

tually less than, I think, 0.16 of a percent of GDP over those 10 years.

So when you actually hear the phrase “tax cuts don't pay for themselves,” or, “you don't get the revenues expected,” that is actually true, except for properly designed and properly targeted.

This is actually the flip side of what we just did. Remember, we just did two boards that showed both the revenues and the actual percent of GDP we raise taxes. How about now if we do sort of the exact same thing but we do it as a tax cut?

Once again, you are going to actually see—and I am sorry, I put additional notes to make it understandable—that not all tax cuts are the same. In this case, I am going from one end to the other side.

So let's say we go to the full end and we did full expensing. So instead of a depreciation table where, over the 7 years, it is this piece of equipment, or 10 years, whatever it may be, what if you could take the value of that almost immediately? In a dynamic model, it is adding a couple hundred billion dollars to the size of the economy.

But if those same dollars, the same amount was spent on, let's say, over here, we cut the bottom tax rate, that might be the appropriate thing to do for societal fairness. But we have to be cognizant, when we are calculating, what that means in GDP growth. You can see the blue here in the end, and the blue here is positive, but barely. That is over 10 years.

This makes it hard because, so often, the very tax policies that are good for us in our reelections may not actually be best for what is good for society and its opportunity for jobs and economic growth.

This is now sort of the exact same slide, but in the percentages and sort of understanding, when we doubled the child care tax credit or we lowered the individual brackets, maybe doubling the child care tax credit actually has an effect on birthrates. That would be terrific for society, and particularly for the future of our ability to pay into our entitlements, but if you are looking for GDP expansion and economic growth, it is marginal.

The expensing or the corporate tax cuts, when you see those on there, you actually see we have substantially more of what they call capital stock. That is the money that is used to buy new equipment to get more productive, to hire more people, to raise their salaries, and for all of us to have more opportunity.

I think we are going to make this our last one. This is the easiest one to sort of get our heads around, and it is the crispest of all.

Say you are a fellow Member of Congress and I come to you and say we have \$70 billion, over 10 years, that we

can plug into on the Tax Code, we have that much capacity. Where do we put it that is best for our society?

The initial instinct is to have that discussion of, well, what if we were to cut the bottom Federal tax rate? It is wonderful for our hardworking brothers and sisters who are at the lowest tier of income. It would be wonderfully fair. How about if we put that into expanding the child care tax credit, expanding that? How about if you put that money into expensing?

If you get in front of an audience and we did an audience vote, what do you think we would get?

The fact of the matter is, when you look at the models, what we have learned from the dynamic scoring, some may get almost no economic expansion. We may get economic fairness, which is a laudable goal. But, ultimately, over the next decade, I need my brothers and sisters in this country to have more job opportunities, more ability to be employed, putting that money into expensing so we get more productive as a society in buying new plants and equipment and machinery to make us more productive so we can pay people more, so we have the ability to save for education, for their retirements. That actually has over 5 percent additional expansion of the size of our economy.

These are the types of issues that those of us on the Ways and Means Committee have been struggling with over the last year and are going to struggle over the next month as we try to find that balance of what is simplicity, what is fairness, but also what maximizes economic growth.

Just as a couple of little last pieces here to sort of understand this.

I am begging for those of us who are going to be in this sort of battle, debate, that we do our best to sort of be intellectually honest about what we are talking about.

A good example is the number of dollars we are talking about right now in rewriting the Tax Code is, I think, 1 percent or so of GDP, maybe less than that. The stimulus from several years ago was 7 percent of GDP.

We have had some folks who are criticizing this over here and saying you intend to dynamically score that, but were almost giddy about spending and scoring actual spending over here that we learned later did not allocate well.

There is a concept, if I had a dollar, where would it be spent best to grow society, if I gave it to you as an individual, as a businessperson or an entrepreneur, saying: Where would you put that? Would you try and take that dollar and do something with it that grows the economy?

Or we have the other side over here. When government spends it, we have this bad habit of spending money on things that are often politically driven

and that don't necessarily have the same type of economic expansionary effects. It is this thing called price theory, where money gets allocated into society. Who is better at allocating that dollar?

I will make you an argument that individuals in the market actually have a long history of doing it much healthier, much better.

As we finish what we will call Dynamic Scoring 101, what did we learn?

The scores are incredibly important in making decisions about how you allocate resources, both on raising taxes, lowering taxes. Where does it have the most impact? Where does it do the most damage? Where does it do the most good?

Dynamic scoring is actually a ranking mechanism, because the ultimate number, we are never going to have enough information to be perfect, but all we can do is take the information we have today and try to find a way to say, with today's information, this use of these resources creates this much more opportunity in our society than spending the same dollars over here.

So when we are going to get into this debate about what the dynamic scoring is providing those of us who are making the policy, understand, it is sometimes more of choosing A over C, because A produces more expansion in our society, more opportunity, even though they cost the same, than sometimes looking at the dollar amounts.

Often, as we saw on some of these boards here, the dollar amounts, if we statically score it, are the same. They just have different effects.

This is really, really important. So think of dynamic scoring as just that: it is the scorekeeping of how we all do this.

For everyone that is actually interested in this, I will strongly encourage you to go to the Joint Committee on Taxation's website. I believe they actually have a tab there that actually geeks out a little bit on what dynamic score is, particularly if you are an accounting or quant major. You will love this stuff.

Also, the Tax Foundation, which is nonpartisan. We have actually borrowed lots of information from them. They actually have some really great examples of, when we, over the years, have made certain types of policy decisions, what has been good for society and where we have actually missed and not gotten near the numbers that we have promised.

Do understand that, when we take a look at what we did in 2003, the U.S. economy ended up being 4.6 percent larger by 2006. So, from 2003 to 2006, we actually were 4.6 percent larger—I know these are a little bit geeky—than the models back then provided for.

□ 1345

It is not that the models were bad and evil. They just didn't have all the

data. But they still provided an opportunity for the policymakers, back in 2003, to actually make their decisions.

So I hope—actually, if anyone actually found this interesting, please write and tell us. If you are now bored out of your mind and we helped you sleep, please let us know. But the reality of it is, what is about to happen in the debate over tax reform is going to have a lot of really technical, really complicated debating points in it.

As I learned yesterday, when we were rolling out some of the math, some of our brothers and sisters who desperately do not want us to have a win decided that zero was a tax hike. I just beg of everyone for at least on this issue, if we can sort of pull our partisan rage away and just sort of focus on the working population of our society and how we help and also how do we help for the future so my 2-year-old daughter, so your children, so my family that may be heading towards retirement, everyone has a fair chance. And that fair chance can only happen if we really start to grow this economy and start to grow it fairly dramatically.

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

RETURN OF STEVE SCALISE AND REPEALING OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this has been a day that answered a lot of our prayers seeing our good friend STEVE SCALISE here, and it brings to mind part of the story of that tragic morning that I haven't heard told anywhere else.

One of our Members, Georgia Congressman BARRY LOUDERMILK, was there, and he was—the shooter started from behind the third base dugout and hit STEVE SCALISE right away. It was so deeply touching to hear STEVE's words today. It is just rather emotional seeing so many of our prayers answered, seeing STEVE return to the House.

That morning, BARRY was saying that he was behind a little closet area, and as the shooter was moving toward the first base side continuing to shoot, Matt Mika had already been shot and was down, and BARRY realized that he had no place to go. He looked for places to run, and there was no place to run.

The shooting had been going on for a while, perhaps 9 or 10 minutes at that point. Capitol Police Officer Griner was there. She and David Bailey, the other Capitol Police officer, were using their suburban for cover and shooting at the shooter—the hate-filled leftist who felt like it was a good idea to kill as many Republicans in Congress as he could.

It was gratifying to hear that admission from our friend from Maryland,

former majority leader HOYER, that it was hateful. He was full of hate. He was a leftist who had supported BERNIE SANDERS. It is not BERNIE'S SANDERS' fault. You don't hear Republicans blaming a party or a candidate that a hate-filled person supported, but he was going to kill people. He was doing what he could.

BARRY had no place to go, and he was working his way to where he was about—BARRY was going to be in the open and could see there was no place to go, and he said a prayer. He saw that Officer Griner had been shot in the ankle, and she was trying to return fire but under tremendous amount of pain.

Just when it looked hopeless, David Bailey stepped out, completely uncovering himself. He had no cover at that point, and yelled twice: "Drop your weapon. Drop your weapon." And as he said those words, the shooter fired twice at him. And as soon as he finished saying, "Drop your weapon" the second time, he fired twice and took the shooter down. Incredible courage.

When I saw David Bailey out at the hospital a few days after the shooting, I said: "BARRY LOUDERMILK said that when it looked pretty hopeless for him, you stepped out from behind the suburban completely uncovered, that you made yourself a target taking all the attention toward yourself. Did you do that?"

And David Bailey, a hero in every sense of the word, with his normal casual way of speaking, just said: "It hit me all of a sudden. I had to make it him or me. I had to make it him or me. That is when I stepped out. And, fortunately, it was him."

That kind of courage—when a shooter is about to get to a position to take out a bunch of defenseless people, some lying on the ground in the dugout, if he had made it just a little further, there would have been a lot of people killed that day.

Crystal Griner shooting as she could and David Bailey stepping away from any cover, and he just instinctively knew, "I have to make it him or me," thank God and thank David Bailey he is still here today and the hate-filled shooter is not

So it was tough and go. The hate that filled this leftist shooter almost did in a couple of people who day. But by the grace of God, the great work of the doctors—but as the doctor said out there that night after the shooting, telling me, the President, Melania, and my staff member Andrew Keyes, it was—he said he would be on pins and needles that night because he just didn't know.

To see STEVE SCALISE, our dear friend, standing right here earlier today, is just an answer to prayer, and I can't wait to cook ribs again for my friend STEVE SCALISE very soon.

It is also a good day for America, despite the House passing a bill that

would have helped Americans by at least repealing part of ObamaCare, as we had promised, and despite the immense suffering by millions around this country who actually became victims of the lie that if you like your insurance, you can keep it; if you like your doctor, you can keep him or her—well, it turns out those were lies when they were spoken, and the people who spoke them knew they were lies when they spoke them. It was discussed that that would not be the case, they wouldn't be able to keep their insurance, and people haven't.

It is a bit disingenuous when some of the alt-left media boasts that so many millions of people have gotten insurance that didn't have it, because there are an awful lot of people in my district that had insurance and, because of ObamaCare, they lost it, and then they were put on Medicaid—not even Medicare, but Medicaid. So they lost their doctor, they lost the hospital that was no longer in the network for Medicaid that they had before. ObamaCare took their insurance.

The people who have talked to me in east Texas and as I go around in other parts of the country, they were desperate. They have been desperate. They are still desperate. They say: Please, you got to give us some help.

It is tragic when you have some millionaires in the Senate who can get whatever healthcare they want, turning a cold shoulder to those suffering around the country because the countless promises they made to repeal ObamaCare are being broken every day we are in session and the Senate does not pass at least some kind of repeal of ObamaCare.

I mean, what kind of person promises over and over, “You elect me, I will repeal ObamaCare, I will get it repealed,” knowing that there will be a smug and proud vote against any effort to repeal, even partially repeal ObamaCare?

You make promises like that knowing that, without those promises, you would not get elected. People count on your promises because they really are hurting, they need the medicine that they are not getting under the new Medicaid, they don't have the doctor that was providing so much help under their insurance before ObamaCare took it away. And an almost cheerful breaking of those promises, it really is tragic. It is simply tragic.

It is really unfortunate that they don't have the millions, like some Senators, to get whatever healthcare they want, that they make—they could suffer less, perhaps be cured if Republican Senators all kept their promises.

□ 1400

It is just tragic. But despite that, this has been a week where the House has done what we can under reconciliation. We sent a bill to the Senate.

They didn't have to pass that bill, just something so that we could have a conference bill to give Americans the help they needed.

We have done what we can there, so we are taking up tax reform. And if we do the right thing by Americans, they will have more money in their pockets. If we pass the bill that has just been proposed—I don't have all the details—the framework certainly looks like something we can really work with that will put a lot more money in middle class pockets.

It is interesting. I hear some people, especially at the other end of the hall in the opposite party, opposing party, who make efforts to tax the poor in order to reward Republican rich friends. We saw back in 2008, there were apparently a whole lot more rich people on Wall Street that supported Barack Obama than supported the unfortunate losing candidate of the Republican Party that year.

Yeah, the rich people on Wall Street, more of them supported Barack Obama. That kind of goes against what is thought to be conventional wisdom that the Republicans are rich and the Democrats are poor when the reports we have to file annually indicate that some of us came here without anything and we sacrificed virtually everything we had to run, to try to make a difference in this country, and we haven't become rich by being here; whereas, there are an awful lot of millionaire Democrats here in the House and in the Senate.

But if you look at what has been proposed, the lowest tax rate in America right now is 10 percent. And it appears, we are told, it should be everybody paying 10 percent right now should end up paying no tax. Well, personally, I would rather see us have everybody pay something in the way of income tax, pay something, the lowest rate possible—whether it is 6, 7, or 8 percent, maybe 7 percent, something—so that every single American pays an income tax so they understand how important it is to have a frugal government and not just constantly be handing out welfare, especially in cases that involve fraud.

I had a lady that was telling me there in Tyler, Texas, that she used to, every spring, work for H&R Block in helping people prepare their tax returns. She said she finally had to give it up. People would come in and they wouldn't have Social Security numbers. They would have tax ID numbers.

Now, why would they have tax ID numbers? Well, even though the law says that you are not supposed to be filing tax returns because you are not supposed to be working if you don't have a Social Security number, the IRS assumed—and we know what that means, they assumed—that, gee, if we give people a tax ID number, then they will pay income tax, and that will bring in more money to the coffers.

But, according to this lady, the reason she couldn't do it anymore was she was becoming a nervous wreck because so many people were coming in with tax identification numbers, not Social Security numbers, and they would have a list of things that they would want her to put in their tax return. And they always had, she said, a number of children listed that they wanted to claim that would ensure that they got more money back from an earned income tax credit than they even paid in.

Since she was a senior citizen on a fixed income, the little extra help that she made helping people prepare tax returns, she gave it up. It was driving her a bit crazy to help people get back more money than they paid in over and over and over again when she understood the law. That is not supposed to be what happened.

So a lot of people say, hey, folks that are illegally in the country—and we are not talking about any particular place, just people illegally here from wherever they are—when they file a tax return and get more back than they paid in, then that is not quite as some represent, oh, gee, they pay so much money in income tax, they are good for the country.

Well, we know an awful lot of hard workers who we have seen—illegal aliens. I hear contractors say: I found out one of my best workers is not here legally.

But it brings us back to the point: Why are such hardworking people especially coming from south of the border into the United States? Well, obviously, for those type of folks—they came in and they are hardworking—they came to get jobs.

But that begs the question: Why are they having to come to the United States to get jobs? They are hardworking. Why wouldn't they find jobs in Mexico or El Salvador or Guatemala? Why wouldn't they find jobs in these other Central American countries or Mexico? The answer is obviously very clear: it is because of all of the corruption.

Even though I understand the President of Mexico recently claimed there were no drug cartel murders going on at the very time when there were an enormous number that happened within the few days of him saying that, we know there is murder, there is corruption, and it is from the drug cartels.

And the gangs and the coyotes that bring people into the United States illegally, they answer to the drug cartels. It is the Border Patrol that told me over and over, every inch of the U.S.-Mexico border is spoken for by some drug cartel; and if you cross into the United States without paying an appropriate price or dues to that drug cartel, then you are not going to last very long because they feel they have to make an example of you.

I saw one estimate of \$70 billion or \$80 billion, somewhere around there,

estimated to have gone from the United States into Mexico, to the drug cartels, for illegal drugs. Well, if we build a wall where it is appropriate and we totally secure our border 100 percent, then that \$70 billion, \$80 billion that is used for the drug cartels in their corruption of the Mexican cities and federal government and state government, that dries up to nothing. And if we could help dry up the \$70 billion to \$80 billion to \$70,000 or \$80,000 for illegal drugs, then, finally, we would help Mexico—as the best neighbor Mexico could ever dream of having—to become one of the very top economies in the world.

They ought to be one of the top 10 economies now, maybe top 5. All the massive natural resources that Mexico has, they are actually in a better location for trade than the United States. They are between two continents, North and South America. They are between two oceans like we are, the Pacific and the Atlantic, with, of course, the Gulf of Mexico in between. They ought to be a top 10 economy, but they are not because of corruption from the drug money that illegally crosses the U.S. border into Mexico. We cut that off.

And then you have all these hard-working people who just want to help their families. They don't want to have to flee the country they love to find a job. The jobs would be abounding all over Mexico. Isn't that what a friendly, caring neighbor would do for a neighbor? Shouldn't we want to help Mexico stop the corruption? Of course.

And any Mexican-elected official who says that there is no corruption, that there is no drug cartel influence, or that there is nobody being killed by the drug cartels, well, a statement by a Mexican-elected official that those things are not going on is an indication that that elected official is either completely ignorant of what is going on in his or her country or they are, as one would suspect, under the finger of the drug cartels themselves.

So I am hopeful we are going to be able to get a wall where we need it. President Trump and Attorney General Sessions are both doing everything they can to help secure the border. We need a Secretary of Homeland Security, and I am sure that will be coming quickly. The Democrats will probably try to block whoever it is for as long as they can, but we need a Secretary of Homeland Security; and we need our border secured not merely to help us, but as being the best possible thing we could do as a caring neighbor of Mexico.

Our Republican Conference we had in the House yesterday seemed very productive. We had a good discussion about the proposed tax reform, and, as I was mentioning earlier, you will have people who have been paying 10 percent will go to paying nothing. Some that

are paying much higher taxes will be cut down to 12 percent, and brackets indicating that there is going to be an awful lot more money in the pockets of people who are working, that will be fantastic, because when we leave more money in the pockets of those who have actually earned it, it gets the economy going.

People, whom I have immense respect for, like Dr. Arthur Laffer, Stephen Moore, Larry Kudlow, it is very clear to them, when they run the numbers, we could never adequately tax our way out of bankruptcy the direction we are headed. We couldn't. We cannot tax enough. If you put on too much tax, then people quit working.

But the way to make Social Security solvent and to make Medicare solvent is if we get the economy growing not at the 1.8 percent—I believe that was the average for the Obama administration—but for the good of everybody. People keep the money in their pockets. That allows them to spend it, and it causes the economy to grow.

I know, during the Obama administration, they saw 3 percent growth in the economy as just being virtually impossible; and I can understand, because their idea was tax, tax, tax, and that kills an economy. Whereas, if you allow people to have more of their own money, they spend more of their money. That allows more jobs to be created, and there are more people paying taxes. They begin making more, so they are paying higher taxes, even though it is at a lower rate. That helps stimulate the economy.

□ 1415

I was really hoping that President Trump's number of 15 percent corporate tax would work out to be our number for corporate tax. I was hoping that would be for regular C corporations, as well as a pass-through subchapter S corporation, because President Trump and I and others know that if it is a 15 percent corporate tax, then we would get back most of the manufacturing jobs, which fled America because of our massive 35 percent tax. Actually, by the time you add in all the others, it is well over 40 to 50 percent tax on corporations.

The reason some of us say the corporate tax is one of the most insidious taxes there is is because the government defrauds Americans into thinking they are not paying the corporate tax. These evil, rich corporations are paying those taxes. They are saying: "We are not paying them. Make the evil corporations." Whereas, anybody that is going to really be honest about it would have to say: "Well, the truth is, yeah, it is actually a pass-through from the customer, because if the corporation doesn't pass on that massive tax they are paying, they go out of business."

So it is actually an additional tax on the little guy. So the middle class,

lower-income folks are paying the big corporate tax. It is not the wealthy. It is the customers that are paying all that extra corporate tax.

So if you got the tax rate for corporations down to 15 percent, those companies start coming back, the manufacturing jobs come back.

As I mentioned to the President one time: "Mr. President, you understand it because of your great business acumen, and I understand it from studying history, but any major nation that cannot manufacture what they need in a time of war will not be a major nation after the next war."

The President wants those jobs back. It is not 15 percent being proposed. It is 20 percent. But that will bring back jobs. Not as many as if we had a 15 percent corporate tax, but it will bring back jobs.

I know there are those who say: Oh, we have evolved in America. We are more of a service economy. We don't want to be a manufacturing economy with those dirty jobs.

Yes, we do. We need to have those manufacturing jobs. Those are good jobs. We have requirements that you have to be concerned about the health of Americans. And by doing that, we bring back the jobs, we help our economy, and we actually save Social Security and Medicare.

I see my friend, Dr. HARRIS, is here.

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

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is absolutely right. An important thing happened this week. We announced that the American public is going to get a tax cut.

As I go around my district, as I am sure Members when they go around their districts, one thing they rarely hear is: You know, Washington spends their money very efficiently. They do everything just right. So why don't you tax me a little bit more?

We don't hear that.

What we hear is that hardworking Americans want to keep more of their paycheck. They look at what the Federal Government takes out of their paycheck. They don't think they are getting their money's worth. Honestly, Mr. Speaker, once you are around here a while, you realize they are probably not getting their money's worth.

So what we are going to do is we are going to follow the President's lead. The President has said that what he wants is a tax reform bill that cuts taxes in America so that businesses come back to America, that our job creators get tax relief, and that hardworking middle class American families can keep more of their paychecks.

And that is exactly what the tax reform outline has laid out for the American public this week.

Now, from the naysayers, you will hear the same old lines: tax cuts for the rich, blah, blah, blah.

The bottom line is that we are going to relieve the tax burden on American businesses that will bring jobs back to this country.

Mr. Speaker, if you look over the past 35 years of what has happened, from 1980 to 2015, the corporate tax rates, back in 1980, the top line of this graph is the U.S. tax rate, marginal corporate tax rate, which was around 50 percent at the time. It was just about the same as what the worldwide average was.

In the 1980s, the last time we had major tax reform under the leadership of President Reagan, we dropped the corporate tax rate to under 40 percent, and at that time, it was right in the middle of where the corporate taxes were worldwide. So the companies had no advantage to take their businesses and move it overseas in order to save taxes.

But something very interesting happened. If you look at the top line here, since then, our corporate tax rate has stayed at right about 40 percent. It is now 39.6 when you add in both the Federal taxes and the State corporate taxes, but the worldwide averages have fallen.

Mr. Speaker, other countries around the world have figured out that businesses will go to countries and they will create jobs in those areas where the taxes are lower.

So what has happened?

So if you look at what the corporate taxes look like now and what the corporate tax rates are around the world, these are the 35 leading nations, our competitors in the world. The United States now has the highest corporate tax rate at 38.9 percent combined. Again, the Federal plus the State tax rate. France and Belgium, 34 percent. Germany, 30 percent.

But if you look at where we are losing our business to, it turns out that very small countries like Ireland, way down at the bottom, years ago lowered their corporate tax rate to 12½ percent.

And what happened?

We moved businesses to Ireland.

When I worked in the operating room—and still do a few days a year—I would pick up what is called an endotracheal tube. It is a tube we use when we breathe for a patient. It goes into their windpipe and they breathe through it. I would pick it up—and this happened 15 years ago—look at it and say: “Wait a minute. This is made in Ireland. How in the world are medical items like this made in Ireland?” And I would look at other items in the operating room, and they were made in Ireland.

I didn’t know at the time that the reason was that Ireland lowered its

corporate tax rate, and literally many things that used to be made in the United States, like those endotracheal tubes, like other medical devices, were now made in Ireland; not by Americans, but by people in Ireland. We lost those jobs over there, and it was as a result of our corporate tax rate.

So our other competitors, you know, we look at car manufacturers, Korea, 24 percent corporate tax rate. Again, ours is at 38.9 percent. We look at other places around the world. The United Kingdom, Britain, one of our largest trading partners and one that certainly competes with us for businesses, whether it is the pharmaceutical industry or whether it is other businesses, they are at 19 percent. We are at 38.9 percent.

So what does this tax plan do?

This tax plan says that for those corporations that are moving businesses around the world based on a tax rate, we can’t have the highest tax rate in the world, because what we have seen is the emptying of American manufacturing to places around the world where the tax rate is lower.

Mr. Speaker, I would offer that if you or I invented something today and we looked to manufacture it somewhere, where would we go? Would we stay in the United States with a 38.9 percent combined corporate tax rate? Or would we go to Ireland, where it is 12½ percent, where, for every item we make, our company can make more money, invest that back in the company and take profits from it?

Of course we would go to Ireland.

So what do we have to do?

We have to address that. The President has said this is one of his top priorities, because this will bring back the jobs that have bled from the United States.

When we looked at what is called a corporate inversion, where a company looks to buy an American company, move its headquarters overseas, it is doing it for tax purposes.

Why should that happen? Why shouldn’t we be attracting these companies to the United States? How do we do it?

We do it by lowering the corporate tax rate. The plan, the outline that we have put forward to the American people this week lowers the corporate tax rate to 20 percent. Again, from 35 percent, which is the Federal rate, to 20 percent. It lowers it to the lowest among our competitive countries. Now, not as low as I would like to see it go, not as low as the President would like to see it go. The President thinks we need to be way down at the bottom of that chart. That is how we need to attract businesses back.

Mr. Speaker, to be honest, if we lower the tax rate just to be competitive, we are not competitive anymore. Companies will bring their business back to the United States for the rea-

sons that a lot of businesses originally were in the United States: we have a highly trained workforce, we have the rule of law, we have a lot of benefits for businesses to do business here.

Now, if Congress agrees, if we can come up with this reform plan, we are going to be seeing businesses fighting each other to come back into the United States because they realize this is the place they can do business best.

Mr. Speaker, only a minority of jobs are actually produced by those large corporations, what we call C corporations, the ones that paid the “corporate income tax.”

So the President said he also wanted to emphasize that what we need to do is lower the tax rate on our small businesses because, as you know, almost two-thirds of the jobs created in this country are created by small businesses.

So the Unified Tax Reform Framework, our tax plan, limits the maximum tax rate for small and family-owned businesses to 25 percent. Mr. Speaker, today that tax rate is 39.6 percent. Again, this will allow these small businesses and our family-owned businesses to take the money, invest it; and then when their businesses make money, when they hire workers and they make money, they are allowed to keep more to put back in those businesses, to hire more workers. This is how we get our economy going again.

If you talk to, again, these small businesses and these family-owned businesses, or the larger businesses, there are two things that these businesses say they need in order to succeed. One is they need a regulatory environment that is reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, the last administration was strangling American businesses through overregulation. So the first thing the President did when he came into office, to his credit, is say: We have to have only reasonable regulations. We can’t overregulate our businesses. We are stifling them.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that over the past 100 years, the average growth in what we call the GDP—the gross domestic product—in the United States, the average growth in GDP is 3.3 percent over 100 years.

Now, over the last administration, of course, you know it has the dubious honor of being the first administration where there was never a year of 3 percent growth. In fact, the average growth was under 2 percent. The mood was so bad in American business and the American business climate that the economists who would predict how the economy was going to operate have actually lowered their expectations of GDP growth to under 2 percent per year for the near future. That is not the America we know.

The America we know leads the world. When we see 6, 7, and 8 percent growth in China, why would we be satisfied with under 2 percent growth?

There is no need to be satisfied with that.

So we have to go to, again, our small businesses and our other businesses and ask them: What do you need to grow and produce jobs, to bring jobs back to this country, to put Americans back to work?

And the answer is: One, relieve us of the regulatory burden.

And from day one, that is what the President has done.

□ 1430

But there is another thing they say. We need relief from our tax rate. Again, the tax rate was the highest in the industrialized world. Our tax rate, the highest in the industrialized world. Our tax rate on small businesses was even higher. 39.6 percent was the highest marginal rate. That is not an environment where businesses thrive.

The President is taking care, to a large extent, of relieving the regulatory burden, the over-regulatory burden, that exists for American businesses.

Now Congress needs to turn its attention to the second leg on that stool, which is the tax problems. So the reform framework does that, and it does it exactly the right way. It says we agree with the President.

Americans are waiting for these jobs to come back. They don't want to see the back end of the moving van leaving American companies and bringing them overseas anymore. They don't like that. I can't blame them. There is no reason why more things can't be made here, more businesses can't thrive here.

So we need to take those steps, but that is only one part of this plan. The President said the other thing we need to do is return more dollars into the pockets of hardworking middle class taxpayers. That is exactly what this plan does. It does it by simplifying the Tax Code, by doubling the standard deduction and lowering all the rates.

The naysayers will say: Well, you know, if you lower the rates, you are going to increase our debt and our deficit. In fact, if you turn on the TV right now, that is what all the talking heads are complaining about. How could those Republicans suggest a plan that will increase our deficit?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you ask some people over at the Congressional Budget Office what happens to revenues if you increase the tax rate to 200 percent of income, they will say: Oh, it goes up 200 percent.

Well, that is ridiculous. At some point, overtaxation suppresses economic activity, and revenues go down.

Conversely, both with the tax cuts under President Kennedy in the 1960s and the tax cuts with President Reagan in the 1980s, what we saw when we lowered rates was, in fact, the rejuvenation of the American economy, a stim-

ulation of our GDP, a stimulation of our economy, leading to, in fact, increased revenue in both of those instances.

But in both of those instances, the naysayers said: You can't do this. If you are going to cut your taxes, your deficits will go up. That just plain doesn't happen.

So, yes, if you assume, all else being equal, that if we lower tax rates that revenue will go down, that would be true. But we know what happens when the American people feel the economy is going well, when they are fully employed, when we bring good-paying jobs back to this country and we lower the tax burden directly on hardworking middle class Americans. We know what happens. The economy grows.

With more money in their pockets, people make the decision to buy a car, to buy a house, to buy the new washing machine, to spend money on things that they have been afraid to spend money on because of the stagnant economy over the past 8 years.

We will unleash growth like we haven't seen since the 1980s, when, in response to the Reagan tax cuts, we had GDP growth not of 3 percent, not of 4 percent, but of 5 and 6 percent after that tax cut. So, in fact, tax cuts stimulate the economy, which lifts all boats, and it increases revenues.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to tackle this challenge.

Now, we know there are a lot of special interests there because, when you simplify the Tax Code, what happens? All the lobbyists come knocking on our doors, and they want to maintain their little piece of this Tax Code.

And the Tax Code runs to thousands and thousands of pages. Very knowledgeable people can't even fill out their tax returns anymore, they are so complicated. Or they are worried they filled it out wrong.

Or, Mr. Speaker, the best thing—or the worst thing—the funniest thing that I hear is that, if you have a tax question and you can't figure out exactly how to do it and you call the IRS, if you call two or three times, you are likely to get two or three different answers about how to fill out that form and how much tax you have to pay.

Well, when you get to that situation, you have gone way too far, and, Mr. Speaker, that is where we are. We are at that situation that a reasonable American can't even fill out their own taxes it has become so complicated.

So, as part of this framework, if we can simplify it the way this framework says, 90 percent of Americans will literally be able to fill out their taxes on something the size of a postcard. That is what we need to get back to, that kind of simplification.

But again, the road won't be easy because we will have all the special interests here in this town, and we know there are a lot of them. We will have

all of those special interests knocking on our doors, saying: Please preserve our little carve-out.

But every little carve-out makes the Tax Code more complicated. Every complication means that hardworking Americans don't get to keep as much in their pockets, and that is what we have to solve. We have to solve this problem. It has been getting worse now.

Again, the last time we dealt with the Tax Code in a comprehensive way was 30 years ago. To its credit, at the time, we reduced rates, we stimulated the economy, but we really didn't simplify the Tax Code as much as we would like to at this point.

So it is going to be hard, it is going to take months, and it is going to take a lot of people looking past the naysayers, past the people who say this can't be done, past the people who say the sky is falling, because we have heard this all before.

I am old enough to have heard it in the 1980s. That is when I started working. That is when I started bringing home a paycheck. That is the time when I started realizing what Federal taxation was.

I always tell the story of my oldest daughter, who trained to become a nurse, and she went and got hired. The first time she brought her paycheck—a real paycheck, a full-time job paycheck from the hospital—home, she said: Dad, what is going on here? I thought I was making this amount of money, and this is the amount I bring home.

We all know what happened. You saw all those lines: The Federal tax taken out; the State tax taken out; the local tax taken out; the Social Security tax taken out; the Medicare. You saw all the taxes that were taken out.

So what we have to do is we have to simplify the Code, bring those tax rates down, put more of that money in the pockets of hardworking middle class Americans. We owe them that. Part of that is simplifying that Tax Code. Now, once we do this and we stimulate the economy, we get the economy going again, our deficits will come down.

Look, we have to control spending. There is no question about it. Spending in this town is out of control. There is no question about it. Our deficit will exceed \$700 billion a year.

To put that in perspective, that is 20 times the size of my State's entire budget, and that is the amount that we are going to borrow this year.

When people say that we need money for this and we need money for that, every time we ask that question, you know, can we afford it, we have to ask: Can we afford passing this debt on to future generations?

I have five children, now, six grandchildren. My children will never pay off this debt. Those listening at home, if they don't believe me, go and look at the Federal Budget website and look at

the projection of Federal debt. It never goes to zero. It never, ever goes to zero—ever—not in my children's lives, not in my grandchildren's lives, not in my great-grandchildren's lives. That is just not the way we ought to run a government.

So once we tackle this tax reform, once we get our economy booming again with businesses vying to come into this country—not to go to some other country, but to come into America to do business—then we have to turn our attention to securing the future for future generations, to making certain that our Social Security system, which our seniors depend on, will not only be here for the seniors now, but for when my children and grandchildren reach their old age; that the Medicare system, which is scheduled now to be bankrupt in 10 years, that the Medicare system that our seniors depend on will not be there just for my generation, not just for my children's generation, but for my grandchildren.

We have to make sure that this country remains the strongest, most powerful country on Earth, a force for good and freedom throughout the world. We have to restore our defense budget. This President, to his credit, has called for that.

But as we restore our defense budget, we do have to redefine our spending priorities, because we don't—or, I guess, maybe we do, print money here, but it is not the right thing to do. We shouldn't be borrowing from future generations to take care of these priorities.

We have to get our economy going, make sure our revenues increase, and then turn our attention to making sure those revenues are spent wisely and that we define the future for our children and grandchildren, a future that they can be proud of in a country that remains, as Majority Whip SCALISE said on this floor today, standing at this podium, a country that the world can look toward for leadership, the country that, for now over a century, the world has looked toward for leadership to be the beacon of freedom, to be what President Reagan called the "shining city on the hill." Mr. Speaker, we do that by restoring the health of our economy.

We took a big step toward that this week with our tax reform framework. We are setting the country up for an economic rejuvenation, for a restoration, for those companies that have gone overseas to come back home. Let our great American workers make their products. Come back home to the greatest country this world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, that was a big step, but it is only the first step. We have weeks and months of work to get that done, a big job, an important job, but the first step was taken this week.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 4 p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 28, 2017, at 3:07 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3823.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike title IV.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I fully support a long-term extension of FAA authority, and I am very concerned that the expiration on September 30th will have serious consequences for our air safety and economy. Congress owes the American people a bill that will provide stability for our air traffic controllers and keep our skies safe. So I am extremely disappointed that the Republican leadership has decided to attach a number of controversial and partisan policy provisions that

are not germane to air travel and for that reason, I cannot support the bill in its original form.

For example, this legislation contains provisions that relate to hurricane disaster relief and the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Unfortunately, this bill does not extend reauthorization, increase borrowing authority, or address the overall stability of the NFIP. Instead, Republicans have decided to use this legislation as a vehicle to develop the private flood insurance market. Furthermore, the provisions providing tax relief to hurricane victims are woefully inadequate in assisting our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Additionally, while this bill extends authority for a number of health care programs, Republicans have decided to disregard essential bipartisan priorities like the Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and Community Health Centers. These programs require immediate reauthorization, and failure to do so will leave states like Minnesota without money to provide healthcare for babies, children, and expecting mothers. Community health centers across the country will lose the support they need to provide basic healthcare. Some will even be forced to close. The bill also fails to address the urgent need to reauthorize the Special Diabetes Program. While a short-term extension is included for the Special Diabetes Program for Indians, the funding is inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, these are all important issues, and deserve immediate Congressional action, but the only way to solve them is with bipartisan solutions. Half measures and political games will only waste more time, and Democrats stand ready to work with our Republican colleagues to address each of these issues in a more thoughtful way.

The Republican leadership has had nine months to work out a bipartisan, long-term solution for FAA Reauthorization. Instead of working with Democrats to pass a customary multi-year reauthorization, the Republican leadership waited until the last minute to push forward only a six month patch. Republicans then wasted more time by including a number of unrelated and partisan provisions that had nothing to do with FAA Reauthorization. Their decision to include a provision that would have effectively dismantled the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) ensured that the previous version of this bill would never pass the Senate.

We owe the American public and our air traffic controllers better. Playing political games with something as important as airline safety is unacceptable. Failure to reauthorize FAA authority would leave our air traffic controllers and the travelling public at great risk. Not only would a lapse in reauthorization mean furloughs for tens of thousands of air traffic controllers, but it would also force vital airport improvement projects to come to a halt. The effects of this shutdown would have serious implications on America's economy and air safety.

Now that the Senate has stripped out the most controversial provisions of this legislation, I am able to support it. However, Congress must put aside partisan differences,

work together, and produce a long-term extension that our airline industry so desperately needs.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2017, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2017

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 2, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3819. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 327. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

S. 1141. An act to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

S. 1866. An act to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 2, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2694. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0033; SC17-922-1 IR] received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2695. A letter from the Chairwoman, Nuclear Weapons Council, Department of Defense and Department of Energy, transmitting a certification that the amounts requested for the National Nuclear Security Administration in the President's budget for Fiscal Year 2018 meet nuclear stockpile and stockpile stewardship program requirements, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 179(f)(1); Public Law 99-661, Sec. 3137(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 112-239, Sec. 1039); (126 Stat. 1927); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2696. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Protection of Human Subjects received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2697. A letter from the Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Repeal of Regulations Governing the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program [Docket No.: 170627596-7803-02] (RIN: 0660-AA34) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2698. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2016-C-2570] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2699. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG — Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-546, Revision 0, "Revise APRM Channel Adjustment Surveillance Requirement" received September 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2700. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Regulatory Issue Summary — 2017-06 NRC Policy on Use of Combination Dosimetry Devices During Industrial Radiographic Operations received September 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Certain Entities from the Entity List; and Revisions of Entries on the Entity List [Docket No.: 170622586-7586-01] (RIN: 0694-AH41) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2702. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2703. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2704. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2705. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2706. A letter from the Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [CPCLO Order No.: 008-2017] received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2707. A letter from the Acting General Council, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Annual Report on Disability-Related Air Travel Complaints received During Calendar Year 2016, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Sec. 41705(c)(3); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 41705(c)(3) (as added by Public Law 106-181, Sec. 707(a)(3)); (114 Stat. 158); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2708. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Marine Event held in the Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0716] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2709. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Village of Sodus Point Fireworks; Lake Ontario, Sodus Point, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0718] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2710. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0008; Product Identifier 2013-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-18985; AD 2017-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2711. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions on Archaeological and Ecclesiastical Ethnological Materials from Guatemala [CBP Dec. 17-14] (RIN: 1515-AE33) received September 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2712. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Pilot Program for Section 355 PLR Procedures (Rev. Proc. 2017-52) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2713. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 115th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 488. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the removal of former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey; with an amendment (Rept. 115-335); adversely. Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1107. A bill to promote conservation, improve public land management, and provide for sensible development in Pershing County, Nevada, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require Internet-based, real-time responses to requests to verify taxpayer income for legitimate business pur-

poses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 3861. A bill to reform the Federal Insurance Office of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3862. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend funding for the National Health Service Corps program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. NOEM, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 3863. A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 to include sex trafficking victims in the transitional housing assistance grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 3864. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3865. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 3866. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude extensions of credit made to veterans from the definition of a member business loan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 3867. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create care management demonstration programs for chronic kidney disease under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3868. A bill to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 3869. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a process for accrediting agencies or associations to seek a waiver of certain accreditation requirements; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 3870. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to lower the cost of college education by establishing pilot programs to expand student access to digital course materials; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FASO (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 3871. A bill to amend the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 to reauthorize and improve the national organic program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 3872. A bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 3873. A bill to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as "Alex Diekmann Peak"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PETERS, MISS RICE of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 3874. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on physical security at Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities, to direct the Secretary to make certain improvements relating to inspections of Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities and improving care for women, to direct the Secretary to evaluate the organizational structure of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand the eligibility of students to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 3876. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the official travel of any senior political appointee on private aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3877. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect health care consumers from surprise billing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BEYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 3878. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide access to free credit freezes for all consumers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 3879. A bill to limit the use of Federal funds for the use of the travel expenses of senior Federal officials in contravention of certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3880. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize and support the creation and dissemination of cardiomyopathy education, awareness, and risk assessment materials and resources to identify more at-risk families, to authorize research and surveillance activities relating to cardiomyopathy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mr. REICHERT, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3881. A bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 3882. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to publish a final rule to provide for the screening, testing, and treatment for sleep disorders of individuals operating commercial vehicles; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3883. A bill to provide for enhanced penalties for certain offenses relating to controlled substances containing fentanyl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida (for himself and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 3884. A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act with respect to the National Child Identification Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 3885. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish guidelines for a model elder abuse registry and to provide grants to States for establishing and operating such a registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 3886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit against the estate and gift tax and to simplify the estate and gift tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 3887. A bill to require Federal agencies and Federal courts to comply with address confidentiality programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 3888. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for additional residency slots in children's hospitals graduate medical education programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend the FAST Act to modify eligibility requirements for participation in a commercial driver pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 3890. A bill to provide that determinations of eligibility and level of assistance for rural development programs shall be made without regard to incarcerated prisoner populations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of State Medicaid fraud and abuse control units to investigate and prosecute cases of Medicaid patient abuse and neglect in any setting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception for certain spun-off voluntary employees' beneficiary associations to the limitation on the exemption from tax on unrelated business taxable income of amounts set aside for qualified benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DUNN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CRIST, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MAST, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3893. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the "Robert H. Jenkins Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution recognizing the International Day of Peace; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROUZER, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of the American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) Chair of Honor; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BABIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 544. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a reading of the names of members of the Armed Forces who died in the previous month as a result of combat; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 545. A resolution recognizing the violence and other challenges faced by transgender women of color in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H. Res. 546. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Community Gardening Awareness Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H. Res. 547. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 3, 2018, as "United States Missing Persons Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 3860.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to the Congress under Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 3862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 3863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 3865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 3866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

[Page H1371]

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 3867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 3869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 3870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 3871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 3872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 3873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 3875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution of the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 3876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 3878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 3879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution: Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 3886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 3887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 3888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 3889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 3890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office there-

of

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 3893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, cl.7

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 113: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 154: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 173: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 246: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 392: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 564: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 620: Mr. LONG and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 631: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 692: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 747: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 771: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 778: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 785: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 799: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 801: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 807: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 811: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 812: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 821: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 909: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 927: Mr. DEFazio and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 959: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 997: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1017: Mr. DENHAM and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1057: Mr. MAST and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1078: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1116: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1150: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1159: Mr. DUNN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1225: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1253: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1298: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1311: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1358: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1438: Mr. TONKO, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1456: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 1468: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1496: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1519: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1563: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1651: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FASO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1660: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1661: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1676: Mr. TIPTON and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1697: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1818: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1949: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1953: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1972: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2029: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2044: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MENG, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2077: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 2098: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 2105: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2121: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2193: Mr. COOPER, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2232: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 2319: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 2332: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2345: Mr. JONES and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2469: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 2472: Mr. NADLER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GALLEGO, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2482: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2589: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 2591: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2635: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2651: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2658: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 2733: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2765: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 2790: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2851: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2899: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 2926: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 2936: Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 2973: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. GUTHRIE,

Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HURD, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. FASO.

H.R. 3042: Mr. JONES and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3053: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 3101: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3138: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 3161: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 3186: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3192: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3197: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 3222: Mr. CAPUANO and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3223: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3282: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 3324: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 3342: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 3378: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3380: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3477: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 3530: Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. KIND, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 3632: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 3684: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3711: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 3712: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLE, Mr. JONES, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3714: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 3717: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 3720: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3748: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3757: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3770: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COMER, Mr. BACON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 3773: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3782: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3784: Ms. LEE, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 3790: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3798: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. BUCHSON.

H.R. 3808: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3810: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3814: Miss RICE of New York and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 3815: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 3820: Mr. ROKITA and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3824: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3827: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3852: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3853: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 58: Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 142: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 239: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H. Res. 279: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H. Res. 464: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 486: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 495: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H. Res. 510: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 518: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 531: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 539: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 5, September 25, 2017, by Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico on House Resolution 508, was signed by the following Members: Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. Cárdenas, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Gomez, Mr. Polis, Mr. Takano, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Gallego, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Welch, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Ms. Slaughter, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Carabajal, Mr. Schiff, Ms. Bass, Mr. Castro of Texas, Ms. Matsui, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Levin, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Quigley, Ms. Pingree, Mr. McNerney, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Walz, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Delaney, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Ruppersberger, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Heck, Ms. Titus, Mr. Sires, Ms. Tsongas, Mrs. Torres, Mr. Schneider, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Crist, Mrs. Demings, Ms. DelBene, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Soto, Mr. McEachin, Mr. Huffman, Mrs. Beatty, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. McGovern, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Ms. Sinema, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Castor of Florida, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Vargas, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Espallat, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Keating, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Ms. Lee, Mr. Evans, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Beyer, Mr. O'Halleran, Mr. Suozzi, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Correa, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Engel, Ms. Barragán, Mr. Pascarelli, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Foster, Ms. Adams, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Jeffries, Ms. Meng, Mr. Rush, Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Schakowsky, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Khanna, Ms. Pelosi, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Hoyer, Mr. Payne, Mr. Costa, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Clay, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Kennedy, Mrs. Murphy of Florida, Mr. Higgins of New York, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Kihuen, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Ms. Esty of Connecticut, Mr. Coffman, Mr. Peters, Mr.

Lynch, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Sherman, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Norcross, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Ms. McCollum, Ms. Maxine Waters of California, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Bera, Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Himes, Mr. Meeks, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Ms. Shea-Porter, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Conyers, Mr.

Schrader, Mr. Lipinski, Ms. Fudge, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Gutiérrez, Mr. Pocan, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Langevin, Mr. O'Rourke, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Neal, Mr. Nolan, Miss Rice of New York, Ms. Gabbard, Ms. Moore, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Ms. Velázquez, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Veasey, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Vela, Mr. Petersen, Mr. Richmond, Ms. Speier, Mr.

Loeb sack, Mr. Kind, Ms. Hanabusa, and Mr. Visclosky.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 3 by Mr. GARRETT on House Resolution 458: Mr. Palazzo.

SENATE—Thursday, September 28, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace and glory, lift us with Your might. You are our security, our hope for years to come.

Lord, give our Senators such confidence in Your power that they will celebrate the victories that are yet to be. May they never forget the inheritance that belongs to all who love and serve Your will on Earth. Provide them with the wisdom to know that You are the only sure foundation for all their strivings. Remind them that unless You protect the Nation, its leaders and citizens labor in vain.

Eternal Spirit, great and marvelous are Your works, just and true are Your ways.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session for the consideration of the Erickson nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the President's nomination of Ajit Pai to head the Federal Communications Commission.

My view is that, Mr. Pai will do an enormous amount of damage to one of the foundational principles of the internet—net neutrality. I am going to outline why that would be a horrendous mistake for our country.

After we came to use the internet and see what an extraordinary asset it would be to our country, really beginning in the late 1990s, and early 2000s, we laid out what I still consider to be the legal foundation for the internet.

On a bipartisan basis, there was a big effort in the Senate and the House to really lay out what were the foundational principles of the net, and there were a variety of them. We wanted to make sure that folks were not hit with multiple and discriminatory taxes, and that they were not taxed on access to the internet. We wrote the digital signatures act, which is of enormous benefit to people, for example, in the Presiding Officer's home State of Nevada, where they are making business transactions. We made a judgment, which some have said has led to \$1 trillion worth of private wealth for our economy, whereby we said that we were not going to expose the small entrepreneur—the person who is getting started in the garage—to needless litigation.

One of those core principles was net neutrality, which, in my view, for the reasons that I am going to describe this morning, I think Mr. Pai would work long and hard to try to undermine.

Because so much of the telecommunications debate sounds like a lot of complicated lingo, I want to try to describe in something resembling English what “net neutrality” is. Essentially, “net neutrality” means that after you have paid your internet access fee, you get to go where you want, when you want, and how you want. In a sentence, that is what net neutrality is all about, and it is a bedrock principle for internet users in the Presiding Officer's home State of Nevada and in Oregon and all across the country.

It locks in equal treatment to accessing the internet.

We are not going to have some kind of information aristocracy in our society whereby the affluent have access to some kind of technological treasure trove, and folks who do not have much

are kind of stuck with what almost resembles dial-up. That is not what we want for communications policy in America. We want to give everybody a chance to get ahead so that the kids in rural Oregon and rural Nevada have the same kind of opportunities as youngsters in Beverly Hills or the Gold Coast of Chicago or Palm Beach. We want to make sure everybody has a chance to get ahead.

Mr. Pai says that he is for real net neutrality, and we have tried to pin him down on a whole host of policies that really get him to commit to the essence of it, but he mostly says a version of what the big cable companies say. The big cable companies have come to say: We like net neutrality. We are not going to block anything. We are for the consumer; we are for the little guy. We just do not want a whole lot of government.

They say that what they really would like is voluntary net neutrality.

Let me tell my colleagues something. There is about as much likelihood that the big cable companies will voluntarily subscribe to net neutrality as there is the prospect that William Peter Wyden—one of my 9-year-old twins, the boy—will voluntarily limit himself to one dessert. It is just not going to happen. It is just not going to work. Mr. Pai is on the side of the big cable companies. He has a long history of putting those companies before the consumers—the big corporate players over the small businesses—and pay to play over a free and open internet.

I introduced the first strong net neutrality bill here in the Senate in 2006. We all know that back then we were just starting the debate about technology policy. The Senate was getting ribbed pretty seriously by the late night talk show hosts who said that the internet was a series of tubes. So, as I have indicated, what we have tried to do is to make sure that if you pay your internet access fee, you get to go where you want, when you want, and how you want.

Net neutrality has been the law of the land, and our economy has grown around this leading principle with respect to equal access to information and customers. Mr. Pai has said that he wants to take a “weed whacker” to the strong, enforceable net neutrality rules. Right away, with his quotes that are on the record, he is talking about blowing up this notion of a level playing field, which is so crucial to innovation and free speech online and that allows the startups to get out of the garage to become the next YouTube and Google and eBay.

I want to emphasize that point.

People talk a lot about technology policy.

To my colleagues, this tech policy debate is about the little guy who wants to be able to get his business out of the garage so that he can become the next big guy. Net neutrality gives us the opportunity to create opportunities for that small entrepreneur, the person who is a small entrepreneur with big dreams.

Net neutrality prevents your internet service provider from favoring one type of content over another. As an example, suppose your internet provider has a financial stake in a third-party content site. It could ensure that content goes to your home faster and clearer than to the homes of its competitors if you did not have real net neutrality—enforceable, real net neutrality, not something like Mr. Pai wants, which is, oh, we will kind of pay lipservice to net neutrality but not make it enforceable.

For example, you could have AT&T deciding to provide free data for customers streaming HBO, which would cause more folks to subscribe to that service over its competitors and starve other creators of the subscribers necessary to create new and innovative content. That is the kind of thing that happens if we do not have real net neutrality.

It even holds true for telehealth providers. Telehealth depends on reliable, fast, and low-cost internet coverage to transmit critical health information, especially in rural and remote areas—for example, the remote monitoring of blood glucose levels in diabetes patients. Net neutrality prevents the internet service providers from viewing this lifesaving service as a cash cow, thus charging rural hospitals and community health centers a premium fee to deliver critical and timely healthcare services.

Not long ago, the Federal Communications Commission adopted a strong legal framework that would make sure that the Federal Communications Commission had the tools to protect the open internet, and the reality was that, then, the Federal Communications Commission and a gentleman named Mr. Tom Wheeler, who had a background in the industry, used their experience in how companies operated and how they treated consumers to make sure that we had constructive, real, and concrete consumer protections.

The reason I feel so strongly about Mr. Pai's nomination is that Mr. Pai made it clear with his comments about taking a weed whacker to anything enforceable. He is going to roll back the rules, and then he is going to claim to be fixing a problem that doesn't exist.

The reality is that we have strong net neutrality protections in place right now. If you vote for Mr. Pai,

make no mistake about it, you are voting to roll back consumer protection. You are voting to take a big step backward for the internet. You are going to hurt the people—the small business people, the startups—who are dreaming in their garage of the chance to be big and who are going to have a lot more problems if there is a telecommunications policy that doesn't give them a fair shake.

As I indicated, this notion of a voluntary solution to net neutrality is absurd. I talked about it in the context of my own son. It would be hilarious if I even suggested to my son that I am going to let him, William, voluntarily limit himself to one dessert. He would smile and wait until I got out of the room, and he would dig in for some more. That is going to be the same thing if we embark on a net neutrality policy that says: Let's just trust the big cable companies; the cable companies, in their heart of hearts, are all about the little guy. They are just going to voluntarily go along with net neutrality because they are just that kind of good folks who want to make sure that the little guy gets ahead. The fact is, Chairman Pai's track record demonstrates that he is not in the consumers' corner.

Last year the Federal Communications Commission acted on the responsibility given to it by the Congress to protect browsing history, favored applications, and even the location of broadband users from the ISP. During that vote, Mr. Pai voted no. He was, again, with cable companies' profits over the American consumers' privacy.

During the August recess, Mr. Pai began an attempt to really backdoor a proposal that would lower the acceptable standard speed of internet access in rural areas. That is just wrong. Rural areas are already facing huge broadband challenges. Last Saturday night, I was in Oak Ridge, OR, which has a population of a little over 3,000. Earlier that day, I had been to La Pine, OR, in Central Oregon. Right on the top of their agenda is trying to find ways to expand opportunities for better communications in rural areas and more opportunities for broadband.

So in the August recess, when communities like Oak Ridge and La Pine want more opportunities in rural communities, we had the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission trying to sneak through a proposal that would lower the acceptable standard speed of internet access to rural America and hurt rural America. Make no mistake about it. That would hurt rural America—the Oak Ridges and La Pines. It is just wrong. The Congress mandated that the FCC expand access to high-speed internet to every American, and Mr. Pai basically said: No, slower internet speed is good enough.

As I indicated, just this last weekend, on Saturday night, we had a town-

hall in Oregon. I am telling you what these small communities are telling me about their current frustrations with slow and unsatisfactory internet speeds. Mr. Pai is giving a big gift to the powerful interests, and their internet speeds are going to get slower rather than what rural America wants, which is faster internet so that they have more opportunities to participate in the global economy and more opportunities to help their kids with their homework. Congress and the Federal Communications Commission ought to be working for all to have access to high-speed internet and not telling folks in rural America that what they have is just good enough.

Mr. Pai has repeatedly failed on another matter, and that is to act even in the face of clear danger to the security of America's mobile phones. Despite years of warnings about well-known weaknesses in mobile phone networks that allow hackers and spies to track Americans' phones, intercept calls and messages, and hack the phones themselves, Mr. Pai has taken a hands-off attitude. His Federal Communications Commission says it is not going to force wireless carriers to fix the weaknesses, and—what a surprise—his traditional answer is that “voluntary measures are going to do enough.” I disagree because they haven't worked.

We always talk about the role of government. I think this is an area that really lends itself to thoughtful discussion because, obviously, we don't want government if you can figure out a way to solve a problem without it. The voluntary measures have not worked here on these basic security issues I have described. The self-regulation approach has failed. The Federal Communications Commission has to force the carriers to secure their networks and protect America's critical communications infrastructure. The failure to act on this security issue means that the American people are going to be less safe.

I close by saying that my view is that net neutrality has sparked the flames of innovation and commerce on the internet. Net neutrality has been one of the foundational principles that we started working on in the late 1990s and in the early part of this century. It was up there in terms of importance, like trying to prevent multiple and discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce, particularly taxing internet access, and the digital signatures law, making sure that you couldn't hold somebody personally liable if they were to invest in a website or a blog. These were foundational principles that have been of enormous benefit to our country, and net neutrality was one of those. I guess it would be the fourth in the list of foundational principles that we talked about and have been talking about for well over a decade.

We should be building on net neutrality, not walking it back. I believe that what Mr. Pai is talking about is a significant retreat from the freedom and openness that the internet is all about.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the confirmation of Mr. Pai. Vote in favor of a truly open internet.

I yield the floor, as I note the Democratic leader is here to speak.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). The Democratic leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak in leader time, and, after my remarks, that the Senator from North Dakota be recognized to speak on the judge nomination and be given the time she wants, about 10 minutes, and that we move the vote to immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM OREGON

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me thank my friend from Oregon for his outstanding remarks. He has been a leader in keeping the internet open and free and making sure that this new highway system, in effect, is as free as our old highway system, or the existing highway system, to let the big guy and the little guy compete on equal terms. That is all we want, and Mr. Pai doesn't seem to get that.

There is a whole round of appointees from this administration who simply side with big corporations no matter what, and this is an example of just that.

So I thank my friend from Oregon for his remarks.

Mr. President, I have three topics this morning—briefly, healthcare, then, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and, finally, taxes.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, on healthcare there is a bit of good news. I just spoke with Senator MURRAY this morning. I saw Senator ALEXANDER in the gym, as I do just about every morning. Both are two of about the best negotiators we have in this body. Both have come to agreements across the aisle on many other occasions. They both inform me that they are on the verge of a bipartisan healthcare agreement to stabilize markets and lower premiums.

Now, we have had some bipartisan sprouts on healthcare recently. It is time for those sprouts to flower, and I am hopeful they will. I told PATTY MURRAY that she has my faith and confidence. She has the freedom to cut the best deal she can, and I hope the leadership will tell the same to Senator ALEXANDER.

It was widely reported, before the Graham-Cassidy bill was withdrawn,

that there was pressure on Senator ALEXANDER to pull back. Well, that is over. Let's all come together. Our healthcare system needs it, and our constituents need it. They don't want premiums to go up and coverage to go down, and it would be a great start for some bipartisanship in this place, which I hope we can continue on more issues.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, on Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, we know about the crisis. Just looking at the pictures breaks your heart. We hear the stories of people desperately needing their medicine and diabetics needing insulin, which can't be refrigerated because there is no electricity to keep the refrigeration going. There are people dying right now because they can't get the medical attention they need, and, of course, there is a need for food, water, power, and transportation. It is awful.

Yesterday, Leader PELOSI and I met with Gen. Lori Robinson. It felt nice, amid this devastation, to see a woman have four stars on her shoulder. She is a four-star general in the Air Force, and she is head of the U.S. Northern Command. She is the military person in charge.

We met with her to get an update on the Department of Defense's work in assisting the islands. It was evident from our conversation that, while the military is increasing the amount of resources it is sending to the island, there is a lack of command and control about how those resources are distributed. In other words, they probably have enough food, they probably have enough gasoline—that is what the Governor of Puerto Rico said today—but they can't get it to the places it needs to go. Part of it is because they need transportation—trucks and things—but a lot of it is because there is no one there to make sure. Puerto Rico's command and control has been decimated by this storm as well. People can't get to the places they are supposed to go. They don't have their phones, et cetera.

I spoke with Senator RUBIO this morning in the gym as well. He had just recently visited Puerto Rico. He had seen the devastation firsthand, and he told me the same—that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are struggling, and they need help fast. His visit to Puerto Rico confirmed this idea that we really need command and control.

Well, there is no better command and control organization than our military, and we need our military to start aiding Puerto Rico in the command and control sense, as well as in the shipping of supplies, food, and the other kinds of things they need.

Puerto Rico needs help fast. They need personnel to direct the supplies and resources on the ground. All the

aid in the world will be ineffective if it doesn't go where it is needed to go. So I joined Senator CANTWELL, the ranking member on the Energy Committee, which has jurisdiction in many ways here, and Senator NELSON, who cares a great deal about Puerto Rico and is from Florida, nearby, and 30 other Senators in sending a letter to the Trump administration that contains a list of needed resources and personnel to coordinate our relief efforts.

It appears there will not be a request for emergency supplemental appropriations this week. We hope it comes very soon.

Mr. President, we cannot forget the utter devastation facing the 3.5 million American citizens in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I have been on this Earth now for quite a few years, and I have never seen such devastation anywhere in the United States or its territories. So we need to act, and we need to act quickly. Command and control, which our military can help supply, should be at the top of the list.

TAX REFORM

Finally, Mr. President, on taxes, yesterday President Trump and Republican leaders laid out their tax plan, sharing the first sketchy set of details with the American people about what they want to change in our Tax Code. Any serious analysis of their proposal will leave you with one conclusion: President Trump and the Republicans have crafted a massive tax break for the very wealthy in our country.

Welfare is supposed to take care of the poor. This plan takes care of the rich. Plain and simple, the Republican plan is "wealthfare," the opposite of welfare. It is designed to take care of the rich. It repeals the estate tax, which goes to so few people in such large amounts of money, slashes the corporate rate, creates enormous tax loopholes for wealthy hedge fund managers in the form of a rate cut on passthroughs, and it lowers the rate, amazingly enough, on the top bracket of the wealthiest Americans while raising the tax rate on those at the bottom of the income scale. Who would have thought?

Secretary Mnuchin, Gary Cohn, and the President himself have said: We want to help the middle class. Then the first thing they come out with—again, we don't know all the details—lowers the top rate on the wealthiest and raises the bottom rate on the working families, which is the opposite of what they are saying.

On the estate tax, the bottom line is that only people whose estates are above \$10 million pay a nickel of estate tax—only those. It is a handful. We are compiling how many people in each State have paid the estate tax for the last 5 years. Everyone in their State will see how few people are affected. You know, if someone has a big farm and maybe it is \$12 or \$15 million and

they don't want to sell it—pass it onto their kids—I am willing to make an exception for that. I think most people will, but that doesn't justify repealing the entire estate tax.

Moving on to corporate taxes, there is a difference between the big corporations and small corporations. The big corporations right now are making record profits. Let's say the thousand biggest are making record profits. They have more money than they have ever had. According to a study—I believe it is by Goldman Sachs, which is hardly a leftwing think tank—they are paying the lowest percentage of their profits as taxes in a very long while. Big corporate America is flush with money. They are not using it to create jobs. Why in God's Name anyone thinks, after giving them more money through a tax break, all of a sudden they are going to start creating jobs when they are not doing it now is beyond me.

It is different for small businesses. We Democrats understand that small businesses need a break. We will work with our colleagues to do it. But even this passthrough—the biggest benefit is going to be wealthy lawyers and hedge fund managers, who will then pay an individual tax rate of 25 percent while so many others who have much less wealth are paying more in taxes.

So the President gets up and says this is a tax break for the middle class. I believe he said this morning that he will not benefit from it. Please, let's have some honesty here. If you really believe giving tax breaks to the wealthiest people and the biggest corporations is going to create jobs, then have the courage to say it. Don't fudge it.

President Trump said that his plan would create a middle-class miracle. I think it would be a miracle if it helped the middle class, given the numbers I have seen. While the tax plan doubles the standard deduction—that is one of the points where they say they help the middle class—it eliminates the personal exemption. The standard deduction is \$12,500; personal exemption is \$6,000. Figure it out, my friends. If you are a family of three or more, you lose, not gain. Three times \$6,000 is \$18,000; that is opposed to a \$12,500 standard exemption. It doesn't make sense.

Oh, and how about this one: The personal exemption is not the only one gone. State and local deductibility—I predict that is going to be a downfall of this plan. I know the ideologues say: Let's go after the States that charge taxes. Let me tell you, there are 40 or 50 Republican Congressmen from well-to-do suburban districts in high-tax States—New York, California, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Maryland—whose constituents will be clobbered by removing State and local deductibility. They will be clobbered. The \$12,500 they gain in the standard deduction, minus

what they lose in the individual deduction, is far less than they pay in State and local taxes in those districts.

We are going to be watching them like a hawk. I will tell my New York Republican friends from those well-to-do suburban and upstate districts: You are going to be hurting your constituents if you vote for a plan that gets rid of State and local deductibility. The eyes of America will be on you, and certainly the eyes of each State.

How about this one: They eliminate the deduction for extraordinary medical expenses. If you have a child with cancer, it is hard to pay for it, and your insurance covers some, but you are not going to get a tax break for shelling out money for that extra medicine or that extra MRI scan—no.

So the Republican game plan gives a few crumbs to the middle class—and many in the middle class will pay more in taxes, a few hundred off taxes maybe—and at the same time gives a huge break to corporations and the superwealthy. The American people will not buy it. This is not 2000 or 1982, my Republican friends. We have huge problems where the wealthy are doing great, and the middle class and the poor are doing badly.

The American people will not buy tax breaks for the rich. They will not buy it. Seventy percent of Americans already think our system favors the wealthy, and the Republican tax plan drops an anvil on the scales of our tax system, tipping them even further in favor of the wealthy. The American people will not be for that.

What about the deficit? We hear about deficits every time there is a new program. This dwarfs any spending program in terms of the deficit that we have enacted over the last several years—\$5 to \$7 trillion of deficit. What has happened to all the Republicans who talk about wanting to be deficit neutral when it comes to spending? Is that out the window? We will see.

Let me tell you something that really got under my skin—sorry to my colleague from North Dakota. I am just agitated about this in a good way.

This morning, the chief economic adviser to President Trump, Gary Cohn, said the administration believes it “can pay for the entire tax cut through growth” by using a dynamic scoring model. Gary Cohn comes from Goldman Sachs. If he used that funny kind of math at Goldman Sachs the way he is using it here in Washington, he would have been kicked out of that firm a long time ago. Gary Cohn should know better; Gary Cohn does know better.

Let me repeat what I said yesterday: Dynamic scoring is fake math. Paying for tax cuts with growth is fake math. We know it is fake math; we have real-world examples. The 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts were promising they would pay for themselves through economic growth. It is the same thing you hear

from the Club for Growth and some of my colleagues.

Some dynamic scoring models at the time predicted the 2001 and 2003 tax breaks would grow the economy so much it would nearly wipe out the national debt, but what happened? I heard the Club for Growth leader get on TV and say: Well, there may be a deficit in the short run, but after 10 years it will all be taken care of. Ten years after the Bush tax cut, CBO estimated the Bush tax cuts added \$1.6 trillion to the deficit.

How about the example of the great State of Kansas? Governor Brownback slashed the top rate. He exempted pass-through businesses. It was a real-life experiment in a Republican State, similar to what President Trump announced. Brownback's backers used dynamic scoring models to estimate that his tax cuts would generate \$323 million in new revenue by 2018. Guess what happened. It added so much money to their deficit over 4 years that they have had to figure out ways to raise taxes now, just as Ronald Reagan did in 1986. So this idea that the administration can pay for a \$5 to \$7 trillion tax cut through growth is simply selling a bill of goods using fake, fake math.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to give my strong support and ask my colleagues to support the confirmation of Judge Ralph Erickson to fill the North Dakota vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. This is a seat that the U.S. Judicial Conference has deemed a judicial emergency, as it has been empty for almost 900 days. Being nominated to a seat on the U.S. circuit court of appeals is an honor and a privilege, virtually unmatched in the legal profession.

After reviewing Judge Erickson's record and talking to his colleagues and the people who have worked with him and appeared before him back in North Dakota, I am very proud to come to the floor this morning and offer my strong support for his nomination to the Eighth Circuit. When Judge Erickson was nominated and confirmed to his current seat on the U.S. District Court for North Dakota, it was with the support of our two great former Senators and my good friends, Byron Dorgan and Kent Conrad. Judge Erickson has certainly upheld their faith and trust in his abilities as a district court judge, and I am confident he will uphold my faith and my trust in his ability as he moves to the Eighth Circuit.

Judge Erickson has a long history of commitment to the legal profession and the State of North Dakota, first through his service on the State court

and, since 2003, as a judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of North Dakota. Very few lawyers can make such a long-term commitment to public service, and his record certainly reflects his belief that when a lawyer is called to serve for the greater good, they should answer that call. I hope Judge Erickson is able to instill this sense of commitment to public service in aspiring young lawyers whom he will come to meet and whom he will be able to influence through his example.

A nominee for the North Dakota seat on the Eighth Circuit must have experience in working with Indian Country, given the number of Tribes and the Indian land that are contained within the jurisdiction of the Eighth Circuit. During his career and at his hearing before the Judiciary Committee, Judge Erickson has shown an in-depth understanding of Tribal sovereignty issues and a recognition of the challenges and disparities in the treatment of Native Americans under the law when they are arrested and charged for crimes in Indian Country.

Judge Erickson has been an advocate for equal treatment of Native Americans under the law. He also serves as the chair of the U.S. Sentencing Commission's Tribal Issues Advisory Group. I have no doubt that Judge Erickson will bring this knowledge and understanding of Tribal issues, sovereignty, and treaties with him to the Eighth Circuit.

The best judges always have been people who can truly understand and bring to the bench a sense of empathy. Judge Erickson has used some of his own struggles and challenges during the course of his life to inform his own views and to give counsel to those who come before him as he uses his own personal struggles as an example. It takes a really big person to recognize and learn from their failings and to use them to help others. I admire him greatly for that.

During his confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Judge Erickson showed an openness and frankness in responding to questions and discussing his past struggles. That was refreshing, illuminating, and honestly all too rare here. I believe he impressed my colleagues on that committee greatly with his willingness to be so forthcoming and so honest. That is why they unanimously reported his nomination out of the committee.

It is a tremendous honor to be on the floor of the U.S. Senate before Judge Erickson's confirmation vote. I am here today to give my highest recommendation in support of his nomination to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. I, again, urge all of my colleagues' thoughtful consideration and evaluation and favorable endorsement of his confirmation.

Thank you so much.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, James Lankford, Jerry Moran, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Ernst	McCaskill
Baldwin	Feinstein	McConnell
Barrasso	Fischer	Merkley
Bennet	Flake	Moran
Blumenthal	Gardner	Murkowski
Blunt	Gillibrand	Murphy
Booker	Graham	Murray
Boozman	Grassley	Nelson
Brown	Harris	Paul
Burr	Hassan	Perdue
Cantwell	Hatch	Peters
Capito	Heinrich	Portman
Cardin	Heitkamp	Reed
Carper	Heller	Risch
Casey	Hirono	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Coons	Isakson	Sanders
Corker	Johnson	Sasse
Cornyn	Kaine	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Schumer
Cotton	King	Scott
Crapo	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Leahy	Stabenow
Donnelly	Lee	Sullivan
Duckworth	Manchin	Tester
Durbin	Markey	Thune
Enzi	McCain	Tillis

Toomey
Udall
Van Hollen

Warner
Whitehouse
Wicker

Wyden
Young

NAYS—1

Warren

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran
Franken

Menendez
Strange

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 95, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1808

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in 2 days, unless Congress acts, the Federal Perkins Loan Program—the Nation's oldest Federal student loan program—will expire, leaving thousands of students with one fewer option to help them afford a higher education.

Since 1958, the Perkins Loan Program has existed with broad bipartisan support and has provided millions of students a stronger path to the middle class.

In the 2016 to 2017 academic year, the program has served more than 770,000 students with financial need across more than 1,400 institutions of higher education. In my home State of Wisconsin alone, Perkins provided aid to more than 23,000 students who are working hard to achieve their dreams.

Colleges and universities are invested in Perkins. This program operates through campus-based revolving funds that combine prior Federal investments with significant institutional resources. While Congress stopped appropriating new funds for Perkins more than a decade ago, these schools continue to invest in this program because they know it works, and the campus-based nature of the program allows them to target aid to students they know are in the greatest financial need.

I am here to call on all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the extension of this critical program and investment in our students across America.

Two years ago, we allowed this important program to lapse, but thanks to the tireless efforts of students, institutions, advocates, and a bicameral, bipartisan majority in support of Perkins, we were able to advance a compromise that ensured that this source of support continued to be available to students in need.

Once again, we are facing a deadline. Once again, there is strong bipartisan support for extending the Perkins Loan Program. Last week, Senators PORTMAN, CASEY, and COLLINS joined me in introducing the Perkins Loan Program Extension Act, which would provide for a 2-year extension. My fellow Wisconsinite, Representative MARK POCAN, together with New York Representative ELISE STEFANIK, have introduced a House companion bill that is supported by over 225 of their colleagues—a bipartisan majority in that Chamber.

I am here to call on my colleagues to act once again and support a 2-year extension of the Perkins Loan Program. And while I look forward to a broader conversation about improving Federal supports for students as we look to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, we cannot once again sit by and watch it expire as America's students are left with uncertainty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1808, a bill to extend the Federal Perkins Loan Program for 2 years; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration and the bill be considered read a third time and passed, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to explain my reason for the objection.

First, I would like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am grateful for her work on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, where she is a valuable, diligent, and constructive member. We work on a great many things together and have agreed to very many things. However, we disagree on this one, and here is why. Let me summarize it at the beginning of my remarks and then explain it with a little more detail.

No one who has a Perkins loan today loses that loan, period. So if you are a student anywhere in the country and you have a Perkins loan for this year, you don't lose that loan, period.

Second, no one who has a Perkins loan for next year loses that loan because no one has one. They were ended 2 years ago. Every student was told in his or her financial aid information that the Perkins Loan Program ends this year, so no one could expect to have one next year. No one has been granted one for next year, so no one who has a loan is losing a loan.

Why did we, in December of 2015—2 years ago—reach a bipartisan agreement to sunset, or end, the Perkins Loan Program in 2 years, which is the end of this week? In that agreement, we allowed graduate students to receive Perkins loans for 1 additional year and undergraduates to receive Perkins loans for 2 additional years. It was made clear at that time—2 years ago—that this was the last time the program would be extended, but we wanted to have a smooth transition, and we did not want students and colleges and universities to be surprised. That agreement, therefore, included many requirements for institutions of higher education to inform students over the last 2 years that the Perkins

Loan Program would end on September 30 of this year, which is the end of this week. That agreement also set policies to make the sunset of Perkins loans as smooth as possible for students. The expiration of this loan program was not and should not have been a surprise. It has not received any appropriation since the year 2004, and the U.S. Department of Education reminded institutions that it was ending the program this year.

Now, why? Why are we ending the program? Why did we agree to do that 2 years ago, and why have the last three Presidents recommended that we end it—President Obama, President Trump, and President Bush?

The Department of Education estimated that in the 2016 to 2017 school year—that is the school year that just ended—the Perkins Loan Program provided less than \$800 million in new Perkins loans to about 300,000 recipients. That may seem like a lot, but by comparison, the Department estimated that the Federal Government disbursed over \$22 billion to almost 7 million undergraduate students in the Stafford Subsidized Loan Program, or the regular Direct Loan Program. The Perkins loan—a separate loan—provides an average loan of roughly \$2,000, and it illustrates the complicated mess in which students find themselves because of our Federal student aid system today.

The Perkins loans have a higher interest rate than other loans that are available to students today. The interest rate is 5 percent, compared with 4.45 percent for undergraduate loans. And students who have a Perkins loan aren't eligible for certain programs that exist for students with other loans, such as the income-based repayment programs and the public service loan forgiveness programs, which help students manage repayment of their loans. Those aren't available to students with a Perkins loan. The default rate for Perkins loans is higher than for the Stafford loan.

The bill which the Senator from Wisconsin has offered would cost taxpayers, according to the Congressional Budget Office, \$900 million for a 2-year extension. If we were to extend the program over 10 years, it would cost \$6.5 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The bill does not have an offset, so these billions of dollars would only serve to add to the \$20 trillion Federal debt we already have.

I object because I think it is time for our country, through legislation by this Congress, to move on to a simplified Federal student aid program that has only one Federal loan for students, one Federal grant for students, and one work-study program for students.

As I have spoken often about on this floor, along with Senator BENNET from Colorado, we would like to reduce the

application form for those Federal grants and loans called FAFSA—the dreaded FAFSA which 20 million students and their families fill out every year. We would like to reduce that from 108 questions to 2 or 5 or 10 questions.

We need a much simpler program for Federal student loans, and the end of the Perkins Loan Program is a small step toward that end.

As I mentioned, President Bush recommended that the program end, President Obama recommended that the program be changed and folded, in effect, into the regular Direct Student Loan Program, and President Trump has the same position.

I look forward to working with my colleagues, including the Senator from Wisconsin, on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act later this year, when we can work together to improve our Federal student loan programs and our grant programs, find ways to simplify them, make it easier and cheaper for students to attend college, and to help students pay those loans off, after they get them, in a fair and simpler way.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am certainly disappointed that my effort to extend the Perkins Loan Program today was just blocked by my Republican colleague, but I want to say that it is an honor to serve on the HELP Committee, where we do some very impressive bipartisan work.

I understand the Senator's concern about the program and his belief that we must simplify. I share his desire to work on a broader reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and I look forward to that broader conversation about our Federal financial aid programs. However, I do not think it is right or fair to end this program, with nothing to replace it, to the detriment of students in need.

Also, I cannot agree that the compromise we hammered out 2 years ago was an agreement to wind down the program. I guess it is the perspective that we each bring to this subject, because I believed we were acting to ensure that the Perkins Loan Program could continue until we could discuss changes, improvements, and reforms to it and all Federal financial aid programs as part of broader legislation to improve higher education. We have yet to get to that bigger conversation, and it would once again be unfair to let this program end now without the benefit of a holistic assessment of the many ways the Federal Government helps to make college affordable for students across this country.

I will continue to fight to extend this support for America's students, and I hope the chairman of the committee

will once again work with me and the bipartisan supporters of this program to find a path forward for the Perkins Loan Program.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks because I see the Senator from Mississippi is here.

Of course I will be glad to work with the Senator from Wisconsin. The fact is, 2 years ago we agreed to end the program. The graduate loans ended last year, and the undergraduate loans end this year. Everybody was told about it.

Every student who wants a loan can get a direct student loan from the government at a lower rate, with better repayment programs and better payment provisions than the Perkins loan. So no one is losing a loan, and everyone can get a better loan if they apply for a direct loan.

We do need a simpler program, and we need to simplify the application process for applying for the loans and grants and for paying them off.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, later on today, the Senate will move to a vote to advance the nomination of Ajit Pai to become Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I rise today in strong, enthusiastic support for confirming Chairman Pai as the permanent Chairman of the FCC.

In the 9 short months since Donald Trump chose Mr. Pai to serve as the FCC's Acting Chairman, he has restored confidence in the agency's ability to do its work on behalf of the American people and within the rule of law.

He is working to establish the light-touch regulatory framework that allowed the internet to become the marvel of the modern age, keeping it free and open for consumers, innovators, and providers. Internet technology will continue to thrive if we keep the heavy hand of government away from the controls.

Chairman Pai recognizes the need to close the digital divide between our Nation's rural and urban communities. I am working closely with him and with other members of the Commission to remove barriers to internet connectivity that exist in my home State of Mississippi and across the country. Without broadband access, these rural communities could lose out on critical jobs, economic development, and many other opportunities borne out of the thriving internet economy.

Mr. Pai has already proven he is capable of being an exemplary FCC Chairman who will fight for the unserved and underserved Americans.

As Acting Chairman, Mr. Pai has overseen the adoption of Mobility Fund Phase II rules supporting universal service. He has sought the advice of experts for the most effective broadband deployment, and he has encouraged the development of better networks, lower costs, and relief from regulatory burdens.

Americans are being well-served by a leader like Chairman Ajit Pai, who understands the strong connection between technology and innovation. Mr. Pai understands how high-speed internet can revolutionize small businesses and benefit local economies. He understands the importance of consumer protections and has already instituted proposals and rules that would benefit public safety.

I hope Mr. Pai will also continue to hold the FCC to the highest standards of transparency. His decision to make proposals and orders accessible to the public prior to the Commission's vote on them was a positive action.

The FCC will continue to be in good hands with Mr. Pai as Chairman and when the Senate votes later on today to move this nomination along. I urge my colleagues to vote yes and eventually to vote yes for his confirmation.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, at 12:15 p.m., all postcloture time be considered expired on the Erickson nomination and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that the Senate then resume consideration of the Pai nomination and the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided prior to a cloture vote on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today we begin debate on a position in our government that impacts the daily lives of every single American. If you use a telephone, connect to the internet, watch television, and pay a big cable company to do all of those things, then you need to know who Ajit Pai is.

President Trump nominated Ajit Pai to be the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. While Ajit Pai has devoted many years to

public service, I cannot support his nomination. Under Mr. Pai's short tenure, he has made the FCC stand for "forgetting consumers and competition."

Let's take a look at who is getting a piece of the FCC pie under Chairman Pai. It is American consumers on the one hand versus big corporations on the other hand. Let's take a piece of this pie and determine who is getting that first slice of what is going on at the Federal Communications Commission.

Let's look at net neutrality. Net neutrality is the basic principle that says that all internet traffic is treated equal. Net neutrality ensures that internet service providers like AT&T, Charter, Verizon, and Comcast do not block, slow down, censor, or prioritize internet traffic.

If Ajit Pai gets his way, a handful of big broadband companies will serve as gatekeepers to the internet. Fewer voices, less choice, no competition, but more profits for the big broadband companies—that is Pai's formula. Yet it is today's net neutrality rules that ensure that those with the best ideas, not merely the best funded ideas, can thrive in the 21st-century economy. It is net neutrality that has been the internet's chief governing principle since its inception.

Consider that today essentially every company is an internet company. In 2016, almost half of the venture capital funds invested in this country went toward internet-specific and software companies. That is \$25 billion of investment. Half of all venture capital in America went toward internet-specific and software companies—half of all venture capital.

To meet America's insatiable demand for broadband internet, the U.S. broadband and telecommunications industry invested more than \$87 billion in capital expenditures in 2015. That is the highest rate of annual investment in the last 10 years.

So we have hit a sweet spot. Investment in broadband and wireless technologies is very high. Job creation is very high. Venture capital investment in online startups is very high. That is why more than 22 million Americans wrote to the Federal Communications Commission to make their voices heard about net neutrality. They do not want it repealed. Yet Chairman Pai's proposal would decimate the FCC's open internet order.

Chairman Pai has said: "We need to fire up the weed whacker" to net neutrality rules. Do we really want a leader at the Federal Communications Commission who, ultimately, is going to implement the agenda of the big broadband companies, which want to crush competition, reduce choice, and then make consumers pay more?

So the first slice of this pie of killing net neutrality goes to the big corporations, and the losers are the consumers.

Let's go to the next slice of the FCC pie. Let's see where that goes as these decisions are being made. The next issue is, in fact, broadband privacy.

Chairman Pai has actively supported efforts to allow broadband providers to use, share, and sell your sensitive information without consumer consent. In 2016, Chairman Pai voted against commonsense broadband privacy protections that gave consumers meaningful control over their sensitive information. When he assumed the FCC chairmanship, Ajit Pai stopped the implementation of data security protections, which would have ensured that broadband providers better protect the information they collect about their users. Can you imagine that? Chairman Pai stopped protections that would improve data security.

I have 143 million reasons as to why that was a bad idea. Just this month, Equifax was subjected to a cyber attack that compromised the personally identifiable information of 143 million consumers. The American public wants more protection, not less. Yet what does Chairman Pai do? He effectively eliminates the very data security protections that consumers need to protect their sensitive information. That is just plain wrong.

Just a few weeks later, Mr. Pai supported congressional Republicans' efforts to rescind the Federal Communications Commission's broadband privacy protections. Now your broadband provider can relentlessly collect and sell your sensitive web browsing history without your consent.

You may wonder why Chairman Pai would actively support efforts to undermine the privacy of American consumers. The answer is simple. He wants that slice of the pie to go to the biggest corporations. How do they use it? They take that data—your personal data, the information you put online—and just sell it without your permission in order to make money for the big corporations. Once again, rather than consumers, the big corporations get the benefit of that decision at the Federal Communications Commission.

Let's take a look at the next issue. The next issue goes to the question of mergers, the mergers of big telecommunications companies.

The Sinclair deal has led to a proposal to merge with Tribune Media, granting one company an unprecedented market power of over 200 broadcast stations around the country. In order to help Sinclair, Ajit Pai reinstated what most consider to be an antiquated rule, the UHF discount, to pave the way for the merger. The UHF discount makes the FCC count only half of the stations on certain frequencies toward companies' ownership

percentages. This merger would allow Sinclair to reach into 72 percent of American households, but with the discount, the FCC counts it as only 45 percent. Putting this discount back on the books is Chairman Pai's first step to helping Sinclair stay within the national ownership cap of 39 percent.

What will be the impact of this massive telecommunications mega-merger? Less local news, sports, and weather that millions of Americans count on today. It will lead to the continued squeezing out of independent programmers, and it will mean higher prices for consumers. What signal does approving this merger reveal? It reveals that the FCC and Ajit Pai have put out the welcome mat for the consolidation of other communications companies.

So this third slice, once again, goes to corporations and not to consumers. They are left out in the cold.

Let's look at the fourth slice and see what happens with that at the Federal Communications Commission under the approval of Ajit Pai's nomination on the floor of the Senate. The next slice is one that deals with the education rate, or the E-rate.

The E-rate has proven to be exceptional in linking up schools and libraries to the internet. We went from a country in 1996 in which only 14 percent of K-12 classrooms had internet access to a near ubiquitous deployment today. The E-rate has ensured that students from working-class neighborhoods can connect just like students from more affluent communities. The E-rate democratizes access to the opportunities and technologies that lead to bright futures. Over \$44 billion to date has been committed nationwide.

Again, Ajit Pai does not take that perspective. At his confirmation hearing in July, I explicitly asked him whether he would commit to preserving the success of this bipartisan program and protecting the funding level or whether he would make programmatic changes that could undermine or weaken the E-rate. He would not make this commitment to maintain current funding for E-rate.

Students and library users around the country will not be able to afford this slice of the pie. Once again, consumers will lose and corporations will win.

Now we go to the final slice of that communications pie at the FCC.

Telecommunication is the great equalizer, but a household with no access to basic telecommunications services could lose educational and employment opportunities as well as emergency services. That is why the FCC's Lifeline Program is truly a lifeline for millions of Americans who are able to connect to the world. In Massachusetts alone, more than 180,000 low-income Bay Staters rely on the Lifeline Program to access voice and internet service.

The value of this universal service has always been a bedrock of our telecommunications policy. Yet one of Ajit Pai's first actions as FCC Chairman was to undermine Lifeline and make it more difficult for low-income people to access affordable broadband. I was dismayed by his decision to abruptly revoke the recognition of nine additional companies as Lifeline broadband providers just weeks after they were approved. Mr. Pai's action did nothing but unfairly punish low-income consumers by limiting choice.

So the final slice, again, goes to the Federal Communications Commission's supporting corporations and not supporting consumers.

That is the pie—the FCC pie—as it is put together on net neutrality, on privacy, on mergers, on E-rate, and on Lifeline. It is all the same. The FCC winds up standing for forgetting consumers and competition. That is the era that we are now in, and it will only intensify as each day, week, and month goes by. That is why I am recommending a “no” vote on Ajit Pai as the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

Which side are we going to be on—that of the consumers or corporations? Are we going to side with innovators? Are we going to side with those who are trying to continue to take these platforms of dynamic change in our society for consumers, for entrepreneurs or are we going to allow for a closing of this revolution?

This is the era in which we live in the 21st century. This is the choice that people must make. In which direction are we going?

I urge a “no” vote by my colleagues on Ajit Pai's nomination. Of all of the things that we are going to do this year, this is very near the top of the list. In many ways, this telecommunications revolution is the organizing principle of our lives here in the United States and around the planet, and we have to make sure that we are heading in the right direction—more openness, more competition, more consumer protection, more privacy protection, and more access in libraries and schools to these technologies, not fewer and fewer and fewer and fewer. It is just the wrong direction to head in. I urge a “no” vote.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT AND FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have been hit especially hard by powerful hurricanes. As I said earlier this week, the Senate will continue to work with FEMA, the Department of Defense, and the rest of the administration to help in the recovery, just as we have in Texas, Florida, and across the Southeast. We are eager to hear more soon about what additional resources will be necessary.

The American people are stepping up, too, just as they always do, and so are the brave men and women of our military.

This week, 70 soldiers and 8 aircraft from Kentucky's own 101st Airborne Combat Aviation Brigade deployed from Fort Campbell to Puerto Rico to support hurricane relief operations. These soldiers will join the larger joint force effort, which includes elements of the 26th Marine Expeditionary Unit, medical support teams, medevac aircraft, and elements from the Army Corps of Engineers.

Kentucky is similarly proud of the men and women of its Air and Army National Guard who have worked to provide relief in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, as well as in Texas where, according to recent reports, their efforts helped save more than 300 lives in the wake of Hurricane Harvey.

We are all proud of their efforts, but we should not forget that disasters of these proportions typically require a response from nearly every arm of the Federal Government. The FAA plays a critical role as well.

As we all know, the FAA's authority to collect and spend money from the aviation trust fund is set to expire on September 30, this week. These are the resources that fund repairs and replacement parts for our air traffic control system. Even absent a crisis, it would be irresponsible to let this lapse.

We have read in recent days that air traffic in and out of Puerto Rico has already been limited because of damage done to radar, navigational aids, and other equipment. The Governor of Puerto Rico reports that air traffic control capacity is only at about 20 percent of normal.

This critical air safety equipment needs repair. The FAA reports that failure to act on the reauthorization would leave them without sufficient funding in the accounts necessary for replacement parts, equipment, and supplies. They would have only enough funding to cover salary costs for these workers for about 1 week.

These American territories are suffering. What they need right now is aid and assistance from the air, not a manufactured crisis from Washington on top of everything else. The House of Representatives will soon pass legislation that reauthorizes the FAA. It will

help open up the air space to that aid so that it can get to where it is needed most.

The House bill goes further by authorizing tax relief for individuals and businesses affected by the recent hurricanes in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and Texas and Florida, as well, because these disaster victims should not suffer a tax bill on top of their losses. We need to pass that legislation here in the Senate without further delay.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Madam President, on another matter, the Senate is considering two qualified nominees today. One is the sitting Chairman of the FCC, Ajit Pai.

Chairman Pai has led a fascinating life, one punctuated by hard work and success. It had its beginnings in Buffalo. It traced a line through Canada. It unfolded in the small town of Parsons, KS, where Chairman Pai grew up with his parents, first-generation immigrants from Southern India. It was on to Harvard after that and then the University of Chicago for his law degree.

Pai's résumé prior to his appointment as a member of the FCC is as varied as it is impressive. He clerked for a Federal judge. He worked in the Justice Department's Antitrust and Legal Policy Divisions. He gained practical experience in the private sector. He served here in the Senate as committee staff. He even won a Marshall fellowship. He also worked in several positions within the FCC itself.

When President Obama nominated Pai to serve as an FCC Commissioner back in 2011, the Senate confirmed him by a voice vote.

When the Senate considers his nomination again today, I hope Senators will come together to give him strong support one more time. After all, it is no wonder why President Trump chose to elevate him to FCC Chairman earlier this year. He understands the communications industry from nearly every angle, considering his impressive resume. He understands the needs of rural communities in States like Kentucky, thanks to his own rural background. His dedication to bringing more openness and accountability to an agency that is too often known for secrecy is commendable. The same can be said of his advocacy for Americans' First Amendment rights.

I look forward to advancing and then confirming his nomination to a new term.

Madam President, one other nominee we are considering today is district judge Ralph Erickson of North Dakota, who is the nominee before us to fill a vacant seat on the Eighth Circuit. He is clearly qualified. He deeply respects the rule of law. He was confirmed by the Senate to his district judgeship by a voice vote. He enjoys the support of both of his home State Senators, Republican Senator HOEVEN and Democratic Senator HEITKAMP.

When his nomination came before the Judiciary Committee recently, every single member of the committee voted to approve him—every single Republican, every single Democrat. This includes the top Democrat, Senator FEINSTEIN, and the Democratic leadership's second-ranking officer, Senator DURBIN. So you would think his nomination would be as noncontroversial as it gets. You would be right.

Yet Democrats still chose to erect another pointless procedural hurdle before we can actually confirm him. We will probably do so overwhelmingly, given that the Senate just voted 95 to 1 on this pointless cloture motion—a pointless cloture motion on a nominee who nobody opposes.

Until now, our friends across the aisle have thrown up one unnecessary procedural hurdle after the next on even the most uncontroversial of nominees. As I have noted before, the opposition they have shown to these nominees most of the time seems to have little to do with the nominees themselves nor whether Democrats even support them. Our Democratic colleagues actually do support the nominees, just as they do now.

This really has to stop. It is time to end these silly games. It is time to confirm Judge Erickson, a dedicated jurist who is going to make a great addition to the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO MARY JO BROWN

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise today to honor a proud educator, a dedicated public servant, a beloved native of my home State of West Virginia, and my very dear friend, Mary Jo Brown. Words cannot express my gratitude for Mary Jo's service and friendship.

Since my days as Governor, Mary Jo has gone above and beyond to uphold the standards not only of professionalism, loyalty, and dedication but also of what it means to be born in the Eastern Panhandle of West Virginia.

Mary Jo has always had a noble passion for education. She worked for Berkeley County Schools as a teacher, a library media specialist, director of public affairs, and finally as principal of Burke Street Elementary School, where we first became acquainted.

Upon her retirement from Berkeley County Schools, I invited Mary Jo to work with me as a regional coordinator, a role she kept through my entire time as Governor and now as U.S. Senator. Her warm personality and sense of humor truly have a way of making you feel at ease—laughing quite frequently at not only her but yourself.

I have heard many times from members of the Eastern Panhandle community that when she is out meeting with elected officials, business owners, and fellow West Virginians, she provides

every confidence that their voices are being heard, and I can assure you, they are. She gets in contact with me immediately.

When Mary Jo is given a task, she doesn't take no for an answer. She is the most tenacious person I have ever met. She gives each project or challenge her all because it is for the good of her community, our State, and her hometown.

It would be difficult to find anyone as knowledgeable and dedicated to our home State as Mary Jo. Among her many contributions to the Eastern Panhandle, together with her loving husband Walter, was founding the Walter and Mary Jo Ziler Brown Fund in 2006 to help Eastern Panhandle students study animal husbandry, agriculture, and veterinary medicine.

We bonded over our passion for public service, inspiring the next generation of leaders, and we share the common goal of helping the rest of the country discover all that our great State of West Virginia has to offer.

Now that she is retiring after a long career of teaching, public service, and more than a decade of Federal service, I know that Mary Jo will carry the same passion for the Eastern Panhandle and for West Virginia that she always has, and she will continue to make a difference wherever she may be and wherever she goes—always for the State of West Virginia and her community.

It is my greatest honor to extend to her and to Walter my very best wishes in the days and years ahead.

Thank you, Mary Jo, and God bless you for everything you have done for me, for our office, and, most importantly, for our State of West Virginia and the Eastern Panhandle. God bless you.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I am honored to come to the floor today to express my support for the President's nominee to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, Judge Ralph Erickson.

Judge Erickson is a longtime North Dakotan and has been a tremendous public servant in his current capacity as Federal district court judge in Fargo, ND. He has made our State proud, and I am confident he will be an excellent addition to the Eighth Circuit Court.

Judge Erickson has a distinguished legal career which spans over two decades. After working in private practice for 10 years, he served as a magistrate judge for Cass County and then as a

State district judge for the East Central Judicial District Court. In 2003, Judge Erickson was nominated by President George W. Bush to the U.S. District Court for the District of North Dakota and was quickly confirmed by the Senate unanimously.

Throughout his tenure, Judge Erickson has demonstrated deep respect for the Constitution and the rule of law. His judicial experience ranges from overseeing routine civil cases to cases involving extreme criminal violence. Throughout all of these cases, Judge Erickson practiced a measured and prudent legal approach that is necessary for a position on the second highest court in the United States.

Judge Erickson has also proved to be a champion for Indian Country. He serves as the Chair of the Tribal Issues Advisory Group on the United States Sentencing Commission, where he works to preserve Tribal sovereignty. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I believe Judge Erickson's expertise on this issue will be a valuable asset to the Eighth Circuit Court.

Madam President, part of our duty as Senators is to evaluate the qualifications of the President's appointees and to vote on their nominations accordingly. This is a responsibility that I take very seriously, and I have no doubt that if confirmed, Judge Erickson will be an excellent circuit judge. I am honored to be here to support his nomination and to urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I would also like to note that in the Gallery today we have his daughter Elizabeth joining us. I think it is wonderful that she could be here to see her father's confirmation vote. She is a sophomore at Catholic University and just an outstanding young person, and there is no doubt that she is extremely proud of her father today. So it is wonderful to welcome her here for this momentous occasion.

With that, Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, all time having expired, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Erickson nomination?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Paul
Blumenthal	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Booker	Harris	Portman
Boozman	Hassan	Reed
Brown	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cardin	Hirono	Sanders
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Casey	Inhofe	Schatz
Cassidy	Isakson	Schumer
Collins	Johnson	Scott
Coons	Kaine	Shaheen
Corker	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—1

Warren

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Strange
Menendez	Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Pai nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ajit Varadaraj Pai, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1:45 p.m. will be equally divided.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to speak on the renomination of Ajit Pai to serve as Chairman of the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, to serve for a term of 5 years.

Under the previous administration, the FCC always had the consumers' back. Back then, that administration's FCC strengthened consumer protections. It furthered competition, it protected public safety, and it pushed forward to ensure universal service for all Americans.

Ultimately, the success or failure of the FCC rises and rests not on the fulfillment of special interest wish lists

but on the treatment of those who are least able to protect themselves and whether their First Amendment rights, including those of journalists, are vigorously protected.

Chairman Pai has been a vocal and excessively partisan and often hostile opponent of pro-consumer steps taken by his colleagues on the FCC. We have seen that time after time in the previous administration.

Since becoming Chairman of the FCC this year, he has systematically undercut much of the work done over the past 8 years. I want to give you several examples.

He has acted to prevent millions of broadband subscribers from receiving key information about rates, terms, and conditions of their service. This is called disclosure. He has threatened the expansion of broadband into the homes of low-income Americans by limiting the effectiveness of the new Lifeline Program reforms. If that is not enough, he has proposed sweeping limits on the ability of States and localities to review and improve the installation of certain types of wireless equipment. Furthermore, he has supported the moves by the GOP Congress to eliminate commonsense privacy rules for broadband services.

If all of that is not enough, he has eliminated several media ownership rules, paving the way for a massive consolidation among TV and radio broadcast stations. Continuing, he has acted as if the way to improve broadband in rural America is to lower standards and saddle our most remote communities with slower speed and worse service. He has also opposed widely supported updates to the E-Rate Program, which brings broadband to schools and libraries in every State in the Nation and leaves that critical program's budget—and the American schoolchildren—in the dial-up era. That is not what we want for our students. Furthermore, he has curtailed rules designed to help small businesses, schools, libraries, and hospitals to find competitive options for high-capacity telecommunications services. What that is going to do is likely raise the cost of these services and potentially harm their quality.

The list I just gave does not include the elephant in the room—Chairman Pai's planned elimination of the FCC's net neutrality protections. This Senator has been very clear that I oppose the effort to revoke these essential consumer protections on the internet. I think Chairman Pai's proposed course is shortsighted, especially when his preferred approach seems to be the abandonment of the FCC's oversight on the action of broadband providers. These are actions that directly impact on the lives of millions of Americans.

In March, I sent to Chairman Pai my deeply held concerns about some of these actions, and I expressed my sin-

cere hope that his early moves were not a sign of things to come, but unfortunately my concerns have only been heightened by his record over the months since that conversation.

At the end of the day, the FCC has a responsibility to put the public interests ahead of the powerful special interests. Just as it has been under the leadership of the past Chairmen and Chairwomen, Congress expects the current FCC to uphold the laws the Congress has passed and to enforce the regulations properly adopted by the agency.

The vast majority of the actions of Chairman Pai have served to eliminate competitive protections, to threaten dangerous industry consolidation, to make the internet less free and less open, and to weaken consumer protections for those most vulnerable.

Ultimately, we need an FCC Chairman who has the consumers' backs. We need an FCC Chairman who is not afraid to use the robust statutory authority Congress has given to the FCC to protect consumers. Based on his record, I have serious and longstanding concerns about whether Chairman Pai really does have the consumers' backs. As a result, I will oppose this nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, it is nice to see the ranking member of the Commerce Committee on the floor today. I appreciate that he and I share a particular view about the privatization of air traffic control.

Today, we are going to presumably pass a 6-month extension for the Federal Aviation Administration. It was passed by the House earlier today, and once again we are in a position which, in my view, we shouldn't be in. We ought to be passing a long-term authorization of the Federal Aviation Administration. Last year, we did so. The Senate, with 95 votes, passed a 4-year FAA bill. It was the kind of meaningful, bipartisan accomplishment that is too rare in Congress today.

I supported that bill, but unfortunately when it was sent to the House and it came time to meet that last year's deadline, we were ultimately forced to pass a short-term extension—which I opposed.

Our ongoing efforts to pass a long-term bill, Republicans and Democrats in both Chambers of Congress, have found common ground and consensus among the entire aviation community on a wide range of important issues.

I am talking about reforms to strengthen the Contract Power Program, one of the most and overwhelmingly popular and successful FAA programs. That matters a lot to the State of Kansas, and communities in the State of Nebraska as well, the home of the Presiding Officer in the Senate.

I am talking about streamlining the aircraft certification process that allows the FAA to focus its valuable resources elsewhere while generating a positive impact on our economy and job security in the aviation manufacturing sector. Because, once again, Congress refuses to set aside the perpetually controversial proposal to privatize our Nation's air traffic control, we are left, again, with a short-term extension. It is another one of those take-it-or-leave-it moments that is occurring here at the eleventh hour in advance of September 30.

We know in the Senate this proposal for privatization will never have the votes to pass. Yet we keep considering short-term extensions that are damaging to the aviation community, particularly the airports that need certainty in planning their infrastructure projects, and they will be, first and foremost, to improve the safety for our air travelers.

A 6-month extension, in my view, is too short to provide the certainty that is needed. The grant process, at the Department of Transportation, will be ongoing, but no airport can plan based upon whether the FAA is going to be authorized 6 months from now.

I have come to the floor numerous times before to talk about how Kansas is a special place when it comes to aviation. Kansas has built three out of every four general aviation aircraft since the Wright brothers first flew at Kitty Hawk. Today, over 40,000 Kansans earn a living in manufacturing, operating, and servicing our world's highest quality aircraft. These aviation businesses and their employees depend upon our ability to compete in a global marketplace, an ability which is significantly damaged when we are putting off passage of a long-term reauthorization bill not just once but year after year.

While general aviation manufacturing is our State's largest industry, it is not just those manufacturers and their employees who understand the problems and ramifications with privatization of air traffic control.

I have often said on the floor that I think at times I get categorized, as a Senator from Kansas, as a State that manufactures lots of airplanes and that my views are therefore solely related to the airplane manufacturing sector. I certainly bring that perspective to Congress, and I speak often and work often on behalf of the manufacturing of aircraft. But any of us who represent airports and communities that are not the largest in the country ought to oppose the privatization of air traffic control.

This is not the traditional rural-versus-urban argument that occurs sometimes around here. This is not about little towns versus everybody else. This is about everyone except for the largest cities with the largest airports and the most travelers. So this is

not about just Garden City, KS; or Manhattan, my hometown; or Hays, my former hometown. This is about Wichita and Topeka. This is about Kansas City. All but the absolutely largest airports would be damaged by the privatization of air traffic control.

We have said this many times. It is important to the manufacturers, but it is also important to the survival of communities that I represent and that all of my colleagues represent across the country.

Everywhere I go in Kansas, I am reminded that ATC privatization is a bad idea. The idea that we would allow a 13-member private board to make decisions about the future of airports and air transportation across the country is troublesome. Moreover, even the major providers of aircraft and avionics equipment that reside in Kansas—those businesses that create thousands of jobs in my State—are perhaps even more outspoken against privatization than anyone. These businesses know that privatization of the Nation's most complex air system is a solution without a problem that will ultimately create lots of problems, lots of unintended consequences.

Americans expect leadership from their elected officials in Washington. At a time when partisan dysfunction puts up constant barriers in the legislative process, we should be doing everything we can to find common ground and pass legislation that will have immediate positive impacts on our economy. For so much of the FAA reauthorization last year and again this year, we found that common ground—except for this one divisive issue that we know ultimately will not become law. It impedes the opportunity to do what, without almost any exception, Members of the House and Senate have agreed to.

True FAA reform will dramatically increase the ability of American aviation manufacturers and businesses to create jobs. This short-term extension represents yet another regrettably missed opportunity to do just that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO ROZANN KIMPTON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week, I have been coming to the floor to talk about my State and what I think makes it the greatest State in the country and in the world. We like to celebrate and recognize somebody in Alaska who is making a difference for their community, for the State, and for the country, and we like to call these extraordinary Alaskan individuals our Alaskan of the Week.

Like many of us here in the Senate, I spent a lot of time recently in August traveling throughout my home State, and wherever I went, I met strong, generous, versatile Alaskans, many of whom survive in some of the harshest

conditions on the planet but still have time for their communities and their families and their neighbors. But, like in many places around the country, I also saw the scourge of addiction that is tearing apart communities and tearing apart families.

We have all heard how addiction is often passed down through generations. There are many in Alaska and many throughout the country who are determined to break this intergenerational cycle of addiction and many who are succeeding. We don't always hear about them, but there are many. So this afternoon I wish to introduce my colleagues to 81-year-old Rozann Kimpton, our Alaskan of the Week, who is doing that and a lot more.

Rozann and her husband moved to Alaska from Washington State in 1958, and they immediately settled in. They ran businesses together, including a small retail store, and then they got into construction and contracting. They raised two children. They were a team. About 10 years ago, they moved to a large plot of land in Wasilla, AK—over 50 acres—to spend time in retirement, and they made plans: gardening, traveling around the world. But it didn't take long for Rozann to recognize that something was wrong—very wrong—in her family, particularly with what was happening to two of her great-grandchildren, Luke and Amanda. They were living in a situation that was harmful to them and they needed help.

At this point, Rozann's husband was also suffering from his own illness—cancer—but the two of them took Luke and Amanda in and adopted them. "It was the only way to make sure they were safe," Rozann said. "And when a kid needs to be taken care of, and when a mommy and daddy can't, you do it," she said. "I couldn't live with myself knowing that they were in danger and I did nothing." This is Rozann talking about her two great-grandkids.

That was 10 years ago. Rozann, now a widow, lives with Amanda and Luke on that big plot of land in Wasilla. Amanda is a senior in high school, and Luke is an eighth grader. They are great kids. As a matter of fact, I just had the opportunity to visit with them in my office yesterday.

Amanda loves geometry. She plays a violin with the Wasilla Youth Orchestra and drums and dances with the Intertribal Drum Group in Anchorage. Luke's big dream is to join the Navy, which I think is great.

The three of them volunteer in their community, helping foster kids. Amanda makes blankets for the foster kids. Every Sunday, they drive over 100 miles to attend Emanuel Presbyterian Church in Anchorage, which is like a second home to all of them.

In addition to all of this, Rozann is the area volunteer coordinator for Volunteers of America Grandfamilies, a

grandparents support group. Once a month, she has a picnic for her fellow grandparents and other parents who have adopted kids. The kids play games, eat hamburgers and hot dogs, and adults sit around the campfire, share stories, and encourage one another in all the work they are doing. She is in constant contact with about 25 families, and whenever she spots someone she thinks might need help with their kids, their grandkids, or their great-grandkids, she gives them her card.

"I am not a shy person," she said. "I will talk to anyone who looks like they are struggling, and I am particularly good at spotting grandparents who are raising kids"—grandparents who are raising kids throughout our great Nation.

As the opioid crisis is hitting Alaska, just like it is hitting so many other States, she is seeing more and more grandparents stepping in. "It is a plague," she said, "but the most important thing is to help the children as early as possible, and to do what we can to make sure they don't carry on that plague."

Rozann Kimpton is here right now in Washington, DC. As I mentioned, I had a great meeting with her yesterday. She is here to attend a banquet where her efforts will be recognized. She is the 2017 recipient of the Alaska Angels in Adoption Award and will be recognized by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption.

Rozann, thank you for your warmth and for all your hard work for Alaska. Congratulations on your award, and congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. President, an issue I have been coming to the Senate floor to speak about for the past couple of years is an issue that I don't think we focus on enough here in the Congress, here in the Senate, and that is the key issue of America's economic growth.

With the exception of national security, strong, robust economic growth is probably the most important issue we can be focused on in this body. We certainly have many challenges in this country, but so many of them are made easier when the American economy is strong, when job opportunities are plentiful and optimism in the future because of that strong economic growth is high.

So how have we been doing over the past decade? I want everyone to take a look at this chart. The answer is, not very well; not very well at all. This chart shows the gross domestic product—GDP—decade after decade through different administrations, Democratic and Republican, over the last several decades. So if we take a look at the chart, we see Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Clinton, Bush 41 and 43, and President

Obama. We see where levels have been. We see that over the years, over the decades, the average economic growth is about right here—about 4 percent.

There has been a lot of talk about what has made America great and what makes America great. This is what makes America great: strong, robust, economic growth decade after decade. That is the key.

So what happened over the past decade, right here? If we take a look right here at this red line, that is 3 percent. That is not the traditional level. Traditional levels over 200-plus years of American history are closer to 4 percent. But 3 percent GDP growth is considered OK—not bad, not great, but pretty good, and something we should all aspire to, something we should hit.

When we look at this chart, we see that in the last decade we never hit it, not even 3 percent GDP growth—more like 1.5, 2 percent. As a matter of fact, President Obama is the first President in American history where we never hit 3 percent GDP growth for a year.

I know what some may be thinking. This seems to be a pretty important issue, right? Economic growth last decade not even hitting 3 percent. Why wasn't the press writing about that? We didn't hear many stories in the press about this very important issue—a decade of lost economic growth. Many of us come to the floor to talk about this critical issue, and there is a yawn in the Press Gallery. There is no interest. It is hard to understand why.

One theory I have is that if you look at our country more broadly, these are the numbers—very, very weak growth—but certain places in the country over the last 10 years have actually done very well, especially this city, Washington, DC. It has been growing very strong, with probably 5, 6 percent growth. Some other places, some of the coastal big cities, including New York, San Francisco, and Boston, are all doing well—way higher than 3 percent. They are growing stronger. So the press, in my view, is probably not that interested in this number because in places like Washington, everything seemed to be going great. But it wasn't going great.

Think about this: If Washington or L.A. or New York or San Francisco are growing at 3 or 4 percent growth and yet the country is at about 1.5 or 2 percent, then there are probably huge parts of America that are actually shrinking, not growing at all.

These charts talk about economic growth, GDP. It can sound a little bit wonky. Really, GDP is a marker for the health of our economy. It is an indicator of American progress. It is a proxy for the American dream and optimism in the future.

As this chart shows, we have had a sick economy over the last 10 years, a lost decade of economic growth. The press hasn't written much about it, and

when they have, they have typically bought the line of the previous administration saying: Hey, look, we know that the traditional levels of economic growth are close to 4 percent. Look at Clinton, look at Reagan—4½, 5, 6. We know that is the case. We know 3 percent is OK. But we haven't hit that in the last 10 years, so what is wrong? Well, the press started buying the line from the last administration: That is the "new normal." We can't hit 3 percent anymore. We certainly can't hit 4 percent anymore. So 1½, 2 percent is America hitting on all cylinders. I believe that is a surrender. I believe dumbing down our expectations for economic growth is a retreat from the American dream.

As you know, the American people aren't buying this. They are not buying the dumbing down. They are not saying: Oh yeah, we can live with this 1½ percent growth. Sure. No problem. They are wise, and they aren't buying the dumbing down.

We all saw the book recently released by former Senator and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and her book is entitled "What Happened." What happened? This is what happened: Our citizens saw the American dream slipping away after a lost decade of economic growth, and they weren't ready to surrender to the new normal.

What do we need to focus on in the Senate? We have to start moving beyond this. We have to. We need policies that are going to focus on reigniting growth—the growth that Democrats and Republicans have supported for decades. What is that? I think there is a lot of agreement—infrastructure, less burdensome regulations, energy. America has enormous supplies of energy that we can take advantage of. Yet the issue we are starting to debate now in the Senate is tax reform.

As we debate this and work in a bipartisan way—I have heard a lot of my colleagues say that we do need to undertake tax reform. We need to keep asking ourselves, on all these policies, what they will do to reignite growth, to reignite the American dream, to allow hard-working American families to keep more of their paychecks, and to return to the optimism that comes with a robust economy, not just along the coast of America but throughout the entire country, to get back to that optimism and growth. That is what I am going to be doing as we undertake this debate on tax reform.

The Trump administration is off to an OK start. The first quarter—again, kind of a hangover from the Obama years—1.2 percent growth. That is not good at all. The last quarter, second quarter, was 3.1. It hit above 3 percent, which is what the President says his policies are meant to do. As long as they are focused on that, I certainly am going to be somebody who wants to support those kinds of pro-growth poli-

cies, and I think it is imperative, whether it is tax reform, infrastructure, regulatory reform, or energy, that we all come together in this body and make sure we work together so the next decade of growth in America does not look like this last one and gets us over 3 percent, gets us back to traditional levels of growth. I don't think there is anything more important we can do in the Senate than getting back to those important levels of growth for our country and our citizens.

TRIBUTE TO TYLER ROBERTS AND MICHAEL SOUKUP

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about some of my staff who have done a great job serving Alaskans and who are leaving my office soon. I am going to miss them a lot. One is here now, and he will probably be embarrassed that I am talking about him on the Senate floor—Tyler Roberts.

Tyler has been a legislative assistant of mine, handling healthcare, budget, tax. He is leaving to join the private sector. He has been with me from the beginning, 2½ years ago. I can tell you this: He has worked long hours serving the people of our great State and has set a tone in the office of hard work, diligent work, good-natured, and we are going to miss Tyler very much.

I wish to also recognize Michael Soukup. Michael is our digital director and press secretary. From educating Alaskans on what we are doing in DC to designing poster boards like this, creating awesome graphics and videos, Michael has been an invaluable member of my team as well. He is an artist. Like all good artists, his work has a distinctive look and style. If you see one of my photo montages on Facebook and you think it is well-done, which we do, you can thank Michael. We call them Soukup specials.

Tyler has also worked tirelessly for me and Alaska, his home State. I know that he will bring the same amount of creativity, ingenuity, and integrity to all he does as he moves into the next phase of his career.

Thank you to all my staff.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3823.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Cassidy amendment at the desk be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1108) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the provisions relating to development of a private flood insurance market)

Strike title IV.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 3823), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here for the third time in as many days to talk about this Nation's response to a humanitarian crisis affecting millions of Americans—the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It is similar to the situation in Florida, in the gulf coast, and, some years ago, in Connecticut and in other parts of this country when they faced a natural disaster that was almost as devastating as an attack would be by a foreign power. Analogous but different, this category 4 Hurricane Maria caused consequences as devastating and destructive as any that man could do. It is a natural disaster, not manmade, but it is turning into a manmade disaster.

So far, the response from our government has been underwhelming. In fact, it has been inadequate and anemic. It has been shamefully slow and undersized and should be vastly upgraded and increased.

Just moments ago, I learned that Lieutenant General Buchanan has been appointed to head the military efforts in Puerto Rico. That appointment followed a call just an hour or so ago with all of the representatives, including FEMA, the Department of Defense, other Federal agencies, and the Red Cross, during which I urged our U.S. military to be mobilized, much as we would be in responding to a natural disaster in Connecticut or Texas or Florida or other places in this country on the mainland where we have seen the same kind of storm.

The 3.4 million people in Puerto Rico are almost exactly the same number as the population of Connecticut. I hope, and I believe, the response would be better in Connecticut if we were to face the same kind of natural disaster. Yet the manmade disaster is the failure to move food, fuel, medicine, water, other necessities, and communications equipment from the ports and the airports into the interior of the country, even into the major cities, where currently apparently a lack of drivers and passable roads make it all the more difficult. Whether the supplies of food and fuel and medicine and water are adequate on the island or need to be increased on an emergency basis and whether there are sufficient shipments and airlifts going into the island, the simple fact is that Puerto Rico faces a disaster—manmade after natural.

I commend the loyal and dedicated people of FEMA and all of the National Guard, including the National Guard of Connecticut, who have performed with such heroism and dedication in the face of the most difficult circumstances imaginable, but their efforts need to be matched by many others. There are 4,500 American military personnel now in Puerto Rico. Rather than 5,000, there should be 50,000 of our National Guard, not to occupy the island, not to enforce martial law but to make sure the logistics—the transportation, the means of delivery of the lifeblood of that island in food and fuel and medicine and water and other basic necessities—are sufficient to move those basic supplies to the places they are needed. The troops who are there now are performing heroic, Herculean work, and so are many volunteers, along with FEMA officials, the Coast Guard, and others, but they need more help.

Nearly a week after this storm, Maria, more than 90 percent of the island's residents are without power, 42 percent have no water, the vast majority of the country's 69 hospitals cannot function, and only 10 percent of the cell towers are working. If those conditions existed in Connecticut, I would be on

the floor 24 hours a day. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have no one here, and they have no elected Representatives in the House of Representatives. They are voiceless or at least voteless in this body. We need to stand for them, speak out, and fight for them. That is why I am here for the third day in a row.

We need a plan and a strategy, which has been lacking from this administration. In that phone call earlier today with FEMA officials and the Department of Defense, I asked about a plan. They are working on it. The military, U.S. Northern Command, is working on a plan. They could not tell me when it will be ready or what it will say or what the total number of troops or other logistical supplies will be nor could they commit that there would be a waiver under FEMA regulations of the C through G conditions, which apply to permanent recovery.

The only decision that has been made is A to B, which provides for debris and other emergency responses over the next 180 days, and that is part of what the island needs—a longer term plan as well as an immediate one to make sure there is a road to recovery, that there is a path that will provide hope. Not only is the well-being and health of this island threatened but so is hope, which is so important for progress to be made.

The people of Puerto Rico have been met with, at best, ambivalence and ambiguity by the President of the United States. Earlier this week, he seemed more inclined to blame the island itself and the size of the ocean than in advocating for help. I hope we can come together on a bipartisan basis. With the kind of situation that is there now—the danger of epidemic as well as immediate health threats before disease takes hold—we must act before people die. We must come to the aid of Puerto Rico. They need medical care. They need access to food and safe drinking water, and, yes, they need greater security.

The 78 mayors of Puerto Rico, along with the Governor, are doing also heroic and Herculean work, but a whole of government response is necessary from this body and from the Federal Government at a much higher magnitude. In the long term, we must have a martial plan—a strategy for rebuilding the island's roads, bridges, rail, airports, ports, and VA facility, much as we do in this country, except that, there, the need is so much more dire and immediate. Hospitals, transportation, electricity, power, communications, safety, housing all have been destroyed, and the consequences will be deadly.

My hope is that Lieutenant General Buchanan will expedite that plan. So far, it has been lacking. It should be done today. It should be integrated with the FEMA approach, and I hope

they will permit visits by Members of the Congress who, so far, have been prevented from going there.

The American people deserve to have elected Representatives there because Puerto Rico has none here. The extraordinary work done by the cable TV and reporters for the print media and others who are there have given us a picture—and often a picture is worth a thousand words—of the devastation that now continues from a manmade disaster that must be avoided before it takes lives and destroys hope.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise to voice my strong support for the nomination of Ajit Pai to a second 5-year term as Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Pai has served as a Commissioner of the FCC since 2012, when he was first confirmed by a voice vote in the Senate. Mr. Pai was designated by President Trump to be the 34th Chairman of the FCC in January of this year and was renominated to a second term to the FCC in March.

In July, the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, which I am privileged to chair, held a hearing on the nomination of Mr. Pai, and the committee reported out his nomination favorably on August 2.

Prior to becoming a Commissioner, Chairman Pai worked on telecommunications policy in both the public and private sectors, notably serving in the Senate as a staffer on the Judiciary Committee as well as in the general counsel's office at the FCC.

It is my belief that Mr. Pai's stellar career and communications policy, his integrity, and his tireless work ethic all serve him well as he continues to serve the FCC and guide the agency back to being a more collaborative and productive institution.

In just 9 months since becoming Chairman, Mr. Pai has made much needed reforms to improve transparency at the FCC and to improve the agency's processes. I am particularly heartened by Chairman Pai's efforts to treat his fellow Commissioners fairly by instituting the process of sharing documents with other Commissioners before discussing them publicly.

Additionally, under Chairman Pai's leadership, the public is now able to view the text of all agenda items in advance of Commission meetings. Also, to better reflect the realities of today's competitive landscape, Chairman Pai has announced the creation of an Office of Economics and Data to provide cost-

benefit analyses to better inform the FCC's work.

These measures are a significant step forward from the last Chairman's leadership style, which I frequently criticized as being hyperpartisan and warned would lead to counterproductive outcomes over the long term. That is why, a little over a year ago, I felt compelled to stand in this same spot and to strongly criticize the previous Chairman of the FCC for leading the Commission with unprecedented partisan zeal. At that time, I noted that the voting record for open meetings at the Commission showed a long history of consensus-building with the previous five permanent FCC Chairmen combining for only 14 party-line votes at open meetings during their tenures. However, this all changed under Chairman Wheeler as he pursued a highly partisan agenda, driven by ideological beliefs more than by a sober reading of the law. Chairman Wheeler forced 3-to-2 votes on a party-line basis a total of 31 times. To put it another way, in 3 years under Chairman Wheeler, the FCC saw over twice as many partisan votes than in the previous 20 years combined.

While partisan differences are sometimes inevitable, what were once very rare events have become standard operating procedure at the Commission. This extreme partisanship was used to do the following things: a complete upending of how the internet is regulated, creating years of uncertainty for everyone; stripping important consumer protection responsibilities from the Federal Trade Commission; a failed attempt to override States' rights on municipal broadband and a power grab that was overturned by the courts; increasing the size of the Universal Service Fund by billions of dollars by simultaneously undermining bipartisan efforts to improve the program's accountability; the unnecessary and possibly unlawful disclosure of trade secrets and a plan to have the FCC and its Media Bureau design and dictate the future of television ads.

I was not alone in noticing Chairman Wheeler's overreach. On several occasions other Federal agencies refused to support his actions. The Copyright Office strongly criticized a proposal for set-top boxes. The staff at the Federal Trade Commission called the FCC's privacy rules "not optimal," which is bureaucrat speak for really bad. The Obama administration's Department of Justice refused to defend the FCC's unlawful action on municipal broadband.

With respect to internet regulations, I am pleased that Chairman Pai has sought to hit the reset button on the 2015 title II order because, as I have previously said, the FCC should do what is necessary to rebalance the agency's regulatory posture under current law. I continue to believe, however, that the best way to provide long-

term protections for the internet is for Congress to pass bipartisan legislation.

Two and a half years ago, I put forward legislative principles and a draft bill to begin the conversation, and I continue to stand ready and willing today to work toward finding a lasting legislative solution that will resolve the dispute over net neutrality once and for all.

Thankfully, the net neutrality debate has not distracted the FCC from important work in other areas. For instance, the FCC's proposed rulemaking on robocalls is a positive step in the right direction. The government must do everything we can to protect consumers from those who are truly bad actors, but we also must be sure that the government's rules are not unfairly punishing legitimate callers who are not acting maliciously. The FCC's notice of inquiry will give that conversation a much needed jump-start.

Furthermore, Chairman Pai's focus on the expansion of rural broadband and acceleration of next-generation infrastructure deployment will help close the digital divide—a goal that we all share. He has also worked tirelessly to help ensure communications services are restored to the communities affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Given the FCC's importance to the future of our economy and our society, it is important for the Commission to seek opportunities for common ground. In the past, people used to say that communications policy was not particularly partisan and that both sides of the aisle could often find common ground to work together. Well, times have changed, and the debate on this nomination is another example of that.

I know that agreement is not always possible. Nevertheless, as a corrective to the Commission's recent history, I urged Chairman Pai at his confirmation hearing to treat all Commissioners fairly, to respect the law, to be willing to ask Congress for guidance, and to seek consensus whenever and wherever possible. I believe doing so will improve the agency's credibility and will result in actions that are more likely to endure, and I believe that Chairman Pai will do these things.

As I noted at the outset, Chairman Pai has already made much needed reforms to improve the processes at the FCC and to empower his fellow Commissioners. He has already shown a commitment to ensuring transparency and openness at the Commission, which gives me great confidence in the direction that he will lead the agency. Chairman Pai's new approach, I believe, will lead to more long-lasting and positive results at the FCC. That is why I believe the elevation of Ajit Pai to be the Chairman of the Commission is a much needed breath of fresh air, and why I believe he should be confirmed promptly and without further delay.

So I urge my colleagues to support this nomination.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ajit Varadaraj Pai, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, Thom Tillis, Ben Sasse, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Jerry Moran, Tom Cotton, John Thune, Pat Roberts, James M. Inhofe, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, James Lankford, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ajit Varadaraj Pai, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Peters
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heller	Roberts
Carper	Hoeven	Rounds
Cassidy	Inhofe	Rubio
Collins	Isakson	Sasse
Coons	Johnson	Scott
Corker	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Casey	Gillibrand
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Harris
Blumenthal	Donnelly	Hassan
Booker	Duckworth	Heinrich
Brown	Durbin	Heitkamp
Cantwell	Feinstein	Hirono
Cardin	Franken	Kaine

King	Nelson	Udall
Klobuchar	Reed	Van Hollen
Leahy	Sanders	Warner
Markley	Schatz	Warren
Merkley	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murphy	Shaheen	Wyden
Murray	Stabenow	

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Strange
Menendez	Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I would like to extend thanks to my colleagues from Ohio and Maryland for allowing me to cut in line.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, a few minutes ago, the Senator from Connecticut made a speech about the natural disaster and humanitarian disaster unfolding in Puerto Rico. He urged the executive branch and, in particular, FEMA, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense to move quicker to enable the Congress to do our oversight responsibilities.

Director Long at FEMA today made clear to a number of us on a conference call briefing that there are constraints into and out of the airport at San Juan. There are all sorts of legitimate arguments he has made. At the same time, it is absolutely imperative for the American people and for the disaster unfolding in Puerto Rico that the Congress, in general, and the Senate, in particular, be able to do our oversight work.

I would like to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Connecticut.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Nebraska, and our hearts go out to those victims of the hurricane now in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, following the terrible devastation in Texas and Florida. These are American citizens who deserve our assistance and urgent help.

I am glad to hear there is now more support mobilizing on the island. I would like to associate myself with the comments of those who talk about the need to move quickly to save lives.

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. President, I rise to talk about something different today, something equally urgent and concerning. It has to do with legislation that is present here in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives. It is about an issue called sex trafficking—human trafficking. It is a crime against humanity. It is a human rights issue that really transcends partisanship and transcends politics.

Every day that we aren't acting here to help push back against this, count-

less vulnerable women and children are suffering. I personally think it is a stain on our national character that sex trafficking is increasing in this country, in this century, at this time. Experts tell us that it is increasing because of the internet. So the internet, which has so many positive aspects, also has a dark side. One is the selling of children and women online with ruthless efficiency.

I appreciated the Senate Commerce Committee holding a hearing last week on bipartisan legislation called the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act. I appreciated the opportunity to testify in support of this legislation at that hearing. But, actually, the most powerful testimony by far came from a mom. Her name is Yvonne Ambrose. Yvonne received a call on Christmas Eve that every parent dreads. As a dad of three kids, I can't imagine. Her 16-year-old daughter, Desiree, was murdered while being exploited and sold for sex on backpage.com, the industry leader in the online sex trafficking of minors.

A 16-year-old girl should never have been trafficked online, but the tragedy of her death is compounded by the fact that backpage.com, the website she was bought and sold on, has repeatedly evaded justice for its role in child sex trafficking.

We know from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children that backpage alone is responsible for most child trafficking. In fact, 75 percent of all child trafficking reports the organization receives from the public have to do with backpage.com. We know from a nearly 2-year investigation by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair, that backpage actively and knowingly facilitated online sex trafficking, coached its users on how to post so-called clean ads for illegal transactions, and knowingly edited ads to conceal evidence of crimes, including the concealed evidence of underage girls being sold online.

Despite these facts, which are horrendous, courts have consistently ruled that a Federal law called the Communications Decency Act protects backpage from its liability for its role in sex trafficking. This law is 21 years old. It shields websites from liability for crimes others commit through their site. It was enacted when the internet was in its infancy. It was intended, by the way, in part to protect children from indecent material on the internet. Now it is protecting websites that sell women and children for sex.

This was never Congress's intention when enacting the Communications Decency Act. In fact, last week, California's attorney general, Xavier Becerra, testified at the Senate hearing I talked about. He was a Congressman in 1996 when the law was enacted. In discussing the Communications Decency Act, he said: "I don't remember

in 1996 believing my 'yes' vote meant I was going to allow, 21 years later, for kids to be sold through the internet for sex."

Congress clearly did not intend for this broad immunity to occur, but courts have made it clear their hands are tied because of legal precedent and have invited the Congress to fix this injustice.

Just last month, a Sacramento judge made the most blatant call on Congress yet. The court threw out pimping charges against backpage.com because of the liability protections provided to the website under Federal law. The court opinion stated: "If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking."

Because of this interpretation of the law over the last 20 years, only Congress can fix this injustice. Again, that is why I introduced the bipartisan Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act.

Along with coauthors Senators BLUMENTHAL, MCCAIN, MCCASKILL, CORNYN, and HEITKAMP, we are determined to get this bill passed to make a difference in the lives of countless women and children who have been exploited by online sex traffickers.

Last week's hearing was a great positive step in that direction. We had bipartisan support in the hearing, and I hope that after the hearing, we can move quickly to a markup. I thank Senator THUNE, who was on the floor earlier—chairman of the committee—for his leadership in this area.

The bill would do two things. They are both very targeted and narrow. One, it would allow sex trafficking victims to get the justice they deserve against websites that knowingly facilitate crimes against them. Second, it would allow State and local law enforcement to prosecute websites that violate Federal sex trafficking laws, again, with the knowing standard.

This standard of knowing is a high bar to meet. Websites would have to be proven to knowingly facilitate, support, or assist online sex trafficking to be liable. Because the standard is so high, our bill protects good technology companies—good actors—and targets rogue online traffickers like backpage. Our bill also preserves the Good Samaritan provision in the Communications Decency Act, which protects the actors that proactively screen their websites for offensive material.

These are commonsense updates to bring a 21-year-old statute into the 21st century.

This bill has received wide bipartisan support. Thirty-three Senators have supported it, one-third of the entire U.S. Senate as cosponsors. We also have the support of dozens of anti-human trafficking groups in all of our

States, faith-based groups from around the country, law enforcement groups, all the national law enforcement groups, including the attorneys general, the groups out there that actually are involved in these prosecutions. They have all publicly endorsed this legislation.

Some significant players in the tech and business community have also stepped up to support it. Recently, Oracle endorsed the legislation, also 21st Century Fox, Hewlett-Packard Enterprise, Walt Disney Company, and others have supported our narrowly crafted legislation because they know it is necessary, it is needed, and it doesn't affect the good actors.

I would love to see others in the tech community step forward and help us. We want them to partner with us in this. They should be as concerned as anyone, if not more, because online, on the internet, this is taking place. They should want to support, address this injustice, where traffickers exploit women and children with immunity.

Some in the tech community have argued this bill would inadvertently harm good-intentioned websites. I don't believe that is true, but, more importantly, nor do legal scholars who have looked at this.

Attorney General Xavier Becerra explained in last week's hearing that "we have to prove criminal intent. We can't win a prosecution unless we can show that the individuals we're prosecuting, like Backpage, had the intent—the knowledge—to do what they are doing. The legislation that you have before you is very narrowly tailored. It goes only after sex trafficking."

That was our intent, to do it narrowly. The bill targets websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking and protects those that don't. It is as simple as that. I think those in the tech community who remain in opposition to this legislation have to realize that by doing so, they are protecting these bad actors, bringing a bad name to the internet. Instead, they should partner with us to protect our kids.

I have spoken about courts and attorneys general calling on Congress to change the Communications Decency Act. The most powerful call on Congress actually came at the Senate hearing last week—not from a lawyer, not from a judge. It came from a mom.

Yvonne Ambrose, whom I mentioned earlier, the mother of the late 16-year-old, Desiree Robinson, with great courage, stated:

Backpage.com and other companies like it must be held responsible for what they have created. I'm sure when this act was put in place in [1996], the Internet was in its infancy, and it was not intended to allow companies to legally sell children on the internet. But somehow, a dollar has become more important than a human life. If you're going to fix this problem, fix it.

Let's fix it. Last week's Senate hearing was a step in the right direction.

Senators from both sides of the aisle understood the injustice that occurs and were passionate in expressing their desire to find a solution. I would just tell you that we have very carefully assessed this problem over the last couple of years, carefully and thoughtfully not just assessed it but looked for a legislative fix that would be a solution to the problems we have identified. We now need to act on it as soon as possible to save those women and children who are being trafficked online every day as we wait.

The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act stops an injustice. I urge the Senate to take up this legislation, seize this opportunity, have the markup, get it to the floor, get it to the House where there is companion legislation, and fix this problem to protect our kids.

Thank you.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first, I want to compliment Senator PORTMAN for his leadership on this issue of ending modern-day slavery and trafficking. The United States is taking the leadership globally in fighting trafficking.

We had the Trafficking in Persons Report that is looked upon as being the most authoritative document on how well every country is doing in fighting modern-day slavery and trafficking, but we must make sure we take care of issues here at home.

I applaud Senator PORTMAN's efforts to make sure we do everything in this country we can to protect those victims who are being trafficked for sex or labor. We need to redouble our efforts. I compliment my colleague for his leadership in this area. I can tell him that all of us here want to work with him to make sure America continues to lead in our fight to end modern-day slavery.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, I would like to say one thing about the fellows who serve in our office. I know many of us are privileged to have fellows who get assigned to us. Arnold Solamillos has been assigned to my office and has helped us in so many different areas. His expertise from the Social Security Administration is a valuable service. I, personally, thank him for the contributions he has made not just to my Senate office but to the work we do in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, I want to comment about the status of healthcare. We had expected that the majority leader might have brought up this week the Graham-Cassidy bill as part of budget reconciliation. I can tell you I am relieved he did not, but I hope this Chamber will consider healthcare legislation not 6 months from now, not a year from now, but there is important work

we need to do now in regard to healthcare, and we need to work together, Democrats and Republicans.

One of the urgent issues is to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP. That program, as I am sure the Presiding Officer knows, expires in the next 2 days. We need to make sure there is predictability for our States to continue this extremely important program that protects the health of our children.

It was created as a bipartisan program, enjoyed bipartisan support. I certainly compliment Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN for their work together to reach an agreement on the reauthorization of this program. I hope we can consider that very shortly.

I also would like to point out that we have very important healthcare policies that have time limits on it and expire, and we need to pass what is known as extenders in health. Some of these policies expire in the next 2 days.

I am going to just mention one. There are many others I could mention, but I want to mention one that I have been involved with ever since Congress made the mistake of placing a limit known as the therapy cap on rehab services. This limit makes absolutely no sense. It made no sense 20 years ago when it was imposed. It was put in there to reach a budget number and reconciliation and had nothing to do with policy.

Today, those who have the most serious needs of therapy services are the ones who are the most at risk. So I would urge my colleagues that we need to take up these medical extenders, and we need to do it now. We need to do it quickly. We don't want to leave the uncertainty out there. Every day we leave the uncertainty, there is a question in the minds of individuals who need these services and those who are providing these services whether, in fact, Congress will extend the policies.

Let me talk a little bit about the broader issue of the Affordable Care Act. We had, I thought, a very informative hearing before the Senate Finance Committee on the Graham-Cassidy amendment to the Reconciliation Act. We had that hearing on Monday, and I thought it was a very informative hearing for the members of our committee and the American public. We had the opportunity to have one of the members of our committee on the panel of witnesses. Senator CASSIDY was a witness at the witness table. During the questioning, I said to him that he had mentioned many examples of individuals who are facing very high premium increases or they don't have the ability to pay the premiums and the out-of-pocket costs. He was using those examples, as some of my other colleagues were using, as to why we have to deal with a change in the Affordable Care Act.

I had the opportunity to question what individuals he was talking about. He identified the group. The group is those who are in the individual marketplace. These are not the families who have policies through their employers or in the group plans, these are individuals who have no other opportunity but to go into the individual market in order to buy their health insurance. Secondly, these are individuals who don't qualify for subsidies because their income is too high.

So I asked Mrs. Miller, who was on the panel who is the insurance commissioner from Pennsylvania, whether my estimate of the number of people who fall into this category is correct. She confirmed it is somewhere between 1 to 2 percent of the population that fall in the individual marketplace and incomes are too high for subsidies.

That is a significant number of Americans, and we need to deal with their concerns. Let me sort of spell out what that is all about. In my State of Maryland, the average cost—capital cost—of healthcare is somewhere around \$8,600 a year. If you don't have an employer helping to contribute to your healthcare insurance or cost or you don't qualify for any subsidies and you are a husband or wife with two children, then your average costs are going to be in excess of \$34,000. That is if you buy insurance so you are not exposed to the unexpected costs. A lot of families just can't afford that.

The problem is, the individual marketplace is not stable. There are too many uncertainties, and those premium costs can become unaffordable for those families whose incomes are too high to receive subsidies. It is an important group, but let's keep in mind it is 1 to 2 percent, so let's not jeopardize the healthcare of 98 to 99 percent of Americans in an effort to say we are doing something for the 1 or 2 percent.

Here is the rub. The Graham-Cassidy bill didn't help that 1 to 2 percent. In fact, it made it worse. It made it less likely that they would be able to get affordable coverage so they didn't deal with the problem that was identified for the reason for the reform. Instead, what the Graham-Cassidy bill did was basically to block grant the Medicaid Program to the States. They had a complicated formula, where many States, like Maryland, would lose a lot of money because we used our State resources to expand Medicaid, and now we are being penalized for it. The bottom line was every State was going to have a cap as to how much money the Federal Government was going to make available, and that cap became tighter and tighter every year.

So I asked one of the witnesses on our panel on Monday: How would you deal with that?

The witness who is responsible in his State said: Well, you manage to the

cap. Those were his exact words: "You manage to the cap."

So I said to Mrs. Miller, the insurance commissioner from Pennsylvania: What does that mean, managing to the cap?

She said: Well, it means that in order to make the cap, you either knock people off the rolls and change the eligibility so fewer people have coverage in our State—and let me remind my colleagues the Congressional Budget Office, although they didn't give us a finite score, did say there would be millions of people who would lose their coverage under the Graham-Cassidy bill—so that is one way. Also, the bill eliminated the expansion of Medicaid, which was part of the Affordable Care Act and was responsible for tens of millions getting healthcare coverage. So there would be millions of people who would lose their benefits because the States have to manage to this cap that was in the bill.

The second way Mrs. Miller said you can manage to the cap is to reduce benefits, and many States have done that. They can impose caps. Caps means that if—I had so many people who wrote me letters, and I am sure the Presiding Officer got letters from people in his State—but the ones who really got to you was when you heard from a young husband and wife who have a child with special needs and that person indicated that within the first couple of months, they would have exceeded the cap that was in the insurance policies before the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

What are we supposed to do? If the State, in order to save money to manage to the cap, imposes a cap on how much the coverage is and you have a child with special needs, what do you do about that?

Well, the answer, quite frankly, is you either sell everything you have, mortgage everything you have, or go into a bankruptcy in order to take care of your child because you just can't do it.

So that is what was at risk.

There was a third way to manage to the cap, and Mrs. Miller said: We could cut provider fees, and States have done that. Cutting provider fees means that in areas where there is a large Medicaid population, you are going to have a hard time finding a hospital or a doctor that will be willing to treat the lack of access to care. We saw that over and over again, where people may have coverage, but they can't get a provider. That is not access to care.

So, for all of these reasons, what would have been done under the Graham-Cassidy bill would not have dealt with the 1 to 2 percent where we do have an issue and we need to work on it, it would have created significant problems for millions of others, and I haven't even gotten to the fact that it eliminated the Patients' Bill of Rights and insurance protections that we put

into law against preexisting conditions and things like that. So I was glad to see we are not considering that amendment this week. That, to me, was the right decision.

I know we are now going to end this fiscal year in the next 2 days and that next week we are likely to see come out of the Budget Committee another budget document so that we are back on fiscal year 2018 rather than fiscal year 2017. We don't know whether that will deal with taxes or with healthcare, but there will come a time that we may be getting back to this debate. I would hope we don't need a budget resolution to do it. I hope we can move in a bipartisan manner and get some things done now to improve and stabilize the Affordable Care Act.

I have been participating, under the leadership of Senator ALEXANDER, the chairman of the HELP Committee, and Senator MURRAY, the ranking Democrat on the committee—who have been conducting hearings over the last several weeks, and we have invited Members who are not on that committee to join them. We were able to ask the witnesses questions. We were able to find out whether there were some common areas where we could in fact help stabilize the market that includes the 1 to 2 percent I have already talked about who are the ones who have issues here.

I have met with our insurance carriers in Maryland in reference to why we were having large increases in the individual marketplaces, and we went over the various reasons. The three principal reasons were all talked about in this bipartisan group. Quite frankly, Senator ALEXANDER said: Look, we are trying to see whether we can't come together with some legislation, perhaps to pass as early as this month, which gave a lot of us confidence that at long last we are coming back to work, Democrats and Republicans.

I was criticized by some of my constituents during this debate who asked: Where is your proposal? How are you going to fix it? So several months ago I filed legislation, and I was pleased to see that a couple of the issues I included in my legislation were consensus proposals in this bipartisan group that has been meeting for the last couple of weeks.

One of those that is in my legislation and that is in conversation is to have predictable funding for the cost sharing. As we know, President Trump has raised a question as to whether he is going to continue to pay the insurance companies for keeping the copays and deductibles and premiums low for low-income families. He is doing it on a month-to-month basis. If we could make that a predictable payment, as was anticipated under the Affordable Care Act, that could affect a significant part of the premium increase that has been sought in the individual marketplace. That was what was told to

me in Maryland, and that was confirmed by a wide network of groups from many States in the discussions with Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY. That is something we could do right now. We anticipated that would be done. We can do that, and then we can help those people whose examples were given for reasons why we need to address the Affordable Care Act.

A second issue that is included in my legislation that was very much included in this discussion is, let's make it easier for States to implement a reinsurance program. A reinsurance program takes the high risks and spreads them over so an insurance company doesn't have to impose higher premiums because they have unknown risks. It is a pretty simple process, to use reinsurance. The State Senate used reinsurance and it has worked. It was in the original Affordable Care Act.

The problem is, the States' budgets have already been put to rest. In order to do a reinsurance program, you have to put some money upfront in order to save money. The States just don't have those funds. So let's look for ways we can make it easier for States to implement the reinsurance program, and part of that is to deal with the waivers that are in the Affordable Care Act. We have guardrails to make sure States use waivers but do not compromise the protections that are in the statute. So let's make it easier for States to implement a reinsurance program which could also bring down rates. Quite frankly, I didn't see anyone object to those two suggestions that were made, which would certainly help.

There are other things I hope we can do. The three main reasons given by the insurance carriers in Maryland for the premium increases are, No. 1, the uncertainty of the cost-sharing payments; No. 2, the reinsurance program; and, No. 3, that we are not enforcing the requirement that everybody be in the pool. We don't do that. You get those that are at the highest risk who are going to come in, but those who feel like they are not going to be using the policies stay out, and then we have adverse risk selection and therefore higher premiums than there should be.

So we really need to do a better job to try to get people into the plans. That is why many of us have been urging our appropriators to provide the funds so we can inform people about the advantages of having healthcare coverage and we can get a broader market in there. I certainly hope a law is passed by Congress that requires the coverage would be enforced. These are things I think we all could do.

There are other issues I hope we can deal with that I think will help all people, in addition to the 1 to 2 percent who need immediate help, as well as bring down the entirety of our healthcare costs. Part of that is to

bring down healthcare costs generally. We all know prescription drugs are too expensive in this country. We pay twice what other countries pay. One simple way is to get the same discounts for Medicare as we get for Medicaid. My understanding is that saves billions of dollars. It was in my legislation, just one simple way. I think that if you can collect the bargaining power of the Medicare marketplace, we can certainly get better prices than we get by using a divided market.

So there are things we can do. We can have a better delivery system for providing healthcare to people in this country. I have talked about this many times—collaborative and integrative care models. In Maryland, we have Mosaic, which is a behavioral health facility, working with Sheppard Pratt, a mental health hospital. They worked together in order to have a more efficient delivery system. We need to encourage those types of models that use integrative care to bring down healthcare costs.

Lastly, we need more competition. Yes, I have always supported a public option under the exchanges. I think that makes sense.

We have a lot of other proposals that have been given. Let's sit down and talk about these proposals to see if we can't find ways to make our system better.

We have, once again, reached a situation where the majority has pulled the budget reconciliation, this time permanently, from the fiscal year 2017 calendar year. Let us start the new year that begins on October 1—the new fiscal year—with a commitment from Democrats and Republicans to work together, to share our best ideas, to make sure our children are protected by the extension of the CHIP program, to make sure policies that are currently in place that protect our constituents such as the therapy cap relief are extended.

Let's join together so the Affordable Care Act can be made stronger, particularly in stabilizing the problems in the individual marketplace, and help bring down the growth rate of healthcare costs. That is what we should be working on now, and I encourage my colleagues to do just that.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BURMA

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, anyone who watches the news, reads the newspaper, or goes on social media

knows there are a lot of bad things happening in our world. Folks at home and across the globe are confronting devastations from hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, wars, and forest fires, as in my home State. Tensions between the United States and North Korea have never been higher, reaching a dangerous level. The world is watching all of this with bated breath.

In the midst of this deluge of news, a human rights catastrophe is unfolding virtually unnoticed. I am talking about the members of the Burmese military engaging in horrific acts of unthinkable violence against the Rohingya—a Muslim minority population in a predominantly Buddhist nation.

The Burmese military, along with civilian accomplices, have slaughtered more than 3,000 innocent civilians. They have raped thousands of Rohingya women. They have beheaded children as young as 6 years old. They have burned countless villages to the ground. Through these brutal acts, the Burmese military has driven half a million Rohingya refugees to camps in nearby Bangladesh, with Burmese soldiers continuing to shoot at them as they try to cross the border—a border, by the way, along which landmines have been laid by the Burmese military.

The brutality of what is happening in that country is truly beyond comprehension. The Burmese Government calls it a security operation, but we need to call it exactly what it is—ethnic cleansing. So often I have heard the words “never again,” that the United States will stand up to ethnic cleansing. This is one of those moments when we must stand up.

What is happening in Burma is a crime against humanity. As a country, we have more responsibility to take a stand and to speak out against it, to make the world take notice of the atrocities, call for their end, and to work toward their end.

The Rohingya are a people trapped in a cycle of violence and persecution by the Burmese Government and military. The Government of Burma has trapped them into stateless people—refusing to recognize them, refusing to give them citizenship in spite of the fact that much of the Rohingya community has been there for centuries. They need our help.

The Burma Government has adopted laws that ban the Rohingyas from traveling without official permission, from owning land, from securing a public education, from obtaining employment by either a state or private business.

When the Burmese Government says that it will welcome back the refugees who can prove their citizenship, they are being completely disingenuous and completely treacherous, because they know—and the whole world should know—that the very laws of Burma make it impossible for the Rohingya to

prove their citizenship since they have been denied citizenship by the Government of Burma. We cannot sit idly by and let ethnic cleansing continue.

One nation that has stepped up is Bangladesh. As the leaders of Burma have persecuted the Rohingya and burned the villages and shot the refugees as they were fleeing, the Government of Bangladesh has opened its door. It has proceeded to allow humanitarian groups access and the United Nations access. This is commendable, but more needs to be done. These refugee camps are overcrowded. There are not enough supplies, clean toilets, food, or clean water. Doctors Without Borders says that they are on the brink of a “public health disaster.” Unlike Bangladesh, other countries have yet to speak up.

Indeed, I am concerned by reports that some factions within India have been explicitly, publicly seeking to expel India’s own Rohingya population. It is important for the international community to weigh in with them and to ask them to respect international law and to protect the Rohingya refugees. India knows full well that there is nowhere to send them. If they send them back to Burma, there will just be more persecution of the men, the women, and the children.

It underscores the fact that the Rohingya need help and that the world should answer the call. As we do, we must use what influence we have to put an end to the violence and the persecution of this ethnic minority. We need to call on Burma’s leaders to protect these minorities, not to assist in the persecution. We need to call on the Government of Burma to immediately give humanitarian groups access to the Rohingya who are trapped in Burma, in what some have described as concentration camps. We need to call on Burma’s leaders to provide the hundreds of thousands of Rohingya refugees who have been forced to flee their homes and villages with a safe and assisted right of return.

In addition, the Burmese Government—the Burmese nation—needs to figure out how to end the root causes of this conflict—an age-old ethnic and religious conflict—and find a way to embrace the diversity within their nation. Certainly, this is not the first time that the tensions have erupted into violence. It has happened time and time and time again, but this is the worst we have ever seen.

Kofi Annan, the former U.N. Secretary General, is the current chairman of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State. He and his team have called on Burma to take the appropriate actions to end this cycle of violence, this cycle of radicalization.

The entire Rohingya community is counting on us—the world—to notice and to act. We must immediately see an end to the violence, full access for

humanitarian organizations, cooperation with and access for the United Nations fact finding mission, the safe return of refugees, and the implementation of the full set of recommendations from Kofi Annan’s report.

It is also critical that the United States and the international community continue to shed light on this horrific problem, provide sustained aid and support to the refugees in Burma and in Bangladesh, and take action to show other repressive governments that there will be consequences for pursuing this type of persecution, starting with a strong U.N. Security Council resolution.

International action to end this violence, increase humanitarian assistance, and extend our aid to the Rohingya people is the right thing to do. I pray that together we will answer that call.

I also thank my colleagues who have already been engaged in this issue. There are a number of them, but I am particularly aware of Senator Richard Durbin’s, Senator JOHN MCCAIN’s, and Senator BEN CARDIN’s involvement and leadership.

Let’s build on that foundation to have the Senate demonstrate attention to this issue through letters, and we should also try to arrange a Senate trip to visit both Burma and Bangladesh in order to draw additional international attention and build momentum for action.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HURRICANE RECOVERY EFFORTS AND TARGETED TAX RELIEF

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it has been quite a few weeks now since Harvey hit and, then, Irma. Now Maria has devastated the island of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Of course, my gaze has been firmly on the devastation wrought by Hurricane Harvey back in my home State of Texas. Yet we are joined together with those who suffered under Irma and Maria, and we will remain steadfastly with them as we all work to recover from these terrible hurricanes.

Last week, I rode in a Black Hawk helicopter with Russ Poppe, as well as our Adjutant General, John Nichols. Mr. Poppe is executive director of the Harris County Flood Control District. We were able to survey in the air things I had seen up close during several trips back home, the wreckage of the land and livelihoods.

It is an emotional thing for families and homeowners to basically take all of their worldly possessions out to the

front of their house and put it in the front yard because it is completely ruined as a result of the water, along with things like the drywall, trying to attack the mold before it grows and makes the house uninhabitable.

We saw from about 10,000 feet in the air what we had previously seen from the ground, but from the air, you definitely get a different perspective on the waterlogged landscape. You see so much more. You see the levees, the reservoirs, the areas hit. You see the damaged goods and drywall that people have taken out of their homes as the first step toward recovery. It definitely has an impression on you, particularly with the size and scale of the affected area. It is really hard to believe until you see it from that perspective.

So when I took off my headset and sunglasses—and by the way, Speaker PAUL RYAN joined us on that particular trip, and we all appreciate his being there. When we stepped off the chopper, what I thought about was not only what we have done so far but how much further we still had to go. It is not just about building materials, street and roof repairs, or even the temporary housing that people need, although all of those things are surely important. We need to remember that the remedies are not going to be one-size-fits-all. We need broad support, but we also need targeted and narrow support to help people get back on their feet. We need to keep each family in mind and what their own particular needs may be depending on their particular circumstances.

As I started out to say, it is not just Texas we are talking about anymore; it is Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands too. We all remember that those places were hit by Hurricanes Irma and Maria right after Texas was hit by Harvey.

I want to make one thing clear, though: We in Texas stand together with our fellow Americans who suffered from Hurricanes Maria and Irma, as well as those who suffered from other natural disasters occurring in and around our country, and we will do everything we can to help the people who were harmed and damaged, even devastated by these terrible storms. We will help them fight to get back on their feet, to recover, and to return their lives to some form of normalcy.

One way we can work together and deliver relief to different people in different geographic areas is in providing temporary tax relief. Now, I know this sounds kind of like a small thing to do, but if you think about it, this is a thousand-year storm. Hurricane Harvey dropped 34 trillion gallons of water on the same area over a period of about 5 or so days. Many people were not in the hundred-year floodplain, which is typically where you would buy flood insurance, so many people suffered losses that were not covered by flood

insurance. What many of these folks will have to do is dip into their retirement savings and other savings in order to help to get life back to normal. This relief will help folks get back on their feet as they rebuild their homes and businesses and neighborhoods in the wake of these hurricanes.

We recently passed—earlier this afternoon—a Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, but it also included the tax package I am talking about now that provides this targeted relief. These provisions will help hurricane victims in all of the devastated areas keep more of their paycheck, first and foremost, but be able to deduct the cost of their property damage on their tax return and encourage even more Americans to generously donate to hurricane relief to help their neighbors and employees.

I know this tax package is a small matter. It is not a panacea and certainly not a cure-all, and it is not supposed to fix every storm-related problem or absolve us from honoring our ongoing responsibilities in the days ahead. But as John Steinbeck once said, “and now that you don’t have to be perfect, you can just be good,” and I think these are good reforms. They will complement other measures by the Federal Government, as well as other State and local actors.

Similar provisions were introduced in a noncontroversial section of the FAA reauthorization bill that unfortunately House Democrats, led by Leader PELOSI, tried to block earlier this week. Despite the delays, I am pleased that the House acted a second time earlier today to ensure that this relief is delivered to those who need it most—again, not just in Texas but in Florida, the Virgin Islands, and in Puerto Rico, which reportedly has been devastated. Now we in this Chamber seem to have finally gotten the message, too, by passing this relief just this very afternoon as part of the FAA bill.

Our colleague from Florida, Representative CARLOS CURBELO, said about the hurricane victims in his home State: “They don’t have time to wait. They certainly don’t have time to play political games.” He is right, and now we can say we have taken those words to heart.

So I remember what I saw from that helicopter. Now that the time for surveying the scene has ended, what is no longer up in the air is this: For many Texans, Floridians, and Puerto Ricans, targeted tax relief will serve to make a difficult year just a little easier.

So I salute the House for getting the job done, and I am glad we in this Chamber have quickly followed suit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I want to thank the senior Senator from

Texas for his leadership in the disaster response, and I pledge my commitment to whatever is needed for Houston and the areas around Houston, as well as Florida. I appreciate the commitment at the legislative level for what needs to be done in Puerto Rico.

Mr. President, we also need to continue to apply pressure to the administration because it does appear as though there is an unequal response between what is happening in Puerto Rico and what has happened in Houston and in Florida. So we need to hold as a country the executive branch accountable for the lack of a sense of urgency for 3.5 million Americans who are mostly going to be without power for 9 months, who are currently without potable water, who are in a devastated situation. It is our obligation to do everything we can.

Mr. President, the Senate is about to make an important decision about who leads the Federal agency that oversees everything from the internet, to the TV, to radio.

This vote is a choice: We can either give our stamp of approval on the FCC’s direction under the leadership of Chairman Pai, or we can decide that his leadership has put the FCC on the wrong track and that it is time for someone else to take charge.

Generally speaking, here is how I approach a nomination. There are three reasons one might reject a nominee. If the person is corrupt, it is a nonstarter. If the person is nonqualified, it is also a nonstarter. And even on policy grounds, in the policy space, just disagreeing with someone can often boil down to the fact that there is a President from another party and is not sufficient to vote no.

Chairman Pai is someone I know. He is skillful, he is a decent human being, he is very smart, and he is qualified. When we disagree, we can do it in a way that doesn’t ruin our ability to work together on the following day on the following issue. And this is no small thing in today’s political climate. So it is important that if we are ever going to get something done, we are able to disagree and find common ground afterward.

I do like Chairman Pai as a person. I think he is ethical and he is capable. But he is just so wrong on policy. For me, that means he is not the right leader for the FCC. I want to highlight four of the concerns I have.

First, the FCC really is trying to end the internet as we know it by getting rid of net neutrality. If they succeed, your internet service provider will have the power to stop you from seeing certain kinds of content. They will be the ones that make decisions about what you can access online and how fast and how much you have to pay for it.

Some people say that companies aren’t going to change the internet because it is not in their interest to

change the internet, even if the law goes away. But think about this: Most often, these ISPs are publicly traded companies, and they are going to make decisions based on their own financial interests. It is not just an objective; it is their obligation. If there is an opportunity to change their business model for internet service, they are duty bound to pursue it. They do not have any obligation to a free and open internet; they have an obligation to shareholders and to profits.

That is why net neutrality exists in the first place—because we should not leave it up to any company to decide whether they are going to charge people more to stream video, for example, or block certain content altogether. If we allow the FCC to end net neutrality, Americans across the country are going to find that the internet no longer works in the way that it should. And this has happened under Chairman Pai's leadership.

It is not just bad policy that he is pursuing; they have also had some serious process fouls. When Chairman Pai announced that the FCC was revisiting the rules, he made clear that the FCC was going to get rid of net neutrality regardless of what happened throughout the process. He said: "This is a fight we intend to wage and it is a fight we intend to win." Why is that a significant thing to say? "This is a fight we intend to wage and it is a fight we intend to win." This is a quasi-judicial agency. They just opened up a public comment period. There were 22 million members of the public who submitted public comments after the Chairman of the Commission has already announced that he has decided which way they are going to go. I think that is antithetical to the governing statute, and it is antithetical to the basic premise that if you have an open comment period where an individual has an opportunity to express themselves, you have to listen to them. You don't say: I already decided, but you 22 million people—if you have an opinion, I will be happy to receive it and file it and do what I planned to do all along. That is the exact opposite of how this is supposed to work.

The agency proposes the rule, the public weighs in, and then the agency considers the comments from the public in making the decision. But Chairman Pai turned it upside down. The FCC has tried to diminish the fact that so many people tried to weigh in. About 96 percent of the roughly 22 million people who have weighed in have weighed in in favor of net neutrality. They are trying to lay the groundwork to get rid of net neutrality even though the vast majority of people are for it. By doing that, the FCC is effectively saying that lobbyists and law firms matter more than regular citizens.

This is just the tip of the iceberg. The FCC has claimed that cyber at-

tacks kept people from being able to comment, but they have not been forthcoming about what exactly happened, and we are still working in our oversight role to figure that all out.

Secondly, I would like to address media ownership. Local TV broadcasters are an essential part of every community. People know their local TV station. They trust it. There is a range of perspectives offered. Because the broadcasters are based in the community, they have relationships with their viewers that make their content better and more relevant.

For decades, Congress and the FCC have taken steps to keep local broadcasting local because it benefits the public interest. These are the public airways. It is like fast food options across the country. You may not mind McDonald's once in a while, but you don't want that to be the only option in your hometown. You want something that captures the local culture in your community. That is what local broadcasting does. It makes TV in Honolulu different from TV in Hartford or Houston.

But now the American tradition of local broadcasting is in real danger because the FCC is going to change the rules so that these stations can be bought out by a single company without any limits. I have no doubt this would create a world of sort of nationalized content distributed through each of these local companies, with consumers having to watch whatever is distributed to them by their national headquarters. This is no longer local news, and this is not the broadcast media that Americans deserve.

The third area I want to talk about is broadband access. Right now, Americans have widely different levels of internet speed basically based on where they live. In some places, you have great broadband access, no trouble streaming video, accessing government services online, downloading, uploading, but in rural and Tribal communities, they are very, very far behind. As the FCC noted, 39 percent of rural America and 41 percent of those on Tribal land lack access to advanced broadband. Even if they have cell phones with internet access, a mobile network will typically offer slower speed than fixed broadband, so they can't go online and do the things we can in Washington, DC, or in many other cities across the country. So everyone, on a bipartisan basis, understands that this needs to change.

High-speed broadband is the cornerstone to economic development, public safety, and quality of life in every community, no matter how many people live in your community. The FCC has historically worked so that every home, school, and business has had adequate access to the internet because that is what it will take to unlock the innovation and potential for all Americans.

The FCC has worked on this issue by setting the bar for what it will take to connect more Americans to the internet. There is already a threshold in place which says that this is what high-speed internet access is, so we know who has it and who doesn't. But instead of actually working to get more people broadband, the FCC is working to change the definition of broadband so that it looks as if they have gotten people more broadband. That way they can say that more Americans are covered, even if they have internet service that does not meet their needs. In other words, they are not actually solving the problem; they are literally just redefining what it means to have access. Rather than giving people access, they are papering over the problem that they are not solving. This is a real issue, and it is something that the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee members have worked on on a bipartisan basis.

The way to get more people broadband access is to get more people broadband access. It is not to change the rules and to change the metrics so that you can come back to the Congress and say: Look, we just achieved more access by allowing these companies to claim that people are covered who are not.

The fourth and final concern I want to raise is a little more sensitive because, as I said, I like Chairman Pai, and I respect Chairman Pai, but he made some comments during his confirmation hearing that worried me. I asked if he agreed with the President's comments calling the media the enemy of the state. He would not give a direct answer.

I understand that Mr. Pai is a Republican. That is not the problem. I understand Republicans will be appointed in a Republican administration. I am the former Democratic Party chairman of the State of Hawaii, so I understand party loyalty. I respect party loyalty.

We have a President and a White House that are pushing to blur the legal, moral, and ethical boundaries in our Nation's Capital. This is not the time to get cute when we ask a question about the rule of law. This is not the time to finesse an answer. The only acceptable answer is this: I will not let anyone interfere with my work, whether it is the President or anyone else, and the media is not the enemy of the state. Mr. Pai did not take that opportunity. This was one of a few opportunities Mr. Pai had to be unequivocal. The senior Senator from New Mexico, if I remember correctly, and other members of the panel, sort of gave him a second and third bite at the apple so that he could get it right. It was an easy one to get right.

I understand it is politically complicated, but sometimes you have to set aside the politics and just say what

is right and do what is right. My instinct is that he will not use the FCC to do anything that crosses any ethical boundaries that I am worried about, but the fact that he will not say so leaves an opening that should not be there.

The President has tweeted about media companies that give him bad coverage. He consistently refers to the media as “fake news” media and “garbage” media and makes unsubstantiated claims about various networks and newspapers and threatens to come after them. So it is not out of the realm of possibility that this could go beyond some partisan talking point from the Democrats in the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee and into a real crisis.

I just want to hear from Mr. Pai. He will be confirmed on Monday, but I want to hear from Mr. Pai that he does not believe the media is the enemy of the state and he will not allow any interference from the White House.

I would like to end by bringing this back to the American people. This vote is our chance to stand up for them. There will not be a vote on net neutrality on the floor in the next weeks or months, but they deserve to keep their faith in local broadcasting, they deserve a free and open internet, and they deserve to have adequate access to the internet no matter where they live. That is why I have to vote no on this nominee.

I admire Chairman Pai. I like him as a person, but he is the wrong leader for the FCC. I urge my colleagues to join me and vote no on his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I, too, rise today to oppose the renomination of Ajit Pai to serve as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I will start my remarks by acknowledging my friend, the Senator from Hawaii, and echoing his sentiments about the respect I have for Chairman Pai's ability, his skill, his intelligence, his dedication, and commitment, but I, too, as a member of the Commerce Committee, have sat through testimony from Mr. Pai and watched a number of things unfold with regard to policy that is critically important to people of New Hampshire and our country. I find that I, too, am in a position of being unable to support this nomination.

The FCC plays a critical role in overseeing our communications networks, protecting consumers, and ensuring that our Nation's businesses can compete on a level playing field. Unfortunately, throughout his tenure at the FCC, and particularly during his time as Chairman, Mr. Pai has not demonstrated a commitment to those goals. To start, I have real concerns with the Chairman's actions to under-

mine net neutrality and the impact that would have on people in New Hampshire and throughout our country.

A free and open internet is essential to consumers, essential to entrepreneurs and innovative small businesses that are the foundation of our economic success. Net neutrality is the concept that internet service providers should provide equal access to applications and content online, and they should not be able to discriminate against content and content providers by making certain web pages, applications, or videos load faster or slower than others. Put simply, net neutrality ensures that even the smallest voices and businesses can be heard and can thrive. People and businesses in New Hampshire know this. Granite Staters have called and written to my office in support of net neutrality, and the FCC has received a recordbreaking number of public comments, reaching tens of millions, from people looking to make their voices heard on this topic.

Chairman Pai is not addressing the concerns of Americans who are speaking out. Instead, he is listening to big cable companies and internet service providers and taking direct aim at net neutrality protections. That is unacceptable. Protecting net neutrality is essential, but with Chairman Pai at the FCC, these critical rules are in danger.

I also oppose this nomination because Chairman Pai is putting rural broadband advancements at stake. Recently, Chairman Pai and the FCC released a notice of inquiry that raises questions about its goals, suggesting it will consider mobile broadband as an adequate replacement for fixed broadband, which would allow speeds that are two-thirds slower. For many parts of New Hampshire, mobile is not dependable enough or fast enough to meet our economy's needs, promote innovation, and connect young students with their homework. We must address the challenges that rural communities face in getting access to broadband. But by focusing instead on mobile broadband, the Chairman would have us leave rural America without a reliable connection.

Finally, I have concerns about Chairman Pai's ability to adequately evaluate the pending Sinclair-Tribune merger that sits before the FCC. For decades, our Nation has maintained a policy that limits the number of broadcast stations that one company can own nationwide. This policy has protected Americans by allowing them to receive robust and fair news content about their communities and has provided a diversity of voices in the broadcast news media marketplace.

This merger would result in Sinclair's ability to reach over 70 percent of Americans across our country, far exceeding the Commission's owner-

ship caps and threatening the diversity in broadcast news that Americans deserve and expect.

Since Chairman Pai took the lead of the FCC, the Commission has worked to loosen regulations regarding media ownership, and, in turn, Sinclair benefited. As this proposed merger is still under consideration, we need someone at the helm of the FCC who will thoroughly vet the implications and ensure that it is in the public interest. There is too much at stake with this merger, and Chairman Pai's actions raise doubts that he can evaluate it impartially.

We need an FCC that is focused on putting consumers first and ensuring that all Americans have the opportunity to thrive in the 21st century economy. There are simply too many concerns about Chairman Pai's record, his ability to express impartiality on key decisions, and his goals for Federal Communications Commission priorities. I will vote against Chairman Pai's renomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to take some time this afternoon to respond to the remarks of the President's top economic adviser, Mr. Gary Cohn, with respect to this administration's approach to taxes.

Let me be clear right at the outset. The President and his parade of millionaires are executing a middle-class con job. I am going to be very specific in saying why I reached that judgment with respect to what they are saying about taxes.

The President said: “I don't benefit. Very, very strongly I think there's very little benefit for people of wealth.” Those are the President's exact words. “It's not good for me, believe me,” the President said in his speech unveiling the tax reform blueprint on Wednesday.

Unless the President paid zero tax, the President is going to benefit enormously from his tax plan. His family would save billions if the estate tax is eliminated, as he has proposed. His more than 500 passthroughs will be able to take advantage of the new Grand Canyon-sized passthrough loophole that his plan proposes. Based on his 2005 tax return—that is the only one available—the President would save millions each year if the alternative minimum tax is eliminated.

Today, the President's top adviser, Gary Cohn, said: “We've also said that

wealthy Americans are not getting a tax cut.” They expect you to believe them and not your lying eyes.

I want to take a few minutes and describe exactly what the well-to-do are getting in this bill.

The plan outlined by the Trump administration would cost upwards of \$5 trillion, and it is overwhelmingly skewed toward the wealthy and the biggest corporations. It lowers the corporate rate from 35 to 20, and much of that goes to wealthy shareholders.

The new passthrough, which would give this big gift to high-flyers, hedge funds, basically would let them start calling ordinary income business income, so it could be taxed at a much lower rate, and they would in the process harm Social Security and Medicare because they aren't paying those payroll taxes.

I mentioned the estate tax. This is for just a few thousand people. The exemption for a couple is already \$11 million. This break would cost the American people between \$250 to \$270 billion. That is an awful lot of money to parcel out to a few thousand families.

They would lower the individual top rate from 39.6 to 35 percent. Let's make no mistake about it—the President of the United States and his top economic adviser have said they are not going to give tax cuts to the wealthy. That is not what they said yesterday. They said that the top rate was going to go down from 39.6 to 35 percent. And to add insult to injury, for those at the bottom of the economic system who pay 10 percent now, theirs would go up to 12 percent. So this is just making a mockery out of the President's pledge that this was going to be about working families and not about the wealthy. The fact is, with respect to the middle class, the Trump team is running a sleight-of-hand shell game. What they give with one hand, they just take away with the other.

They touted yesterday that they were going to be helping middle-class folks by doubling the standard deduction. First of all, that is walking back the bipartisan proposal we had here in the Senate—written by myself and my colleague Dan Coats, now a member of the Trump administration—that would triple the standard deduction.

What is particularly outrageous is that the Trump people aren't leveling with those middle-class families. Basically, they are saying: Oh, you are really going to do well. You are going to double the standard deduction. What they don't tell them is that they are going to eliminate the personal exemption that large middle-class families rely on. In effect, those large middle-class families—I think a lot of working-class families who may have supported the President—are going to see a tax increase under the President's tax outline that we heard about yesterday, even with this larger standard deduction.

The President's team also took a big pass on the opportunity to expand the child tax credit to make sure more working families would benefit from it. There are no specifics about the child tax credit in this plan.

The Treasury Secretary went on FOX News and said that the tax plan is going to cut the deficit by a trillion dollars. Mr. Mnuchin is doubling down on the failed experiment—the idea that the tax cuts, in effect, pay for themselves through economic growth. History shows that just is not true.

The tax cuts don't pay for themselves. The 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts were billed as tax relief for the middle class to spark economic growth. Instead, the benefits skewed to those at the very top, and they added trillions of dollars to America's debt. Middle-class wages fell. Unemployment increased. This is a pattern that working families, middle-class families, cannot afford to have repeated.

Now the Secretary of Treasury's claim is: Well, the Trump tax cuts will not just pay for themselves; they are going to bring in an additional \$1 trillion in revenue atop their own cost. William Peter Wyden, age 9, my son, would say: That is just a bunch of whoppers. It couldn't be further from the truth.

As even Republican-appointed Budget Office Director Keith Hall has said and made clear, the tax cuts do not pay for themselves: “No, the evidence is that tax cuts do not pay for themselves.” Those are the words of the Budget Director appointed by the Republicans.

That Budget Director, Mr. Keith Hall, went on to say that the models they are doing—the macroeconomic effects, the fancy kind of economic lingo for the big picture in the long term—show it.

The other comment that was noteworthy from Mr. Gary Cohn is that the President remains committed to ending the carried interest deduction. Despite his campaign promise that won him bouquets from political commentators and typical middle-class voters, once again, the President's plan doesn't close the carried interest loophole. This is the second big occasion on which the President has failed to follow through on his campaign promise.

A few months ago, in the spring, they had a one-page outline. They said that was where they were going on taxes. They said that one-page outline was shorter than a typical Fred Meyer receipt. Fred Meyer is kind of an iconic store in our State. They had one page then and didn't do anything about following through on the President's promise to get rid of the carried interest loophole.

Yesterday—again, we didn't get a bill, but at least when you kind of eliminate all the white space, they put out close to five pages. Once again, they didn't close the carried interest loophole.

In fact, the plan gives such massive tax cuts to those at the top, investment managers will not be the only people who can get away with paying less than their fair share. Many of the megawealthy are going to be able to do so. It is all going to be legal under the President's plan.

What is the one question on which the Trump team doesn't bend the truth? Whether their plan will protect the middle class from a tax hike. On ABC, the Trump adviser, Mr. Cohn, said that he couldn't guarantee taxes will not go up for middle-class folks. On ABC, the Treasury Secretary said that he couldn't guarantee middle-class folks would not pay more under the tax plan.

What is really striking about this, and it is quite a contrast, is that what people at the very top are going to get is spelled out in detail—in detail. They are going to see the abolition of the estate tax, an incredible windfall to a few thousand families.

Middle-class folks—can't guarantee you will not pay more. Mr. Cohn said: We are aiming to help the middle class. But then he was asked: Would you commit to it? His answer: Well, I don't know. There might be somebody somewhere.

Then there are State and local taxes. He just wouldn't stand behind the middle class the way that this administration stands foursquare behind those at the top. It is why I have said that the President and his parade of millionaires are executing a middle-class con job, and we sure saw it today.

The President's ultrawealthy, out-of-touch advisers clearly fail to understand that the time is now to deliver tax relief to middle-class folks who need it most. It is time to go back to the drawing board and come up with a plan that doesn't threaten middle-class Americans, particularly those with larger families, and doesn't hit them with a tax increase they can't afford.

I want to close by way of saying that on our side, we have repeatedly said we share the view that the tax system is a dysfunctional, broken-down mess filled with loopholes. Then you have the inversion virus. Often my wife says: Why don't you stop there? Any more is going to frighten the children.

We share the view that the tax system is broken. I have been very proud over the years to join two senior Republicans, close allies—the majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL—in a tax reform proposal that is bipartisan that really puts the focus on the middle class and on red, white, and blue jobs.

Our proposal—the outline laid out by Democrats—was that there had to be fiscal responsibility, it had to focus on the middle class, and the tax relief couldn't go to the 1 percent. The bill I wrote that had Republican support, the outline led by the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER,

doesn't even go as far as Ronald Reagan and the Democrats went in 1986.

President Reagan, whom no one would call a flaming liberal, entered into an agreement with Democrats in 1986 that said there would be equal treatment of income earned by a cop or a nurse with that earned by someone from a hedge fund or an investment shop.

In effect, Ronald Reagan said that a dollar is a dollar is a dollar. Everything ought to be treated fairly. That was important then, and it is even more important now because, in reality, there are two tax systems in America. There is one for the cop and the nurse. They have their taxes taken out every paycheck. That taxation is compulsory—no Cayman Island deal for them.

Then there is another tax system for the kind of people who benefit from what the President outlined yesterday. Those are the high-fliers. They get to pay what they want when they want to. I think it is very unfortunate that what the President has described is another gift to that group I just described, who pay what they want when they want to. To quote the President, it is really sad to hear that this administration and the President are pretending that they are doing something else and putting the focus on the middle class when what they really are doing is advancing the cause of the parade of millionaires, a number of whom are part of this administration.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 328, 334, 335, and 336.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of John R. Bass, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; Jon M. Huntsman, Jr., of Utah, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Pleni-

potentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation; Justin Hicks Siberell, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Bahrain; and A. Wess Mitchell, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (European and Eurasian Affairs).

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bass, Huntsman, Siberell, and Mitchell nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 316, 317, 318, and 319.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Robert J. Higdon, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina for the term of four years; J. Cody Hiland, of Arkansas, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas for the term of four years; Joshua J. Minkler, of Indiana, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of four years; and Byung J. Pak, of Georgia, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Higdon, Hiland, Minkler, and Pak nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 338 through 348 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael R. Fenzel

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jacqueline D. Van Ovost

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Jeffery D. Aebischer
Col. Nathan B. Alholinna
Col. Boris R. Armstrong
Col. Kimberly A. Baumann
Col. Robert L. Bell
Col. Shawn N. Bratton
Col. Jeffrey L. Butler
Col. Michael E. Callahan
Col. Kevin J. Campbell
Col. Thomas S. Cauthen
Col. Lawrence L. Christensen
Col. Shawn A. Clouthier
Col. Darwin L. Craig
Col. Robert C. Desko
Col. Kevin M. Donovan
Col. Bobbi J. Doorenbos
Col. David M. Dziobkowski
Col. Randal K. Efferson
Col. Howard L. Eissler, III
Col. Shawn D. Ford
Col. Jed J. French
Col. Daniel E. Gabrielli
Col. Mark P. Gaul
Col. Rainer G. Gomez
Col. Patrick M. Guinee
Col. Penny C. Hodges-Goetz

Col. Jeremy C. Horn
 Col. Cassandra D. Howard
 Col. Paul D. Johnson
 Col. Edward S. Jones
 Col. Gary W. Kirk
 Col. Heidi L. Kjos
 Col. Meaghan Q. LeClerc
 Col. Gregor J. Leist
 Col. Suzanne B. Lipcman
 Col. Keith G. MacDonald
 Col. Rolf E. Mammen
 Col. Gerald E. McDonald
 Col. Christopher G. McGraw
 Col. Michael R. Morgan
 Col. Rebecca L. O'Connor
 Col. Duke A. Pirak
 Col. Jeffrey L. Ryan
 Col. Jon S. Safstrom
 Col. William L. Sparrow
 Col. James R. Stevenson, Jr.
 Col. Jeffrey D. Storey
 Col. Bryan J. Teff
 Col. Edward L. Vaughan, IV
 Col. April D. Vogel
 Col. Charles M. Walker
 Col. Christopher S. Walker
 Col. David A. Weishaar
 Col. Wendy B. Wenke
 Col. Gregory T. White
 Col. Brent W. Wright
 Col. William T. Yates
 Col. Daniel S. Yenchesky

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John E. Cardwell

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Joseph D'Costa

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Michael A. Bills

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Daniel J. Christian

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Kenneth H. Moore

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Matthew P. Easley

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Johnny R. Bass

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the

grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Tony L. Wright

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN944 AIR FORCE nomination of Stephen J. Augustine, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN945 AIR FORCE nomination of William J. Vit, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN946 AIR FORCE nomination of Theresa A. Jones, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN947 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning JAMES S. SHIGEKANE, and ending ANDREW H. STEPHAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN948 AIR FORCE nominations (2095) beginning MARC AALDERINK, and ending JOSEPH R. ZITO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN949 AIR FORCE nominations (149) beginning IAN S. ANDERSON, and ending JOAN DIAZ ZUNIGA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN950 AIR FORCE nominations (53) beginning JENNIFER L. BAKER, and ending DORIAN R. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

IN THE ARMY

PN952 ARMY nomination of Derrick C. Long, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN953 ARMY nomination of Natalie E. Vanatta, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN954 ARMY nomination of John F. Lopes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN955 ARMY nomination of Terrance R. Latson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN959 ARMY nomination of Robert P. L. Bailey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN960 ARMY nomination of Mariah C. Smith, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN961 ARMY nomination of Mark W. Canary, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN962 ARMY nomination of David E. Meacher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN963 ARMY nomination of Christopher D. McDevitt, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN964 ARMY nominations (8) beginning BRUCE M. COCCOLI, and ending SCOTT J. SHERIDAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN965 ARMY nominations (35) beginning THOMAS A. BROOKS, and ending D012739, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN966 ARMY nominations (2) beginning EDWARD A. JARRETT, and ending CASEY T. SCHOBBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN967 ARMY nominations (19) beginning CURTIS J. ALLEN, and ending BRADLEY A. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN979 MARINE CORPS nomination of Megan L. Bustin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN980 MARINE CORPS nomination of Robert M. Barclay, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

IN THE NAVY

PN968 NAVY nomination of Jason A. Tews, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN969 NAVY nomination of Christopher P. Carroll, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN970 NAVY nominations (2) beginning GABRIEL PEREZ, and ending ERIC R. TRUEMPER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN971 NAVY nominations (91) beginning ANTON A. ADAM, and ending YING P. ZHONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN972 NAVY nominations (33) beginning ADRIENNE T. BENTON, and ending AARON R. WESSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN973 NAVY nominations (55) beginning SALAHHUDIN A. ADENKHALIF, and ending VICTOR T. F. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN974 NAVY nominations (107) beginning SANTIAGO A. ABADAM, II, and ending JAIME M. YORK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN975 NAVY nominations (49) beginning SARAH A. AGUERO, and ending DENNIS E. WESTMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN976 NAVY nominations (123) beginning JOKO A. ABUBAKAR, and ending YUI Y. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN977 NAVY nominations (77) beginning BROOKE T. AHLSTROM, and ending MARK C. WARNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

PN978 NAVY nominations (212) beginning MIGUEL M. ALAMPAY, and ending ZACHARY A. ZANFES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 5, 2017.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote No. 205, on the nomination of Makan Delrahim, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote No. 206, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Ralph Erickson, of North Dakota, to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote No. 207, on the nomination of Ralph Erickson, of North Dakota, to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote No. 208, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Ajit Varadaraj Pai, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission. Had I been present, I would have voted nay. •

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, yesterday, September 27, 2017, I was in Indiana with the President of the United States and was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in support of Mr. Heath Tarbert's nomination to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and in support of Mr. Makan Delrahim's nomination to be an Assistant Attorney General.

CONFIRMATION OF MAKAN DELRAHIM

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate confirmed the nomination of Makan Delrahim to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division. While I voted in favor of that nomination, I would like to explain my expectations for Mr. Delrahim and express my deep concerns about the Trump administration's approach to antitrust policy, such as it is, as he assumes that important position.

As a former antitrust lawyer myself, I know these are complex issues that

benefit from a rigorous and non-political assessment, which is best done by the talented career professionals at the Department of Justice, but I am also concerned that, in what has become a much politicized Department of Justice, such an independent review may not be respected and the recommendations of career lawyers and economists can be overridden.

At every turn, the Trump administration has catered to the interests of big business over those of the American consumer, and I am very concerned about what their approach to antitrust enforcement will be. In the past, the President has made remarks about supporting or opposing particular mergers that are deeply troubling and highly political. I am particularly concerned about this haphazard approach from the President because there are a number of major proposed and rumored mergers that will be coming before the Antitrust Division in the coming months and years, particularly in the telecommunications industry, and they will require very careful and professional review independent of politics. I am also deeply concerned about the possibility that this administration will use antitrust laws as a weapon against companies it perceives as somehow unfair to it.

For example, Sinclair Broadcast Group's proposed merger with the Tribune Media Company would give Sinclair control of stations in 42 cities, expanding its reach to a total of 108 communities. In the past, Sinclair has drawn criticism for programming that benefitted then Republican Presidential candidates Donald Trump and George W. Bush. Given reports of the President's continued attacks on the press, including reports of his threats to jail journalists, it is imperative that consumers retain access to a diversity of news sources. The Department of Justice, through its Antitrust Division, must ensure that their review of this merger is free of political considerations.

However, despite those concerns, I believe Mr. Delrahim has the qualifications necessary to lead the Antitrust Division, which does the important work of preventing unlawful anti-competitive conduct and upholding our Nation's antitrust laws. Mr. Delrahim has served as a deputy assistant attorney general in the division he would now lead, as well as chief counsel and staff director for the Judiciary Committee under then-Chairman HATCH, and as an attorney in private practice working on complicated antitrust cases. He has a remarkable personal story and has received the support of many of his peers, both Democrats and Republicans.

During his nomination hearing on May 10, Mr. Delrahim promised to protect competitive markets and consumers, vigorously enforce the anti-

trust laws, and to cooperate with the Judiciary Committee in a bipartisan manner. I will hold him to these promises. Importantly, he told the committee that he would follow the law and his ethical responsibilities to recuse himself in cases involving his former clients. I support his nomination with the expectation that he will honor these commitments.

Mr. Delrahim also made a number of assurances in response to written questions for the record that I submitted after his hearing, questions that were based on my concerns about the anti-competitive impact of corporate mergers, as well as about actions taken by President Trump.

In response to my question about President Trump holding private meetings with the CEO of AT&T, which is planning on merging with Time Warner, and the CEOs of Bayer and Monsanto, which are planning on merging, Mr. Delrahim promised that he would conduct antitrust investigations "in a fair, professional, and impartial manner, without regard to political considerations." He promised to comply with Department of Justice policies intended to ensure only appropriate communications with the White House.

This concern is particularly pressing because during his campaign, President Trump singled out the proposed AT&T-Time Warner merger, promising to block it. The President has also repeatedly attacked CNN, which is owned by Time Warner, and it was even reported that White House advisers have discussed the proposed merger as a "potential point of leverage" over the network. Mr. Delrahim specifically stated that he had no preordained outcome in mind for that merger investigation. He can be certain that the Department of Justice will receive particular scrutiny in its treatment of this merger. Leveraging antitrust laws to coerce or intimidate a media company goes against the foundational protections for a free press.

While Mr. Delrahim expressed that he shared my concerns about consolidation in the media and agricultural sectors, I regret that he refused to address my specific concerns about the proposed merger of Sinclair Broadcast Group with the Tribune Media Company and the effect of the proposed Bayer-Monsanto merger on prices for Hawaii farmers. I would have welcomed his comments about these types of mergers and I expect him, as head of the Antitrust Division, to give concerns about the impact of these types of mergers the attention they deserve.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I will continue to exercise oversight of the Department of Justice, and of the Antitrust Division in particular, to ensure that it is meeting the commitments Mr. Delrahim made during his nomination, especially as to his independence and his ability to be a

fair, active, and nonpartisan ally of consumers and competitive markets. With this in mind, I supported his confirmation.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON AMERICANS OUTDOORS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in 1985, when I was Governor of Tennessee, I got a call from Don Hodel, the Secretary of the Interior for President Reagan. He asked me to be the chairman of ORRRC 2, a follow-up (commission to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which was led by Laurance Rockefeller a generation earlier. I agreed in part because of my love for the outdoors, but also because Don told me that Gil Grosvenor would serve as vice chairman of the commission and Pat Noonan would serve on the board.

The chance to work with them and the National Geographic Society made the request to serve as chairman of the commission even more attractive. My first act as chairman was to change the name from ORRRC 2 to the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. The new name did a better job of conveying our mission: "to look ahead for a generation and see what needs to be done for Americans to have appropriate places to do what they want to do outdoors."

More than a generation has passed now, and on this 30th anniversary of the commission, we can look back on the recommendations of the report and take an assessment.

Overall, the commission found that "outdoor recreation occurs close to home, in or near towns or cities where 80 percent of us soon will live. So, more and more, the solutions must be found close to home. We have concluded that the best way to assure that Americans will have adequate outdoor recreation opportunities is through a prairie fire of concern and investment, community by community. State and local governments will play a major role, but implementation of our recommendations ultimately will depend on the efforts of thousands of individual citizens, nonprofit organizations, and businesses."

The idea that outdoor recreation occurs close to home was especially true for me.

I was one of the luckiest guys in the world growing up in Maryville, in Blount County, TN.

When you grow up next to a national park, what do you do? You grow up in the park. You spent your weekends and special times there, and most all the memories I have are related to the Smokies.

When I was 15, my dad dropped me off at Newfound Gap on the day after Christmas. I was with two other boys in 3 feet of snow, and my dad said, "I'll pick you up in Gatlinburg," which was

15 miles away. He did, later that afternoon.

Then, later that same year, we were in Spence Field, and we made an error in judgment. About 3 in the morning, I looked over, and I thought one of my bunkmates was moving around, but it turns out it was a bear. We left breakfast in our packs inside the tent, which is something you should never do and something I have never done since. These are memories that stick with us forever.

A generation earlier, in 1958, Congress created the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to ensure America did not neglect its heritage of the outdoors. The commission was chaired by Laurance Rockefeller. Like me, Laurance Rockefeller was fascinated with the natural world from a young age. His father, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was an enthusiastic supporter of park-building and historic preservation. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., also had a hand in shaping my childhood outdoor memories.

1872, Congress established Yellowstone National Park, carving the park out of land already owned by the Federal Government. In the following years, Congress followed this model, protecting and preserving Federal acres out West. In the early 20th century, citizens in the eastern part of the country began to push for national parks of their own. However, the land was already privately owned and would need to be purchased and donated to the Federal Government before a park could be created.

In the late 1920s, \$5 million was raised to create a new national park in the Smokies on the border of Tennessee and North Carolina. The two States had appropriated \$2 million each for the effort and combined that with \$1 million in private donations, but that was only half the money needed to purchase the land that was needed to create the new park.

That is when John D. Rockefeller, Jr., stepped in and matched the money that had been raised with a donation of \$5 million through the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund. Rockefeller's donation assured the purchase of the land and the creation of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, where I spent my childhood and still live next to today.

Nearly 25 years after the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was established, John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s son worked with Congress to find solutions to continue to protect our Nation's treasures. The Rockefeller Commission advocated for a Federal national recreation policy "to preserve, develop and make accessible to all Americans the resources needed for individual enjoyment and outdoor recreation."

The Land and Water Conservation Fund and the National Wild and Scenic

Rivers System grew out of the recommendations of the report. Years later, the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors reaffirmed our commitment to these Federal programs, and we also took an important step forward by recommending policies that States, towns, and individuals could adopt. We focused on State and local action, calling for investments from communities around the country to help keep our outdoors great.

First, our commission recommended land trusts, "private landowners recognizing the opportunity to provide expanded recreation resources and services to the public." Local land trusts have been one of the fastest growing conservation tools in the past 30 years. These local land trusts work with landowners who volunteer to preserve their property through conservation easements. According to the Land Trust Alliance's "Land Trust Census," there are over 1,300 land trusts that are active in the United States.

These 1,300 national, State, and local land trusts have conserved more than 56 million acres as of the end of 2015, an increase of 9 million acres since 2010. In Tennessee, 15 active land trusts have protected nearly 900,000 acres throughout the State. In 1999, Jeanie Nelson and former Governor Phil Bredesen founded the land trust for Tennessee. In less than 20 years, the land trust has protected over 100,000 acres of Tennessee landscapes. In 2015, the Foothills Land Conservancy, which "is dedicated to protecting, preserving, and enhancing the lands and environments of the Southern Appalachian region," completed "a record number 24 land partnerships totaling 7,215 acres" spanning five States and seven Tennessee counties.

When our report came out 30 years ago, less than 5 million acres were protected by State and local land trusts. Today more than 20 million acres are protected by State and local land trusts. The explosion of state and local land trusts has greatly increased access to our country's outdoors.

Second, our commission recommended that "local and state governments create a network of scenic byways, compose of scenic roadways and thoroughfares throughout the nation." We are seeing the benefits from that recommendation today. In 1991, Congress created the National Scenic Byways Program to recognize and protect roads for their archaeological, cultural, historic, natural, recreational, and scenic value.

Today, according to the Federal Highway Administration, there are 150 designated National Scenic Byways and American Roads in 46 States throughout the Nation. Five of these national scenic byways pass through Tennessee.

In the 1980's, as Tennessee was building new highways to attract the auto

industry, the State created 10,000 miles of State roads and scenic highways. These roads, marked with mockingbird signs, prohibited new billboards and new junkyards and allow people to enjoy the beauty of the state as they drive across the country. These scenic byways bring visitors to Tennessee and the beauty of our State keeps them coming back.

Third, we recommended that “communities establish greenways, corridors of private and public recreation lands and waters, to provide people with access to open spaces close to where they live, and to link together the rural and urban spaces in the American landscape.” Today, there are almost 1,000 greenways and trails in Tennessee that provide access to the outdoors to Tennesseans in their own communities.

A good national example of the popularity of greenways is the dramatic increase in rails-to-trails projects across the country. In communities throughout the Nation, unused railroad tracks and the land surrounding the tracks are sold or donated and converted into to new recreational trails.

According to the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, there are over 22,000 miles of open trails that were converted from previous railroad tracks and rights-of-way. In Tennessee, today there are over 30 rails-to-trails projects that cover 125 miles.

Fourth, we recommended full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which was first proposed in Laurance Rockefeller’s Commission. The idea for the Land and Water Conservation Fund was very simple. It was to say, “When we have an environmental burden, we should have an environmental benefit.” If we are going to drill for oil offshore for example, that is an environmental burden. We said let’s take some of those revenues and use them for an environmental benefit.

So since the 1960s, we have used oil and gas revenues to conserve important parts of America. Rocky Fork, in my home State of Tennessee, is an excellent example of the productive use of LWCF funding. Ten years ago, the Southern Appalachian Highlands Conservancy, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy, and the Conservation Fund began working with the U.S. Forest Service, the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency, and the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation to protect Rocky Fork, a 10,000-acre tract in Tennessee within the Cherokee National Forest.

In 2015, working together and using Land and Water Conservation Fund dollars, Federal, State, and local partners saved the largest unprotected tract of land in the Southern Appalachians from development. To make sure everyone could enjoy this natural treasure, the State of Tennessee used some of the land to create the Rocky

Fork State Park. The State park—with its proximity to the Appalachian Trail, miles of native brook trout streams with cascades and waterfalls, historic battle site, Black Bear Reserve, significant wildlife habitat and scenic vistas—may 1 day be the State’s most popular park. It wouldn’t have been possible without tree Land and Water Conservation Fund.

As chairman, I also called on my fellow Governors to establish State-level outdoor commissions. Twenty-five States responded by establishing commissions or holding Governors’ forums. Seven additional States had recently completed conferences on the topic in anticipation of a national study. The purpose of my call to the Nation’s Governors was “to stimulate action at the local and state levels on behalf of the outdoors. More than 2,000 people testified at hearings or participated in meetings sponsored by States in 1986.” The Tennessee State-level outdoor commission, Tennesseans Outdoors, sought to “look 40 years down the road, to consider what people will want to do outdoors, and to see that there will be places for them to do those things.”

The Tennessee Commission recommended setting aside special places throughout the State, making the most of the State’s resources, ensuring a quality environment, spreading the word on the importance of the outdoors and recreation, and providing stable funding for important conservation and outdoor recreation projects. Specifically, one of the report’s recommendations was for cities to promote urban open space preservation and riverfront planning. Today all of my home State’s major metropolitan areas have taken steps to implement this recommendation.

In 2004, Memphis adopted the Memphis Riverfront Master Plan, and the city has been making progress on riverfront redevelopment. Just 3 months ago, the Big River Crossing—the longest public pedestrian and bike bridge across the Mississippi River—opened in Memphis.

In 2005, the city of Chattanooga completed the 21st Century Waterfront Project, which redeveloped 129 acres “along the river to create multiple public spaces and opportunities for citizens to enjoy Chattanooga’s waterfront.”

In 2006, Nashville began the process to revise the Nashville Riverfront for the 21st Century to “provide new public attractions, parkland and waterfront access, giving residents and visitors a reason to come and enjoy both banks of the Cumberland River.”

Also in 2006, Knoxville adopted the Knoxville South Waterfront Vision Plan to implement an improvement strategy for 750 acres along the 3-mile shoreline of the Tennessee River that flows through Knoxville.

Last year, the Tennessee Wildlife Federation called for the State to cre-

ate a forum on Tennessee’s great outdoors to “assess the current status of our state’s natural resources, identify critical challenges facing their management and conservation, and develop strategic solutions to ensure their persistence well into the future.”

When advocating for a new forum, Mike Butler, the CEO of the Tennessee Wildlife Federation, acknowledged the success of the implementation of many of the recommendations of the Tennesseans Outdoors report, but also recognized that much has changed over the last 30 years and “these changes have had a profound effect on our natural resources and outdoor recreation needs.” Mike understands the need to reexamine the issues facing our State’s great outdoors and to work together to maintain and expand the benefits that our outdoors provide.

Like the State of Tennessee, 30 years ago, we looked at ways to help our future generations enjoy the great American outdoors like we did. Our report stated: “We have learned over the course of our study of urgent needs for action to protect our outdoor recreation estate. Preservation of fast-disappearing open space, investment in rehabilitation of deteriorating facilities, getting ahead of urban growth as it races across the land—these are actions which cannot wait, but must be taken now, for tomorrow they will be more expensive, or in some cases, impossible.”

From land trusts to greenways to scenic highways, many of the recommendations have been implemented, and we, as a country, have been able to preserve some of our open spaces and protect our outdoor recreation estate.

One way to illustrate the success of these programs is to take a look at the economic benefit of today’s outdoor economy. According to an Outdoor Industry Association economic study in 2012, outdoor recreation generates \$646 billion in consumer spending and 6.1 million direct jobs each year. In Tennessee, outdoor recreation generates \$8.2 billion annually in consumer spending and supports 83,000 direct jobs across the State.

Our work is not done. Theodore Roosevelt once said that nothing short of defending this country in wartime “compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us. . . .”

On the 30th anniversary of the Americans Outdoors Commission report, I look forward to continuing to work to protect and preserve the great American outdoors and leave future generations a more beautiful nation.

TRIBUTE TO BOB MILLS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Bob Mills as the 67th recipient of the Dayton Region’s

2017 Citizen Legion of Honor Award from the President's Club. As founder of Synergy Building Systems and Mills Development, Bob Mills' leadership and vision for quality development in and around the I-75 and I-675 corridors has made a tremendous impact on the economic vitality of the region.

More than a dozen corporate and not-for-profit boards have benefited from Bob Mills' leadership over the years, including Greene Memorial Hospital, the Air Force Museum, Wright State University Foundation, and the Dayton Development Coalition. He has been recognized for his generosity by the Dayton Regional STEM School, Beavercreek Chamber of Commerce, the American Cancer Society, the Leukemia Lymphoma Society, and as the recipient of the Mathile Community Award.

Maybe most impressive, Bob Mills and his family created the Gala of Hope Foundation and have raised more than \$6 million to fight cancer and improve cancer care in the Dayton region by providing grants and funding for patient care, families, caregivers, and research.

Additionally, he and his family have worked tirelessly to support Dayton Children's new patient tower which supports local children's needs for important healthcare services.

I would like to honor and congratulate Bob Mills for his many contributions to his community and our State.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICE GORDON

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Patrice Gordon in honor of her retirement this week after 29 years of exceptional service to the Congress at the Congressional Budget Office. She began her congressional career in CBO's Natural Resources and Commerce Division in 1988 after receiving her Ph.D. in economics from the University of Maryland.

Since that time, Patrice has been recognized as one of CBO's best when it comes to focusing on details, ensuring analyses are thorough and correct, and questioning any gaps in reasoning. She is a critical thinker with an encyclopedic mind for details. Throughout her career, she has balanced her keen analytic approach with humility and kindness, becoming a mentor to many young analysts and helping them hone their quantitative skills. She is a valued colleague to everyone who has worked closely with her.

In the mid-1990s, Patrice and a few other colleagues at CBO took on the task of implementing requirements of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and soon she would end up supervising all of CBO's work on private-sector mandates. Throughout her tenure, she helped distill the principles that guide CBO's analyses of Federal mandates,

ensuring that the agency's work was consistent with the provisions of UMRA. During that time, she also reviewed virtually every bill reported by a congressional committee, including bills that regulate the transportation of snakes on airplanes to healthcare reform and bankruptcy regulation. Patrice has probably read more than 10,000 bills during her time at the Congressional Budget Office.

In short, over the past 29 years, the Congressional Budget Office and Congress have been fortunate to enjoy the dedication and insight that Patrice has brought to her work. I understand she is looking forward to playing more competitive bridge and perhaps even tuning up a clarinet and saxophone to jazz up her time away from cost estimates and mandate analyses. I know my Senate colleagues join me in extending our appreciation to Patrice for her service to our Nation and our very best wishes for a happy and productive retirement.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID AHART AND CATHY GLENN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate and thank Mr. David Ahart and Ms. Cathy Glenn on their retirement for their more than 28 years of service to the U.S. Senate.

I have worked with Dave and Cathy in various roles within the U.S. Senate Recording Studio for nearly three decades.

Before working in the radio division, Dave worked on the television side of the Senate Recording studio.

Cathy also worked on the television side before coming to radio. Before that, she worked for Senator Dennis DeConcini of Arizona.

It is not unusual for me to go to the Senate recording studio multiple times a week. If you do the math, you can see I have gotten to know Dave and Cathy very well over the years.

I have always said that representative government is a two-way street, and communicating with Iowans through the media has always been an important part of my job. Dave and Cathy are an instrumental part of that process. Put simply, they have helped me keep in touch with Iowans, and for that, I couldn't be more grateful.

It's also worth noting that Dave and Cathy are immensely kind and patient. Many days, my schedule can change in an instant. Dave and Cathy are always generous with their time and help me and my staff complete the work that needs to be done.

Those who know Dave and Cathy know you never leave their studio without a smile and laughter. They are as friendly now as they were 30 years ago.

Dave, I hope you get back to Denison soon and stop at Cronks.

Dave had family who lived in Denison, IA. Cronks is a mutually favorite restaurant that I always try to stop at when traveling through the area.

Cathy, as you celebrate, make sure to eat an extra piece of chocolate for me. I think you have as big of a sweet tooth as I do.

I wish Dave and Cathy all the best in retirement and the years to come.

So to you two, I say thank you for all you have done. The U.S. Senate, the Senate Recording Studio, my staff and I will be forever grateful for your service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING BAKER FURNITURE

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing a multigeneration cornerstone of the community in Fallon County. Baker Furniture has served the people of eastern Montana for over eight decades. Through the years, the team at Baker Furniture has skillfully navigated changes in consumer tastes and a shifting business climate in order to provide quality furniture and appliances for the folks in Baker.

Baker Furniture initially began operations on Main Street in 1936, by the original proprietor, Leif Holmlund. Leif's understudy in the furniture industry, Army veteran Orville Stevens, would eventually take the reins of the enterprise in the 1960s. Under Orville's guidance, the business flourished. Orville's sons, Tom and Dave, also pitched in to help make the business a success.

Tom and Dave went on to assume the primary duties for the business in the late 1990s. After a life that included service to his Nation, raising a family, and operating a successful business, Orville passed away in 2009. Since his passing, the business that Orville developed has continued to thrive and meet the needs of the community.

Small businesses, operated by hard-working family members, are an engine of commerce for many rural communities across Montana. Baker Furniture is a shining example of this business model, and many shoppers in Baker and the surrounding area are grateful. Thank you to the team at Baker Furniture for the many years of excellent service to your neighbors, and I wish you continued success in the future.●

RECOGNIZING THE MASSACHUSETTS WALKING TOUR

• Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Massachusetts Walking Tour. Founded in 2010 in Webster, MA, the Walking Tour recognizes and celebrates local arts and culture

throughout Massachusetts by featuring a nonprofit concert tour across the Commonwealth. Every concert is unique as it pairs the traveling musicians with local artists and outdoor recreation enthusiasts and is free for the whole community. These memorable events include diverse artistic and musical performances and even discussions about public land use with outdoor educators and trail managers. Since its founding, the Walking Tour has visited 90 towns in Massachusetts, playing 101 free community concerts. I thank founders Mark Mandeville and Raianne Richards, as well as all of the performers, artists, educators, and nature enthusiasts who have made Walking Tour such a success across Massachusetts.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 327. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

S. 1866. An act to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3229. An act to protect the safety of judges by extending the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact sensitive information contained in their financial disclosure reports, and for other purposes.

At 11:40 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3823. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:54 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 1141. An act to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

H.R. 3819. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 12:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2792. An act to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act.

H.R. 2824. An act to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, and to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 327. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

S. 1866. An act to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 4:27 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announcing that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of

1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2792. An act to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2824. An act to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, and to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 3229. An act to protect the safety of judges by extending the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact sensitive information contained in their financial disclosure reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1894. A bill to exempt Puerto Rico from the coastwise laws of the United States (commonly known as the "Jones Act").

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 28, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 810. An act to facilitate construction of a bridge on certain property in Christian County, Missouri, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1766. A bill to reauthorize the SAFER Act of 2013, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Halsey B. Frank, of Maine, to be United States Attorney for the District of Maine for the term of four years.

D. Michael Hurst, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

Jeffrey B. Jensen, of Missouri, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri for the term of four years.

Thomas L. Kirsch II, of Indiana, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Indiana for the term of four years.

William J. Powell, of West Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of West Virginia for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1881. A bill to expand eligibility for health care under the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to include certain veterans seeking mental health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1882. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require the Attorney General to make procurement quotas for opioid analgesics publicly available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1883. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to publish a final rule to provide for the screening, testing, and treatment for sleep disorders of individuals operating commercial vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. LEE):

S. 1884. A bill to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1885. A bill to support the development of highly automated vehicle safety technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 1886. A bill to amend subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize agencies to make noncompetitive temporary and term appointments in the competitive service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 1887. A bill to grant expedited hiring authority to the head of an agency to appoint college graduates and post-secondary students; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 1888. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of a Voluntary Separation Incentive Payment and to include an annual adjustment in accordance with the Consumer Price

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

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1889. A bill to require Federal agencies and Federal courts to comply with address confidentiality programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1890. A bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1891. A bill to promote peace and justice in Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1892. A bill to provide tax relief related to Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1893. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1894. A bill to exempt Puerto Rico from the coastwise laws of the United States (commonly known as the "Jones Act"); read the first time.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1895. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1896. A bill to amend section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the treatment of availability pay for Federal air marshals and criminal investigators of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1897. A bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to retroactively repeal the individual mandate for health insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1899. A bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1900. A bill to require all persons who acquire, maintain, or use personal information to have in effect reasonable cybersecurity

protections and practices whenever acquiring, maintaining, or using personal information in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 270. A resolution designating September 2017 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. Res. 271. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Community Gardening Awareness Week; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 272. A resolution commemorating the 230th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 273. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2017 as "Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month" in order to educate communities across the United States about sickle cell disease and the need for research, early detection methods, effective treatments, and preventative care programs with respect to sickle cell disease, complications from sickle cell disease, and conditions related to sickle cell disease; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. Res. 274. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles, increasing personal financial literacy, and engaging the people of the United States on the keys to success in achieving and maintaining retirement security throughout their lifetimes; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 275. A resolution congratulating Northeastern Illinois University on the sesquicentennial of the University; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 276. A resolution designating September 2017 as "Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 277. A resolution designating the week of September 25 through 29, 2017, as "National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 220

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr.

HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 220, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 574

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 574, a bill to restrict the use of funds for the long-range standoff weapon until the Secretary of Defense completes a Nuclear Posture Review that includes an assessment of the capabilities and effects of the use of the long-range standoff weapon, and for other purposes.

S. 593

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

S. 620

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 620, a bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes.

S. 680

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 680, a bill to protect consumers from security and privacy threats to their motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 736

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hamp-

shire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1361, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure that the reciprocal deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes.

S. 1561

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1561, a bill to repeal the Jones Act restrictions on coastwise trade, and for other purposes.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1595, a bill to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

S. 1672

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1672, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit related to the production of electricity from offshore wind.

S. 1702

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr.

CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1702, a bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to reduce predation by sea lions on endangered Columbia River salmon and other species not listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1766, a bill to reauthorize the SAFER Act of 2013, and for other purposes.

S. 1767

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1767, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 1808

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1808, a bill to extend temporarily the Federal Perkins Loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 1816

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1816, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to enhance fraud alert procedures and provide free access to credit freezes, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1854

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1854, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to enhance penalties for theft of a firearm from a Federal firearms licensee.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1864

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1864, a bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students.

S. 1865

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1865, a bill to provide temporary direct hire authority for certain emergency response positions.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 250

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 250, a resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy.

S. RES. 264

At the request of Mr. DAINES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 264, a resolution designating September 2017 as "National Kinship Care Month".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1890. A bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bipartisan Chronic Kidney Disease Improvement in Research and Treatment Act of 2017, which I am introducing with Senators BLUNT and NELSON today. This legislation seeks to make a real difference in the lives of Americans suffering from kidney disease and end-stage renal disease.

Kidney disease is the 9th leading cause of death in the United States, and unfortunately, more than 1 in 10 Americans today suffer from some form of kidney disease. More than 661,000 Americans are living with kid-

ney failure or end-stage renal disease, which is an irreversible condition that can be fatal without a kidney transplant or life-sustaining dialysis. Of these, 468,000 patients in our Country rely on life-sustaining dialysis care to survive and roughly 193,000 live with a functioning kidney transplant.

This legislation seeks to promote research, expand patient choice, and improve care coordination for these hundreds of thousands of patients. Specifically, it would identify payment disincentives that create barriers to kidney transplants. The bill would require the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to submit a comprehensive report on how and to what extent palliative care is utilized in treating individuals with advanced kidney disease and the effect of palliative care on the quality of life and treatment outcomes of individuals with ESRD. It would also direct the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to evaluate and report on the biological, social, and behavioral factors related to kidney disease and efforts to slow the progression of disease in minority populations disproportionately affected by this disease.

This legislation would improve access to pre-dialysis kidney education programs to better manage patients' kidney disease and even prevent kidney failure in some cases. Nephrologists and other health professionals would be incentivized to work in underserved rural and urban areas, and current payment policies would be modified to encourage home dialysis, which is not incentivized under the current Medicare payment structure. Patients with acute kidney injury would also be allowed to receive treatments through dialysis providers, therefore reducing costs associated with care provided in the more expensive hospital outpatient setting. Perhaps most importantly, our legislation would guarantee access to Medigap policies to all ESRD Medicare beneficiaries, regardless of age. Currently, Medicare patients under 65, whether disabled or ESRD beneficiaries do not have access to Medigap plans, even though Medicare is their primary insurance.

Lastly, the bill would expand the options for patients by allowing individuals diagnosed with kidney failure to enroll in the Medicare Advantage program starting in plan year 2020 and re-authorizing on a permanent basis the Medicare Advantage Special Needs Plan for patients with kidney failure.

I urge my colleagues to join me, Senator BLUNT and Senator NELSON in supporting the Chronic Kidney Disease Improvement in Research and Treatment Act of 2017, which will improve the care of patients who suffer from kidney disease and end-stage renal disease.

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

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

S. 1890

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chronic Kidney Disease Improvement in Research and Treatment Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—IMPROVING PATIENT LIVES AND QUALITY OF CARE THROUGH RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Sec. 101. Improving patient lives and quality of care through research and innovation.

Sec. 102. Enhancing care through new technologies.

Sec. 103. Understanding current utilization of palliative care services.

Sec. 104. Understanding the progression of kidney disease and treatment of kidney failure in minority populations.

TITLE II—EMPOWER PATIENT DECISION MAKING AND CHOICE

Sec. 201. Providing individuals with kidney failure access to managed care.

Sec. 202. Medigap coverage for beneficiaries with end-stage renal disease.

Sec. 203. Promoting access to home dialysis treatments.

TITLE III—IMPROVING PATIENT CARE AND ENSURING QUALITY OUTCOMES

Sec. 301. Maintain an economically stable dialysis infrastructure.

Sec. 302. Improve patient decision making and transparency by consolidating and modernizing quality programs.

Sec. 303. Increasing access to Medicare kidney disease education benefit.

Sec. 304. Certification of new facilities.

Sec. 305. Improving access in underserved areas.

TITLE I—IMPROVING PATIENT LIVES AND QUALITY OF CARE THROUGH RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

SEC. 101. IMPROVING PATIENT LIVES AND QUALITY OF CARE THROUGH RESEARCH AND INNOVATION.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall conduct a study on increasing kidney transplantation rates. Such study shall include an analysis of each of the following:

(1) Any disincentives in the payment systems under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act that create barriers to kidney transplants and post-transplant care for beneficiaries with end-stage renal disease.

(2) The practices used by States with higher than average donation rates and whether those practices and policies could be successfully utilized in other States.

(3) Practices and policies that could increase deceased donation rates of minority populations.

(4) Whether cultural and policy barriers exist to increasing living donation rates, including an examination of how to better facilitate chained donations.

(5) Other areas determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), together with such recommendations as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 102. ENHANCING CARE THROUGH NEW TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) **AGREEMENT WITH NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences within six months of the date of the enactment of this Act under which the National Academy of Sciences will conduct a study on the design of payments for renal dialysis services under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, including an analysis of whether adjustments to such payments are needed to allow for the incorporation of new technologies and therapies.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall evaluate the current payment system for renal dialysis services under the Medicare program, identify barriers to adopting innovative items, services, and therapies, and make recommendations as to how to eliminate such barriers.

SEC. 103. UNDERSTANDING CURRENT UTILIZATION OF PALLIATIVE CARE SERVICES.

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Comptroller General”) shall conduct a study on the utilization of palliative care in treating individuals with advanced kidney disease, from stage 4 through stage 5, including individuals with kidney failure on dialysis through any progression of the disease. Such study shall include an analysis of—

(A) how palliative care can be utilized to improve the quality of life of those with kidney disease and facilitate care tailored to their individual goals and values;

(B) the successful use of palliative care in the care of patients with other chronic diseases and serious illnesses;

(C) the utilization of palliative care at any point in an illness, including when used at the same time as curative treatment; and

(D) other areas determined appropriate by the Comptroller General.

(2) **DEFINITION OF PALLIATIVE CARE.**—In this section, the term “palliative care” means patient and family centered care that optimizes quality of life by anticipating, preventing, and treating suffering. Such term includes care that is furnished throughout the continuum of the illness that addresses physical, intellectual, emotional, social, and spiritual needs and that facilitates patient autonomy, access to information and choice.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 104. UNDERSTANDING THE PROGRESSION OF KIDNEY DISEASE AND TREATMENT OF KIDNEY FAILURE IN MINORITY POPULATIONS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”) shall conduct a study on—

(1) the social, behavioral, and biological factors leading to kidney disease;

(2) efforts to slow the progression of kidney disease in minority populations that are disproportionately affected by such disease; and

(3) treatment patterns associated with providing care, under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the Medicaid program under title XIX of such Act, and through private health insurance, to minority populations that are disproportionately affected by kidney failure.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), together with such recommendations as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

TITLE II—EMPOWER PATIENT DECISION MAKING AND CHOICE

SEC. 201. PROVIDING INDIVIDUALS WITH KIDNEY FAILURE ACCESS TO MANAGED CARE.

(a) **PERMANENT EXTENSION OF MEDICARE ADVANTAGE ESRD SPECIAL NEEDS PLANS AUTHORITY.**—Section 1859(f)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–28(f)(1)) is amended by inserting “, in the case of a specialized MA plan for special needs individuals who have not been determined to have end stage renal disease,” before “for periods before January 1, 2019”.

(b) **ACCELERATED ACCESS TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE.**—Section 17006(a)(3) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended by striking “2021” and inserting “2020.”

(c) **ACCELERATED MEDPAC RISK ADJUSTMENT REPORT.**—Section 17006(f)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255) is amended by striking “2020” and inserting “2019.”

SEC. 202. MEDIGAP COVERAGE FOR BENEFICIARIES WITH END-STAGE RENAL DISEASE.

(a) **GUARANTEED AVAILABILITY OF MEDIGAP POLICIES TO ALL ESRD MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1882(s) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ss(s)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “is 65” and inserting the following: “is—

“(i) 65 years of age or older and is enrolled for benefits under part B; or

“(ii) is entitled to benefits under 226A(b) and is enrolled for benefits under part B.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “(or is entitled to benefits under 226A(b))” after “is 65 years of age or older”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by inserting “(or is entitled to benefits under 226A(b))” after “is 65 years of age or older”; and

(ii) in clause (vi), by inserting “(or under 226A(b))” after “at age 65”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to medicare supplemental policies effective on or after January 1, 2020.

(b) **ADDITIONAL ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.**—

(1) **ONE-TIME ENROLLMENT PERIOD.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of an individual described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a one-time enrollment period during which such an individual may enroll in any medicare supplemental policy under section 1882 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ss) of the individual’s choosing.

(B) **ENROLLMENT PERIOD.**—The enrollment period established under subparagraph (A)

shall begin on January 1, 2020, and shall end June 30, 2020.

(2) **INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.**—An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who—

(A) is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act under section 226A(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 426–1);

(B) is enrolled for benefits under part B of such title XVIII; and

(C) would not, but for the provisions of, and amendments made by, subsection (a) be eligible for the guaranteed issue of a medicare supplemental policy under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 1882(s) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ss(s)).

SEC. 203. PROMOTING ACCESS TO HOME DIALYSIS TREATMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1881(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(2) in clause (ii), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), strike “on a comprehensive” and insert “subject to subparagraph (B), on a comprehensive”;

(3) by striking “With respect to” and inserting “(A) With respect to”; and

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

“(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), an individual determined to have end-stage renal disease receiving home dialysis may choose to receive the monthly end-stage renal disease-related visits furnished on or after January 1, 2018, via telehealth if the individual receives a face-to-face visit, without the use of telehealth, at least once every three consecutive months.”.

(b) **ORIGINATING SITE REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1834(m) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(m)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4)(C)(ii), by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

“(IX) A renal dialysis facility, but only for purposes of section 1881(b)(3)(B).

“(X) The home of an individual, but only for purposes of section 1881(b)(3)(B).”; and

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

“(5) **TREATMENT OF HOME DIALYSIS MONTHLY ESRD-RELATED VISIT.**—The geographic requirements described in paragraph (4)(C)(i) shall not apply with respect to telehealth services furnished on or after January 1, 2018, for purposes of section 1881(b)(3)(B), at an originating site described in subclause (VI), (IX), or (X) of paragraph (4)(C)(ii).”.

(2) **NO FACILITY FEE IF ORIGINATING SITE FOR HOME DIALYSIS THERAPY IS THE HOME.**—Section 1834(m)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(m)(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), and indenting appropriately;

(B) in subclause (II), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), by striking “clause (i) or this clause” and inserting “subclause (I) or this subclause”;

(C) by striking “SITE.—With respect to” and inserting “SITE.—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), with respect to”; and

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

“(ii) **NO FACILITY FEE IF ORIGINATING SITE FOR HOME DIALYSIS THERAPY IS THE HOME.**—No facility fee shall be paid under this subparagraph to an originating site described in paragraph (4)(C)(ii)(X).”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1881(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42

U.S.C. 1395rr(b)(1)) is amended by striking “paragraph (3)(A)” and inserting “paragraph (3)(A)(i)”.

(d) EXCLUSION FROM REMUNERATION FOR PURPOSES OF APPLYING CIVIL MONETARY PENALTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1128A(i)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7a(i)(6)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (H)(iv), by striking “; or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

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

“(J) the provision of telehealth or remote patient monitoring technologies to individuals under title XVIII by a health care provider for the purpose of furnishing telehealth or remote patient monitoring services.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to services furnished on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—IMPROVING PATIENT CARE AND ENSURING QUALITY OUTCOMES

SEC. 301. MAINTAIN AN ECONOMICALLY STABLE DIALYSIS INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1881(b)(14) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(b)(14)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “Such system” and inserting “Subject to subparagraph (J), such system”; and

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

“(J) For payment for renal dialysis services furnished on or after January 1, 2018, under the system under this paragraph—

“(i) the payment adjustment described in clause (i) of subparagraph (D)—

“(I) shall not take into account comorbidities; and

“(II) shall only take into account age for purposes of distinguishing between individuals who are under 18 years of age and those who are 18 years of age and older but shall not include any other adjustment for age;

“(ii) the Secretary shall reassess any adjustments related to patient weight under such clause;

“(iii) the payment adjustment described in clause (ii) of such subparagraph shall not be included;

“(iv) the standardization factor described in the final rule published in the Federal Register on November 8, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 67470), shall be established using the most currently available data (and not historical data) and adjusted on an annual basis, based on such available data, to account for any change in utilization of drugs and any modification in adjusters applied under this paragraph; and

“(v) take into account reasonable costs for determining the payment rate consistent with paragraph (2)(B).”.

(b) INCLUSION OF NETWORK FEE AS AN ALLOWABLE COST.—Section 1881(b)(14) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(b)(14)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) Not later than January 1, 2018, the Secretary shall amend the ESRD facility cost report to include the per treatment network fee (as described in paragraph (7)) as an allowable cost or offset to revenue.”.

SEC. 302. IMPROVE PATIENT DECISION MAKING AND TRANSPARENCY BY CONSOLIDATING AND MODERNIZING QUALITY PROGRAMS.

(a) MEASURES.—Section 1881(h)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(h)(2)) is

amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(F) WEIGHTING LIMITATION.—No single measure specified by the Secretary or individual measure within a composite measure so specified may be weighted less than 10 percent of the total performance score.

“(G) STATISTICALLY VALID AND RELIABLE.—In specifying measures under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall only specify measures that have been shown to be statistically valid and reliable through testing.”.

(b) ENDORSEMENT.—Section 1881(h)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(h)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The exception under the preceding sentence shall not apply to a measure that the entity with a contract under section 1890(a) (or a similar entity) considered but failed to endorse.”; and

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

“(iii) COMPOSITE MEASURES.—Clauses (i) and (ii) shall apply to composite measures in the same manner as such clauses apply to individual measures.”.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR DIALYSIS FACILITY COMPARE STAR RATING PROGRAM.—Section 1881(h)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(h)(6)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY DIALYSIS FACILITY COMPARE STAR RATING PROGRAM.—To the extent that the Secretary maintains a dialysis facility compare star rating program, under such a program the Secretary—

“(i) shall assign stars using the same methodology and total performance score results from the quality incentive program under this subsection;

“(ii) shall determine the stars using the same methodology used under such quality incentive program; and

“(iii) shall not use a forced bell curve when determining the stars or rebaselining the stars.”.

(d) HOSPITALS REQUIRED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—Section 1881 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) HOSPITALS REQUIRED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a process under which a hospital or a critical access hospital shall provide a renal dialysis facility with health and treatment information with respect to an individual who is discharged from the hospital or critical access hospital and who subsequently receives treatment at facility.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—Under the process established under paragraph (1)—

“(A) the request for the health information may be initiated by the individual prior to discharge or upon request by the renal dialysis facility after the patient is discharged; and

“(B) the information must be provided to the facility within 7 days of the request being made.”.

(e) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—Section 1881(h)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(h)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a provider of services or a renal dialysis facility that the Secretary determines exceeds the attainment performance standards under paragraph (4) with respect to a year, the Secretary may make a bonus payment to the provider or facility (pursuant to a process established by the Secretary).

“(ii) FUNDING.—The total amount of bonus payments under clause (i) in a year shall be equal to the total amount of reduced payments in a year under subparagraph (A).

“(iii) NO EFFECT IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—The provisions of subparagraph (C) shall apply to a bonus payment under this subparagraph in the same manner subparagraph (C) applies to a reduction under such subparagraph.”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to items and services furnished on or after January 1, 2019.

SEC. 303. INCREASING ACCESS TO MEDICARE KIDNEY DISEASE EDUCATION BENEFIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861(ggg) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(ggg)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or stage V” after “stage IV”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or of a physician assistant, nurse practitioner, or clinical nurse specialist (as defined in section 1861(aa)(5)) assisting in the treatment of the individual’s kidney condition” after “kidney condition”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “(A)” after “(2)”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i);

(iii) by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(v) by adding at the end the following: “(C) a renal dialysis facility subject to the requirements of section 1881(b)(1) with personnel who—

“(i) provide the services described in paragraph (1); and

“(ii) is a physician (as defined in subsection (r)(1)) or a physician assistant, nurse practitioner, or clinical nurse specialist (as defined in subsection (aa)(5)).”.

(b) PAYMENT TO RENAL DIALYSIS FACILITIES.—Section 1881(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(15) For purposes of paragraph (14), the single payment for renal dialysis services under such paragraph shall not take into account the amount of payment for kidney disease education services (as defined in section 1861(ggg)). Instead, payment for such services shall be made to the renal dialysis facility on an assignment-related basis under section 1848.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to kidney disease education services furnished on or after January 1, 2018.

SEC. 304. CERTIFICATION OF NEW FACILITIES.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1865(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395bb(a)(1)) is amended by striking “or the conditions and requirements under section 1881(b)”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to a finding made on or after such date.

(b) TIMING FOR ACCEPTANCE OF REQUESTS FROM ACCREDITATION ORGANIZATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall accept a completed application from any national accreditation body for providers and facilities that provide services under 1881(b), in accordance

with section 1865(3)(A)). Any application received pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be deemed approved unless the Secretary, within 90 days after the date of the submission of the application to the Secretary, either denies such request in writing or informs the applicant in writing with respect to any additional information that is needed in order to make a final determination with respect to the application. If the Secretary requests additional information pursuant to the preceding sentence and the applicant submits such information, the application shall be deemed approved unless the Secretary, within 90 days of date of receiving such information, denies such request.

SEC. 305. IMPROVING ACCESS IN UNDER SERVED AREAS.

(a) DEFINITION OF PRIMARY CARE SERVICES.—Section 331(a)(3)(D) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254d(a)(3)(D)) is amended by inserting “and includes renal dialysis services” before the period at the end.

(b) NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 338A(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254l(a)(2)) is amended by inserting “, including nephrology health professionals” before the period at the end.

(c) NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 338B(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254l-1(a)(2)) is amended by inserting “, including nephrology health professionals” before the period at the end.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1894. A bill to exempt Puerto Rico from the coastwise laws of the United States (commonly known as the “Jones Act”); read the first time.

S. 1894

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

SECTION 1. EXCEPTIONS TO APPLICATION OF COASTWISE LAWS FOR PUERTO RICO.

Section 55101(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

“(1) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;”.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to retroactively repeal the individual mandate for health insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 1898

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Repeal and Refund Act”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATE.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking chapter 48.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—

(i) Section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

“(g) MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘minimum essential coverage’ means any of the following:

“(A) GOVERNMENT SPONSORED PROGRAMS.—Coverage under—

“(i) the Medicare program under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act,

“(ii) the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act,

“(iii) the CHIP program under title XXI of the Social Security Act,

“(iv) medical coverage under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, including coverage under the TRICARE program,

“(v) a health care program under chapter 17 or 18 of title 38, United States Code, as determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary,

“(vi) a health plan under section 2504(e) of title 22, United States Code (relating to Peace Corps volunteers), or

“(vii) the Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program of the Department of Defense, established under section 349 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 10 U.S.C. 1587 note).

“(B) EMPLOYER-SPONSORED PLAN.—Coverage under an eligible employer-sponsored plan.

“(C) PLANS IN THE INDIVIDUAL MARKET.—Coverage under a health plan offered in the individual market within a State.

“(D) GRANDFATHERED HEALTH PLAN.—Coverage under a grandfathered health plan.

“(E) OTHER COVERAGE.—Such other health benefits coverage, such as a State health benefits risk pool, as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with the Secretary, recognizes for purposes of this subsection.

“(2) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER-SPONSORED PLAN.—The term ‘eligible employer-sponsored plan’ means, with respect to any employee, a group health plan or group health insurance coverage offered by an employer to the employee which is—

“(A) a governmental plan (within the meaning of section 2791(d)(8) of the Public Health Service Act), or

“(B) any other plan or coverage offered in the small or large group market within a State.

Such term shall include a grandfathered health plan described in paragraph (1)(D) offered in a group market.

“(3) EXCEPTED BENEFITS NOT TREATED AS MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.—The term ‘minimum essential coverage’ shall not include health insurance coverage which consists of coverage of excepted benefits—

“(A) described in paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 2791 of the Public Health Service Act; or

“(B) described in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of such subsection if the benefits are provided under a separate policy, certificate, or contract of insurance.

“(4) INDIVIDUALS RESIDING OUTSIDE UNITED STATES OR RESIDENTS OF TERRITORIES.—Any

applicable individual shall be treated as having minimum essential coverage for any month—

“(A) if such month occurs during any period described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 911(d)(1) which is applicable to the individual, or

“(B) if such individual is a bona fide resident of any possession of the United States (as determined under section 937(a)) for such month.

“(5) INSURANCE-RELATED TERMS.—Any term used in this section which is also used in title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall have the same meaning as when used in such title.”.

(ii) Section 36B(c)(2)(B) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.—The term ‘coverage month’ shall not include any month with respect to an individual if for such month the individual is eligible for minimum essential coverage other than eligibility for coverage described in subsection (g)(1)(C) (relating to coverage in the individual market).”.

(iii) Clauses (i)(I) and (ii) of section 36B(c)(2)(C) of such Code are each amended by striking “section 5000A(f)(2)” and inserting “subsection (g)(2)”.

(iv)(I) Subclause (II) of section 36B(c)(2)(C)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “(within the meaning of section 5000A(e)(1)(B))”.

(II) Paragraph (2) of section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) REQUIRED CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (C)(i)(II), the term ‘required contribution’ means—

“(i) in the case of an individual eligible to purchase minimum essential coverage consisting of coverage through an eligible employer-sponsored plan, the portion of the annual premium which would be paid by the individual (without regard to whether paid through salary reduction or otherwise) for self-only coverage, or

“(ii) in the case of an individual eligible only to purchase minimum essential coverage described in subsection (g)(1)(C), the annual premium for the lowest cost bronze plan available in the individual market through the Exchange in the State in the rating area in which the individual resides (without regard to whether the individual purchased a qualified health plan through the Exchange), reduced by the amount of the credit allowable under subsection (a) for the taxable year (determined as if the individual was covered by a qualified health plan offered through the Exchange for the entire taxable year).”.

(v) Section 162(m)(6)(C)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “section 5000A(f)” and inserting “section 36B(g)”.

(vi) Subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1) of section 4980H of such Code are each amended by striking “section 5000A(f)(2)” and inserting “section 36B(g)(2)”.

(vii) Section 4980I(f)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “section 5000A(f)” and inserting “section 36B(g)”.

(viii) Section 6056(b)(2)(b) of such Code is amended by striking “section 5000A(f)(2)” and inserting “section 36B(g)(2)”.

(ix) The table of chapters of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 48.

(B) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.—

(i) Section 1251(a)(4)(B)(ii) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “section 500A(f)(2)” and inserting “section 36B(g)(2)”.

(ii) Section 1302(e)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“(2) INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR ENROLLMENT.—An individual is described in this paragraph for any plan year if the individual has not attained the age of 30 before the beginning of the plan year.”.

(iii) Section 1311(d)(4) of such Act is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(iv) Section 1312(d)(4) of such Act is amended by striking “section 5000A(f)” and inserting “section 36B(g)”.

(v) Section 1363(e)(1)(C) of such Act is amended—

(I) by striking “section 5000A(f)” and inserting “section 36B(g)”, and

(II) by striking “or is eligible for an employer-sponsored plan that is not affordable coverage (as determined under section 5000A(e)(2) of such Code)” and inserting “or who is eligible for an employer-sponsored plan and whose household income for the taxable year described in section 1412(b)(1)(B) is less than the amount of gross income specified in section 6012(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the taxpayer”.

(vi) Section 1332(a)(2)(D) of such Act is amended by striking “36B, 4980H, and 5000A” and inserting “36B and 4980H”.

(vii) Section 1401(c)(1)(A)(iii) of such Act is amended by striking “section 5000A(f)” and inserting “section 36B(g)”.

(viii) Section 1411(a) of such Act is amended—

(I) by inserting “and” at the end of paragraph (2),

(II) in paragraph (3)—

(aa) by striking “and section 5000A(e)(2)”, and

(bb) by striking “, and” and inserting a period, and

(III) by striking paragraph (4).

(ix) Section 1411(b)(4)(C) of such Act is amended by striking “5000A(e)(1)(B)” and inserting “36B(c)(2)(D)”.

(x) Section 1411(b) of such Act is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(xi) Section 1411(e)(4)(B) of such Act is amended by striking clause (iv).

(C) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2715(b)(3)(G)(i) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking “section 5000A(f)” and inserting “section 36B(g)”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(b) REPEAL OF REPORTING OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subpart D.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 6056(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(d) COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Secretary may provide that any return or statement required to be provided under this section may be provided as part of any return or statement required under section 6051.”.

(B) Section 6724(d)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by inserting “or” at the end of clause (xxiii), by striking clause (xxiv), and by redesignating clause (xxv) as clause (xxiv).

(C) Section 6724(d)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting “or” at the end of subparagraph (FF), by striking subparagraph (GG), and by redesignating subparagraph (HH) as subparagraph (GG).

(D) Subsection (c) of section 1502 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is repealed.

(E) The table of subparts for part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item relating to subpart D.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(c) TAXPAYER REFUND PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall implement a program under which taxpayers who have paid a penalty under section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any taxable year receive 1 payment in refund of all such penalties paid, without regard to whether or not an amended return is filed. Such payment shall be made not later than April 15, 2018.

(2) WAIVER OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Solely for purposes of claiming the refund under paragraph (1), the period prescribed by section 6511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to any payment of a penalty under section 5000A shall be extended until the date prescribed by law (including extensions) for filing the return of tax for the taxable year that includes December 31, 2017.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 270—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2017 AS “NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 270

Whereas ovarian cancer is the deadliest of all gynecologic cancers;

Whereas ovarian cancer is the fifth leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States;

Whereas, in 2017 in the United States, approximately 22,440 new cases of ovarian cancer will be diagnosed and 14,080 women will die of ovarian cancer;

Whereas the mortality rate for ovarian cancer has not significantly decreased since the “War on Cancer” was declared more than 40 years ago;

Whereas ¼ of women will die within 1 year of being diagnosed with ovarian cancer and more than ½ will die within 5 years of that diagnosis;

Whereas, while the mammogram can detect breast cancer and the Pap smear can detect cervical cancer, there is no reliable early detection test for ovarian cancer;

Whereas the lack of an early detection test means that approximately 80 percent of cases of ovarian cancer are detected at an advanced stage;

Whereas all women are at risk for ovarian cancer, but approximately 20 percent of women who are diagnosed with ovarian cancer have a hereditary predisposition to ovarian cancer, which places them at even higher risk;

Whereas scientists and physicians have uncovered changes in the BRCA genes that some women inherit from their parents, which may make those women 30 times more likely to develop ovarian cancer;

Whereas the family history of a woman has been found to play an important role in ac-

curately assessing the risk of that woman of developing ovarian cancer and medical experts believe that family history should be taken into consideration during the annual well-woman visit of any woman;

Whereas many experts in health prevention now recommend genetic testing for young women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer;

Whereas women who know that they are at high risk of breast and ovarian cancer may undertake prophylactic measures to help reduce the risk of developing those diseases;

Whereas, as of 2017, the Society of Gynecologic Oncology recommends that all women who are diagnosed with ovarian cancer receive counseling and genetic testing;

Whereas many people are unaware that the symptoms of ovarian cancer often include bloating, pelvic or abdominal pain, difficulty eating or feeling full quickly, urinary symptoms, and several other symptoms that are easily confused with other diseases;

Whereas awareness of the symptoms of ovarian cancer by women and health care providers can lead to a quicker diagnosis;

Whereas, in June 2007, the first national consensus statement on ovarian cancer symptoms was developed to provide consistency in describing symptoms to make it easier for women to learn and remember those symptoms; and

Whereas, each year during the month of September, the Ovarian Cancer Research Fund Alliance and community partners hold a number of events to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2017 as “National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month”; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 271—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL COMMUNITY GARDENING AWARENESS WEEK

Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

S. RES. 271

Whereas countless families in the United States live with hunger every day and do not have access to fresh produce in their neighborhoods;

Whereas community gardens conserve limited resources and promote sustainability;

Whereas community gardens provide an important and nutritious source of fresh produce donations for local food pantries and social service agencies;

Whereas community gardens enable individuals to gain control over the quality, variety, and cost of their food supply;

Whereas community gardening encourages individuals of diverse cultural and economic backgrounds to work together, foster a better sense of community, and improve the quality of their lives;

Whereas community-based youth and school gardening programs encourage personal self-esteem and healthy attitudes toward learning;

Whereas community gardening and greening projects provide a catalyst for neighborhood and community development;

Whereas community gardens reduce city heat and preserve open spaces for present and future generations;

Whereas community gardens and other green spaces—

(1) provide a more livable environment in municipalities throughout the United States; and

(2) present a positive local image to the residents of, and visitors to, a community;

Whereas community gardens help provide local food banks with fresh produce for individuals in need; and

Whereas the last week of September 2017 is an appropriate week to designate as “National Community Gardening Awareness Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Community Gardening Awareness Week, including—

(1) raising awareness of the importance of community gardens and urban agriculture;

(2) improving access to public land for the development of sustainable food projects;

(3) encouraging further growth of community gardens and other opportunities that increase food self-reliance, improve fitness, contribute to a cleaner environment, and enhance community development; and

(4) supporting cooperative efforts among Federal, State, and local governments and nonprofit organizations—

(A) to promote the development and expansion of community gardens; and

(B) to increase the accessibility of community gardens to disadvantaged population groups.

SENATE RESOLUTION 272—COMMEMORATING THE 230TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 272

Whereas, on September 17, 1787, the Constitution of the United States was signed by 39 delegates from 12 States;

Whereas the Constitution of the United States was subsequently ratified by each of the original 13 States;

Whereas James Madison and the other delegates drafted the Constitution of the United States “in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty” for the people of the United States;

Whereas the Constitution of the United States has provided the means and structure for the United States and the people of the United States to achieve a level of prosperity, liberty, security, and justice that is unparalleled among nations;

Whereas the contributions of the Constitution of the United States to the welfare of individuals reach far beyond the borders of the United States;

Whereas the Constitution of the United States—

(1) was the first permanent constitution in the world adopted by elected representatives;

(2) includes seminal ideas about individual rights, the separation of powers, and the rule of law; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States has been amended 27 times since its adoption and includes amendments that reflect the will of the people of the United States “to form a more perfect Union”, such

as amendments to recognize and protect individual rights, eliminate slavery, and expand the franchise;

Whereas the Senate continues to strive to preserve and strengthen the values and rights bestowed on the United States and the people of the United States by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the preservation in the hearts and minds of the people of the United States of the values and rights expressed in the Constitution of the United States would be advanced by an official recognition on September 17, 2017, of the 230th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) on September 17, 2017, commemorates the 230th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and respect, including by reading the Constitution of the United States and reflecting on the enduring structure of government built by the Founders and successive generations of people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 273—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 2017 AS “SICKLE CELL DISEASE AWARENESS MONTH” IN ORDER TO EDUCATE COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES ABOUT SICKLE CELL DISEASE AND THE NEED FOR RESEARCH, EARLY DETECTION METHODS, EFFECTIVE TREATMENTS, AND PREVENTATIVE CARE PROGRAMS WITH RESPECT TO SICKLE CELL DISEASE, COMPLICATIONS FROM SICKLE CELL DISEASE, AND CONDITIONS RELATED TO SICKLE CELL DISEASE

Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 273

Whereas sickle cell disease (referred to in this preamble as “SCD”) is an inherited blood disorder that is a major health problem in the United States and worldwide;

Whereas SCD causes the rapid destruction of sickle cells, which results in multiple medical complications, including anemia, jaundice, gallstones, strokes, restricted blood flow, damaged tissue in the liver, spleen, and kidneys, and death;

Whereas SCD causes episodes of considerable pain in the arms, legs, chest, and abdomen of an individual;

Whereas SCD affects an estimated 100,000 individuals in the United States;

Whereas approximately 1,000 babies are born with SCD each year in the United States, with the disease occurring in approximately 1 in 365 newborn African-American infants and 1 in 16,300 newborn Hispanic-American infants, and is found in individuals of Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, Asian, and Indian origin;

Whereas more than 3,000,000 individuals in the United States have the sickle cell trait and 1 in 13 African-Americans carries the trait;

Whereas there is a 1 in 4 chance that a child born to parents who both have the sickle cell trait will have the disease;

Whereas the life expectancy of an individual with SCD is often severely limited;

Whereas, while hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (commonly known as “HSCT”) is currently the only cure for SCD and advances in treating the associated complications of SCD have occurred, more research is needed to find widely available treatments and cures to help patients with SCD; and

Whereas September 2017 has been designated as Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month in order to educate communities across the United States about SCD, including early detection methods, effective treatments, and preventative care programs with respect to SCD, complications from SCD, and conditions related to SCD: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, events, and activities during Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month to raise public awareness of preventative care programs, treatments, and other patient services for those suffering from sickle cell disease, complications from sickle cell disease, and conditions related to sickle cell disease.

SENATE RESOLUTION 274—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL RETIREMENT SECURITY WEEK, INCLUDING RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE VARIOUS TAX-PREFERRED RETIREMENT VEHICLES, INCREASING PERSONAL FINANCIAL LITERACY, AND ENGAGING THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE KEYS TO SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING RETIREMENT SECURITY THROUGHOUT THEIR LIFETIMES

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 274

Whereas people in the United States are living longer and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;

Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the sole source of retirement income for families;

Whereas recent data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in the United States—

(1) only approximately % of workers or the spouses of those workers are saving for retirement; and

(2) the amount that workers have saved for retirement is much less than the amount those workers need to adequately fund their retirement years;

Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is important so that those workers understand the need to save for retirement;

Whereas saving for retirement is a key component of overall financial health and security during retirement years and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;

Whereas many workers may not—

(1) be aware of the various options in saving for retirement; or

(2) have focused on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement and successfully achieving retirement security;

Whereas, although many employees have access through their employers to defined benefit and defined contribution plans to assist the employees in preparing for retirement, many of those employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;

Whereas saving for retirement is necessary even during economic downturns or market declines, which makes continued contributions all the more important;

Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from developing personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies that take advantage of tax-preferred retirement savings vehicles;

Whereas effectively and sustainably withdrawing retirement resources throughout the retirement years of an individual is as important and crucial as saving and accumulating funds for retirement; and

Whereas the week of October 15 through October 21, 2017, has been designated as “National Retirement Security Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Week, including raising public awareness of the importance of saving adequately for retirement;

(2) acknowledges the need to raise public awareness of a variety of tax-preferred retirement vehicles that are used by many people in the United States but could be used by more; and

(3) calls on States, localities, schools, universities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Retirement Security Week with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing the retirement savings and personal financial literacy of all people in the United States, thereby enhancing the retirement security of the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 275—CONGRATULATING NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY ON THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE UNIVERSITY

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 275

Whereas Northeastern Illinois University has served the Chicagoland area and beyond for 150 years, having graduated nearly 80,000 students who have—

(1) strengthened the local workforce;

(2) made a positive difference in their communities; and

(3) transformed the lives of others, just as the University has done for those students;

Whereas Northeastern Illinois University is regarded as the most diverse regional uni-

versity in the Midwest and is designated by the Department of Education as a Hispanic-Serving Institution;

Whereas Northeastern Illinois University is known for—

(1) having the safest campus in the State of Illinois;

(2) being among the best institutions in the United States for adult learners; and

(3) the fact that graduates of the University have the ninth-lowest amount of student loan debt among graduates of 4-year colleges and universities in the United States; and

Whereas Northeastern Illinois University offers more than 80 undergraduate and graduate programs in the arts, sciences, education, and business at 5 locations in the Chicago metropolitan area, including in the North Park and Bronzeville neighborhoods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Northeastern Illinois University on the sesquicentennial of the University; and

(2) extends best wishes to Northeastern Illinois University for continued success and achievement.

SENATE RESOLUTION 276—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2017 AS “PULMONARY FIBROSIS AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 276

Whereas pulmonary fibrosis is a debilitating and ultimately fatal lung condition that causes progressive scarring in the lungs and has no definitive cause;

Whereas as many as 200,000 individuals in the United States are known to suffer from pulmonary fibrosis, the majority of whom are between the ages of 50 and 75;

Whereas the average life expectancy from the diagnosis of the idiopathic form of pulmonary fibrosis is just 2.8 years, and as many as 80 percent of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis patients die within 5 years of diagnosis;

Whereas pulmonary fibrosis takes the lives of 40,000 or more individuals in the United States each year—approximately 1 individual every 13 minutes;

Whereas many patients afflicted with pulmonary fibrosis are misdiagnosed for 1 year or longer after the patients are presenting with pulmonary fibrosis symptoms;

Whereas, as of July 2017, there are no confirmed biomarkers for screening and testing for pulmonary fibrosis;

Whereas a cure, treatment, or drug to halt the fibrotic process in pulmonary fibrosis does not yet exist;

Whereas the symptoms of pulmonary fibrosis vary from person to person and include shortness of breath, a dry cough, fatigue, weight loss, and aching muscles and joints;

Whereas volunteers, researchers, caregivers, and medical professionals are working to improve the quality of life for individuals with pulmonary fibrosis and for the families of those individuals; and

Whereas developing more effective treatments for pulmonary fibrosis and providing access to quality care to individuals with pulmonary fibrosis requires increased research, education, and community support services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2017 as “Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support more robust and accelerated research to develop more effective treatments for pulmonary fibrosis and to ultimately find a cure for the disease;

(4) recognizes the courage and contributions of individuals with pulmonary fibrosis who participate in vital clinical trials to advance the knowledge of the disease; and

(5) commends the dedication of organizations, volunteers, researchers, and millions of individuals in the United States and abroad working to improve the quality of life for individuals with pulmonary fibrosis and the families of those individuals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 277—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 25 THROUGH 29, 2017, AS “NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY WEEK”

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 277

Whereas the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development reports that approximately 36,000,000 adults in the United States lack the basic literacy and numeracy necessary to succeed at home, in the workplace, and in society;

Whereas the literacy of the people of the United States is essential for the economic and societal well-being of the United States;

Whereas the United States reaps the economic benefits of individuals who improve their literacy, numeracy, and English-language skills;

Whereas literacy and educational skills are necessary for individuals to fully benefit from the range of opportunities available in the United States;

Whereas the economy and position of the United States in the world marketplace depend on having a literate, skilled population;

Whereas the unemployment rate in the United States is highest among those without a high school diploma or an equivalent credential, demonstrating that education is important to economic recovery;

Whereas the educational skills of the parents of a child and the practice of reading to a child have a direct impact on the educational success of the child;

Whereas parental involvement in the education of a child is a key predictor of the success of a child, and the level of parental involvement in the education of a child increases as the educational level of the parent increases;

Whereas parents who participate in family literacy programs become more involved in the education of their children and gain the tools necessary to obtain a job or find better employment;

Whereas, as a result of family literacy programs, the lives of children become more stable, and the success of children in the classroom and in future endeavors becomes more likely;

Whereas adults need to be part of a long-term solution to the educational challenges faced by the people of the United States;

Whereas many older people in the United States lack the reading, math, or English-

language skills necessary to read a prescription and follow medical instructions, which endangers the lives of the older people and the lives of their loved ones;

Whereas many individuals who are unemployed, underemployed, or receive public assistance lack the literacy skills necessary to obtain and keep a job, to continue their education, or to participate in job training programs;

Whereas many high school dropouts do not have the literacy skills necessary to complete their education, transition to postsecondary education or career and technical training, or obtain a job;

Whereas a large portion of individuals in prison have low educational skills and prisoners without educational skills are more likely to return to prison once released;

Whereas many immigrants in the United States do not have the literacy skills necessary to succeed in the United States; and

Whereas National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week highlights the need to ensure that each individual in the United States has the literacy skills necessary to succeed at home, at work, and in society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 25 through 29, 2017, as “National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week” to raise public awareness about the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy;

(2) encourages people across the United States to support programs to assist individuals in need of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs;

(3) recognizes the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs; and

(4) calls on public, private, and nonprofit entities to support increased access to adult education and family literacy programs to ensure a literate society.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1107. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3823, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1108. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. KENNEDY)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3823, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1107. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3823, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ FEDERAL AUTHORITY OVER INTER-STATE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14501(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “Paragraph (1)” and inserting “Paragraphs (1) and (6)”;

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “Paragraph (1)” and inserting “Paragraphs (1) and (6)”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State, a political subdivision of a State, or a political authority composed of 2 or more States may not enact or enforce a law, regulation, or other provision having the force and effect of law relating to meal or rest breaks applicable to employees whose hours of service are subject to regulation by the Secretary under section 31502.

“(B) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit the provisions under paragraph (1).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall have the force and effect as if enacted on the date of the enactment of the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-305).

SA 1108. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. KENNEDY)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3823, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike title IV.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 28, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., in 216 Hart Senate Office Building, in order to conduct a hearing entitled “Rural Development and Energy Programs: Perspectives for the 2018 Farm Bill.”

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 28, 2017, at 10 a.m., in closed session, to receive a briefing on North Korea.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 28, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “Evaluating Sanctions Enforcement and Policy Options on North Korea: Administration Perspectives.”

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 28, at 10:30 a.m. in room 216 of the Capitol.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 28, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION OPERATION, SAFETY AND SECURITY

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 28, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my science fellows Michelle Romo and Beth Wester be granted floor privileges today and for the rest of their fellowship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Arnold Solamillos, who is a Brookings Fellow on my staff on loan from the Social Security Administration, during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE AMERICAN LEGION 100TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2519, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2519) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 2519) was passed.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAIN STREET CYBERSECURITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 217, S. 770.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 770) to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to disseminate resources to help reduce small business cybersecurity risks, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Making Available Information Now to Strengthen Trust and Resilience and Enhance Enterprise Technology Cybersecurity Act of 2017” or the “MAIN STREET Cybersecurity Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Small businesses play a vital role in the economy of the United States, accounting for 54 percent of all United States sales and 55 percent of jobs in the United States.

(2) Attacks targeting small and medium businesses account for a high percentage of cyberattacks in the United States. Sixty percent of small businesses that suffer a cyberattack are out of business within 6 months, according to the National Cyber Security Alliance.

(3) The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7421 et seq.) calls on the National Institute of Standards and Technology to facilitate and support a voluntary public-private partnership to reduce cybersecurity risks to critical infrastructure. Such a partnership continues to play a key role in improving the cyber resilience of the United States and making cyberspace safer.

(4) There is a need to develop simplified resources that are consistent with the partnership described in paragraph (3) that improves its use by small businesses.

SEC. 3. IMPROVING CYBERSECURITY OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(2) RESOURCES.—The term “resources” means guidelines, tools, best practices, standards, methodologies, and other ways of providing information.

(3) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term “small business concern” has the meaning given

such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(b) SMALL BUSINESS CYBERSECURITY.—Section 2(e)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272(e)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vii), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (ix); and

(3) by inserting after clause (vii) the following:

“(viii) consider small business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)); and”.

(c) DISSEMINATION OF RESOURCES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in carrying out section 2(e)(1)(A)(viii) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, as added by subsection (b) of this Act, in consultation with the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Director considers appropriate, shall disseminate clear and concise resources for small business concerns to help reduce their cybersecurity risks.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Director shall ensure that the resources disseminated pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) are generally applicable and usable by a wide range of small business concerns;

(B) vary with the nature and size of the implementing small business concern, and the nature and sensitivity of the data collected or stored on the information systems or devices of the implementing small business concern;

(C) include elements that promote awareness of simple, basic controls, a workplace cybersecurity culture, and third party stakeholder relationships, to assist small business concerns in mitigating common cybersecurity risks;

(D) are technology-neutral and can be implemented using technologies that are commercial and off-the-shelf; and

(E) are based on international standards to the extent possible, and are consistent with the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(3) NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The Director shall ensure that the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) are consistent with the efforts of the Director under section 401 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7451).

(4) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Director, to the extent practicable, shall consider any methods included in the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 1841(a)(3)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328).

(5) VOLUNTARY RESOURCES.—The use of the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) shall be considered voluntary.

(6) UPDATES.—The Director shall review and, if necessary, update the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) in accordance with the requirements under paragraph (2).

(7) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director and such heads of other Federal agencies as the Director considers appropriate shall each make prominently available to the public on the Director’s or head’s Internet website, as the case may be, information about the resources and all updates to them disseminated under paragraph (1). The Director and the heads shall each ensure that the information they respectively make prominently available is consistent, clear, and concise.

(d) CONSISTENCY OF RESOURCES PUBLISHED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—If a Federal agency publishes resources to help small business concerns

reduce their cybersecurity risks, the head of such Federal agency, to the degree practicable, shall make such resources consistent with the resources disseminated under subsection (c)(1).

(e) OTHER FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to supersede, alter, or otherwise affect any cybersecurity requirements applicable to Federal agencies.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered; that the Schatz amendment No. 977, as modified with the changes at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 977), as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 7, beginning on line 14, strike “Sixty” and all that follows through line 17.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 770), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 770

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Making Available Information Now to Strengthen Trust and Resilience and Enhance Enterprise Technology Cybersecurity Act of 2017” or the “MAIN STREET Cybersecurity Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Small businesses play a vital role in the economy of the United States, accounting for 54 percent of all United States sales and 55 percent of jobs in the United States.

(2) Attacks targeting small and medium businesses account for a high percentage of cyberattacks in the United States.

(3) The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7421 et seq.) calls on the National Institute of Standards and Technology to facilitate and support a voluntary public-private partnership to reduce cybersecurity risks to critical infrastructure. Such a partnership continues to play a key role in improving the cyber resilience of the United States and making cyberspace safer.

(4) There is a need to develop simplified resources that are consistent with the partnership described in paragraph (3) that improves its use by small businesses.

SEC. 3. IMPROVING CYBERSECURITY OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(2) RESOURCES.—The term “resources” means guidelines, tools, best practices, standards, methodologies, and other ways of providing information.

(3) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term “small business concern” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(b) **SMALL BUSINESS CYBERSECURITY.**—Section 2(e)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272(e)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vii), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (ix); and

(3) by inserting after clause (vii) the following:

“(viii) consider small business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)); and”.

(c) **DISSEMINATION OF RESOURCES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in carrying out section 2(e)(1)(A)(viii) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, as added by subsection (b) of this Act, in consultation with the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Director considers appropriate, shall disseminate clear and concise resources for small business concerns to help reduce their cybersecurity risks.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Director shall ensure that the resources disseminated pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) are generally applicable and usable by a wide range of small business concerns;

(B) vary with the nature and size of the implementing small business concern, and the nature and sensitivity of the data collected or stored on the information systems or devices of the implementing small business concern;

(C) include elements that promote awareness of simple, basic controls, a workplace cybersecurity culture, and third party stakeholder relationships, to assist small business concerns in mitigating common cybersecurity risks;

(D) are technology-neutral and can be implemented using technologies that are commercial and off-the-shelf; and

(E) are based on international standards to the extent possible, and are consistent with the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(3) **NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.**—The Director shall ensure that the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) are consistent with the efforts of the Director under section 401 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7451).

(4) **SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Director, to the extent practicable, shall consider any methods included in the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 1841(a)(3)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328).

(5) **VOLUNTARY RESOURCES.**—The use of the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) shall be considered voluntary.

(6) **UPDATES.**—The Director shall review and, if necessary, update the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) in accordance with the requirements under paragraph (2).

(7) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Director and such heads of other Federal agencies as the Director considers appropriate shall each make prominently available to the public on the Director’s or head’s Internet website, as the case may be, information about the resources and all updates to them disseminated under paragraph (1). The Director and the heads shall each ensure that the information they respectively make prominently available is consistent, clear, and concise.

(d) **CONSISTENCY OF RESOURCES PUBLISHED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—If a Federal agency publishes resources to help small business concerns reduce their cybersecurity risks, the head of such Federal agency, to the degree practicable, shall make such resources consistent with the resources disseminated under subsection (c)(1).

(e) **OTHER FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to supersede, alter, or otherwise affect any cybersecurity requirements applicable to Federal agencies.

NATIONAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 267 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 267) designating September 2017 as “National Workforce Development Month.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 267) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 25, 2017, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 272, S. Res. 273, S. Res. 274, S. Res. 275, S. Res. 276, and S. Res. 277.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

SIGNING AUTHORITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader and the senior Senator from Alaska be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions on Friday, September 29, 2017, through Monday, October 2, 2017.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1894

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1894) to exempt Puerto Rico from the coastwise laws of the United States (commonly known as the “Jones Act”).

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, October 2; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Pai nomination, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on the Pai nomination expire at 5:30 p.m.; finally, that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate vote on confirmation of the Pai nomination with no intervening action or debate and, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2017, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:17 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 2, 2017, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

THOMAS HARKER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE SUSAN J. RABERN.

ROBERT H. MCMAHON, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE DAVID J. BERTEAU, RESIGNED.

JOHN P. ROTH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE RICARDO A. AGUILERA, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ROBERT HUNTER KURTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE SANDRA BROOKS HENRIQUEZ, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

BRUCE LANDSBERG, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2022, VICE CHRISTOPHER A. HART, TERM EXPIRING.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

DANA BAIOTTO, OF OHIO, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 2017, VICE MARIETTA S. ROBINSON, TERM EXPIRING.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

RAYMOND MARTINEZ, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, VICE THOMAS F. SCOTT DARLING III.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

KENNETH E. ALLEN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2021, VICE C. PETER MAHURIN, TERM EXPIRED.

A. D. FRAZIER, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2022, VICE VERA LYNN EVANS, TERM EXPIRED.

JEFFREY SMITH, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2022, VICE MARILYN A. BROWN, TERM EXPIRED.

JAMES R. THOMPSON III, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2021, VICE JOE H. RITCH, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

IRWIN STEVEN GOLDSTEIN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY, VICE RICHARD STENGEL, RESIGNED.

SEAN P. LAWLER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF OF PROTOCOL, AND TO HAVE THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE, VICE PETER A. SELFRIEDGE.

JAMES RANDOLPH EVANS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO LUXEMBOURG.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

LINDA A. PUCHALA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JAMES BLEW, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PLANNING, EVALUATION, AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE CARMELO MARTIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

NORMAN EUELL ARFLACK, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PARKER LOREN CARL, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHAEL T. BAYLOUS, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN DALE POSTER, TERM EXPIRED.

DAVID G. JOLLEY, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JAMES THOMAS FOWLER, RETIRED.

DANIEL R. MCKITTRICK, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DENNIS J. ERBY, TERM EXPIRED.

JESSE SEROYER, JR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ARTHUR DARROW BAYLOR, RETIRED.

ERIN ANGELA NEALY COX, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE SARAH R. SALDANA, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

RYAN T. HOLTE, OF OHIO, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE NANCY B. FIRESTONE, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DUANE A. KEES, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE WILLIAM CONNER ELDRIDGE, RESIGNED.

MATTHEW D. KRUEGER, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JAMES L. SANTELLE, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

HOWARD C. NIELSON, JR., OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, VICE BRIAN THEODORE STEWART, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CHRISTINA E. NOLAN, OF VERMONT, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ERIC STEVEN MILLER, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 28, 2017:

THE JUDICIARY

RALPH R. ERICKSON, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ROBERT J. HIGDON, JR., OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

J. CODY HILAND, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JOSHUA J. MINKLER, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

BYUNG J. PAK, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN R. BASS, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN.

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR., OF UTAH, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

JUSTIN HICKS SIBERELL, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF BAHRAIN.

A. WESS MITCHELL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EUROPEAN AND EURASIAN AFFAIRS).

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL R. FENZEL

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JACQUELINE D. VAN OVOST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. JEFFERY D. AEBISCHER
COL. NATHAN B. ALHOLINNA
COL. BORIS R. ARMSTRONG
COL. KIMBERLY A. BAUMANN
COL. ROBERT L. BELL
COL. SHAWN N. BRATTON
COL. JEFFREY L. BUTLER

COL. MICHAEL E. CALLAHAN
COL. KEVIN J. CAMPBELL
COL. THOMAS S. CAUTHEN
COL. LAWRENCE L. CHRISTENSEN
COL. SHAWN A. CLOUTHER
COL. DARWIN L. CRAIG
COL. ROBERT C. DESKO
COL. KEVIN M. DONOVAN
COL. BOBBI J. DOORENBOS
COL. DAVID M. DZIOBKOWSKI
COL. RANDAL K. EFFERSON
COL. HOWARD L. EISSLER III
COL. SHAWN D. FORD
COL. JED J. FRENCH
COL. DANIEL E. GABRIELLI
COL. MARK P. GAUL
COL. RAINER G. GOMEZ
COL. PATRICK M. GUINEE
COL. PENNY C. HODGES-GOETZ
COL. JEREMY C. HORN
COL. CASSANDRA D. HOWARD
COL. PAUL D. JOHNSON
COL. EDWARD S. JONES
COL. GARY W. KIRK
COL. HEIDI L. KJOS
COL. MEAGHAN Q. LECLERC
COL. GREGOR J. LEIST
COL. SUZANNE B. LIPCAMAN
COL. KEITH G. MACDONALD
COL. ROLF E. MAMMEN
COL. GERALD E. MCDONALD
COL. CHRISTOPHER G. MCGRAW
COL. MICHAEL R. MORGAN
COL. REBECCA L. O'CONNOR
COL. DUKE A. PIRAK
COL. JEFFREY L. RYAN
COL. JON S. SAFSTROM
COL. WILLIAM L. SPARROW
COL. JAMES R. STEVENSON, JR.
COL. JEFFREY D. STOREY
COL. BRYAN J. TEFF
COL. EDWARD L. VAUGHAN IV
COL. APRIL D. VOGEL
COL. CHARLES M. WALKER
COL. CHRISTOPHER S. WALKER
COL. DAVID A. WEISHAAR
COL. WENDY B. WENKE
COL. GREGORY T. WHITE
COL. BRENT W. WRIGHT
COL. WILLIAM T. YATES
COL. DANIEL S. YENCHESKY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN E. CARDWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOSEPH D'COSTA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL A. BILLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DANIEL J. CHRISTIAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. KENNETH H. MOORE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MATTHEW P. EASLEY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHNNY R. BASS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. TONY L. WRIGHT

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF STEPHEN J. AUGUSTINE, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF WILLIAM J. VIT, JR., TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF THERESA A. JONES, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES S. SHIGEKANE AND ENDING WITH ANDREW H. STEPHAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC AALDERINK AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH R. ZITO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH IAN S. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JOAN DIAZ ZUNIGA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER L. BAKER AND ENDING WITH DORIAN R. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF DERRICK C. LONG, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NATALIE E. VANATTA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN F. LOPES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TERRANCE R. LATSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ROBERT P. L. BAILEY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARIAH C. SMITH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARK W. CANARY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID E. MEACHER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER D. MCDEVITT, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRUCE M. COCCOLI AND ENDING WITH SCOTT J. SHERIDAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS A. BROOKS AND ENDING WITH D012739, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDWARD A. JARRETT AND ENDING WITH CASEY T. SCHOBBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CURTIS J. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH BRADLEY A. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MEGAN L. BUSTIN, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF ROBERT M. BARCLAY, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JASON A. TEWS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER P. CARROLL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GABRIEL PEREZ AND ENDING WITH ERIC R. TRUEMPER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTON A. ADAM AND ENDING WITH YING P. ZHONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADRIENNE T. BENTON AND ENDING WITH AARON R. WESSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SALAHHUDIN A. ADENKHALIF AND ENDING WITH VICTOR T. F. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SANTIAGO A. ABADAM II AND ENDING WITH JAIME M. YORK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAH A. AGUIERO AND ENDING WITH DENNIS E. WESTMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOKO A. ABUBAKAR AND ENDING WITH YUI Y. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BROOKE T. AHLSTROM AND ENDING WITH MARK C. WARNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MIGUEL M. ALAMPAY AND ENDING WITH ZACHARY A. ZANFES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on September 28, 2017 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

RYAN DEAN NEWMAN, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, VICE ALISSA M. STARZAK, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON APRIL 28, 2017.

DAVID G. EHRRHART, OF TEXAS, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE GORDON O. TANNER, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JUNE 12, 2017.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF
JEFFREY H. BROTMAN

HON. SUZAN K. DELBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of my friend and constituent, Mr. Jeffrey H. Brotman, who recently passed away at the age of 74.

Jeff was a Washington state native well known for his business accomplishments. From growing up working in his father's stores to opening Bottoms and eventually as a founder of Costco, Jeff's work made a significant impact around the world.

But he wasn't just a business leader. Jeff's generosity and tireless dedication to bettering our community will have a lasting impact on the Puget Sound region.

Jeff was a dedicated Husky and served as a University of Washington trustee. He also chaired the Million Dollar Round Table, working to bring people together to help others today and long into the future. In recognition of his work, he received the 2014 United Way Beacon Award for Visionary Philanthropy.

I would like to commemorate Jeff's lifetime of achievements. He will be remembered by his uplifting demeanor and abiding optimism, and as a committed community servant whose important work will continue to echo in years to come. My thoughts are with his wife, Susan, his children Justin and Amanda, and all of his family and friends.

RWANDA: DEMOCRACY THWARTED

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I held a hearing on democratic governance in Rwanda. Rwanda is an important African ally. This East African nation has been a valuable contributor to peacekeeping in Africa and is the sixth largest troop and police contributor to United Nations missions. However, reports have increased about the status of human rights and rule of law inside Rwanda and its efforts to silence critics living abroad. This hearing will examine the future of democracy and rule of law in Rwanda in light of persistent criticism of its government's behavior at home and on the international stage.

Rwanda is a constitutional republic dominated by a strong presidency. In 2015, the country held a constitutional referendum in which an estimated 98 percent of registered voters participated. Approximately 98 percent of those who voted endorsed a set of amendments that included provisions that would

allow the president to run for up to three additional terms in office, meaning Paul Kagame could be President for more than 20 more years. His election to a third term in August 2017 was achieved with 99 percent of the vote.

A popular politician in the United States or most other countries would be unlikely in most circumstances to win nearly 100 percent of the vote in a free, fair and competitive election. Consequently, it is difficult to believe that even someone as widely admired as President Kagame has been could be that popular. Such suspicion is stoked by reports of vote irregularities and actions by the Rwandan government to restrain opposition activism and enact stringent controls on opposition activism, including legal restrictions on civil liberties and stringent controls on the free flow of information.

An example of why there is skepticism about the nature of free elections in Rwanda is the case of businesswoman Diane Rwigara, who ran as a critic of Kagame. Days after she launched her campaign, nude photos allegedly of her were leaked onto the Internet in an attempt to discredit her. She said she would not be intimidated and continued her campaign. On July 7th, the National Electoral Commission disqualified her and two other candidates on technical grounds, alleging that they had not collected enough valid signatures. Amnesty International said that the election would be held in a "climate of fear and repression" and the commission's decision was criticized by the U.S. State Department and the European Union.

Following the election, Rwigara launched an activist group called the People Salvation Movement to challenge the regime on its human rights record, saying that the country's parliament is little more than a rubber-stamp. Within days, her home was raided, and she was arrested for forgery and tax evasion. Although she was released, Rwigara, was re-arrested for forgery and offences against state security; her mother and her sister also were subsequently arrested for tax evasion.

This is not the only case of harsh punishment of those who criticize the Kagame government. David Himbara, one of our witnesses today, was a close adviser to President Kagame and has an inside view of how this government deals with those seen as failing the government or those who disagree. He testified on the inner workings of the Kagame government at our May 20, 2015, hearing on Rwanda. Another witness at that May 2015 hearing was Robert Higirow, who told a chilling account of being solicited to commit the murders of two formerly high-ranking military and security officials. That account was backed by authenticated recordings of Rwanda's security chief offering large sums of money for the murders. In fact, after Higirow testified about this offer, he had to move from Belgium to the United States because his life was in danger.

Both of our Rwandan witnesses have new information that will be important for our government's policy toward Rwanda.

During a staff delegation to South Africa last year, two of my staff spoke with officials in the Government of South Africa, which was highly offended that the Rwandan government would be involved in the murder of a dissident on New Year's Eve 2013. My staff also spoke with Rwandan refugees in South Africa who reported being afraid of officials at the Rwandan embassy in South Africa, who they said had threatened them for seeking asylum.

Again, Rwanda is not your typical dictatorship in which all people suffer under an unpopular leader who does not provide for social services or security. Many Rwandans apparently genuinely feel the government is acting in their interest, especially in providing for inter-ethnic harmony. It is this anomaly we seek to better understand through today's hearing.

My office has compiled a report on our government's human rights issues with Rwanda, and we are due to discuss these matters with them further. We would be a poor ally if we did not caution the Rwandan government about human rights abuses the international community cites, including governments in Africa. We hope these abuses can be stopped, but until such time as they are, we cannot ignore them and must bring them up in our interactions with the Government of Rwanda whether or not they readily accept the view others have of their behavior. It is in their interest and ours that we do so.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING
JEROME MILEUR

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, today I remember and honor the life of Jerome Mileur who passed away on September 5 this year.

Jerry was born in Murphysboro, Illinois in 1934 where he honed a love of government, politics, baseball and corny humor punctuated with comedic puns. A loyal son of Illinois, Jerry earned undergraduate and graduate degrees from his beloved Southern Illinois University where he served for many years on the board of directors of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute.

An accomplished author and editor, Jerry joined the Political Science faculty of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in 1967 where his teaching and research focused on U.S. political parties and elections for nearly four decades. He served as chair of the Department of Political Science, received the UMass Amherst Chancellor's Medal, founded

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

the Jackie Robinson Initiative which marked the 50th anniversary of baseball's integration and advised a cadre of doctoral students.

So many people knew Jerry's passion for baseball. He could be seen wearing a baseball cap with a pencil in hand to keep score at nearly every game he attended in person, and he was the longtime owner of the Harrisburg Senators minor league baseball franchise. As a diehard Cubs fan myself, Mr. Speaker, I must say Jerry's one irredeemable feature was his passionate devotion to the St. Louis Cardinals. In all seriousness, though, Jerry's historical study of the St. Louis Cardinals led to the publishing of two books about the Cardinals, and he finished the manuscript for a third book just days before his death.

Jerry's commitment to his communities, both in Illinois and in Massachusetts, could be evidenced by his governmental and political activity, his substantial support for the arts, and his longstanding weekly meals and happy hours with friends of all ages.

On behalf of all of Jerry's countless friends and associates, I just want to thank him for all he has done for the people of Illinois and our country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we might all keep in our thoughts and prayers the Mileur family and friends as they mourn their loss. In that spirit, I celebrate Jerry's life and think about what an impact that life made on so many people.

DLA & COMPANY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud DLA & Company for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Chamber Business of the Year Award. This award recognizes businesses or individuals for their contribution to the community, and are a positive reflection of the City of Wheat Ridge's values.

DLA & Company was founded by Dale Anderson in 1985 as an independent full-service financial planning firm committed to helping individuals and business owners pursue their financial goals. DLA & Company was one of the founding businesses of the Wheat Ridge Chamber of Commerce. Dale chaired the Leads Group, and is a member of the Wheat Ridge Business Association, the West Chamber of Commerce and the High Plains Drifters Charter Club of the International Federation of Fly Fishers.

I applaud Dale Anderson for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate him on his success.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BOLIVAR
HIGH SCHOOL FISHING TEAM

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Bolivar High School Fishing

Team and their recent victory in the National Youth Fishing Association (NYFA) South Division Championship.

Bolivar High School anglers, Andrew Johnson and John Hubbert, emerged as champions of the high school division on Sunday, July 16, 2017.

Taking place at the Pomme de Terre Lake, the NYFA South Division event brought 290 high school and middle school teams to southern Missouri where the anglers from Bolivar took first place. John and Andrew not only brought home a trophy but \$2,000 worth of scholarship money as well.

I am honored to both recognize and congratulate Andrew and John, along with the Bolivar High School Fishing Team, on this terrific achievement. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating this team and these two individuals on their outstanding achievements.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LUKE
KENLEY FOR HIS SERVICE TO
INDIANA

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the retirement of Senator Luke Kenley from the Indiana State Senate after 25 years. For decades Senator Kenley has served not only his constituents in Indiana's 20th Senate district, but has served our state and our nation. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Senator Kenley's commitment to making our Hoosier home and our country a better, safer, place to live.

The oldest of eight children, Howard "Luke" Kenley is a life-long Hoosier and was raised in Hamilton County. He and his siblings split time between Noblesville during the school year and working summers at his grandparents' west Texas cattle ranch in Ft. Stockton. Senator Kenley graduated from Noblesville High School as their senior class president in 1963, where he met his high school sweetheart and future wife, Sally. Senator Kenley then attended Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, my alma mater. He graduated in the class of 1967 earning his bachelor's degree in economics. Following graduation from Miami, he went on to Harvard to pursue his law degree. Senator Kenley left law school in 1969 during the fourth year of the Vietnam war to enroll in officer candidate school (OCS) where he graduated first in his class with the rank of Lieutenant. After completing OCS, Senator Kenley returned to Harvard to finish his law degree in 1972. Senator Kenley then returned to Noblesville to start his career and begin a family with his wife, Sally.

Senator Kenley practiced business law in Indianapolis for two years, after which he left to run the family business, founded in 1940 by his grandfather R.A. Kenley. Under his leadership Kenley Supermarkets, in Noblesville, grew tremendously from 20 employees and \$2 million in yearly sales to two stores and 175

employees with \$16 million in yearly sales. Senator Kenley managed operations from 1974 to 1998, at which time Marsh Supermarkets purchased the business. In addition to his time at the helm of Kenley Supermarkets, Senator Kenley served as the Noblesville City Court judge at the urging of Hamilton County Republican leaders. In 1990, after 15 years and 40,000 cases, Senator Kenley retired from the bench. It was not long before he was again asked to serve. In 1992, Senator Kenley was tapped to fill the vacancy in state Senate campaign in his home district. Senator Kenley won the seat and has served with distinction ever since his first term.

He earned respect from his peers during his very first term and he was awarded "Freshman Legislator of the Year". During his career in the Senate, Senator Kenley worked tirelessly on the Tax and Fiscal Policy committee to make Indiana a fiscally responsible and affordable state. He is responsible for pushing through the largest tax cut in Indiana's history, while simultaneously leading the charge on welfare reform. His budgetary talents led him to the chairmanship of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and in turn led him to become one of the key architects of the Indiana state budget. This year Indiana will once again have a balanced budget, including provisions for a long term road maintenance plan and no tax increases. During his eight-year tenure as chairman, Indiana has seen its reserves grow to two billion dollars, while also eliminating excess taxes. Senator Kenley, in addition to his work on the budget, sat on the Education and Career Development Committee. He consistently pushed for continued K-12 funding as well as school choice. During his tenure, Senator Kenley helped to craft the Community Transition Program, which seeks to create a better transition back to society for offenders following their release from prison. Continuing with his care for all life, Senator Kenley's determination in protecting the unborn has led Indiana to be one of the most pro-life states in the nation. Senator Kenley was recognized for his numerous contributions in both 2013 with a Sagamore of the Wabash as well as in 2014 through the Distinguished Public Official Award from Ivy Tech Community College, well-deserved recognitions indeed.

During his vibrant career, Luke also served as the Board President for the Noblesville Boys and Girls Club while also maintaining active memberships in the Noblesville Chamber of Commerce, the United Way of Central Indiana, Elks Lodge No. 576, the American Legion, the Hamilton County 50 club, and the First United Methodist Church of Noblesville. In 2004, he acted as the coordinator for Hamilton County Veteran's Organization Vietnam Wall Recreation Activities. Senator Kenley and his wife Sally's crowning achievement have been helping establish the Noblesville Education Foundation, which provides access to financial and material resources for Noblesville teachers. In addition to the Foundation, they created the "Strings" music program for Noblesville schools. He also holds annual leadership conferences at the State House for high school senior class presidents from his district about the importance of public service. Senator Kenley says "It's important for our young people to think about public service as

part of what they're going to contribute . . . It's part of the commitment to the success of our society." He says for democracy to work, "Everybody's got to pitch in".

Senator Kenley's lifetime of service to his community, through his military service, as Noblesville City Court judge, as state Senator, and as the architect of our state budget and our state's fiscal stability, he has been invaluable not only to his district but to our whole state and nation. Thanks to his dedication to fiscal responsibility, to K-12 education, and numerous other projects throughout his career, Indiana is a great place to live and do business. On behalf of all Hoosiers, I wish to extend a heartfelt thank you to Senator Kenley for his lifetime of service. I wish the very best to Senator Kenley, his wife Sally, their three children John, Bill, and Etsy as well as the rest of the Kenley family in his well-deserved retirement at home and on the ranch.

HONORING ANDREW "ANDY"
RIENDEAU GOODWIN

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor the life and legacy of Andrew "Andy" Riendeau Goodwin, a Maryland National Guardsman and member of the Abingdon Fire Company.

A native of Ft. Leonard Wood, Missouri, and a resident of Abingdon, Maryland, he was the son of Timothy Riendeau and Elizabeth Goodwin.

Andy attended Harford Community College where he earned an Associate of Arts Degree after graduating from Aberdeen High School as the Captain of his soccer, lacrosse and wrestling teams.

Andy was a member and Sergeant of the Abingdon Fire Company of Abingdon, Maryland.

A proud member of a military family, on October 2, 2015, Andy enlisted in the Maryland Army National Guard and was assigned to A Company, 1st Battalion, 224th Aviation Regiment as a 15F, Aircraft Electrician, where he developed a passion for the helicopter unit and earned numerous commendations, including the National Defense Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, and the Basic Aviation Badge.

Andy had a passion for the outdoors and enjoyed hiking, camping, fishing, and clay shooting. He was not only a cherished uncle, but a role model to his niece and nephews. He is survived by his brother, sister, nephews, niece, and grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join with me today to acknowledge the service and sacrifice of Andy Riendeau Goodwin and that of his family. It is with great sadness that I mourn his loss and commemorate Suicide Awareness Month. Today I humbly express my condolences to his family and wish them peace and comfort in the days ahead.

H.R. 3354, STATE ASSESSMENT
GRANTS AMENDMENT

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my bipartisan amendment to H.R. 3354 to increase funding for State Assessment Grants.

I want to thank my colleague and friend, Representative COSTELLO for his continued leadership on this issue, and for his commitment to a successful implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

In the last Congress, we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, a bipartisan bill, to leave behind No Child Left Behind. After 14 years, Democrats and Republicans in both Chambers came together on a compromise legislation to update federal K-12 education policy and reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

ESSA ensures equity protections for America's students. It supports our most vulnerable and underserved students and works to close the achievement gap. ESSA gives states and school districts flexibility to develop their own plans for holding schools accountable, measuring student success, and encouraging improvements. It also recognizes the important role of assessments in education. Assessments serve as a tool to monitor student progress and gauge how students are performing across each state. Assessments also inform teacher instruction by providing valuable information to support student learning. ESSA includes provisions from the SMART Act, a bipartisan bill I authored with Representative COSTELLO to help make assessments more effective.

Our amendment would provide full funding for ESSA's State Assessment Grants. State Assessment Grants provide critical resources to help states and school districts build high-quality assessment systems that support teachers and students. By fully funding State Assessment Grants, states and school districts can audit their assessment systems and reduce excessive, repetitive testing. This funding can also help states—like my home state of Oregon—develop new assessments to strengthen student learning. Oregon is preparing to pilot a K-3 formative assessment to improve student outcomes.

The good work being done in Oregon is an example of what is possible if states have the resources and flexibility they need to focus on student success. I thank my colleague Representative COSTELLO for his partnership, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

IN CELEBRATION OF NATIONAL
BAKERY DAY

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on September 28, to celebrate the first ever

National Bakery Day and to honor our independent bakeries.

Local and family-owned bakeries put bread on our tables and a touch of sweetness in our lives, all while reflecting the uniqueness of our neighborhoods. They're small businesses that invest in Main Street and provide good jobs and give back to our communities in many ways.

Grandma's Bakery, in White Bear Lake, Minnesota and others like it around the country succeed along with their communities. Located in historic downtown White Bear Lake, Grandma's owners John and Deb Lupo employ 100 hundred staffers making delicious breads, delectable pastries and other goodies. By investing in the bakery and the community, John and Deb have grown Grandma's Bakery into a beloved institution and a destination in White Bear Lake.

All across Saint Paul and the East Metropolitan area, independent bakeries are part of the lifeblood of their neighborhoods—like Dorothy Ann Bakery in Woodbury, the excellent Saint Paul bakeries A Piece of Cake, Wuollet's, PJ Murphy, Trung Nam, Morelos, Mojo Monkey Donuts, Pancho Villa, and so many others. Bakeries are special places that deliver wholesome goodness and a place for neighbors to gather.

National Bakery Day is a way to celebrate not only the important role that bakeries play in our lives, but also the creativity and talent required of bakers to make the tasty baked goods that are so hard for us to turn down. Bakeries help us preserve and enjoy the individual character of the community and the traditions passed down from generation to generation.

Bakeries are with us not only during meals, but also during important and joyous moments in our lives such as weddings, birthdays and graduations. In recognition of National Bakery Day, I thank independent, local bakers around the country for the important place that they hold in our communities.

DOWN RIVER EQUIPMENT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Down River Equipment for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Special Recognition Award—A "Colorado Company to Watch" Award. The Special Recognition Award recognizes businesses or individuals showing strong community ties and a positive reflection of the City of Wheat Ridge's values.

Down River Equipment was named a Colorado Company to Watch by the Colorado Office on Economic Development and Trade as a "second stage" company for their performance in the marketplace, innovative products, unique processes and philanthropic actions. "Second stage" companies are those who have moved past the startup stage and into a period of growth. Down River Equipment has been manufacturing and supplying river equipment in Colorado since 1985. The company is

owned by boaters and employs an experienced team to assist with all the customer's river needs. The company specializes in the custom fabrication, distribution and retail of equipment of all types of river adventures.

I applaud Down River Equipment for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

HONORING MARY KELLEY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mary Kelley of the District of Columbia on her retirement on September 29, 2017, after more than 34 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives.

During Mary Kelley's tenure, she has worked for both the Office of the Clerk and the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). She is retiring as the Resource Manager for the Office of Acquisitions Management within the CAO.

Mary Kelley began her career in December 1983 as a Clerk Typist for the Office of the Clerk. During her time with the Clerk, she worked for various offices, including Office Equipment Services and Office Systems Management. She also held various positions within these offices, including Equipment Accounts Clerk, Senior Accounts Payable Specialist and Manager.

In 1995, Mary Kelley began working for the CAO. She has worked for various offices within CAO, including House Support Services, the Office Supply and Gift Shop and Acquisitions Management. As the Resource Manager for the Office of Acquisitions Management, she was responsible for the development, analysis and execution of personnel and operational budgets and oversight of payment process activities, among other assigned duties. She planned and provided assistance to the management team in preparation of the annual budget.

Upon her retirement, Mary Kelley plans to do more traveling. In addition, she hopes to become a volunteer with the Washington Nationals, her favorite baseball team. I am pleased and proud that Mary Kelley is a D.C. resident.

Therefore, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mary Kelley for her many years of dedicated service and outstanding contributions to the U.S. House of Representatives. We wish her many wonderful years in fulfilling her retirement dreams.

HONORING RETIRED ARMY LIEUTENANT COLONEL HAROLD T. RIGGINS, III

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today we honor retired Army Lieutenant Colonel Harold

T. Riggins, III, decorated combat soldier, community trailblazer, and passionate advocate for veterans transitioning from military to civilian life.

During 27 years of active military duty—as an enlisted Sergeant, then as an officer—LTC (R) Riggins deployed with the 101st Airborne Division for two tours in Iraq, earning distinction as a proven combat leader. For his outstanding service, he was awarded the Legion of Merit, two Bronze Stars, coveted Ranger Tab, and multiple medals and badges.

While working post-retirement as program director for the Soldier for Life-Transition Assistance Program (SFL-TAP), he personally walked 38,000 Fort Campbell soldiers, hand-in-hand, through one of the toughest processes they experience at the end of their careers. Working with multiple city, county and state governments, and thousands of companies in a one-stop facility, he delivered a “smooth takeoff” for each of the 400 soldiers transitioning monthly from the Army, helping them successfully move into the National Guard and Reserves, higher education, civilian or self-employment worldwide, while learning to plan financially and utilize federal and state benefits. His servant attitude, superior management, and infinite compassion make him an inspirational model for military personnel nearing end of service.

Leadership is not as it appears, but as it performs. We now celebrate LTC (R) Riggins, who for seven dynamic years ensured the 1 percent of Americans who sacrificed to serve our nation thrive in the communities they love.

HONORING MAYSVILLE'S 50TH AUTUMN LEAF FESTIVAL

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the city of Maysville as its residents prepare for their 50th Autumn Leaf Festival.

Each year, this event brings friendly faces together to celebrate the dawn of a new season. Friends and neighbors participate in games, savor Autumn-themed treats, and cheer as they watch a parade pass through their community's streets.

The people of Maysville invest their time and energy in this festival because, for them, this celebration is a way to serve their neighbors and put a smile on their faces.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine northeast Georgia without the city of Maysville, whose people help make our region the welcoming place that we know and love.

This fall, the leaves will take on new colors and the air will become cooler, but the people of Maysville will remain unchanged—their warmth and compassion renewed with every season, as we see through their 50th Autumn Leaf Festival.

JOSEPH F. CHEFF

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Joseph Cheff, who has celebrated his retirement from Passaic County Education Associations this past Friday.

Expressing how much Mr. Cheff meant to Passaic County is a delightful task. As a fellow official in the education system, as an admirer, and as a Patersonian, it gives me great pleasure to add my personal appreciation and commendation.

Mr. Cheff served in the school district at the peak of his memorable career. In 1982, he was a mathematics instructor for the Paterson Public School borough. Joseph Cheff's mission statement was to prepare each student for success in the collegiate institution of their choice and in their careers. His role in education and leadership leaves a positive mark on New Jersey's youth.

Throughout the course of his life he has been involved in numerous organizations such as Paterson Education Association, where he resides as delegate assemblyman. One of his most prominent affiliations was as president of The Passaic County Education Association, where he believed that every student should have an extraordinary educational experience.

As president of Passaic County Education Association, his mission was to extend an opportunity for representation of various education groups to confer about problems affecting public education in Passaic County. Ultimately his desire was to facilitate the dissemination of information from national, state, county, and local educational associations.

Joseph Cheff continued to strive for the efforts of the teacher's union rights, tenure reform, and teacher evaluations on NJSBA (New Jersey School Boards Association). The services provided by the NJSBA allowed teachers and members of the New Jersey schools to carry out their daily responsibilities, tackle difficult situations, and realize the rewards of successful boardsmanship. By standing up for teacher's rights, Cheff knew that teachers with a less strenuous work life would not only become more relaxed in their workplace, but also outperform expectations and truly interact with their students, so as to contribute to the reformation of a poorly established educational program, and create informative methods of educating students for their futures.

It is an honor to commemorate the outstanding career of Mr. Joseph Cheff. Your hard work and tireless advocacy for both students and teachers, has impacted the community of Passaic for years to come. You are a wonderful person with a caring heart and your work will live on.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating over 30 years of the contributions and services you have contributed to the residents of Passaic County from Mr. Joseph Cheff.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues in extending our gratitude towards a humanitarian who has planted the seed for aspiring students. Let us celebrate over 30 years

of his dedicated service to not only the Paterson Public School System, but also for his tireless, hard work and amicable efforts as President of the Passaic County Education Association, Mr. Joseph Cheff.

**FOUR SEASONS FARMERS AND
ARTISANS MARKET**

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Four Seasons Farmers and Artisans Market for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Cultural Commission Award for 2017. The Cultural Commission Award recognizes businesses or organizations that actively contribute to the enrichment of the culture of the City of Wheat Ridge.

This award recognizes the business that has made an impact by encouraging culture and arts, promoting awareness of the city's cultural activities, diversity and heritage and supports opportunities in art education for all ages incorporating art into the architecture and design of their building.

I applaud the Four Seasons Farmers Market of Wheat Ridge for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

HONORING MR. DON STRAIT

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Don Strait, a champion for Connecticut's environment, who recently retired after 25 years as the President of Connecticut Fund for the Environment. As President, Don has played a crucial role in numerous achievements in environmental protection and conservation in our state, and his work will benefit generations to come.

Since 1992, Don has been Executive Director and President of Connecticut Fund for the Environment, which later merged with Save the Sound. His tireless work in our state with local, state, and federal leaders has led to substantial victories for protection and conservation of our air, land, and water. The organization helped protect thousands of acres of land in western Connecticut vital to recreation and wildlife, and has ensured enactment of landmark climate policies, clean car laws, and environmental regulations vital for our public health.

Don facilitated the organization's merger with Save the Sound in 2004 and brought his track record of success to the group's expanded focus on both Connecticut's and the Long Island Sound's environmental quality. Connecticut Fund for the Environment/Save the Sound has been instrumental in reforming sewage management around the Sound, water quality monitoring, and the successful

fight against the planned Broadwater gas plant.

What's more, Don has generously shared his time and expertise to support the crucial work of other leading groups in our state. He cofounded the Connecticut League of Conservation Voters to mobilize environmentally conscious citizens and has served on boards of Restore America's Estuaries and the State Environmental Leadership Program.

Mr. Speaker, Don Strait has been a dedicated and visionary leader for Connecticut. Present and future generations in our state owe him a great deal for protecting our world, and I am lucky to call him a friend. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

**RECOGNIZING MR. ROBERT
NEWLEN**

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and thank Mr. Robert Newlen, Deputy Librarian of Congress, for more than 40 years of dedicated service to the Library of Congress. Prior to his current position, Mr. Newlen served in a wide variety of leadership roles within the Congressional Research Service and the Law Library, as well as Chief of Staff.

Throughout his distinguished career, Mr. Newlen received various awards and recognitions. I know, however, what he has valued the most is the opportunity to serve and to promote the value of knowledge with Members of Congress, staff, and countless others.

The Library of Congress is a great gift to this country and to all who benefit from this treasury of learning. Robert has devoted his career to building up this institution in every way possible. And, at a time when truth sometimes seems elusive, he and his colleagues strive to make accurate information the foundation of what we do.

Mr. Newlen will leave this week to pursue other opportunities, but I have no doubt that his spirit of service will go with him. On behalf of all of us who have benefitted directly or indirectly from his work, I offer my sincere gratitude.

**IN RECOGNITION OF THE 65TH
ANNIVERSARY OF AVENUES**

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Avenues' 65th anniversary, which will be celebrated on September 28, 2017. For over six decades, Avenues has served disabled Pennsylvanians throughout Schuylkill, Carbon, Northumberland, Lebanon and Luzerne Counties.

Avenues was originally founded as United Cerebral Palsy of Schuylkill County in 1952 by

a group of sixty parents whose children had special needs. The group's prime focus was addressing the lack of local medical care and educational services for their children. On September 12, 1952, the founders filed an application for a charter to become a member of United Cerebral Palsy. The organization was incorporated in November that year as United Cerebral Palsy of Schuylkill County.

Today, Avenues is responsible for planning, promoting and assisting the establishment, maintenance and operation of training centers or clinics for the education, social and physical betterment of those with Cerebral Palsy and similar disorders. Its aid has supported a wide array of research in the prevention and treatment of developmental disabilities and handicaps. It sponsors various educational campaigns for the general public to raise awareness about the requirements of and problems facing special-needs clinics. Avenues is a great wealth of information to its clients and their parents, families and friends.

It is an honor to recognize Avenues as it celebrates its 65th anniversary. I am grateful for the assistance it provides to people across its service area which includes Counties in my congressional district. May its staff and volunteers be able to continue their work helping Pennsylvanians with disabilities for many, many years to come.

**CONGRATULATIONS TO KRYSTAL
CAYLOR**

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Krystal Caylor on her 2017 gold medal in the 200-yard individual medley race.

Competing in the Missouri State High School State Activities Association swimming championships, Ms. Caylor proudly represented the 7th district's Kickapoo High School located in Springfield, Missouri. Ms. Caylor went on to take the gold and win the 200-yard individual medley with a time of 2:03.48.

Ms. Caylor has now finished her Kickapoo swimming career and intends to continue her swimming career at the collegiate level at the University of Indianapolis.

I am honored to recognize Ms. Caylor for her outstanding achievement and wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ms. Caylor on her outstanding performance.

EMILY GREEN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emily Green for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Rising

Star Award. This award recognizes businesses or individuals improving the organization and the community, and are a positive reflection of the City of Wheat Ridge's values.

The Rising Star Award is given each year to a member who has made a difference in the Wheat Ridge Business Association. Emily made a difference immediately upon her entrance to the Association. She joined various committees, volunteered, became a board member and subsequently became a board officer. Emily schedules and plans the monthly "Biz Mix" networking event; finding a location, obtaining food and drink sponsors and advertising the events. Emily also owns a local business, Cibo Meals. This meal-delivery service brings fresh, creative, and environmentally-responsible vegetarian meals around Northwest Denver using reusable Mason jars.

I applaud Emily Green for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate her on her success.

H.R. 3354, TITLE VIII NURSING
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
AMENDMENT

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to highlight the importance of each of the individual Title VIII Nursing Workforce Development Programs, including Advanced Education Nursing; Nursing Workforce Diversity; Nurse Education, Practice, and Retention; and the Nurse Faculty Loan Program. Title VIII programs are a critical lifeline for America's nursing workforce and the patients they serve.

Demand for healthcare services provided by nurses continues to grow, so we should be expanding not cutting programs that maintain a highly-educated nursing workforce. Just last year, Title VIII supported more than 61,000 students in almost every state.

Additionally, Title VIII programs create a culturally diverse workforce to make sure that our increasingly diverse patient population is cared for by culturally aware providers. Title VIII programs also prepare nurses to serve the most vulnerable communities and regions, such as rural areas that are in desperate need of providers.

I was disappointed to see that this bill condensed funding for the Title VIII programs into a single-line item. Each of the programs is designed to target specific needs within the nursing workforce and patient population, and that is why it's imperative that we preserve funding for each individual program.

I will continue to advocate for Title VIII Nursing Workforce Development and hope my colleagues will join me in supporting continued funding for the individual programs.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind my colleagues that October 10th is Taiwan's National Day—also known as Double Ten Day. As this day approaches, I would like to congratulate President Tsai Ing-wen and the people of Taiwan, both on this occasion and on building one of the world's great democracies.

Over the past 30 years, Taiwan has come to embody the same principles we hold dear: constitutional government, democracy, and free enterprise. With its successful, sixth-direct presidential election last year, Taiwan continues to serve as a proud example of democratic success in the Asia-Pacific region. But rather than focusing solely within its own borders, Taiwan has been able to use its immense capabilities to become a leader both in the export of culture humanitarian work, and technical expertise the world over.

Given Taiwan's vibrant democracy, I urge my colleagues and the House as a body to advocate for Taiwan's return to both the World Health Assembly and the International Civil Aviation Organization, as well as its meaningful participation in other international organizations where it cannot be a member. Arguments against Taiwan's inclusion in these bodies belie the immense benefit that Taiwan can provide; Taiwan's omission is a detriment to both to the mission of these organizations and the wider world.

The bond between the United States and Taiwan, cemented by the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances, remains strong. I reaffirm it today, and again congratulate the people of Taiwan on this important occasion.

THE SISTERS OF CHARITY OF ST. ELIZABETH

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the extraordinary efforts and dedication of the Sisters of Charity of Saint Elizabeth, who were honored on Saturday, September 23, 2017 during St. Joseph's Healthcare System's Charity Ball on Ellis Island, where they celebrated 150 years of service to the community.

The Sisters of Charity in the United States were founded by Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton, in the spirit of Saint Vincent de Paul and Saint Louise de Louise de Marillac in Emmitsburg, Maryland, in 1809 by Mother Mary Xavier Mehegan. After the establishment of the Convent Station in 1860, Mother Mehegan swiftly established educational programs amongst other community outreach programs and institutions to address and assist with services to the public. In 1886, the Sisters established St. Joseph's Hospital in Paterson, NJ.

During the 1860's, the Sisters of Charity of Saint Elizabeth had difficulty gathering funds

for the fledgling hospital. The Sisters petitioned the city for its support and reached out within the community, such as, local factories, workers, owners, and some of the wealthier residents in the community for financial assistance. They farmed their land to feed the patients and would sell the remainder in order to support their hospital. They depended on the generosity and kindness of the community to help the infirmed citizens find comfort and care. Through all of this dedicated hard work, support and effort, the Sisters slowly expanded the hospital and began to build the large healthcare system that we know today.

Throughout the majority of St. Joseph's history, charismatic and determined women guided the hospital, turning challenges into opportunities. In 1875, Sister Mary Clare Reilly became the first of several influential leaders who would shape the essence of St. Joseph's.

A champion for the hospital for more than four decades, "Mother Clare" as she was called, was renowned for her strength of judgement, business sense, and ability to be flexible and progressive.

In more recent times, we appreciate the significant contributions that Sister Jane Frances Brady made to the success of St. Joseph's. Sister Jane remains an icon in The State of New Jersey as a passionate advocate for the needs of the sick and the poor. Sr. Jacqueline Burns, SC, also a dynamic leader and immediate past Chairperson of the Boards of Trustees of SJHS, led the integration of the Healthcare System and revitalization of our organization.

The Sisters provide an inspirational leadership presence throughout St. Josephs Healthcare System, with 30 sisters ministering within SJHS. Today, the sisters sponsor one college, two academies, three hospitals and one women's center. The Sisters of Charity of Saint Elizabeth remain focused on the heart of their calling: service and advocacy through their work including research and dialogue on major issues of social and global significance.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating individuals who have dedicated their lives to serving the people. The Sisters of Charity of Saint Elizabeth's commitment to public service is truly commendable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues to celebrate the long record of service to their community by the Sisters of Charity of Saint Elizabeth.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF PATRICK AWOSOGBA AND SUPPORT OF CHILDREN'S CARDIOMYOPATHY AWARENESS MONTH

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Patrick Awosogba and in support of Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month.

Patrick Awosogba was an avid baseball player and a graduate of East Brunswick High

School. In 2015, Patrick tragically passed away while playing pick-up basketball during his freshman year at Rutgers University from an undiagnosed case of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy is a chronic and degenerative heart disease that thickens the heart muscle, causing an irregular heartbeat and which can tragically lead to death. Patrick was a beloved son and brother and cherished member of his community.

September is Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month. Cardiomyopathy is one of the leading causes of sudden death in young people, and the primary cause of heart transplants in children over the age of one. Knowing your family's history and heart health, and discussing it with your doctor, can help determine whether your child is at risk. The mortality rate for pediatric cardiomyopathy exceeds that of all childhood cancers combined, and yet there is a shocking lack of both awareness and research on this terrible disease.

Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation, based in my home state of New Jersey, is a leading nonprofit which provides resources and support to families struggling to care for their children suffering from this condition. They work to raise awareness for the potentially fatal disease. Along with their grassroots network of families, they also advocate for research and policies that help those suffering from pediatric cardiomyopathy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in remembering the life of Patrick Awosogba and in raising awareness for pediatric cardiomyopathy.

SEYFER AUTOMOTIVE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Seyfer Automotive for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Business of the Year Award for 2017.

The Business of the Year Award recognizes local businesses who demonstrate a commitment to their community, strong management practices and are a positive reflection of the City of Wheat Ridge's values.

As noted in their mission and vision statement, "For over 50 years, Seyfer Automotive has provided expert, quality auto repair. Wheat Ridge drivers have come to know them for their reputation of fixing problems that no other shop can fix. Their mission is to provide their customer and their vehicle with the quality service they expect and deserve. The Wheat Ridge auto repair team takes pride in their ability to outperform local dealerships."

I applaud Seyfer Automotive for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

IN RECOGNITION OF D/F/LT. MARY KAPP FOR HER DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN THE MICHIGAN STATE POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Detective 1st Lieutenant Mary Kapp for over 33 years of distinguished service to the Michigan State Police Department. She has worked tirelessly to help keep Michigan communities safe through her career as a law enforcement officer.

Lieutenant Kapp has served in the Michigan State Police Department since the 1980s. Prior to becoming a trooper, she was an athletic trainer in Lansing; she chose to pursue her dream career as a police trooper after the Michigan State Police Department dropped its height requirement. She has served in various capacities at the Michigan State Police Department, including as commander of the Monroe Post, as administrative leader of the Monroe Area Narcotics Team and Investigative Services, as a law enforcement officer overseeing Detroit casinos and as leader of the Downriver Area Narcotics Organization. The initiatives and programs implemented by Lieutenant Kapp has helped to make Michigan communities safer to live and work in.

Throughout her tenure, Kapp has been a tireless advocate for drug reform and community outreach, especially to high school students. She was named the 2016 Prevention Person of the Year by the Michigan Prevention Association, in honor of her work collaborating with local organizations and coalitions. Successful programs ran by Kapp include the Downriver Anti-Trafficking Coalition, Stop Underage Drinking and Drugs Coalition, and regular visits to local high school classrooms. Kapp is committed to educating community members about substance abuse and aided the department in collecting over 990 pounds of prescription drugs in 2016. She has performed the critical work of ensuring that Michigan residents remain safe at great personal risk. She is loved in our community, and her hard work and expertise will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Detective 1st Lieutenant Mary Kapp for her service to the state of Michigan. She has helped make the community safer through her work and outreach.

HONORING THE 2017 PORTUGUESE AMERICAN LEADERSHIP AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. ZELDIN, Co-Chairs of the Congressional Portuguese Caucus, to recognize the recipients of the 21st Annual Portuguese-American Leadership Awards as be-

stowed by the Portuguese American Leadership Council of the United States (PALCUS). These recipients are unique individuals who have accomplished much throughout their careers and continue to uphold their cultural traditions and lead the next generation.

Receiving the Leadership in the Arts Award, Ms. Ana Ventura Miranda founded the Arte Institute on April 11, 2001, an organization dedicated to promoting Portuguese culture, highlighting multiple aspects of Portuguese art including literature, music, dance, and film. This institute serves as a platform for Portuguese artists to connect and showcase their work in New York. In 2011, Ms. Ventura Miranda organized the first New York Portuguese Short Film Festival showing a total of twenty films, providing Portuguese film directors an opportunity to share their work.

Receiving the Leadership in Scholarship Award, Dr. Francisco Cota Fagundes of the University of Massachusetts Amherst is in his thirty-ninth year of teaching. Dr. Fagundes's studies are focused on contemporary Portuguese literature, specifically of the Portuguese North American diaspora. At the University of Massachusetts Amherst, he is a Professor of Spanish and Portuguese Studies. Dr. Fagundes has also written over thirty books and numerous articles on a wide array of topics.

Receiving the Leadership in Entrepreneurship Award, Ms. Maria Lawton "the Azorean Green Bean" is known for her authentic, Azorean cooking. With her popular cookbook *Azorean Cooking: From My Family's Table to Yours*, Ms. Lawton continues her quest to recreate her family recipes for everyone to enjoy.

Receiving the Leadership in Education Award, Mr. Alan Tenreiro is the President of Mt. Saint Charles Academy, a Catholic Junior and Senior High School located in Woonsocket, Rhode Island. Over the years, Mr. Tenreiro has been recognized for his leadership work as a principal. During his tenure at Cumberland High School, the school saw a significant rise in test scores, major drop in disciplinary issues, and an increase in the amount of advanced placement classes offered.

Receiving the Leadership in Community Service Award, Ms. Rosa Leal is the Founder & President of the Daughters of Portugal. Ms. Leal is the founder and main organizer in the Mineola Portugal Day Parade. This year she was honored as the Grand Marshal of the event. In addition, Ms. Leal also serves as the Vice President of the New York Portuguese-American Leadership Conference.

Receiving the Young Portuguese-American "Promessa" Award, Mr. Adam Costa is also a 2017 United Kingdom Fulbright Scholar recipient. As a graduate of Bridgewater State University in 2017, Mr. Costa will be using his Fulbright Scholarship to begin a master's program in politics abroad in England at the University of Manchester. He will continue his comparative research which he started at Bridgewater State on youth violence reduction programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that we ask our colleagues to join us in recognizing and honoring the 21st Annual Portuguese-American Leadership Award recipients. These

individuals are exemplary leaders who continue to inspire the next generation of Portuguese American Leaders.

HONORING CLARIBEL LOUISE
LEMM HILL AND HAROLD MIL-
LARD "BUD" HILL

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Clair and Harold Hill upon the occasion of their one-hundredth birthdays. Clair was born on August 14, 1917 and Harold was born September 16, 1917.

Clair and Harold were born and raised in Chico, California where they graduated from Chico High School. They were married on September 4, 1938. Harold enlisted in the United States Air Force during World War II, serving from December 1943 to January 1946. He attended radar school, and they moved to Boca Raton, Florida where he worked as a radar instructor. In 1956, Clair and Harold moved to Santa Rosa, California, where they have lived ever since.

Harold started a successful insurance business and Clair became an artist. She sold her beautiful landscape paintings all around Sonoma County. She also started a popular costume rental business, designing and sewing the costumes herself. They have three daughters, Patricia, Janet and Barbara, nine grandchildren and seventeen great-grandchildren. Their home is a gathering place for family, friends and neighbors who enjoy their warm hospitality.

Clair and Harold have been valuable members of our community and have served as strong mentors to our young people. Clair volunteered with the P.T.A., Campfire Girls and the 4-H Club. Harold was a member of the Lions Club and Elks Club. For many years, he volunteered in an elementary school classroom and as an after school mentor for children who needed extra support.

Clair and Harold have enjoyed watching their family expand and have continued to develop their interests and skills. Clair was an avid flower gardener and was active in the Redwood Garden Club. She is a talented cook and baker. Harold enjoys growing vegetables, and reading and writing poetry. He is a lifelong golfer, hitting a hole-in-one at the age of 98.

Mr. Speaker, Clair and Harold Hill have led long, wonderful lives. Their service during World War II, entrepreneurial spirit and lifelong community service epitomize what Tom Brokaw has called the Greatest Generation. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor them on their one hundredth birthdays this year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KATHERINE M. CLARK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably detained and missed Roll

Call vote number 538. Had I been present, I would have voted no.

MIKE STITES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Mike Stites for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's City Council Partnership Award for 2017. Selected by the Wheat Ridge City Council, the Council Partnership Award recognizes businesses or individuals showing strong community ties and a positive reflection of the City of Wheat Ridge's values.

The Council unanimously selected Mr. Stites for his lifelong commitment to Wheat Ridge. Mr. Stites recently closed his successful B&F Tire Company on 38th Avenue where he and his father ran the shop until Mr. Stites retired in early 2017.

I applaud Mike Stites for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate him on his success.

THE DREAM ACT

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD letters of support for the DREAM Act from several California colleges and universities, and the County of Los Angeles:

SEPTEMBER 8, 2017.

Re Immigration Reform for Undocumented Students.

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NAPOLITANO: On Tuesday, U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the administration planned to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. This program provides immigrant students brought to the United States as minors the opportunity to enroll in a college or university and seek authorization to work without fear of deportation. To date, nearly 800,000 students have applied for DACA status, with nearly one-third—223,000—calling California home. These students are currently pursuing academic and vocational pathways that position them for future success; the termination of the DACA program threatens these students, their families, our institutions, and our communities. Accordingly, we implore Congress to act swiftly to create a permanent solution for these students.

At minimum, we urge the passage of H.R. 496, the "Bar Removal of Individuals who Dream and Grow our Economy" or BRIDGE Act, sponsored by Reps. Coffman (R-CO) and Gutierrez (D-IL). This bipartisan bill would codify the DACA program, allowing students registered under DACA to continue their studies and/or maintain the ability to work

with a new, protected status for a period of up to three years. It would also safeguard the privacy of their personal information except in cases of national security or criminal investigation.

More so, we encourage you to adopt a more comprehensive measure, such as H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act of 2017, sponsored by Reps. Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL) and Roybal-Allard (D-CA). This bipartisan bill would create a pathway to permanent legal status for students and military service personnel who call the United States home. In doing so, this more comprehensive measure would communicate that students' and veterans' efforts to work hard, protect our nation, graduate from college, and find meaningful and gainful employment, would give them a permanent opportunity to provide financially for their families, to engage in community and civic life, and, ultimately, to achieve the American dream.

Though a politically complex issue, we entreat you to act now. An Economist/YouGov poll taken September 3-5, 2017, reveals widespread bipartisan support for the DACA program. Nearly 60% of all registered voters supported or strongly supported DACA, including 53% among Republicans and 70% among Democrats. In addition, more than 55% of voters under age 29 and older than age 65 support this program. It enjoyed favor across race, ethnicity, and income levels. In addition, education leaders of private and public institutions across the state have pledged near-universal support for students in the DACA program, and faith communities are overwhelmingly supportive of immigration reform measures that offer protection to DACA/DREAMer students.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,

Los Angeles, CA, September 15, 2017.

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NAPOLITANO: We are writing to respectfully urge you to support a permanent legislative solution for all the recipients of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program and their families.

The pending termination of the DACA program puts at stake the future of nearly 800,000 young people nationwide. California is home to one in four DACA recipients, of which half reside in Southern California. In addition to the personal impact to these young individuals and their families, DACA's termination would hurt the nation's economic viability. Ending DACA and admonishing recipients from the labor force could cost the United States \$460.3 billion in GDP and decrease Social Security and Medicare contributions by \$24.6 billion over the next decade.

Action by Congress in the next six months is critical to the future of DACA recipients and our nation. Our Board supports the DREAM Act of 2017, bipartisan legislation that would allow DACA recipients to earn lawful permanent residence and provides them a pathway to American citizenship. The DREAM Act exemplifies the type of strong legislative solution that would allow these young immigrants to continue contributing to our communities.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS,
Chairman of the
Board, Supervisor,
Second District.

HILDA L. SOLIS,
Supervisor, First District.
SHEILA KUEHL,
Supervisor, Third District.
JANICE HAHN,
Supervisor, Fourth District.
KATHRYN BARGER,
Supervisor, Fifth District.

IN MEMORY OF MR. ALTO "BUD"
ADAMS, JR.

HON. THOMAS J. ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Alto "Bud" Adams, Jr. of Fort Pierce, Florida, who passed away on September 22nd at the age of 91 in his home on Adam's Ranch in Fort Pierce.

Bud Adams, a larger than life cowboy known for his integrity and firm handshake, was a fixture in Florida's agricultural community. Bud was the patriarch of the Adams Ranch, a four generation family operation that spans 80 years and spreads across more than 50,000 acres in four counties. He began managing the ranch with his father in 1947 after serving in the Navy during World War II. A legend among Florida cattlemen, Bud was responsible for the development of the Braford breed of beef cattle, a breed capable of withstanding Florida's hot and rainy summers. He served as the President of the Florida Cattlemen's Association, and is also a member of Florida's Agricultural Hall of Fame.

Bud was also an ardent conservationist and environmentalist who not only believed, but proved, that the land could be worked in a way that preserved Florida's natural beauty. He was an avid wildlife and nature photographer who could capture the natural splendor of God's creation through the lens of his camera. His photographs of Florida's landscape and wildlife have been featured in numerous books and magazines. For his conservation efforts, Bud was recognized by both the National Cattlemen's Association and the Florida Cattlemen's Association for environmental stewardship, and he was named landowner of the year by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Bud's land that he bought, developed, managed, and cared for with his family, will continue to stand as a lasting testament to his dedication to preserving Florida's beauty.

Bud is survived by his loving wife of 67 years, Dorothy "Dot" Adams, his three sons Alto, Michael, and Robert, his fourteen grandchildren and nine great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Florida has truly lost an icon. My thoughts and prayers are with Bud's family and loved ones as they mourn his passing. Bud Adams will be greatly missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we should deport known criminal gang members who are undocumented. That's why I voted for H.R. 3697, the Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act. However, I have real concerns about the overly vague language of this bill and believe there is much room to improve. We need to make sure that families, humanitarian aid workers, and religious institutions that help rehabilitate gang members are not penalized. I am disappointed that the House leadership did not follow regular order or allow amendments to the bill, so we could have addressed these concerns. I urge the Senate to work together to make improvements to the overly broad language in the bill.

TIM ROGERS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Tim Rogers for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Mayor's Partnership Award for 2017. Selected by the Mayor of Wheat Ridge, Joyce Jay, the Mayor's Partnership Award recognizes businesses or individuals that show strong community ties and a positive reflection of the City of Wheat Ridge's values.

The Mayor selected Mr. Rogers for his continued support of the City of Wheat Ridge. Besides his day job as a commercial real estate broker for Genessee Commercial Group, Rogers is the Chair of "Renewal Wheat Ridge," the City's Urban Renewal Authority. Under his guidance, the City has seen growth and development of new housing and retail opportunities, among other developments and projects within the city.

I applaud Tim Rogers for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate him on his success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 26, 2017, I requested and received a leave of absence for the rest of the week due to an illness in the family.

For the information of our colleagues and my constituents, below is how I would have voted on the following vote I missed during this time period.

On Roll Call 532, on ordering the previous question (providing for consideration of the bill

(H.R. 2824 and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2792) Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act), I would have voted no;

On Roll Call 533, on agreeing to the Resolution to Increasing Opportunity through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act and providing for consideration of the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act, I would have voted no;

On Roll Call 534, on approving the Journal, I would have voted no;

On Roll Call 535, on agreeing to the Pascrell Amendment, I would have voted aye;

On Roll Call 536, on motion to recommit with instructions (Increasing Opportunity and Success for Children and Parents through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act), I would have voted aye;

On Roll Call 537, on passage of Increasing Opportunity and Success for Children and Parents through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act, I would have voted no;

On Roll Call 538, on ordering the previous question, Providing for consideration of H.R. 3823, Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, I would have voted no;

On Roll Call 539, on agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted no;

On Roll Call 540, Recognizing that for 50 years the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has worked toward stability, prosperity, and peace in Southeast Asia, I would have voted aye;

On Roll Call 541, Democratic Motion to Recommit to H.R. 3823, I would have voted aye;

On Roll Call 542, on passage of H.R. 3823, Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017, I would have voted no; and

On Roll Call 543, Passage of H.R. 2792, Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017, I would have voted no.

CELEBRATING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OAK LAWN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Oak Lawn Chamber of Commerce as it celebrates 70 years of service to the community.

Founded in 1947, the Oak Lawn Chamber started as a small group of local business owners. Since then, it has grown to more than 350 members who work tirelessly to promote the local business community in Oak Lawn, Illinois. The Chamber is successful because leaders like current Executive Director Julie Miller and President Adam Woodworth strive to fulfill the mission of advancing the business community "with constant integrity, fairness, and cooperation to promote and improve the economic atmosphere, business climate, and image of Oak Lawn."

The Chamber takes great pride in being an active member of the community and its members show their commitment to the organization and its role in the area at a variety of programs throughout the year. Events such as

health fairs, small business clinics, and business showcases facilitate invaluable relationships between businesses and their local clientele.

Additionally, the Oak Lawn Chamber of Commerce offers valuable marketing and communications resources to help promote and inform small businesses. Specifically, their legislative committee aims to keep members informed about proposals from all levels of government that could impact them.

Through its dedication to the interests of local business owners, the Oak Lawn Chamber of Commerce has contributed immensely to the hospitable business climate of Oak Lawn and the surrounding area. I sincerely offer the Chamber's many dedicated members my heartfelt congratulations on the occasion of its 70th anniversary.

Among those most dedicated to advancing the mission of the Oak Lawn Chamber of Commerce, is the following list of past presidents.

1947—James Sweeney, 1949—Charles McKay, 1950—Matt Smilde, 1951—Elmer Buell, 1953—Warren Schlieske, 1955—Roland Beckley, 1956—Milt Betterman, 1957—Al Schintz, 1958—Stephen Kizaric, 1959—William Cairnes, 1960—Stanley Dawson, 1961—Donald Talac, 1963—Erwin Fueren, 1964—Dr. J. Salus, 1965—Percy Cump, 1966—John Spicer, 1968—Lou Kole, 1969—Ron Frank, 1970—Matt Lamb, 1972—Vincent Barcelona.

1973—Le Roy Corradino, 1974—Frank Bablak, 1975—Merrill Stenbon, 1976—Davis Boyd, 1977—Milt Andersen, 1978—Betty Gallo, 1979—Lou Mirabelli, 1980—Barbara Kozlarek, 1981—Sal Crivellone, 1982—Vina O'Malley, 1983—Robert Gaul, 1984—Linda McFarland, 1985—James Buschbach, 1986—Marie Napolillo, 1987—Paul Paskvan, 1988—Tom Gavin III, 1989—Marianthe Karson, 1990—Robert Kuenster, 1991—George Freitag, 1992—Dorthea Grieco.

1993—Shirley Mis, 1994—Brian Anderson, 1995—Klem Brzuskiwicz, 1996—Joann Buschbach, 1997—James Brady, 1998—Laura Shallow, 1999—Chris Augle, 2000—Doris Marks, 2001—Chuck Dinolfo, 2002—Patricia Nienhaus, 2003—Dave Kobak, 2004—Anne Marie Casey, 2005—Jack Baker, 2006—Leo Gutchewsky, 2007—Kevin Mathers/Jackie Truty, 2008—Jackie Truty, 2009—Glen Kato, 2010—Rita Olsen, 2011—Christy Hernandez, 2012—Karen Boll, 2013—Jeff Reichl, 2014—Michelle Williams, 2015—Jennifer Villifan, 2016—Larry Lehman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 28, 2017, I missed four Roll Call votes because I was attending a funeral for my cousin in New Jersey. Had I been present, I would have voted:

YES on the Democratic Motion to Recommit on H.R. 3823, Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (Roll Call No. 541). This amendment includes the full,

bipartisan National Disaster Tax Relief Act, which I introduced with my colleague Representative TOM REED from New York. The Reed-Pascrell bill would help victims of natural disasters recover faster with tax relief to alleviate cleanup and rebuilding expenses. The bipartisan bill would provide tax relief to communities across the country devastated in a presidentially-declared disaster in recent years. The amendment takes nothing away from the underlying bill, only making tax relief more robust for victims of recent hurricanes, and adding tax relief for victims of Sandy and other disasters.

NO on final passage of H.R. 3823, Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (Roll Call No. 542). I was pleased to support aid to those affected by Harvey and Irma and will continue to do so. We urgently need to deliver relief and assistance to those currently impacted by Hurricane Maria in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, where the entire island has lost power and many are without water. But, I would have cast my vote in opposition to this legislation before us today, which does not even come close to providing the robust relief that Puerto Rico needs. The Congress and this Administration need to step up and help Puerto Rico recover. However, this bill includes extraneous provisions that provide limited tax relief to 2017 hurricane victims while omitting natural disaster tax relief for victims of disasters from 2012 through 2016. The bill before us today completely circumvented the committee process, despite the fact that Representative REED and I have had legislation on comprehensive disaster tax relief for years.

NO on final passage of H.R. 2792, the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017 (Roll Call No. 543). This bill would harm vulnerable seniors and individuals with disabilities by cutting off their life-saving Supplemental Security Income benefits without due process, and in many cases for offenses with low monetary values, probation violations for misdemeanor offenses, and unpaid court fees or fines. I voted in opposition to this bill when it was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means on September 13, 2017, and I would have opposed it again today.

YES on the Journal Vote.

CONGRATULATIONS TO STRAFFORD HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2017 Strafford High School Girls Basketball Team on an undefeated season that was topped off with a state championship title.

The Strafford Indians maintained absolute perfection throughout the 2017 girls basketball season, failing to lose a single game and finishing with an outstanding 33-0 win-loss record.

Strafford emerged victorious in March 2017 with a Missouri Class 3 girls basketball state

championship. This is the Indian's second straight girls basketball state championship in a row after a title in 2016 as well.

I am honored to recognize the Strafford High School Girls Basketball Team on their magnificent season and dedication to hard work and excellence. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating these impressive young women on their great season.

HONOR FLIGHT OF OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the twenty World War II veterans and one Korean War veteran from Oregon who are visiting their memorial on the National Mall on Saturday, September 30th, 2017 through Honor Flight of Oregon. Every time I have the chance to meet one of these heroes from the "Greatest Generation," I am reminded of the poignant words of General Dwight D. Eisenhower. In a message to Allied troops just before D-Day, he said, "The eyes of the world are upon you. The hopes and prayers of liberty-loving people everywhere march with you."

He was right then, of course, Mr. Speaker. But over seventy years later, liberty-loving people everywhere continue to owe these heroes for their extraordinary service and their incredible stories of sacrifice and bravery on behalf of our country. That's why it is my privilege to enter their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

The veterans on this Honor Flight from Oregon are as follows: William Cochran, Army; Warren Davis, Army; Richard Fultineer, Army; William Johnson, Army; John Ritz, Army; Jack Downs, Army Air Force; Lawrence Willis, Army Air Force; Charles Kriegh, Marine Corps; Hiram Underwood, Marine Corps; Harry Howard Jr., Merchant Marine; John Webber, Merchant Marine; Raymond Ayers, Navy; Ernest Gallo, Navy; Paul Gessford, Navy; Lawrence Horton, Navy; Stanley Luther, Navy; Lester Manosar, Navy; Harold Simpson Sr., Navy; Orville Stoltz, Navy; Gerhard Tank, Navy; and Paul Vincent, Navy.

These twenty-one heroes join over 150,000 veterans who have been honored through the Honor Flight Network of volunteers nationwide since 2005.

I would also like to recognize the fourteen guardians traveling on this trip who have also served our country: Leon Clay Jr., Air Force; Charles Wills, Air Force; Ronald Kohl, Army and Air Force; Lyle Gessford, Army; Steven Howard, Army; Terry Wynkoop, Army; Gordon Wood, Marine Corps; Laurie Dutton, Navy; Terry Haines, Navy; David Haines, Navy; Chester Johnson, Navy; Larry Kennedy, Navy; Richard Santillie, Navy; and Tanya Wilson, Navy.

I would also like to recognize Richard Wing Jr., who served our Veterans for 36 years as an RN at the VA Hospital, in Palo Alto, California.

And, of course, none of this would be possible without Gail Yakopatz, the longtime

President of Honor Flight of Oregon. Gail has assisted hundreds of veterans, has been a tireless advocate for Oregon's veterans and is someone I am proud to call my friend!

Mr. Speaker, at the height of the Civil War in 1863, President Abraham Lincoln wrote, "Honor to the Soldier, and Sailor everywhere, who bravely bears his country's cause." Each of us in this Chamber and in this nation should be humbled by the courage of these brave veterans who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country.

TINAMARIE SEYFER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Tinamarie Seyfer for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Member of the Year Award. This award recognizes businesses or individuals who have dedicated the past year for their contribution to the organization and the community, and are a positive reflection of the City of Wheat Ridge's values.

Tinamarie Seyfer spearheaded a new fundraising idea at the Wheat Ridge Holiday Lighting Ceremony—the tree auction. Tinamarie found groups and businesses to donate and decorate the trees for auction. She then worked to deliver the trees to the buyers' homes or offices. Tinamarie serves on the Wheat Ridge Business Association board and assisted with the 2017 Ridgefest Car Show along with her husband, Troy. Tinamarie and Troy also hosted one of the monthly "Biz Mix" networking events, as well as owning her own business, "Five Rings Financial."

I applaud Tinamarie Seyfer for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate her on her success.

H.R. 3354

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3354, the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act. I am grateful to the Chairman and Ranking Member for including many of my policy priorities in the bill, but I cannot support the final measure because of the devastating cuts to education funding, environmental resources, and our nation's healthcare system.

In 2015, Congress passed the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act. It is our respon-

sibility to provide the resources necessary for states and localities to fully serve students as authorized by ESSA. Unfortunately, the bill we are voting on undermines one of the great successes of the ESSA by significantly underfunding the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants. Congress intended these grants to go to school districts so they can provide locally-tailored programming and supportive services for students, including school-based mental health programs, drug prevention programs, expanded access to arts, music, and foreign language programs, and other programs that fit the needs of districts. I am grateful that my amendment to highlight the need for full funding of this program was included in the bill, but I am deeply disappointed that we have not committed to providing this critical resource to local communities.

Another central tenet of the ESSA was a commitment to reducing student testing, and making sure that states and school districts are able to audit their assessment systems and eliminate duplicative and ineffective tests. The State Assessment Grants provide funding for these efforts, and I thank the Appropriations Committee for accepting my bipartisan amendment to fully fund these efforts.

The final bill includes my bipartisan amendment to increase funding for Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Grants, which will provide tradeswomen in Oregon the support and assistance necessary to advance their careers and retain good-paying jobs. The bill also includes my amendment to fund Title VIII Nursing Workforce Programs through separate line-items, which will preserve funding for the individual programs, including Advanced Education Nursing; Nursing Workforce Diversity; Nurse Education, Practice, and Retention; and the Nurse Faculty Loan Program.

Additionally, my amendment to provide critical resources to combat coastal climate threats by highlighting the need for funding ocean acidification programs was adopted, as was my amendment to increase funding to mitigate harmful algal blooms. Ocean acidification and harmful algal blooms are decimating our oceans and lakes, destroying wildlife, and crippling our local economies. Increasing funding for NOAA's ocean acidification and harmful algal blooms programs will give our coastal communities additional resources to understand and address these threats.

Despite these victories, the bill did not earn my support because of the harmful cuts and policy riders that remain. The bill underfunds the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and undermines the National Oceans Policy. It eliminates Title X Family Planning, and eliminates funding for Teen Pregnancy Prevention Programs. The bill undermines the Affordable Care Act by prohibiting funding from being used to further provisions of the law, including ACA navigators. As Congress continues work on an FY2018 funding package, I urge my colleagues to put aside their partisan policy priorities and advance a bill that invests in our communities and sets them up for success.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
MARKUP

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Chairman ROYCE for convening this mark-up on a number of substantive pieces of legislation. As our time is limited, I will focus on a few key items.

I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 3445, and I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, as well as my friend and colleague KAREN BASS, for trying to strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

I would like to thank my good friend and fellow member of the New Jersey delegation, ALBIO SIREs, for his bipartisan Global Health Innovation Act of 2017, H.R. 1660, of which I am a cosponsor.

This bill will allow us to exercise greater oversight over USAID programs and to gauge how effectively USAID is developing and utilizing innovations in health programs.

I support H.R. 3320 and commend Chairman YOHO for his work on this timely bill. The Chinese Communist government has been slowly squeezing Taiwan's international space, taking extraordinary measures to exclude Taiwan from multi-lateral institutions like the World Health Organization.

Such exclusions create real international blind spots that pose threats to global health and security. As you all know, SARS spread from Taiwan and China to other parts of the globe.

With the World Health Organization in particular, I intend to push for admission of Taiwan.

I commend Ranking Member, Mr. ENGEL, along with Chairman YOHO, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SHERMAN, for putting together H. Res. 422, on Hong Kong.

The threats to Hong Kong's autonomy and its freedoms are real and progressing. These freedoms and the rule of law are vital economic interests of the United States and the foundation of the city's vitality, creativity, and entrepreneurial spirit.

Beijing has become more assertive in Hong Kong's affairs over the past several years and ramped up efforts to destroy the pro-democracy movement over the summer. Six legislations were disqualified through unprecedented interventions by the National People's Congress into Hong Kong's judiciary. The pan-democratic minority could stop pro-Beijing legislation in the past, but now it cannot. China can push through any measure it wants now with its block of unelected legislators.

And, as you all know, the Hong Kong government has re-sentenced the leaders of the peaceful Umbrella Movement of 2014. Joshua Wong, Nathan Law, and Alex Chow should now be considered Hong Kong's first political prisoners. They will not be the last, as new trials begin soon.

This resolution is needed but should not be our last word. That is why I introduced, along with Congressman TIM WALZA (a fellow CECC Commissioner), the Hong Kong Human Rights & Democracy Act—a bill that I introduced in

the last Congress and which has been introduced by Senator MARCO RUBIO and Senator BEN CARDIN in the Senate.

I would urge my colleagues to consider this legislation and find ways to protect U.S. interests in a free and autonomous Hong Kong in addition to Ranking Member ENGELS' resolution which is before us today.

Hizballah is a cancer that has metastasized in Lebanon and threatens to invade nearly every corner of the region if we do not stay vigilant. H.R. 3329, introduced by Chairman ROYCE, would choke off additional sources of financial support for this malignant growth, particularly by targeting the group's grass roots fundraising enterprise that it expanded to circumvent existing sanctions. Building on the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act that the House passed unanimously in 2015, this bill would require third-party sanctions on those who substantially support Hizballah fundraising operations.

The reports required in this legislation would also go further to ferret out the extent of the group's fundraising network, which it would rightly classify as a transnational criminal organization. Make no mistake: Hizballah is an international crime syndicate, wrapped in an Iranian paramilitary proxy, inside a terrorist organization, masquerading as a political resistance movement.

H.R. 3342 introduced by MIKE GALLAGHER would direct our government to use the tools at its disposal to impose penalties on Hizballah for employing human shields to defend its installations and outposts. Hizballah's use of innocent human lives to protect its nefarious activities is a clear human rights violation and plainly demonstrates that Hizballah is an enemy of Lebanon's freedom-loving people. The bill also encourages the President to direct our Permanent Representative at the United Nations to use her voice and vote to push for a resolution condemning this sickening practice. I can confidently say that the United States could not ask for a stronger or more clear-eyed defender of American interests and the security of our most critical regional ally, Israel, at the UN than Ambassador Haley.

RECOGNIZING DAVID C. PUCKETT

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. David C. Puckett as he completes 35 years of service as CEO of American 1 Credit Union, headquartered in Jackson, Michigan.

In 1982, David Puckett began his journey as General Manager of a small, local credit union which had 15 employees and two locations. Today, American 1 Credit Union has nearly 200 employees, provides service to 56,000 members, and has 13 branches located across the state.

David Puckett not only effectively shaped the fiscal success of American 1 Credit Union, but also forged a lasting legacy of giving back to the people of Jackson County. Over the

years, American 1 has funded and provided manpower to support many community programs such as Rose Pageant scholarships, the Rose Parade, the Kids Fest program and the American 1 Grand Prix.

Throughout his tenure, David has brought the private and public sectors together in ways that have benefited the community. The most noteworthy example of these partnerships is the agreement made in 2016 in which American 1 will donate \$4 million towards the construction of a convention center in Jackson. The American 1 Credit Union Convention Center will be utilized for conferences, trade shows, weddings, and entertainment, and will foster the ongoing development of Jackson's downtown riverfront area.

David Puckett's leadership and spirit of co-operation will be remembered for years to come by all who continue to benefit from the results of his commitment. I congratulate David on an impressive career at American 1 Credit Union and wish him the best in the future.

WHEAT RIDGE ANIMAL HOSPITAL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Wheat Ridge Animal Hospital for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Reinvestment Award for 2017. The Reinvestment Award recognizes businesses who play an active role in improving the City of Wheat Ridge.

Wheat Ridge Animal Hospital, with more than thirteen years in Wheat Ridge, was selected because of their redevelopment of an old office building, demolition of a blighted older business and their accommodation for parking in their new facility. The company purchased an older two story office building that had been shuttered for over three years. The owners of Wheat Ridge Animal Hospital completely rehabilitated the building to accommodate the re-use.

I applaud Wheat Ridge Animal Hospital for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

HONORING COMMUNITY CLINIC ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND OTHER COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS IN CALIFORNIA'S 44TH DISTRICT

HON. NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a health care success story that so many of us here, on both sides of the aisle, can appreciate: the role that our nation's community health centers play in providing high-quality primary and preventive care to more than 27 million patients in nearly 11,000

communities nationwide. Unfortunately, these centers are at risk unless Congress acts quickly to extend funding for programs that support CHCs.

CHCs have provided care for low-income, rural, and underserved communities for more than fifty years. In that time, many of these health centers have expanded to offering integrated services like behavioral health, dental care, and—increasingly—substance use disorder treatments essential to combating nationwide epidemics like opioid addiction. It's this kind of integrated and patient-centered care that leads to better health outcomes for patients, as well as cost-savings for both our nation's health care system and for taxpayers.

In my district, we have 15 federally funded health center organizations who collectively leverage \$46.4 million in federal investment to serve 500,328 people at 22 locations. I've been to many of these locations, and seen in person what a difference these organizations make in the lives of our neighbors, and in the health of our community.

Two years ago, the House of Representatives voted overwhelming to extend funding for CHCs as part of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015. Now that that deadline is upon us, Congress must act again. This time Congress must pass a long-term extension of at least five years, so that our CHCs can have the predictability and stability they need to recruit providers, purchase equipment, and plan strategically for how to meet the current and future needs of communities. I strongly support keeping funding levels for CHCs whole, something more than 350 members in both the House and Senate signed letters supporting earlier this year.

For the sake of our communities and their health, we can't delay in securing funding for CHCs. It's time to fix the health center funding cliff and invest in a local solution we all know delivers results.

TRIBUTE TO RICK ELKINS' DEDICATED CAREER IN JOURNALISM AND SERVICE TO OUR COMMUNITY

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional newsman and life-long journalist, whose desire and commitment to inform and strengthen the community led him to an impressive career in journalism spanning nearly four decades.

Rick Elkins retired this August from the Porterville Recorder, leaving an unparalleled legacy of service not only to the newspaper, but also to the community he covered. As one of California's longest-serving and most locally-invested journalists, Rick spent 22 out of his 39 years in journalism at the Porterville Recorder before his retirement last month.

Rick began his career as a reporter in January of 1976. Ever since, his inquisitive nature has yielded countless stories covering many facets of life. From our region's historic drought to the infamous Tulare County cocaine bust in the late 1980s, Rick kept the

people of Porterville and the surrounding communities well-informed for decades. The magnitude of his service has earned him recognition as one of California's great journalists.

There are many individuals around our community who turned to the Porterville Recorder to learn what was happening in Porterville and Tulare County because of Rick's professionalism and dedication to truthful news coverage. His career and contributions reflect his attitude toward treating the community as a family, among which was his leadership in returning the Porterville Recorder's focus to local news first. As the Representative for California's 23rd Congressional District, I greatly value the importance of an informed citizenry and holding elected officials accountable. The press plays a key role in that. I always looked forward to being interviewed by Rick—he always had his thumb on the pulse of the community and got to the crux of the issues on the community's mind. This approach to journalistic integrity was also reflected by how he ran the Porterville Recorder, earning the respect of his reporters, staff, and the local commu-

nity. Rick's reporting reflected his passion to make sure his readers got the facts of the story and he respected them enough to allow them to draw their own conclusions.

I am confident Rick's legacy will live on for generations to come and that his contribution to our community will have a lasting impact. I thank Rick for his lifetime of service to journalism and his lasting impact on Porterville. I'm sure Rick is looking forward to spending more time with his wife, Doris, and Dana, his daughter, as he begins this new chapter of his life. I wish Rick and his family happiness in his retirement and look forward to his continued involvement in our community.

WHEAT RIDGE POULTRY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Wheat Ridge

Poultry and Meats for receiving the City of Wheat Ridge's Business of the Year Award for 2017.

The Business of the Year Award recognizes local businesses who demonstrate a commitment to their community, strong management practices and are a positive reflection of the City of Wheat Ridge's values.

As noted in their mission and vision statement, "Your local butcher has been on duty since 1942 offering fresh cuts of beef, pork and chicken served from our fresh meat case. Add simplicity, variety and freshness to your family table. Our poultry comes from farms where the birds roam free and animals have spacious barns. Our selection of jams and jellies offers nothing but the freshest fruits and finest ingredients."

I applaud Wheat Ridge Poultry and Meats for being the recipient of this well-deserved honor by the City of Wheat Ridge, and I congratulate them on their success.

SENATE—Monday, October 2, 2017

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we lift our hearts to You. Lord, please shower Your mercy on our Nation, as we seek to deal with the Las Vegas mass shooting. Please show mercy to the victims and their families. Lord, in spite of this horrific act, give us faith to believe that evil will not ultimately prevail in our world. May this tragedy motivate us to plant and water seeds of peace as we cultivate a greater respect for the laws of seedtime and harvest. Cut in pieces the cords of wickedness that seek to bind us.

Today, guide our Senators and use them as ambassadors of reconciliation in our Nation and world.

Eternal God, although we walk in the midst of trouble, stretch forth Your hands and revive us with Your might.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE LAS VEGAS ATTACK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now observe a moment of silence for the victims of the Las Vegas attack.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will now observe a moment of silence for the victims of the attack in Las Vegas.

(Moment of silence.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The majority leader is recognized.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the news we awoke to this morning was

heartbreaking. What happened in Las Vegas is shocking, it is tragic, and for those affected and their families, it is devastating. It is hard to even imagine their pain. I hope they will know that we are praying for them now. I hope they will find strength in the love and kindness of those around them in these hours of such darkness and pain. I hope they will see that our country is standing by their side today.

Many Americans are still in shock. Others have begun to wonder why someone would do something this terrible. Investigators will continue their dedicated work in search of answers, but what is clear now is that this is a moment for national mourning and for prayer.

Just a moment ago, President Trump led the country in observing a moment of silence. As he noted this morning, we are all grateful for the courageous efforts of the first responders. They always put their lives on the line to save others. They do so with a selflessness that reminds us of the inherent courage and mercy that remains possible within each of us—light amidst the dark, hope in times of terrible grief.

The same is true of the national spirit of compassion that shines through our country in the moments when it is needed most. Whether it is lining up to donate blood or signing up to volunteer their time, our fellow Americans are always there to offer what they can when others are in need.

We thank these Americans and law enforcement and the first responders for everything they have done. We thank them for their efforts that continue now.

We again send our condolences to everyone affected by this terrible tragedy.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Pai nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ajit Varadaraj Pai, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there are a number of issues I wish to speak on today, but first I wish to extend my most sincere condolences to the victims of violence in Las Vegas.

What we witnessed last night was a tragedy without precedent. Today, our thoughts are with all those folks who have lost—the families, loved ones, and friends whose lives will never be the same as a result of this shooting.

Our hearts are with all of you, and so are our prayers. We love you. We stand by you today. We ask that God will stand by you always.

REMEMBERING ELDER ROBERT D. HALES

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Elder Robert D. Hales, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

With his family gathered around his bedside, Elder Hales passed away peacefully yesterday afternoon in between sessions of LDS General Conference. More than a beloved leader, he was a caring family man, a powerful role model, and a close friend whom I will miss dearly. Today, I wish to pay tribute to Elder Hales as we remember a life well-lived.

Elder Hales was born on August 4, 1932, to Rulon and Vera Hales. He grew up on Long Island in a diverse neighborhood, which allowed him to become familiar with a variety of different cultures. Although raised on the east coast, Elder Hales always maintained strong western roots. He would speak fondly of the summers he spent in Utah bailing hay, riding horses, tending sheep, and herding cattle in the mountain pastures. Although Elder Hales would later become an accomplished businessman, he was no stranger to manual labor, and he credited his early days working on the farm as the source of his strong work ethic.

During his teenage years, Elder Hales distinguished himself as a student and excelled as a pitcher for his high school baseball team.

After enrolling at the University of Utah, he returned home to New York for the summer and met Mary Crandall. It was love at first sight. They married a year later in the Salt Lake Temple on June 10, 1953.

Following his graduation from college, Elder Hales joined the U.S. Air

Force, where he served as a fighter pilot. His squadron's motto was "Return With Honor." In his own words, "The motto was a constant reminder to us of our determination to return to home base with honor after we had expended all of our efforts to successfully complete every aspect of our mission."

"Return With Honor" would become the credo by which Elder Hales lived his life, expending every effort as a faith leader, father, and friend to better himself, bless others, and build the Kingdom of God.

Yesterday afternoon, after decades of dedicated service as a minister of Jesus Christ, he completed his mortal mission and returned with honor to our heavenly home. The challenge he leaves behind is for all of us to do the same.

To the very end, Elder Hales was a model of selfless service. Even in his later years, beset by illness and old age, he continued to carry out the responsibilities of his apostolic office without hesitation and without complaint. Elder Hales decided when he was still a young man that he would never let anything get in the way of his church service.

Following his career in the Air Force, Elder Hales enrolled at Harvard Business School, where he was called to serve as Elders Quorum president, one of the most demanding leadership positions in the LDS Church. Because of his heavy course load, Elder Hales could have easily declined the calling, but he gladly accepted it. His wife Mary guided him in making this decision. When Elder Hales said he might fail his classes if he agreed to serve as the Elders Quorum president, Mary said:

Bob, I would rather have an active priesthood holder than a man who holds a master's degree from Harvard. We'll do both.

With Mary's unwavering support, Elder Hales served successfully as an Elders Quorum president in addition to earning his MBA. He would later go on to work as a high-level executive at multiple national corporations.

From this formative experience, Bob and Mary learned that God would provide for them as long as they put the gospel first. That is why Elder Hales did not hesitate to leave his business career behind when he was called to serve as a mission president and later as an apostle in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Elder Hales provided a model of servant-leadership for all of us to follow. He was a true disciple of Jesus Christ, putting the welfare of others before self and the Kingdom of God above all. He was gracious and loving, thoughtful and kind. In all things, Elder Hales exemplified humanity and humility, which was the hallmark of his life.

While millions of us grieve his passing, we take peace and comfort in knowing that his service continues on the other side.

I knew him very well, played golf with him, thought he was one of the great men in my life. I am going to pay tribute to him and his family here today in front of the whole United States Senate and the country. He was one of the most worthwhile people I ever met. We are going to miss him.

REFORM OF CRIMINAL INTENT REQUIREMENTS

Mr. President, with the time I have remaining, I wish to address an issue that remains critically important as well—overcriminalization and the need to reform criminal intent requirements in our Federal criminal code.

Like many of my colleagues, I believe Congress has criminalized far too much conduct and has mandated overly harsh penalties for too many crimes. A number of my colleagues have sought to address these problems by cutting prison sentences, altering statutory minimums, or releasing prisoners early for good behavior. But as we seek to reform the criminal justice system, we must be careful not to overlook one of the major roots of the problem: the lack of adequate criminal intent requirements in Federal statutes.

"Mens rea" is a Latin phrase meaning guilty mind. One of the time-honored, fundamental features of our criminal law is that for a person to be found guilty of a crime, he or she must have committed the act with criminal intent or mens rea. In the English common law, this principle was summarized in the idea that the act is not culpable unless the mind is guilty. Mens rea requirements protect individuals who commit an illegal act without knowing that their action was wrong or unlawful.

To give an example, a person who mistakenly retrieves the wrong coat from a coatroom does not become a thief merely because he took something that wasn't his but looked like his. Only if he knows that the coat belongs to someone else does he commit a criminal act.

Unfortunately, many of our current criminal laws and regulations contain inadequate mens rea requirements, and some contain no mens rea requirement at all. This leaves individuals—innocent individuals—subject and vulnerable to prosecution for conduct they believed to be lawful at the time.

In recent years, as Congress and Federal agencies have criminalized more behavior, they have often been vague about mens rea requirements or even silent about mens rea altogether.

In a 2014 Tennessee Law Review article, Michael Cottone investigated how many Federal criminal statutes there are in the U.S. code. Mr. Cottone explained that "tellingly, no exact count of the number of federal statutes that impose criminal sanctions has ever been given." Most scholars agree that there are approximately 5,000 Federal statutes that impose criminal sanctions, but those criminal statutes do

not include the nearly 300,000 Federal regulations that also carry criminal penalties.

With so many criminal laws on the books, it is far too easy for Americans to break Federal laws unwittingly, with no understanding whatsoever that their behavior happens to be illegal. For example, did you know it is a Federal crime to write a check for an amount of less than \$1 or that it is a Federal crime to allow a pet to make a noise that frightens wildlife on Federal land? Even more incredibly, did you know it is a Federal crime to keep a pet on a leash that exceeds 6 feet in length on Federal land?

These are only a few examples of unlawful activities that reasonable people could not reasonably be expected to know. What is worse, many of these unlawful activities are punishable by time in prison. This is not only ridiculous, but it is immoral. The lack of adequate mens rea requirements in our Federal criminal code subjects innocent people to unjustified punishment.

To address this issue, I reintroduced the Mens Rea Reform Act of 2017. Today I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the Heritage Foundation and the Federalist Society for highlighting the need for mens rea reform and for supporting my efforts to protect innocent people. They are not the only ones. Anybody who looks at this has to say: Are we going to send people to jail when they didn't know what they were doing was wrong? It makes anybody stop and think: Is that right? Should we do that? Is that fair?

Likewise, I wish to thank Senators RAND PAUL, TED CRUZ, MIKE LEE, and DAVID PERDUE for joining me as cosponsors on this bill. Our bill sets a default intent requirement of willfulness for all Federal criminal offenses that lack an intent requirement. Additionally, the bill defines willfulness to mean that a person acted with knowledge that his or her conduct was unlawful.

Naturally, our bill does not apply to any offenses that Congress clearly intended to be strict liability offenses. Our proposal has garnered widespread support from a variety of organizations, including the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, Koch Industries, the Federal Defenders, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Heritage Foundation—just to name a few.

Importantly, our bill does not remove any crimes from the books, nor does it override any existing mens rea standards written in statute. Moreover, it does not limit Congress's authority to create new criminal offenses, including strict liability offenses.

Mens rea really is a simple issue. Individuals should not be threatened with prison time for accidentally committing a crime or for engaging in an activity they did not know was wrong.

If Congress wants to criminalize an activity and does not want to include any sort of criminal intent requirement, Congress should have to specify in statute that it is creating a strict liability offense.

I believe this simple legislative solution will go a long way in reducing harsh sentences for morally innocent offenders. It will also push back against the overcriminalization of innocent behavior. As I have said many times, any consideration of criminal justice reform or sentencing reform is incomplete without reforms to mens rea requirements.

FOREIGN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. President, on a final note, I wish to express my concern about a provision in U.S. law that allows foreign litigants to come into U.S. courts and gain access to documents and other evidence for use in foreign judicial proceedings.

Under current provision, 28 U.S.C. 1782, an American citizen can be subjected to invasive requests by a foreign entity even when the citizen has no ability under the laws of the foreign jurisdiction to obtain similar information from the foreign entity itself. This gives foreign entities an unfair advantage over their U.S. counterparts.

Equally problematic, U.S. persons may be compelled under Federal law to turn over business information or trade secrets for use in Federal judicial proceedings without any guarantee that such information will be adequately protected in the foreign jurisdiction. This places U.S. businesses at risk and, again, creates an unfair playing field.

Such unfairness and lack of reciprocity is deeply concerning. Our laws should not disadvantage our own citizens and companies. Rather, we should ensure a level playing field.

In the coming weeks, I will be introducing legislation to do just that. These are important bills, and these are important ideas. I appreciate having this time to be able to express them for the country at large.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, before my planned remarks on the Federal Communications Commission, I want to say a few words about the awful events that happened in Las Vegas. Our hearts are with the families affected by the tragedy and with the city of Las Vegas, and we do send them our best wishes and our prayers. But we can do more than send our thoughts and prayers to the grieving. We can do more

than thank the first responders. We can do more than lower the flag to half mast.

We can take a stand against gun violence by passing commonsense gun safety laws. Otherwise, this becomes a ritual of mass murder, mourning, and moving on. Let's stop this awful ritual. Let's stop the violence. Let's do something about it.

Mr. President, I wish to talk about the nomination of Chairman Ajit Pai to lead the Federal Communications Commission for another 5 years. When it comes to Chairman Pai, personally and professionally, I want to say that I believe in his integrity as a public servant, and I believe he is smart and qualified. But the FCC is supposed to create competition and protect consumers, and Chairman Pai isn't doing that.

First, Chairman Pai's FCC is trying to get rid of net neutrality. Net neutrality is a Federal rule that says ISPs—internet service providers—must treat all content equally. They can't discriminate by making certain kinds of content slower, charging more for other kinds of content, or blocking some content altogether.

That is the basic premise of the internet. Once you pay for your broadband internet access and then you jump on a browser, everything comes down to the same speeds. It is so foundational to the way we use the internet that it is actually hard to describe a future without net neutrality, but it could be that you pay your ISP, and certain websites download fast.

Certain websites are almost impossible to find. For certain websites, you have to pay a premium just to be able to capture their content. Forget what you may have to pay Hulu, Netflix, and others. The ISP will essentially control your access to the internet. That is why net neutrality was so important. It is not that, in that moment, things were necessarily undermining the current internet but that, without a firm rule, these companies may have incentives to change the internet as we know it.

When Chairman Pai announced that the FCC would review the rules on net neutrality, he said: "This is a fight we intend to wage, and it is a fight that we are going to win." But that is not how the FCC is supposed to work. This is a quasi-judicial agency. They are supposed to propose a rule, allow the public to weigh in, and then the agency considers the comments before making a decision. Chairman Pai had made it clear from the beginning that he had already made up his mind. Even though there were 22 million individual comments from American citizens about what we should do with the free and open internet, he had decided in advance of that.

Unfortunately, this is part of a pattern. Right after Congress took away

the FCC's ability to protect people's privacy online, he wrote an op-ed that essentially read that this is good news. It is pretty unusual to have a chairman of a quasi-judicial body weigh in on something that the legislative branch does or to completely disregard the process for public input. Chairman Pai has not yet demonstrated a willingness to stray from the party line.

One of the things I like about him is that I know that he has a big brain. We have talked policy, and when we have had private conversations, I have seen that he has liked the engagement, that he likes the job, and that he likes public service. The challenge is that there has been no instance in which he has done anything that was other than predictably Republican. That is OK for now, as it has been a relatively short tenure, but what we need in an FCC Chairman is someone who takes his own views and the facts, as the record becomes established, and makes up his own mind. He is not a Republican while he is on the FCC. His job is to apply the facts and his own judgment.

During the confirmation hearing, I asked him about the President of the United States calling the media the "enemy of the state." He would not say one way or another what he thought of those comments or how he would guide the FCC based on those comments. At some point, he needs to demonstrate some independence from his party and from the President.

With this vote, the Senate has a chance to say that the person who leads the FCC should understand, at a bare minimum, how to run a quasi-judicial agency in a nonpartisan fashion, that he or she should value public input, and that he or she should not simply go along with what the party is asking and implement it no matter how it stacks up against the statute.

Here is another example. Earlier this year, Chairman Pai rolled back a rule in order to allow local TV stations to be bought up without any limits by one single company. This decision seemed to be for the benefit of one company, the Sinclair Broadcast Group, which just happens to be a company with strong conservative leanings. Sinclair is already the largest owner of local broadcasting stations in the United States, but now it is trying to buy another company, Tribune Media, which would expand Sinclair's reach into 72 percent of the households.

For decades, both Congress and the FCC have taken steps to protect local broadcasting because it has benefited the public interest. So, under normal circumstances, Sinclair would not be able to buy up these other stations, but Chairman Pai has changed the rules so that this company will have even more power and reach. The secondary beneficiary of this change will be the Republican Party, because Sinclair has a decades-long history of pressuring its

local stations to broadcast certain news that helps the Republican cause.

We need an independent Chairman at the helm of the FCC. We need someone who will make decisions based on statute, not based on political affiliation. That is why I will vote no on Mr. Pai's nomination, but I hope that I will be proven wrong.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM HAWAII

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my friend from Hawaii for his words.

I will make a statement for the record with regard to Mr. Pai, as I agree with Senator SCHATZ' vote and will be voting no, but I want to first speak about the horrible situation in Las Vegas.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. President, there are precious few words for days like this. Last night, as everyone now knows, at a concert in Las Vegas, NV, a gunman opened fire on a crowd of 22,000, killing at least 58 and sending hundreds more to the hospital. It was the deadliest mass shooting in the history of our country.

Our collective hearts, so hardened now by the absurd frequency of these mass shootings, are broken once again. We mourn for the families of the fallen, and we pray with the families of the wounded. We have the deepest gratitude for every first responder, cop, and firefighter who rushed to the scene, as their heroism in the moment of this national tragedy has been an inspiration. Yet today we are filled with shock and horror, with sadness and rage.

The horrific massacre was perpetrated by an American on his fellow Americans and the visitors from every corner of the world, who are the very lifeblood of Las Vegas. We are left with many questions, the answers to which we will seek in the coming days and weeks.

How did this monster acquire the arsenal that he used to rain down death on a crowd of innocents? Were these guns purchased and compiled legally? What was this person's perverted motive? Was there any history of mental health issues?

What circumstances could lead a man to commit such violence upon his fellow human beings—complete strangers—what twisted reasoning, what demented logic?

There is much more that we do not know than what we do know. Some of the questions that we have today will not have clear answers. Others are, perhaps, beyond our fathoming. Yet some will have answers, and we will have to reckon with the fact that this man was able to assemble an arsenal of military-grade weapons.

As much as we might hope to, we cannot banish evil from the Earth. Congress cannot do that, and the President cannot do that. What Congress can do and what Congress must do is to pass laws that keep our citizens safe, and that starts with laws that help prevent guns, especially the most dangerous guns, from falling into the wrong hands.

We will take care of the injured—their bodies and their hearts—and nurse them back to health. We will mourn those lost with all of our collective love and support. We will bind up this new national wound. Then, we will aggressively ferret out the facts, and based on that reality, we will confront—we must confront—the deeply troubling issues that have been raised by this atrocity.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, our friends and relatives and fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands should know that, even while we mourn and process the incomprehensible events in Las Vegas, we remain laser-focused on the needs of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and we will continue our advocacy for a more comprehensive, more sure-footed, and better coordinated response to their crisis.

Mr. President, shortly the Senate will vote on the nominee to be Chairman of the FCC, Mr. Ajit Pai.

I cannot support this nominee for the office of Chairman. The FCC is tasked with the critical role of protecting consumers and promoting innovation in the telecommunications and technological fields that are becoming more and more integral to our day-to-day lives. However, over his time at the FCC and particularly in his tenure as Chairman so far, Mr. Pai has established a clear record of favoring big corporations at the expense of consumers, innovators, and small businesses.

He supported congressional attempts to reverse the FCC's 2016 broadband privacy rule, which would have prevented big cable and internet companies from profiting off of personal internet data. Now, internet service providers no longer have to obtain consumer consent before they sell or share sensitive personal data.

Most disturbingly, Chairman Pai is currently attempting to dismantle the open internet order, the net neutrality rules under which millions of consumers currently have access to a free and open internet. Net neutrality has had a huge impact on everyone who uses the internet—on communities of color, on small businesses, on schools, on civic engagement, and on our economy.

Net neutrality is not the only issue where I disagree with Chairman Pai's agenda. In his first 2 weeks on the job, Chairman Pai stopped 9 companies

from providing discounted high-speed internet to low-income individuals, and he jammed through nearly a dozen industry-backed actions, including some to begin curtailing net neutrality. The most alarming part: these clandestine moves to clip the public's fundamental right to a free and open internet were done without seeking public comment first.

It is no surprise, therefore, that Chairman Pai would be willing to further undermine the FCC's protection of net neutrality, notwithstanding the views of the nearly 22 million American citizens who have commented in opposition to his net neutrality proposal.

The open internet order is working well as it is and should remain undisturbed. Mr. Pai, however, seems bent on rolling back the open internet on behalf of a few corporate friends, rather than serving the American consumer and the American economy by keeping the current protections in place.

For these reasons, I feel very strongly that I must oppose his nomination; I cannot support this agenda, which I believe imperils consumers and the internet itself.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you very much.

Today, I am here to speak on behalf of a good friend and an exceptional public servant, Chairman Ajit Pai of the Federal Communications Commission.

I have admired his work throughout his service within the Commission, which dates back to 2007, when he was in the Office of General Counsel. Over time, he was promoted to become the Deputy General Counsel of the Federal Communications Commission. In 2012, by voice vote, he was confirmed by the Senate to serve as a Commissioner, and he has continued to embody integrity, honesty, and dedication in this role, something we would expect from a Kansan.

As only the second Kansan ever to be nominated to serve on the Federal Communications Commission—the first being Bob Wells of Garden City, KS, who served from 1969 to 1971—Ajit Pai has proven himself to be a capable and talented leader and one of the smartest people whom I have ever met, especially when it comes to public policy.

I have worked with him and his staff throughout my time on the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee and have traveled

with him throughout our home State. My getting to know him on a personal level has really been a delight, something that has been a highlight of my time while serving in the Senate. He is a native of Parsons, KS, which is a small town in the southeast corner of our State, and he brings with him an understanding of the challenges that face rural America. He understands the importance of access to high-speed broadband and wireless connectivity, and I believe that his roots as a small town Kansas kid make him exceptionally qualified to advocate for rural America.

Ajit came to Wichita just this past week to explore ideas and explain policy opportunities to close the digital divide within local broadband providers that work in Kansas communities I serve. The lack of broadband connectivity in parts of rural Kansas has lasting economic, educational, and public health impacts, and Ajit Pai has prioritized incentive-based solutions like the Connect America Fund and Mobility Fund to close this divide in a fiscally responsible and competitively driven way.

Outside of supporting high-speed broadband build-out to unserved or underserved areas, Ajit created the Broadband Deployment Advisory Committee to promote broadband deployment across America, including removing regulatory burdens and barriers and improving permitting and the right-of-way process through regulatory reform.

While in Kansas, he was also able to see the great work that was being done to implement the Next Generation 9-1-1 technology in our home State. As we know, improving these communications systems is absolutely necessary to ensure adequate emergency services to rural and urban Americans alike, and we see that today and over the last several months with the disasters and tragedies that have occurred in our country.

Ajit has also proven himself to be a leader who is committed to free markets, clearly understanding that regulations should be balanced with pro-growth economic principles that do not unduly harm employers or stifle innovation. To this end, Ajit Pai announced his intentions to stand up a new Office of Economics and Data within the FCC to provide economic analysis of the policies and functions of the agency. We are looking for thoughtful, data-backed input to the agency that should lead to market-driven policy decisions the Commission can then hang their hat on.

Critical issues before the FCC today require this type of expertise; things such as efficient and effective broadband deployment, quality spectrum management that schools and libraries desperately need, as well as hospitals that also desperately need

this spectrum, and fostering innovation just in the general sense. If we want a growing economy with more jobs, better jobs, higher paying jobs, we need access to the latest technologies across the country.

As the currently appointed Chair of the FCC, Ajit has improved openness and transparency within the Commission, eliminated onerous and duplicative regulations holding up that innovation, and has protected consumers from illegal and fraudulent robocalls. One recent decision under his leadership that has received so much attention from consumer advocates, industry representatives, and policy academics is the FCC order Restoring Internet Freedom Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Under Chairman Pai's leadership, the Commission has collected tens of millions of comments regarding the agency's proposal to roll back the 2015 open internet order and has extended the deadline so more interested parties can be heard. This input collection, coupled with fundamentally improving the rulemaking processes, has increased the Commission's culture of openness and transparency, something I certainly support and would continue to encourage.

I believe the Federal Government must ensure a fair and open internet that is not blocked or slowed. I do not want outdated utility-style regulations to the internet that were established for telephone companies in the 1930s. Instead of leaving this important regulatory framework open to interpretation and change with every new administration, Congress—the U.S. Senate—and our Commerce Committee should and must craft bipartisan legislation that preserves the fair and open internet.

Chairman Pai has taken thoughtful steps toward a long-term solution by seeking to eliminate the harmful 2015 regulations hindering broadband deployment and harming an innovative internet ecosystem.

Ajit Pai has repeatedly proven himself to be a public servant of the highest caliber, with strong integrity and character. I am proud to recommend his swift confirmation to the Federal Communications Commission and call on my colleagues to support his nomination. Ajit Pai is an intelligent, articulate public servant who has the character and integrity that is required at the Federal Communications Commission. I support his nomination and ask my colleagues to do the same. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. President, as I noted last week, the nominee before us, FCC Chairman Ajit Pai, has led a fascinating life with two defining features: hard work and success.

He understands communications policy from just about every angle—no wonder, given his deep and impressive resume.

He comprehends the needs of rural communities in states like mine, a product of his own rural upbringing.

He has dedicated himself to issues like advocating for Americans' First Amendment rights and bringing more openness and more accountability to the FCC, an agency that, too often, has earned a reputation for secrecy.

Chairman Pai is just the kind of person we need over at the FCC.

I was glad to see the Senate advance his nomination last week.

I look forward to confirming him to a new term later this afternoon.

Mr. DURBIN, Mr. President, I come to the floor today to voice my concern regarding the nomination of Ajit Pai to serve as a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission.

Many of my colleagues are planning to speak about the threat Mr. Pai poses to a free and open Internet, but what brings me to the floor is a different looming threat to the public interest: the proposed Sinclair Broadcast Group merger with Tribune Media Company. If approved, the Sinclair-Tribune merger would create the Nation's largest television broadcast company in history, reaching over 70 percent of households nationwide. There is reason for concern.

Mr. Pai's track record at the FCC has shown that he will not hesitate to put the needs of industry ahead of the best interests of consumers. Under his leadership as Chairman, the FCC acted to reinstate an outdated loophole known as the UHF discount that would make it easier for companies to get around rules limiting national media ownership. These rules are essential in maintaining the trust Americans have placed in their local broadcasters and ensuring consumers benefit from programming representing diverse viewpoints.

What was Mr. Pai's motivation for putting this loophole back in place? I will just say this: The loophole was reinstated in April, and Sinclair announced its acquisition of Tribune in May.

My concerns about the merger are not solely grounded in Sinclair's practice of mandating its stations distribute its self-produced conservative content, as troubling as that is. Rather it is that no single company should be able to decide what 72 percent of the country's news looks like. The Sinclair-Tribune merger undermines competition and threatens local broadcasting as a trusted and diverse voice for its viewers in Illinois and across the country.

Because of Mr. Pai's deregulatory campaign and repeated failure to put the best needs of the consumer first, I will oppose his nomination to serve a second term as a Commissioner for the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. LEAHY, Mr. President, in 2015, the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, did something that can be

all too rare Washington: It listened to the American people. After a record number of Americans spoke in favor of clear rules to protect a free and open Internet, the FCC voted to adopt strong net neutrality protections that accomplished this goal. These protections, which ensure that innovation and free speech can flourish online, are currently under threat as the FCC now moves to repeal them. On net neutrality and on many other key telecommunications policy issues, Chairman Pai has stood against consumers, startups, and small businesses. Today I choose to stand with them and with millions of Americans who support net neutrality by opposing his reappointment.

Vermonters have been clear that they want strong FCC rules in place to ensure that the Internet remains the ultimate platform for economic opportunity and free expression. These protections are particularly important for small businesses, which compete on the internet's global stage against the largest companies in the world. The Vermont Country Store is a great example of a small company that has taken advantage of the promise of an open Internet. Family-owned with a rich history dating back to 1897, the internet offered new opportunities to extend the company's reach. As fifth generation storekeeper Cabot Orton said when he testified in Vermont about the FCC's effort to craft net neutrality protections in 2014:

We don't want to imagine an America with two Internets: a fast one for giant corporations and a slow one for everybody else. We don't want to imagine being held for ransom by telecom behemoths and cable monopolies just to reach our customers with the same speed and convenience that global conglomerates enjoy . . . A small business website that is no longer protected from giant Internet toll-keepers would have one choice: pay to play. Failing that, a company becomes the proverbial tree falling in the forest with no one there to hear it.

Chairman Pai has shown total disregard for the concerns of businesses like the Vermont Country Store. In proposing to repeal the existing net neutrality protections, he makes no mention of their importance to the small business community. Instead of recognizing the very real impact on small businesses of stripping away these protections, Chairman Pai claims that there are no possible harms these protections could be designed to prevent.

This is particularly clear when he discusses the current rule banning harmful paid prioritization agreements that would create the type of two-tiered internet small businesses fear. Chairman Pai claims that there was no need for this rule because some large internet service providers, ISPs, said they "had no plans" to engage in this kind of behavior. This is despite the fact that at least one major ISP said

outright in its 2014 FCC filing that it wanted the "flexibility" to charge websites for priority access and that, even though it had no plans for these arrangements, they "should be permissible and should be tested."

I introduced legislation to ban pay-to-play deals online before the FCC adopted its rule because of the harm they would cause small businesses like the Vermont Country Store. I find Chairman Pai's failure to understand the importance of a level playing field for small businesses extremely disconcerting.

Not only is Chairman Pai ignoring the small business community by barreling ahead to repeal net neutrality protections, he is also ignoring the clear will of the American people. Over 22 million Americans have submitted comments in the proceeding he started to repeal these critical protections, shattering records at the FCC. Poll after poll has found overwhelming bipartisan support for net neutrality. In Washington, Chairman Pai calls net neutrality protections burdensome and unnecessary. In Vermont, we just call them common sense.

Vermonters also value their privacy rights and want basic protections in place to protect their personal data. In 2016, over Chairman Pai's objections, the FCC put in place important privacy protections to prevent ISPs from selling their sensitive information, including their web browsing history, without their consent. These rules also included basic data security and data breach notification requirements. We have seen how important it is to hold companies to basic data security and breach notification standards in the wake of the total disregard Equifax showed for protecting sensitive consumer information.

Unfortunately, Chairman Pai was a strong supporter of the resolution of disapproval passed by this Congress that permanently repealed the FCC's privacy and data security protections. At a time when the personal information of every single American is under constant threat, Chairman Pai thought it was simply too much to ask for ISPs to take reasonable steps to secure their subscribers data and notify them if a breach occurs.

Chairman Pai's approach to rural broadband, which is one of the most pressing issues for Vermonters, also raises cause for concern. Just recently, he has proposed to effectively lower the speed standard used to measure whether Americans have access to adequate broadband service. As someone who represents a rural State, ensuring that we accurately measure how many Americans lack this essential service is critical. Under the current standard set by the previous FCC, 39 percent of rural Americans lack access to true high-speed broadband service. In contrast, only 4 percent of urban Americans lack access.

I supported the FCC's decision to set a high minimum broadband speed to use as the baseline for comparing rural and urban areas. All Americans deserve the same quality of broadband service, whether they live in the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont or the heart of Kansas City. Rural Americans should not be held to a lower standard simply so that Chairman Pai can rig the numbers to falsely claim that he has closed the digital divide once and for all.

Chairman Pai has shown far too often in his time at the FCC that he will side with Goliath over David and that he will ignore the overwhelming sentiment of the American people. With the fate of the open internet and many other critical telecommunications issues at stake, I must oppose Chairman Pai's nomination.

Mr. MORAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today we mourn the loss of at least 50 lives in Las Vegas, the victims of senseless violence at an outdoor concert near the Mandalay Resort and Casino. The lives of fellow Americans were taken in a barbaric manner that defies all justification, excuse, or even explanation. That these events have become almost commonplace in modern society makes them no less shocking or morally reprehensible.

The date and location—a country music festival on a Sunday afternoon—make the act seem doubly cruel. Thousands of innocent spectators were there from around the country enjoying themselves, with security being the furthest thing from their minds, until the shots rang out.

As news reports have now indicated, the event is one of the deadliest mass shootings in modern U.S. history. It and other forms of violence continue to tear apart the fabric of our country, and the scars left among the victims' families and loved ones will be painful and permanent.

My prayers go out to all those in Nevada who have not slept since yesterday and who are still grappling with the aftermath of the shooting, the families tending to loved ones in hospitals, as well as the first responders and law enforcement officers who ran toward, not away from, the gunfire and who are now nursing various wounds. Here in Washington, we will continue to monitor the situation. We will continue to keep the fallen in our prayers in the days ahead.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, turning to the legislative business at hand, the last time Congress enacted tax reform was 1986. Back then, I was a State district judge in San Antonio, TX, the Spurs had a bad losing streak, and gasoline was 89 cents a gallon.

A lot has changed since 1986. We have seen parties in Congress win the majority, lose it, and win again. We have seen six Presidents come and go, bringing us to this moment, this year, with the President committed to providing Americans with real tax relief and the promise of a resurgent economy. After countless meetings, hearings, and conversations amongst Members who represent varying and diverse constituents, Republicans in the House and the Senate and the administration have joined together to unveil a unified framework for tax reform.

In the more than 30 years since our Tax Code has become overhauled, it has become the punch line in a bad joke. No one will defend it. Everyone knows it needs to be fixed. Over time, the code has become more complex and is now riddled with deductions, credits, and loopholes advocated by an army of lobbyists and special interests, so much so that the majority of Americans now pay somebody else to prepare their taxes because it is too complex for them to figure it out on their own, but with renewed focus and determination, we are committed to taking this framework and using it to enact real reforms to simplify a Tax Code that has grown so complex over the years, but that is not the main reason.

The main reason we need tax reform is that the Tax Code has become the enemy of a growing, prosperous economy; the enemy of more take-home pay, and the enemy of America's competitiveness in a global economy. It is self-inflicted harm, and we can and must do better.

Our first priority should be to reduce taxes for all American families, not one socioeconomic class or another—everyone. With a simpler, fairer, and more competitive Tax Code, we can raise living standards so people who earn the money can make decisions on how best to spend it themselves—on their children's education, on their home, on a car they need in order to get reliable transportation to get to and from work, or just maybe putting a little bit of money away for retirement.

I think about the newly graduated teacher in Houston's public schools who is worried about stagnant wages, the entrepreneur in Austin with a great business idea who needs investors to succeed, or a single parent in San Antonio who is living paycheck-to-paycheck. Ultimately, this is about empowering all citizens to pursue the American dream. This is about reducing government's big bite out of our

wages each month and about small businesses spending more time growing and creating jobs.

By coming to the aid of hard-working American and Texas families, we will reawaken the sleeping giant that is our economy by reincentivizing investment and job creation.

I know these are lofty goals. If it were easy, we would have done it more recently than since 1986. I know some of our colleagues across the aisle and some in the public are already questioning this framework. Some have wasted no time lobbing accusations, but they don't even bother to do their homework first. They are engaging in the same kind of class warfare many have come to love to wage here in Washington, DC, but those tactics are deeply cynical and deeply untrue.

Here is their lie. They say our tax plan cuts taxes for the wealthy and hurts the poor, even though the actual plan hasn't been written yet. Some claim they already know what the bill says, and they don't. That is entirely predictable in this political environment and wholly false. Let me tell you why.

First, we will cut taxes for all American families without shifting the burden from higher income households to lower or middle-income households. To accomplish this, the framework creates a large zero tax bracket by doubling the standard deduction. The first \$12,000 of income for an individual and \$24,000 for a couple would be tax-free.

Let me say it again. If you are a couple who makes \$24,000 or less, you will pay zero Federal income tax, which is effectively a zero tax bracket. Additionally, the proposed individual rates are collapsed into three, at 12 percent, 25 percent, and 35 percent. So instead of seven tax brackets, which we have now for individuals, we will have four, including the zero tax bracket. This framework also enhances the child tax credit. It repeals the death tax that has hurt small businesses and their families; it has broken up family farms and ranches. And it repeals the special interest tax breaks that primarily benefit the wealthy.

The other refrain some critics have already started making is the claim that our tax plan gives big tax cuts to job creators. As I said, in addition to closing the special interest loopholes, nearly everyone will see some sort of benefit, and job creators will take that benefit and invest in their businesses. They will hire more people, and they will improve wages and growth in the economy, from which we will all benefit. So why would our Democratic colleagues oppose that?

Our unified framework is a template that will be used by the tax-writing committees to put the nuts and bolts together for tax reform. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I look forward to working with Chair-

man HATCH, Ranking Member WYDEN, as well as colleagues in the House—Ways and Means Chairman KEVIN BRADY, Speaker RYAN, and others—on these ideas. I even look forward to working with our Democratic colleagues if they will join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Madam President, for the recognition.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Today is a day of mourning for Las Vegas and for America. My heart goes out to all those touched by the ruthless and cowardly shooting last night.

One of the victims was Lisa Romero, a secretary at Miyamura High School in Gallup, NM. The students knew her well as Ms. Lisa, and she was adored by everyone at the school. Her loss will be deeply felt. I send my condolences and prayers to her family, as well as her school family, and to everyone in Gallup, NM.

I also want to recognize the true bravery of first responders—the police, the fire fighters, the EMTs—some of whom risked their own lives to save others. There are heroes in America, and we saw them in action last evening.

Las Vegas, NV, and New Mexico share a kinship. Nevada is a sister Western State. Many New Mexicans have family in Las Vegas, and New Mexicans are reeling because of this tragedy. As westerners and as Americans, we must always come together to support the victims, thank our first responders, and focus resources and policy on preventing future massacres.

Madam President, I rise in opposition to the renomination of Mr. Ajit Pai to the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Pai, both as FCC Commissioner and now as Chairman, has not been a vigorous watchdog for free speech. He has not put the people's right to information first. In fact, he has put corporate interests first, and he has opposed policies outright that ensure underserved communities have access to essential technology. I strongly oppose his renomination to the Commission.

Let's begin with his responsibility to guard First Amendment rights. President Trump has relentlessly attacked NBC, CBS, ABC, CNN, the New York Times, and the Washington Post. He called these established and esteemed news outlets "fake news." He even called them "the enemy of the people."

Earlier this year, in February, during a Senate Commerce Committee hearing—this was an oversight hearing—I asked Chairman Pai pointblank whether he agreed with the President that these mainstream news organizations were the enemy of the people. He refused to answer, refused to disagree with this patently outrageous and anti-American statement.

His written answers were better, but even then Chairman Pai did not demonstrate that he could stand up to power and defend First Amendment rights. Democrats on the Commerce Committee sent a letter asking again whether he believed the media were the enemy of the people, and he qualified his answer in the negative by writing that “the President has made clear he was referring to ‘fake news’ [as the enemy of the people].” I wish that were true, but it is not. The President referred to well-respected, mainstream media organizations.

The FCC must unequivocally stand up for the First Amendment, and the Chairman needs to strongly disavow the President's unfounded attack on the media.

The FCC took a huge step forward in favor of consumers in 2015 when it passed the open internet order. That order, known as the net neutrality order, was codified. The principle underlying net neutrality is simple and fair. It means that internet service providers must treat all internet traffic equally. They cannot block access to particular websites, apps, or services. They can't give fast lanes or special treatment to websites or apps that pay more or are favored by some companies' executives.

Consumers benefit because internet service providers can't “pick winners and losers in the online marketplace for services and ideas.” Those are the words of President Obama.

Our democracy benefits because the internet lowers the barriers to communication—but not if the massive companies that control infrastructure can erect new ones. As a Commissioner, Mr. Pai voted against that pro-consumer measure, and as Trump's Chairman, he has now moved to dismantle it. The American people are outraged with the Chairman's move to undo net neutrality. The Commission has received a record 22 million comments in that regulatory proceeding.

Who is against net neutrality? The megaproviders like Comcast and Verizon—Chairman Pai's old employer—can benefit financially from giving advantage to selected websites. Chairman Pai's record is that if there is a choice between consumers and big corporations, corporations win.

Let's look at what the Chairman did recently to allow the biggest broadcast company in America to become even bigger. Congress has put into law a limit on the market share that ultra-high frequency or UHF stations can own, and that limit is 39 percent. The Commission had considered that Sinclair Broadcast Group, the largest broadcast company, holds a 38 percent market share. But Sinclair wants to expand its reach and merge with another big company, Tribune Media. The \$3.9 billion deal would give Sinclair control over 200 more local television

stations and expand its market to 72 percent of the television-owning households. Here is a chart that shows how expansive Sinclair's proposed takeover would be. You can see here the current marks, and you can see down below the proportional footprint.

Traditionally, the FCC has interpreted its rules to prohibit Sinclair from making that deal, but Chairman Pai authored an order in April reinterpreting FCC policy to allow Sinclair to grab almost three-quarters of the market, and Sinclair happens to be well known for its friendly coverage of President Trump. It even requires local broadcast outlets to regularly carry national commentary from a former Trump campaign and White House media surrogate, and its executives have been complimentary of Chairman Pai personally.

Congress intended for there to be a multiplicity and diversity of voices and opinions on the airwaves. Congress explicitly wants to prevent one media organization from having an outsized influence over the Nation.

I have strong reservations about Chairman Pai's leadership and values. Free speech, media ownership rules, and net neutrality are essential to a healthy democracy, and the Chairman is equivocating or moving backward on all fronts. For these reasons, I oppose this nomination.

Nevertheless, if he is confirmed, I hope we can find common ground and work together. One area where we could do that is rural and Tribal broadband in the West. In my home State of New Mexico, rural areas, pueblos, and Tribes do not have access to the internet that is anywhere near adequate. Approximately 63 percent of people living on Tribal land lack access to acceptable fixed broadband speeds, compared to only 17 percent of the U.S. population as a whole. The gap is even higher for residents of Tribal lands in rural areas, with approximately 85 percent of Tribal people lacking access.

We all know that in today's world, broadband internet is essential to virtually all successful economic and commercial activity. It is essential to everyday life in America. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I will continue to push the FCC to do all it can to close the digital divide.

Broadband expansion is not a question of political ideology; it is a question of political will. The Federal Government played a big role in expanding electricity and telephone service to every American. We, as a country, have made major investments. We must do the same for rural broadband. Senate Democrats have made a number of concrete proposals recently. I hope we can work with our Republican colleagues on these. I urge Chairman Pai to take them seriously.

Members of the Commission must be 100 percent committed to principles of

free speech, to protecting consumers and the underserved. Mr. Pai's record does not give me sufficient confidence that he shares that commitment, and, therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to reject his nomination.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I come here today to talk about the nomination of FCC Chairman Ajit Pai, but before I begin, I think all of us have incredibly heavy hearts in our homes, in our States, in the country, and in the world, as the horrifying events of Las Vegas really begin to sink in.

I just saw an article come across the news line in my home State of West Virginia with one of the first identifications of the victims. Her name was Denise Burditus. She is from Martinsburg, WV. She and her husband Tony were at the concert together. They have been married 32 years. They were high school sweethearts and were there vacationing and at the concert. Tony wrote on his Facebook page that his wife died in his arms. So we have lost a mother of two, and soon to be a grandmother of five, to this horrible tragedy. My heart sinks for them and for everyone. I really don't have the words to say to comfort or explain or understand, except that I feel deeply sad and sorry, and I pray for them and their families.

Today, Madam President, I want to talk about the nomination and reappointment of Ajit Pai as the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Chairman Pai has been an important partner in my quest to bring rural America and much of my State online. I was very lucky to meet Chairman Pai several years ago. Without question, he has been a champion.

Without question, high-speed internet access has allowed us to connect with one another on a scale we never could have imagined a decade ago. No other technology has become so critical to our daily lives. It is the backbone for our innovation, competition, and economic growth. From starting a business to digital learning and telemedicine, broadband access is critical to the strength of our economy and our communities. Unfortunately, for all the potential opportunities that broadband can offer, not having access to this important service can create insurmountable barriers.

Better connecting States like mine—West Virginia—through improved broadband has become one of my top

priorities. Without this, our rural areas risk being left behind. The digital divide exists in this country, and rural Americans are the ones who are on the wrong side of the divide. Small communities and businesses across West Virginia and elsewhere in rural America lack this fundamental infrastructure.

No one understands these issues more than Ajit Pai. Chairman Pai grew up in rural Kansas. He told me that sometimes when he goes home to visit his parents, he cannot get connected in his own hometown. He knows the challenges facing rural communities.

I have had the pleasure of hosting Chairman Pai and his staff multiple times in West Virginia. Most recently, Chairman Pai came to Wardensville in Hardy County, WV, where we have good connectivity and where we have actually been able to create new businesses and opportunities for a small town such as Wardensville. Following our visit, we traveled just 20, 30 miles over to Hampshire County, where getting high-speed internet has been far more challenging. There, Chairman Pai met Eric Hott of Kirby, WV, who has a small chocolate business. Eric is having trouble following up with orders and attracting new customers because he can't get consistent broadband access.

Last August, I held a roundtable discussion with Chairman Pai in Fayette County, WV, focusing on the digital divide and the impacts on tourism. We visited Adventures on the Gorge. I even convinced him to join me on a bridge walk across the beautiful New River Gorge. This outdoor recreation destination is one of West Virginia's most beautiful and premier tourist destinations, but the small businesses there are hampered by the lack of connectivity.

We heard firsthand from business owners who can't grow their business because of poor internet connectivity. It is hard to attract a talented workforce to live and visit in these more rural parts of our States. A local restaurant owner shared their difficulty in notifying customers of available tables through their online system. They lost business because of this.

During each of the Chairman's visits, we discussed possible solutions to promote greater access and competition. Chairman Pai is a great listener. He listens to what the issues are, and those include reducing barriers to investment, streamlining the regulatory environment, encouraging public-private partnerships, and ensuring accountability on behalf of the taxpayer.

Following his tour across the country, during which he stopped in West Virginia, Chairman Pai proposed a digital empowerment agenda right down the alley of the issues we just talked about—to grant Americans living in communities of all sizes, from urban cores to smaller, rural towns, with

these online opportunities. Chairman Pai's agenda highlighted a variety of specific measures the FCC, Congress, and State and local governments could make to simplify broadband deployment.

Broadband access will be the result of partnerships between private, local, State, and Federal agencies and organizations. We need to have this collaboration to eliminate duplicative and outdated programs so that States like mine can efficiently deliver broadband to our rural communities efficiently and cost-effectively.

By listening to communities like ours—and remember, I said Chairman Pai is a great listener—the Chairman has built a plan for achieving widespread broadband access that meets the unique demands of our rural communities.

The FCC plays an imperative role in addressing these issues in large and small States, particularly rural States like mine.

In the 21st-century economy, robust telecommunication networks are increasingly important for today's users and the foundation of future innovations.

Under his leadership at the FCC, he has already taken steps toward modernizing the Commission's role and promoting digital empowerment. Since the beginning of his tenure, the Commission has hit the ground running, enacting a broad strategic vision to close the digital divide, to modernize the Commission's rules, promote innovation, protect consumer and public safety, and improve the Commission's daily operations.

Under Chairman Pai's leadership, the Commission has made significant investments to deliver broadband service to underserved and unserved areas of the country. I am confident that rural America will see more progress with his continued leadership, and today I am very proud to support his renomination to the FCC as he ascends and retakes the chairmanship of a very important part of our communications and telecommunications network.

With that, I yield back.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I wish to begin by offering my condolences to the victims of the massacre in Las Vegas last night and to their loved ones. I am heartsick for the residents of Las Vegas and everyone around the country who woke up to the

horrendous news of last night's attack and who is worried sick about whether their family members, friends, and neighbors are OK.

Thoughts and prayers are good, but they are simply not enough. Thoughts and prayers are not enough when more moms and dads will bury their children this week. Thoughts and prayers are not enough when sons and daughters will be forced to grow up without their parents.

Attacks like the one last night have happened all too often in America. Enough is enough. We have to have a conversation about how to stop gun violence in America, and we need to have that conversation right now.

Madam President, I want to take some time to discuss the vote we will be taking shortly on the nomination of Ajit Pai to serve as the Chair of the Federal Communications Commission, or the FCC.

One thing that last night showed us is the importance of connections. Every day, moms and dads pick up their phones to check in on their kids, students go online to do research on homework assignments, and families sit together to watch the newest hit television show or movie. It is just a fact—media and telecommunications services play a vital role in helping American households connect with their loved ones, communities, and the world around them.

The FCC makes sure those services are available and accessible to all Americans, whether they live in a rural community or in a large city—at least that is what the FCC is supposed to do. There are a lot of powerful companies that want to change that picture, companies that want to change the rules so they can line the pockets of their corporate executives and their wealthy investors. Those powerful companies have launched an all-out assault on every branch of our government with only one goal: to make sure the government works for them and for their buddies. If it leaves everyone else in the dirt, they don't much care.

As powerful companies know, it is good to have friends on the inside, and they have invested a lot of money in making friends. Giant corporations have spent unlimited amounts of money to elect politicians who will promote their views and to flood Congress with lobbyists who will work around the clock to destroy laws and rules that the industry doesn't like and to reshape those laws to suit corporate interests. But electing politicians and inflating Congress with lobbyists isn't enough. Their Republican buddies in Congress can only do so much. Powerful corporations need weak agencies that will not hold them accountable, so they work to fill those agencies with their allies—friends who can undo the rules that giant corporations don't like, friends who will not go after those

companies when they throw the rules out the window to make an extra buck.

The FCC is one of the agencies that have been on their hit list for a long time, and now they see their opportunity to execute a corporate takeover of the FCC. They started at the top with Ajit Pai, President Trump's pick to chair the FCC.

Since his appointment as Chair of the FCC, Chairman Pai has worked at breakneck speed to transform the FCC from an agency that works in the public interest to a big business support group.

Chairman Pai started with net neutrality protections—rules that help keep the internet free and open by preventing giant broadband companies from discriminating against certain internet users and turning the internet into another service that caters to those who can pay top dollar. Like his big broadband buddies, Chairman Pai opposes net neutrality. Once President Trump was elected, Chairman Pai declared that the days of net neutrality protections were numbered, and now he is working hard to reverse those rules.

Chairman Pai has more items on his agenda. He is working to weaken the FCC's Lifeline Program, which helps low-income households across the country pay for phone and broadband service. Chairman Pai has also halted the FCC's efforts to demand some accountability from private prison phone companies that charge sky-high rates to prisoners and their loved ones. Chairman Pai thinks it is just fine for private companies to make it harder for prisoners to stay connected to their families and their communities by charging exorbitant phone fees.

Chairman Pai defends killing these strong, public-centered rules by repeating a version of the same old, tired refrain that we have heard over and over from industry: Government should stay out of the way and let big corporations do as they please because when big corporations make lots of profits, that benefits everyone. Yeah, right. That worn-out theory has been disproved time and time again. Americans know that when government is asleep at the wheel and big companies get to make the rules, those giant companies make out like bandits, while everyone else gets stuck with the bill.

That is not all. When government doesn't do its job, when it fails to protect the public interest, the big guys can grow even larger and more powerful and can translate greater economic power into greater political power, and that is where it gets very scary. Just look at Sinclair Broadcast Group. Sinclair is the largest television station owner in America, and it has made a name for itself by aggressively promoting ultraconservative views. It is infamous for forcing its stations to regularly run rightwing segments, and it melds its radical ideology with a take-

no-prisoners profit-making mission, finding more and more creative ways to reduce news coverage and instead promote its sponsors' products.

Being the biggest isn't enough for Sinclair—it wants to become even more powerful, so it has put in a bid to purchase Tribune Broadcasting, another large television station owner. If government regulations don't stop the merger, Sinclair would have access to over 70 percent of American households. If the alarm bells haven't already gone off, this is where they should start ringing like crazy.

During the Presidential campaign, Sinclair was a huge supporter of then-Candidate Trump. It used its power in local television markets to spread slanted, pro-Trump news stories. Jared Kushner, President Trump's son-in-law, even bragged about reaching a deal with Sinclair to get more positive news media coverage of Trump.

The day before Trump's inauguration, Sinclair's chairman met with Pai—who was then an FCC Commissioner but who was expected to be promoted to Chairman—he met with him to urge him to change the rules so Sinclair can grow even more powerful. When President Trump nominated Pai to chair the FCC, Sinclair got exactly what it wanted: Chairman Pai immediately got to work changing the rules so it would be easier for Sinclair to acquire Tribune.

Local media is sacred to many Americans. It is where we catch up on what is happening in our communities from people who know and care about our communities. A merger between Sinclair and Tribune would allow Sinclair to change that dynamic. With more local programming coming from a centralized source, there would be less information and less diversity of ideas in local reporting. That kind of concentrated power is bad for competition, and it is worse for democracy. Whether the Sinclair agenda is on the political right or the political left, no single, centralized corporation should control access to local programming for so many households.

We need a strong Chair at the FCC, a Chair who understands that the government's role is to work for American families and to hold giant corporations accountable. We do not need a Chair at the FCC who is working for the most powerful communications corporations in this country. That is why I will vote no on the nomination of Chairman Pai to be Chairman of the FCC.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

TRIBUTE TO LYLE E. STROM AND WILLIAM J. RILEY

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to recognize two Nebraskans who are retiring after long careers of service to the American people: the

Honorable Lyle E. Strom and the Honorable William J. Riley. Both of these judges have spent years upholding the rule of law, and their professionalism has established a strong reputation for their respective courts. They are true role models for current and aspiring lawyers and judges, and their exceptional work should be acknowledged.

Lyle Elmer Strom was born on January 6, 1925, in Omaha, NE. His mother was a schoolteacher. His father worked as an oil trader. Judge Strom has said that he didn't much care for school while he was growing up. Instead, he found himself causing more trouble than good, especially when he played football on top of the nearby grain silo with some friends.

In 1943, after being rejected by the Navy because of weak eyesight, Strom enlisted in the Merchant Marines as a radio signal operator. During his time in the Naval Reserve, he was inspired to become a lawyer after being impressed by his fellow Merchant Marines who had obtained college and professional degrees.

After serving his country in the military, Strom graduated from Creighton University with a B.A. in 1950. That same year, he married the love of his life, his wife Regina. Together, they had seven children. In 1953, Strom graduated from Creighton University's School of Law, finishing at the top of his class. He soon joined the prestigious firm of Fitzgerald, Schorr, Barmettler, & Brennan.

Strom started his career believing he would be a business type of lawyer. Shortly after joining the firm, however, Bob Hamer brought Strom into his litigation group because he was smart and a hard-working professional. By 1958, Strom led the litigation practice for the firm.

Over his years of private practice, Lyle Strom became a well-known, well-liked litigator in Nebraska, especially in Omaha. In 1985, after 32 years of law practice and with encouragement from Congressman Hal Daub, President Ronald Reagan appointed Strom to the U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska. He served as chief judge of the court from 1987 until 1994 and in 1995 took senior status, allowing him the ability to continue sitting as a judge on cases over the past 22 years.

Judge Strom has always been dedicated to the craft of practicing law. He served as the president of the Omaha Bar Association from 1980 to 1981 and as president of the Nebraska State Bar Association from 1989 to 1990.

One of his biggest joys has come in the form of mentoring aspiring lawyers and young people—something he has done throughout his career. In his first decade as a lawyer, he worked as a professor at Creighton University. In his fifth, after becoming a Federal judge with a full caseload, Judge Strom

served as the Creighton Law School internship program director and clinical professor of law.

Strom has also dedicated decades of service to the Boy Scouts of America and was the founder of the Inns of Court organization in Nebraska and has been closely involved with the Nebraska Mock Trial Program.

During his 64 years of practice, Judge Strom has been a model for dedication to the rule of law. His hard work and mentoring to both aspiring lawyers and young people across Omaha have made him a staple in our communities.

He has also had an eye for talent. In 1973, while still working as a litigation lawyer, Strom hired a new lawyer to the firm—William J. Riley. This began a great professional relationship between two of the top lawyers in Nebraska.

Born in Lincoln in 1947, Bill Riley obtained both his B.A. and his juris doctorate from the University of Nebraska, graduating from the law school in 1972. While in school, Riley served as the editor and chief of the Nebraska Law Review, and he graduated at the top of his class.

From 1972 to 1973, Riley clerked for the Honorable Donald P. Lay with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, a court he would later serve on 30 years later.

It was Judge Lay who told Riley that the best tutelage he could receive as a trial attorney would be at the firm of Fitzgerald, Schorr, Barmettler, & Brennan, the firm where a legendary attorney, Lyle Strom, had led the Litigation Department since 1958. It was great advice. After Strom became a judge, it was Riley who took his place as chair of the firm's litigation department.

In 2001, Riley's professionalism caught the eye of both Nebraska Senators and the President of the United States, George W. Bush. The new President nominated him to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Riley was confirmed unanimously in September of 2001, becoming one of President Bush's first circuit court appointments. He became chief judge for the Eighth Circuit in 2010.

During his tenure, Riley was intimately involved in the governance and policy-setting for the entire U.S. Federal court system. He served on the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference of the United States, an organization presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Riley also served as strategic planning coordinator for the Judicial Conference, helping enact greater cyber security measures throughout the Federal court system.

Judge Riley has served our country well over the last 16 years, and on June 30, 2017, after 45 years of practicing law, Judge Riley took senior status on the Eighth Circuit. He said that now he

is going to have time to relax with his wife Norma, their three children, and their nine grandchildren.

Riley has served his local legal community by teaching trial practice at both Creighton University School of Law and the University of Nebraska College of Law. He is a decorated Boy Scout leader and served as a founding member of the Robert M. Spire American Inn of Court legal mentoring program.

Before his appointment to the court, Riley served as president of the Omaha Bar Association from 2000 to 2001.

Both of these judges deserve our respect for how they approach the justice system and the law. Both are role models that I hope future lawyers and judges follow. Their careers should be applauded and their commitment to our community should be honored. I wish them the best in their retirement.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Madam President, now, if I may, I would like to express my sympathies and the sympathies of the people of Nebraska for those who have lost loved ones in Las Vegas. Our hearts are heavy. I am praying for them and for those who were injured and for their families as well.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak about the vote we will have at 5:30 p.m., but I want to give my condolences to those who have been impacted by the horrific shooting in Las Vegas and to the families and the victims of this horrible incident. I want them to know that our thoughts and prayers are with them as the whole Nation turns to this situation.

My thoughts and prayers also go out to at least one Washington family who was impacted and was at this event. We may find out that there are others. We are thinking and praying deeply for their recovery, and I hope everybody will take the time to say some thoughts and prayers for those who have been impacted by this incident.

Madam President, I come to the floor to speak in opposition to the nomination of Ajit Pai to have a second term as the Chairman of the FCC. The reason why we are speaking about this vote that will happen in a short period of time is because we are concerned about the future of innovation, the future of where consumers play in the decision making of how they access content, and the future of our economy.

What I am worried about is that, in the short period of time that Chairman Pai has been at the FCC, instead of the policies that would have enabled consumers, he has taken actions that, I think, will have consumers paying more for less access and with which media concentration will be more enabled and plans to protect net neutrality in an open internet will be reversed.

This, in and of itself, is the biggest issue that I and the economy of Washington State could possibly see with this renomination; that is to say, the State of Washington and the internet and innovation that exists there could be greatly impacted by the rolling back of protections that we have now, which say that you cannot artificially throttle or slow down internet activity and hold consumers hostage to paying more.

The mission of the FCC is to promote the use and deployment of communications in the public interest, and it is the job of the Chairman to make sure that mission is carried out. Undoing the existing net neutrality laws on the books, I do not think, is in the public interest, and it will not promote the access we need. Dismantling this rule that would preserve the diversity of content will negatively impact our marketplace for a long time.

When we think about some of the issues that we have already seen and what we could see in the future, more consumers will have to pay a toll to use the internet. What we will see is that, if you want to get in the fast lane or if you want to have rapid access, you have to pay more.

Today consumers are using mobile apps to preorder coffee, to get access to healthcare information, and to make sure that we protect ourselves from attacks on everything, from our electricity grid to people's homes and security systems. I am very worried that, if the internet's arteries are officially slowed down or clogged, critical information could arrive too late to help protect consumers.

We are living in a world where people are seeing things happen then using their smart phones to collect and share information that can keep all of us safe. So this is another reason why we want to make sure that consumers can get access to and share information and are not slowed down or throttled in any way.

When we think about this and the app economy that exists in Washington State, these are the fastest growing businesses. It is part of a large organization, where, today, 1.7 million Americans' jobs are because of these apps, and nearly 92,000 of them are in the State of Washington. They have grown at an annual rate of 30 percent. The average growth rate for all other jobs is 1.6 percent. Why would we confirm someone who has already pledged to

roll back the rules of an open internet, which basically will create throttling and slowing down of content that will hurt the app economy and small businesses?

Nobody wants to develop a new application that connects consumers—whether it is in healthcare or protecting people in cyber or education or, for that matter, even the Senate—if they are going to have to pay a toll to get faster access to information or to get faster access to their customers.

Dismantling net neutrality puts our economy in jeopardy. While I know some would say that it is necessary for investment, I would say that instead what we have seen in the last several years, while the open internet rules have been in place, is the type of increased investment in the internet infrastructure that is needed to support its growing importance.

I do not agree with my colleagues who think this reversing the open internet rules is necessary to grow our investments. That's just what the large cable companies tell you they need so that they can build fast and slow lanes and charge consumers more if they want access to those fast lanes.

I encourage my colleagues to vote no on Ajit Pai for a second term as FCC Commissioner. Let's get focused on making sure we protect an open internet.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish to start my remarks with my deepest condolences and prayers for the people of Las Vegas and for the families and loved ones of the victims of the worst mass shooting in our Nation's history. The Nation's heart breaks that innocent concertgoers had to suffer such senseless violence. May you find the strength and love to overcome your grief, to heal, and to move forward.

We owe our gratitude to the brave first responders for their efforts last night and to the medical professionals who are working tirelessly to heal wounds and save lives right now. But enough is enough. Americans are tired of living in fear that their community will be the next Newtown, Aurora, Orlando, or Las Vegas. We must act so that we do not become numb to this preventable carnage.

This epidemic of gun violence in our country is not preordained. It is preventable. We can begin by banning these military-style assault weapons, like the AR-15, which are the guns of choice for those who seek to inflict mass casualties on civilians. These are weapons that belong in combat, not in our communities.

Unfortunately, the gun lobby prevailed on Congress to let the assault weapons ban expire in 2004, but we need

it now more than ever. We must also pass legislation to ensure that all gun purchases include a background check. Ninety-two percent of Americans support expanded background checks. No one should be able to purchase a gun through Facebook or Instagram without a background check. Instagram should not be "Instagun," which it is in America today.

Let's also close the gun-show loophole that allows anyone to go into one of these Kmart's full of killing machines and buy a gun without a background check. Let's close the loophole that allows domestic abusers to buy guns. Let's close the loophole that allows straw purchasers to buy guns and flood our streets with them. Let's repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, or the PLCAA, and take away the gun manufacturers' immunity from civil liability. PLCAA should stand for "protecting lives, creating arms accountability."

We must also recognize that this epidemic of gun violence is a public health emergency, and we must treat it that way. We must fully fund this critical research agenda at the Centers for Disease Control and give the CDC the resources it needs.

We will hear lots of people say that now is not the time to politicize this tragedy, that talking about legislation is insensitive and wrong. The only thing the NRA wants more than to sell lots of gun silencers is to put a silencer on the debate about gun safety legislation. The only thing the NRA wants more than allowing nationwide concealed carry laws is to conceal the overwhelming support for background checks. The only thing the NRA wants more than to stifle smart gun technology is to stifle debate on gun violence protection.

So to anyone who says having this debate now is too soon, it is already too late for at least 58 people in Las Vegas and the hundreds of others who were wounded. We should not wait another day. We need to pass common-sense gun safety legislation so we can hold a moment of silence for the NRA's stranglehold on American politics. We must make "NRA" stand for "not relevant anymore" in American politics and in our country. That should be our agenda here on the floor of the Senate.

What is wrong is leaving Americans in our communities unprotected yet again from gun violence. What is wrong is not having a debate and allowing the NRA to block sensible gun safety legislation. We must act so that we do not become numb to the preventable carnage for the people of Las Vegas and the people of Newtown, Aurora, San Bernardino, and every community in our country. That should be our responsibility now in this country.

Mr. President, I wish to turn my attention to the confirmation of FCC Chairman Ajit Pai, the subject of today's vote on the Senate floor.

Last week, I took to the floor to explain how, in his short tenure as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Ajit Pai has stood up for big corporations and ignored American consumers.

Under Ajit Pai, the FCC now stands for "forgetting consumers and competition." Here are the five reasons I gave.

No. 1, on net neutrality, I explained how Ajit Pai wants to take a "weed whacker"—his words—to net neutrality, allowing broadband providers to serve as internet gatekeepers and pick online winners and losers.

No. 2, on privacy, Chairman Pai has actively supported efforts to allow broadband providers to sell consumers' sensitive information without their consent, as well as eliminating requirements for those companies to put in place data security protections, despite the obvious need to protect personal information.

No. 3, on megamergers, Mr. Pai has paved the way for massive mergers, which will squeeze out independent programmers and lead to higher prices for consumers.

No. 4, on the E-rate, the education rate, Chairman Pai has refused to commit to protecting the E-rate, the most successful educational technology program in our country's history, which links up schools and libraries to the internet.

No. 5, on the Lifeline Program, Mr. Pai has undercut the Lifeline Program, which provides access to voice and internet service for millions of low-income Americans.

The case against Chairman Pai's nomination is clear. I want to spend a few more minutes today on the particularly critical issue of net neutrality, the chief governing principle of the internet.

Net neutrality ensures that all internet traffic is treated equally, requiring that internet service providers like AT&T, Charter, Verizon, and Comcast do not block, slow down, censor, or prioritize internet traffic.

Today, essentially every company is an internet company. Every company has to deal with the digital revolution to be relevant in the 21st century. In 2016, almost half of the venture capital funds invested in this country went toward internet-specific and software companies. That is \$25 billion worth of investment—half of all venture capital in this country. That is good.

To meet America's insatiable demand for broadband internet, the U.S. broadband and telecommunications industry—the big companies—invested more than \$87 billion in capital expenditures in 2015. That is the highest rate of annual investment in the last 10 years. That is good.

We have hit the sweet spot. Investment in broadband and wireless technologies is very high. Job creation is very high. Venture capital investment

in online startups is very high. With net neutrality rules in place, the best ideas, not merely the best funded ideas, can thrive in the 21st century.

Chairman Pai says he “likes” net neutrality, but then he says he wants to take an ax to the very order that established today’s net neutrality rules. That is like saying you value democracy but don’t really like the Constitution. It makes no sense. Net neutrality is the organizing principle of the internet.

Chairman Pai and the ISPs—that is, internet service providers, the big companies—keep walking around, whispering how title II is some terrible word, some terrible thing.

Let’s understand how we landed here. What is title II? It gets very mysterious until you put it into very simple language. In 2010, the Federal Communications Commission attempted to put net neutrality rules in place without reclassifying broadband under title II of the Communications Act. The District of Columbia Circuit Court proceeded to invalidate those rules and said to the Federal Communications Commission: Here is how you can do it, and it will not be struck down. Here is a smart way for you to put net neutrality on the books, which will make it legal.

So the Federal Communications Commission, in correctly reading the court decision, went back, and in 2015 adopted the open internet order, which reclassified broadband as a telecommunications service under title II—under this ability to regulate. They did it, and the circuit court of appeals upheld the rules in a 2016 decision.

There it is: instructed by the court how to do it, follow the instructions, implement, done. It is now baked into the personality of the internet to have openness. The apertures are there for anyone to be able to get on, not to be discriminated against. That is what the internet should be like in the 21st century.

Title II is appropriate because it was Congress’s intent to preserve the FCC’s authority to forestall threats to competition and innovation in telecommunications services, even as those technologies used to offer those services evolve over time.

We are not locked into one period of technology. As it evolves, so, too, does an evolution occur in terms of what openness means—the ability of everyone to be able to use the internet without being discriminated against.

Broadband has become the single most important telecommunications service Americans use to transmit information to one another, and it has become clear that innovators, businesses, and consumers overwhelmingly view broadband as a telecommunications service.

This is common sense to Americans around the country, with the only ex-

ception being big telecommunications lobbyists and lawyers who work to close this internet, who want to stop this incredible, entrepreneurial, democracy-enhancing set of rules that exists to ensure that this communications mechanism is not controlled by just a small number of companies.

Ajit Pai has said that he likes net neutrality, but he thinks it should be voluntary. But voluntary regulations will not work. We know that the broadband industry—your cable, your wireless, your telecommunications provider—cannot regulate themselves. They struggle to even show up on time to install or fix your service.

Do we really trust the broadband industry to resist leveraging their internet gatekeeper role and putting their online competitors at an unfair disadvantage? Of course not.

Americans have made their voices heard about net neutrality. More than 22 million Americans have written to the Federal Communications Commission in the past several months, sending a clear message of support for net neutrality. Hear that again: 22 million Americans sent a message to the Federal Communications Commission that they do not want to see a change in the net neutrality rules for our country. Yet Ajit Pai will not listen. His plan will allow broadband providers to stifle innovation, stifle entrepreneurship. His plan will allow big broadband barons to crush competition, reduce choice, and then make consumers pay more.

We cannot allow this to happen. That is why this vote we are about to take is so important. That is why I urge my colleagues to stand up for consumers and to vote no on Ajit Pai’s nomination to be the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise to voice my strong support for the nomination of Ajit Pai to a second 5-year term as a Commissioner at the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Pai has served as a Commissioner at the FCC since 2012, when he was first confirmed by a voice vote in the Senate. He was designated as Chairman earlier this year.

A native of Kansas, Chairman Pai has focused on the expansion of rural

broadband and the acceleration of next-generation infrastructure deployment. In recent weeks, he has worked tirelessly to help ensure that communications services are restored to the communities that have been affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. In just his 9 months since becoming Chairman, Mr. Pai has also made much needed reforms to improve transparency at the FCC and to improve the agency’s processes.

I am particularly heartened by Chairman Pai’s efforts to treat his fellow Commissioners fairly by instituting the process of sharing documents with other Commissioners before discussing them publicly. Additionally, under Chairman Pai’s leadership, the public is now able to view the text of all agenda items in advance of Commission hearings.

With respect to the thorny issue of internet regulations, I am pleased Chairman Pai has sought to hit the reset button on the 2015 title II order because, as I had previously said, the FCC should do what is necessary to rebalance its regulatory posture under current law. At the same time, I continue to believe the best way to provide long-term protections for the internet is for Congress to pass bipartisan legislation.

Rather than prolonging the back-and-forth debate on this issue, I, once again, invite my colleagues to work with me to find a lasting legislative solution that will resolve the dispute over net neutrality once and for all.

As for the nomination before us, I can think of no better pick to lead the FCC as it works to address a host of issues at the heart of our interconnected economy. As I noted at the outset, Chairman Pai has already made much needed reforms to improve the processes at the FCC that empower fellow Commissioners. He has already shown a commitment to ensuring transparency and openness at the Commission. That gives me great confidence in the direction he will lead the agency.

Chairman Pai’s approach, I believe, will lead to more long-lasting and positive results at the FCC. That is why I believe the elevation of Ajit Pai to be the Chairman of the Commission is a much needed breath of fresh air and why I believe he should be confirmed promptly and without further delay. I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Pai nomination?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Isakson	Sasse
Collins	Johnson	Scott
Corker	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Strange
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Tester
Cruz	McCaskill	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	
Flake	Perdue	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Schatz
Brown	Heinrich	Schumer
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Shaheen
Cardin	Hirono	Stabenow
Carper	Kaine	Udall
Casey	King	Van Hollen
Coons	Klobuchar	Warner
Donnelly	Leahy	Warren
Duckworth	Markey	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—7

Cochran	McCain	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Menendez	
Heller	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Arizona.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF AMY BARRETT

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss how we allow religious believers to participate in public life.

From the founding of our country, religious believers have played a central role in our government. The Declaration of Independence was signed by a Presbyterian minister, John Witherspoon, and Charles Carroll, the cousin of our first Catholic bishop.

The importance of religious participation was in the air the Founders breathed, and the benefits religious believers of all backgrounds contributed to the common good was understood by the Framers of the Constitution. That is why they made it clear in article VI of the Constitution that no public officers could be subject to a "religious test." This new country wouldn't be a country for Anglicans or for Congregationalists or for Quakers; it would be a country for all Americans and all faiths—all of those who are committed to the Constitution and the common good.

Unfortunately, the religious test clause is no longer just the subject of history lessons. During this Congress, there have been a number of cases where my friends in the minority have seemed to ask nominees about their substantive religious beliefs. I find this particularly troublesome because, as a Mormon, I am a member of a faith that, while it is growing rapidly, still counts fewer adherents than many other religions. It is religious liberty, espoused in constitutional provisions like article VI and the First Amendment, that has allowed my faith, despite a very difficult history, to flourish in the United States, and it is religious liberty that is threatened when we seem to evaluate the fitness of nominees for higher office on religious orthodoxy.

The most recent example of this was the recent Judiciary Committee nomination hearing of Professor Amy Coney Barrett of the Notre Dame Law School. During the hearing, she was asked repeatedly about her Catholic faith and faced what bordered on ridicule when she repeatedly stated that she would perform her judicial duties without interference from the doctrines of the Catholic faith. It was stated by one questioner: "The dogma lives loudly within you, and that's of concern." What does that statement mean in this context, if not to question Professor Barrett's judicial fitness based on her religious beliefs?

Liberal groups have been relentless in their opposition to Professor Barrett, mischaracterizing her record to paint her as some kind of fringe ideologue waiting to take orders from the Pope or others in clergy on how to decide cases. Just last week, the New York Times ran a 1500-word story on where Professor Barrett worships. As it turns out, apart from her parish

church, Professor Barrett has been part of an ecumenical charismatic community.

I should note that charismatic Christianity is gaining a lot of ground among Latinos in the United States and throughout Latin America. It is a vibrant and very diverse religious tradition.

According to the Times, Professor Barrett should have disclosed her participation in this charismatic community to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Professor Barrett's former professor and colleague, Professor Cathy Kaveny of Boston College, went so far as to ask: "[Nominees] have to disclose everything from the Elks Lodge to the alumni associations we belong to. Why didn't she disclose this?" Well, I am no law professor, but I can tell you why: because in the United States of America, it doesn't matter where you worship when you are being considered for Federal office, and that is as it should be.

The Judiciary Committee does not require disclosure of religious affiliation, and I trust my colleagues would join me in strenuously objecting if it did.

It is ironic that a Notre Dame professor is a target of this kind of animus. Notre Dame, of course, has long been at the forefront of fighting prejudice in this country.

Early in its years, Notre Dame helped rid America of the scourge of slavery. Many artists have rendered Notre Dame professor, Father William Corby, giving the Irish Brigade general absolution during the Battle of Gettysburg.

The school then faced down the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s. At a time when a large number of White men in Indiana were members of the Klan, Notre Dame students made it clear that the Klan's brand of nativist, anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic hate was not welcomed in South Bend.

Four decades later, Notre Dame's president, Father Ted Hesburgh, received a call about a rally at Soldier Field being organized by Dr. Martin Luther King. Hesburgh was told that Mayor Daley and Cardinal Cody had declined invitations to appear at the civil rights rally, and the organizers wondered if he would be willing to appear. In response, Hesburgh drove to Chicago, locked hands with Dr. King, and sang "We Shall Overcome."

Whether it is slavery, nativism, or Jim Crow, Notre Dame has stood up to it and has triumphed. In that same tradition, I am confident that Professor Barrett is up to that task. What is remarkable is that I need to say this in 2017.

It bears repeating that a Roman Catholic can be a faithful steward of the law. So can an Episcopalian. So can a Mormon. So can a Muslim. Of course, so can an atheist.

We in the Senate give the President advice and consent on judicial nominations. We therefore should examine their jurisprudential views and their qualifications. We must not examine their relationships with the Almighty.

I sincerely hope this body will step back from this dangerous ledge and evaluate Professor Barrett based on her impeccable qualifications, not where she attends church.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 119, Lee Francis Cissna.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John McCain, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Lee, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, James M. Inhofe, Cory Gardner, Jeff Flake, John Thune, John Barrasso, Orrin G. Hatch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 112, Eric Hargan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James M. Inhofe, Tom Cotton.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 301, Randal Quarles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, James Lankford, Jerry Moran, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Rob Portman.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 226, Callista Gingrich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Johnny Isakson, Patrick J. Toomey, Richard Burr, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, Richard C. Shelby,

Cory Gardner, John Thune, James E. Risch, Deb Fischer, David Perdue.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I think all of us felt a familiar knot in our stomach early this morning when we received news of what might be the deadliest mass shooting in American history. The numbers are hard to comprehend. They certainly aren't final. Fifty-eight people are dead, and perhaps over 500 have been wounded, either by the gunshots themselves or by the pandemonium that ensued once the thousands of concertgoers in downtown Las Vegas figured out they were being fired upon from above.

There is nothing wrong with sending every thought and prayer and every bit of your heart to Las Vegas, to all of the family members who lost loved ones, to those who are recovering, to the first responders, and to the community at large. It really does help. I lived through one of these as a witness in Sandy Hook. Many of those parents are still my friends. We are about the same age, and our kids are the same age. While there are absolutely no words and no gestures that can ever salve the wounds that come with losing a child—especially a first grader—it did not hurt to know that the rest of the world was thinking every single minute about that community. There was an overwhelming amount of stuff that showed up in Sandy Hook—the teddy bears that piled up in the days and weeks that followed. It was a reminder to that town that they weren't forgotten. It helps. It does. But it is not enough.

I want to just spend a few moments—I know I was preceded by a few of my colleagues—to talk about the work that we have to do here if we are to address what I would consider to be a festering, lingering paradox that exists in this country. What I mean by that is this. This is a country that leads. Almost every great magical invention in this world today—whether it be open economies, participatory democracies, communication through the internet—is essentially a modern American invention.

The reason that we were able to catapult the rest of the world in just a quarter millennium to a point of global preeminence is because we saw big problems and we solved them before anybody else did. Then we took those solutions and we exported them to the rest of the world. That is a definitional characteristic of this country—working harder than anybody else to solve big problems and then giving that solution to others so they can use it for

themselves. The paradox lies here. We solved a lot of big problems: How to govern ourselves, how to order our economies, how to talk to each other, and how to save people from disease. Yet maybe the longest standing human concern is a very simple one—concern for our physical safety.

I can chart you a history of civilization based upon society's ability to protect more consistently our physical body. That is, in fact, one of the original reasons why humans found each other—to try to protect ourselves from physical harm that comes from the outside. The paradox lies in the fact that, when it comes to this country's ability to protect its citizens from physical harm, we are not a leader. We are a laggard. We are an outlier when compared to other industrialized first-world nations. You are much more likely to meet a violent death, especially by the hands of a firearm, in this country than you are in other first-world countries.

It is time for us to explore why this paradox exists. Why are we such a leader and why have we been such a leader over the course of 240 years on so many different concerns, and yet we are a laggard when it comes to protecting ourselves and our fellow citizens from physical violence? The scope of this problem is enormous. When you look at OECD countries, there are just a handful that have a higher rate of violence—and, in particular, gun violence—than the United States.

I have been down on this floor as have Senator DURBIN and others to talk about the numbers, over and over. But every day approximately 80 people lose their lives by gunfire, and two-thirds of those are suicide. But still, about 30 people every day are killed with a gun that is used by someone else. There is really no other country in the industrialized world that meets that rate of gun violence.

The mass shootings, which get the most attention, are truly epidemic. We have become normalized and regularized to 50 or 40 or 30 people losing their lives, but this happens nowhere else other than the United States at this rate. This is a uniquely American problem, and, by the way, it is not just the Las Vegases, the Orlandos, and the Sandy Hooks. We have actually had more mass shootings this year than days in the year, if you categorize a mass shooting as four or more people being shot in any one given time. Let me guarantee you, if four or more people were shot in your town or your neighborhood, that would be a cataclysmic event, and yet it happens on average more than once a day in this country. Because we have become so regularized to it, only with the moments like last night, where the scale is truly epic, do we focus on it as a Nation.

I want my colleagues to understand the pain that comes when the victims

of this kind of epidemic violence see nothing but silence from this body. The hurt is deep. The scars are wide in Newtown, but they are made wider by the fact that this body, in 4½ years, has done absolutely nothing to reduce the likelihood of another mass shooting. Indeed, because we have done nothing, the mass shootings continue.

I know these are harsh words, but I believe it in my heart. I think this is an unintentional endorsement that gets sent to these mass murderers when, slaughter after slaughter, Congress does nothing. If the greatest deliberative body in the world doesn't act in unison to condemn them through policy change, it starts to feel and look like complicity. So there is going to be another wave of unimaginable pain that will sweep across Las Vegas and the country as we learn about who these victims were and, perhaps, as the numbers mount. They will, over time, be just as angry and just as furious at this body as those parents in Sandy Hook are today that we do nothing to try to reduce the likelihood of these shootings. Compassion is important, but it is not enough.

I read a little passage of the Bible to my 5-year-old son every night. I am the furthest thing from a theologian, but I know that sprinkled throughout the Bible are references to the fact that prayer has to be matched with action—with works. James says: "Show me your faith apart from your works, and I will show you my faith by my works." Thoughts and prayers need to be matched by action, and that is our job. Our job, frankly, is not just to send good thoughts. The reason why we exist is to act, to change the laws of the Nation, and to address challenges that our constituents face. Since the beginning of time, the most important challenge our constituents have faced—the human race has faced—is that of physical security.

So before I turn this over to my colleagues, let me just run down very quickly through the arguments that are going to be used over the next few days to continue to do nothing. The first is already in operation today, and it is a critique I hear very often. It is often lodged at me personally. It is this: To talk about policy change in the wake of a mass shooting is to politicalize it, to cheapen it. I reject that argument in full force because the reality is that every single day there is a mass shooting. Every single day 80 people die from gun violence. Unfortunately, the news media doesn't pay attention to that regular carnage.

If we aren't talking about policy change the day after a mass shooting in this country, then you are never talking about policy change, because a mass shooting happens, on average, every day. Unfortunately, the ones in which 8 people are shot or 12 people are shot do not get national attention.

Second, whether we like it or not, the world's attention—the country's attention—is positioned on this question of how we protect our country from harm in the immediate aftermath of these mass shootings. It is an enormous gift to the gun lobby, to the forces of status quo, if we cannot talk about how to change our laws to make people safer when everyone's mind is on that question. When a murder occurs, there is not a 48-hour waiting period before the police can try to investigate who did it and how to hold them accountable. So why can't we get immediately to the question of why these shootings are happening and try to solve it?

Also, others today are saying that legislation is a pointless exercise because you can't regulate away evil. There is truth to that. There are evil people in the world who are regularly doing very bad things, and there is no way that a set of laws can stop people from doing harm. But I would argue in some way, shape, or form, that the very nature of government is an attempt to try to regulate the effect of evil on citizens. Our laws against murder, arson, rape, and assault are attempts to try to make sure that people are protected from evil, from bad people. So why can't we have a conversation about how to make sure that people who are contemplating mass violence, at the very least, do the least violence possible?

It is not coincidental that these epidemic mass shootings, in which 50 or 60 or 40 people have died, largely have happened after the expiration of the assault weapons ban. Now that it is much easier to get your hands on a gun that is much more accurate and much more lethal, the likelihood of large numbers of people dying, as happened last night, is much greater.

An AR-15 style weapon does something different to a human body than a pistol does. That is why 20 kids were shot in Sandy Hook, and not a single one of them survived.

Laws do work. Just look at a State like Connecticut, which requires universal background checks, doesn't allow you to buy assault weapons, and requires you to get a permit before you can carry it. When we passed that set of laws, it resulted in a 40-percent reduction in gun violence, even when you attribute or account for other factors that could have caused that reduction. That is a Johns Hopkins study.

In places that have universal background checks, gun homicides are lower; domestic violence homicides are much lower by a degree of 40 percent. Laws work. The data is irrefutable on this point.

Though you can't regulate away evil in total, you can do more to protect people, especially from this mass-scope gun violence.

Third, people will say: Well, this guy clearly was very mentally ill. With gun

laws, you can't do anything about the fact that people are mentally ill. That is true. We should fix our broken system of mental health treatment because it is broken, but we should also recognize that this problem of mass execution is a uniquely American problem, despite the fact that there is no evidence that we have a higher rate of mental illness than any other country.

There are plenty of very mentally ill people in other OECD countries. But in those countries, their mental illness is not a straight line to a gun crime, in large part because they have a very different set of laws that make it harder to get your hands on a gun and much harder, if not impossible, to get your hands on a weapon that does the kind of mass violence we saw last night.

Lastly, one of the favorite arguments is that this is just too hot an issue for the U.S. Senate or a political body to handle, that it is controversial. It is controversial, but it is not as controversial as people may think.

In fact, the issue of background checks—which I understand may not have been dispositive on what happened in Las Vegas last night but might have reduced the likelihood that another 80 people died from gun violence over the course of Sunday—is supported by 80 percent of Americans.

Most polls will suggest that a majority of Americans support the other sweep in law changes that I talked about as well.

In fact, many of the first steps we would take as a body—saying that people on the terrorist watch list can't buy guns, tightening up the law to make sure people who are mentally ill can't buy guns—are supported by 80 to 90 percent of our constituents, no matter whether they live in a blue State or a red State. The question of making sure that only the right people own guns is actually one of the least controversial issues in the American public today. Why don't we start by finding that common ground? Then maybe after that, we can find other common ground.

This is going to keep happening. This is going to keep happening over and over again. I know the answer can't be that we are powerless, as a body, to do something about it. I personally just can't bring that answer back to the families of Sandy Hook for another year.

I don't want to speak for them, but I have a feeling that the delegation from Nevada is going to have a hard time bringing that answer back to the victims in Las Vegas as well.

This is a growing fraternity—a tragic, awful fraternity—of Members of Congress who represent States and have gone through these horrific mass executions. I had too many phone calls from Senators, Representatives, who were already part of that club when Sandy Hook happened. I got to make

that call this morning, as well, to offer whatever advice I could on how to help the community heal.

But this silence has become an unintentional endorsement. It has become a kind of sick complicity, and I hope that in the coming days we can come together—Republicans and Democrats—to start talking about, at the very least, some baby steps to show the people of Las Vegas, to show the people of Orlando, to show my constituents, my friends from Sandy Hook, that silence is no longer an option.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Connecticut. He sponsored a filibuster on this issue, I believe it was last year. I participated in it, as did many Members of our caucus.

Both he and Senator BLUMENTHAL bring a special perspective to this issue of gun violence, representing the State of Connecticut and the families who lost their first graders. I believe they were first graders who were shot down, 20 of them killed in their classrooms.

I remember, when I heard that story on how those children died and their teachers died, I thought to myself: This must be the moment that will motivate America to finally do something if innocent, first grade children can be shot down in their classrooms in this fashion.

The honest answer is that we have spoken a lot about the issue, but we have done little or nothing to change the circumstances that led to their death.

If that were the only case, it would be bad enough, but the Orlando nightclub—I believe 49 were killed there. Some crazed person went there and killed innocent people gathered at that nightclub.

As Senator MURPHY has said, when you go through the litany, it is an endless litany of victims of gun violence—and last night in Las Vegas, NV, the worst gun crime in the modern history of the United States of America, the worst.

Estimates now, which I saw as I came to the floor, are that 58 have died and over 500 were seriously injured. I don't know what the ultimate numbers will be, but those numbers, in and of themselves, are incredible.

Last night, we witnessed what was the worst mass shooting to date in the Nation. This gunman, supposedly, at 10 p.m. last night in Las Vegas local time, began firing from a room on the 32nd floor of a hotel into a crowd of people gathered for a country music festival. He supposedly was holed up in his hotel room with at least 10 guns and obviously fired hundreds of rounds of ammunition.

As I mentioned, 58 people have been reported to have died, and over 515 injured. Those are staggering and horrifying numbers.

There are literally hundreds of families tonight and communities who have been changed forever by this horrendous crime. Our prayers, obviously, naturally, go out to them in this moment of loss and uncertainty.

During and after the shooting—as we expect but should never take for granted—law enforcement, first responders, acted like the heroes that they are, working to stop the shooter, securing the scene, helping the victims, saving lives. We are grateful to these first responders, who so often are called to run to the sound of gunfire to keep us safe, not to run away.

It is unthinkable that this type of shooting tragedy could happen in the United States of America, but I am sorry to say it is becoming a regular occurrence. This was the worst, but yesterday, October 1, was also the 2-year anniversary of the mass shooting in Roseburg, OR, when a gunman killed eight students and a professor at a community college.

Also, this past weekend, at least 33 people were shot in the city of Chicago. At least four died. The relentless toll of gun violence never seems to stop.

The American Medical Association has declared that gun violence is a public health crisis in America. On an average day, 300 Americans are shot. On an average day, 300 Americans are shot. About one-third of them will die from that gunshot.

Mass shootings, as Senator MURPHY said earlier, have become a daily occurrence. If our critics would say “Please, don’t exploit the event of a mass shooting by speaking on the floor,” as Senator MURPHY has made clear, then we wouldn’t be able to speak any day of the year because they are so common.

We can’t let this become the new American normal. We can’t just shrug our shoulders when we see over 30,000 Americans shot and killed year after year after year. We can’t sit back and do nothing while hundreds of our fellow Americans are shot in one night simply because they went out to hear a music concert.

Just this last week, I was at a concert in Nashville, TN, at the Ryman, the site of the Grand Ole Opry; 2,000 people gathered there. They were mainly folks from the Midwest, many of them retired, who love country music, I am sure, as the people in Las Vegas did. When I heard about what happened in Las Vegas, I thought: Well, what if someone had walked into that theater and opened fire? It could have, sadly, happened there.

What are we going to do about it? Certainly, there will be outrage at the death. There will be grief over the loss. But then what? That is what Senator MURPHY challenges us to think about.

We serve in the U.S. Senate. We are not just casual observers of this violence. We are supposed to pass laws to make America safer. What will we do

because of what happened in Las Vegas last night? That is the question that brings me to the floor this evening. If we have a responsibility to keep our families and America safe, what are we prepared to do?

For the gun deaths in Chicago, there are some things that I would do instantly. Background checks—I don’t believe we should be able to walk into a gun show and buy a firearm or more than one, incidentally, and take them out of the back door without somebody asking: Who are you? Do you have a criminal record? Would you be disqualified from buying these same guns at a licensed gun dealer?

Currently, the law is riddled with loopholes, and those loopholes lead to death, death on the streets of Chicago.

We also have these purchases being made by straw purchasers. In other words, the girlfriend, who has no criminal record, who walks into the gun shop in the suburbs of Chicago and buys the gun for her boyfriend outside in the car, who is going to use it that night to shoot up a rival gang member or some other criminal activity. Those are two very obvious things I would push for instantly: Close the gun show loophole; make sure we do something about straw purchasers so that the penalties are serious enough that they will never do it again.

There is more. This morning, I was on a radio show in Chicago, one of the most famous ones, I guess. I listened to a fellow named Steve Cochran celebrating his 1,000th show on the air. This was the topic we talked about.

Steve asked me: Well, what can we do? I said: Steve, we have to rely on people who honor the Second Amendment and believe it is an important part of our Constitution to stand up and lead. I am talking about members of my family who are hunters and sportsmen. I have been out hunting myself. We have to have people who are concerned about guns for self-defense stand up and say: We have to draw a reasonable line. There is no reasonable line under the Second Amendment that would allow what happened in Las Vegas last night.

To think that someone could injure over 500 people and kill 58—what kind of weaponry did he use? We will know. We will find out the details, but it certainly goes beyond any reasonable weaponry needed for self-defense, sport, or hunting purposes.

Can we not at least appeal to those who honor the Second Amendment to join us in drawing a reasonable line so combat and military-style weapons that can lead to such carnage are not considered to be normal or acceptable? Decades ago we did when it came to machineguns. Decades ago we said this is a weapon no one should have, period, except for the military and perhaps law enforcement. Can we return to that conversation? We are going to need the

leadership from people who believe in the Second Amendment to make it happen.

We have seen Democrats and Republicans join together to pass meaningful laws to deal with public health crises like opioid addiction. We have to do the same for this public health crisis.

I am sorry to report that a recent nominee for Surgeon General of the United States was almost denied that opportunity because he was bold enough to say that gun violence is a public health crisis. It certainly is.

There is no single law or policy that will prevent every tragic shooting, just as there is no single law or policy that will end heroin overdoses, but let’s start working together to do something.

We can’t stop the shootings that have already happened in Las Vegas, Chicago, Roseburg, OR, and across the Nation. We failed to respond in time for those victims and their families. But if we work together, we can stop shootings in the future. That is something we should all strive to do.

We must do all we can to spare families the unimaginable pain so many in Las Vegas are feeling today in the aftermath of this horrible tragedy. I hope we will.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I commend the words and the determination for action that were expressed by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Illinois. Like them, and like so many people across the country, I start with condolences and prayers and commendations. I offer condolences to the families—the names and the families we don’t know yet—of this most recent tragedy, but we do know they are not only worthy of our expressions of condolence but will be in need of our prayers. Then, I offer commendations, of course, to the first responders and the law enforcement officials who responded as they always do, running toward the danger, running to help. We can’t say enough about the work they do.

If we stop at expressing condolences and offering prayers and commending those who take action, like first responders and law enforcement—if we stop there, I don’t think that is an adequate response to this tragedy, just like it wasn’t an adequate response in connection with the Pulse Night Club or the tragedy in December of 2012 in Newtown, CT. It is nowhere near an adequate response when we consider the enormity of this problem.

I believe we have to take action. I will talk about that in a moment. Action must start with what happens on this floor. It is difficult to take action necessarily if there isn’t time for debate, time for collaboration on legislation, and ultimately consideration of

legislation on the floor of the Senate and I would hope in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The enormity of this tragedy is almost hard to comprehend when we think about it, not just in terms of the number, which at last count was 58 killed and over 500—over 500—injured. Those numbers are almost too large to comprehend; that one person with one weapon or maybe several weapons was able to inflict that kind of carnage in one place at one time. I don't know how long it took, but he wasn't shooting for many hours to kill that many people. He did it in a short timeframe.

When we consider those numbers, I have to ask—I don't know if we went back and compared a similar day or a similar timeframe, comparing the loss of life in the context of war, but I am sure there were plenty of days of conflict where Americans were on foreign soil in a battle, in a war, where we would have lost even less lives on a particular day or a portion of a particular day. The scale of this is almost unimaginable.

Then, we need to consider what has been happening on our streets. Every State, every community has their own numbers. I can point to Pennsylvania. Just since 2014, thousands of shootings—by one estimate I think over 7,700—but then, of course, the more ominous number is the number of people killed as a result of those shootings. In Pennsylvania, since 2014, some 2,072 people have died as a result of that larger number of shootings.

I think for the Nation, and I think, certainly, undoubtedly for me, maybe the most important or the most seminal day in this debate was in December of 2012 at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who joins us on the floor and started tonight with his remarks, remembers it better than probably any other Member of the Senate, other than his colleague in Connecticut and others who lived through it.

One of the questions I asked myself at the end of that weekend, after watching hours and hours of television coverage and reading a lot about it and then watching a news report on Sunday evening which tracked the pathway of the killer going to one classroom and killing 20 children—6-year-olds, 7-year-olds, first graders—after he had done that, he was on his way to another classroom. So I concluded from that, if he had more time, in addition to the 20 killed in one classroom and the adults who were killed, we would have been reading about potentially hundreds of children killed in one school in even less—a lot less than a day, maybe an hour or two or three, but that didn't happen. He took his own life.

So I began to ask myself not only what should we do in response to this—and I had concluded at that point to

support legislation—but a larger question kept coming to mind. If one person, with one weapon or a few weapons and unlimited ammunition—if one person cannot only kill 20 children in Connecticut, I guess almost 50 people in Florida, and now we know from Las Vegas at least 58, and I am sure some who were injured will die—but if one person can do that, we have to ask ourselves, Is there nothing we can do? Because that becomes part of the debate, right?

One side says: Let's take action by way of legislation or take some action that would reduce the likelihood that we have more tragedies like this, more mass shootings, but the response immediately comes back that the other side says: We agree it is tragic, we agree we want to prevent it, we agree we want to reduce the likelihood, but there is nothing we can do legislatively to reduce the likelihood or to prevent it.

I don't think anyone would argue that a law that passes in the aftermath of this Las Vegas tragedy or a law that passes even in the aftermath of Sandy Hook Elementary School—if the law, the proposals, the bills, really, that were voted on in the Senate in 2013, if they had passed, no one can argue with certitude or with scientific precision that if you pass this law, this many lives will be saved. After Newtown and after this tragedy, I come back to the same question: Is there nothing we can do legislatively? We are the most powerful country in the world. We led the world in winning World War II, a war that was not on its way to winning until we got involved, until we were forced to respond because we were attacked. We are the country that has cured disease and built the strongest Republic in the history of the human race; that has the strongest military, without a doubt; that has the strongest economy, without a doubt; that has so much in ways that we can point to of American exceptionalism and strength and achievement—achievements that are unmatched anywhere in the world in almost any part of American life that one can point to. Is that same country completely disabled from taking an action that would reduce the likelihood—and we would hope substantially reduce the likelihood—that we will not have another Las Vegas or another Orlando or another Newtown, and go on and on from there, all of these tragedies in all of these places? Is that really what our answer is going to be?

We take action when we are attacked, to fight back and to prevent it from happening again. We take action when there is an epidemic. We take action when there is a crisis. We take action when there is a natural disaster. We are seeing some of that most recently. We take action as a government. The Congress takes action. The

executive takes action. Yet, in this circumstance, what can only be described as an epidemic—that might be an understatement—where we are losing more than 30,000 people a year, are we saying that there is nothing we can do legislatively to reduce that likelihood? I don't think any American, if they think about it, would conclude there is nothing we can do.

So when I considered that in the context of Sandy Hook, I had to ask myself: Are you saying to yourself that you are going to vote no on what became three bills, vote no on them because you believe there is nothing you can do? That is what your vote is going to be? That is going to be your response? As a legislator with the opportunity to cast a vote in a body of 100 people, you are going to say no three times, as it turned out in 2013, to legislation because you believe there is nothing your vote and nothing this legislative body can do?

Well, I decided to vote yes, at least, but even that is not enough. We haven't had votes in years on these issues. Here we are, almost 5 years later—in December it will be 5 years, half a decade—since Newtown, CT, since the massacre at Sandy Hook.

I have a page from the Wall Street Journal that was printed within a couple days of that tragedy. It had very small color pictures and very small biographies of those very small people, those 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds. It has been on my desk all of these years, and it is a very yellowed copy of a newspaper article. I often think about what those families have gone through all of these years.

The great recording artist Bruce Springsteen had a song after September 11. The name of the song is "You're Missing." The refrain in that song, of course, is "You're missing," talking about someone, of course, who lost a loved one on 9/11. He says: "You're missing when I turn out the lights, you're missing when I close my eyes, and you're missing when I see the sun rise." The same could be said of those Newtown families, the same could be said of those families in Orlando, and now, unfortunately and tragically, the families in the Las Vegas area—and maybe well beyond Las Vegas—who were there for that concert.

I hope this will be an occasion not just for speeches and expressions of condolence and commendation for those who showed such bravery in this tragedy, or prayers and solidarity, but that this will be a time for action, meaning action in the context of debate and action in the context of legislation.

I think there are a number of steps we can take—I will not outline them all now—a number of commonsense steps we can take that are entirely consistent with the Second Amendment but would reduce the likelihood

over time of having more and more of these tragedies or maybe, just maybe, taking action that will reduce the number of deaths. Even that would be substantial progress. I just cannot accept the idea that there is absolutely nothing we can do legislatively to reduce the likelihood—and I would hope substantially reduce the likelihood—of these tragedies so that we can prevent or at least reduce the number of tragedies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY'S SALMON P. CHASE COLLEGE OF LAW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate a special anniversary in my home State. The Salmon P. Chase College of Law at Northern Kentucky University, NKU, is marking its 125th year of educating students and helping them follow their dreams in the legal field.

Chase's story is one of transformation and innovation, and through it all, the school has produced graduates prepared to excel in the legal field. Originally founded in Ohio, Chase was only the third law school in the Nation to offer night programs. Since then, Chase has crossed the Ohio River into Kentucky, joined with NKU, and continued to find the best ways to grow as a respected institution.

Named after Salmon P. Chase, the sixth Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the college is known as the Lawyer's School for its commitment to helping students be practice-ready upon graduation. Today Chase is a proud part of Kentucky's legal community. With graduates in a wide range of careers, including serving as Federal judges and as Members of Congress, Chase's impact has grown considerably since its founding. It is also the proud home to a nationally recognized moot court team and has led the Commonwealth in the bar exam passage rate in recent years.

These successes wouldn't be possible without the dedicated work of Chase's faculty, staff, and administration. I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to Jeffrey Standen, who serves as dean and professor at Chase.

Under his leadership, Chase has continued its growth, innovation, and achievement. The school's distinguished faculty come from some of the highest levels of the bench and bar with the experiences and passion to prepare students for success in their careers. The school's alumni, more than 5,000 and counting, are using their skills in more than 47 States, in Washington DC, and around the globe.

I would also like to thank NKU's interim president Gerard St. Amand, a current professor and former dean of Chase himself, for his commitment to the university and his willingness to help guide the community.

Each time I have had the opportunity to engage with Chase students, I have noted their intellectual curiosity and their passion for the law.

The Chase College of Law has grown so much in the last 125 years, and it has become an integral part of Kentucky's legal community. I am proud to join with the Chase students, faculty, staff, administration, and alumni to commemorate this occasion. I urge my colleagues to help me celebrate Chase's quasiquintennial anniversary, and I look forward to many more years of accomplishments.

CONFIRMATION OF HEALTH TARBERT AND CFIUS REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to congratulate Heath Tarbert, who was confirmed by the Senate last Wednesday and will soon be serving as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Markets and Development, and also to talk about reform legislation that relates to his new area of responsibility. I was pleased to support Mr. Tarbert's nomination, along with the vast majority of my Senate colleagues. He has held a number of important positions in all three branches of the Federal Government, including his service as a special counsel to the Senate Banking Committee during the negotiations leading to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; an associate counsel to the President of the United States during the global financial crisis; and a law clerk for the Supreme Court of the United States. He is an experienced lawyer and financial expert who will be a valuable asset to the Treasury Department. While his new position may not be well known to many outside of the Beltway, it is vitally important to safeguarding our national security interests, as Chairman Crapo of the Senate Banking Committee attested to when Mr. Tarbert was voted out of committee in near-unanimous fashion in May. I have no doubt of Mr. Tarbert's qualifications to take on this key role, and given that only one Member voted against his nomination, it is clear that there is a bipartisan consensus on that point.

With that being said, I look forward to working closely with him on some important reforms that are desperately needed to protect our national security and modernize the way we screen foreign investment deals for those risks. Specifically I am referring to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, better known as CFIUS. As you may know, Mr. Tarbert will now be charged with overseeing the vetting of hundreds of proposed investments annually. I am confident that Mr. Tarbert will make effective use of the tools and authorities that CFIUS has. Unfortunately, those current tools and authorities are not adequate, in light of the changing national security landscape. There are clear gaps in the CFIUS process, which nations such as China are exploiting on a daily basis. The reason for this is simple: CFIUS was not designed to stop investment-driven technology transfers, and unfortunately, many such transactions are occurring today that are carefully designed to sidestep CFIUS's limited jurisdiction.

The need to close these gaps has garnered support from Republicans and Democrats alike, something that is seemingly rare in Washington these days. In fact, there is a bipartisan effort coming together right now to introduce legislation that would modernize the CFIUS process for the first time in a decade. Such commonsense reforms should be made to heighten scrutiny on certain types of investments, especially from countries such as China that pose a potential threat to U.S. national security interests. At a minimum, we should expand the types of transactions that fall under CFIUS jurisdiction, including joint ventures and minority-position investments, as well as certain real estate transactions in close proximity to military bases and other sensitive national security facilities.

My legislation, the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act, or FIRRMA, will do just that, and I intend to file it in the next few weeks. It will address the aforementioned gaps in the current CFIUS process and will help protect our national security. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and support these commonsense reforms for the sake of our long-term national security.

(At the request of Mr. McCONNELL, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I want to express my sincere condolences to the victims of the shooting in Las Vegas, NV.

As a lifelong Nevadan, I am overcome with sadness and grief by this senseless massacre, in which a gunman opened fire on more than 22,000 innocent

concertgoers, killing more than 50 people and injuring more than 500 individuals.

Nevada's communities are all in mourning, and some of our loved ones and friends have been personally impacted by this carnage.

I stand beside Nevada as they reel from this heinous, wide-scale tragedy, working to ensure that my State has the resources it needs to recover from this senseless act of violence. For these reasons, I must be with the people of Nevada right now.

I have a commitment to serve my constituents and will continue to work tirelessly on the ground with the people of Las Vegas ensuring that they have resources to recover and rebuild as a community.

My sincerest gratitude goes out to our first responders, local medical staff, and police officers for their swift actions and efforts that without a doubt, saved numerous lives. I also would like to recognize the countless Nevadans at the show who aided strangers in need and the wounded, using tourniquets and carrying people to safety, as the shooting continued.

I have been in contact with the White House, Governor Sandoval, Mayor Carolyn Goodman, and Sheriff Joseph Lombardo and stand ready to assist Clark County Commission Chair Steve Sisolak and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. I will continue to monitor the situation as this horrific event unfolds.

Lynne and I are praying for all of the victims and their families who are experiencing immense pain and grave, shocking loss that cannot be measured.

Nevada is our home, and I know it will rise again from this perilous day.●

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote No. 209, on the nomination of Ajit Varadaraj Pai, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.●

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CONFIRMATION OF AJIT PAI

● Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had every intention of ably performing my duty as Senator and voting today on the confirmation of Mr. Ajit Pai to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission. Unfortunately, the tragic events in Las Vegas last night required me to travel back to my home State. My thought and prayers are with the families of those killed and wounded in the vicious and

senseless attack outside the Mandalay Bay Resort.

On the question of Mr. Pai's nomination, I wanted to make my vote in opposition to his confirmation clear. Many of the specific actions taken by Mr. Pai as Chairman of the FCC have raised questions about whether he should garner my support for another term at the Commission. I have come to this decision through a process of reviewing his resume, meeting with him personally to discuss his governing perspective, as well as having questioned him during multiple FCC hearings before the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee.

I will continue to keep an open mind in working with Mr. Pai to bridge the digital divide in remote parts of Nevada and for my constituents who simply need more access to complete their homework, apply for jobs, or perform various everyday functions that require quality internet service. At this time, there were too many concerns about actions taken in Mr. Pai's tenure since January, including the process by which he is looking to reform a free and open internet.●

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-44, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Commonwealth of Australia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$815 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-44

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Australia.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$661 million.

Other \$154 million.

Total \$815 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Up to three thousand nine hundred (3,900) GBU-53/B Small Diameter Bomb Increment II (SDB II).

Up to thirty (30) GBU-53/B Guided Test Vehicles (GTV).

Up to sixty (60) GBU-53/B Captive Carry Reliability Trainers (CCRT).

Non-MDE: Also included in this sale are Weapon Load Crew Trainers (WLCT), Practical Explosive Ordinance Disposal Trainers (PEST), containers, support and ground crew test equipment, site survey, transportation, warranties, repair and return, maintenance, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor representative engineering, logistics, and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-YAH).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: September 29, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Australia—GBU-53/B Small Diameter Bomb Increment II (SDB II)

The Government of Australia has requested a possible sale of up to three thousand nine hundred (3,900) GBU-53/B Small Diameter Bomb Increment II (SDB II), up to thirty (30) GBU-53/B Guided Test Vehicles (GTV), up to sixty (60) GBU-53/B Captive Carry Reliability Trainers (CCRT). Also included in this sale are Weapon Load Crew Trainers (WLCT), Practical Explosive Ordinance Disposal Trainers (PEST), containers, support and ground crew test equipment, site survey, transportation, warranties, repair and return, maintenance, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor representative engineering, logistics, and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value is \$815 million.

This sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major non-NATO ally that continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Western Pacific. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist our ally in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale of SDB II supports and complements the ongoing sale of the F-35A to the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF). This capability will strengthen combined operations, particularly air to ground strike

missions in all-weather conditions, and increase interoperability between the United States and the RAAF. Australia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale will improve Australia's F-35 survivability and will enhance its capability to deter global threats, strengthen its homeland defense and cooperate in coalition defense initiatives.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, AZ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government personnel or contractor representatives to Australia.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-44

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The GBU-53/B Small Diameter Bomb Increment H (SDB II) is a 250-lb class precision-guided air-to-ground munition used to defeat moving or mobile targets through adverse weather from standoff range. SDB II has deployable wings and fins and uses Inertial Navigation System/Global Positioning System (INS/GPS) guidance, network-enabled datalink, (Link-16 and UHF) and a multi-mode seeker to autonomously search, acquire, track, and defeat targets from a standoff range. SDB II employs a multi-effects warhead for maximum lethality against armored and soft targets. Sensitive areas include operating manuals and maintenance technical orders containing performance information, operating and test procedures, and other information related to support operations and repair. The GBU-53/B SDB II hardware, including guidance, multi-mode seeker, and datalink, is UNCLASSIFIED. The software is UNCLASSIFIED.

a. SDB II Guided Test Vehicles (GTV) are telemetry test vehicles used for land or sea range based testing of the SDB II weapons system. The GTV have common flight characteristics of an SDB H but with an inert warhead. In place of the multi-effects warhead is a Flight Termination, Tracking, and Telemetry (FTTT) subassembly that mirrors the multi-effects warhead's size and mass properties, but provides safety flight termination, free flight tracking and telemetry, and transmission of encrypted data from the vehicle to the ground. The SDB II GTV can have either inert or live fuses. All other flight control, guidance, data-link, and seeker functions are representative of the SDB II. The hardware, including guidance, multi-mode seeker, and datalink, is UNCLASSIFIED. The software is UNCLASSIFIED.

b. SDB II Captive Carry Reliability Test (CCRT) vehicles are SDB II variants primarily used for captive flight reliability testing. The CCRT has common characteristics of an SDB II but with an inert warhead and fuze. The CCRT does not have an FTTT subassembly in place of the warhead; it instead uses ballast to mimic the warhead's mass properties. The CCRT is a flight capable representative of the SDB II and, although not its primary objective, could be dropped as a test round on ranges not requiring

telemetry, digital tracking, or a Flight Termination System (FTS). All other flight control, guidance, data-link, and seeker functions are representative of the SDB II. The hardware, including guidance, multi-mode seeker, and datalink, is UNCLASSIFIED. The software is UNCLASSIFIED.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary obtains knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the Commonwealth of Australia can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Commonwealth of Australia.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I wish to voice my support for the victims of the horrific mass shooting in Las Vegas.

This mass shooting was the worst in our Nation's history. There are more than 50 dead and more than 500 wounded.

It should shock every American that one individual, with easy access to weapons and ammunition, can inflict such devastation.

Sadly, it was only a little more than a year ago that we also experienced what had then been the worst mass shooting in our Nation's history. That was when 49 people who were enjoying an evening of dancing with friends and loved ones were massacred in Orlando.

Just 6 months before that, 14 people were killed and more than 20 injured in San Bernardino.

Two years ago, on October 1, 2015, an assistant professor and eight students were murdered at Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, OR.

In 2013, 12 people were fatally shot at the Navy Yard, less than 2 miles from where I stand today.

On December 14, 2012, 20 children had their lives taken at Sandy Hook Elementary School.

These massacres have not and will not stop unless we do something. I believe we must acknowledge that these shootings are possible because of our Nation's weak gun laws.

Our laws permit criminal and domestic abusers to easily obtain weapons at gunshows and on the internet without a basic background check.

We know background checks work. States that require background checks on private handgun sales see fewer women killed by their partners and fewer law enforcement officers killed with handguns.

It is time we expand background checks to cover sales at gunshows and on the Internet.

We are still learning about what happened in Las Vegas, but we do know that the shooter had more than 10 rifles in his hotel room and that he may have used an assault weapon.

Today in the United States, military-style assault weapons may be sold legally to civilians. Assault weapons are not needed for either hunting or self-defense.

They are weapons of war designed to kill large numbers of people in close quarters.

This is not sustainable—and the public agrees. Just last year, a poll showed that 57 percent of Americans favor a ban on assault weapons.

In fact, from 1994 and 2004, we had laws that prohibited anyone from getting an assault weapon. I believed then and I believe now that those laws made all of us safer.

Unfortunately, right when the positive effects of those laws were taking effect, they were allowed to expire. Now, time and again, we have felt the costs of our inaction.

It is time that we finally take steps to ensure that other communities do not experience the pain that Sandy Hook, Washington, San Bernardino, Roseburg, Orlando, and now Las Vegas have gone through.

I hope my colleagues will join me in remembering the victims of this attack and will support legislation to prevent any of us from once again having to rise to remember what will be another worst mass shooting in our Nation's history.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONNECTICUT STATE AFL-CIO

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Connecticut State Labor Council AFL-CIO as they celebrate 60 years of extraordinary and exemplary advocacy on behalf of Connecticut workers and their families.

Since its formation in 1957 with the merging of the Connecticut Federation of Labor and the Connecticut State Industrial Union Council, the Connecticut State AFL-CIO has demonstrated an impressive dedication to the wellbeing of workers across the State. The organization seeks fair and equal treatment for workers through collective bargaining on their behalf and promoting legislation to create good jobs and provide people with the skills needed for them.

Simply, they strengthen the middle class, allowing tens of thousands of people to own a home, raise their families, and retire with financial security.

Uniting workers and their families toward these common goals, the Connecticut AFL-CIO has fought continuously and ceaselessly for better wages,

benefits, and conditions for the working families of the State. Throughout its six decades, the Connecticut AFL-CIO has facilitated union member access to insurance plans, credit cards, and beneficial mortgage programs.

Always looking for ways to raise the standard of living for our middle-class workers, the Connecticut AFL-CIO was one of the early leaders in the fight to achieve affordable and accessible quality healthcare, pay equity, and parental and medical leave for all employees. The Connecticut AFL-CIO also helps those who have lost their jobs, supporting fair unemployment compensation laws and education and job training programs.

Since its formation, the Connecticut AFL-CIO continuously puts the needs of workers and their families first. I applaud their numerous achievements and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Connecticut State AFL-CIO on 60 years of service and commitment to Connecticut employees.●

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL BOBBI DOORENBOS

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate an exceptional airman, Brig. Gen. Bobbi Doorenbos, on her selection for promotion to the rank of brigadier general in the Air National Guard. This promotion means she will leave behind her role as commander of the Arkansas Air National Guard's 188th Wing in Fort Smith, AR, to assume her new responsibilities in Washington, DC, as part of the leadership team within the Pentagon's Total Force Continuum Office.

Brigadier General Doorenbos clearly epitomizes the finest qualities of a military leader as evidenced by her distinguished career. After graduating from Iowa State University, she entered the U.S. Air Force in 1995 and initially served as an F-16 pilot in the Iowa Air National Guard's 185th Fighter Wing. She continued her honorable service by holding various positions in the Maryland, Washington, DC, and Virginia areas, including Air National Guard Crisis Action Team member; White House Fellow; executive officer/speechwriter for the Air National Guard Director; chief of Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance; special adviser to Vice President Joe Biden for Defense Policy and Intelligence Programs; and chief of program requirements and integration at the National Guard Bureau. She has flown combat missions in support of Operations Noble Eagle, Southern Watch, and Iraqi Freedom. Brigadier General Doorenbos is also a senior pilot with more than 1,200 flight hours in the F-16C Fighting Falcon and MQ-1B Predator.

She is truly a trailblazer. As the first female to command the 188th Wing at

Ebbing Air National Guard Base in Arkansas, she simultaneously held the title of air commander with responsibility for over 1,000 Federal technicians, Active Guard, and Reserve members in the execution of three distinct mission sets: remotely piloted aircraft; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance operations; and targeting. Her wing in comprised of the most dedicated, loyal, and highly trained airmen that the National Guard has to offer. As a team, they have taken immense pride in fulfilling their roles and obligations to the State of Arkansas and to the Nation. As a testament of Brigadier General Doorenbos's superior leadership, the 188th Wing was awarded the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award for its incredible accomplishments during her tenure as wing commander.

Brigadier General Doorenbos has displayed an extraordinary amount of dedication and passion throughout her life and career. As a mother of three daughters, it is my pleasure to watch Brigadier General Doorenbos excel in her career and show young women that they are capable of achieving anything. She will continue to be a major asset to the U.S. Air Force in her new role at the Pentagon.

I want to extend my sincere congratulations to her on this well-deserved promotion. I am very proud of her many accomplishments and wish her all the best in her future service to our country.●

TRIBUTE TO STEVE FARNHAM

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the service of an extraordinary individual in northern Maine. Mr. Stephen M. Farnham, of Mapleton, has been a driving force behind the Aroostook Area Agency on Aging. Steve began with the Aroostook agency in its infancy in the mid-1970s and is stepping down after having led the agency for the last 40 years.

Steve attended the University of Maine in Presque Isle, where he earned his bachelor of arts and went on to earn his master of public administration degree from the University of Maine in Orono. He also received a number of certificates and attended specialized courses that helped him continuously improve services and collaboration at the agency. While serving as an adjunct professor, he taught courses at public and private institutions in Maine, as well as health and safety courses with the American Red Cross. He also held many different positions with the Katahdin Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America, for which he has been recognized with multiple awards.

As chief executive officer of the not-for-profit corporation Aroostook Area Agency on Aging, Steve oversaw its expansion to 140 employees, an annual budget of \$3.4 million, and the responsi-

bility for a congregate housing project which the agency developed, owned, and managed. His professional appointments and boards on which he served insured that the State of Maine, as well as the Nation, were able to capitalize on his expertise on aging related policies. These ranged from being a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging three times, serving with the Federal Council on Aging, and helping incorporate, lead, and direct the Aroostook Regional Transportation System.

In addition to the entities already mentioned, Steve also served his hometown on the budget committee and has received a number of meritorious awards, including the Presque Isle Area Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year Award, the Maine State Bar Association John Ballou Distinguished Service Award, and was named a Rotary International Paul Harris Fellow. Despite all the very public recognition for a job well done at work and beyond, the most telling recognition is the strength of the programs and the high praise by clients and collaborators. Steve is universally respected, well-loved, and will be greatly missed, but the solid structure that he put in place and strengthened over the years will stand. I thank Steve both for his work at the helm of the Area Agency on Aging and his work serving communities across Aroostook County.●

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALASKA QUARTERLY REVIEW

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize one of our Nation's finest literary journals, the Alaska Quarterly Review, now marking its 35th year of literary excellence.

Alaska Quarterly Review was first published in 1982 at the University of Alaska Anchorage and has evolved to be a joint publication of the university and the Center for Narrative and Lyric Arts. From the beginning, it was designed to highlight the work of strong literary voices from Alaska and beyond. Publishing fiction, short plays, poetry, photo essays, and literary non-fiction, the journal has an especially strong commitment to promote new and emerging writers.

The founding editor and editor-in-chief of Alaska Quarterly Review, Ronald Spatz, envisioned the journal as a way to break through stereotypes and present Alaska to the greater literary community. That goal was far surpassed, as Alaska Quarterly Review has won accolades from some of the most prestigious reviewers and publications in the country. Pulitzer Prize-winning critic Michael Dirda wrote in *The New York Review of Books* that the Alaska Quarterly Review "remains one of our best, and most imaginative, literary magazines." *The New York Times Book Review* labeled it "fresh treasure."

Alaska Quarterly Review has also been featured and supported by the National Endowment for the Arts, the Alaska Humanities Forum, Alaska State Council on the Arts, and the Rasmussen Foundation, and honored by Alaska Center for the Book and others. A number of works originally published in the journal have been subsequently selected for inclusion in The Best American Essays, The Best American Poetry, The Best American Mystery Stories, The Best Creative Nonfiction, The Best American Short Stories, The Best American Nonrequired Reading, Prize Stories: The O. Henry Awards, The Beacon Best, and The Pushcart Prize: The Best of the Small Presses.

In addition to its literary influence on the national level, Alaska Quarterly Review brings a strong focus to the development and importance of Alaska Native and indigenous literatures. Alaska Native language survival and resilience are portrayed as a national and global concern.

Mr. Spatz writes that Alaska Quarterly Review “has been and is of Alaska but not Alaskan. We have a global perspective, and, although we have published primarily American authors, our writers hail from a wide range of nations.” The journal’s 35th anniversary observance in October reaches across the Pacific Ocean by featuring “In the Footprint of the Crocodile Man: Memories, Myths and Contemporary Art of the Sepik River, Papua New Guinea,” a reflection of the commonalities of human experience. At the same event, the universal elements of birth and language are celebrated in a beautiful film, “Shaawatke’es Birth,” performed in English and Tlingit, one of Alaska’s precious indigenous languages.

The impact of Alaska Quarterly Review extends far from its origins in my home State and is worthy of celebration by this body and all Americans who recognize the power of the literary arts to shape our thoughts, our ideals, and our country. I commend Alaska Quarterly Review and its editor, Ronald Spatz, its contributors, and its supporters for 35 years of excellence. I hope for many more to come.●

REMEMBERING ALTO “BUD” ADAMS, JR.

● Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the legacy of an extraordinary Floridian and friend who passed away this past weekend.

Alto “Bud” Adams, Jr., owner of Adams Ranch, died this weekend at age 91. Born in Fort Pierce, FL, in 1926, Bud was known in Florida and around the Nation for developing the Braford breed, a new breed of heavy-yielding cattle, crossed between the Herefords and the Brahms, that was better able to handle the heat of south Florida.

For 75 years, Bud Adams tended the family-owned Adams Ranch, which has

grown to 50,000 acres of land across St. Lucie, Madison, Okeechobee, and Osceola Counties.

The family’s land is home to one of the largest cow-calf ranches in the country. This land was also one of the first sets of conservation easements to be added to the Everglades. Today thousands of acres of Adams Ranch land have been placed into permanent land trust, including part of the Everglades Headwaters National Wildlife Refuge and Conservation Areas.

Adams Ranch was first purchased in 1937 for \$1.50 an acre by Bud’s father, Florida Supreme Court Judge Alto Adams, Sr.

Since then, Adams Ranch has received multiple environmental awards from Audubon Florida, the Farmers Conservation Alliance, and the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association for the owners’ leadership in land, water, and wildlife management.

Bud was also honored with the Pete Hegener Leadership Award by the Economic Development Council of St. Lucie County, an honor presented every year to a dedicated business leader who makes a significant contribution to St. Lucie County’s economy and quality of life.

Bud Adams was not just a cattleman and businessman; he was a devoted environmental conservationist and a philanthropist. Bud founded the United Way of St. Lucie County and supported causes like the A.E. Backus Museum & Gallery and Heathcote Botanical Gardens. He also sat on the board of the Indian River State College Foundation.

In Bud’s own words, “It is not enough for us to just do a good job breeding and caring for cattle. We must have a more holistic approach that keeps man, cattle, wildlife, and the land in a relationship that is profitable, productive and can be continued indefinitely.”

Bud showed us what it truly meant to be an environmental steward and a cowboy. He always took pride in his management of land, water, and wildlife, and Florida is better because of it.

I extend my deepest condolences to his family, particularly his wife, Dorothy. He is also survived by his sister Elaine Harrison; his children Alto Lee Adams, III, and his wife, Cindy, Michael L. Adams and his wife, Rachael, and Robert Adams and his wife, Cindee; his grandchildren; and great-grandchildren.●

37TH ANNIVERSARY OF “I LOVE LIFE” RADIO SHOW

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize one of radio broadcasting’s longest running shows, “I Love Life.” Created by South Dakota native, Jerry Dahmen, the show has hosted several of country music’s biggest stars and been featured on a number of local and national television programs.

Since the program began airing on KXRB Radio in Sioux Falls, the show has featured more than 1,600 guests who have shared inspirational stories of what it takes to turn adversity into victory. “I Love Life” has also given back to the community by providing donations from book and CD sales.

I offer my congratulations to Jerry Dahmen and wish the show continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on September 29, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2519. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

H.R. 3823. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the enrolled bills were signed on September 29, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. McCONNELL).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1894. A bill to exempt Puerto Rico from the coastwise laws of the United States (commonly known as the “Jones Act”).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on September 28, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1141. An act to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on September 29, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 327. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

S. 1866. An act to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Stephen Censky, of Missouri, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

*Ted McKinney, of Indiana, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1901. A bill to require global economic and political pressure to support diplomatic denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, including through the imposition of sanctions with respect to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and any enablers of the activities of that Government, and to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1902. A bill to specify the state of mind required for conviction for criminal offenses that lack an expressly identified state of mind, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 1903. A bill to assist communities affected by stranded nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1904. A bill to promote the use of smart technologies and systems in communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1905. A bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 278. A resolution expressing condolences to the victims of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, commending the resiliency of the people of Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands, and expressing gratitude to other neighboring States willing to stand by the people of the affected areas during the relief and recovery efforts; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 538

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 538, a bill to clarify research and development for wood products, and for other purposes.

S. 548

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 548, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 794

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 794, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to improve the process whereby Medicare administrative contractors issue local coverage determinations under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for meals.

S. 1157

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1157, a bill to establish the Vulnerability Equities Review Board, and for other purposes.

S. 1162

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1162, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

S. 1301

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1301, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1522

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1522, a bill to establish an Every Kid Outdoors program, and for other purposes.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a home infusion therapy services temporary transitional payment under the Medicare program.

S. 1754

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1754, a bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1766, a bill to reauthorize the SAFER Act of 2013, and for other purposes.

S. 1768

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1768, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1783

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1783, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to implement a process under which individuals who are 16 years of age may apply to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public election activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1803

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1803, a bill to improve medical research on marijuana.

S. 1808

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1808, a bill to extend temporarily the Federal Perkins Loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 1816

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1816, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to enhance fraud alert procedures and provide free access to credit freezes, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1829, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program.

S. 1838

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1838, a bill to repeal the authority under the National Labor Relations Act for States to enact laws prohibiting agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condi-

tion of employment, and for other purposes.

S. 1868

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1868, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 1895

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1895, a bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 19, a concurrent resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 278—EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE VICTIMS OF HURRICANE HARVEY, HURRICANE IRMA, AND HURRICANE MARIA, COMMENDING THE RESILIENCY OF THE PEOPLE OF TEXAS, LOUISIANA, FLORIDA, PUERTO RICO, AND THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO OTHER NEIGHBORING STATES WILLING TO STAND BY THE PEOPLE OF THE AFFECTED AREAS DURING THE RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 278

Whereas, in August and September of 2017, Hurricanes Harvey and Irma reached the shores of the United States and wreaked havoc on the States of Texas, Louisiana, and Florida;

Whereas, in September of 2017, Hurricane Maria devastated Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands;

Whereas, as a result of these hurricanes, a major Federal disaster was declared for Texas on August 25, 2017, for the United States Virgin Islands on September 7, 2017, and for Florida and Puerto Rico on September 10, 2017;

Whereas a Federal emergency was declared for Louisiana on August 28, 2017;

Whereas, as of September 2017, Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria have been responsible for the deaths of more than 150 individuals;

Whereas, as a result of Hurricane Harvey—
(1) many communities in Texas and Louisiana were flooded and without electrical

power for extended periods of time and an entire city in Texas, with a population of 118,000, lost access to drinking water;

(2) some weather gauges in the State of Texas measured more than 50 inches of rainfall between the evening of Thursday, August 24, 2017, and the afternoon of Tuesday, August 29, 2017;

(3) more than 4,500,000,000 liters of water fell in Harris County in Texas in only 100 hours;

(4) in the State of Texas alone, more than 130,000 residences were destroyed; and

(5) more than 1,000,000 vehicles in Texas were destroyed;

Whereas, as a result of Hurricane Irma—

(1) nearly 13,000,000 people in Florida were left without electrical power;

(2) an estimated 90 percent of the homes in the Florida Keys were damaged or destroyed;

(3) Florida's \$8,600,000,000 citrus industry faces crop losses of 70 percent, with some growers experiencing losses of 90 percent or more;

(4) the maritime culture of Florida has been severely impacted, including—

(A) the disruption of commercial fishing, trapping, and aquaculture;

(B) the loss of recreational fishing opportunities for residents and tourists;

(C) widespread debris limiting safe navigation in waterways and channels; and

(D) reports of more than 850 displaced or sunken vessels; and

(5) property insurance claims in Florida have exceeded \$3,600,000,000 and are still rising;

Whereas the Federal Emergency Management Agency has estimated that flood damage claims as a result of these 3 hurricanes could total several billion dollars;

Whereas refinery closures along the Gulf Coast after Hurricane Harvey resulted in a temporary loss of 20 percent of the capacity of the United States to refine crude oil into gasoline, diesel, and other fuels;

Whereas, as a result of Hurricane Maria—

(1) some parts of Puerto Rico may be without electrical power for 6 months;

(2) more than 1,500,000 individuals were left without access to clean drinking water;

(3) critical infrastructure was damaged, hindering recovery efforts;

(4) thousands of residents of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands face an extreme housing crisis; and

(5) approximately 80 percent of the agricultural crop value in Puerto Rico was destroyed, with an estimated \$780,000,000 loss in agricultural yields;

Whereas the devastation of these 3 hurricanes, which caused a disruption in the distribution of gasoline, has been felt on a global scale; and

Whereas, after these 3 hurricanes—

(1) numerous localities in all of the affected areas were forced to close schools due to power outages and dangerous road conditions;

(2) flights were cancelled in Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands;

(3) doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel worked expeditiously to provide care and ensure that patients were safe under extreme circumstances;

(4) hospitals, medical centers, and triage units provided needed care;

(5) volunteer organizations and charities supplied hurricane victims with food, water, and shelter;

(6) immediate humanitarian aid and long-term rebuilding assistance is needed in the many devastated regions; and

(7) thousands of volunteers and Federal, State, and local government employees from across the United States committed time and resources to help with recovery efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses condolences to the victims of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria;

(2) commends the resiliency and courage of the people of Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands;

(3) applauds the work and commitment of emergency responders and law enforcement officers on the ground in the aftermath of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria; and

(4) commits to provide the necessary resources to stand by the people of Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands as they rebuild their communities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1109. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1616, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1109. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1616, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 381 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 822. NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized for fiscal years 2017 through 2022 within the United States Secret Service a National Computer Forensics Institute (in this section referred to as the ‘Institute’). The Institute shall disseminate information related to the investigation and prevention of cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and educate, train, and equip State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges.

“(b) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the Institute shall include the following:

“(1) Educating State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on current—

“(A) cyber and electronic crimes and related threats;

“(B) methods for investigating cyber and electronic crime and related threats and conducting computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

“(C) prosecutorial and judicial challenges related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

“(2) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers to—

“(A) conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations;

“(B) conduct computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

“(C) respond to network intrusion incidents.

“(3) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on methods to obtain, process, store, and admit digital evidence in court.

“(c) PRINCIPLES.—In carrying out the functions specified in subsection (b), the Institute shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that timely, actionable, and relevant expertise and information related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats is shared with State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers and prosecutors.

“(d) EQUIPMENT.—The Institute may provide State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers with computer equipment, hardware, software, manuals, and tools necessary to conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

“(e) ELECTRONIC CRIME TASK FORCES.—The Institute shall facilitate the expansion of the network of Electronic Crime Task Forces of the United States Secret Service through the addition of State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers educated and trained at the Institute.

“(f) SAVINGS PROVISION.—All authorized activities and functions carried out by the Institute at any location as of the day before the date of the enactment of this section are authorized to continue to be carried out at any such location on and after such date.”

(b) FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, amounts appropriated for United States Secret Service, Operations and Support, may be used to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 821 the following new item:

“Sec. 822. National Computer Forensics Institute.”

SEC. 3. PREVENTION, INVESTIGATION, AND PROSECUTION OF ECONOMIC, HIGH TECHNOLOGY, INTERNET, AND OTHER WHITE COLLAR CRIME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART MM—PREVENTION, INVESTIGATION, AND PROSECUTION OF WHITE COLLAR CRIME

“SEC. 3030. SHORT TITLE.

“This part may be cited as the ‘National White Collar Crime Control Act of 2017’.

“SEC. 3031. ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance is authorized to enter into a cooperative agreement with or make a grant to an eligible entity for the purpose of improving the identification, investigation, and prosecution of white collar crime (including each category of such crimes set forth in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b)) by providing comprehensive, direct, and practical training and technical assistance to law enforcement officers, investigators, auditors and prosecutors in States and units of local government.

“(b) WHITE COLLAR CRIME DEFINED.—For purposes of this part, the term ‘white collar crime’ includes—

“(1) high-tech crime, including cyber and electronic crime and related threats;

“(2) economic crime, including financial fraud and mortgage fraud; and

“(3) Internet-based crime against children and child pornography.

“SEC. 3032. PURPOSES.

“The purposes of this part include the following:

“(1) To ensure that training is available for State, local, tribal and territorial law enforcement agencies and officers nationwide to support local efforts to identify, prevent, investigate, and prosecute cyber and financial crimes, including those crimes facilitated via computer networks and other electronic means, and crimes involving financial and economic impacts such as intellectual property crimes.

“(2) To deliver training to State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, and other criminal justice professionals concerning the use of proven methodologies to prevent, detect, and respond to such crimes, recognize emerging issues, manage electronic and financial crime evidence and to improve local criminal justice agency responses to such threats.

“(3) To provide operational and technical assistance and training concerning tools, products, resources, guidelines, and procedures to aid and enhance criminal intelligence analysis, conduct cyber crime and financial crime investigations, and related justice information sharing at the local and State levels.

“(4) To provide appropriate training on protections for privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties in the conduct of criminal intelligence analysis and cyber and electronic crime and financial crime investigations, including in the development of policies, guidelines, and procedures by State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement agencies to protect and enhance privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties protections and identify weaknesses and gaps in the protection of privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

“SEC. 3033. AUTHORIZED PROGRAMS.

“A grant or cooperative agreement awarded under this part may be made only for the following programs, with respect to the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of certain criminal activities:

“(1) Programs to provide a nationwide support system for State and local criminal justice agencies.

“(2) Programs to assist State and local criminal justice agencies to develop, establish, and maintain intelligence-focused policing strategies and related information sharing.

“(3) Programs to provide training and investigative support services to State and local criminal justice agencies to provide such agencies with skills and resources needed to investigate and prosecute such criminal activities and related criminal activities.

“(4) Programs to provide research support, to establish partnerships, and to provide other resources to aid State and local criminal justice agencies to prevent, investigate, and prosecute such criminal activities and related problems.

“(5) Programs to provide information and research to the general public to facilitate the prevention of such criminal activities.

“(6) Programs to establish or support national training and research centers regionally to provide training and research services for State and local criminal justice agencies.

“(7) Programs to provide training and oversight to State and local criminal justice

agencies to develop and comply with applicable privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties related policies, procedures, rules, laws, and guidelines.

“(8) Any other programs specified by the Attorney General as furthering the purposes of this part.

“SEC. 3034. APPLICATION.

“To be eligible for an award of a grant or cooperative agreement under this part, an entity shall submit to the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance an application in such form and manner, and containing such information, as required by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

“SEC. 3035. ELIGIBILITY.

“States, units of local government, not-for-profit entities, and institutions of higher education with demonstrated capacity and experience in delivering training, technical assistance and other resources including direct, practical laboratory training to law enforcement officers, investigators, auditors and prosecutors in States and units of local government and over the Internet shall be eligible to receive an award under this part.

“SEC. 3036. RULES AND REGULATIONS.

“The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this part, including rules and regulations for submitting and reviewing applications under section 3035.”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to carry out —

(1) part MM of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) section 401(b) of the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (34 U.S.C. 30103(b)).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 1 request for a committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, October 2, 2017 at 5:45 p.m., in S-216, Capitol (President's Room), in order to conduct a business meeting to report the following nominations: Stephen Censky, of Missouri, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture and Ted McKinney, of Indiana, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1894

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1894) to exempt Puerto Rico from the coastwise laws of the United States (commonly known as the “Jones Act”).

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

MAKING TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN MARINE FISH CONSERVATION STATUTES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 224, S. 396.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 396) to make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes.

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 396) was passed, as follows:

S. 396

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

SECTION 1. BILLFISH CONSERVATION ACT OF 2012.

Section 4(c)(1) of the Billfish Conservation Act of 2012 (16 U.S.C. 1827a(c)(1)) is amended by inserting “and retained” after “landed”.

SEC. 2. SHARK CONSERVATION ACT OF 2010.

The Act entitled “An Act to amend the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to improve the conservation of sharks”, approved January 4, 2011 (Public Law 111-348; 124 Stat. 3668), is amended—

(1) by striking section 104 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 104. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

“Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed as affecting, altering, or diminishing in any way the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to establish such conservation and management measures as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate under sections 302(a)(3) and 304(g) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)(3), 1854(g)).”; and

(2) in section 1, by striking the item relating to section 104 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 104. Rule of construction.”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STRENGTHENING STATE AND LOCAL CYBER CRIME FIGHTING ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1616 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1616) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Cornyn amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1109) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle C of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 381 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 822. NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized for fiscal years 2017 through 2022 within the United States Secret Service a National Computer Forensics Institute (in this section referred to as the ‘Institute’). The Institute shall disseminate information related to the investigation and prevention of cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and educate, train, and equip State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges.

“(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—The functions of the Institute shall include the following:

“(1) Educating State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on current—

“(A) cyber and electronic crimes and related threats;

“(B) methods for investigating cyber and electronic crime and related threats and conducting computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

“(C) prosecutorial and judicial challenges related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

“(2) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers to—

“(A) conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations;

“(B) conduct computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

“(C) respond to network intrusion incidents.

“(3) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on methods to obtain, process, store, and admit digital evidence in court.

“(c) **PRINCIPLES.**—In carrying out the functions specified in subsection (b), the Institute shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that timely, actionable, and relevant expertise and information related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats is shared with State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers and prosecutors.

“(d) **EQUIPMENT.**—The Institute may provide State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers with computer equipment, hardware, software, manuals, and tools necessary to conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

“(e) **ELECTRONIC CRIME TASK FORCES.**—The Institute shall facilitate the expansion of the network of Electronic Crime Task Forces of the United States Secret Service through the addition of State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers educated and trained at the Institute.

“(f) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—All authorized activities and functions carried out by the Institute at any location as of the day before the date of the enactment of this section are authorized to continue to be carried out at any such location on and after such date.”.

(b) **FUNDING.**—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, amounts appropriated for United States Secret Service, Operations and Support, may be used to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 821 the following new item:

“Sec. 822. National Computer Forensics Institute.”.

SEC. 3. PREVENTION, INVESTIGATION, AND PROSECUTION OF ECONOMIC, HIGH TECHNOLOGY, INTERNET, AND OTHER WHITE COLLAR CRIME.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART MM—PREVENTION, INVESTIGATION, AND PROSECUTION OF WHITE COLLAR CRIME

“SEC. 3030. SHORT TITLE.

“This part may be cited as the ‘National White Collar Crime Control Act of 2017’.

“SEC. 3031. ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance is authorized to enter into a cooperative agreement with or make a grant to an eligible entity for the purpose of improving the identification, investigation, and prosecution of white collar crime (including each category of such crimes set forth in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b)) by providing comprehensive, direct, and practical training and tech-

nical assistance to law enforcement officers, investigators, auditors and prosecutors in States and units of local government.

“(b) **WHITE COLLAR CRIME DEFINED.**—For purposes of this part, the term ‘white collar crime’ includes—

“(1) high-tech crime, including cyber and electronic crime and related threats;

“(2) economic crime, including financial fraud and mortgage fraud; and

“(3) Internet-based crime against children and child pornography.

“SEC. 3032. PURPOSES.

“The purposes of this part include the following:

“(1) To ensure that training is available for State, local, tribal and territorial law enforcement agencies and officers nationwide to support local efforts to identify, prevent, investigate, and prosecute cyber and financial crimes, including those crimes facilitated via computer networks and other electronic means, and crimes involving financial and economic impacts such as intellectual property crimes.

“(2) To deliver training to State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, and other criminal justice professionals concerning the use of proven methodologies to prevent, detect, and respond to such crimes, recognize emerging issues, manage electronic and financial crime evidence and to improve local criminal justice agency responses to such threats.

“(3) To provide operational and technical assistance and training concerning tools, products, resources, guidelines, and procedures to aid and enhance criminal intelligence analysis, conduct cyber crime and financial crime investigations, and related justice information sharing at the local and State levels.

“(4) To provide appropriate training on protections for privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties in the conduct of criminal intelligence analysis and cyber and electronic crime and financial crime investigations, including in the development of policies, guidelines, and procedures by State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement agencies to protect and enhance privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties protections and identify weaknesses and gaps in the protection of privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

“SEC. 3033. AUTHORIZED PROGRAMS.

“A grant or cooperative agreement awarded under this part may be made only for the following programs, with respect to the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of certain criminal activities:

“(1) Programs to provide a nationwide support system for State and local criminal justice agencies.

“(2) Programs to assist State and local criminal justice agencies to develop, establish, and maintain intelligence-focused policing strategies and related information sharing.

“(3) Programs to provide training and investigative support services to State and local criminal justice agencies to provide such agencies with skills and resources needed to investigate and prosecute such criminal activities and related criminal activities.

“(4) Programs to provide research support, to establish partnerships, and to provide other resources to aid State and local criminal justice agencies to prevent, investigate, and prosecute such criminal activities and related problems.

“(5) Programs to provide information and research to the general public to facilitate the prevention of such criminal activities.

“(6) Programs to establish or support national training and research centers regionally to provide training and research services for State and local criminal justice agencies.

“(7) Programs to provide training and oversight to State and local criminal justice agencies to develop and comply with applicable privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties related policies, procedures, rules, laws, and guidelines.

“(8) Any other programs specified by the Attorney General as furthering the purposes of this part.

“SEC. 3034. APPLICATION.

“To be eligible for an award of a grant or cooperative agreement under this part, an entity shall submit to the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance an application in such form and manner, and containing such information, as required by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

“SEC. 3035. ELIGIBILITY.

“States, units of local government, not-for-profit entities, and institutions of higher education with demonstrated capacity and experience in delivering training, technical assistance and other resources including direct, practical laboratory training to law enforcement officers, investigators, auditors and prosecutors in States and units of local government and over the Internet shall be eligible to receive an award under this part.

“SEC. 3036. RULES AND REGULATIONS.

“The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this part, including rules and regulations for submitting and reviewing applications under section 3035.”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to carry out —

(1) part MM of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) section 401(b) of the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (34 U.S.C. 30103(b)).

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 1616), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, October 3; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time

for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Cissna nomination; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators Gillibrand and Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the horrific mass murders last night. My heart is obviously with the victims and their families, and I thank all of our brave first responders who acted so quickly.

These senseless mass shootings must end. We cannot allow this to be the new normal, where tragedy after tragedy happens, and we do absolutely nothing to address it. It is not good enough to just send thoughts and prayers and extend our condolences when people are losing their lives to gun violence every day.

We still have to learn the details about what happened, but what we do know is this: This violence, this mass murder, is one of the worst massacres we have ever seen in this country. It is yet another reminder of Congress' failure to act to protect Americans from gun violence. It is another disturbing and painful example of how Congress is too weak and too cowardly to stand up to the gun industry.

The news reports are saying that the gun was shooting in rapid-fire bursts, a military-style weapon specifically designed to kill as many people as possible in the shortest amount of time, a weapon of war.

We have to pass laws that protect the American people from this kind of horrific violence. It should not be legal for a civilian on American soil to own and use a weapon of war like an assault weapon. Our military is highly trained to use such weapons. It should not be easy for any person to buy a suppressor—known by many people as a silencer—to attach to their guns, which makes it harder for police to do their jobs and catch violent criminals.

The people of Nevada voted in November to require background checks on all weapons, but the politicians in that State are refusing to implement the will of the people. The violence in

Las Vegas is only the latest tragedy like this. Mass shootings get all the news, but every single day in my home State, gun violence on a much smaller scale is destroying more and more lives.

We really need to act. We must take gun violence as seriously as we take the threat of terrorism, wherever it is happening.

We will get to the facts and the bottom of this. And when we do, let's honor the lives of those we have lost by doing something about it, doing everything we can to make sure this never happens again.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, we have been here before. We have been here in the wake of Virginia Tech, Sandy Hook, Orlando, numerous other mass shootings, and now Las Vegas.

We can all agree that our hearts and prayers, mourning and condolences go out to the families of loved ones who have suffered this senseless, horrific violence. We can also agree that many of the details are unknown about the shooter, and a lot of investigation will be done. We can all agree that Las Vegas was struck by evil; call it pure evil.

We know what it looks like in Connecticut because we saw it firsthand in Newtown. We lived through the heartbreaking, unspeakable violence of that day, just a few years ago, when evil visited Newtown and caused the death of 26 beautiful human beings, including 20 children. America came together in support of us in Connecticut, and today we should come together in support of the people of Nevada.

My heart and prayers are with them, but thoughts and prayers are not enough. We know the evil that visited Connecticut also brought forth good in other people—in the first responders, the doctors, and countless members of the community and people of America who united.

I will never forget that day in Newtown when the community came together in St. Rose of Lima Church for an evening of mourning. I said then that the whole world was watching. Indeed, what the world saw was courage and resilience of truly heroic proportions—some of the good along with the evil.

When I saw those images today in Las Vegas—the sound of that gunfire, the pandemonium, the reports of injuries and deaths—it brought back to me that day in Newtown. I was not there

for the shooting, as I had gone later in the day, but the memories of that day and of the successive days, weeks, and years had been brought back. My heart broke, but my stomach also churned with anger. I was frustrated and furious.

I am now furious because Congress has failed to act. Nothing has changed since Newtown. Congress has been complicit when we have had numerous opportunities and many reasons to make America safer and adopt commonsense measures that 90 percent of Americans support. So thoughts and prayers are not enough. Hand-wringing and soul-searching is needed, but it is insufficient. What is needed now is action.

I am under no illusions. Nobody needs to tell me where the votes are at this moment. We need to be realistic about what the agenda is in our going forward. We need to be very clear-eyed and realistic, but we also need to recognize that we can win this fight. Between the time that Ronald Reagan had almost been assassinated and the day that the Brady bill had passed, it had been almost 10 years. We need to be in this fight as a marathon, not as a sprint, and that is the determination and resolve that must be brought to this effort.

It was 5 years ago when a man wielding a semiautomatic rifle murdered 20 children and 6 adults at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown. The cries of grief echoed around this country, and there was a moment when action could have been taken. We need to seize this moment. Then, the vote, shamefully, failed to reach 60 for commonsense measures, like background checks. We needed 60, and we had a majority, and our colleagues in the House of Representatives told us that that measure would have passed there.

Since then, every day in this country an average of 92 Americans die due to gun violence, which is 33,000 Americans every year, and 59 is the death toll as of this moment in Las Vegas. Day after day, 92 Americans are killed as a result of gun violence, and 60 of them are suicides, but that is no less a death, and it is a preventable death if there are commonsense measures that will stop this carnage.

I would be happy never to speak about this topic, never to complain again about Congress's complicity, but our hearts break, and our stomachs churn with fury. America's should as well. After Newtown, Aurora, Blacksburg, Charleston, Chattanooga, Lafayette, San Bernardino, Orlando, and, now, Las Vegas, these cities have become synonymous with mass shootings—unjustly tarnished. What is needed is national resolve.

For anyone who says that we should only mourn or offer condolences, let me just say, very simply: Let us honor those victims and keep faith with their

memories, so that their lives and losses will not be in vain, by taking action that makes America safer. Let us redouble our determination. The bills are ready to go, the agenda is set, and the action is clear. Let us honor their memories through action. If the President believes this carnage was pure evil, let him lead—if not today, tomorrow, and if not tomorrow, Wednesday, when he visits Las Vegas. If these actions were pure evil, let us all lead by our example, and let us move forward to stop this carnage in the future. We grieve these losses, but we need to recognize that the measures now before Congress are a travesty and a dishonor to those lives that were lost.

One of these proposals is an innocuous-sounding Hearing Protection Act—let me repeat: the Hearing Protection Act—which could come to a vote as early as this week in the House of Representatives. This measure would gut regulations on gun silencers.

Now, let's be very clear. Silencers are already widely available to hundreds of sportsmen who pay the fee, register, and wait for a short period. This legislation would make it terrifyingly easy to buy a gun silencer. Hunters and recreational shooters deserve to have silencers but only if they comply with those regulations. This measure would pose an unacceptable risk to public safety and make it more difficult for law enforcement, especially in urban areas, to identify gunshots, locate shooters, and protect civilians.

In one interview after another of the victims of last night's shooting, there was a common refrain: They ran, and they escaped because they heard those gunshots. The only supposed reform measure before the Congress right now that has been given a chance of passage is a proposal to make it easier to buy gun silencers. The only thing that led those individuals to escape—or one of the only things—was, in fact, the sound of gunshots. How many lives would have been taken last night if the shooter had had a silencer?

Another proposal is the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which would essentially eliminate the States' ability to regulate concealed-carry permits in their States, undermining the laws that States like Connecticut have put in place to keep our residents safe.

In the wake of Newtown, Charleston, Orlando, and, now, Las Vegas, Members of Congress should come together to protect our lives from these senseless killings. It is not about Republicans or Democrats. It is not about politics. It is not even about policy. It is about public safety, simply. We should not be undermining protection. What a travesty and tragedy and what a dishonor to the memories of those victims in Las Vegas to now be on the verge of weakening rather than strengthening our public safety laws.

Let's join hands across the aisle and across both Houses to stand up to the gun lobby, the NRA, and other special interests and release and break their grip on Congress. More than thoughts and prayers are necessary, although they fulfill a vitally important function. Talk must be turned into action. Waiting simply means more deaths, and delay means time. Time is not on our side with there being 92 deaths, on average, every day as a result of gun violence.

Let us join together and combat evil. Certainly, it was there in Las Vegas, but it will visit other communities, as it does every day. Those 92 deaths and mass shootings will continue unless commonsense, sensible measures, like a ban on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines, are adopted, as well as there being mandatory background checks for all gun sales. Until this is adopted, America will be more at risk. We must make America safer, and that is an obligation that we share across the aisle and across the two bodies of Congress.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:31 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

GREGORY E. MAGGS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS TO EXPIRE ON THE DATE PRESCRIBED BY LAW, VICE CHARLES E. ERDMANN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DIANA FURCHTGOFF-ROTH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NAZAKHTAR NIKAKHTAR, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE MARCUS DWAYNE JADOTTE, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

DENNIS M. DEVANEY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 16, 2023, VICE IRVING A. WILLIAMSON, TERM EXPIRED.

RANDOLPH J. STAYIN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 16, 2026, VICE MEREDITH M. BROADBENT, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

BARRY W. ASHE, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, VICE L. R. LEMELLE, RETIRED.

DANIEL DESMOND DOMENICO, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO, VICE ROBERT E. BLACKBURN, RETIRED.

STUART KYLE DUNCAN, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE W. EUGENE DAVIS, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PAUL J. LACAMERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. TWANDA E. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROGER D. MURDOCK

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JULIE P. AKEY, OF VIRGINIA
DULCE M. AYOUBI-ACOSTA, OF VIRGINIA
HENRY N. BAKER, JR., OF KENTUCKY
JEFFREY S. BARRUS, OF UTAH
BENJAMIN J. BAUGHMAN, OF TEXAS
SARAH M. BELOUSOV, OF FLORIDA
STRAUN W. BOSTON, OF CALIFORNIA
SHANNON M. BRINK, OF COLORADO
ANTHONY C. BROSNAN, OF MISSOURI
TUCKER A. BROWN, OF TEXAS
JOEL BURGER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
THOMAS G. CECIL, OF FLORIDA
MOLLY MCCABE CHINCHILLA, OF ALASKA
VINCENT G. CILLI, OF FLORIDA
EVA COFFEY, OF TEXAS
ADAM R. COLVIN, OF ALABAMA
SYDNEY A. CROSS, OF MISSOURI
STACI RAAB DAWSON, OF VIRGINIA
CRAIG A. DENNISON, OF IOWA
RISHI PRAFUL HAYWAR DESAI, OF WEST VIRGINIA
COLIN J. DONOVAN, OF WISCONSIN
KATRINA N. DRAYTON, OF MICHIGAN
EDWARD A. EICHLER, OF MAINE
ELIZABETH LAUREEN EVANS, OF VIRGINIA
MANDY Z. FEUERBACHER, OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC K. FONG, OF CALIFORNIA
DARIN FOSTER, OF TEXAS
MARINA O. GALKINA, OF FLORIDA
DANIELA GARRETON, OF CALIFORNIA
JONAS B. GIL, OF NEVADA
PHILLIP M. GUTHRIE, OF TEXAS
RUSSELL C. HEADLEE, OF NEBRASKA
TODD A. JURKOWSKI, OF FLORIDA
NICHOLAS A. KLINGER, OF FLORIDA
FAITH E. KROEKER-MAUS, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
ABRAHAM YISUNG LEE, OF MARYLAND
RUBY V. MARCELO, OF MARYLAND
COURTNEY M. MAZZONE, OF NEW YORK
TIMOTHY S. MCNALLY, OF ILLINOIS
CHRISTOPHER I. MERRIMAN, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN C. PHELPS, OF FLORIDA
RICHARD E. PINKHAM II, OF OHIO
CHRISTOPHER J. PISTULKA, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
JAMISON F. PIXLEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
CALEB D. PORTNOY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
RYAN M. REYNOLDS, OF UTAH
ROYAL S. RIPLEY, OF FLORIDA
LEAH J. SEVERINO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AMELIA R. SHAW, OF NEW YORK
CRYSTAL DAWN SHERIDAN, OF TEXAS
GENEVIEVE C. SIEBENGARTNER, OF OREGON
NICHOLAS S. SIEGEL, OF VIRGINIA
HELEN ELISABETH SOCOLOW, OF NEW YORK
SARAH R. STEPHENS, OF OKLAHOMA
SCOTT C. TUTTLE, OF NEW YORK
MERRY M. WALKER, OF WASHINGTON
JESSICA ELLEN WARDER, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL Y. WARDER, OF FLORIDA
MICHELLE KRISTINE WARREN, OF NEW JERSEY
JOSEPH N. YACKLEY, OF ILLINOIS
VERA N. ZDRAVKOVA, OF IDAHO

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 2, 2017:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

AJIT VARADARAJ PAI, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2016.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 2, 2017

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 2, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRADLEY BYRNE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO THE COMMUNITY OF EL CAMPO, TEXAS

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the community of El Campo, Texas.

Recently, while surveying crop damage from Hurricane Harvey in and around El Campo, two members of my staff and one USDA staffer were involved in a serious car accident. They were immediately transported to El Campo Memorial Hospital, where they received exemplary care and were later discharged. As the stories from the day later unfolded, I was struck by the outpouring of kindness and generosity of the many farmers, ranchers, and community members of El Campo.

This is a town and a community that is still recovering in the wake of Hurricane Harvey—a community that has suffered tremendous losses over the past month. Yet, without a second thought, area farmers and ranchers lined up in the hospital waiting room offering spare bedrooms, meals, and transportation for my staff.

These were producers who, in some cases, had never met my team, but who felt compelled to lend a hand to those in need.

America is hurting right now. Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria have wreaked havoc in States and cities across our Nation; and the good citizens of Las Vegas are dealing with another disaster of a different making. Nevertheless, folks are hurting there as well.

We need look no further than the compassion of those bighearted farmers, ranchers, and first responders of El Campo, Texas, to understand America's strength and resolve. They make Texas strong. They make America strong. Together, we will get through all of our challenges.

May God continue to bless Texas, and may God bless the United States of America.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

Lord, once again, our Nation reels in grief and horror after yet another mass shooting on our soil. We ask Your blessing upon us all, but most especially on those who mourn the loss of their loved ones. Have mercy on all Your children who died.

The debates will, once again, ensue. Speed us to the day when the wisdom of Solomon might inspire our congressional Members beyond the limitations of sound bites and platitudes before more and more American citizens are deprived of their lives.

Lord, the suffering of our world is all around us. Stimulate our hearts and minds so that everything we may do this day would be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

SOUTH CAROLINA GUARD EFFORTS IN PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our thoughts and prayers are with the families impacted by the massacre in Las Vegas. We are blessed with courageous law enforcement.

I am extremely grateful to the South Carolina National Guard for sending nearly 150 engineer soldiers to assist Puerto Rico in relief efforts after Hurricane Maria. This was a devastating storm for the people of Puerto Rico, and they have been in our thoughts and prayers each and every day.

These dedicated soldiers are part of a multi-State engineer task force with North Carolina, Louisiana, and New York Army National Guards. They will be assisting in clearing roads, debris, and working to reach areas that have been deemed unreachable due to the storm. They will also work on restoring infrastructure.

As a veteran of the South Carolina Army National Guard and the father of three sons who have served in the Guard, I am grateful that our State is able to assist the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico in their time of need. On my visits to San Juan, I have been very impressed by its dynamic citizens.

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

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

I am very appreciative of the leadership of South Carolina Adjutant General Robert Livingston, the experienced South Carolina Army National Guard members, as well as the leadership of Governor Henry McMaster.

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

ALL THINGS HAVE THEIR TIME

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in mourning. Many hearts are bleeding.

Mr. Speaker, there is much suffering. Lives have been lost in a senseless and needless manner in Las Vegas.

Mr. Speaker, there is a right time for all things. This is a time for our Nation to mourn and for hearts to heal.

Mr. Speaker, I announce that impeachment is postponed. Let us mourn, and let us heal.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 29, 2017, at 9:53 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 770.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2519.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills were signed by Speaker pro tempore HARRIS on Friday, September 29, 2017:

H.R. 2519, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion;

H.R. 3823, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT OF MINERAL RIGHTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2316) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to repeal provisions relating only to the Allegheny National Forest.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows

H.R. 2316

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cooperative Management of Mineral Rights Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF PROVISIONS REGARDING THE ALLEGHENY NATIONAL FOREST.

(a) REPEAL.—Subsection (o) of section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) and section 2508 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486; 106 Stat. 3108) are repealed.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted—

(1) to limit, modify, or otherwise affect the existing requirement to provide in writing 60-day advance notice of specific activities in accordance with the order dated December 16, 1980, in the case United States of America v. Minard Run Oil Company, 1980 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9570 (W.D. Pa., Dec. 16, 1980); or

(2) to limit existing authority of the Forest Service under provisions of law codified in section 551 of title 16, United States Code.

(c) PERMITTING AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted to alter, repeal, or otherwise limit the existing authority of the Forest Service to permit the harvest or sale of timber derived from the Allegheny National Forest.

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

Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank leadership for allowing H.R. 2316 to come to the floor.

The Allegheny National Forest, located in my district in northwestern Pennsylvania, is located near the first commercial oil discovery in the country. The Allegheny National Forest is Pennsylvania's only national forest and, since its creation in 1923, has been home to numerous recreational and commercial activities.

Oil and gas has been produced from privately owned subsurface minerals within the forest for decades, and mineral owners worked cooperatively with the Forest Service to safely produce oil and gas within the national forest boundaries.

Mineral owners routinely provided 60-day notification of drilling plans prior to the commencement of operations, and the Forest Service then issued a notice to proceed, or NTP. However, in 2006, the Forest Service deemed issuance of an NTP to be a major Federal action that triggered the application of the National Environmental Policy Act.

This designation requires a full environmental analysis of the Allegheny National Forest, and environmental groups were quick to sue the Forest Service to enforce the new rule. After settling with these groups, the Forest Service issued a moratorium when issuing NTPs until the full environmental analysis was completed. This moratorium had immediate and severe impacts on the mineral rights owners, who were unfairly denied access to their mineral property.

The oil and gas industry sued, claiming that the Forest Service did not have the authority to preclude the development of privately owned minerals, and in 2009 the U.S. District Court of Western Pennsylvania agreed and lifted the moratorium in the Allegheny National Forest. The lower court's decision was confirmed on appeal in 2013. This bill fully repeals the invalidated language from the Mineral Leasing Act and the Energy Policy Act of 1992 in accordance with these court decisions.

Throughout the litigation, the Forest Service claimed section 2508 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, codified in the Mineral Leasing Act, provided them with the authority to restrict mineral development. It is critical to strike this language. Had this regulation not been challenged, over 11 million acres of split estate minerals throughout the country would have been locked up, devastating mineral owners and local and State economies.

A similar version of this bill passed the House during the 114th Congress, demonstrating the support for protecting private property rights in the Allegheny National Forest.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to implementing this crucial solution. I urge adoption of the measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2316 is nearly identical to a bill that passed the House last year with overwhelming bipartisan support.

The intent of the bill, according to the sponsor, is to ensure that owners of mineral rights in the Allegheny National Forest are allowed to drill for their oil and gas within the boundaries of that national forest.

In the Natural Resources Committee last Congress, the majority accepted an amendment by Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee Ranking Member LOWENTHAL that clarified the intent of the bill and ensured that the Forest Service would still receive advance notice of any oil and gas operations and that no other national forest would be affected.

So this bill is a bipartisan compromise that protects the private property rights while also protecting the rights of the Forest Service, and I thank the sponsor for working so cooperatively on this.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2316, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2316.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UDALL PARK LAND EXCHANGE COMPLETION ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1547) to provide for the unencumbering of title

to non-Federal land owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest to the City.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1547

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Udall Park Land Exchange Completion Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CITY.—The term "City" means the city of Tucson, Arizona.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means the approximately 172.8-acre parcel of City land identified in the patent numbered 02-90-0001 and dated October 4, 1989, and more particularly described as lots 3 and 4, S½NW¼, sec. 5, T.14S., R.15 E., Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL REVERSIONARY INTEREST IN LAND LOCATED IN TUCSON, ARIZONA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, the reversionary interests of the United States in and to the non-Federal land for the purpose of unencumbering the title to the non-Federal land to enable economic development of the non-Federal land.

(b) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the exact legal descriptions of the non-Federal land shall be determined in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions to the conveyance under subsection (a), consistent with that subsection, as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) COSTS.—The City shall pay all costs associated with the conveyance under subsection (a), consistent with that subsection, including the costs of any surveys, recording costs, and other reasonable costs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1547 completes the transfer of the Bureau of Land Manage-

ment's reversionary interest in Udall Park, located in Tucson, Arizona, nearly three decades after the city donated \$4 million worth of land to the Bureau of Land Management to complete their portion of the exchange.

Twenty years after the exchange took place, the Bureau of Land Management threatened to invoke its reversionary interest because the city dared to hold a local farmers market in the park. The city of Tucson has invested millions of dollars in this community park, building swimming pools, recreation centers, and athletic fields, and it deserves to have clear title to the land and complete jurisdiction over the uses of the park.

The bill is bipartisan and has nearly unanimous support from the Arizona congressional delegation. I urge adoption of the measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1547 transfers the reversionary interest associated with Udall Park to the city of Tucson, Arizona.

The land was transferred to the city back in the 1980s under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, a program that authorizes the conveyance of Federal land to local governments and nonprofits.

These conveyances include what is known as reversionary interest, which stipulates that the land must permanently remain in use for a public purpose or ownership reverts back to the United States.

Typically, if a recipient wants to convert the land to a nonpublic purpose, they have to compensate the Federal Government. However, this is not the typical situation.

In 1989, Tucson came to an agreement with the Bureau of Land Management. In exchange for the title to Udall Park, the city gave the Bureau of Land Management a 297-acre parcel known as the Freeman Road property.

A letter from the BLM State Director at the time indicates that the agency supported elimination of Udall Park's reversionary interest in exchange for the Freeman Road property. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Congress never followed through on that promise.

This bill honors the Federal Government's long forgotten commitment, which is why we support it and encourage its swift adoption. The unique circumstances of Udall Park justify transferring the reversionary interest without further consideration or compensation.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 1547, the Udall Park Land Exchange Completion Act.

Udall Park is a cherished urban park in the heart of Tucson. The city has invested millions of dollars in park facilities, including construction of very large community recreation and senior centers, a large swimming pool, a walking track, and multiple athletic fields and picnic areas.

In 2011, the mayor and city council approved a master plan update that calls for plans to invest even more money into the park by way of additional athletic fields and expanded recreational programming. However, unresolved disputes over this land have directly impeded the city from taking advantage of opportunities to supplement park funding, approve certain community events, or look to other commercial ventures like local farmers markets on small portions of the park that would benefit the city in general.

The Udall Park Land Exchange Completion Act resolves this historic land exchange agreement between the city of Tucson and the Bureau of Land Management at Udall Park.

In 1989, the city of Tucson and BLM entered into an agreement to exchange 297 acres of land adjacent to Saguaro National Park for 173 acres of BLM-owned land in northeast Tucson, now known as Udall Park. This agreement specifically outlined that the terms and conditions of this land conveyance would include a legislative fix to remove any and all encumbrances on Udall Park. Unfortunately, this legislation never came to fruition due to staff changes in multiple agencies in the city, and who knows what else, but as a result, the city has been prevented from utilizing Udall Park to its fullest extent. Recently, the issue came to a head over disputes on a small commercial lease located in Udall Park.

Federal red tape should not stand in the way of communities like mine developing local parks. It is common sense. Udall Park is a beautiful place in our southern Arizona community to gather, but this longstanding land dispute has prevented the city of Tucson from improving the park and growing it to its full potential for too long.

When I am out and about in my district and people come to me with challenges and issues like this, the first question I usually ask is: Does this literally take an act of Congress to fix? Let me say that again. Does this literally take an act of Congress to fix? In this case, the answer is yes.

I appreciate, as we testified before the House Natural Resources Federal Land Subcommittee, the ranking member, Ms. HANABUSA, was saying, no kidding, in July: "If it takes an act of Congress to get this done . . . then that's what we've got to do."

I am with the ranking member at this point. It is time to finally take ac-

tion and get this thing finished. My legislation would formally and finally complete a long overdue agreement on land that has already been exchanged at fair market value. The act directs conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest in Udall Park to the city, as the parties intended when the land exchange was made. This bill will allow Tucson to finally take full ownership of the park.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman BISHOP, Chairman MCCLINTOCK, and the members of the Natural Resources Committee, really, on both sides of the aisle, for working with me to move this legislation forward. This has got strong bipartisan support. I look forward to seeing this issue through and ensuring the land transfer is completed.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1547.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1715

SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK REDESIGNATION ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 965) to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park", and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 965

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park Redesignation Act".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site shall be known and designated as the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park".

(b) *AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 88-543.*—Public Law 88-543 (78 Stat. 749) is amended—

(1) by striking "National Historic Site" each place it appears and inserting "National Historical Park";

(2) in section 2(a), by striking "historic site" and inserting "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park";

(3) in section 3, by—

(A) striking "national historical site" and inserting "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park"; and

(B) striking "part of the site" and inserting "part of the park"; and

(4) in section 4(b), by striking "traditional to the site" and inserting "traditional to the park".

(c) *REFERENCES.*—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site shall be considered to be a reference to the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Augustus Saint-Gaudens is one of the most prolific sculptors in our Nation's history. His work includes Boston's Robert Gould Shaw Memorial, Chicago's Standing Lincoln, and New York's William Tecumseh Sherman Memorial. Most notably, Saint-Gaudens designed a \$20 double eagle gold piece for the U.S. Mint, considered one of the greatest American coins ever issued.

The Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site is a 190-acre historic site in Sullivan County, New Hampshire. The site encompasses the summer home and studio of this renowned American artist, whose annual presence in Sullivan County helped spawn the Cornish Artist Colony in nearby Cornish, New Hampshire. This colony, which was comprised of painters, sculptors, and musicians, helped drive a period of American artistic resurgence called the American Renaissance in the years following the Civil War.

The main house and surrounding gardens were initially designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1962, which was converted to a National Historic Site in 1964, when the grounds were donated to the National Park Service. The current property contains 21 buildings, a number of Saint-Gaudens' sculptures, and miles of hiking trails.

This bill simply changes the designation of Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site to a National Historical Park, allowing the National Park Service to better relay the impact and legacy of this historic American artist.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 965, introduced by Representative KUSTER of New Hampshire, redesignates a site in her State as the Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park, a critical name change that recognizes the cultural and historical importance of that landscape.

Augustus Saint-Gaudens was a key-stone figure in the 19th century American Renaissance of art and architecture. Since 1977, the home, studio, gardens, and artwork of this American icon have been managed and preserved by the National Park Service as part of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site in Cornish, New Hampshire.

One of Saint-Gaudens' most well-known creations is the Shaw Memorial in Boston. This sculpture memorializes the bravery of Robert Gould Shaw, who led the first regiment of African-American soldiers recruited from the North during the Civil War. However, this is just one of the many public monuments credited to Saint-Gaudens, many of which are preserved and managed by the National Park Service at the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site.

In 2010, however, the National Park Service acquired the adjacent Blow-Me-Down Farm, an important meeting place for the Cornish Art Colony led by Saint-Gaudens. The acquisition of the farm allows the site to fulfill its vision as a national park for the arts. The expanded physical size and historical scope is better defined as a National Historic Park rather than a National Historical Site, which is usually reserved for a single building or other stand-alone structure.

Importantly, this redesignation will not change any laws or policies affecting the site and will only require changes in signage, maps, and handouts. Therefore, redesignating this area as Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park conforms to naming standards used by the National Park Service and further honors the legacy of Augustus Saint-Gaudens.

In addition to preserving Saint-Gaudens' legacy, the site also protects a variety of important ecosystems. The site is bordered by two streams that feed into the Connecticut River, and it contains a large forest and pond where visitors can observe wildlife.

Representative KUSTER introduced H.R. 965 with the support of the entire New Hampshire delegation, and I would like to thank her for her dedication to protecting the historic areas important to her State and our national story.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), the author of this fine piece of legislation.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MCEACHIN for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H.R. 965, the Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park Redesignation Act.

Named after the great American sculptor Augustus Saint-Gaudens, this historic site, located in Cornish, New Hampshire, has preserved his home and working studios since it was established in 1965.

Augustus Saint-Gaudens was born in Dublin, Ireland, and immigrated to America with his parents when he was just 6 months old. It was at a young age when Augustus developed a strong interest in sculpting, which set him on a path to Paris and Rome, where he studied art and architecture and worked on his very first commission.

In 1876, Saint-Gaudens was tapped for his first of several prominent Civil War-related commissions, which include the Standing Lincoln statue of our 16th President. At over 12 feet tall, this historic landmark stands prominently in Chicago's Lincoln Park. After working on the statue for close to a decade, the towering piece was unveiled in 1887 to a crowd of over 10,000 people, including President Lincoln's only living grandson.

His most famous work was commissioned soon after: the Robert Gould Shaw Memorial, a bronze bas-relief which took Saint-Gaudens 14 years to complete. Located in Boston Common, this iconic sculpture depicts Colonel Shaw and the 54th Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, which was the first African-American regiment organized by the Union in the Civil War.

As one of the foremost American sculptors of the 19th century, Saint-Gaudens left a lasting legacy on our country's artistic heritage, which continues to be cherished at our historic site in Cornish.

Since its authorization by Congress in 1964 and establishment a year later, the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site has blossomed into a popular tourist attraction and location for local artists and musicians to share their talents. However, the present name, which designates this location as a historic site, is no longer the most appropriate or useful to accurately portray the complexity of this site.

Whereas, National Historic Sites are typically designated for single buildings or sites that only encompass a few acres in size, the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site is 190 acres in size and includes multiple buildings, a vast collection of American art, and a small

trail network that allows visitors to explore the grounds.

My legislation would simply redesignate Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site to Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park, which would more accurately illustrate all that the park has to offer.

In partnership with the Saint-Gaudens Memorial, a private nonprofit that operated the site until it donated the land to the National Park Service in 1965, this historic site offers rotating contemporary and historical exhibitions, concerts, hands-on workshops, lectures, and many other educational opportunities for our visitors.

The array of recreational activities offered to visitors makes this park much more than a historic site. It is a living remembrance to the great American sculptor Augustus Saint-Gaudens and the artistic legacy that he has left behind. It is my hope that this proposed name change will help attract more interest in the park, boost annual visitation, and help drive our local economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass this legislation.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, having no one else to speak on this issue, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I encourage support for this piece of legislation and thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for putting this forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 965, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONFIRMING STATE LAND GRANTS FOR EDUCATION ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2582) to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2582

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Confirming State Land Grants for Education Act”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to valid existing rights, the State of Utah may select any lands in T6S and T7S, R1W, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, that are owned by the United States, under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and identified as available for disposal by land exchange in the Record of Decision for the Pony Express Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary for Utah County (January 1990), as amended by the Pony Express Plan Amendment (November 1997), in fulfillment of the land grants made in sections 6, 8, and 12 of the Act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107) as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Utah County Quantity Grants” and dated June 27, 2017, to further the purposes of the State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, without further land use planning action by the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) *APPLICATION.*—The criteria listed in Decision 3 of the Lands Program of the resource management plan described in subsection (a) shall not apply to any land selected under subsection (a).

(c) *EFFECT ON LIMITATION.*—Nothing in this Act affects the limitation established under section 2815(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2582, introduced by the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE), seeks to resolve an ongoing standoff between the State of Utah and the Bureau of Land Management over statehood-era land grants to promote responsible land management and enable the United States to fulfill its commitments to provide land for the support of Utah’s higher education system.

Since 1998, the Bureau of Land Management has cited an administrative technicality to favor land exchanges over State selections of land, which has held up the State of Utah’s selection of roughly 500 acres of Bureau of Land

Management land classified for disposal.

The land in question has been selected by the State for the benefit of Utah State University, and this bill makes it clear that State selections are equally acceptable as land exchanges and would confirm that the Bureau of Land Management may process the State’s current selection as well as future State selections in the immediate area.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2582 authorizes the Bureau of Land Management to process the State of Utah’s land claims without amending existing planning documents.

The Utah State Enabling Act of 1894 authorized the State of Utah to select certain lands to support schools and other public purposes. Approximately 2,000 acres of authorized grants are unfilled.

In 1998, the State started the application to acquire 440 acres of land in Utah County, Utah, to support Utah State University. BLM eventually rejected the application because the lands are identified for disposal by exchange, which only allows BLM to convey the land under certain conditions.

This bill allows the agency to process these specific claims without updating the underlying planning documents, something that would take a significant amount of time and money. BLM testified in support of this legislation but requested an amendment to clarify that the lands will be used for Utah State University and the addition of a legislative map.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE), the State of Utah, and the Republican Committee staff for working with us to address these concerns. Thanks to their consideration, we were able to amend this bill in markup to address these concerns.

There are many fights over public lands in this country, but this does not have to be one of them. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for supporting this legislation.

More than 120 years ago, the Utah Enabling Act, which enabled my State—now the greatest State in the country—to be admitted into the Union, was approved. This granted Utah the right to select acreage to support various public institutions, including public schools and universities. Now, 123 years later, much of the acre-

age made available for State selection remains outstanding.

The BLM’s Pony Express Resource Management Plan governs management practices for public lands in Utah’s Tooele, Utah, and Salt Lake Counties. It has identified thousands of acres within the plan’s area as available for disposal. The State can presently obtain these lands via land exchange. However, the resource management plan does not explicitly state that these lands can be obtained using the unfulfilled land credits granted by the Utah Enabling Act.

□ 1730

My bill, the Confirming State Land Grants for Education Act, would simply amend the Pony Express RMP to allow the State of Utah to use outstanding land grant credits to obtain lands within the limited area of RMP that already has been identified available for disposal.

This solution would satisfy both the State and Federal Government and help to keep the promises made to the State of Utah for more than 120 years. More importantly, it would ultimately raise funds for the benefit of Utah students by allowing Utah’s School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, SITLA, to manage these lands for the benefit of students. As Utah finds more ways to fund public schools and public education, this bill helps provide much-needed resources.

Notably, the passage of H.R. 2582 would not convey any land on its own. Existing conveyance processes would still apply.

Additionally, my bill does not dictate land use policies once the land is conveyed. As a former mayor, I respect the State and local officials and processes, and I certainly have no desire to supersede them. My bill is merely meant to facilitate the process that enables conveyance through the use of available selection credits. It was voted out of committee by unanimous consent, and I urge this body to show similar support today.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the gentlewoman from Utah that the only reason that she can suggest that Utah is the greatest State in the Nation is because Virginia is a Commonwealth.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, being from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2582, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNITY RECLAMATION PARTNERSHIPS ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2937) to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to authorize partnerships between States and non-governmental entities for the purpose of reclaiming and restoring land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining activities before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2937

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Community Reclamation Partnerships Act".

SEC. 2. REFERENCE.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.).

SEC. 3. STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING FOR CERTAIN REMEDIATION.

(a) MEMORANDA AUTHORIZED.—Section 405 (30 U.S.C. 1235) is amended by inserting after subsection (l) the following:

"(m) STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING FOR REMEDIATION OF MINE DRAINAGE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A State with a State program approved under subsection (d) may enter into a memorandum of understanding with relevant Federal or State agencies (or both) to remediate mine drainage on abandoned mine land and water impacted by abandoned mines within the State. The memorandum may be updated as necessary and resubmitted for approval under this subsection.

"(2) MEMORANDA REQUIREMENTS.—Such memorandum shall establish a strategy satisfactory to the State and Federal agencies that are parties to the memorandum, to address water pollution resulting from mine drainage at sites eligible for reclamation and mine drainage abatement expenditures under section 404, including specific procedures for—

"(A) ensuring that activities carried out to address mine drainage will result in improved water quality;

"(B) monitoring, sampling, and the reporting of collected information as necessary to achieve the condition required under subparagraph (A);

"(C) operation and maintenance of treatment systems as necessary to achieve the condition required under subparagraph (A); and

"(D) other purposes, as considered necessary by the State or Federal agencies, to achieve the condition required under subparagraph (A).

"(3) PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Before submitting a memorandum to the Secretary and the Administrator for approval, a State shall—

"(i) invite interested members of the public to comment on the memorandum; and

"(ii) hold at least one public meeting concerning the memorandum in a location or locations reasonably accessible to persons who may be affected by implementation of the memorandum.

"(B) NOTICE OF MEETING.—The State shall publish notice of each meeting not less than 15 days before the date of the meeting, in local newspapers of general circulation, on the Internet, and by any other means considered necessary or desirable by the Secretary and the Administrator.

"(4) SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL.—The State shall submit the memorandum to the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for approval. The Secretary and the Administrator shall approve or disapprove the memorandum within 120 days after the date of its submission if the Secretary and Administrator find that the memorandum will facilitate additional activities under the State Reclamation Plan under subsection (e) that improve water quality.

"(5) TREATMENT AS PART OF STATE PLAN.—A memorandum of a State that is approved by the Secretary and the Administrator under this subsection shall be considered part of the approved abandoned mine reclamation plan of the State.

"(n) COMMUNITY RECLAIMER PARTNERSHIPS.—

"(1) PROJECT APPROVAL.—Within 120 days after receiving such a submission, the Secretary shall approve a Community Reclaimer project to remediate abandoned mine lands if the Secretary finds that—

"(A) the proposed project will be conducted by a Community Reclaimer as defined in this subsection or approved subcontractors of the Community Reclaimer;

"(B) for any proposed project that remediates mine drainage, the proposed project is consistent with an approved State memorandum of understanding under subsection (m);

"(C) the proposed project will be conducted on a site or sites inventoried under section 403(c);

"(D) the proposed project meets all submission criteria under paragraph (2);

"(E) the relevant State has entered into an agreement with the Community Reclaimer under which the State shall assume all responsibility with respect to the project for any costs or damages resulting from any action or inaction on the part of the Community Reclaimer in carrying out the project, except for costs or damages resulting from gross negligence or intentional misconduct by the Community Reclaimer, on behalf of—

"(i) the Community Reclaimer; and

"(ii) the owner of the proposed project site, if such Community Reclaimer or owner, respectively, did not participate in any way in the creation of site conditions at the proposed project site or activities that caused any lands or waters to become eligible for reclamation or drainage abatement expenditures under section 404;

"(F) the State has the necessary legal authority to conduct the project and will obtain all legally required authorizations, permits, licenses, and other approvals to ensure completion of the project;

"(G) the State has sufficient financial resources to ensure completion of the project, including any necessary operation and maintenance costs (including costs associated with emergency actions covered by a contingency plan under paragraph (2)(K)); and

"(H) the proposed project is not in a category of projects that would require a permit under title V.

"(2) PROJECT SUBMISSION.—The State shall submit a request for approval to the Secretary that shall include—

"(A) a description of the proposed project, including any engineering plans that must bear the seal of a Professional Engineer;

"(B) a description of the proposed project site or sites, including, if relevant, the nature and extent of pollution resulting from mine drainage;

"(C) identification of the past and current owners and operators of the proposed project site;

"(D) the agreement or contract between the relevant State and the Community Reclaimer to carry out the project;

"(E) a determination that the project will facilitate the activities of the State reclamation plan under subsection (e);

"(F) sufficient information to determine whether the Community Reclaimer has the technical capability and expertise to successfully conduct the proposed project;

"(G) a cost estimate for the project and evidence that the Community Reclaimer has sufficient financial resources to ensure the successful completion of the proposed project (including any operation or maintenance costs);

"(H) a schedule for completion of the project;

"(I) an agreement between the Community Reclaimer and the current owner of the site governing access to the site;

"(J) sufficient information to ensure that the Community Reclaimer meets the definition under paragraph (3);

"(K) a contingency plan designed to be used in response to unplanned adverse events that includes emergency actions, response, and notifications; and

"(L) a requirement that the State provide notice to adjacent and downstream landowners and the public and hold a public meeting near the proposed project site before the project is initiated.

"(3) COMMUNITY RECLAIMER DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'Community Reclaimer' means any person who—

"(A) seeks to voluntarily assist a State with a reclamation project under this section;

"(B) did not participate in any way in the creation of site conditions at the proposed project site or activities that caused any lands or waters to become eligible for reclamation or drainage abatement expenditures under section 404;

"(C) is not a past or current owner or operator of any site with ongoing reclamation obligations; and

"(D) is not subject to outstanding violations listed pursuant to section 510(c)."

SEC. 4. CLARIFYING STATE LIABILITY FOR MINE DRAINAGE PROJECTS.

Section 413(d) (30 U.S.C. 1242(d)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting "unless such control or treatment will be conducted in accordance with a State memorandum of understanding approved under section 405(m) of this Act" after "Control Act" the second place it appears.

SEC. 5. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 405(f) (30 U.S.C. 1235(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking the "and" after the semicolon in paragraph (6);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

"(8) a list of projects proposed under subsection (n)."

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

Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank leadership for allowing H.R. 2937 to come to the floor. This legislation, introduced by my friend from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), will help address the challenge of abandoned coal mines present in many affected communities across the Nation.

The Community Reclamation Partnerships Act enables States to partner with Good Samaritan entities to reclaim abandoned mine sites and facilitate acid mine drainage cleanup. H.R. 2937 creates more opportunities to address this challenge.

Mr. Speaker, representing the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, just to note, my congressional district has more abandoned mine sites than any congressional district in the country, so I am very grateful for the leadership that Mr. LAHOOD has shown in bringing H.R. 2937 forward.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2937, introduced by Representative LAHOOD, is a step forward for communities looking to address abandoned coal mines in their backyards by partnering with Good Samaritans seeking to help.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, my home State, estimates that it will need over \$400 million to clean up all of its remaining abandoned coal mines and, while this bill is no substitute for a long-term reauthorization of the Abandoned Mine Land fund, every little bit helps.

Each project funded by a Good Samaritan through this bill will help one more community make their economy stronger and their environment healthier.

A hearing on a discussion draft of this bill brought a number of problematic issues to light, but I greatly appreciate the willingness of the bill's sponsor and the majority staff of the Natural Resources Committee to reach across the aisle and work with us on a bipartisan agreement that was able to achieve unanimous consent in the Natural Resources Committee.

I thank the sponsor for his diligent and collaborative work on this bill, and I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2937.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman THOMPSON and the ranking member for helping to bring this bill, in a bipartisan way, to the floor. I appreciate your support on H.R. 2937.

This legislation will help address the complex legal and funding-related challenges for abandoned mine lands across the Nation.

The Community Reclamation Partnerships Act amends the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to enable States to partner with nongovernmental entities to reclaim abandoned mine sites and facilitate acid mine drainage cleanup across the country.

Nongovernmental entities, like Trout Unlimited, have recognized the need for reclamation in coal communities and are willing to contribute their resources and expertise to address the problem. Unfortunately, liability and regulatory concerns have discouraged them from participating and partnering with the States on reclamation projects. This legislation enables nongovernmental entities' participation in State reclamation programs by minimizing undeserved liability and codifying proven practices established by the State reclamation agencies.

This legislation also addresses a frequent problem that States experience in addressing water pollution at abandoned mine land sites. States must choose between risking noncompliance under the Clean Water Act or foregoing acid mine drainage abatement projects altogether. Some States, like Pennsylvania, have successfully addressed this problem by establishing their own guidelines for the treatment of water pollution at abandoned mine land sites. These State-specific strategies have resulted in successful water treatment projects and a significant reduction in acid mine drainage in several States. We want to replicate that across the country with this legislation.

Currently, State reclamation activities have been funded solely by fees levied on the coal industry over the past four decades. These fees have resulted in reclamation of approximately \$4 billion of abandoned mine land liabilities. However, according to the Department of the Interior, the estimated remediation costs exceeds \$10 billion across the country.

The outstanding abandoned mine land liabilities in Illinois, my home State, is \$156 million; and in my district, the 18th Congressional District,

it is \$17 million. The cost of reclaiming these sites will continue to strain State resources in the coming decades, and the conditions of these sites will only worsen over time.

In short, this bill empowers State and local community leaders who want to assist in abandoned mine cleanup efforts so that future development can occur in these areas. No group should be punished for wanting to help out their local community in a responsible way.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2937 brings more resources to bear on this considerable challenge, and I urge adoption of this bipartisan measure.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask my colleagues to support this piece of legislation. I am very appreciative to the author of this bill for his leadership. Having a congressional district that has significant presence of abandoned mine lands, I know that the authorities and the protections he is seeking here will be good for all, for the communities, for the environment, and for the economy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2937.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS ACT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 289) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for recreation services on lands managed by Federal agencies, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 289

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS; DEFINITIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Guides and Outfitters Act” or the “GO Act”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents; definitions.
- Sec. 2. Special recreation permit and fee.
- Sec. 3. Permit across multiple jurisdictions.
- Sec. 4. Guidelines and permit fee calculation.
- Sec. 5. Use of permit fees for permit administration.

Sec. 6. Adjustment to permit use reviews.
 Sec. 7. Authorization of temporary permits for new uses for the Forest Service and BLM.

Sec. 8. Indemnification requirements.
 Sec. 9. Streamlining of permitting process.
 Sec. 10. Cost recovery reform.
 Sec. 11. Extension of Forest Service recreation priority use permits.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

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

(A) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to a Federal land management agency (other than the Forest Service); and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the Forest Service.

(2) SECRETARIES.—The term “Secretaries” means the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture acting jointly.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RECREATION PERMIT AND FEE.

Subsection (h) of section 803 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802) is amended to read as follows:

“(h) SPECIAL RECREATION PERMIT AND FEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may—

“(A) issue a special recreation permit for Federal recreational lands and waters; and

“(B) charge a special recreation permit fee in connection with the issuance of the permit.

“(2) SPECIAL RECREATION PERMITS.—The Secretary may issue special recreation permits in the following circumstances:

“(A) For specialized individual and group use of Federal facilities and Federal recreational lands and waters, such as, but not limited to, use of special areas or areas where use is allocated, motorized recreational vehicle use, and group activities or events.

“(B) To recreation service providers who conduct outfitting, guiding, and other recreation services on Federal recreational lands and waters managed by the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(C) To recreation service providers who conduct recreation or competitive events, which may involve incidental sales on Federal recreational lands and waters managed by the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(3) REDUCTION IN FEDERAL COSTS AND DUPLICATION OF ANALYSIS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The issuance of a new special recreation permit for activities under paragraph (2) shall be categorically excluded from further analysis and documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), if the proposed use is the same as or similar to a previously authorized use and the Secretary determines that such issuance does not have significant environmental effects based upon application of the extraordinary circumstances procedures established by the Secretary under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(B) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘similar’ means—

“(i) substantially similar in type, nature, and scope; and

“(ii) will not result in significant new impacts.

“(4) RELATION TO FEES FOR USE OF HIGHWAYS OR ROADS.—An entity that pays a special recreation permit fee shall not be subject to a road cost-sharing fee or a fee for the use of highways or roads that are open to private, noncommercial use within the

boundaries of any Federal recreational lands or waters, as authorized under section 6 of Public Law 88-657 (16 U.S.C. 537).”.

SEC. 3. PERMIT ACROSS MULTIPLE JURISDICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an activity requiring permits pursuant to subsection (h) of section 803 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802) for use of lands managed by both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management—

(1) the Secretaries may issue a joint permit based upon a single application to both agencies when issuance of a joint permit based upon a single application will lower processing and other administration costs for the permittee, provided that the permit applicant shall have the option to apply for separate permits rather than a joint permit; and

(2) the permit application required under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) the application required by the lead agency; and

(B) submitted to the lead agency.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF THE LEAD AGENCY.—The lead agency for a permit under subsection (a) shall—

(1) coordinate with the associated agencies, consistent with the authority of the Secretaries under section 330 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (43 U.S.C. 1703), to develop and issue the single, joint permit that covers the entirety of the trip;

(2) in processing the joint permit application, incorporate the findings, interests, and needs of the associated agencies, provided that such coordination shall not be subject to cost recovery; and

(3) complete the permitting process within a reasonable time after receiving the permit application.

(c) EFFECT ON REGULATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall alter, expand, or limit the applicability of any Federal law (including regulations) to lands administered by the relevant Federal agencies.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSOCIATED AGENCY.—The term “associated agency” means an agency that manages the land on which the trip of the special recreation permit applicant will enter after leaving the land managed by the lead agency.

(2) LEAD AGENCY.—The term “lead agency” means the agency that manages the land on which the trip of the special recreation permit applicant will begin.

SEC. 4. GUIDELINES AND PERMIT FEE CALCULATION.

(a) GUIDELINES AND EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN REVENUES.—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish guidelines in the Federal Register for establishing recreation permit fees; and

(2) provide appropriate deductions from gross revenues used as the basis for the fees established under paragraph (1) for—

(A) revenue from goods, services, and activities provided by a recreation service provider outside Federal recreational lands and waters, such as costs for transportation, lodging, and other services before or after a trip; and

(B) fees to be paid by permit holder under applicable law to provide services on other Federal lands, if separate permits are issued to that permit holder for a single event or trip.

(b) FEE CONDITIONS.—The fee charged by the Secretary for a permit issued under section 803(h) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(h)) shall

not exceed 3 percent of the recreational service provider’s annual gross revenue for activities authorized by the permit on Federal lands, plus applicable revenue additions, minus applicable revenue exclusions or a similar flat per person fee.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF FEES.—A holder of a special recreation permit may inform its customers of the various fees charged by the Secretary under section 803(h) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(h)).

SEC. 5. USE OF PERMIT FEES FOR PERMIT ADMINISTRATION.

(a) DEPOSITS.—Subject to subsection (b), revenues from special recreation permits issued to recreation service providers under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 803(h)(2) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(h)(2)) shall be held in special accounts established for each specific unit or area for which such revenues are collected, and shall remain available for expenditure, without further appropriation, until expended.

(b) USE OF PERMIT FEES.—Revenues from special recreation permits issued to recreation service providers under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 803(h)(2) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(h)(2)) shall be used only—

(1) to partially offset the Secretary’s direct cost of administering the permits;

(2) to improve and streamline the permitting process; and

(3) for related recreation infrastructure and other purposes specifically to support recreation activities at the specific site for which use is authorized under the permit, after obtaining input from any related permittees; provided, however, that the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 1 et seq.) shall not apply to any advisory committee or other group established to carry out this paragraph.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FEES.—The Secretary may not use any permit fees for biological monitoring on Federal recreational lands and waters under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) for listed or candidate species.

SEC. 6. ADJUSTMENT TO PERMIT USE REVIEWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that the Secretary utilizes permit use reviews, in reviewing and adjusting allocations of use for permits for special uses of Federal recreational lands and waters managed by the Forest Service, and in renewing such permits, the Secretary of Agriculture shall allocate to a permit holder a level of use that is no less than the highest amount of actual annual use over the reviewed period plus 25 percent, capped at the amount of use allocated when the permit was issued unless additional capacity is available. The Secretary may assign any use remaining after adjusting allocations on a temporary basis to qualified permit holders.

(b) WAIVER.—Use reviews under subsection (a) may be waived for periods in which circumstances that prevented use of assigned capacity, such as weather, fire, natural disasters, wildlife displacement, business interruptions, insufficient availability of hunting and fishing licenses, or when allocations on permits include significant shoulder seasons. The authorizing office may approve non-use without reducing the number of service days assigned to the permit in such circumstances at the request of the permit holder. Approved non-use may be temporarily assigned to other qualified permit holders when conditions warrant.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF TEMPORARY PERMITS FOR NEW USES FOR THE FOREST SERVICE AND BLM.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall establish and implement a program to authorize temporary permits for new recreational uses of Federal recreational lands and waters managed by the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, respectively, and to provide for the conversions of such temporary permits to long-term permits after 2 years of satisfactory operation. The issuance and conversion of such permits shall be subject to subsection (h)(3) of section 803 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802).

SEC. 8. INDEMNIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) INDEMNIFICATION.—A permit holder that is prohibited by the State from providing indemnification to the Federal Government shall be considered to be in compliance with indemnification requirements of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture if the permit holder carries the required minimum amount of liability insurance coverage or is self-insured for the same minimum amount.

(b) EXCULPATORY AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall not implement, administer or enforce any regulation or policy prohibiting the use of exculpatory agreements between recreation service providers and their customers for services provided under a special recreation permit.

SEC. 9. STREAMLINING OF PERMITTING PROCESS.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise part 251, subpart B, of title 36 Code of Federal Regulations, and the Secretary of the Interior shall revise subpart 2932, of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, to streamline the processes for the issuance and renewal of outfitter and guide special use permits. Such amended regulations shall—

(1) shorten application processing times and minimize application and administration costs; and

(2) provide for the use of programmatic environmental assessments and categorical exclusions for environmental reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for the issuance or renewal of outfitter and guide and similar recreation special use permits when the Secretary determines that such compliance is required, to the maximum extent allowable under applicable law, including, but not limited to, use of a categorical exclusion as provided under section 803(h)(3) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6802(h)(3)).

(b) ONLINE APPLICATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, where feasible and efficient, the Secretary shall make special recreation permit applications available to be filled out and submitted online.

SEC. 10. COST RECOVERY REFORM.

(a) REGULATORY PROCESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise section 251.58 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Secretary of the Interior shall revise section 2932.31(e) and (f) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, to reduce costs and minimize the burden of cost recovery on small businesses and adverse impacts of cost recovery on jobs in the outfitting and guiding industry and on rural economies provided, however, that nothing in the revised regulations shall further limit

the Secretary's authority to issue or renew recreation special use permits.

(b) DE MINIMIS EXEMPTION.—

(1) COST RECOVERY LIMITATION.—Any regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to establish fees to recover processing costs for recreation special use applications and monitoring costs for recreation special use authorizations shall include an exemption providing that at least the first 50 hours of work necessary in any one year to process and/or monitor such an application shall not be subject to cost recovery. The application of a 50-hour credit per permit shall also apply to any monitoring fees on a per annum basis during the term of each permit.

(2) APPLICATION OF EXEMPTION.—An exemption under paragraph (1) shall apply to the processing of each recreation special use permit application and monitoring of each recreation special use authorization for which cost recovery is required, including any application or authorization requiring more than 50 hours (or such other greater number of hours specified for exemption) to process or monitor. In the event that the amount of work required to process such an application or monitor such an authorization exceeds the specified exemption, the amount of work for which cost recovery is required shall be reduced by the amount of the exemption.

(3) MULTIPLE APPLICATIONS.—In situations involving multiple recreation special use applications for similar services in the same unit or area that require more than 50 hours (or such other greater number of hours specified for exemption) in the aggregate to process, the Secretary shall, regardless of whether the applications are solicited or unsolicited and whether there is competitive interest—

(A) determine the share of the aggregate amount to be allocated to each application, on an equal or prorated basis, as appropriate; and

(B) for each application, apply a separate exemption of up to 50 hours (or such other greater number of hours specified for exemption) to the share allocated to such application.

(4) COST REDUCTION.—The agency processing a recreation special use application shall utilize existing studies and analysis to the greatest extent practicable in order to reduce the amount of work and cost necessary to process the application.

(5) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may not recover as processing costs for recreation special use applications and monitoring costs for recreation special use authorizations any costs for consultations conducted under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) or for biological monitoring on Federal recreational lands and waters under such Act for listed, proposed, or candidate species.

(6) WAIVER OF COST RECOVERY.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may waive the recovery of costs for processing recreation special use permit applications and renewals, on a categorical or case-by-case basis as appropriate, if the Secretary determines that—

(A) such costs would impose a significant economic burden on any small business or category of small businesses;

(B) such cost recovery could threaten the ability of an applicant or permittee to provide, in a particular area, a particular outdoor recreational activity that is consistent with the public interest and with applicable resource management plans; or

(C) prevailing economic conditions are unfavorable, such as during economic recessions, or when drought, fire, or other natural disasters have depressed economic activity in the area of operation.

SEC. 11. EXTENSION OF FOREST SERVICE RECREATION PRIORITY USE PERMITS.

Where the holder of a special use permit for outfitting and guiding that authorizes priority use has submitted a request for renewal of such permit in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to grant the holder one or more extensions of the existing permit for additional items not to exceed 5 years in the aggregate, as necessary to allow the Secretary to complete the renewal process and to avoid the interruption of services under such permit. Before granting an extension under this section, the Secretary shall take all reasonable and appropriate steps to complete the renewal process before the expiration of the special use permit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to present my bill today, H.R. 289, the Guides and Outfitters Act of 2017, also known as the GO Act. I would like to thank the Natural Resources Committee for its overwhelming support of this bill, which happened on June 27 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I expect that nearly every Member of this body has fond memories of being on our public lands, whether it be fishing as a kid or with your kids, hunting with friends, hiking, on a horse, or camping with the family. Outdoor activities generate not just memorable moments and a love and respect for the great outdoors but also important, considerable economic activity, which is especially important for our rural areas of northern California, where my district is, and all across our Nation.

The Outdoor Recreation Association estimates that recreational activity in the United States contributes nearly \$900 billion to our GDP annually, supporting about 7.6 million jobs.

Unfortunately, public access to public lands is too often hindered by costly and complex permit requirements that vary from agency to agency, sometimes even crossing from agency to agency what the requirements are to seek a permit.

The GO Act enhances and protects access to our public lands by streamlining Federal agencies' special recreation permit process, moving the permit process online, and providing joint permits for activities across a combination of National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service land.

In rural America, where rural economies often depend on annual outdoor events—some events, this might be their only event of the year, a big part of their local economy. We have that in northern California in some areas. The GO Act provides greater assurance that such activities on public lands will continue into the future.

This bill also authorizes agencies to use categorical exclusions to grant annual events a streamlined review, ensuring such events don't need expensive and duplicative studies year after year. Really, there is no need to reinvent the wheel each year for an existing permitted activity.

Getting more American families and groups and clubs outdoors can only be accomplished by building a permit process that doesn't deter outdoor enthusiasts from enjoying public lands but, indeed, makes them feel welcome and encouraged to enjoy these lands that belong to all of us.

The idea behind this bipartisan bill is simple: getting more Americans outside, on their lands, for less cost, less money, less headache of permits, less red tape; that is really what this is about. There is no need for some of the process that people have to go through to get a permit when it is especially an already-known activity with very minimal or no impact.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, let's make recreating in our public lands an open and simple experience. Once again, I urge swift passage of this bill, H.R. 289, the Guides and Outfitters Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 27, 2017, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported as amended H.R. 289, the Guides and Outfitters Act, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask that you allow the Committee on Agriculture to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Agriculture represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed

by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding.

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

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP.

Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review H.R. 289, the Guides and Outfitters Act. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, while the Agriculture Committee received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 289 from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Agriculture reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

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

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

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an earnest effort to improve the availability of recreation permits on Federal lands. Public lands support the thriving outdoor recreation economy, and many small businesses partner with the Federal Government to provide a range of visitor services.

The stated purpose of the bill is to reduce permitting time and administrative hurdles faced by permit applications. We are open to the idea of approving the permit process to ensure timely and transparent access to public lands for recreation activities and other special events. However, we are concerned that some of the methods used by the bill could lead to more problems than they solve.

For example, section 2 creates a categorical exclusion for permits related to activities that have been previously considered through the National Environmental Policy Act process. Categorical exclusions are reserved for types of activities that are determined to have limited environmental impacts. They are most commonly developed through a rulemaking process which provides for public comment and provides the agency with the flexibility to determine when they are appropriate.

The Forest Service already stresses the use of existing categorical exclusions for special recreation permits and does what it can with available resources to speed up permit processing times. It is unclear why this section is necessary or appropriate.

If current categorical exclusions are insufficient, Congress should encourage a rulemaking process to address the inadequacies. While we have some concerns, this bill is a good first step, and we would hope our concerns can be addressed in the Senate.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the input from my colleague from Virginia, and we certainly want to have this be a process that works well. By delineating some of the categorical exclusions, we just seek to make it more usable, more user-friendly in that sense. So I thank you for the support on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK), my neighbor.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 289, the Guides and Outfitters—or GO—Act, offered by my Natural Resources Committee colleague and my California neighbor, Congressman DOUG LAMALFA.

For many years, we have seen increasingly severe restrictions on the public's use of the public's land. One of the most galling aspects of this exclusionary policy is the use of exorbitant fees to prevent many group events and small business services that have often been the economic mainstay of small mountain communities like those in my district in the Sierra Nevada.

This abusive practice was made possible by the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement—or FLREA—Act in 2004. It unleashed a flood of complex rules, regulations, and court decisions that have gradually increased the cost of permit administration for the Forest Service and for the Bureau of Land Management, which these agencies, in turn, have used as an excuse to raise fees on the public to cost-prohibitive levels.

For example, the California Endurance Riders Association have been using the El Dorado National Forest for many years. In 2009, when they sought a simple 5-year, 10-event permit to continue doing exactly what they had been doing without incident for decades, the Forest Service demanded \$11,000 in fees.

Well, they paid those fees. But the El Dorado National Forest management, nonetheless, pulled the approved permit and halted the process on utterly specious grounds. It then demanded an additional \$17,000 fee, causing the Endurance Riders Association to cancel

what had been a long-term civic tradition that had been a boon to the local economy.

In 2010, this outrage was repeated after the group spent \$5,800 for the Fool's Gold endurance run that had been an ongoing event for more than 40 years.

Hardest hit are guides and outfitters, the folks who make it possible for visitors to fully enjoy our national lands. They are the small businesses that provide specialized knowledge, skills, and equipment that new visitors just don't possess. Both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have used FLREA to require these small businesses to pay for permit processing and environmental analyses that require more than 50 hours.

These fees, along with complex planning requirements, have virtually shut down so many legitimate and traditional public events and uses. Efforts to encourage the agencies to modify and streamline the process have failed, even when those efforts were supported by agency policy.

The GO Act is a long-overdue relief of these practices. It amends FLREA to streamline the recreation permitting process and allow for increased public access to recreational opportunities on the Federal lands. The GO Act was crafted in consultation with a wide variety of recreation groups throughout the country, and it aims to reduce the cost and complexity of these permits.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and personally thank Congressman LAMALFA for listening to his constituents, the people of the Sierra Nevada, and to the thousands of recreation service providers across the country who have been begging Congress to make these changes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers to speak to this issue, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the input by my colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, as well, who has lived this in some of those same Sierra counties we are talking about, and other areas in the West. So we, again, are very encouraged by the bipartisan support, the strong support coming out of committee, and that H.R. 289, the Guides and Outfitters Act, is something that will open the gateway to more enjoyment of our public lands without the constraints, such as exorbitant, extraneous fees and permits that really don't yield any additional care for the environment or care for the area with people that are already good stewards.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 289, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. CHENEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-338) on the resolution (H. Res. 548) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1547, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 965, by the yeas and nays.

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

UDALL PARK LAND EXCHANGE COMPLETION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1547) to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest to the City, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

YEAS—401

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

McNerney	Renacci	Speier
McSally	Rice (NY)	Stefanik
Meadows	Rice (SC)	Stewart
Meehan	Roby	Stivers
Meeks	Roe (TN)	Suozi
Messer	Rogers (AL)	Swalwell (CA)
Mitchell	Rogers (KY)	Takano
Moolenaar	Rokita	Taylor
Mooney (WV)	Rooney, Francis	Tenney
Moore	Rooney, Thomas	Thompson (CA)
Moulton	J.	Thompson (MS)
Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Murphy (FL)	Roskam	Thornberry
Murphy (PA)	Ross	Tiberi
Nadler	Rothfus	Tipton
Napolitano	Rouzer	Tonko
Neal	Roybal-Allard	Torres
Newhouse	Royce (CA)	Trott
Noem	Ruiz	Turner
Nolan	Ruppersberger	Upton
Norcross	Rush	Valadao
Norman	Russell	Veasey
Nunes	Rutherford	Vela
O'Halleran	Sánchez	Velázquez
O'Rourke	Sanford	Visclosky
Olson	Sarbanes	Wagner
Palazzo	Scalise	Walberg
Pallone	Schakowsky	Walden
Palmer	Schiff	Walker
Panetta	Schneider	Walorski
Pascarella	Schrader	Walters, Mimi
Paulsen	Schweikert	Walz
Payne	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Pelosi	Scott, Austin	Schultz
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Waters, Maxine
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Watson Coleman
Peters	Serrano	Weber (TX)
Peterson	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Pittenger	Shea-Porter	Wenstrup
Pocan	Sherman	Westerman
Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Williams
Poliquin	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Polis	Sinema	Wittman
Posey	Slaughter	Womack
Price (NC)	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Quigley	Smith (NE)	Yoder
Raskin	Smith (NJ)	Yoho
Ratcliffe	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Reed	Smith (WA)	Young (IA)
Reichert	Smucker	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—32

Bridenstine	Jenkins (KS)	Rosen
Buchanan	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Kaptur	Simpson
Clarke (NY)	Katko	Sires
Collins (GA)	Kihuen	Soto
Connolly	Langevin	Titus
Crist	Long	Tsongas
Crowley	Meng	Vargas
DeFazio	Pearce	Wilson (FL)
DesJarlais	Richmond	Yarmuth
Gutiérrez	Rohrabacher	

□ 1851

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 544.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE ATTACK IN LAS VEGAS

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the attack in Las Vegas.

SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK REDESIGNATION ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 965) to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park", and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

YEAS—401

Abraham	Clay	Flores
Adams	Cleaver	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Clyburn	Foster
Agullar	Coffman	Fox
Allen	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Amash	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Arrington	Collins (NY)	Gabbard
Babin	Comer	Gaetz
Bacon	Comstock	Gallagher
Banks (IN)	Conaway	Galleo
Barletta	Conyers	Garamendi
Barr	Cook	Garrett
Barragán	Cooper	Gianforte
Barton	Correa	Gibbs
Bass	Costa	Gohmert
Beatty	Costello (PA)	Gomez
Bera	Courtney	Gonzalez (TX)
Bergman	Cramer	Goodlatte
Beyer	Crawford	Gosar
Biggs	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Bilirakis	Culberson	Gowdy
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Granger
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Davidson	Graves (LA)
Black	Davis (CA)	Graves (MO)
Blackburn	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Blum	Davis, Rodney	Green, Gene
Blunt Rochester	DeGette	Griffith
Bonamici	Delaney	Grijalva
Bost	DeLauro	Grothman
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeBene	Guthrie
Brady (PA)	Demings	Hanabusa
Brady (TX)	Denham	Handel
Brat	Dent	Harper
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Harris
Brooks (IN)	DeSaulnier	Hartzler
Brown (MD)	Deutch	Hastings
Brownley (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Heck
Buck	Dingell	Hensarling
Bucshon	Doggett	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Burgess	Doyle, Michael F.	Higgins (LA)
Bustos	Duffy	Higgins (NY)
Byrne	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Himes
Capuano	Dunn	Holding
Carbajal	Ellison	Hollingsworth
Cárdenas	Emmer	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Engel	Hudson
Carter (GA)	Eshoo	Huffman
Carter (TX)	Españillat	Huizenga
Cartwright	Estes (KS)	Hultgren
Castor (FL)	Esty (CT)	Hunter
Castro (TX)	Evans	Hurd
Chabot	Farenthold	Issa
Cheney	Faso	Jackson Lee
Chu, Judy	Ferguson	Jayapal
Cicilline	Fitzpatrick	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
		Johnson (GA)

Johnson (LA)	Meeks	Schiff
Johnson (OH)	Messer	Schneider
Johnson, Sam	Mitchell	Schrader
Jones	Moolenaar	Schweikert
Jordan	Mooney (WV)	Scott (VA)
Joyce (OH)	Moore	Scott, Austin
Keating	Moulton	Scott, David
Kelly (IL)	Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Kelly (MS)	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Kelly (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Sessions
Kennedy	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Khanna	Napolitano	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Neal	Sherman
Kilmer	Newhouse	Shimkus
Kind	Noem	Shuster
King (IA)	Nolan	Sinema
King (NY)	Norcross	Slaughter
Kinziger	Norman	Smith (MO)
Knight	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Krishnamoorthi	O'Halleran	Smith (NJ)
Kuster (NH)	O'Rourke	Smith (TX)
Kustoff (TN)	Olson	Smith (WA)
Labrador	Palazzo	Smucker
LaHood	Pallone	Speier
LaMalfa	Palmer	Stefanik
Lamborn	Panetta	Stewart
Lance	Pascarell	Stivers
Langevin	Paulsen	Suozi
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Takano
Latta	Perlmutter	Taylor
Lawrence	Perry	Tenney
Lawson (FL)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Pingree	Thompson (PA)
Lewis (GA)	Pittenger	Thornberry
Lewis (MN)	Pocan	Tiberi
Lieu, Ted	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Lipinski	Poliquin	Tonko
LoBiondo	Polis	Torres
Loeback	Posey	Trott
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Turner
Loudermilk	Quigley	Upton
Love	Raskin	Valadao
Lowenthal	Ratcliffe	Vargas
Lowey	Reed	Veasey
Lucas	Reichert	Vela
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Velázquez
Lujan Grisham, M.	Rice (NY)	Visclosky
Luján, Ben Ray	Rice (SC)	Wagner
Lynch	Richmond	Walberg
MacArthur	Roby	Walden
Maloney	Roe (TN)	Walker
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Walters, Mimi
Marino	Rokita	Walz
Marshall	Rooney, Francis	Wasserman
Massie	Rooney, Thomas	Schultz
Mast	J.	Waters, Maxine
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson Coleman
McCarthy	Roskam	Weber (TX)
McCaul	Ross	Webster (FL)
McClintock	Rothfus	Welch
McCollum	Rouzer	Wenstrup
McEachin	Roybal-Allard	Westerman
McGovern	Royce (CA)	Williams
McHenry	Ruiz	Wilson (SC)
McKinley	Rush	Wittman
McMorris	Russell	Womack
Rodgers	Rutherford	Woodall
McNerney	Sánchez	Yoder
McSally	Sanford	Yoho
Meehan	Sarbanes	Young (AK)
	Scalise	Young (IA)
	Schakowsky	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—32

Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Rosen
Bridenstine	Jenkins (KS)	Ruppersberger
Buchanan	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Kaptur	Simpson
Clarke (NY)	Katko	Sires
Connolly	Kihuen	Soto
Crist	Long	Titus
Crowley	Meadows	Tsongas
DeFazio	Meng	Wilson (FL)
DesJarlais	Pearce	Yarmuth
Fudge	Rohrabacher	

□ 1900

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 2nd, on rollcall votes 544 and 545, I was not present because I was tending to my community in Las Vegas, in the aftermath of the deadliest mass shooting in United States history. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 544 and "yea" on rollcall vote 545.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNALAM

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

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, today I rise to recognize Unalam, a family-run lumber manufacturing business in Otsego County, New York, which will celebrate its 125th anniversary this year on October 4.

Unalam is owned by the Van Cott family, which has established a multigenerational reputation of supporting our upstate farmers and small businesses with quality lumber products and innovations.

Unalam's journey began in 1892, when J.W. Van Cott began selling lumber in Unadilla, New York. Since then, each generation has left its mark on the family's business. Unalam has become a renowned firm for its expert production of glulam, or laminated timber barn rafters.

Today, Unalam is headed by J.W. Van Cott's great-great-grandson, Craig Van Cott, and his children, Zoe Vandermeulen and Leif Van Cott.

I thank and congratulate the Van Cott family as well as the past and present employees of Unalam as they celebrate this incredible milestone.

ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, last night we witnessed another unspeakable act of gun violence that took too many innocent lives.

Today my heart breaks once again for those victims of the Las Vegas shooting and for the families whose lives have been irrevocably changed by this terrible tragedy. Each of them is in my prayers today.

Mr. Speaker, prayers alone are not enough. We cannot, in good conscience, sit idly by as innocent people continue to die.

Mr. Speaker, there are reasonable steps that we can take to make our communities safer, things like limiting high-capacity magazines and banning

assault weapons—weapons, by the way, that are weapons of war and have no business being on the streets in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, we have a solemn responsibility as Members of Congress to ensure that our communities are safe. Let us honor the victims of the Las Vegas shooting by doing something to prevent such tragedies from happening in the future.

MASSACRE IN LAS VEGAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the band played the latest country western song, gunfire erupted from the 32nd floor window across the street.

Twenty minutes later, when the shots stopped and the smoke cleared, 59 people were murdered and over 520 were wounded.

The SWAT team quickly found the hiding place of the evil villain, and as they approached, the outlaw shot himself. Thus, he avoided a date with the hangman. Justice occurred.

The casualties would have been much worse but for quick action by members of the crowd. People, including former military and off-duty police officers, helped hide and cover others while endangering their own lives.

The first responders, police, doctors, emergency medical technicians quickly tended to the wounded. These unnamed quick responders, both civilian and law enforcement, and medical, without regard to their own life, saved others.

The band had stopped playing music, but the cries of the wounded and the tears of the mourning continue, Mr. Speaker. We must have prayers for Las Vegas, and God bless them one and all.

And that is just the way it is.

OBJECTING TO POLICY OF COLLECTING SOCIAL MEDIA ACCOUNT INFORMATION OF NATURALIZED CITIZENS

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers also go to the victims of the Las Vegas shooting.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address another subject that, unfortunately, came up last week.

Mr. Speaker, as one of ten naturalized United States citizens in Congress, I rise today to express strong objections to the Department of Homeland Security's new policy to collect the social media account information of naturalized citizens.

In accordance with this new rule, the DHS will include social media alongside basic information, such as biometrics, Social Security numbers, and contact information in naturalization records. This is unprecedented.

There is no evidence that tracking social media accounts of naturalized citizens will in any way make the United States more secure.

Rather than target naturalized citizens, the President should work with Congress to reform our immigration system and ensure that all Americans, natural born or naturalized, are able to work, study, and pursue the American Dream.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF SHAW CARTER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Shaw Carter, who passed away on August 9, 2017, at the age of 24.

Shaw was a rare individual who touched the hearts of many people in his life. He was a recent graduate of Young Harris College in north Georgia, and was a graduate assistant at the University of Georgia, where he was working on his master's degree in public administration.

Born with a heart defect, he underwent three open heart surgeries before his third birthday and had a heart transplant before his 21st birthday.

Through the obstacles with his illnesses, he preserved and selflessly volunteered his time to uplift other kids who had other severe medical issues. For example, he volunteered over 200 hours for Mended Hearts at Northeast Georgia Medical Center.

When he was awarded the Young Harris Spirit Award, he was described as the "indefatigable Shaw Carter." There is no better way to describe him. He will truly be missed.

WE MUST CONFRONT DOMESTIC TERRORISM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, with the humblest of hearts, I cannot imagine the fear and the horror of those who heard those violent sounds late last night in Las Vegas, nor the horror of family members who had to wonder where their loved ones were or are now calling numbers to discern what happened.

One of my closest relatives was in Las Vegas, and I can only imagine what they went through, as I had the great fear myself, not knowing where and what.

I think the American people expect us to mourn and to honor them and to have a moment of silence, but I believe that the American people demand, and should, and those families who are now mourning, that we should be sensible.

Mr. Speaker, we should not ever put on the floor of the House the deregulation of silencers. Can you imagine how

many more would have died if the perpetrator who had ten guns had a silencer?

We have to confront domestic terrorism. We can't run away from it. We have to confront automatic weapons no matter what, where, and how.

My prayers are with the families, but I think they demand, Mr. Speaker, action from this Congress.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, October is National Disability Employment Awareness Month, and it is a time when we celebrate the numerous contributions and skills of American workers with disabilities.

Many Americans with disabilities struggle to find employment opportunities despite the wealth of skills they have to offer. In 2016, only 27.7 percent of working-age Americans with disabilities were employed.

More employers should recognize the fresh perspectives and skills that these men and women can add to an organization.

Workers with developmental disabilities tend to be reliable, dedicated, and loyal employees with a positive attitude and a strong work ethic.

Right here on Capitol Hill, my office participates in the Congressional Internship Program for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities. This program is designed to give students with varying intellectual disabilities an opportunity to gain congressional work experience, and it has been rewarding for everyone involved.

Mr. Speaker, hiring an individual who has a disability can have a profound impact on their life. They experience the independence, economic self-sufficiency, pride, and community that come with a job.

These individuals promote workforce diversity and can truly enhance the workplace for the better.

WITH GUN RIGHTS COMES RESPONSIBILITIES

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the victims and the families impacted by the horrific shooting in Las Vegas. Gun violence is a public health crisis that has claimed thousands of innocent lives, and we must do everything we can to address it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of being outraged, of sending

thoughts and prayers, of seeing men, women, and children die because the gun lobby puts profit over people. That is not what our Founders intended by the right to bear arms.

With rights come responsibilities: the responsibility to stop gun sales loopholes, to enact protections that make sure our kids and those with severe mental illnesses don't have access to guns, to address funding for mental health, and to oppose any efforts to make it easier to purchase silencers.

Mr. Speaker, 87 percent of gunowners and 74 percent of NRA members support those commonsense solutions, like criminal background checks.

I have a plea for gunowners across this country: urge the NRA to represent your views; show them that you mean business by speaking out or even terminating your NRA membership; show them that you care about your fellow Americans. Act now. Enough is enough.

□ 1915

CANCER LINK CELEBRATES 30 YEARS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 30th anniversary of Cancer Link, an amazing volunteer organization dedicated to finding a cure for breast cancer and assisting those in south Florida whose lives have been impacted by this disease.

Cancer Link was founded in 1987 by a small group of 10 Miami women who wanted to spread awareness about breast cancer after suffering the devastating loss of a friend. In the years since, this wonderful organization has grown into an impactful volunteer group that has supported essential breast cancer research at the Sylvester Cancer Center in Miami, Florida.

The volunteers at Cancer Link have also helped provide essential community healthcare programs that ensure that healthcare for breast cancer treatment is accessible to every woman in our community.

Congratulations again to all who have been a part of Cancer Link throughout the years, and thank you for 30 years of service to our community.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO MAKE IT HARDER FOR DANGEROUS PEOPLE TO ACQUIRE ASSAULT WEAPONS

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

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sorrow and anger. Last night, more than 58 people were

tragically murdered and over 500 wounded in a senseless act of violence in Las Vegas, Nevada.

The murderer was found to have 20 guns, including at least one automatic rifle. No person should be allowed to possess a weapon that makes indiscriminately killing human beings easier.

It just baffles me that some of my colleagues don't agree with that basic premise. Not only do they not agree with sensible gun control measures like background checks and no fly, no buy, they won't even allow public research dollars to be used to research gun control and gun violence.

Until Congress acts to make it harder for dangerous people to acquire these types of weapons, tragedies like this will continue to happen.

How many more people have to die?

How much more blood must be shed before Congress decides to act?

Moments of silence and sympathy and prayers from Members of this body are not enough anymore. The time has come to act. We must act now.

OCTOBER IS BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Breast Cancer Awareness Month and all who have been affected by this terrible disease. Each October we take time to raise awareness about the threat breast cancer poses to women and men throughout the country and the world.

Studies show that one in eight women across the Nation will be diagnosed with breast cancer in their lifetime and that more than 249,000 people in the United States are diagnosed each year. Roughly 1 percent of those are men.

This month, it is not only imperative that we reflect upon all who are affected by breast cancer, but that we also take action to fight against it.

Today I would like to recognize a courageous constituent, friend, and cancer survivor, Karen Newton. Earlier this year, I played in the Congressional Women's Softball Game in honor of Karen's triumph over breast cancer. Karen is a vibrant testament to the fact that strides we make in medicine are helping cancer patient and their loved ones, though I don't think she is a very good driver.

Whether it is wearing pink to raise awareness or offering support to a brave person who is fighting this disease, in October, let's all join together to fight to end breast cancer.

CONGRESS MUST PROVIDE RELIEF TO PUERTO RICO

(Ms. BARRAGÁN asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because American citizens are suffering in Puerto Rico. Twelve days after Hurricane Maria made landfall, more than half of the island's residents are still without running water.

Low-income communities have been hit especially hard. They are trying to survive through unsafe and unsanitary conditions, where the basics of life can be impossible to find.

After an earthquake struck Haiti in 2010, I was proud to see that America deployed every available resource the very next day at the crack of dawn to help out. But I wonder why the same response wasn't deployed to help Americans in Puerto Rico.

I call on the administration and Congress to ensure that Puerto Rico receives the emergency aid it needs now so we don't lose more American lives to the storm.

Congress must also provide real relief and aid to our brothers and sisters there. The situation in Puerto Rico is dire, and our fellow Americans are counting on us to act now.

SUPPORTING THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I, along with all of our American citizens, recoil today at the senseless and evil mayhem and killing that went on in Las Vegas. We pray for the families of those whose lives were lost, as well as those who are injured and suffering right now.

I, along with, I am sure, many Americans, recoil at senseless abuse of innocent animals that we love and we enjoy. But I wonder how many of us also recoil at the senseless abuse and murder of innocent babies in the womb.

I stand here today to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, H.R. 36. I support it because it is backed by science. It protects the unborn from suffering. It saves innocent lives. It promotes American values, values that made this country great, that understand the sanctity of life and the beauty of our creator's evidence in this world today in human beings.

I ask my colleagues to join with me and many others this week as we support H.R. 36, and we say to our creator and our God: Thank you for innocent life itself, and may it be preserved and protected.

WE HAVE GOT TO DO SOMETHING TO STOP MASS SHOOTINGS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when will it end? When will the carnage end? How many more times are we going to have to turn on our televisions or our phones or get a text message to talk about some other mass shooting in America?

We have got to do something to stop this now.

There is no reason that someone like the killer should have automatic weapons or semiautomatic weapons.

I believe people have legitimate reasons to have guns, but not legitimate reasons to have automatic weapons to mow down so many innocent people. And it will happen again and again and again, because we refuse to do anything to have sensible gun control in this country.

My heart goes out to the families, but thoughts and prayers are not enough. A moment of silence in the House is not enough. We need to do something now to have sensible gun control laws; otherwise, these words ring hollow.

This country is hurting, and guns are doing it, guns in the hands of wrong people.

Again, guns for hunters, guns to keep people safe, I am not opposed to that, but I certainly am opposed to automatic weapons. Nobody needs automatic weapons. They are weapons of war, and they should not be in the hands of anybody who is unstable.

CONGRATULATING HARLEY DREW ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, the beloved Augusta radio host Harley Drew, on his recent retirement. He is one of the most successful and longest tenured radio personalities in the history of Georgia broadcasting.

Harley was born at Fort Gordon, Georgia, and has always called Waynesboro, Georgia, home.

He became interested in radio and electronics at the age of nine, and got a part-time job at WBRO in Waynesboro at the age of 14, where he worked full time after graduating from high school.

Harley moved to Augusta in 1962 to help put WFNL on the air. I can remember in my high school days listening to "Handsome Harley Drew" on WBBQ, as he was known for playing the all-time best oldies.

He is also a past recipient of Augusta's Best Radio Personality award from Augusta Magazine, was given the Louis Harris Award by the West Augusta Rotary, and has received numerous State and national awards for programming excellence.

Harley was a founding board member of the Georgia Radio Hall of Fame and

also served as its vice president. In honor of his career achievements, he was inducted into the Georgia Radio Hall of Fame in 2011.

Harley anchored Augusta's morning news on WGAC until his retirement last Friday, September 29, 2017.

Harley, congratulations on a remarkable career.

GIVE BLOOD TO HONOR THOSE AFFECTED IN LAS VEGAS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I don't need to add any more adjectives or an official statement about what happened in Las Vegas last night. It has been said: horrific.

What I would like to add is that we see examples of people pulling together to help each other that isn't reported very much. In this horrific thing, giving thanks to the SWAT team who was able to put down that shooter without making it even worse, the emergency personnel, people helping each other get out of the way, hop over a fence, whatever it took, and the people who are so highly impacted in the hospitals around Las Vegas right now making heroic efforts, trying to keep up with the flow there, these are things we should dwell on.

Pray for those who are gone, who are injured, who are on life support right now. Console those who are around them. And an action item we can all do wherever you are: give blood. I do, six-gallon club—not to brag, but it is important.

I ask all of you, if you have never thought of it before, because only a couple percent of Americans do, think about it now, and go do it. It doesn't hurt: just a little pinprick here to test your blood, and just a little needle right here to take that all-important pint.

Just the other day, our friend STEVE SCALISE, it is a miracle he was here on this floor. It was a miracle he got off that ballfield, because he had 18 pints, units of blood waiting for him there, a miracle he was able to even walk out of that emergency room.

Give blood. It makes a big difference.

PROTECTING THE UNBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House of Representatives will vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and before that occurs, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor tonight and just remind all of us that the United States of

America is, indeed, a unique nation that is premised on the foundation that we are all created equal and that each of us is endowed by our creator with the unalienable right to live.

But 2 years ago, Mr. Speaker, numerous video recordings were released that incontrovertibly documented corporate officers and employees of Planned Parenthood casually discussing their rampant practice of harvesting and selling the little body parts from many of the hundreds of thousands of innocent babies they are guilty of killing in their abortion clinics across this Nation every year.

□ 1930

Now, these videos irrefutably reveal officers of Planned Parenthood haggling over the price of these little organs and body parts and casually describing ways of killing these little babies, often using much more painful methods, like partial-birth abortion, to make sure that the saleable organs of these little babies remained undamaged.

One of these videos described an incident where one of Planned Parenthood's employees calls one of the younger employees over to witness something that was "kind of cool;" that one of those baby's hearts was still beating. The older employee said: "Okay. This is really a good fetus, and it looks like we can procure a lot from it. We are going to procure a brain."

Then, using scissors, together the two employees, starting at the baby's chin, cut upward through the center of this child's face and then pulled out the baby's little brain and placed it in a container where it could later be sold.

Mr. Speaker, I find it so crushingly sad that the only time this little baby was ever held by anyone in his very short life was by those who cut his face open to take his brain.

Have we forgotten that, not so long ago, authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, and there they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies, within the constraints of the English language, any description. The grand jury, at that time, reported: "Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it ensuring fetal demise. The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it snipping. Over the years, there were hundreds of snippings."

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2 feet long, that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but were, in her words, making like, this "screeching noise." And she said it "sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, this can't be who we truly are. The fact is

that more than 18,000 late-term, pain-capable, unborn children were torturously killed, without anesthesia, in America in just the last year. Many of them cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords, we couldn't hear them. It is the worst human rights atrocity in the United States of America.

Now, I know that many of those on this floor and the American media will hold to the standard line and try to cloak all of this in the name of freedom of choice; but I would beg them, Mr. Speaker, to open their hearts and ask themselves what is so liberating about brutally and painfully dismembering living, helpless little human babies.

In spite of all the political noise, protecting these little, helpless, pain-capable, unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue, and it is not a Democrat issue. It is a basic test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

Mr. Speaker, the sands of time should blow over this Capitol dome before we ever give Planned Parenthood one more dime of taxpayer money. And in the name of humanity, Democrat Senators should not be allowed to filibuster the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in the Senate because passing it would prevent the vast majority of these ongoing evil acts of torture against helpless, little, pain-capable human babies that these videos have now shown so clearly to the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the greatest pro-life champions in the history of the United States and a precious friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding, for his passion, for his courage, and for authoring the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and for doing so so informed. TRENT FRANKS has been an incredible defender of life, and I want to thank him for his leadership on this extraordinarily important human rights piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, overwhelming majorities of Americans, some 60 to 64 percent, according to the pollsters, support legal protection for pain-capable unborn children.

Today, we know that unborn babies not only die but suffer excruciating pain during dismemberment abortions, a cruelty that rips arms and legs off of helpless children.

A former abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino, testified before Congress, before TRENT FRANKS' committee. Here is a man who has performed 1,200 abortions, over 100 late-term abortions up to 24 weeks; and he said, and I quote in part: "Imagine if you can that you are a pro-choice obstetrician/gynecologist like I was." Using a sopher 13 clamp

with rows of ridges or teeth, "grasp anything you can" inside the womb. "Once you've grasped something inside, squeeze on the clamp to set the jaws and pull hard, really hard. You feel something let go and out pops a fully formed leg about 6 inches long. Reach in again"—he goes on—"and grasp anything you can and out pops an arm."

He noted that a "second trimester D&E abortion is a blind procedure." So he says: "Reach in again and again and again with that clamp and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs."

Mr. Speaker, even swing vote Justice Anthony Kennedy, in his dissent in the *Stenberg v. Carhart* decision, said about dismemberment abortions: "The fetus, in many cases, dies just as a human adult or child would: It bleeds to death as it is torn limb from limb. The fetus can be alive at the beginning of the dismemberment process and can survive for a time while its limbs are being torn off."

Mr. Speaker, even if pain wasn't present, dismembering a child is violence against children, and it is inhumane. But these babies actually suffer in this process.

Dr. Robert White, professor of neurosurgery at Case Western Reserve, has said an unborn child at 20 weeks' gestation "is fully capable of experiencing pain . . . without question, abortion is a dreadfully painful experience. . . ."

Dr. Anand wrote, and he is an expert on pain: "The human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks' gestation. . . ." He points out that it is even worse for an unborn child at that time period because "the highest density of pain receptors per square inch of skin in human development occurs in utero from 20 to 30 weeks' gestation. Thus, a fetus at 20 to 32 weeks' gestation would experience a much more intense pain than older infants or children or adults." We have known this for some time, Mr. Speaker.

In 2006, I authored the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act that garnered 250 votes in favor—including 40 Democrats—to 162 against. I remember thinking on that day of the vote: How can anyone refuse to make child pain information part of an informed consent?

Congressman TRENT FRANKS has authored four—count them, four—extraordinarily important human rights bills over the years to actually protect pain-capable babies in Federal law from the violence of abortion, including the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that passed the House in 2013 and again in 2015. Tragically, President Obama vowed to veto this child protection legislation, and the Senate failed to pass it.

However, this year, we have a President who said, and he put out a Statement of Administration Policy: You

present this legislation to me, and I will sign it.

Finally, not only will babies be protected by TRENT FRANKS' law at 5 months, and the pain suffered by these babies will be averted, but H.R. 36 requires that a late abortion, permitted under very limited circumstances, provide "the best opportunity for the unborn child to survive" and that "a second physician trained in neonatal resuscitation" be "present and prepared to provide care to the child" to the same degree as the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 prescribed.

Following the care required to be rendered, the born-alive child shall immediately be transported and admitted to a hospital.

Sixteen States have passed legislation that resembles this important legislation that we will have before us on this House floor.

My good friend and colleague talked about Dr. Gosnell. Four years ago, Dr. Gosnell was convicted of murder, conspiracy to kill, and involuntary manslaughter, and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Even though the news of Gosnell's child slaughter was largely suppressed by the mainstream media, many of my colleagues may remember that Gosnell operated a large Philadelphia abortion clinic where women died and countless babies were dismembered, all gruesome procedures causing excruciating pain to the victim.

This is a humane bill, a major human rights bill, and, again, I want to thank my great friend and colleague for his leadership. It is extraordinary.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my dear friend and colleague, Mr. TRENT FRANKS, who is certainly a champion of our time in standing up for life, for our national defense, and has a heart so big that comes through in everything he does. And certainly, tonight, I think we see the gentleman's heart for unborn children, certainly at the beginning of 6 months of age, who deserve to live.

The gentleman's bill, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, also known as Micah's Law, will do that, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it tomorrow.

But tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you a heartwarming story that puts a face to what we are talking about. It is one thing to say 20 weeks old, a baby, unborn baby, but it is another thing to look at the picture of Micah Pickering—and his picture is up there, as well as up front.

Micah Pickering was born at 20 weeks' gestation. He was born at the age of which we are talking about that you are trying to say we should not allow for abortions at this stage because they can live, and Micah is a living example of that.

You know, I want to share a little bit about what his mother shared about his story, with Micah, her son. His mother's name is Danielle, and she recalled that when Micah was born, he cried twice immediately, and that was music to her ears and contrary to the worst case scenarios for which Micah's parents were bracing.

This is what Danielle talked about during those first few moments. She said: "The second I was able to meet Micah changed my life. He was so small. I didn't know what to expect. Would he look normal? Could I bond with this baby? Those questions were a mess in my head as I was wheeled into his room 2 hours after his birth. The sight I saw was a perfectly formed baby." At 20 weeks, at the beginning of 6 months, she says he was a perfectly formed baby.

"Lots of tubes and monitors all set up to be an artificial womb to this baby born too soon. My husband and I stood there just staring at this beautiful little boy who we were told we couldn't hold, as the skin was so sensitive it would hurt him. We were told we could press lightly on the skin, so we each put our hand near him.

"He"—the baby, Micah—"reached up and held our fingers. This was the strongest grasp I would ever feel. I never knew how strong a baby was until that moment. He had a powerful grip on our hands and now"—has a powerful grip on—"our hearts."

This little miracle baby spent 4 months in intensive care. He underwent heart surgery 2 weeks after birth, weighing a little over a pound. He was on a ventilator for a while. He was on morphine to ease the pain, and this was the size of the diaper that he wore.

□ 1945

Isn't that incredible?

But he wore a diaper that size, and this little preemie, when he was born, he was the size of an M&M package. It is hard to believe that a baby could be that small and live, but that is about the size of a baby at this age, 20 weeks old, the beginning of 6 months, and he lived. His name is Micah. Now he is a healthy, energetic kindergarten student.

Micah's story is beautiful. It is a miracle. And we thank God for Micah's fighting spirit, for his parents' unwavering love for their son, and for the team of doctors, nurses, surgeons, and medical professionals who tended to Micah during those first few months.

But the point about Micah is he puts a face on this that, from the moment of conception to the birth of a child, the growth and development of the baby is miraculous. With advances in medical science, we can better understand what is happening at each stage of development.

When these little babies are just 4 weeks old, the basics of their nervous

system are developed. By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch. After 20 weeks, and that is the age of the gentleman's bill, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human, for example, by recoiling.

We know that by the 20th week, the beginning of the sixth month, unborn babies, children the same age as Micah when he was born, respond to painful stimuli by flinching and jerking, just like you and I would if we were burned or hurt in some way.

Micah's parents were told that they could not hold their little son, that it would be too painful for the newborn. But babies at this stage are actually hyperresponsive to pain since the neurological features that inhibit or regulate pain sensations do not develop until much later in pregnancy.

Certainly, these babies should not undergo this pain and, certainly, not have to have their life snuffed out through abortion. When a mother and her unborn baby undergo a surgical procedure, doctors give fetal pain medication, or fetal anesthesia to the baby so that he or she does not feel the procedure. This is common practice. It is common sense.

The legislation before the House tomorrow will ensure that unborn children are not subjected to the excruciating pain of being euthanized in the womb. And this is where I wish the story could end, that all children be given a fighting chance like Micah. But that is not the case for too many children whose lives are taken from them before they can take their first breath.

Late-term abortion procedures, abortions performed on babies 20 weeks and later in pregnancies, are graphic, detestable, and, tragically, allowed in this country.

In a dissent opinion that Representative SMITH just shared, and I want to share it again, Justice Kennedy offered the insight into this grizzly practice. He said: "The fetus, in many cases, dies just as a human adult or born child would: it bleeds to death as it is torn limb from limb."

Aborted, unborn babies endure unspeakable pain in the most horrific manner possible. Knowing that innocent 20-week babies acutely experience pain and endure inhuman dismemberment or poisoning should be enough to pierce each of our hearts and prick our sensibilities.

Micah's Law, the legislation that would protect the lives of unborn children halfway through pregnancy because of their ability to feel pain, is our call to action.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to leave you with the words of Micah's mom as she watched her tiny infant grow into the child he is today, and it speaks to the potential of every one of these children that we hope from now on will have a chance to live like

Micah. She said: "He still had his eyes fused shut. You could see his chest vibrate from the ventilators. It was heartbreaking. Here was a boy who we would see get to take his first sneeze, his first smile. We would get to see the hiccups from the outside. We would watch his eyes slowly unfuse. We would watch his hair grow in and we would watch his body develop. It was indescribably the most joyful time of our life."

So as we anticipate tomorrow's historic vote, I ask my colleagues to lend their support for Micah and thousands of children just like him who want to live, who want to experience life, and who have so much to give.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON.)

I am very grateful that you are here tonight, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressmen FRANKS, SMITH, HARTZLER, KING, and all of the others, all of my colleagues who have spent so many years working for the sanctity of every human life in this Chamber. For nearly 20 years, I have been working to defend the sanctity of every human life in the courts, and that brings us here today.

You and I have talked about this many times that it is our Nation's birth certificate, the Declaration of Independence, which states so succinctly what has been known as the American creed. And in that creed, as articulated in the second paragraph of the Declaration—we know the language well—"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The reason the Founders recognized that fundamental freedom, the right to life, and recognized it first is because it is so essential to who we are as human beings. The reason the Founders recognized that and sought to put it first is because they understood, they acknowledged, that we are made in the image of a Holy God. We are made in the image of that creator who gave us those rights. And because of that, every single human life has inestimable dignity and value.

And are values not related in any way to our socioeconomic status, the color of our skin, where we went to school, what we make for a living, what we can contribute to society, our talents, how good-looking we are—totally irrelevant. Our value is inherent because it is given to us by our creator.

So tomorrow, because of your hard work, we have a landmark opportunity with the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I am proud to stand in support of that bill and to assist as a cosponsor and to encourage all of our

colleagues to support this important legislation.

Why do we do this? Because, as has been mentioned, at 20 weeks' gestation, a baby is developed enough to live and grow outside the womb, and at 20 weeks, a baby can feel pain. Yet, in the United States, we remain one of only seven nations on the planet—including North Korea and China, I might add—that allows abortions after 20 weeks. It is a practice that kills thousands of innocent babies each year, as we know.

A law that allows someone to end the life of an unborn baby when that child can live outside the womb and feel the pain inflicted by this violent procedure is simply unconscionable. These procedures can be fatal not only for the child, by the way, but for the mother, as well, because abortion performed later in the pregnancy puts the mother at greater risk.

We have to pass this bill to ensure that America leads in the fight to protect the most vulnerable among us. All life is precious, and this bill protects the life of the mother and that of the unborn child.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to stand with us in support of this important legislation and to join us in the efforts to defend the defenseless.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I so sincerely thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my precious friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me, and I appreciate the years that we have sat elbow to elbow on the Judiciary Committee and on the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee and have done the battle for life. What I am reflecting here, tonight, is the sequence of pro-life leaders that I have had the privilege to walk these floors and halls with.

When TRENT FRANKS and I arrived at this Congress, Henry Hyde had the lead, and he did so many glorious things to lay the foundation for life now. CHRIS SMITH was there at his side the full time that I was here, and then Joe Pitts.

I want to remember Joe Pitts, as well, and TRENT FRANKS. So I put those four gentlemen in a category of the leaders in this movement here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I remain counting those moments precious that I have to serve and work on this cause with each of you.

This bill that we will bring to the floor tomorrow on a rules vote and a final passage vote will pass this floor of the House of Representatives—I have every confidence that it will—and it will be messaged over to the Senate. There is a lot of work that has been put into this, the 16 States that have passed the legislation that is similar to H.R. 36, Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I just add that, when Mr. JOHNSON mentioned the seven countries that allow for an elective abortion after 20 weeks, of course, the United States; the other six—he mentioned a couple of them—North Korea, China, which will impose forceable abortions on mothers, that cruel and heinous activity, Vietnam, Singapore, Netherlands, and Canada. I think Canada might have been affected with the United States along the way. The Netherlands is one of the more liberal countries in the world.

And this list is not a list that I want the United States of America on. I want us out. I want to be able to send this message that a baby who has a chance at survival at 20 weeks of development from conception, that at 20 weeks, that precious little baby that VICKY HARTZLER so well described in her presentation here, 65 percent of premature babies born in the range of 22 to 26 weeks will survive—65 percent.

We all know one or two of those little babies who are walking around. I ran into a friend after church a couple of weeks ago at the grocery store who I hadn't seen in several years, and I asked him how his son was doing.

And I am not going to use names here on purpose.

I asked him how his son was doing. He said: Oh, he is doing fine. He is 30 years old now. He has got a great job out there. He has got a family. I have got grandchildren.

All things were wonderful. He knew why I asked him, because we were doing a job that he was on back then when that little premature boy was born 21 or 22 weeks old. When he came back from 2 weeks of sitting next to that child where he could come back home again and go to work because he now had a good chance that that little boy would be able to survive, I said: We will spend all kinds of money, won't we? We will do anything. We will go to any length to keep a child alive who is born premature.

A child that is born at 20 weeks, 21 weeks, 22, 23, 24, 26 weeks, there is no expense that we will spare ourselves from because that life, we know, is so precious.

Well, the life in the womb is as precious as the life out of the womb, and the pain that that child feels at 20 weeks, 22 weeks, 24 weeks. But this little boy—he remembered what I said to him that day. I said: You are doing everything to save this little child's life, but when you go into the polls and vote, you are going to vote on the other side of that issue like you always have.

And he called me a name that day, kind of like the President did some of the NFL players, but he remembered exactly what I had said to him 30-some years ago. And he said: You know, you really straightened me out that day—because I gave him my remarks on that.

Now, that is a change in heart and a change in minds. America has undergone a change in heart and a change in minds. In fact, I stepped into a member of my staff's office here just last Friday, and the frame of the ultrasound of his firstborn is there, and it has been there for 9 years beside his desk. That little child, that little child they first bonded with him by looking at the ultrasound.

That little child, by the way, is my godson.

So each one of these lives are so utterly precious, and we are not going to stop. We are going to defend every life we can. We are going to protect every life we can. We are going to do the right thing that we can for the babies that we can save. Meanwhile, this goes on the conscience of America when we fall short.

But we are going to fall short tomorrow. We are going to succeed. We are going to find a way to move this legislation and others through the House and through the Senate to a President's desk who will sign that legislation.

When we contemplate the litigation that is bound to take place—because there are people that are dug in deeply on promoting and defending abortion—we are going to have a new Supreme Court. One more appointment to that Court and we will get this past them, and a number of other pieces of legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his attention, his years of work on this very precious cause, and all of the rest who have done so much to step up and defend these lives. I am looking forward to tomorrow. There should be a great shout of joy coming off the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my very good friend.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I express my gratitude and thanks to my colleague and good friend, TRENT FRANKS, for yielding and for his leadership and tireless work on behalf of the unborn.

Congressman FRANKS' fight to save each and every life is one that we should all be championing, and I am proud and pleased to be standing by his side today. I am grateful that I have had the opportunity to fight for the unborn in venues around the world at various multilateral institutions standing on behalf of the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. If signed into law, this legislation will prohibit abortions starting at 20 weeks, almost 5 months, in all 50 States.

The pro-abortion lobby will tell you to disregard the rights of unborn children, but science shows that they are just as human as you and I. In fact,

emerging science has proven that babies feel pain inside the womb as early as 20 weeks old.

In cases of fetal surgeries occurring after the 20-week mark, anesthesia is regularly administered to the fetus to protect against fetal pain. Doctors have also experienced babies born prematurely at or near 20 weeks who experience pain in the same way that a full-term baby or an adult would.

It is inhumane to subject these innocent beings to that gruesome practice of abortion, knowing full well that they will feel every painful moment.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, I think about my own children and how excited my wife and I were throughout her pregnancies. Even without today's developed science, we knew that our children were special, that they were alive, that they were helpless, and that we had the responsibility for their safety and well-being in the womb. We never would have intentionally caused pain or harm to any of our unborn children.

But by allowing this practice to continue, we are not only torturing these helpless babies who will be dismembered limb by limb, we are also ending their lives. They will never realize their God-given potential on this Earth. They will never be mothers, wives, husbands, and fathers. They will never be siblings. They will never be able to fulfill the measure of their creation. Their last memory will be filled with great agony and distress.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that we do in Congress that will have efficacy if we choose to fail to protect the most innocent among us. If, at the very least, we cannot defend those who feel pain, then we are unworthy to lead this Nation.

We have a great responsibility and charge to protect these children, and we will not fail them. Please vote "yes" tomorrow.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS), and I thank him for coming to the floor tonight.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona and all those who have spoken, obviously, so emotionally and so passionately about protecting the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 36. I am a strong believer in the sanctity of life. I believe each and every person, born and unborn, is a child of God.

Our children are our future and a gift to all of us, and respecting the right to life is one of the strongest values we hold as Americans. That is why I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which would stop late-term abortions.

Studies have shown that unborn children can feel pain in the womb 20 weeks after pregnancy, an agonizing fact with disturbing indications that we know that this is a gruesome act against the unborn.

As a proud father of three, we know, when those babies come into this world, that their cries are cries of joy; it is a cry of life. That is what we are protecting. No child of God should be subjected to the torturous pain that comes as a result of a late-term abortion.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that my constituents sent me to Washington to promote a culture and respect for life. They know as well as I do that it is vital for us to fight for those who have no voice and cannot be heard.

This bill shows the world that America will stand up to protect the most vulnerable amongst us. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Let this Congress and the vote of each and every Member be known as the one who stood up for life by speaking out against the horrors of abortion.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

It is now my honor to yield to the honorable gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this piece of legislation, which will, quite literally, save lives. I am so grateful that we are having this debate on the House floor at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I believe that every life, including an unborn baby's life, has dignity and value. But more than 40 years ago, the Supreme Court handed down a decision in direct contradiction to those principles.

In the decades since, I have joined with many families and my colleagues in the House and many across the Nation fighting to undo the damage that has been done. We have got a long way to go in this country, but the passage of H.R. 36 would be a step in the right direction.

A strong and growing body of medical research provides evidence that pain receptors develop in unborn babies at no later than 20 weeks. Medical professionals have testified about seeing babies that age recoil from painful stimuli. Others have been able to measure increases in stress hormones when babies inside the womb are subjected to pain.

If fetal surgery is performed, that baby is given anesthesia in many cases to shield them from the pain of surgery. Yet our Nation's laws allow for these babies to endure the pain of a life-ending abortion. It is absolutely heartbreaking.

My husband and I knew that our lives had completely changed the minute that we heard our oldest daughter's heartbeat. I will never forget that moment. I hope that she knows how proud we are of the generous and compassionate person that she has grown up to become. She has grown up quickly, and I love to think back about those days when she was still a little girl and when she wasn't much taller than I.

We read a lot back then. We read books. We read the Bible. One of her favorite books was Dr. Seuss' book, "Horton Hears a Who!" which says: "A person is a person no matter how small." Each time we read that line, I thought back to those first moments when I heard her muffled heartbeats and thought about Cassidy and thought about "a person is a person no matter how small."

I had that blessed moment three different times with my three different children, and I pray every day that each and every baby's heartbeat would be heard by parents who understand the gift that that life is from our God who loves them dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defend the smallest among us this week and pass H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague from Arizona's bill, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, as well as the rights of the unborn. As a father of 4 children and a grandfather to 15 grandchildren, I strongly believe that life begins at conception. I wholeheartedly feel that nothing is more precious or beautiful than a life. I will do everything in my power to continue to advocate for those who cannot advocate for themselves.

Since the passage of *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, nearly 60 million abortions have been performed. Mr. Speaker, this is a moral atrocity. I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 36, which would make it illegal to attempt or to perform an abortion if an unborn child is 20 weeks or older with exceptions. Science has proven that babies are capable of feeling pain at the start of the third trimester. It is imperative that we protect the lives of the unborn.

Our Nation was built upon the idea of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We guarantee that every American citizen has a right to pursue absolute happiness. Our Constitution guarantees that every American has the right to liberty and justice.

Should we, as Americans, not guarantee that every American has a right to life as well?

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this

bill and the protection of the sanctity of life for all Americans.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very sincerely for his remarks. I am glad he came this way here recently.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend, TRENT FRANKS, for yielding to me and for providing the leadership in the pro-life movement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. As a proud father of 5 and a grandfather of 13, I firmly believe that the value of an unborn life cannot be understated.

H.R. 36 takes a crucial step to ensure that we protect thousands of innocent lives every year. Scientific evidence clearly demonstrates that unborn babies feel pain by at least 20 weeks of age. By 20 weeks, an unborn baby is so developed that he or she can hear and respond to sounds.

Ending these lives through abortion is both cruel and inhumane. There is no excuse. Our Nation must do better. We should not be one of only seven countries—including North Korea, Vietnam, and China—to have elective, on-demand abortion after 20 weeks of development. This is an abuse of the basic human rights, and it is unacceptable in the eyes of God and by any standard of human morality.

As Members of Congress, it is our duty and our moral obligation to pass H.R. 36 so that we may protect those who are the most defenseless. Mr. Speaker, our Declaration of Independence guarantees all Americans enjoy the unalienable right of life, and that includes the unborn.

Thanks to incredible advances in modern medicine, babies born at 20, 21, and 22 weeks of age are able to survive. Our medical community strives to save and protect these premature babies, yet, in an inconsistent fashion, current policy permits aborting a child at that exact same stage of development.

Mr. Speaker, the sanctity of every human life must be protected. This bill affirms the humanity of the unborn while curbing the inhumanity of abortion. God knows that it is time that we hold abortionists who perform these late-term abortions accountable for their abhorrent actions.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Texas very much for speaking on the floor tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

I, too, rise today in strong support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This bill would prohibit any elective abortion attempt of an unborn child who is 20 weeks or

older, the age at which research shows children are able to feel pain.

I think it is worth noting that this landmark legislation is projected to save between 12,000 and 18,000 lives each year. These are individuals who will become fathers, mothers, technological innovators, servicemembers, and hardworking contributors to our great Nation.

Ten years ago, studies began to emerge proving that an unborn child is able to feel pain as early as 20 weeks post-fertilization. So as our Nation's understanding of fetal pain has become more advanced, protections for pain-capable unborn children have been signed into law in 20 States, including my home State of Indiana.

But that is not enough. Despite claims from many pro-abortion groups, late-term abortion is neither safe or, unfortunately, rare. As recently as 2014, it was estimated that 430 abortion facilities in the United States were willing to perform abortions on unborn children 20 weeks or older.

This sort of late-term abortion—at the point when the child can actually feel the procedure—will continue to happen without a Federal prohibition. Sixty percent of women, 56 percent of Independents, and 46 percent of Democrats support this sort of legislation. It has broad public support.

Let's ensure that all 50 States have protections for vulnerable pain-capable unborn children. I have advocated for these protections my entire career, from the State house in Indiana to here in the United States Congress.

That is why today I express my strong support for the passage of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman TRENT FRANKS of Arizona. I urge my colleagues tomorrow as well to support this important legislation.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BANKS very much for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

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

Mr. Speaker, pre-born babies feel pain. The medical field has found clear evidence that pre-born babies have the capacity to feel intense pain at 20 weeks.

□ 2015

That is what this legislation is about. When a child's body is gruesomely dismembered, they feel pain. When the abortion doctor attempts to use a "less crunchy technique"—as we learned in last year's abhorrent videos about Planned Parenthood, which was their words—to procure more intact body parts, they feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think of the millions of lives taken from this

world in such a gruesome and violent manner. Equally disturbing is the thought of how much pain has been endured by millions of pre-born babies whose lives have been cut short since *Roe v. Wade*.

We must do more to promote a culture of life in this country. We must do more to lessen a culture of violence. That is why I rise today in strong support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. By acknowledging that babies feel the pain of abortion at 20 weeks, this legislation affirms the inherent humanity of the most innocent—unborn babies—in our country.

To add to that, this legislation also includes protections for babies that survive an attempted abortion. It ensures that children who do survive and are able to continue to live outside the womb are given the immediate medical attention they deserve so that they have a chance to live.

With growing developments in the medical field, children are able to survive outside the womb at earlier points in pregnancy. Such was the case for Micah Pickering, for whom this legislation is named. Micah was born at 20 weeks' gestation and is now a healthy 5-year-old.

The Congressional Budget Office recently reported that approximately 2,750 lives per year will be saved through this bill. That is 2,750 girls and boys; daughters and sons; brothers and sisters; and not medical waste, like opponents of this legislation would like you to believe.

The United States is only one of seven countries, including North Korea and China, that allow abortion after 20 weeks.

Are we really that kind of Nation? Does our Constitution not grant all Americans the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, no matter how small or seemingly insignificant they are?

Mr. Speaker, this is commonsense legislation. I urge every single Member of this body to take a deep look inside themselves and ask if they support not only inflicting pain on unborn babies, but also denying these innocent babies their constitutional right to life.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, for his leadership on this important issue.

If you want to stand for a culture of life, vote for this bill. If you want to take a stand against a culture of violence, vote for this bill.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I simply say that sometimes I think we kind of get caught up in things and we grow used to something that otherwise would horrify us.

Before the sun set this evening, we saw 3,000 unborn little Americans die a tragic and lonely death. That is in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, each time that took place, not only did a nameless little baby die a lonely and tragic death, but the mother was never the same again. All the gifts that that child might have brought to this world are now lost forever.

So, Mr. Speaker, I pray that somehow in this debate we would put aside which people are right and ask: What is the right thing for America?

The very creed of this country is the notion that all of us have the *Imago Dei*, or the image of God, stamped on our souls. If that is true, Mr. Speaker, then there is a far greater question here than we can ever imagine.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we ask ourselves the truest and deepest question, then perhaps we will begin to see the winds of change begin to blow in this country. That is very simply without all of the rationalization, without all of the gotchas and the what-ifs and the avoiding of the subject, and if we just ask ourselves one basic question: Does abortion kill a little baby?

If it does not, Mr. Speaker, then I sincerely am one that can get up out of this Chamber and never speak of it again. But if abortion really does kill a little human child, then those of us standing here in the seat of freedom, the greatest Nation in the history of the world, also stand here in the midst of the greatest human genocide in the history of the human family.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what we are called to do in this world, as the greatest Nation that ever had the chance to exist on this Earth.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that, as we debate the bill tomorrow, we can put aside anything but the truth and just examine in our own hearts who we really are. If we do that, I believe we will pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act on October 3, 2017. By the grace of God, it will go over to the Senate and they will find a way to bring this bill to the floor and send it to President Trump, who I have every conviction will sign the bill, and for which I am very grateful.

Mr. Speaker, God bless America, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague TRENT FRANKS for his hard work on this important issue. I rise today in support of the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Children are gifts from God—before and after they are born. They are tiny humans with endless potential and complete innocence.

This bill would stop the practice of ending these precious lives after 20 weeks of pregnancy, except in cases of rape or incest or necessity to save the mother's life.

Similar laws have been passed in about 16 states, and this Chamber passed similar legislation in 2015. The United States is 1 of only 7 countries that does not ban abortions of these 20-week-year-old unborn babies.

Science indicates that, at about this age, these children have the physical structures needed to feel pain.

We do not want anyone to have an unwanted pregnancy, but we want mothers to know that abortion is not their only option. And we want these children protected from pain and harm.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to protect our Nation's most innocent from inhumane suffering and premature death.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS: GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE IN NATURAL DISASTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to rise today to anchor this CBC Special Order hour.

Today, Monday, October 2, members of the Congressional Black Caucus will be speaking on the floor about the devastating impact of natural disasters, particularly hurricanes, and the critical role of the Federal Government's response.

In the wake of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and now Maria, the Federal Government has already deployed assets to affected regions, from HHS public health resources, the Coast Guard, the Urban Search and Rescue Task Force, to Corps of Engineers flood-fighting projects.

In the coming weeks and months, additional resources will help shelter displaced Americans and get businesses back on their feet. Congress must also ensure that the Federal response to these disasters is just and equitable, and that communities of color are not directly or indirectly harmed by recovery efforts.

During this time, we will hear from other members of the Congressional Black Caucus and its friends to discuss this issue. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to speak directly to the American people on issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, Congress, the constituents we represent, and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), from the city of Newark.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, Congresswoman PLASKETT, for hosting tonight's Special Order hour on the Federal Government's response to natural disasters. I believe that Ms.

PLASKETT and the experience that she has had in her homeland can open our eyes to the devastation that has taken place in the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico as well.

It is unthinkable what these American citizens have been through over the last several weeks and will continue to suffer for months into the future.

Before I begin, I have a message for the families and the friends of the 58 innocent people whose lives were taken and the more than 500 who were injured in Las Vegas overnight: The country's compassion and thoughts go out to you. Our hearts break with yours.

For those injured, know that the American people are praying for your recovery.

To the first responders who put their lives on the line daily: Thank you.

What went down in Las Vegas last night was an act of terrorism. There is no other name for it. A deranged man with a small arsenal of firearms in a hotel room shot into a crowd of people at a concert. For an hour and 12 minutes, people watched the chaos unfold.

All the moments of silence in the world won't change what happened last night in Las Vegas, last year in Orlando, the year before in Charleston, and the list goes on.

Moments of silence used to be for showing honor or respect. There is nothing honorable about keeping silent and doing nothing to prevent gun violence. There is nothing respectful about rejecting every single reasonable gun bill proposed in the past decade.

What kind of Nation are we when we sacrifice human lives on the altar of the gun lobby?

The time to act was yesterday. The Federal Government has a moral duty to protect the welfare of American citizens before tragedy strikes. Yet, when the news moves from one disaster to another, we often suffer a sort of amnesia. We don't seem to remember or learn from our mistakes. We forget to fix the problems our citizens call us about every single day, and the problems inevitably repeat themselves.

One issue we seem to have repeated amnesia about is the high cost our constituents face when evacuating disaster areas, particularly after hurricanes. We read reports that, due to reduced capacity and high demand, flights are full or tickets are prohibitively expensive. Even if the airlines capped flight prices, like they did last week, Federal taxes and fees can increase the price of an evacuation by 20 percent.

Recently, this hit home for me. One of my district staffers had family stuck in Puerto Rico. Because Hurricane Maria knocked out power and the telephone lines, my staffer had no way of knowing whether her loved ones were alive or dead. Many constituents have contacted our offices to let us know the difficulty they were having in try-

ing to find out whether their loved ones were safe or not and how we could help.

She tried to get in touch with her family for 8 long days before hearing that they were okay. Then, when my staffer tried to book a flight for her family to get out of Puerto Rico, the only tickets available were for first class. First class. That is over \$700 on a flight full of disaster evacuees.

My D.C. staff did a little digging. Here is what they learned. The American people rely on the goodwill of the airlines to cap the prices of flights from disaster areas. The airlines decide when to start the cap and when to end it.

□ 2030

The airlines decide whether to keep selling first class tickets, and the Federal Government never stops charging taxes on flights from disaster areas.

American citizens deserve better, Mr. Speaker. That is why, starting this week, I will be introducing a series of bills to ease the financial burden Americans face when escaping natural disasters.

The humanitarian flight fairness package will do four things. First, it will allow the Secretary of Transportation to declare an aviation humanitarian crisis at specific airports covered by a Presidential declaration of emergency.

Second, it will allow the Secretary of Transportation to mandate that airlines charge no more than the median fair price of all seats sold on that route in the prior calendar year.

Third, the package would require the FAA to waive the \$5.60 passenger facility charge during an aviation humanitarian crisis.

And fourth, the package would require the FAA to waive the U.S. international transportation tax, which is \$18 on a flight from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

American citizens, Mr. Speaker. Too often Congress reacts to crisis. It is time for us to be proactive. It is time for us to legislate before another disaster strikes. The humanitarian flight fairness package is a commonsense solution to a problem that directly affects our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I always try to deal in common sense. As a matter of fact, I have a constituent back at home who constantly reminds me of how shallow I am, so I can do nothing but rely on common sense based on this constituent's feelings about me.

I want to thank the congresswoman again for hosting this Special Order hour, and I look forward to continue working with her as she addresses the issues faced by Americans affected by natural disasters, whether it is on the mainland or in the territories. They all are American citizens.

When it benefits this Nation to have Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands be a

part of the United States, it does not hesitate. But when these American citizens are in trouble, they deserve the same rights that every American citizen benefits from in this great Nation—and it is great, and we want to continue to make sure that it remains great.

I continue to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that these are American citizens we are talking about. This is not foreign aid. This is not mutual aid. This is aiding American citizens in trouble, in disaster, in peril, no insulin for diabetics, no dialysis for kidney patients in two or three weeks. That is a death sentence, Mr. Speaker, and we cannot allow it to continue.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PAYNE, my colleague, for those sentiments and that support to the people of the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico and to all the people of the Caribbean region. I am grateful for his empathy, for his support, the support of his constituents, as well as all the Members who have reached out to the Virgin Islands in these last several weeks.

The islands have been struck by something that is nothing less than cataclysmic in many respects, particularly in a time of year when we are preparing for what is right now our only viable and large industry, the tourism industry. We have lost that for this year. We have lost that on all of the islands, all of the regions at this time.

I know that so many of you have seen and expressed—so many Members on both sides of the aisle have come up to me and said, or texted or called and said, that they are there for me, and I am going to hold them to that. I am going to hold them to that because what we are facing in the Virgin Islands, I feel guilty right now—and I told my staff—being here, having air conditioning, sitting in a room. I feel guilty because I know what the children of the Virgin Islands are going through right now.

There is no air conditioning. There is no light on the islands right now. Many of the people, many of the communities are in utter darkness, and as the heat rises with the amount of moisture that is in the air, we know that there will be health hazards that are about to happen in terms of mosquitoes, with dengue, chikungunya, and all other kinds of diseases that are going to be occurring.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PLASKETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me just say in terms of your guilt. It is not a guilt. It should not be guilt. It is an obligation for you to be here in the people's House to represent your constituents here, to be their voice. That is why they sent you here to Washington. So do not be guilty about doing the job you have been sent to do.

Ms. PLASKETT. I know that that is why I am here because I need to be their voice, because they are voiceless right now. If you look on national media, you hear about what is happening in Puerto Rico, and, Lord knows, I feel for our fellow islanders, our brothers and sisters over there, but very rarely do you hear about what is happening in the Virgin Islands.

On September 6, Hurricane Irma, one of the most powerful Atlantic storms this century, destroyed the islands of St. John and St. Thomas, the islands that are part of the district that I represent. Three weeks later, the island of St. Croix was devastated by Maria, a second Category 5 hurricane ripping through the U.S. Virgin Islands in less than a month. Both Hurricanes Irma and Maria have wreaked havoc in the U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and other Caribbean nations.

We forget that there are other places in the Caribbean that have also been struck, St. Martin and Sint Maarten, Barbuda, Anguilla, our very close neighbors, the British Virgin Islands, Tortola, Anegada, Virgin Gorda, Jost Van Dyke, places that Americans love to go to, to vacation, to enjoy themselves, not thinking about the lives of the people that are there or not there anymore.

We know that right now the island of Barbuda is without an inhabitant, without an inhabitant in centuries. There is no one on Barbuda after the hurricane.

Turks and Caicos, Guadeloupe, Montserrat, one that also strikes me is Dominica. Dominica was not hit by the first Hurricane Irma, and that little island nation reached out to the U.S. Virgin Islands, reached out to Puerto Rico and said: We don't have much, but we are going to give you the money that we have. We, as a government, will give you 200,000. We will bring relief. We will bring whatever we can.

And 2 weeks later, Hurricane Maria struck them and has devastated that island.

Their Prime Minister went to the United Nations a week ago and begged, begged the support of the free world, begged the support of the members of the United Nations to support them.

Although the full extent of the two hurricanes' impact has yet to be assessed, it is clear that, in the Caribbean, the damage from these storms appears to be unparalleled.

President Trump issued major disaster declaration for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. Dozens of deaths and hundreds of injuries have been reported alongside widespread infrastructure damage all throughout the Caribbean.

I received a text just this morning from members of my family who are still looking for loved ones on the island of St. Croix. That is why, in the days and months ahead, we must con-

tinue to work together to ensure that the individuals and families impacted by these devastating storms receive all the aid they need. The catastrophic destruction caused by Hurricanes Irma and Maria demands massive amounts of aid to address the overwhelming needs of the countless victims who now face the daunting task of rebuilding their lives.

FEMA has been on the ground in the Virgin Islands even before Irma hit the islands of St. John and St. Thomas. There are now more than 12,600 Federal staff engaged in response and recovery operations from Hurricanes Maria and Irma in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, representing nearly three dozen departments and agencies.

Storms of this magnitude require the full attention and support of the entire Nation. The people of the Virgin Islands have lost their homes and possessions. Businesses have been lost alongside hospitals, schools, utility systems, and other vital infrastructure.

To give you an example, after Irma, Roy Schneider Medical Center, the only hospital on the island of St. Thomas, was partially destroyed, its roof ripped off, its walls caved in, windows blown out. Patients needed to be evacuated to the island of St. Croix and to San Juan to be at Juan Luis Hospital on St. Croix and additional hospitals on San Juan, as well as the veterans facility there.

Of course, people were thinking that St. Croix, after Irma, would be the base. As people on St. Thomas and St. John were reeling from the devastation of Irma, post offices were gone, schools annihilated, mud slides began after additional rains, people in Coral Bay on St. John felt lost, isolated, trapped. Many people had days, almost weeks before they could get out and be in the rest of the public population.

When Maria came, Maria struck what we thought would be our base camp, the island of St. Croix, and as luck would have it, the only functional hospital left in the Virgin Islands, the hospital of Juan Luis was breached by Hurricane Maria and has now been condemned by the Army Corps of Engineers.

What facility will Virgin Islanders use? Will we continue to be in tents manned by the brave men and women of our military who have come down to support us? Will we operate from an operating room, an emergency room in a box, what they have given us thus far?

That can't be. We have one functioning operating room that is being held together by the good graces and MacGyvering of the men and women of Juan Luis Hospital right now. Should that be for American citizens?

I went on distribution lines. I went to grocery stores where people were waiting for hours. I am telling you hours—3 hours to get gas; 3, 4 hours, the entire time of a curfew, to go on a distribu-

tion line to get a couple of packs of water and some MREs for a family, standing out in the hot Caribbean sun. People were sharing umbrellas, sharing water, singing with each other trying to keep their spirits up.

I met a man who had his veteran's cap on, Vietnam vet, people who are members of The American Legion and asking me: "I fought for this country; I am an American citizen; do they think about us? I have not seen us on the news. My family tells me that we are not on the news," because, of course, his TV is not working, because almost all of the Virgin Islands is in darkness.

□ 2045

We have been able, through the valiant effort of our water and power authority and the linemen and others who are out there, to bring power to critical structures; to our government house; to the main blocks in Christiansted; to parts of Charlotte Amalie, the capital of the Virgin Islands; to the airport so that relief planes can come in and out. That is who is in light right now.

But for so many others and children right now, it is darkness for them. The couple of hours that they have outside of the curfew are to be making the rounds to get ice, to keep insulin refrigerated in their homes, to keep milk for children and formula for babies cold before it goes bad. That is the daily struggle now of Virgin Islanders, American citizens, veterans, people who pledge their allegiance to this flag, people who are proud to say that they are American citizens.

As we saw on the mainland in the United States following Hurricanes Katrina, Sandy, and, most recently, Harvey, Americans need to come together again with compassion and care. I have heard commitment from the President and my colleagues in Congress to the U.S. territories receiving the support they need.

Moving forward, I am hopeful, but vigilant, and I will make sure that they keep to their promise and their commitment that President Trump and this Congress delivers on the promises to support their fellow Americans in the Caribbean region. This is a plea by me on behalf of my people to keep us in your thoughts, prayers, and support in the coming months and years. May our collective attention span endure enough through the constant new cycle so that we can come together to move beyond relief to healing and prosperity.

This is an opportunity. I keep trying to tell our young people on the islands who are in despair, who have low morale, that this is an opportunity for us to leapfrog technology, to create the kind of Virgin Islands, for the Virgin Islands to be the beacon in the Caribbean region, the beacon of what American might can do when it does what it is supposed to do.

It is this Congress' constitutional responsibility to the territories. The benign neglect that this Congress has gotten away with for the last 100 years needs to stop right now. They need to stop wagging their finger and telling Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands that they have not done what they are supposed to do when this Congress knows that they are not doing the right thing by those territories. Our formulas are different. The money that we receive is different. We get the short shrift on every bill that comes on this floor. Yet, still, you expect us to stretch that out like the poor stepchild that you think we are to make do and keep quiet.

But it is going to stop right now. We cannot be quiet anymore, because not only are we hungry, 30 percent of the children of the Virgin Islands live in poverty, but now we are blind as well. There is no cell reception in most of the areas of the Virgin Islands. While I was down there last week, my staff and I roamed the islands with our cell phones, sitting in bypasses, sitting in areas with others, trying to get a signal to plead with the National Security Council, plead with FEMA, and others to do the right thing by the Virgin Islands.

Given the enormity of the challenges ahead, the Virgin Islands will require the coordinated and sustained financial commitment of the United States. For this reason, I ask that Members of Congress fully support inclusion of funding in forthcoming disaster supplemental packages that will aid in short-term as well as long-term relief, recovery, and reconstruction of the Virgin Islands. The international community, including the United States, has an obligation to work with affected governments to restore infrastructure, provide critical relief, and help recovery and build back our islands. We must act quickly to save lives, ensure that those in the Virgin Islands are back on the road to swift recovery.

Listen, I know we are hearing that FEMA is on the ground, that supplies are there, and that things are moving along. I must admit, FEMA is on the ground. I see the supplies in the cartons, in the containers on our ports, and I hear the discussions at daily briefings that go on at our local emergency management system to how they are working hand in hand with FEMA. I believe that the Army Corps and the Department of Defense and FEMA are there and they want to lend a hand.

But something is not working, whether it is in the local government, a dysfunction there, or dysfunction in communications, or dysfunction at the highest levels of the Federal Government. Because when I go to neighborhoods like Whim, when I go to Tutu High Rise, when I go to Coral Bay, when I go to Hannah's Rest, when I go to Frederiksted and talk with people

and they tell me they haven't had water in a week, something is wrong, and something needs to be done by this Congress that has the responsibility for the Virgin Islands.

How can a child in the United States say that they don't have water? How can a child in the United States say that water is streaming over them because many of the roofs in many of these areas are completely gone?

So what I wanted to do was to walk the Members of Congress and you, Mr. Speaker, through the destruction that I have seen with my eyes in the Virgin Islands.

What you see right here is a home. This is a private homeowner's home completely gone. It looks like a construction site. It looks as if they are trying to start building when, in fact, this was someone's home before.

Additionally, this is another home that now looks like a construction site that people are living in. People can no longer be here. They have abandoned—they have had to leave this home.

I have additional things that I would like to show you.

This is a line right now of people to fill up some containers with gas so that they can keep generators going for a couple of hours a day so that their children can read, so that they can wash themselves, so they can find out what is going on in the outside world. People can listen to a radio to find out what is not being said about them by others.

Here is another home in the Virgin Islands. This is the kind of destruction that took place on the islands that I represent, the islands that are my home. This is all of St. John. Our transportation system between the islands has been completely obliterated. This is a ferry that was used between St. Thomas and St. John to bring goods, to bring people between those islands. The islands of St. John, Cruz Bay, Chocolate Hole, and Coral Bay now feel cut off, left out, because the ferry system has been down for many weeks.

Look at this. This is what is happening in the Virgin Islands right now. This is the main street in Christiansted. If you look over here, this is the government house, and this is what our roads look like after the hurricane. You can see that this roof is actually a part of the roof over here that has completely been sheared off by Hurricane Maria and strewn across the street. Lines are down and poles are down.

This is a commercial business on the island of St. Croix, a business that will take months, if not a year, at least, to recover if FEMA moves quickly on supporting a small business loan so that they can have the support that they need to be able to do that.

These are the things that you don't see on the news that the people of the Virgin Islands are dealing with right now. What is our greatest asset—and

has been for some years after our oil refinery was closed, after this Congress in 2004 changed the rules for the American JOBS Act that took away many of our knowledge-based businesses, our financial services sector—is we have had to rely on tourism.

And this is a hotel room in one of our major hotels. This is what the destruction of the hurricanes look like in the Virgin Islands right now. This is a hotel room that will not be available for the coming months for the people of the Virgin Islands to be able to sustain themselves with employment.

What I am showing you now was, at one point, two homes, two homeowners' families. You can see the two houses look literally as if a hurricane just came across them and smashed them with a fist from the top. You can barely make out what was once in these homes. These homes no longer exist. These people have no homes.

There is no temporary shelter designation right now. People are living in shelters in some of the few schools that are still intact, which means: Where are our children going to go to school?

Many of our schools have also been destroyed. What will happen to the children of the Virgin Islands? What will happen to us all?

Here is what some of the roads look like when we talk about the utility system and the need—or why we are in the dark in the Virgin Islands right now.

This is a major road. Can you imagine having this next to your house? Can you imagine this amount of transponders, transformers, in front of your home?

This is why most of the Virgin Islands are in the dark right now. This is what is happening on these islands.

This is someone's home. This is our industry. This is tourism right now in the Virgin Islands. This is a hotel room in one of our major resorts. Places known over the world—Caneel Bay on St. John—are gone, are obliterated, will be no more for 2 or 3 years.

What are the people of the Virgin Islands supposed to do? Are we asking for much?

We are asking for support. We fight in your wars. We begged when we became part of the United States to be part of the draft because we want to take on the responsibility of American citizenship. But under the Constitution, it is this Congress, Mr. Speaker, which has responsibility for the territories: Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Marianas. And I have to tell you that it has been a poor job that you have been doing of that responsibility thus far.

We get the short shrift in Federal funding in formulas. Let's not talk about the Affordable Care Act. We don't even have an exchange to have been upset that we lost an exchange.

That was never given to us. The Virgin Islands, with 30 percent of the children living in poverty, still don't get the disproportionate share for hospitals that the rest of the United States get.

Why?

I can't get a straight answer about why we shouldn't have it, but we don't. Neither do the smaller island territories.

This is what we are left with. And we are asking you for your support. I am asking you for their support. I am begging for support for the people that I represent, because many Virgin Islanders are not going to beg you for support. That is not in them, that is not who they are. The biggest phrase that people have right now when I go around the islands after Irma and after Maria—both Category 5 when they struck the U.S. Virgin Islands—and I ask people, “How did you make out?”—that is now our new greeting for one another: “So good to see you. How did you make out?” And people's response is continually: “Thank God I have life. I am blessed I have life.”

And when you have to press them to ask them, “What happened to your home,” then they will just shake their head, “It is no more. My home is no more. But thank God I have life. I am good. We are good.”

That is the kind of people who are the people of the Virgin Islands. So they are not going to beg this Congress for support. I am going to beg for them, because you haven't been doing it out of your own volition or what you know is right to do. You haven't done it thus far. What is happening in Puerto Rico is happening in the Virgin Islands right now.

As the sole representative here in Congress representing the Virgin Islands, I will continue the work that I have been doing in support of the islands' overall recovery efforts, including facilitating generators and security for local grocery stores, businesses so Virgin Islanders can get fresh food and goods, working with local shipping companies to clear the ports and bring commerce and relief packages to the islands, coordinating with housing support for the Red Cross and local shelters, as well as rebuilding efforts of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Additionally, I will continue to update my residents and businesses around the ongoing efforts to make sure that the U.S. Virgin Islands continue to receive the attention and support they need during these difficult times.

□ 2100

While the devastation of this hurricane season has been felt in many parts of our country, it is imperative that we make sure our Virgin Islands continue to be remembered and supported as we begin the long and arduous process of our recovery. We are hopeful. Virgin Is-

lands' motto is “United in Pride and Hope.” That is who we are.

I want to thank the Virgin Islanders who are living in the mainland because they, through their efforts, have bridged the gap. Our office gets calls continually from Virgin Islands associations in places like Houston, Atlanta, New York, Tampa, Orlando, Miami, good Virgin Islanders like Tim Duncan, who, through his own efforts, brought planeloads of support to the people of the Virgin Islands because we want to take care ourselves. We don't want to ask for your support. But it is your responsibility, Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of this Congress to ensure that that is done.

I think back on, as a child, hearing stories about Casper Holstein. Many of you may not know the name, but many of you may know him from gangster movies, discussions about New York at the turn of the 20th century. He was a Virgin Islander who created something that everybody calls the numbers system in New York.

After a hurricane and a tsunami in the Virgin Islands, he, of his own pocket, reached in, commissioned a ship, and sent that ship filled with goods for his fellow Virgin Islanders back home.

That is what is happening now because we can't always count on the Federal Government to do what is right by us. We have to count on ourselves. But I am going to make sure, and I will fight continually with those colleagues on either side of the aisle, whomever is willing to, to support the people of the Virgin Islands, to ensure that their efforts are not in vain.

Let me give you a statistic when I talk about veterans and us willing to fight. In the last five conflicts, Virgin Islanders have paid the ultimate price, have greater casualties, three times the national average per capita. We send our sons and daughters on the regular to fight our wars. That is not a duty that we shirk from.

Are you shirking from your duty to us, of your responsibility to us?

I understand, as I have said, FEMA is on the ground, but there are children who are not getting water. There are old people who are eating MREs that others have brought back to them. Is that what should be happening?

Not everybody can get to a distribution center. Not everybody can carry packs of water on their shoulders, on their heads, on their back a mile, whatever it is, to get back to their home because, as crazy as it sounds in this day and age, not everybody owns a car, not everybody can do that. So this Congress has got to figure out a way.

I know that Ranking Member CUMMINGS and I issued a request on September 29 for my good friend—and he is my friend, TREY GOWDY, chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee—to express our extremely grave concerns about the dire status of

recovery efforts in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, requesting that the committee hold an emergency hearing this week with officials from the Department of Defense, Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, as well as from the White House.

The committee this week, I know, has no hearings, no business meeting, no activity scheduled for the entire week, and this issue is in desperate need of rapid and robust oversight. Millions of American citizens residing in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are facing massive calamities, widespread disease and death, and we need to help them now.

Lieutenant General Russel Honore, who commanded Joint Task Force Katrina, recently warned the administration's response to this humanitarian crisis is replaying a scene from Katrina. Admiral Paul Zukunft, the Coast Guard Commandant, warned this week that the victims feel betrayed, they feel isolated, and they are probably getting a sense of betrayal of “where is the cavalry?” Everybody else is seeing what other individuals in Puerto Rico have said and their concern for what is happening.

Now, I want my colleagues to know, I am not necessarily saying that it is the Federal Government's fault. If it is the fault of local government, then shame on them and let's expose that for what it is, because all I am concerned about is the welfare of the people of the Virgin Islands, not protecting local government, not protecting bureaucracy, whether it be at the Federal level or at the local level.

Let's have this hearing. Let's get that information out.

The fact that there is no functioning hospital in the Virgin Islands should scare the heck out of us. I was in the hospital at Juan Luis on Wednesday and watched doctors and others creating lists of people, how to get them off the island, how to get our disproportionate amount of dialysis patients off the island, how they were going to deal with those who have shunts, heart disease patients in the coming weeks with one makeshift operating room that they were working out of.

How were they going to do that? How were they going to operate out of a tent that the Army was setting up when we still have a month and a half of hurricane season in the Virgin Islands, in the Caribbean? We are not going to be able to continually ship people off the island, fix them up, triage them, and get them off.

Our labor and delivery: What if there is a child with special needs when they are born? What about neonatal services, if that is needed, for a child that is born during this time? God help us. And if you don't act, God help you in this time of need of your fellow Americans.

I want to thank those Members who have reached out to me and who have expressed their desire to support and help us. Thank you. I am calling on you now for that help to make sure that the people of the Virgin Islands do not continually feel forgotten.

I want to thank House Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI, who recently issued a statement calling for the swift and immediate financial commitment to help rebuild the Virgin Islands.

I want to thank my Republican colleague, JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. She and I have been continually texting. I remember texting with her through Maria as she and her brother were holding the door of their home in Puerto Rico, trying to ensure that Maria did not get in that house. Thank you for your support. Thank you for your sisterhood as we both go through this, and how ever you need me, I am there for you.

Republicans must join Democrats; Democrats must join Republicans in Congress to address the needs of the communities in crisis by swiftly passing a robust relief package that provides assistance not only today, but throughout the long road to recovery. This is our chance in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico to show American might, to show American technology, to show American strength.

President Trump, you have complained about the other islands not wanting to support us when we go to the United Nations or the Organization of American States against places like Venezuela or Cuba or China. Show that they can vote with us because Americans do what they are supposed to do for the islands that they have responsibility over.

How are they going to trust us if we can't even take care of what belongs to us?

Our fellow Americans in the Virgin Islands deserve to know that their government will be there for them without question or hesitation.

I want to thank the country of Denmark, our previous owner. Many of you know that the Virgin Islands have had seven flags that have been flown over those islands. We are a very valuable place. We are geographically situated in the mouth of the Caribbean Basin to support the United States. That was why we were purchased in 1970.

But we have maintained close ties with Denmark, and I want to thank the Ambassador and the Prime Minister, who reached out and said that they wanted to support the territory and submitted the request of the Danish Government to our own U.S. Government to bring their own additional emergency management agency to the Virgin Islands in support of ongoing efforts in areas such as healthcare, water purification systems, and experts, command control support, logistics for clearing, and security support. Thank

you for your continued commitment to us.

Let that not be the only commitment that we have. I know that the Federal Government, the executive branch, is doing its part. Let this Congress do its part. Let this Congress show, in this time of crisis, that it can rise above partisanship and support the islands of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Let those 3.6 million Americans living in those territories—more than many States in this country—know that they have the full support of this Congress, of the American people, that they are not just a sound bite, that they are not just a rum and Coke and a pina colada when you decide that you want to get away from where you live, that we mean more than that to you, that we are, indeed, full citizens in this American experience, in this democracy.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the 2017 Atlantic hurricane season was among one of the most active hurricane seasons on record. Four major hurricanes—Harvey, Irma, Jose, and Maria—left terrible devastation in their wakes as the United States and its surrounding neighbors were hit with historically catastrophic storms. As we know far too well, these storms caused billions of dollars in damage across Texas, Louisiana, Georgia, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and other areas in the region. Much like Hurricane Katrina, the effects of this devastation will be felt for decades.

The frequency and intensity of these storms continue to be an ongoing issue for our country, and it is a problem that is only further exacerbated by global warming. Warmer oceans and extra heat in the atmosphere caused by climate change provide even more fuel for weather systems. Studies are already demonstrating that storms are intensifying significantly faster today than they did 25 years ago. Additional water vapor in the atmosphere is also leading to extreme precipitation. In fact, Hurricane Harvey brought more than 50 inches of rainfall to the Texas Gulf Coast, representing the greatest accumulation of rainfall ever recovered in the contiguous United States from a single tropical storm.

As the costs of natural disasters continue to increase, we need to be cognizant of the impact of these costs on communities all across the United States—particularly communities of color or other areas where our most vulnerable populations reside. Federal disaster response needs to be fair and equitable across the board. Communities of color suffer greatly from natural disasters as many are left without housing or jobs to return to after the storm. Low income individuals and minorities suffer even greater when these events occur, making a strong and equitable federal response that much more important.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be looking at what we can do as Americans to support our fellow citizens and the steps that we can take to build more resilient infrastructure in the wake of such devastating natural disasters. Each

and every American shares in the responsibility to face these natural disasters together as one nation, and we cannot afford to ignore entire segments of the population in the wake of these disasters.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in drawing attention to this year's catastrophic hurricane season that has severely impacted the Texas, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico this Hurricane Season.

The biggest challenge for residents of the 18th Congressional District is accessing the assistance that is available to them.

From getting rooms in hotels for those displaced by flood waters to finding Disaster Assistance Centers that are accessible—when so many cars were damaged by Hurricane Harvey flood waters.

This past Saturday, I joined with representatives from FEMA to provide critical information to Houstonians attempting to recover from the catastrophe of Hurricane Harvey.

Many of them are still waiting for home inspections and need answers regarding the appeals process and how best to utilize Home Inspection Teams.

I am calling on FEMA to create a new app to provide homeowners with instant status updates on the inspection process," said Congresswoman Jackson Lee. "This app should speed up the process of scheduling FEMA inspectors for a home visit if your home has not been inspected in more than 10 days.

This will help the many who are struggling to get their lives back in order.

This week, FEMA announced the creation of a new housing program under the Direct Housing Assistance Program, which allows FEMA disaster relief funding to go to individual homeowners or to local governments to provide housing. To be considered for this program, people must first register with FEMA at www.DisasterAssistance.gov.

Local government immediate disaster assistance housing options are as follows:

1. Multi-Family Lease and Repair:

Direct assistance to repair or improve existing multifamily housing such as apartments in order to provide more housing for survivors.

Properties must be three or more units, with each unit providing complete living facilities for cooking, eating, and sanitation. Hotels, motels, and extended stay hotels are not eligible at this time.

2. Direct Leasing:

Direct Leasing: Enables local governments to lease a property that typically would not be available to the public, such as corporate lodging.

Local government enters into the lease agreement on behalf of individuals or households. Various types of housing properties may be eligible.

Manufactured Housing Options (Mobile Homes and Recreational Vehicles):

Direct housing places manufactured housing units on private land or commercial pads.

Local permitting may apply.

There are conditions to receiving housing assistance, but no assistance will be available if an application to FEMA is not made.

It is problematic for constituents from the 18th Congressional District, when I know that 81,950 FEMA applicants have been rejected.

I know that tens of thousands are still displaced with over a 1 million cars having been destroyed by flood water it is difficult to get to the Disaster Recovery Centers.

I continue to work to get more Disaster Recovery Centers opened before the October 24, 2017 deadline to make sure that FEMA resources are as accessible as possible.

We know that site for housing must be suitable.

There will be Hauling and installation included only for those people who have applied for FEMA assistance and have been approved to receive assistance.

An inspection of the site to determine suitability will be scheduled.

Partial Repair and Essential Power for Sheltering (PREPS):

PREPS provides minor repairs to homes in locations with limited housing options.

For eligible properties that have incurred limited damage displacing individuals from their homes.

PREPS provides basic, emergency home repairs—not to include finish work.

3. Direct Assistance for Limited Home Repair:

Program provides partial repairs to homes with significant damages.

Program can include partial repairs to a damaged home where alternative housing is not available or is not cost-effective.

FEMA will determine eligibility for permanent housing construction on a case-by-case basis.

All other forms of housing assistance must be exhausted before the program can be considered.

Some Hurricane Harvey survivors are getting an extension to stay temporarily in hotels while they look for an alternative place to live. October 14 is the new checkout date for the Transitional Sheltering Assistance (TSA) program, which pays for short-term hotel stays.

All applicants for FEMA recovery assistance have the right to appeal if they are dissatisfied with FEMA's determination letter. All appeals must be in writing and explain the reasons why FEMA's decision may not be correct. The appeal should include any documentation that FEMA requests or that supports your claim. Appeals can be submitted via computer by opening a Disaster Assistance Center (DAC) account at www.disasterassistance.gov.

In addition to all of the needs of family are the needs of small businesses who are going to be instrumental in rebuilding our communities.

I will soon introduce a bill to provide grants of up to \$100 thousand to qualified small business owners to help them with Hurricane Recovery.

I thank my Colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus for joining in this Special Order and I look forward to our efforts to meet the needs of people who are impacted by this hurricane Season.

I would also like to include in the RECORD an article from Vox regarding climate change:

[From vox.com, Sept. 28, 2017]

ONE OF THE CLEAREST SIGNS OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN HURRICANES MARIA, IRMA, AND HARVEY WAS THE RAIN

Warmer temperatures are increasing the energy and moisture available to hurricanes.

The intensity of Hurricane Maria, which made landfall on Puerto Rico as a Category

4 storm on September 20, was part of why it was so devastating to the island and its weak infrastructure, leaving Puerto Ricans in a humanitarian crisis.

But this year's intense Atlantic storm season had another element tying its biggest events together: a monstrous, and sometimes deadly, amount of rain.

Images of the flooded metropolises of Houston, Jacksonville, and San Juan with overtopped dams, billowing sewage, and flooded homes show that torrential rain can be one of the most devastating consequences of hurricanes, especially in urban areas where concrete makes it harder for water to drain and where people can drown.

Scientists say the extreme rainfall events that feed these floods are on the rise for many parts of the world, and this year's hurricanes fit that trend. In particular, rising temperatures in the ocean and the air alongside booming construction in vulnerable areas are fueling the increased risk from massive deluges.

Of the seven hurricanes this year so far, Harvey, Irma, and Maria stand out not just for the amount of rain they dropped, but for how fast they dished it out.

WHY HURRICANES UNDER WARMER CONDITIONS CAN DUMP SO MUCH RAIN

Downpours go hand in hand with hurricanes, since the cyclones are powered by evaporating and condensing moisture.

Warm ocean waters provide the fuel for hurricanes, and warm air causes the water to evaporate. This moisture-laden air then precipitates as rainfall during a hurricane, dissipating the heat energy from the water.

"Tropical cyclones are very, very good at converging a whole lot of heat in one place at one time," said Kossin.

Air can hold about 7 percent more water for every degree Celsius increase in temperature, Kossin explained.

That means warmer air and warmer water could lead to larger, more intense hurricanes, which in turn lead to more rainfall. (The Saffir-Simpson scale only accounts for windspeed, but precipitation is closely linked to a storm's intensity.) Scientists are studying these links to understand how future storms will respond to these conditions.

"Hurricanes live and die by the amount of rainfall they make out of moisture," said George Huffman, a research meteorologist at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center.

But where that water lands depends on the speed and the course of the storm, and not all areas are equally vulnerable.

"We know that in particular that [the regions around] Houston, Louisiana, and Florida are prone to some of the most extreme precipitation events in the United States," said Sarah Kapnick, a researcher at NOAA's Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory. "We do see signs of precipitation extremes increasing in these regions."

It's challenging to make direct comparisons between extreme rainfall events since their weather systems (e.g., hurricanes, thunderstorms) behave differently, so scientists draw on several benchmarks depending on the situation.

These include the peak rate of rainfall, total volume of rain, the three-day average rainfall, and the maximum depth of rainfall. And all of these are separate from flooding, which is governed by local geography and how people use land, in addition to the rates and total amounts of rain.

"There is a difference between a 100-year rain event versus a 100-year flood event," Kossin pointed out.

HARVEY WAS ABLE TO DUMP AN EXTRAORDINARY QUANTITY OF RAIN BECAUSE OF HOW IT HELD STILL OVER HOUSTON

Hurricane Harvey hovered over the Gulf Coast in late August and dumped 33 trillion gallons of water on US soil, according to some estimates, and is now the wettest storm in US history.

"When a storm stalls, that has more to do with the larger scale flow fields it's sitting in," said Kossin. "That was just very, very bad luck."

The total volume of rain is easier to calculate when a storm remains over a fixed area, but it much harder to suss out when hurricanes remain mobile and dump water over a wide swath of land and ocean.

NASA's satellite measurements reported rainfall rates from Harvey as high as 5.8 inches per hour (meteorologists define "heavy rain" as greater than 0.3 inches per hour), while the National Weather Service showed that a ground-based rain gauge in Nederland, Texas, reported 60.58 inches of rainfall, a new record.

Meteorologists still have to vet this number, but if confirmed, it would best the previous record—52 inches in Hawaii from Hurricane Hiki in 1950—by 8 inches.

The US Geological Survey reports that flooding causes an average of \$6 billion in damages and 140 fatalities each year. And this year was not an average year, with Harvey alone costing upward of \$180 billion and killing more than 75.

The waters from flooding can linger for days, causing injuries, spreading disease, and hampering relief efforts. The majority of Harvey's victims drowned after the storm, while others were delayed from life-saving care. In one case, a woman died from a flesh-eating bacterial infection after falling into the festering Harvey floodwater in her house.

IRMA'S PEAK RAIN WAS OVER CUBA

Hurricane Irma, meanwhile, set a record for its sustained intensity.

"Irma was a complete standout: 185 mph and stayed there for a day and half," Kossin said. "These storms do not stay there that long."

This intensity was matched with a firehose of rain, dumping water at 10.8 inches an hour, reaching depths of 20 inches in Cuba and 15.8 inches in Florida.

The downpour led to flooding from 23 rivers and creeks in Central and North Florida, forcing highways to close. The state reported at least seven deaths from drowning.

In Cuba, Irma's storm surge overtopped the Havana seawall, while unrelenting rain turned the capital's streets into rivers, killing at least 10 people.

MARIA TOOK DIRECT AIM AT PUERTO RICO AND THEN REGAINED STRENGTH

With tropical force winds reaching 230 miles from its center, Hurricane Maria completely engulfed Puerto Rico as it bisected the 100-mile wide island, picking up steam again one it was clear.

Satellite measurements already show that it poured as much as 6.44 inches of rain per hour and has left Puerto Rico shrouded in darkness.

The Cordillera Central mountain range that forms the spine of the island of Puerto Rico acted as a juicer for Hurricane Maria, Huffman explained.

Perhaps the worst blow from Maria was the 150 mph winds that knocked down 80 percent of the island's power transmission lines and 85 percent of its cellphone towers, leaving people in the dark and struggling to contact each other. But the flooding from rainfall

has been a hazard too, including threatening to breach Guajataca Dam in the Western part of the island, forcing hundreds to evacuate.

At least 18 fatalities have been reported in Puerto Rico so far, including two police officers who drowned.

THE CLIMATE SIGNAL IN DELUGES LIKE THESE IS EMERGING

No single weather event—even an extreme one—can be “caused” by climate change, as Vox’s David Roberts has explained in detail. And when talking about hurricanes, researchers are quite hesitant to even estimate how much climate change is to blame. Huffman said he’s not yet sure if this storm season is “unprecedented” in its ferocity.

However, rising average temperatures are definitely an important element of huge storms like Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Warmer temperatures are driving sea level rise, which is increasing risks from the storm surges that often herald hurricanes.

Increasing heat is also warming up the ocean, and hotter air holds onto more moisture, increasing the available energy for hurricanes.

And independent of cyclones, extreme rainfall events are on the rise.

Kapnick noted that even individual rain storms can be overwhelming, like storm that drenched Baton Rouge last year with 31.39 inches of rain and three times the volume of water of Hurricane Katrina throughout Louisiana in 2005.

As the chart below shows, the amount of rain from a once-in-every-30-years rainstorm like the one that immersed Baton Rouge has gone up due to warming:

“In this region where we have known precipitation extremes, we have been able to detect an increase in precipitation extremes due to a warming climate,” Kapnick said.

And scientists are getting better at figuring out when the torrential downpours are coming.

“If you pay attention, we’ve had a really remarkable series of forecasts,” said Huffman. “For Irma, we knew four to five days in advance that there would be a sharp right turn. Twenty years ago, you wouldn’t have dreamed of doing that.”

“Everything we see is consistent with what we expect climate change to do,” Kossin said.

INSTRUMENTS SOMETIMES CAN’T STAND UP TO THE EXTREME WEATHER THEY’RE TRYING TO MEASURE

Huffman explained that researchers aim to combine different instruments to get a robust handle on rainfall.

“The gold standard is rain gauges because they physically collect the rain,” said Huffman.

The next option is ground-based radar, which covers a wider swath of the weather than rain gauges, but less directly measures rain.

But take a look at what happened to a weather radar station in Puerto Rico:

This illustrates part of the challenge of attaching numbers to extreme weather events. Many of the systems used to track them are also vulnerable to them, leaving only indirect figures and estimates.

What’s more, both rain gauges and ground-based radar have limited ranges, leaving vast stretches of ocean where hurricanes spend most of their existence unmeasured. And when a hurricane does make landfall, gales can knock them down.

“We don’t really have anything on the surface [of the ocean] to tell us the details,”

said Huffman. “When the chips are really down, sometimes satellites are the only choice.”

That means the full accounting for the rainfall from Harvey, Irma, and Maria could take months to deliver as meteorologists piece together their models with the measurements they have.

However, scientists are eagerly waiting for the dust to settle so they can confirm their suspicions about the record-breaking storms this year. The American Geophysical Union added a last-minute session for researchers to present their findings on Harvey and Irma at their December meeting.

“There’s going to be a tremendous amount of research coming out in the next few months,” Kapnick said.

HONORING HELEN SMITH, POW ADVOCATE, ON HER 91ST BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), my colleague.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to speak on behalf of a person I have come to know and love. In fact, the First District of Texas has been blessed to be the home of many remarkable individuals who have gone above and beyond to serve others in Texas and throughout the world.

It is indeed a privilege to honor a woman from Longview, Texas, who has dedicated her life to serving and providing comfort for our Nation’s veterans, particularly our prisoners of war. Her name is Helen Smith, and October 5 of this year marks her 91st birthday.

Helen’s caring for our Nation’s POWs began with her husband, Gordon Smith, a survivor of the Bataan Death March in 1942 and a POW until the end of World War II.

Throughout her long and happy marriage to Gordon, Helen gained a personal understanding of the struggles many of our veterans and former POWs endure; but armed with the knowledge of what our veterans and former POWs face on a daily basis, Helen set out into the world to help as many of our veterans as she possibly could. She spent countless hours in VA facilities ensuring veterans, young and old, got the care they so desperately needed and deserved.

Helen has walked the Halls of Congress advocating for our veterans and former POWs throughout her life. She is a driving force and was behind Public Law 97-37, which improved VA benefit programs for former POWs.

Helen is not slowing down even at her age. At 90, Helen would head over to the Longview Community Based

Outpatient Clinic every morning at sunrise. She would make a pot of coffee and spend her day talking to veterans, giving them a sympathetic ear and helping them through the VA process.

It is a distinct privilege to recognize such a remarkable woman, to thank her for her tireless service to our veterans and former POWs, and to wish her a very happy 91st birthday.

Her accomplishments are recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

I do thank my friend from Virginia for yielding.

□ 2115

Mr. GARRETT. Much has been said recently about the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and specifically how in this land of the free we have the prerogative to do as we choose in matters that manifest themselves, as communication that we can speak freely even when that speech is objectionable to some.

And many people who have been fortunate enough to be amongst the 1 in 1,300 high school football seniors to take the field on a Sunday at an NFL stadium have availed themselves of this right that was given to them by people greater than themselves, perhaps who shed their very lifeblood that they might make a decision not to stand for the anthem that embodies the gratitude for that sacrifice.

Brian Tracy once said: “Develop an attitude of gratitude and give thanks for everything that happens to you, knowing that every step forward is a step towards achieving something bigger and better. . . .”

More recently, an individual said: “If you were successful somebody along the line gave you some help. There was a great teacher somewhere in your life. Somebody helped to create this unbelievable American system that we have that allowed you to thrive.”

Later in that speech, President Obama said, “So if you have a business, you didn’t build that,” someone did it for you. And he was roundly excoriated, but at some level he acknowledged the sacrifice of so many that compels me to stand here today to ask that when the national anthem of the United States of America is played, that you demonstrate some semblance of gratitude for the sacrifice that has been given by untold millions before you that allows you the prerogative not to stand.

And so should you choose not to stand, I support that right. I believe that right is fundamental to what makes us Americans, but I implore you to learn the history of our Nation that allows you the right not to stand, for, to be certain, there are places in the world, North Korea, where choosing not to stand when the anthem is played might lead to a horrible demise.

Gilbert Chesterton once said: "One sees great things from the valley; only small things from the peak." And the French political philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville said: "The greatness of America lies not in her being more enlightened than any other Nation, but rather in her ability to repair her faults."

And so when a slaveowner named Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, he talked about how all people were created equal, despite his inherent flaw or flaws, and when the preamble to the Constitution was hammered out, the Founders suggested that we should strive not to be a perfect union but a more perfect union by acknowledging that, in fact, where there are humans in charge, we will never achieve perfection.

Tonight, I ask your indulgence, if you tuned in at home completely by accident, for a moment to learn about how lucky we are, regardless of the circumstance of our birth, compared to our peers across the globe, to have the opportunity to live in this, the greatest Nation in the history of mankind, and how standing for an anthem that honors an imperfect nation that continually strives for perfection is not only the right thing to do, it is the only thing to do if you understand the scope of the sacrifice of those who came before us.

Imperfect people like Thomas Jefferson gave us near perfect documents. And so tonight, as my vehicle to discuss why we should stand for our anthem, I will choose the district that I am honored to have the opportunity to serve, Virginia's Fifth District. I will say, in all humility, that while I am ordinary, the district is great; that the Fifth District of Virginia is, in my humble opinion, without hyperbole, the greatest congressional district in the country. And I will give you ten reasons why I hope the next time the anthem is played you will stand and think with reverence upon those who made sacrifices that gave us the opportunity to live in the greatest land humanity has ever seen.

In 1743, born in the Fifth District of Virginia was this very man, Thomas Jefferson. An imperfect man who had a thirst for knowledge and said, "I cannot live without books," and continually sought to understand what might be perfected as it related to government amongst men, and in the Declaration created a document which was the first message that a fledgling nation held out to the world to say: This is who we are.

And he said, in that document, that all people were created equal; a concept that this Nation did not arrive at in reality by virtue of slavery and things like the failure to grant women suffrage for some 150 years, nearly, later.

However, a charge to work towards a more perfect union, that was contained

in the document, the Constitution, overseen by James Madison also of the Fifth District of Virginia.

And so while we were imperfect, we were given the greatest and most noble of goals, and that is to strive to be more perfect.

So the vision of Jefferson outlined in the Declaration and expanded upon James Madison in the Constitution, and later articulated in this town, Washington, D.C., by Dr. King when he said that we should judge individuals based not on the color of their skin but on the content of their character, it was borne in the hearts and minds of imperfect people from the Fifth District of Virginia who gave us near perfect documents.

In 1819, another of Mr. Jefferson's visions came to fruition with the foundation of the University of Virginia, a leading public research university and the source of incredible scholarship on things like human rights and individual liberty and natural law and the freedoms that individuals are bestowed by virtue of the Nation in which we live, again, in the Fifth District of Virginia.

Fast forward to 1865, the end of the bloodiest era in our Nation's history internally, a conflict as we moved towards a more perfect union, in which if you count disease and dysentery and starvation, along with combat deaths, over a million Americans gave their lives as we worked to become a more perfect union. And we know but a small fraction of a percentage of those people's names.

And we know that Abraham Lincoln took a bullet by someone who was not willing to accept that progress meant acknowledging that Jefferson's words were true, as they were later manifest by Dr. King, once again, 53 years ago in August in this city.

Fast forward to 1933 and the 21st Amendment repealing prohibition, Franklin County, Virginia, dubbed the wettest county in America. And as we watched as jobs left the Fifth District of Virginia and opportunity seemingly left with them, we saw a wellspring of opportunity and economic development in the form, ironically, of wineries and distilleries and breweries. So when Burlington and Broyhill and Bassett and Lane and Dan River Mills left, distilleries and breweries and wineries crept in. It started in Franklin County, Virginia.

Fast forward to 1944, Bedford, Virginia, June 6. The Allied invasion of Normandy, D-day. The Town of Bedford lost more of her sons per capita than any other town in the United States—19 in one day, more than decimating an entire graduating class and removing the best and brightest from that small Virginia locality.

Notably, three other young men from Bedford died later in the Normandy campaign, bringing the total Bedford

KIA during Normandy to 22. And ironically, these men died serving in the Blue-Gray 29th Infantry Division, so named because it honored the fact that it brought soldiers from both sides of the Mason-Dixon line together to fight and bleed and die to free foreign women and men whom they had never met.

Fast forward to 1951, Prince Edward County, Virginia, the hamlet of Farmville. Barbara Johns, a high school student, had an uncle who was a scholar, who discussed with her and her family over the dinner table the ideas expanded upon by Jefferson and the Declaration, and suggested that, indeed, all people were created equal. And this manifests itself through Barbara Johns in action. This teenage girl looked at the school that she attended, the Moton High School, and looked across the county to the all-White new high school and understood that if all people were, indeed, created equal, as her uncle had suggested as was written by Jefferson, then it was unfair that court cases like *Plessy v. Ferguson* that any law that said that separate but equal was anything close to a possible theoretical reality must be struck down.

Now, I have passed by other residents of the Fifth District of Virginia. Patrick Henry, for example. John Marshall, for example. But back to Henry. Henry stood before the American Revolution and said: "I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." And from the back of the room someone shouted: Treason. And Patrick Henry responded, "If this be treason, make the most of it," acknowledging that to do something great that he believed in he might need to die.

Barbara Johns did that very same thing on April 23, 1951, when she led a walkout of Moton High School demanding an end to separate but equal segregation in Virginia, thus sparking the civil rights movement in Virginia that also can look to its forbearers and see Booker T. Washington, a civil rights leader amongst the last generation of African-American leaders born into slavery. His vision began to culminate when Johns led the student walkout in Prince Edward County that led to desegregation at the very risk of her life.

Now, I like to liken Johns to Patrick Henry, both of whom are heroes of mine, as two people who were willing to stand up and do what they thought was right regardless of the fact that it, quite literally, might cost them their lives. They might die. But I tell people when I speak to them, the difference between Patrick Henry and Barbara Johns is Patrick Henry was a 37-year-old attorney trained to speak in front of people, and Barbara Johns was a teenage girl, and this happened in America as we worked to become a more perfect union.

Fast forward to Pittsylvania County, where Deborah Coles, another hero of

mine, was born one of eight children to a tobacco sharecropper. Growing up in a Virginia where racism was far too evident and common, Deborah Coles bucked the odds, learned a work ethic from her mother and father, became the first in her family to attend college, attending Virginia State University, and later going on into public education where she was and is an educator and an administrator in the small town where I went to high school and where she had undoubtedly touched the lives of innumerable thousands of students over the decades—finding ways to say yes, finding means to encourage thought, finding ways to stimulate young minds. And she did this despite the ridiculous challenges faced by her forbearers, and she did it here as we worked to become a more perfect union in America.

Fast forward to the 21st century. Servicemembers, not unlike their brethren from Bedford who fell on June 6 at D-day, just a handful of the sacrifice from the Fifth District of VA, 1-435th of our Nation.

Humayun Khan, a graduate of the aforementioned University of Virginia, who, at risk to himself, moved his soldiers away and sought to determine whether or not a vehicle approaching the point where he was working was a threat, and ultimately, in protecting those with whom he served, gave his life wearing the uniform of a nation to which his parents had immigrated.

□ 2130

Sergeant Andrew Crabtree, a Special Forces soldier who served multiple tours defending America in the global war on terror and recently passed to the next life from a cancer deemed to have been service-related.

And Seaman Dakota Rigsby, the son of working class folks from Fluvanna County, Virginia, in the Fifth District, who tragically perished while wearing the uniform of this Nation, defending that which is worth defending, aboard the USS *Fitzgerald*.

Then, moving to today, and reason number 10, although, to be fair, Booker T. Washington, Patrick Henry, and John Marshall could make this 13 if I counted them separately, and that is the families of Pastor Hassan and Abdumawla, Christians from the Republic of Sudan, who, after about 9 months of work on our part and about 18 months of imprisonment on the part of the two gentlemen I named, have now moved to Buckingham County, Virginia, where they have an opportunity to experience a land where they are free to stand or sit when the anthem is played, where they are free to worship or not worship as they feel compelled, and where no dream is too big.

I would wager that, having lived in a foreign land and not having been amongst those 1 in 25 or 26, roughly,

fortunate enough to have been born here in this imperfect land perpetually seeking to be a more perfect Union, I would wager that, when our national anthem is played, these newest residents of Virginia's Fifth Congressional District will choose to stand. I hope, when you think of the sacrifices made by millions who came before us, that you will, too.

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

RECOGNIZING THE RESILIENCE OF FLORIDIANS AND FIRST RESPONDERS AFTER HURRICANE IRMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) until the hour of 10 p.m.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the resilience of my fellow Floridians, to thank our men and women in uniform, including our State and local first responders, and to recognize our State and local leaders for the tremendous aid and direction they gave to all of our fellow Floridians during their response to Hurricane Irma.

We normally think of men and women in uniform as those who defend our country abroad, but they also deserve our recognition and thanks for their service on the homefront as well.

The Florida Army National Guard, the United States Coast Guard, the Navy, and many others aided our State before, during, and after the storm. In fact, I witnessed National Guard units from various States working together with the Florida National Guard to rescue citizens of northeast Florida.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Coast Guard did an incredible job carrying out hundreds of rescues, and I commend U.S. Coast Guard Commandant Zukunft, Captain Wiemers of Port Jacksonville, and all of their men and women who risked their lives to save others during and after the storm.

I also want to recognize all of the first responders, police, and firefighters who responded quickly and saved so many lives. As an example, the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office, in 1 day, rescued more than 350 of our citizens.

I also want to commend Governor Rick Scott and our State agencies for the advanced planning that they did leading up to Hurricane Irma and the recovery efforts that are still going on.

In northeast Florida, we experienced, historic flooding, levels not seen since 1846. That is the year after Florida became a State.

In St. Johns County, small businesses were flooded and homes literally toppled over into the ocean. Many more still threaten to fall into the ocean, undermined by severe beach erosion.

In Nassau County, here, a week after the storm, areas of the county were still not accessible due to heavy flooding, and shelters were still open.

But throughout all of this, Mr. Speaker, I spoke with many local volunteers who had damage to their own homes but were out helping rescue other families. I even spoke with a retired coastguardsman who traveled to Nassau County from Virginia to serve with the Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, the Florida delegation in this House is now unified to ensure that Floridians receive the Federal support they need to recover from this horrible natural disaster, Hurricane Irma.

I especially want to recognize Senator MARCO RUBIO and Florida Representatives AL LAWSON, NEAL DUNN, TED YOHO, RON DESANTIS, STEPHANIE MURPHY, VAL DEMINGS, and DARREN SOTO for coming to see, firsthand, the damage to our First Coast community.

I also want to thank the congressional leaders from around the country for coming to northeast Florida. Speaker PAUL RYAN, Appropriations Chairman RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, and Chairman JOHN CARTER all personally toured our damaged communities, leaving us with a promise to do all they can to assist in Florida's recovery. I thank them for the support, and I am grateful for their work to quickly provide emergency aid to help hurting Floridians.

We are all also heartbroken that, now, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are enduring incredibly devastating damage from Hurricane Maria. We believe it is important that we share resources with our neighboring islands.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Port of Jacksonville is ground zero for getting shipments of needed goods to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In fact, the American Maritime Partnership and the entire U.S. maritime industry are, in fact, first responders in times of emergency like Irma and Maria when they strike Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I am proud of what the American maritime industry has accomplished. They have been working tirelessly around the clock to get goods to those who are in need. Almost immediately, there were 10,000 containers delivered; 35,000 pounds of cargo, were delivered by TOTE and Crowley of Jacksonville. And as we know, distribution has been the challenge.

Our prayers go out to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and we are prepared to stand by them as they face the daunting task of rebuilding their communities. We will continue to work together with our State, local, and Federal officials to ensure that Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands can recover and build even stronger than before.

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

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 703 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 903), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Social Security Advisory Board to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Ms. Nancy Altman, Bethesda, Maryland.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of delayed flight.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family illness.

Ms. KAPTUR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. KIHUEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 3 on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

Ms. ROSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

Mr. SOTO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HARRIS, on Friday, September 29, 2017.

H.R. 2519. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

H.R. 3823. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2714. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); Public Law 110-161, Sec. 1517(b); (121 Stat. 2285); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2715. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Head Start Program (RIN: 0970-AC63) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2716. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Evaluation of the Graduate Nurse Education Demonstration Project: Report to Congress", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ww note; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 5509(c); (124 Stat. 675); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2717. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2718. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2719. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0809; Product Identifier 2017-NM-094-AD; Amendment 39-19030; AD 2017-18-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2720. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0560; Product Identifier 2016-NM-172-AD; Amendment 39-19028; AD 2017-18-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2721. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0529; Product Identifier 2016-NM-123-AD; Amendment 39-19044; AD 2017-19-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public

Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2722. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Ameri-King Corporation Emergency Locator Transmitters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6673; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-092-AD; Amendment 39-18978; AD 2017-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2723. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0339; Product Identifier 2016-NM-078-AD; Amendment 39-19042; AD 2017-19-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2724. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8177; Product Identifier 2015-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-19041; AD 2017-19-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2725. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0533; Product Identifier 2016-NM-156-AD; Amendment 39-19024; AD 2017-18-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2726. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0451; Product Identifier 2013-NM-253-AD; Amendment 39-19026; AD 2017-18-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2727. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0525; Product Identifier 2016-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-19033; AD 2017-19-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2728. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0808; Product Identifier 2017-NM-102-AD; Amendment 39-19027; AD 2017-18-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2729. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation Turbohaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0961; Product Identifier 2011-NE-22-AD; Amendment 39-19023; AD 2017-18-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2730. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31153; Amdt. No.: 3764] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2731. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31152; Amdt. No.: 3763] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2732. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31151; Amdt. No.: 3762] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2733. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0308; Product Identifier 2016-SW-083-AD; Amendment 39-19022; AD 2017-18-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2734. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Falls City, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9593; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ACE-12] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2735. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Arkadelphia, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0182; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASW-3] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2736. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; B/E Aerospace Protective Breathing Equipment Part Number 119003-11 and Part

Number 119003-21 [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0439; Product Number 2017-CE-010-AD; Amendment 39-19021; AD 2017-18-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2737. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mason, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0722; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-16] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2738. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0608; Product Identifier 2017-CE-017-AD; Amendment 39-19020; AD 2017-18-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2739. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Oskaloosa, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0296; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ACE-7] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2740. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31150; Amdt. No.: 3761] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2741. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pauls Valley, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0184; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWS-5] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2742. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Plains, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0165; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ACE-1] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2743. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Electric-Powered Vehicles: Electrolyte Spillage and Electrical Shock Protection [Docket No.: NHTSA-2017-0085] (RIN: 2127-AL68) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2229. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-337, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. CHENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 548. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-338). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2229 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3894. A bill to protect grizzly bear populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3895. A bill to promote the use of smart technologies and systems in communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Education and the Workforce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr.

PALLONE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 3896. A bill to require certain entities who collect and maintain personal information of individuals to secure such information and to provide notice to such individuals in the case of a breach of security involving such information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MAST, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of the Gold Star Installation Access Card to the surviving spouse, dependent children, and other next of kin of a member of the Armed

Forces who dies while serving on certain active or reserve duty, to ensure that a remarried surviving spouse with dependent children of the deceased member remains eligible for installation benefits to which the surviving spouse was previously eligible, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. HOLINGSWORTH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 3898. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to place conditions on certain accounts at United States financial institutions with respect to North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 3899. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 3900. A bill to amend section 510 of the Social Security Act regarding a youth empowerment program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself and Mr. SMUCKER):

H.R. 3901. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Challenge Grant Program to promote technological innovation in our Nation's cities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 3902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to small employers providing an eligible automatic contribution arrangement under a retirement savings plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 3903. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to expand the ability to use testing the waters and confidential draft registration submissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 3904. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules that require covered entities to secure sensitive personally identifiable information against a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota):

H.R. 3905. A bill to require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota, to provide for the renewal of certain mineral leases in such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3906. A bill to establish centers of excellence for innovative stormwater control infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infra-

structure, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 3907. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to create a classification that more accurately reflects the vital role of wildland firefighters; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3908. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to eligible entities to prevent or alleviate community violence by providing education, mentoring, and counseling services to children, adolescents, teachers, families, and community leaders on the principles and practice of non-violence; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3909. A bill to authorize the Gandhi-King Scholarly Exchange Initiative focusing on peace and nonviolence in global conflict resolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan):

H.R. 3910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make lifetime income and managed account options of defined contribution retirement savings plans portable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 3911. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to risk-based examinations of Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Move America bonds and Move America credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H. Res. 549. A resolution supporting the understanding that climate change is real; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H. Res. 550. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need for State legislatures to pass comprehensive sexual assault kit reforms by 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H. Res. 551. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the International Day of Non-Violence; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H. Res. 552. A resolution reaffirming the United States-Liberia partnership, and calling for free, fair, and peaceful elections in Liberia in October 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3894.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 3895.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3896.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 3897.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 3898.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(i.e. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States)

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 3899.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section I, which states "The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 3900.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 3—The Congress shall have the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States . . . and to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 3901.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:

H.R. 3902.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Amendment XVI.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, providing the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states."

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 3904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 8

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 3905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause), which confers on Congress the power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 3906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 3907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 57: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 103: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 184: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 247: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 299: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 308: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 354: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 371: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 472: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 535: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 544: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 564: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 620: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 644: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 669: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 681: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 685: Mr. O'HALLERAN and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 747: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 757: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 807: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COMER, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 812: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 820: Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 844: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 846: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GALLEGGO, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 866: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 909: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 927: Mr. EVANS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 980: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 997: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 1017: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1038: Mr. COHEN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1078: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1090: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. BERGMAN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1094: Mr. NADLER and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1148: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1164: Mr. HOLDING and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1171: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1225: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1251: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1267: Mr. EMMER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1276: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1316: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1368: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1406: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1450: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1456: Mr. COSTA and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1485: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1498: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1542: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1550: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 1552: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1587: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1612: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1651: Mr. DENT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1676: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1681: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1727: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1738: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1779: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 1824: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1832: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1861: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1891: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1896: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1953: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1993: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2059: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 2089: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2095: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2121: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 2147: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2148: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2232: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2285: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2309: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 2321: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2379: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2380: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2401: Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2408: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2418: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2434: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2451: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 2465: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2482: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2501: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 2505: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2550: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2556: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2584: Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LEE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2591: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 2599: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2603: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 2651: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2654: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2670: Ms. LEE, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2705: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2721: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 2723: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 2790: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2797: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2856: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2908: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KIHUEN, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2909: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2938: Mr. DENT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 2973: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BACON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 3030: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 3034: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 3042: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3053: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3139: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3145: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3199: Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3227: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3273: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 3274: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 3275: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 3285: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3303: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 3304: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 3329: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. COOK, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 3378: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 3380: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 3394: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3395: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 3441: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 3449: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 3459: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 3488: Ms. ROSEN.
 H.R. 3497: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DENHAM, and Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 3529: Mrs. LOVE.
 H.R. 3530: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3548: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 3605: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3652: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 3671: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3679: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 3692: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 3745: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 3758: Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 3770: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RASKIN, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 3784: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 3792: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 3824: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 3832: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 3833: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3840: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 3852: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 3857: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 3858: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 3859: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 3865: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 3866: Mr. ROYCE of California.
 H.R. 3876: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MENG, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 3879: Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 3887: Ms. GABBARD.
 H. J. Res. 48: Mr. LYNCH.
 H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. GALLEG0.
 H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. BASS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H. Res. 58: Mr. NADLER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 129: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H. Res. 142: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HECK, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 257: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H. Res. 274: Mr. BEYER.
 H. Res. 283: Ms. MOORE.
 H. Res. 318: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 359: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H. Res. 367: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H. Res. 401: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. CHABOT.
 H. Res. 464: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H. Res. 517: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H. Res. 528: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H. Res. 529: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PANETTA.
 H. Res. 535: Mr. KHANNA.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 36 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. CHARLES J. "CHUCK" FLEISCHMANN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish both the people of Taiwan and Americans celebrating Taiwan's National Day this October 10th a Happy Double Ten Day.

In the decades preceding and following the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, the United States and Taiwan have built a solid bond that cannot be broken—born out of our shared values and our cooperation with each other in times of crisis, and in times of advancement.

During the years, this key ally in the Asia-Pacific has transformed itself into a multiparty democracy which is a significant contributor to the global economy and humanitarian assistance. This is chiefly due to the hard work of the 23.5 million people on Taiwan, who value education, science, and progress. Americans share these values, which is why we have also contributed to Taiwan's success not only through our support and friendship, but through the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances, cornerstones of our relations with Taiwan.

In 2016, Taiwan ranked as the United States' 10th largest trading partner and 7th largest export market for U.S. agricultural products. Moreover, Tennessee's exports to Taiwan reached \$265.19 million in the same year. Taiwan is Tennessee's 7th largest export market in Asia. Tennessee companies have substantial opportunities to expand their business and cooperation with Taiwan. I will, together with Taiwan, work to find areas where we can partner to our mutual benefit.

This is a day to celebrate, and to be optimistic. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing ourselves to the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, and in wishing Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day.

HONORING ROBERT REESE

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert Reese, an outstanding constituent in my district on the Central Coast of California. Robert has served as the executive director for the Carl Cherry Center for the Arts for over 30 years. His dedication to preserving a vibrant artistic culture that pays homage to the traditions of the original artists' colony of Carmel, CA has served to make the central

coast a hub of innovative art and science. Whether it be through sculptures, paintings, concerts, poetry readings, recitals, or multimedia performances, the Center for the Arts has consistently provided the invaluable service of allowing residents the opportunity to see themselves, and their community, through a different lens.

Throughout his tenure as executive director, Robert has remained true to the founding vision of Jeanne D'Orge, who founded the Carl Cherry Center for the Arts in the 1940's. Famous for producing and hosting some of the world's greatest artists, poets, and writers since the turn of the 20th century, Carmel-by-the-Sea continues to nurture original art and new forms of theater, a wonderful public service that Robert has contributed to tirelessly over the past three decades. His keen eye for fully exploring the "ethos" behind any given piece of artistic expression is a gift that served him well at bringing the community the best kind of art—that which challenges our preconceived notions, and changes the way we think.

In addition to being an expert curator of fine arts, Robert is also a former journalist and award-winning writer. His writing earned him an anthology in the publication Best Spiritual Writing, and the Monterey County Cultural Arts Benefactor Award. A man of great civic virtue, he also regularly volunteers as a chaplain for the Monterey County Jail, and at the Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing Robert Reese for his many accomplishments and contributions to his community. In these polarized times, bringing people together in any way possible is of the utmost importance, and there is no better way to accomplish this than through appreciation of great art, whatever form that may take.

RECOGNITION OF DEPUTY LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS, ROBERT NEWLEN

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to rise today to recognize and commend the Deputy Librarian of Congress, Robert Newlen, who is leaving the Library of Congress after more than 43 years of distinguished service to accept a position with a private foundation.

Before being named Deputy Librarian last year, Mr. Newlen served as chief of staff, assistant law librarian in the Law Library, and held several leadership positions within the Congressional Research Service.

Mr. Newlen is literally an institution within an institution. He has provided exceptional lead-

ership and counsel across the Library of Congress since the mid-1970's and is admired and respected widely by his many colleagues and friends there. His knowledge, energy, and wisdom have enabled him to be an enthusiastic champion for the Library, both across the nation and the world.

It has been my honor to serve as Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress in the current Congress and in previous terms, and in those capacities I have always been impressed with Mr. Newlen's dedication to the world's premier library and his personal warmth and self-effacing manner. Robert Newlen is a classic example of what a public servant should be. I thank him for his service to the Library of Congress, to the United States Congress, and to the American people. He will be missed on Capitol Hill. I wish him well.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY J. WALZ

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for Roll Call Nos. 542 (on the passage of H.R. 3823), and 543 (on the passage of H.R. 2792). Had I been present, I would have voted No on both these votes.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 106TH NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. MIKE BISHOP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 106th National Day of the Republic of Taiwan (China), or the "Double-Ten" celebration. Since the signing of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), the United States and Taiwan have forged a strong partnership based on our shared values of democracy, freedom, and rule of law.

Over the years, Taiwan's economy has developed into one of the most innovative and advanced in the world. Taiwan has also proved itself to be a model of democracy in the Asia-Pacific region. The relationship between Taiwan and the United States is particularly strong when it comes to trade between the two countries, having created roughly half-a-million jobs in the United States. Taiwan's role and importance as a trading partner with the United States continues to grow every day.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to further strengthening our relationship to create even

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

more prosperity for our two countries. I stand ready to work with this administration in order to do so.

WE MUST ROOT OUT RACISM

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank my colleagues, for organizing this important special order hour and for their dedicated leadership in the fight to take racism and discrimination head on in America.

I'd also like to thank Chairman RICHMOND for his mighty leadership of our caucus as we work in resistance to this Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand with my colleagues in the fight to Root Out Racism from our society.

Our country was founded on the values of freedom, justice and equality.

Right now, those very same values are under attack from the highest levels of our government where the President of the United States and Republicans are openly embracing racist and discriminatory policies and actions.

As we speak the Trump Administration is actively supporting a Presidential Voting Commission which is rooted in voter suppression and racism.

As we speak, Attorney General Jeff Sessions is undoing consent decrees, funding private prisons and reviving the failed War on Drugs which is rooted in racism.

As we speak, this Administration is waging an all-out attack on affirmative action on campuses across the country which is rooted in racism.

As we speak, the President of the United States is being advised by individuals with ties to white supremacists, white nationalists and Neo-Nazis.

And to make matters worse, the President takes to Twitter nearly every morning to fan the flames of division and discrimination.

Choosing to tacitly speak out against racially motivated killings in Charlottesville but finding ample time to insult athletes who are protesting in solidarity with Colin Kaepernick.

Mr. Speaker, a recent NBC News/Wallstreet Journal poll found that 70 percent of Americans believe race relations in America are poor.

This should come as a surprise to no one. I am convinced that the public wants us to root out racism.

Attacks against communities of color seem to have no end under the Trump Administration. Racism, unfortunately is alive and well in the United States.

We need look no further than the devastating budget cuts Republicans have proposed which would disproportionately impact African Americans.

We must also acknowledge that systematic racism permeates these policies.

Last year then-presidential candidate Donald Trump asked African Americans what do we have to lose?

The answer is clearer than ever before: everything.

Critical programs that help the most vulnerable such as Meals on Wheels, heating and energy assistance, and nutrition aid to women and children are on the chopping block in the President's budget.

The President's budget eliminates: Community Development Block Grants; HOME programs that provide affordable housing for low-income residents; Legal Services Corporation, which helps those who cannot afford legal representation; and the Minority Business Development Agency, which helps promote minority-owned businesses.

And Republicans are determined to continue their crusade against the Affordable Care Act which would rip healthcare from millions of African Americans.

For over 50 years our progress as a nation has been measured by how we reckon with the remaining vestiges of slavery, how we root out racism when it rears its ugly head.

Administrations have been judged by their support for civil rights, voting rights, advances in health care, public education, social justice and strengthening ladders of opportunity to enter the middle for African Americans.

This Administration is failing on all accounts. That is why as the "Conscience of the Congress", Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have united to resist the rollback of progress.

We will resist this cruel hearted political agenda, which exudes racism at its core.

We will stand united in defense of our communities.

And we will exercise our God-given constitutional rights.

From Jamestown to Jim Crow, we've fought to root out racism in this country and we have won amazing victories.

So right now, despite the challenges we face with this President and Republicans in Congress, the Congressional Black Caucus will continue to fight.

Whether it's standing up to the alt right agenda in the White House or taking a knee in solidarity with courageous Americans, we will not lose heart in the fight to root out racism. Because in the words of that old negro spiritual, "We aint gonna let nobody, turn us around".

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PAUL'S LUTHERAN CHURCH

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize St. Paul's Lutheran Church of Troy, Illinois, on the occasion of its 150th anniversary.

St. Paul's had its beginning in 1864 when local Lutheran families first came together for worship. In 1865 a new church building was dedicated, which served both as a place to worship and as a school, and on January 25, 1867, St. Paul's Lutheran Congregation was officially established.

Since then, St. Paul's has had a strong presence in Troy. Whether by providing an elementary school education to its children, giv-

ing back to Troy through its community-based services, or simply ministering to its congregation, St. Paul's has been a focal point for the religious and spiritual needs of the community.

In the years since the first church building was dedicated, St. Paul's has undergone many changes: a second house of God was dedicated in 1888, German and English services began in 1900, an extensive remodeling occurred in 1938, and construction on the current church began in 1961. But what has not changed over the past 150 years has been the spirit of love and joy in God's work that first animated St. Paul's and is present in today's congregation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge an important milestone for St. Paul's Lutheran Church, and I wish it, and its pastor, the Reverend Michael Schuessler, the very best as they celebrate the church's 150th anniversary.

HAPPY DOUBLE TEN DAY (TAIWAN)

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish both the people of Taiwan and Americans celebrating Taiwan's National Day this October 10th a Happy Double Ten Day.

Our two countries' partnership has flourished thanks to a mutual commitment to democratic values and constitutional government. Taiwan has created a strong democracy, as evidenced by the six direct presidential elections the country has held since 1996 and the three peaceful passages of power from one political party to another in the wake of these elections, most recently in 2016. Taiwan now serves as a strong example of democracy for not only the Asia Pacific region, but also the world.

The strength of this bond has also been demonstrated most recently by a series of common initiatives. In August, our two nations collaborated on the launch of Taiwan's first domestically built satellite, the Formosat-5, and Taiwan signed letters of intent to purchase approximately 365 million bushels of U.S. grains in 2018 and 2019 worth almost \$3 billion. Additionally, Taipei pledged \$800,000 to relief efforts in the wake of Hurricane Harvey.

I applaud Taiwan's commitment to deepening ties with the United States, and the people of Taiwan should rest assured that Americans and this Congress share it.

This is a day to celebrate, and to be optimistic. I ask my colleagues to join me in recommitting ourselves to the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, and in wishing Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day.

RECOGNIZING PAWNEE UNITED
METHODIST CHURCH'S 165TH AN-
NIVERSARY

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize Pawnee United Methodist Church as they celebrate their 165th anniversary serving Pawnee, Illinois through ministry and service.

In 1852, Pastor Rev. A. Bradshaw established the first Methodist class in Pawnee, IL, where they met in a home of a member of the congregation. Five years later, the first Methodist church was built in what is now the heart of downtown Pawnee. By 1966, an additional space was needed to accommodate the growing congregation, thus a new sanctuary was built.

Pawnee United Methodist Church continues to serve the area with God's enduring blessings and faithful watch. The congregation's commitment to faith, service, and community embodies the virtues of true servants of God. I extend my sincere congratulations and gratitude to Pawnee United Methodist Church for all they have done and continue to do. May they continue to make disciples of Jesus Christ in the world.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind my colleagues that October 10th is Taiwan's National Day—also known as Double Ten Day. As this day approaches, I would like to congratulate the people of Taiwan, both on this occasion and on building one of the world's great democracies.

Over the past 30 years, Taiwan has come to embody the same principles we hold dear: constitutional government, democracy, freedom, and entrepreneurship. Through the democratization over the last three decades, Taiwan now serves as a strong example of democracy for not only the Asia-Pacific region, but also the world. Yet it is not just our commitment to democratic and constitutional values that ties our two countries together.

Taiwan and the United States have together faced a number of challenges, and have time and again displayed a steadfast commitment to one another's security and prosperity. The Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) was enshrined in 1979, and later supplemented by the Six Assurances given by President Ronald Reagan in 1982. The TRA and the Six Assurances form the cornerstone of our relations with Taiwan, and I would like to express my strong and continuing support for these foundations to our relations. I reaffirm it today, and again congratulate the people of Taiwan on this important occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF BEN ROSE
AND HIS SERVICE TO CABARRUS
COUNTY

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ben Rose on nearly a decade of service to North Carolina's 8th District as Cabarrus County Department of Social Services Director.

Originally from Raleigh, Ben received his undergraduate degree in biology at Campbell University and went on to finish his Master's in social work at Tulane University. Since finishing school, he has applied his education to community service and helping those who need it most. Ben has been an integral part of helping me assist our shared constituents and provide them with the best services possible.

Over the years, Ben has dedicated his life to furthering the state of North Carolina. He has served on the boards of the North Carolina Association of County Social Services Directors, Cabarrus County Mental Health Advisory, Cabarrus County Transportation Advisory, Cabarrus County Conflict Resolution and Teen Court, Cabarrus Literacy Council, and on the Advisory Board of the State Employees Credit Union. As you can see, Ben's servant heart never stops, no matter the day or time.

Residing in North Carolina, he and his wife, Brenda, have one daughter. Ben has shown immense dedication to his career and his family over the years. I am extremely grateful for Ben's service to our community and I wish him continued success.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring Ben Rose for his service to our community.

HONORING CHIEF DONALD R. OLIVER
ON THE OCCASION OF HIS
RETIREMENT

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend Donald R. Oliver as he retires as Chief of the City of Wilson, North Carolina Fire/Rescue Service located in my congressional district where he has led the department since 1992.

Chief Oliver began his firefighting career in Wichita, Kansas 50 years ago with the Wichita Fire Department. It was there that he met his wife Linda who worked at the Department as a fire-dispatcher.

After serving the people of Wichita as a firefighter, the two moved to Thornton, Colorado where Chief Oliver served as a firefighter for nearly 20 years and moved up the ranks first as Lieutenant, then Training Officer, Assistant Chief and ultimately Chief.

Mr. Speaker, in 1992, Chief Oliver moved to my hometown of Wilson, North Carolina and began serving as Chief of the Wilson Fire/Rescue Service. He is the longest serving

Chief of the Fire/Rescue Service in the history of our great City and I know I speak for residents of the City in thanking Chief Oliver for working day and night to keep us safe.

In addition to his duties as Chief of the City of Wilson's Fire/Rescue Service, Chief Oliver represented his fellow firefighters on the International Association of Fire Chiefs Fire Prevention Committee where he served as Chair. The worldwide association represents the leadership of firefighters and emergency responders. Chief Oliver served as President of the National Fire Protection Association from 1996 until 2004 and was a charter member of the National Society of Executive Fire Officers. He also was a member of the Board of Visitors for the National Fire Academy from 1996 until 2009.

Mr. Speaker, for a quarter century, Chief Oliver has led the City of Wilson Fire/Rescue Service. He has been responsible not only for protecting the lives of the residents of our City, but also those who served under his capable leadership. I am grateful for his work.

So on behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the residents of the First Congressional District of North Carolina, I thank Chief Donald R. Oliver for his enormous sacrifices over his great career and wish him well as he retires from honorable service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 28, 2017, I missed Roll Call vote 543 on H.R. 2792, the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted Nay on Roll Call vote 543.

HONORING ZAGATHON

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Zagathon and the students of Gonzaga University who are associated with this annual event. Today, Gonzaga joins with more than 300 Miracle Network Dance Marathon programs across the country for Child Health Day.

In 2013, this event, formerly known as Gonzaga University Dance Marathon, set out to raise money for children in the community. In 2013, the group raised \$6,000 for Children's Miracle Network and last year raised an astounding \$76,000. This money stays in Eastern Washington, benefitting the Sacred Heart Children's Hospital in Spokane.

Past dance marathon events have provided Vein Finder devices for less painful IV starts and a vital piece of equipment for the NICU that prevents premature infants from having to be moved to receive lifesaving treatments. According to John Lauck, President and CEO of

Children's Miracle Network Hospitals, "the caliber of students who participate in Miracle Network Dance Marathon completely contradict the millennial stereotype. I appreciate the countless hours they contribute to this effort, the leadership skills they demonstrate throughout the process and the immense impact they have on local kids".

I applaud the efforts of the students of Gonzaga University for doing their part to raise money for some of the most vulnerable in our communities, our children.

TRIBAL HERITAGE AND GRIZZLY BEAR PROTECTION ACT

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, the Tribal Heritage and Grizzly Bear Protection Act will ensure continued respect for both the ecological and cultural values of the grizzly bear. It requires that conservation and management of the species is conducted in close consultation with federally recognized Indian Tribes, as many Tribes value the bear in ways that cannot be accounted for solely under Endangered Species Act (ESA) protections. Eagles have been recognized for their symbolic importance to our country and were protected by Congress under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, even after these species had recovered under the ESA. Similarly, grizzly bears are essential to the culture and history of our nation's Tribes and deserve strong protections.

The recent decision by the Department of the Interior to remove Endangered Species Act (ESA) protections from grizzly bears in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) remains controversial and is being challenged in court. While GYE grizzly bears have made significant progress towards recovery over the past forty two years, the population is still at risk of extinction from a suite of impacts, including habitat loss and fragmentation, climate change, decline of food sources, and human caused mortality. The best available science does not support the decision to delist the GYE grizzly bear population without putting in place strong safeguards to prevent population decline and maintain connectivity with other populations of grizzly bears. Removing protections reverses the progress that has been made over the last four decades under the ESA. Over 50 Tribal Nations stand in opposition to delisting and have raised concerns over the Department of the Interior's decision, particularly regarding the science, lack of transparency, and irreparable harm that delisting GYE grizzly bears would cause to Tribal sovereignty, sacred site protections, treaty rights, consultation mandates, and spiritual and religious freedoms.

To guarantee continued protection of all grizzly bears, the Tribal Heritage and Grizzly Bear Protection Act sets strong conservation standards for grizzly bears and their habitat. It bans trophy hunting and only permits the take of grizzly bears under a narrow set of circumstances: scientific or exhibition purposes,

religious purposes of federally recognized Indian Tribes, and protection of agricultural interests and public safety. Grizzly bears are important top predators and help maintain ecosystems by keeping grazing populations in check, which prevents overgrazing of key habitats. They are a critical component of our landscapes and should not be hunted simply for sport. Additionally, grizzly bears have already lost large expanses of their historic range and existing habitat should be protected against further destruction.

Human caused mortalities of grizzly bears are a key threat to the species, including aggressive predator control of grizzly bears. This bill prohibits non-discriminatory predator control measures, such as those used by many states, which may result in the taking of grizzly bears on U.S. public lands. The bill also increases annual funding for livestock loss prevention programs to add prevention of loss from grizzly bears; productive, precautionary measures like these can address human-grizzly interactions much better than indiscriminate measures that kill large numbers of grizzly bears and result in few positive outcomes.

Finally, this bill affirms Tribal sovereignty and spiritual and religious rights. The grizzly bear is considered an ancestor by many Native American cultures, celebrated in numerous ceremonies, and is a key part of environments that include sacred and historical sites. This bill recognizes the grizzly bear's significance by requiring consultation with Tribes before permitting grizzly bear take and before major federal actions that may impact bears or their habitat. It also adds Tribal members to the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee and creates a much needed process and management partnership for reintroduction of grizzly bears to suitable land of willing Tribes. Grizzly bears are a core part of Tribal heritage and healthy ecosystems, and it is critical to protect this remarkable species and the culture they embody.

CONGRATULATING TEAM USA ON THEIR SOLHEIM CUP VICTORY

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Team USA for their victory over Team Europe in the Solheim Cup.

Team USA includes our nation's best women golfers, and they took home the title for the second consecutive time by defeating Team Europe 16½ to 11½. The team was led by captain Juli Inkster and South Florida native Lexi Thompson, the third best female golfer in the world. The Americans went into the final day of the tournament with a five-point lead and they fought hard to maintain it. Important final day victories by veteran Paula Creamer as well as South Florida's own Christine Kerr helped seal the win for Team USA.

All the members of Team USA played well throughout the tournament, and I am happy to congratulate them again on this impressive accomplishment.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF SACRAMENTO CENTRAL SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 130th Anniversary of Sacramento Central Seventh-Day Adventist Church. As the church community gathers to celebrate this momentous occasion, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring this well-established congregation in Sacramento.

The Sacramento Central Seventh-Day Adventist Church began as only a handful of Sacramento faithful who would meet every week near 14th and I Street. The first meeting occurred on November 9th, 1881, and the group grew all the way into the twentieth century. The congregation was then joined by a pastor and started a series of moves and construction projects as the burgeoning community necessitated ever more space for worship. This journey culminated in 1973, when the building that serves as the Central Church was constructed along the banks of the American River.

The members of the Sacramento Central Adventist Church have worked tirelessly to better the world around them, both at their doorstep with a host of services to benefit their local community and across the globe through mission trips. Their generosity and moral courage have won them many adherents in the course of their 130 years in Sacramento, and their journey is far from over.

Mr. Speaker, as the congregation gathers in honor of the 130th Anniversary of Sacramento Central Seventh-Day Adventist Church, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring this staple of the Sacramento area and all it has provided to the community.

RECOGNITION OF DOUBLE TEN DAY, TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Double Ten Day, the upcoming national day of Taiwan.

Taiwan celebrates its national day every October 10th. As this special day approaches, I would like to wish the people of Taiwan and all Taiwanese and Chinese Americans a happy Double Ten Day.

These occasions remind us to reflect on our past successes and look forward with renewed commitment to what we may accomplish together in the days and months ahead.

The United States and Taiwan share a special bond, forged by mutual respect and a steadfast commitment to one another's security and prosperity.

Through the passage of the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 and the deliverance of the Six Assurances by President Ronald Reagan

in 1982, the United States and Taiwan cemented a strong friendship deepened by mutual strength in the face of hardship.

I believe the United States and Taiwan must continue to prioritize investment in defense capabilities that will secure its peace, but also want to recognize that the commitment to the bond between our nations extends to humanitarian support.

In fact, recently, officials Taipei pledged to donate \$800,000 to local governments and relief efforts in the wake of Hurricane Harvey, which touched the lives of thousands of Americans. Taiwan rose up and came to the aid of our struggling communities—showcasing Taiwan's leadership and dedication to its relationship with the United States.

I would like to extend thanks to President Tsai Ing-wen and the people of Taiwan for their generosity and friendship, and again wish them a Happy Double Ten Day.

**CELEBRATING THE LAUNCH OF
HABITAT FOR HUMANITY'S
SOUTHERN ADIRONDACK RE-
STORE**

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the opening of Habitat for Humanity's Southern Adirondack ReStore.

Habitat for Humanity has a long history of serving Northern Saratoga, Warren and Washington counties by providing affordable housing to those in need. In order to continue its mission, Habitat for Humanity is expanding its services to a new ReStore in Moreau, New York. At this location, Habitat for Humanity will sell furniture, appliances, home accessories, building materials and more for an affordable price. Habitat for Humanity's ability to offer these goods and services at the ReStore is made possible by the hard work of volunteers and donors throughout the community. By working on behalf of their neighbors, the volunteers of Habitat for Humanity continue to enrich the North Country community.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to thank Habitat for Humanity and its volunteers for providing an invaluable service to the North Country. We are grateful for Habitat for Humanity's commitment to this region, and look forward to the benefits that the ReStore will provide for years to come.

**CONGRATULATING THE 106TH
NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN**

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate President Tsai Ing-wen and the people of Taiwan as they celebrate the 106th anniversary of its National Day on October 10, 2017.

With the success of its sixth direct presidential election, Taiwan continues to serve as

a beacon of vibrant democracy in the Asia-Pacific region.

We just celebrated the 38th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) this past April. The TRA was intended by Congress to endure an important relationship between close friends and allies. I am heartened by the strengthening of ties that have taken place in recent years, from Taiwan's admission to the U.S. Visa Waiver Program in 2012, and the first visit of a Cabinet-level official since the Clinton Administration in 2014. The bond between the United States and Taiwan is stronger than ever.

Taiwan is also a great friend in times of despair. Following the recent devastation of Hurricane Harvey, Taiwan generously contributed \$800,000 for relief efforts. In 2005, after Hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans, Taiwan, by the same token, offered a helping hand and donated \$2 million.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating our friend, Taiwan, on this important occasion.

**CELEBRATING THE 15TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF PPL'S FUSE PROGRAM**

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to bring to the House's attention the 15th anniversary of FUSE, Pennsylvania Power and Light's employee business resource group for members of the LGBTQ community and their allies.

In 1920, eight Pennsylvania utilities came together to form the Pennsylvania Power and Light (PPL) Corporation. By 1928, the company—headquartered in the iconic PPL building in Allentown, Pennsylvania—would link with Philadelphia Electric Co. to form the world's first fully-integrated power pool.

For nearly a century, PPL has continued to grow and expand. Today, PPL services nearly 10 million customers in central and eastern Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and the United Kingdom. Furthermore, the company employs over 13,000 people.

PPL has demonstrated itself as an impressive business, based not only on its commitment to the greater Lehigh Valley and Pennsylvania's 15th District, but also on its commitment to its employees. The FUSE business resource group is a shining example of this commitment.

FUSE was founded 15 years ago to promote and provide an inclusive, considerate, and diverse work environment for PPL employees who identify as part of the LGBTQ community. The program allows LGBTQ employees and their allies to come together to tackle workplace projects and pursue meaningful professional development opportunities. Fifteen years removed from FUSE's founding, PPL's commitment to its LGBTQ employees was honored earlier this year when it was named a 2017 Best Place to Work for LGBT Equality by the Human Rights Campaign Foundation.

PPL is a valued member of Pennsylvania's 15th District and a respected corporate citizen,

powering our communities and providing good jobs and good wages to our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to offer my congratulations to the men and women of Pennsylvania Power and Light, on the 15th anniversary of the FUSE program's founding. May they continue to be champions of diversity and inclusion in the workplace.

**CONGRATULATING HAR SINAI CON-
GREGATION ON ITS 175TH ANNI-
VERSARY**

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Maryland was founded as a haven for freedom of worship, and our state is proud to be home to religious institutions and communities that enrich the life of our state and our country. One of those is the Har Sinai Congregation in Owings Mills. Founded on May 15, 1842, it is the oldest continuously operating Reform Jewish congregation in the United States. This year marks the 175th anniversary of its establishment.

Drawing on practices adopted by some of the first Reform synagogues in Europe, Har Sinai Congregation served a small community of immigrants first in Baltimore and later, as the community grew, in the suburbs. The synagogue's first leader, Rabbi David Einhorn, arrived in 1855 and became one of the central voices of American Reform Judaism in the nineteenth century. The 'Olath Tamid' siddur he published in 1856 went on to become a template for the Union Prayer Book later adopted widely by Reform congregations across the country. Rabbi Einhorn also preached against slavery, a courageous act to undertake in a Southern state where that horrific institution was still practiced. His abolitionism eventually led him to flee to Philadelphia in 1861, escaping a violent, pro-Confederacy riot in Baltimore during the Civil War.

Among the clergy who followed in leading Har Sinai Congregation was Rabbi David Philipson, an American-born scholar and theologian who led the community from 1884 to 1888. A member of the first graduating class of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, he would go on to become one of the most prominent Reform rabbis of his age, authoring books on history, theology, and literature while speaking out against anti-Semitism and, in his later years, the rise of Nazism. Today, the congregation is led by Rabbi Linda Joseph, a native of Australia and the first woman to lead the community, having taken up the pulpit there last year.

Now a congregation of more than 400 families, and with more than 200 students in its religious school, Har Sinai Congregation has become one of Maryland's most active and dynamic synagogues. With the mantra of 'worshipping together; caring together; working together,' its members are putting into practice the ancient Jewish precepts that call for social justice, charitable works, education, and community engagement. On Shabbat and holidays, congregants gather in worship and join

in liturgical song, led by Cantor Robert Gerber, as they continue the traditions of American Reform Judaism that Har Sinai Congregation helped establish.

I join in congratulating the clergy, lay leadership, and congregants of Har Sinai Congregation on reaching this milestone in the community's history, and I wish all of them a Shana Tovah U'Metuka—a sweet and happy new year for 5778.

CONGRATULATING THE CHINESE
AMERICAN MEDICAL SOCIETY

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Chinese American Medical Society as they host their 54th Annual Scientific Symposium and Annual Red Lantern Gala.

This year, CAMA is focusing on advancing women's health. Throughout its history as one of the most successful national Chinese American Medical Societies, CAMA has sought to eliminate health disparities for Chinese Americans and other underserved minority populations. Each year, the Symposium is an opportunity for many of medicine's most foremost experts to gather, collaborate and ultimately impact lives.

Their annual Red Lantern Gala is a chance to celebrate the ground breaking work of all those who have dedicated their lives to advancing health and well being for Chinese Americans. I'd especially like to salute this year's honorees: Dr. Anna Suk-Fong Lok with the 2017 CAMS Scientific Award, and Mr. Michael J. Dowling, Mr. Peter Lau and Dr. Wai Lap Leung with the Community Service Award.

I applaud CAMA for their unwavering dedication to improving health outcomes for Chinese Americans both in New York City and around the country.

RECOGNIZING REVEREND WILLIAM
GLUCK FOR FIFTY YEARS OF
DEDICATED SERVICE TO COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend William Herbert Gluck, fondly known as "Preacher Bill," of Andalusia for his fifty years of service to Community Baptist Church.

Preacher Bill was born on October 15, 1936 to William and Catherine Gluck, and grew up in Moline. After graduating from Moline High School in 1954, Preacher Bill enlisted in the U.S. Army, where he served for eight years. After leaving the Army in 1962, Preacher Bill served as a pastor for a short time in Georgia, and volunteered at Central Baptist Church in Moline before finally beginning his impressive

tenure at Community Baptist in Andalusia in October of 1967. In August of 1968, Preacher Bill married his wife, Carol, who sadly passed away in 2011. He has been blessed with six children, ten grandchildren, and one great-grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Preacher Bill once again for his dedicated service to Community Baptist Church over the last five decades. I wish him, his church, and his family nothing but the very best in all the years ahead.

RECOGNIZING CEDAR CREST
COLLEGE'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cedar Crest College on the occasion of its 150th anniversary. In 1867, Robert Emmett Wright—a distinguished lawyer and public servant in Lehigh County—envisioned a school which his daughters could attend. On July 12, he joined members of the Reformed Church leadership at Allentown's Zion's Reformed Church in putting a proposal forward to purchase property for Lehigh Female Academy, which would later become Cedar Crest College.

Classes were first held in September, with only eight students in attendance; however, in a year's time, attendance grew, and the school relocated to Clover Nook, at Fourth and Turner Streets. Its name was once again changed to Allentown Female College. Additional classrooms, a library, gymnasium, and a fully equipped art room were added to accommodate the increasing educational interests of the college's growing student body. In 1913, the school moved to its modern day location, and it officially became Cedar Crest College.

Today, Cedar Crest College remains committed to its original goal of providing higher education for women and preparing leaders for the increasingly global community. With a graduate and undergraduate count of over 1,500 students, Cedar Crest College provides a personable and high quality approach to education for local women and those in the nearby states of New York and New Jersey.

It is my honor to recognize the students and faculty who comprise Cedar Crest College on this momentous occasion. Cedar Crest students are both bright and capable, but it is their approach to leadership as service to the community and the world around them that really makes them shine. May they experience continued growth and success over the next 150 years.

COMMEMORATING THE 106TH
ANNIVERSARY OF TAIWAN

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the people of Taiwan on the 106th

anniversary of their republic, celebrated on October 10th. October 10th, known in Taiwan as "Double Ten Day", is revered by the Taiwanese people—just as Fourth of July is here in the United States. It commemorates the Wuchang Uprising, which triggered a revolution that led to the overthrow of China's imperial regime and the establishment of the Republic of China.

Since the Republic of China was founded on January 1, 1912, the people of Taiwan have developed a democracy of which they should be proud. They are our 10th largest trading partner, including more than \$200 million in purchases from my home state of Michigan. They are an economically and socially growing nation, that has recently implemented a single-payer National Health Insurance (NHI) system. This system is similar to legislation that I have been championing in the U.S. House for more than a decade, and which BERNIE SANDERS recently introduced in the U.S. Senate. I believe that America has much to learn from this work, and I am eager to see them succeed in guaranteeing their citizens a universal right to healthcare—a practice America would do well to follow.

I also want to commend the people of Taiwan on their success this past year, in which they inaugurated their first female president—a first not only for the island, but also the first woman elected head of state in Asia in her own right, who was not related to a notable male politician.

I want to congratulate my friends across the ocean and wish them a very happy 106th Double Ten Day.

CAPTAIN OSCAR MEDELLIN ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT FROM
THE CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exceptional law enforcement career of California Highway Patrol (CHP) Captain Oscar Medellin, who will retire on September 30, 2017.

After serving honorably in the U.S. Air Force, Captain Medellin was hired by the CHP in 1988. Captain Medellin worked in a number of capacities during his CHP career, which include the Inland Division Critical Incident Team, Inland Division Investigative Services Unit, and, most recently, Area Commander for Victorville.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate and thank Captain Medellin for his 28 years of service to the citizens of California. His professionalism and dedication to the profession of law enforcement reflects great credit upon himself and the California Highway Patrol.

**CELEBRATING 40TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE BLACK WOMEN'S TASK
FORCE OF TUCSON**

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the Black Women's Task Force of Tucson on the event of its 40th anniversary.

The Black Women's Task Force of Tucson organized with the mission of "educating and empowering women through support and networking for equality and success in the Tucson community." Serving as a bedrock of the Tucson community for four decades, it has met its mission statement and more.

The Black Women's Task Force of Tucson provides much-needed access to information on healthcare and business, as well as hosting events and providing a space to share stories with the Tucson community. Part of its community support is assisting local students through a variety of programs and scholarships.

For example, the Black Women's Task Force donated over one hundred computers to students in the Tucson Unified School District and sponsored student trips to Africa and South America with an academic focus. There have been many changes throughout the last 40 years; and many fights won in the pursuit of social and economic equality for women.

However, there is still much work to be done both in Tucson and throughout the nation. I know that the Black Women's Task Force will continue to be a positive force for change. I cannot emphasize enough the impact that this organization has had on the Tucson community.

From helping victims of domestic violence to feeding the hungry, the Black Women's Task Force has worked tirelessly to make our city a better place for everyone. I look forward to seeing the impact the Black Women's Task Force has on the next forty years. For that, it would be my honor to ask that the work done for the past forty years by the Black Women's Task Force be known to this Congress as a force for good in the City of Tucson.

**CONGRATULATING CORONADO
THEATRE ON ITS 90TH BIRTHDAY**

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the historic Coronado Theatre in Rockford, Illinois, on their 90th birthday.

The Coronado Theatre was built in 1927, and over the years it has hosted many legendary performers including Frank Sinatra, Bob Hope, Louis Armstrong, and more recently, Jerry Seinfeld.

Between 1999 and 2001 the theater underwent an \$18.5 million renovation, thanks to the support of the community, the City of Rockford, and Friends of the Coronado, a non-profit dedicated to ensuring the theater will continue

to be a community asset for all to use and share. The renovation preserved the theater's history while making much-needed improvements to ensure future generations would be able to enjoy all the theater has to offer. The Coronado Theatre's staff, Friends of the Coronado, and the entire Rockford community should be truly proud of this milestone birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to congratulate Coronado Theatre on this momentous birthday, and wish them much success over their next 90 years.

**HONORING THE LIFE OF
THURGOOD MARSHALL**

HON. NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include in the RECORD the following Proclamation to commemorate the extraordinary life of Thurgood Marshall and declare October 2, 2017 to be Thurgood Marshall Day in California's 44th Congressional District:

Whereas in 1940 while an attorney for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Thurgood Marshall won the case of *The State of Connecticut v. Joseph Spell*, which helped lay the groundwork for the Civil Rights Movement to come; and

Whereas Thurgood Marshall was the Chief Counsel in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954, the landmark Supreme Court decision that declared state laws establishing segregated public schools to be unconstitutional; and

Whereas the Honorable Thurgood Marshall, on October 2, 1967, became the first African-American appointed to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States of America; and

Whereas date of October 2, 2017, marks the 50th anniversary of this historic achievement; and

Whereas the legacy of Thurgood Marshall continues to serve as an example and inspiration to both individuals and groups that continue to fight for justice and equality for all throughout the United States of America: and Now therefore

I declare and hereby recognize October 2, 2017 to be Thurgood Marshall Day in the 44th Congressional District of California.

**IN TRIBUTE TO COLONEL
CHRISTOPHER J. BARRON**

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Colonel Christopher J. Barron upon his retirement from the Army Corps of Engineers.

For 27 years, Colonel Barron had dedicated himself to serving our nation with the Army Corps of Engineers. Colonel Barron, a native of Goshen, New York, was commissioned as

a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers in 1991. His overseas deployments include combat, reconstruction, and peacekeeping missions in Somalia, Haiti, Macedonia, Bosnia, and Iraq. In his last assignment, Colonel Barron served as District Commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in New England from July 31, 2014 to July 19, 2017. Prior to this post, Colonel Barron served as the U.S. Army War College's Visiting Defense Fellow at Queen's University in Ontario, Canada.

While serving as District Commander of the New England District, Colonel Barron had many accomplishments including dredging projects, navigation improvement, flood risk management, and environmental restoration. It was an honor to work with him on a wide array of dredging projects in my district and across the Connecticut coastline, and I will certainly miss his knowledge of and passion for water resource programs in our area. He was always accessible and open to input from my office which I greatly appreciated.

Please join me in congratulating my friend, Colonel Barron, on an impressive career of service with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and wishing him a wonderful retirement.

**IN HONOR OF PIEDMONT HIGH
SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM'S 500TH
WIN**

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the 500th win of the Piedmont High School Football Team in Piedmont, Alabama.

On December 1, 2016, Piedmont High School won the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 3A football state title for the second year in a row. The team's very first win was over Cave Spring High School in October of 1924 under Coach J.O. Ogle.

Piedmont High School's football team has had two All-American players, over 100 All-State players and 215 All-County players with six alumni players who have been inducted into the Calhoun County Hall of Fame.

Congratulations to Coach Steve Smith, the football team, Piedmont City Schools and all their loyal fans.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 500th win by the Piedmont High School Football Team. Go Bulldogs.

**CONGRATULATIONS TO THE
CARTHAGE LODGE 197**

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Carthage Lodge 197 on its 150th birthday. On the 7th of October, members of this Freemason lodge will gather to celebrate this landmark occasion.

The first organized Grand Lodge met in 1717 in England. Freemasonry has promoted a strong sense of pride, family values and intellectual development in its members over the centuries. Furthermore, Freemasonry has deep roots in the United States, with George Washington himself being initiated into Freemasonry in the year of 1752.

Freemasonry has been part of Missouri and the city of Carthage for generations. The Grand Lodge of Missouri chartered a lodge in Carthage, Missouri in 1849. In 1861 this lodge was destroyed, but no one is exactly sure how this lodge was destroyed. Most likely it was destroyed in the Battle of Carthage during the Civil War. In 1867, former members of the previous lodge and other Freemasons gathered to organize for the chartering of a new lodge to be located in the city. The current Carthage Lodge 197 was granted its charter on October 19, 1867. Members of the lodge meet in this location to this very day.

I am honored to recognize the 150 years of the Carthage Lodge 197 in southwest Missouri. This is truly a historical achievement. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating the members of Carthage Lodge 197 on its 150th birthday.

**HONORING MR. GORDON KLASNA
ON BEING SELECTED MONTANA'S
PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR**

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gordon Klasna on his recent selection as the Montana Principal of the Year by the Montana Association of Secondary School Principals.

Mr. Klasna has been principal of Lockwood's Eileen Johnson Middle School since 2011. Founded in 1954, it provides an education to over 1,250 students. Mr. Klasna is passionate about educating Montana's students and is a positive influence on his students. He is renowned as a hard worker who dedicates much of his time to his vocation. Mr. Klasna is a strong advocate for his school, serving on the School District 2 High School Trustee Board representing Lockwood.

Teachers and students at Eileen Johnson Middle School describe Mr. Klasna as a gracious, polite public servant who demonstrates his passion to help students every day. During his tenure as principal, Mr. Klasna has encouraged the growth of special elective courses to include robotics and journalism.

I wish Mr. Klasna the very best as he works to continue the pattern of excellence at Eileen Johnson Middle School. He is a great example of an educator going the extra mile to help our children succeed. I ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating Gordon Klasna on his outstanding achievement.

**EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES FOR
THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSE-
LESS MASS SHOOTING IN LAS
VEGAS, NEVADA**

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my condolences to the victims of the Las Vegas country music show mass shooting massacre.

I offer my deepest condolences to those personally affected by this cowardly act, and call for the restoration of federal law banning the sale and purchase of assault weapons and large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

On October 1, 2017 the deadliest mass shooting in the history of the United States occurred in Las Vegas, Nevada when, in a heinous act of terror and hatred, 58 persons were killed and 515 others were injured in a shooting at an outdoor concert near the Mandalay Bay Resort and Casino in Las Vegas.

Until yesterday, June 13, 2016 marked the deadliest mass shooting in the history of the United States in Orlando, Florida, when, in another heinous act of terror and hatred, 49 persons were killed at Pulse, a popular nightclub, meeting place, and sanctuary for Central Florida's vibrant and dynamic LGBTQ community; sadly, the Las Vegas mass shooting surpassed that dreadful shooting in numbers of dead and injured.

The horrifying events in Las Vegas on Sunday night mark the 273rd mass shooting in the U.S. in the 275 days that have passed so far in 2017, according to Gun Violence Archive.

Mass shootings are a near daily occurrence in America, but what happened in Las Vegas stands out: It was the deadliest such incident in U.S. history, with more than 58 killed and 515 injured.

Including that massacre, the four deadliest U.S. mass shootings have occurred over the past 10 years.

A mass shooting is defined by Gun Violence Archive as any incident in which four or more are shot and/or killed in a single event, at the same general time and location not including the shooter.

Recent U.S. mass shootings include:

1. Las Vegas, 2017: 50+ killed
2. Orlando, 2016: 50 killed
3. Virginia Tech, 2007: 32 killed
4. Sandy Hook, 2012: 27 killed
5. San Ysidro, 1984: 21 killed
6. San Bernadino, 2015: 14 killed
7. Edmond, 1986: 14 killed
8. Fort Hood, 2009: 13 killed
9. Columbine, 1999: 13 killed

There have been more than 11,600 deaths linked to gun violence so far in 2017, which is roughly equivalent to nearly four 9/11 attacks in terms of the total number killed on September 11, 2001.

Comparatively, more than 15 thousand were killed by gun violence in 2016, and there were 383 mass shootings.

It is horrifying to admit that gun violence now seems to be a staple of American life.

The United States ranks No. 1 in the world in terms of firearms per capita—with 88.8

guns per 100 people—and it has the highest homicide-by-firearm rate in the developed world.

The problem is so endemic that gun violence is now the third leading cause of death for children in the U.S.

An average of 1,297 children die annually from gun-related injuries.

Guns are linked to roughly 33 thousand deaths in the U.S. per year; about two-thirds of them are suicides.

According to Pew Research Center, a majority of Americans (across partisan lines) support gun policy proposals such as barring people with mental illnesses from buying guns; prohibiting gun purchases by people on federal no-fly or watch lists; and background checks for private gun sales and sales at gun shows.

The majority must cut its close ties to the powerful gun lobby to facilitate useful gun control legislation necessary immediately.

America has six times as many firearm homicides as Canada, and nearly 16 times as many as Germany.

United Nations data shows that America far and away leads other developed countries when it comes to gun-related homicides.

America has 4.4 percent of the world's population, but almost half of the civilian-owned guns around the world.

In December 2012, a gunman walked into Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, and killed 20 children, six adults, and himself.

Since then, there have been at least 1,518 mass shootings, with at least 1,715 people killed and 6,089 wounded.

The fairly broad definition of "mass shooting" includes not only shootings in which four or more people were murdered, but shootings in which four or more people were shot at all (excluding the shooter).

Even under this broad definition, mass shootings make up a tiny portion of America's firearm deaths, which totaled more than 33,000 in 2014.

On average, there is more than one mass shooting for each day in America.

Whenever a mass shooting occurs, supporters of gun rights often argue that it is inappropriate to bring up political debates about gun control in the aftermath of a tragedy.

For example, former Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal, a strong supporter of gun rights, criticized former President Barack Obama for "trying to score cheap political points" when Obama mentioned gun control after a mass shooting in Charleston, South Carolina.

But if this argument is followed to its logical end, then it will never be the right time to discuss mass shootings.

Under the broader definition of mass shootings, America has nearly one mass shooting a day.

So if Congress is forced to wait for a time when there is not a mass shooting to talk gun control, Congress could find itself waiting for a very long time.

States with more guns have more gun deaths.

Within the United States, a wide array of empirical evidence indicates that more guns in a community leads to more homicide.

Higher populations, more stress, more immigrants, and more mental illness does not correlate with more gun deaths.

States with tighter gun control laws have fewer gun-related deaths.

A 2016 review of 130 studies in 10 countries, published in *Epidemiologic Reviews*, found that new legal restrictions on owning and purchasing guns tended to be followed by a drop in gun violence—a strong indicator that restricting access to guns can save lives.

The good news is that all firearm homicides, like all homicides and crime, have declined over the past two decades—although that may have changed in 2015 and 2016, with a recent rise in murders nationwide.

There is still active debate among criminal justice experts about why this crime drop is occurring—but one theory that researchers have widely debunked is the idea that more guns have deterred crime—in fact, the opposite may be true, based on research compiled by the Harvard School of Public Health's Injury Control Center.

Although America's political debate about guns tends to focus on grisly mass shootings and murders, a majority of gun-related deaths in the U.S. are suicides.

Research that shows greater access to guns dramatically increases the risk of suicide.

The states with the most guns report the most suicides.

Perhaps the reason access to guns so strongly contributes to suicides is that guns are much deadlier than alternatives like cutting and poison.

Reducing access to guns can be so important to preventing suicides: stalling an attempt or making it less likely to result in death makes a huge difference—it opens the opportunity for someone to help or for the suicidal person to reach out to someone to help.

That is why limiting access to lethal means is so powerful.

Since police shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, on August 9, 2014, police have killed at least 2,902 people as of May 2017.

Given that states with more guns tend to have more homicides, it is not too surprising that, as a study in the *American Journal of Public Health* found, states with more guns also have more cops die in the line of duty.

Researchers looked at federal data for firearm ownership and homicides of police officers across the U.S. over 15 years.

They found that states with more gun ownership had more cops killed in homicides: Every 10 percent increase in firearm ownership correlated with 10 additional officers killed in homicides over the 15-year study period.

The findings could help explain why U.S. police officers appear to kill more people than cops in other developed countries.

For police officers, the higher rates of guns and gun violence in America means they not only will encounter more guns and violence, but they can expect to encounter more guns and deadly violence, making them more likely to anticipate and perceive a threat and use deadly force as a result.

Over the past 20 years, Americans have clearly shifted from supporting gun control measures to greater support of "protecting the right of Americans to own guns."

This shift has happened even as major mass shootings, such as the attacks on Columbine High School and Sandy Hook Elementary

School, have received more press attention.

Although mass shootings are often viewed as some of the worst acts of gun violence, they seem to have little effect on public opinion about gun rights.

That helps explain why Americans' support for the right to own guns appears to be rising over the past 20 years even as more of these mass shootings make it to the news.

Although Americans say they want to protect the right to bear arms, they are very much supportive of many gun policy proposals—including some fairly contentious ideas, such as more background checks on private and gun show sales and banning semi-automatic and assault-style weapons.

This type of contradiction is not exclusive to gun policy issues.

For example, although most Americans in the past said they do not support Obamacare, but most of them also said they like the specific policies in the health-care law.

On average, 7 children and adolescents lose their lives to gun violence each day, 75 percent of which are under the age of 12 years old.

So many people die annually from gun violence in the United States that the death toll between 1968 and 2011 eclipses the total lives lost in all the armed conflicts in the history of the United States.

On June 7, 2015, a gunman shot and killed nine people at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church Charleston, South Carolina, one of the oldest and largest black congregations in the South.

On November 11, 2009, at Fort Hood, near Killeen, Texas, a gunman shot and killed 13 people, and wounded 30 others.

On August 5, 2012 in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, a gunman shot and killed six people, and injured three others, at the Sikh Temple of Oak Creek.

On July 7, 2015 in Chattanooga, Tennessee a gunman shot and killed five people, including two U.S. Marines and a Naval Officer, and shot and injured two others at a recruiting center and U.S. Naval Reserve Center.

On December 2, 2015 in San Bernardino, California, two gunmen killed 14 people and injured 21 others at the Inland Regional Center.

On December 14, 2012, a gunman murdered 26 persons, including 20 children and 6 school administrators and teachers, at Sandy Hook Elementary in Newtown, Connecticut.

On August 8, 2015, a gunman brutally murdered his ex-girlfriend and her six children and husband in one of the most notorious cases of domestic violence in the history of Houston, Texas.

On April 16, 2007, a gunman killed 32 persons and injured 17 others at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia.

Mass shootings occur more frequently in states that do not require background checks for all gun sales.

Analyses of mass shootings in the United States between 2009 and 2015 document that the majority of mass shootings occur in venues where the carrying of firearm is not restricted.

In states that require background checks for all handgun sales, including guns offered in

unlicensed sales online and at gun shows, there are 52 percent fewer mass shootings.

Congress must take action to prevent other incidents such as the recent act of terror and hatred in Las Vegas, Nevada that resulted in the tragic loss of 58 innocent lives.

We extend our deepest sympathies to all those affected by this tragedy and recognize the skill and heroism of the law enforcement officers and first responders who came to the aid of others.

We commend the efforts of those who are working to care for the injured and investigate this horrific incident.

We extend our heartfelt condolences and prayers to the families of the fallen, and to all those affected in the community of Las Vegas and in the United States.

And I pledge to continue to work to reduce gun violence and prevent mass shooting.

HONORING THE ANACOSTIA COORDINATING COUNCIL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Anacostia Coordinating Council (ACC) on its 25th anniversary and the retirement of its chairman Arrington Dixon, for his service to the ACC and the District of Columbia.

Arrington Dixon took his 25th boat ride down the Anacostia River while retiring as chair of the ACC on Saturday, September 30, 2017.

A boatload of District of Columbia residents proudly celebrated the silver anniversary of the ACC boat ride and, particularly, the service of Arrington Dixon as chair of the ACC.

Arrington Dixon has led not only the ACC, but also the ACC's annual boat ride on the Anacostia River. This year's boat ride provided a unique opportunity to celebrate Ward 8 and the one-of-a-kind fellowship offered by the boat ride.

The boat ride also proudly celebrates its sponsoring organization, the ACC. The ACC has been deeply embedded in the life and work of the Ward 8 community since 1983, when it was founded to organize support for the Anacostia Metro.

Arrington Dixon was born in Anacostia. Unlike many civic leaders, Arrington Dixon has held important elected offices in the District of Columbia. He was a member of the first D.C. Council of the District of Columbia (1978–1979), representing Ward 4; chairman of the Council (1979–1983); and at-large member of the Council (1997). In 1995, he was appointed to the National Capital Planning Commission and remains on the Commission. After such distinguished service, most leaders often believe they have done their work. However, Arrington Dixon has continued to serve without portfolio. His service as chair of the ACC is among his most notable civic achievements. He has built the ACC into a formidable organization much-admired for its leadership and many contributions.

Arrington Dixon's decision to retire on the silver anniversary of the ACC boat ride offered an appropriate occasion to recognize his many distinguished contributions to his hometown and to his Anacostia community as well as the contributions of the ACC for its annual boat ride.

Therefore, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing:

Arrington Dixon for his outstanding official and civic contributions to the District of Columbia;

The ACC for its civic and financial contributions to the District of Columbia; and

The silver anniversary of the ACC.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 3, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 4

9 a.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine efforts to combat robocalls.

SD-562

9:15 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive a closed briefing regarding ordered departure of personnel from the U.S. Embassy in Havana, Cuba.

SVC-217

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Finance

Business meeting to consider and original bill entitled, "Keep Kids' Insurance Dependable and Secure (KIDS) Act of 2017".

SD-215

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Equifax cybersecurity breach.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 1872, to authorize the programs of the Transportation Security Administration relating to transportation security, S. 1015, to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-

to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system, S. 1534, to direct the Federal Communications Commission to amend its rules so as to prohibit the application to amateur stations of certain private land use restrictions, an original bill entitled, "American Vision for Safer Transportation through Advancement of Revolutionary Technologies (AV START) Act", and the nominations of Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Howard R. Elliott, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, and Walter G. Copan, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary for Standards and Technology, Timothy Gallaudet, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, and David J. Redl, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, all of the Department of Commerce.

SH-216

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael Dourson, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, and Matthew Z. Leopold, of Florida, David Ross, of Wisconsin, and William L. Wehrum, of Delaware, each to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 146, to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, S. 1847, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure that the needs of children are considered in homeland security, trafficking, and disaster recovery planning, S. 1281, to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, S. 1769, to require a new or updated Federal website that is intended for use by the public to be mobile friendly, S. 1305, to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with adequate flexibility in its employment authorities, S. 1791, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, S. 708, to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, H.R. 3210, to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, H.R. 70, to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, an original bill entitled, "TSA LEAP Pay Reform Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Direct Hire

of Students and Recent Graduates Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Temporary and Term Appointments Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Voluntary Separation Incentive Payment Adjustment Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act", and the nomination of John Marshall Mitnick, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stephanos Bibas, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Liles Clifton Burke, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Michael Joseph Juneau, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, Tilman Eugene Self III, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, and John C. Demers, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine pending nominations; to be immediately followed by a Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues hearing to examine the future of Iraq's minorities, focusing on what's next after ISIS.

SD-419

2:30 p.m.

Committee on the Budget

Business meeting to markup the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

SD-608

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 943, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an accurate comprehensive student count for the purposes of calculating formula allocations for programs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine Indian gaming, focusing on new issues and opportunities for success in the next 30 years.

SH-216

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law

To hold hearings to examine Equifax, focusing on continuing to monitor data-broker cybersecurity.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Melissa Sue Glynn, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Enterprise Integration), Cheryl L. Mason, of Virginia, to be

Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and Randy Reeves, of Mississippi, to be Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SR-418

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

3 p.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and David G. Zatezalo, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, both of the Department of Labor, and Peter B. Robb, of Vermont, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

SD-430

OCTOBER 5

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Gregory Ibach, of Nebraska, to be Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, and William Northey, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, both of the Department of Agriculture.

SR-328A

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Paul Trombino III, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-406

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jeffrey Gerrish, of Maryland,

to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and Industrial Competitiveness), Department of State, Gregory Doud, of Kansas, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, and Jason Kearns, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission.

SD-215

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. 1118, to reauthorize the North Korea Human Rights Act of 2004, S. 832, to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, S. Res. 245, calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and S. Res. 211, condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the Federal response to the opioid crisis.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Joan Louise Larsen, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, William L. Campbell, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, Annemarie Carney Axon, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Michael Lawrence Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Thomas Alvin Farr, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of

North Carolina, William M. Ray II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Robert M. Duncan, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years, Charles E. Peeler, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Georgia for the term of four years, and Brian D. Schroder, to be United States Attorney for the District of Alaska, all of the Department of Justice.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

Business meeting to continue to markup the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

SH-216

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.

SD-419

OCTOBER 18

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice.

SH-216

OCTOBER 25

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing naval forces and the Navy's current and planned capabilities to meet those threats.

SVC-217

SENATE—Tuesday, October 3, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Hear our prayers, Eternal God, as You bend Your ears toward us. Provide for the needs of the high and low, the rich and poor, the just and unjust.

Empower our Senators to love even their enemies, to bless those who curse them, and to pray for those who seek to misuse them. Lord, give our lawmakers lips that speak wisdom, hearts that love purity, and minds that embrace understanding. Deliver them from fear, even in calamitous times. May they not trust in wealth or might but put their faith in You, the author and finisher of destinies.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SASSE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning our thoughts and prayers con-

tinue to be with those in Las Vegas who suffered a horrendous massacre. We will all be praying for them and hoping they can recover from these grievous wounds.

THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, last week the chairman of the Budget Committee unveiled a comprehensive budget for fiscal year 2018 that the committee will consider this week. This comprehensive budget resolution provides a path to balance by restraining Washington's spending, by reducing the tax burden, and by putting our country on a trajectory for better economic growth. I look forward to considering it on the floor after the committee finishes its work.

Not only will this budget put our country on a better fiscal track, with reduced spending, it will also provide Congress with legislative authority to enact much needed tax reform for hard-working American families.

The tax framework released by the administration and Congress's tax-writing committees is a template that will guide these committees as they work toward producing pro-American tax reform. The framework envisions a 21st-century tax code that is built for growth, that supports middle-class families, and that promotes American workers and American jobs. It is the framework our committees will look to as they work through a transparent and inclusive process in pursuit of its important goals, such as more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks.

Basically, here is what our framework envisions: We want to take more money out of Washington's pocket and put more in yours, simply put. I know the chairman of the Finance Committee is committed to goals like those. I know I am. I hope our friends across the aisle will work with us in a serious way to achieve them as well because after decades of lost economic opportunities, it is time to get our economy on the right track again so it can finally grow at its full potential.

Let's shift our economy into high gear with pro-jobs tax reform. Let's put our finances on a better path with Chairman ENZI's budget. Let's watch the good work of each initiative advance within the Finance and Budget Committees this week, including the Finance Committee hearing on tax reform this morning.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, last week Congress

passed legislation to reauthorize the FAA, including its authority to collect and spend money for repairs and replacement parts for our air traffic control system. I am proud that we worked together to get this bill over the finish line. Now the FAA can continue to play a critical role in the Federal Government's response to the powerful hurricanes that have hit our country.

HURRICANE RECOVERY EFFORTS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the President is on his way to Puerto Rico to survey the hurricane damage personally and see how the Federal Government can continue to assist in the recovery efforts.

Our thoughts remain with the hurricane victims as they continue to piece their lives and communities back together.

During his visit, the President will have the opportunity to see the resilience of the Puerto Rican people. He can also witness the overwhelming support of their fellow Americans who have volunteered to help deliver relief. Much of that support has come from the military, including the men and women of Kentucky's own Air and Army National Guard, who have helped bring relief to Texas, Florida, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. Just last week, the 101st Airborne Combat Aviation Brigade deployed from Fort Campbell in my home State to help support relief efforts in Puerto Rico.

President Trump will also have the chance to see the groundswell of generosity from our communities. Many donated money, food, and other essentials. Other brave Americans left their homes behind to go to the disaster sites to offer aid.

I am especially proud to recognize some of the Kentuckians who have volunteered to join the relief efforts in the wake of these storms.

The Kentucky Board of Emergency Medical Services selected eight fire departments from around my State to send to Florida to assist local operations after Hurricane Irma. Working 12-hour shifts, these firefighters responded to 911 calls in Tampa as residents began to move back into their homes.

Throughout my State, churches and nonprofits sent volunteers to help however they could. One religious organization arranged more than 200 volunteers to help flood victims in Texas and Florida. In all, they served over 78,000 meals, helped with laundry, and distributed many bottles of water.

The Kentucky Humane Society stepped in to care for pets that were affected, and chapters of the American Red Cross from across the Commonwealth have mobilized to help where needed.

The Kentucky Association of Electric Cooperatives sent dozens of linemen to Georgia to help restore power after Hurricane Irma. The joint effort from 17 of our State's electric cooperatives represents one of the largest mutual deployments in Kentucky's history.

These Kentuckians, along with so many more, have generously given their time and labor to help their fellow Americans during this time of suffering. And they aren't alone. Compassionate men and women from around the country have joined the cause to help ease the pain of the victims.

Along with my colleagues in the Senate, I am committed to continuing to do our part to support relief efforts with FEMA, the Department of Defense, and the rest of the administration. We will soon receive a supplemental funding request from the administration. When we do, I expect Congress will act quickly to ensure that the men and women providing critical support in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands have the resources they need. The Senate will continue to stand with those suffering from these devastating storms.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Cissna nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, the Nation continues to reel from the awful events of Sunday night in Las Vegas—the most deadly mass shooting in modern American history. It has gotten even deadlier in the last 24 hours, with 59 dead and 527 injured—some wounded by gunfire, some injured because they were trampled in the chaos. There were 22,000 concertgoers who fled for their lives from the scene. The police found 23 guns in the hotel room of the monster who committed this atrocity and 19 more at his home. Some of them had been modified to cause even more carnage.

Of course, as always, the beauty of the American people and the first responders pulled through. I saw on TV today a man who had been shot. Two young women came and risked their lives while those shots were going. They took off his belt and tied a tourniquet around his upper thigh because he was bleeding profusely from his leg. They saved his life. He said he will never know who they are, but they saved his life. That story, I am sure, will be repeated over and over again. The valor, the bravery of the average American and the greatness of our first responders is the only counterpoint to the evil, the carnage, the horror we have all witnessed.

We cannot banish evil or madness from the Earth, but we sure can do what we can in our power to make our country a safer place. We need commonsense reforms, and these reforms have broad public support.

In the face of tens of thousands of gun deaths every year, too many Republicans in Congress have tried to enact the dream agenda of the NRA and the gun lobby. They have pursued a national concealed carry law. Can you imagine if that were to have passed? This horrible man could have concealed carry under the laws of Nevada and gone to Times Square in New York City or to Walt Disney World in Florida and just shot away.

Most of our police organizations are against this concealed carry bill. In light of the carnage, in knowing of the evil that exists, with the power of evil magnified by guns and automatic weapons, how can we try to pursue it?

What about gun silencers? There is a move actually in this Congress—it is in the House right now, and I am sure it has support on the other side of the aisle in the Senate—to make it easier for citizens to acquire silencers. Why? Let me tell you something. One of the few ways the police had to go after the shooter was trying to hear the sound of where the guns were coming from.

Thank God our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have pulled back

on this bill. It is not the first time. They had to postpone a hearing on the bill when the congressional baseball team was attacked during an early morning practice. When two mass shootings force you to delay a bill that would make those mass shootings harder to detect and stop, maybe it is a sign that you ought to let go of the bill once and for all.

Of course, we have this absurd NRA nostrum that if everyone were to have a gun, we would all be safe because if people were in an arena—a place—where someone was shooting, they could shoot them back. They sure could not have shot back at someone who was 32 stories up in a hotel. This idea that the only thing that can stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun is absurd in this situation. It is absurd in many situations.

So where do we go from here?

This place has been gridlocked on the issue of gun control for a while. President Trump, before he ran for office, was for certain sane, rational, limited aspects of gun control. After Sandy, he called for the gun laws to be tightened. I know when he ran, that the power of the NRA, the money of the NRA, and the narrow special interest of the NRA lobbyists here were just the swamp he decried—small groups going against the public interest and persuading Congress to do that. Yet maybe he can have a bit of a reawakening, in the horror of what happened, as he goes to Las Vegas tomorrow.

Today I am calling on the President to come out against the absurd law about silencers—to threaten a veto if he must and put an end to that bill. I am also calling on President Trump to bring together the leaders of Congress and let both sides know he is ready and willing to address head-on this issue of gun safety. He should tell Members of his party it is time to work to address this epidemic that costs the lives of more than 30,000 Americans a year.

I am glad the President is going to Las Vegas—that is a good idea—but he should take it a step further. He should call us together and lead this Nation in some rational laws about gun safety that the overwhelming majority of Americans—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—support.

If we truly want to honor our first responders and protect our fellow Americans, as we say we do, President Trump should stand up and tell the NRA that they are not always right, abandon some of their most extreme policies—I would abandon most of them—and come to the table and do the work that so many Americans are desperate for Congress to do.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, on another matter, the crisis in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, today, President Trump will be visiting Puerto Rico nearly 2

weeks after Hurricane Maria made landfall in Puerto Rico. In my view, the lateness of his visit is indicative of his leadership and the Federal response to this humanitarian crisis. It has been slow, it hasn't been well coordinated or sure-footed, and it has been too late in coming.

President Obama visited Sandy two days after the storms hit. President Trump himself was much quicker to visit Texas when Harvey hit. Two weeks is too long. It is better than nothing. That is for sure. But it is too long. It sends a signal that maybe he believes what happened in Puerto Rico is less important than what happened in Texas or in Florida.

In the lead-up to Hurricanes Harvey and Irma, President Trump was tweeting on an almost daily basis, prevailing on Texans and Floridians to stay safe from the storm. That was the right thing to do. But when it came to Puerto Rico, there were no tweets or public statements in the lead-up to the storm, and it took several days to even mention Puerto Rico in his tweets. Even then, he had mostly blame for Puerto Rico or pats on the back for his own administration. He kept decrying fake news, but he couldn't fool the American people. They saw on TV what was happening and the devastation that stayed for so long.

Let me give a comparison. The President said that, because it is an island, it is harder to get to. It is, but when Haiti was struck by a massive earthquake in 2010, the United States didn't wait for things to get worse. We ramped up military and disaster assistance quickly and responded with an overwhelming amount of support. Within 2 days of the earthquake in Haiti, 8,000 troops were in route. Within 2 weeks, 22,000 troops were in route with 300 helicopters assisting relief efforts. Even to this moment, the number for Puerto Rico is much smaller. That shows that the response has not been good enough. Why was his response for Puerto Rico so much less than the response for Haiti?

So we need a much better response on the ground in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I would say to President Trump, I am glad you are going—glad you are going—but this is your chance to make up for what has been a plodding start.

When the President visits Puerto Rico today, he should not get into any political fights or blame Puerto Rico for its problems. The President needs to figure out what is wrong and what else has to be done and marshal the resources of our government and our military to fix it. The 3.5 million American citizens in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are counting on their President. These are American citizens.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, returning to the Republican tax plan, over the weekend,

we heard some pretty absurd claims from Republican legislators and Cabinet officials about the tax plan. The President and his top advisers are selling this as a middle-class miracle, but every independent analyst is saying that the Republican plan focuses on the rich to the exclusion of the middle class.

The GOP tax plan lowers the top rate from 39.6 to 35 percent and repeals the estate tax, which affects only the top two-tenths of 1 percent of the estates in this country, or any estate over \$11 million. That is not the middle class. It lowers the rate on passthrough entities, creating a huge loophole that would allow wealthy hedge fund managers, law firms, and lobbyists to pay a rate that is a lot lower. According to the Tax Policy Center, the top one-tenth of 1 percent would reap 80 percent of the benefits of the GOP plan. The top 0.1 percent, or folks who make more than \$5 million a year, would get a break of a million dollars a year. How many Americans believe that people who make over \$5 million a year should get a \$1 million tax break? That is what is in the bill right now.

They are saying that maybe it will change, but why did they put out such a shoddy product to begin with? Why didn't they wait and put in more details than what is there now? It is not a middle-class tax cut by any stretch of the imagination. Those who put together this bill, the hard rightwing of the Republican Party, really aren't interested in middle-class tax cuts. They are interested in tax cuts for the rich and scraps for everyone else. Nothing makes this clearer than their budget resolution, and every day this plan comes with a surprise.

Here is the surprise today, and it is amazing. The Republican budget resolution calls for a \$450 billion cut in Medicare. Folks, this tax bill cuts your Medicare. In the budget bill that outlines the tax bill that we are doing this week, the plan calls for a \$473 billion cut in Medicare and more than \$1 trillion in cuts to Medicaid.

If you are an older American, you are saying: Maybe this tax bill will not affect me.

It sure will. It sure will because, amazingly, to pay for these tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans—the most powerful of Americans—they cut your Medicare by over \$450 billion and cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion.

Haven't our Republican colleagues learned? When they tried to do a similar thing in healthcare—to cut healthcare so they could save money and cut taxes on the very wealthy—they had to abandon it. This is going to meet a similar problem. It is going to meet the opprobrium of the American people—\$1.5 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans—and the budget tees up even more cuts to Medicare. If the GOP tax plan were to pass,

another provision known as statutory pay-go would offset the deficit increase automatically with cuts to Medicare and many other programs that support our Nation's economy. So not only does this bill favor the rich, the very wealthy, but to help finance those tax cuts for the wealthy, they are cutting Medicare by one-half trillion dollars—close to one-half trillion dollars—and they are cutting Medicaid by \$1 trillion.

So this is just like the Republicans' first healthcare bill, but in reverse. In the first TrumpCare bill, the Republicans proposed cutting back on healthcare to sneak through tax breaks for the rich. Now they are proposing massive tax cuts to the rich to sneak through cuts to healthcare.

Wait till America finds out about this bill. It is going to get the same cold, horrified reception that the healthcare bill did, and it will not pass. The American people will not be fooled. They have seen this movie before. The top 1 percent of corporations would win, and millions of seniors, the disabled, and working-class Americans would lose, and lose a lot.

The rich are doing great. They don't need a tax break. To compound the injury, to say we are going to pay for their big tax break by cutting Medicare and Medicaid, that ain't going to fly. Don't even try it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday I mentioned how our colleagues across the aisle and, of course, some groups outside of Capitol Hill have predictably started attacking tax reform, actually a plan that doesn't even yet exist in legislative language. With the fall season now upon us, they have decided to shoot arrows at a straw man.

One would think, given their effusive support for tax reform in the past, our Democratic friends would at least wait to review the legislation before they pounce on it. I had hoped that they would work with us to come up with a bipartisan plan, but I guess I am not entirely surprised. That has never stopped them before from pillorying smart policy when it served a political end.

Yes, they are already piling on, spreading misinformation, and assuming the worst because that is the easy and politically expedient thing to do. The problem is that many of the criticisms of our framework have been misleading and counterproductive. Worse,

some Members seem more content to misconstrue a plan than to understand it and give it a fair hearing.

Allow me to clarify the record for just a moment. What is most striking is that the new framework unveiled by the so-called Big 6 shares many of the core features of previous plans that were widely embraced by Democrats—not only that, but many of the folks who are now critical of the new plan came out in support of these provisions as recently as this year. The senior Senator from Oregon is typical in this regard. In response to our framework, he said that “this is a far-right Republican scheme to endow future generations of the mega wealthy and leave what amounts to crumbs for the middle-class behind.” That is kind of a breathtaking allegation. Those are indeed strong statements, but the American people are smart. The American people realize that the plan our colleague from Oregon is criticizing is similar to the one he sponsored and promoted in 2011.

Let’s get the facts straight. The Senator from Oregon had previously sponsored a plan in 2011 with our former colleague, Senator Coats of Indiana, called the Wyden-Coats plan. Here on the left is the Big 6 framework that he described.

Let me read that again. He said that “this is a far-right Republican scheme to endow future generations of the mega wealthy and leave what amounts to crumbs for the middle-class behind.”

Well, here is the framework he was criticizing by the language I just provided, and here is his plan in 2011. Each of these plans—the Wyden-Coats plan from 2011 and the one we are considering now—is based on three individual tax rates. Both the plan the Senator from Oregon once supported and the one we are now discussing, the framework, would collapse seven tax brackets in the current system down to three, vastly simplifying the Tax Code and the burden of complying with that Tax Code by ordinary Americans. Each plan would also eliminate the alternative minimum tax. It vastly increases the standard deduction. The Wyden-Coats plan would have tripled it. The Big 6 framework, which he criticized, doubles the standard deduction, making it so that a married couple who earn \$24,000 or less would be essentially in a zero tax bracket.

So my question is, What has changed, other than the political party of the President in office? These changes to our Tax Code used to be noncontroversial, and certainly not partisan.

The Big 6 plan isn’t just similar to the Wyden one, though. It also shares key features with the so-called Simpson-Bowles plan from 2010, which not long ago was embraced by a number of Democrats, including the current minority whip, the Senator from Illinois.

Here is a comparison of the so-called Big 6 framework and the Simpson-

Bowles plan. As you can see, there are a lot of similarities: seven brackets collapsed into three, eliminating the alternative minimum tax, and eliminating a number of itemized deductions or so-called base broadeners. It enhances the child tax credit, and it lowers the corporate rate.

These proposals were once a no-brainer for Republicans and Democrats alike. So why the change in tune? Our Democratic colleagues used to think these reforms were long overdue. They were right then, and they are wrong now.

None other than the Senate minority leader, our colleague from New York, has said: “To preserve our international competitiveness, it is imperative that we seek to reduce the corporate tax rate from 35 percent.” That was the Senator from New York in 2012. He said: “This will boost growth and encourage more companies to reinvest in the United States.”

He was absolutely correct in 2012. He is entirely wrong now to change his view and suggest that this is somehow a wrong way to approach getting the economy growing again and encouraging businesses that have earned money overseas to bring that money back home and invest it in businesses and jobs and pay for American workers here at home.

We do need to change incentives, and we do need to spur growth. That is why the new framework we are considering will create a new tax structure for small businesses, allowing them to better compete.

Once upon a time, none of this was particularly partisan, and many of our colleagues across the aisle got the picture. Our colleagues from Ohio, Minnesota, and Missouri have all said in recent years that we should lower the corporate tax rate, not because we love corporations but because we recognize that provides incentives for them to stay here and invest in jobs and businesses in America rather than overseas. But it also makes it more likely that hard-working Americans will be able to find a job and that the jobs they hold will actually pay better wages. Thanks to our reduction in individual tax rates, they will actually have more take-home pay. As some have pointed out, this literally would raise their standard of living and make it possible for them to provide for their children’s education, maybe buy a reliable car so that they can go back and forth to their job every day, maybe buy a home, or perhaps save for their retirement.

There is nothing partisan about wanting an updated and more competitive tax code that will incentivize businesses to keep jobs on American soil. That is what the so-called reduction in the corporate rate will do.

Right now, we have the highest corporate rate in the world, so many busi-

nesses have simply picked up their roots here in America and have moved overseas to countries that have lower tax rates because they simply can’t rationalize to their shareholders, to whom they have a fiduciary duty, paying higher taxes and remaining in the United States. So they take it overseas.

Even for those who stay behind—because of our extraordinarily high tax rate and the fact they literally would have to pay double taxes for income earned abroad and brought back to the United States—they pay the tax rate in the country where the money is earned, bring it back to the United States, and have to pay twice. So they pay 35 percent on top of whatever they have to pay in the countries where the money is earned.

Is it any wonder, for example, that IBM—I read this last weekend—actually has more jobs in India than it does in the United States? Let me say that again. IBM, the global computer company, has more jobs in India today than it does in the United States. I have no doubt that has to do with certain incentives the country will pay to companies to invest and to build their business in their country, and, no doubt, it has to do with access to skilled labor. That certainly has to be a part of it, but there can be no doubt that our Tax Code is simply encouraging companies like IBM to shift more of their work overseas. Even if they wanted to bring the money they have earned overseas back to the United States, they would have to pay twice. So what do they do? They simply invest in their workforce, they simply invest in their business in another country, much to our detriment.

If something is broken, which our Tax Code is, it needs to be fixed, not avoided. Our Democratic colleagues need to once again acknowledge this, as so many of them did when it came to our outdated Tax Code, as I pointed out. There is no reason why tax reform can’t be bipartisan, and if our colleagues just returned to some of their statements, which I have highlighted here—if they returned to those policies in a bipartisan fashion and worked with us, we could change our Tax Code for the better. We could make it simpler. We could make sure individuals have lower tax rates so they could have more take-home pay from the wages they earn and, in the process, improve their standard of living for themselves and their families. Finally, we could become more competitive in a global economy where the highest tax rate in the world does not serve American interests well. It doesn’t serve the interests of American businesses well, and it doesn’t serve the interests of American workers or taxpayers either.

We can do this. All it takes is political will. All it takes is approaching this in a fashion that benefits all

Americans on a nonpartisan basis. I hope our colleagues will listen.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the aftermath of Las Vegas is a time for this Senator to reflect on whether a shooting is like Mateen's, in the Orlando nightclub, where he was motivated as a terrorist, and then there was the remarkable recovery of Congressman SCALISE in the attempted killing of SCALISE by a shooter who was motivated by politics, and then there is the massive massacre in Las Vegas, apparently by a shooter who was mentally deranged in some form. The fact is, massive amounts of ammunition with high-caliber, rapid-fire assault weapons is making this easier for whatever the motivation of the shooter is. As a result, you get to the point of, how many more of these do we have before you say enough is enough?

That leads to the subject of politics. When does humanity overtake the divisiveness of our politics so we can come together and have a commonsense discussion about what should be done? Because if we don't, and humanity does not overtake our politics, we will continue, and it will be more of the same.

So I ask—I yearn for that public but also private discussion with our colleagues because going down this road over and over again is not going to be the answer, and we ought to say enough is enough.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1907 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING LOUIS J. AMABILI

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Lou Amabili, a true Delawarean, a fantastic, dedicated, and tireless volunteer, a gentleman who dedicated his life and service to others.

Mr. Louis J. Amabili, the son of Italian immigrants, rose from volunteering at his local volunteer fire company to become one of the most impor-

tant and trusted voices in the American fire service. Lou passed away last Thursday, September 28.

Lou was a giant in the fire service community, and his decades of dedicated service are a testament to how much he cared about his calling and his neighbors. Lou was a legend in the Delaware firefighting community, especially in my small hometown of Hockessin, DE. Lou proudly served the Hockessin Fire Company for 70 years, holding every position one could possibly hold—chief engineer, first and second assistant chief, along with vice president, president, president emeritus, and director.

Lou was a humble, down-to-earth, passionate, and caring gentleman. He rarely sought the limelight, even as he was often thrust into it. He could walk into any event, whether a national convention or just a local meeting, and know an individual's name, making them feel as if they were the most important person in the room.

Lou embodied the term "public servant," which so many of us aspire to, yet he quietly and with dignity achieved this for decades. He heard his calling to serve his community, and he embraced it with dedication and a quiet passion.

There was no greater ally of firefighters in Delaware or across the country than Lou. His continued service of seven-plus decades set the highest standard of dedication to the volunteer fire service.

I first had the honor of meeting Lou around 2000 when I was county council president. Over my decade of service in New Castle County government, Lou was a frequent source of powerful advice, encouragement, insight, and occasional correction. I always looked forward to seeing him, whether at a county meeting, a State meeting, or at a national organization meeting. I was always certain I would get honest, direct, and constructive feedback from Lou about how things were going at home and how things were going nationally for America's firefighters.

Lou's nationally recognized service is long and impressive. He first gained national recognition in the fire service when President Richard Nixon appointed him to serve on the National Commission for Fire Prevention and Control in 1970—the Commission that produced the landmark report, "America Burning."

A graduate of Conrad High School and of the University of Delaware with a degree in chemistry, Lou was appointed the first director of the Delaware State Fire School in 1964 and served in that capacity for more than three decades through 1996. Upon his retirement, then-Governor TOM CARPER, my senior Senator, signed a resolution naming the Delaware State Fire School the Louis J. Amabili Fire Training Center.

From 1973 to 1980, Lou served as president of the International Society of Fire Service Instructors. From 1978 to 1986, he served as a charter member of the National Fire Academy Board of Visitors. Lou also served on the NFPA board of directors for 6 years in the 1980s and was chairman of the Fire Department Instructors Conference in 1979 and 1980.

Widely respected by his colleagues, the president of Congressional Fire Services Institute, William F. Jenaway, said:

Throughout his entire career, Lou was fully committed to the health and safety of the men and women who have served in the fire service. He was always willing and eager to share his knowledge with both aspiring and veteran firefighters and cared deeply about preserving the fire service's rich heritage. It was an honor to serve with him for many years on the CFSI Board of Directors. I valued his friendship as did my fellow board members. . . . His contributions to our organization and to the nation's fire service will preserve his legacy as a legendary leader for many years to come.

While the fire service and the safety of his fellow firefighters was his passion, his family was his love. Lou's wife of nearly 60 years, Carmella, was his constant companion as he traveled extensively to national conventions, local meetings, or speaking engagements. Lou's daughter Janice; his son Louis Junior and his wife Bridget; his grandson Louis J. Amabili III and his wife Lacie; and Lou's great-grandchildren, Lyza and Silas, will be forever proud of his legacy of service to Hockessin, to Delaware, and to our Nation.

Lou was an inspiration to generations of volunteers, first responders, and firefighters, not just in his home company in our small town of Hockessin but to all the firefighters of Delaware and our country.

Lou Amabili was exactly the sort of man on whom the safety of our Nation has been built and whose service and dedication to his community and his neighbors will never be forgotten.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Louisiana.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit about Social Security and, specifically, about the windfall elimination provision and the government pension offset. Now, I know that sounds real technical, but, basically, here is the problem.

We have a lot of Americans who have paid into Social Security who are now getting screwed by Social Security. They are not getting their money back. All of us want to do everything we can to maintain the stability and sanctity of the Social Security system, and I think all of us believe that we all ought to get the Social Security payments that we are entitled to. That is all this issue is about. Let me explain.

For many middle-class Americans, receiving Social Security at retirement is sort of like a welcoming light at the end of the tunnel. They have worked hard, they have retired, and now they are entitled to some of the money back that they paid into the Social Security system. I am talking, of course, about the hard-working women and the hard-working men who have seen a chunk of their monthly earnings go into the Social Security system throughout their entire careers—10, 15, 20, and sometimes 30 and 40 years. These same Americans have not seen a pay raise or an increase in their median household income for a long time. The median household income in America today, as the Presiding Officer knows, is pretty much the same as it was in 1999.

I guess whom I am talking about are ordinary people. You can call it the middle class, if you would like, or working families. They were the ones who were hit the hardest by the great recession of 2008. They have been struggling throughout their lives to participate in the great wealth of this Nation. They are entitled to participate in the great wealth of this Nation, and they should not have to keep on struggling to get money for retirement from the Social Security system when they have already paid into the Social Security system.

The principle behind Social Security is pretty simple. Throughout your working life, you pay some money and your employer pays some money. When you are done working, or when you retire, according to a formula, you get your money back through a Social Security check. It is simple in theory. You put money in, and when you hit the retirement age, you get some of it back, except that for 1.7 million Americans, that is not the case. That is not how the system works for them. That includes about 38,000 hard-working folks in my home State of Louisiana, but there are a lot more in other States as well. I am talking about millions of teachers, police officers, firefighters, and a lot of other folks who earn modest pensions in service to their communities who face little or no access to Social Security.

Here is what I am talking about. I am talking about a teacher who paid into the Social Security system. I am talking about teachers or firefighters or policemen who paid into their own retirement systems. So they are rocking along. They are, basically, paying into two retirement systems—Social Security and the private retirement system. They are doing the right thing in getting up every day, going to work, obeying the law, and trying to save money for retirement. It is deferred gratification. They are ready to retire, but because they were prudent enough to invest in a private retirement system, they do not get their Social Security check even though they have al-

ready paid into it. Additionally, a worker can pass away before reaching retirement age not even knowing that his spouse and children will not have full access to his Social Security survivors' benefits. That is just not right.

Until 2005, there was not even a legal requirement for human resources to notify workers that switching careers would affect their eligibility for Social Security or Social Security survivors' benefits. Many of these 1.7 million Americans who are getting screwed tried to do the right thing. They paid into a private retirement system, and they paid into Social Security only to find out later that they can get their money from the private retirement system but that they cannot get their money from Social Security. They are being punished for being prudent. Many of them retire with no idea that that is the law. By then, of course, it is too late.

In June of this year, one in six Americans collected Social Security benefits, and I am happy for every one of them because, to collect, they had to pay in. That is about 61 million Americans. By 2031, when the last of the baby boomers hits retirement age, that number is going to increase to about 75 million Americans. These are going to be our seniors. They are our seniors, and they are our seniors to be. They are battling against the rising costs of housing, healthcare, automobiles, taxes, and fees. Many of them have had their private retirement accounts or home values wrecked by the great recession. Yet these Americans press on.

When we talk about tax reform—and we are going to be talking a lot about tax reform here over the next few weeks—we need to make clear that we are talking about reforms that will help these middle-class Americans. They are the people who get up every day, go to work, obey the law, and try to do the right thing by their kids and teach their kids morals and try to save a little money for retirement.

Let me be blunt. I would like to eliminate the windfall elimination provision and the government pension offset in the Social Security office. I think it would be a vital step in ensuring that our middle-class seniors can enjoy continued economic security after their retirements. Not only would it help the economy, but it is the right thing to do.

I sum up. We can provide economic relief immediately to some of those middle-class retirees about whom I have been talking by eliminating the windfall elimination provision and the government pension offset of the Social Security system. It will not cost much money. It will have a small effect on the cost of Social Security, at about 0.13 percent—not 13 percent but 0.13 percent. It is a little over one-tenth of 1 percent.

After taking care of this simple fix, which is more than about money—it is

about fairness—we can turn our eyes to out-of-control Washington spending to ensure that Social Security remains a reliable source of retirement income for Americans in the long term.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, a recent survey reported that 50 percent of people in this country consider themselves living paycheck to paycheck, and one third of these people say they are just \$400 away from financial crisis. That is not acceptable.

Unfortunately, after 8 years of economic stagnation under the Obama administration, living paycheck to paycheck is starting to feel like the new normal for most Americans. But it doesn't have to be. We have the resources to be the strongest economy in the world. American workers and job creators are as dynamic and creative as ever, and they can get our economy thriving again. In order to get them to do that, we need to clear some obstacles in their path. That starts with reforming our complicated and outdated Tax Code, which has increasingly been strangling our economy.

This month, Republicans in the House and Senate are making comprehensive tax reform one of our top priorities. After weeks of work, last week leaders from the Senate, the House, and the White House unveiled the framework that will guide our final tax reform legislation.

The framework is built around Republicans' five principles for tax reform: first, providing tax relief for the middle class; second, increasing wages, jobs, and economic growth; third, keeping good-paying jobs here at home in America; fourth, increasing American competitiveness in the global economy; and, finally, fifth, simplifying the Tax Code. The framework outlines our plans to provide relief for middle-class families.

First, we will lower rates for hard-working Americans. By collapsing the seven income tax brackets to three, we will ensure that working families get to keep more of what they earn. Our plan will also expand the child tax credit and make it available to more families, and our plan doubles the standard deduction, which will provide significant relief for those who need it the most. Under our plan, a family making \$24,000 a year will no longer owe any Federal income taxes. All of these measures will provide direct relief to working families.

Just as important for families, however, is the other half of our tax reform plan, which involves creating the kind of economic environment where hard-working Americans can thrive—the kind of environment where Americans have access to good jobs, higher wages, and more opportunities.

Over the past few weeks, I have come to the floor to talk about Republicans' tax reform principles and have highlighted some of the ways our tax reform plan will improve the economic outlook for American families. Last week, I talked about our third principle, reforming our Tax Code to keep those good-paying jobs here at home. This week I would like to spend a few minutes talking about our fourth principle, which is keeping American businesses competitive in the global economy.

In order for individual Americans to thrive economically, we need our businesses to thrive. Thriving businesses create jobs, provide opportunities, and they increase wages and invest in workers. Right now, though, our Tax Code is not helping businesses thrive, and it is making it more difficult for American businesses with an international footprint to compete in the global economy.

Our Nation has the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world—at least 10 percentage points higher than the majority of our international competitors. It doesn't take an economist to realize that high tax rates leave businesses with less money to invest, less money to spend on wages, less money to create new jobs, less money to devote to research and development of new products and services, and less money to put back into new property or equipment for those businesses. This situation is compounded when an American business has international competitors that are paying a lot less in taxes than you are. It is no surprise that U.S. businesses struggling to stay competitive in the global economy don't have a lot of resources to devote to creating new jobs and increasing wages.

On top of our high business tax rates, there is another major problem with our Tax Code that puts American businesses at a competitive disadvantage globally—our outdated worldwide tax system.

What does it mean to have a worldwide tax system? It means that American companies pay U.S. taxes on the profit they make here at home, as well as on part of the profits they make abroad once they bring that money back home to the United States. The problem with this is that most other major world economies have shifted from a worldwide tax system to a territorial tax system.

In a territorial tax system, taxes are paid on the money earned where it is made and only there. You are not taxed

again when you bring money back to your home country. Most American companies' foreign competitors have been operating under a territorial tax system for years. So they pay a lot less taxes on the money they make abroad than American companies pay. That leaves American companies at a disadvantage.

Foreign companies can underbid American companies for new business simply because they don't have to add as much in taxes into the price of their products or services. When foreign companies beat out American companies for new business, it is not just American companies that suffer. It is American workers. That is why a key part of the tax framework that Republicans unveiled last week involves lowering our massive corporate tax rate and transitioning our tax system from a worldwide tax system into a territorial tax system. By making American businesses more competitive in the global economy, we can improve the playing field for American workers.

There are a lot of other things we are going to do to help hard-working families and American workers, from improving the tax situation for small businesses to helping family business owners, farmers, and ranchers like those in my home State of South Dakota by repealing the death tax.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to complain about our plans to repeal the death tax. They complain that it is not something to really worry about since they claim relatively few estates are expected to actually have to pay the tax. Well, I would like them to come and talk to some of the farmers and ranchers in my State of South Dakota. Some of these farmers and ranchers are paying tens of thousands of dollars a year in an effort to avoid having their families hit by the estate tax when they die. Why? Because they know that without careful and costly planning, if the Federal Government comes around after their death demanding a staggering 40 percent of their estate, their children won't have the money to pay the government without risking the farm or the ranch.

Farming and ranching is a land-rich but cash-poor business. Farmers and ranchers own valuable land, but they are only earning cash on the crops they grow or the livestock they raise on that land. So while their overall farm or ranch may have a substantial value, the amount of money they have coming in is relatively small and subject to the swings in the market from year to year. Too often, when farmers and ranchers die, the vast portion of their estate is made up of their land, while actual disposable income is a very small part of it. If they don't take measures to avoid having their family hit by the death tax, the family will have no choice but to sell off some or

all of their land to pay the government, which means, in many cases, losing the family's farm or ranch. And the same situation faces other types of family-owned businesses across the country where the value of the estate is tied up in that business.

Removing the threat of the death tax for family-owned businesses, farms, and ranches would free up resources that these business owners could invest in their businesses and in our economy instead of on complex estate plans, insurance, and expensive tax professionals.

Before I move on, let me just remind everybody that when we talk about the death tax, we are talking about double and sometimes triple taxation. The money the government is taxing has already been taxed at least once. It boggles the mind that some think that a person's death is justification for taxing his or her income a second or a third time. Death should not be a taxable event. When someone dies, they shouldn't have to see the undertaker and the IRS at the same time.

Our Tax Code is increasingly strangling our economy and placing heavy burdens on hard-working American families. If we want to improve the economic situation of American families, comprehensive tax reform is essential.

Republicans in the House and the Senate are continuing to work on the final draft of the bill that we will take up later this fall. I look forward to passing comprehensive tax reform that will help American families thrive, that will create greater economic growth, better paying jobs, higher wages, and bigger paychecks for American workers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. STRANGE).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, a tragedy took place in Las Vegas this week. It is a tragedy that has affected hundreds of families. It is a tragedy in which each and every one of us sends our prayers to those who have lost loved ones. And to those who have family members who are now hospitalized, we send our prayers to you as well, with the great hope that a full recovery is in their future.

This was an unimaginable event that occurred in our country. It is now time

for us to talk about this issue. There are many people who say this is not the time to talk about it, but the truth is, the only thing the National Rifle Association wants more than to sell lots of gun silencers is to put a silencer on the debate about gun safety legislation. The only thing the NRA wants more than allowing nationwide concealed carry laws is to conceal the overwhelming support for background checks. The only thing the NRA wants more than to stifle smart gun technology is to stifle debate on gun violence prevention.

So to anyone who says having this debate now is too soon, it is already too late for at least 59 people in Las Vegas and hundreds of others who were wounded. We should not wait another day.

We need to pass commonsense gun safety legislation so that we can hold a moment of silence for the National Rifle Association's stranglehold on American politics. That is what must end in our country.

We need a debate on this floor on background checks. We need a debate in this Chamber on whether we are going to do research on the relationship between guns and violence in our society. We don't need to debate the issue of bringing silencers into our society that can be attached to guns and that would have made it infinitely more difficult for the police to find where the shooter was or for people to know that they needed to hide or move to a more secure location. That would not have happened. We would not have had 59 deaths; we could have had 259 deaths, 559 deaths, or 959 deaths because a silencer would have given less notice to all of those people that they should be moving and hiding and protecting themselves and their loved ones.

On concealed carry, the Republicans are moving a bill that allows for someone to conceal a gun under a law in one State—because that State allows you to conceal a gun, you would be able to move into any other State and continue to conceal a gun even though that State's laws prohibit concealing guns. They want that law to move through.

So when the Republicans talk about debating gun control, what they are talking about is lessening the safety around these guns, lowering the standards that would protect people, and allowing for silencers to now be proliferating on these assault weapons, these weapons of war that should not be on the streets of our country and that have the capacity to kill people without people hearing them.

They say they are needed because we need to protect people's hearing when they are firing assault weapons. Well, it is more important that the police hear the bullets and that the people who might be hit hear the sound of

those bullets as they are leaving the gun. That is going to provide far more protection. It is far more important that the police in a State or in a city know that someone has a concealed weapon. It is critically important for police protection. But the National Rifle Association does not want those kinds of protections to remain on the books. That is who they are. That is what they want.

What should we be debating? We should be debating background checks. We should be debating whether someone should be able to buy a gun on Instagram and turn it into an "insta-gun" without background checks. That is what we should be talking about out here.

Over 90 percent of Americans want stronger background checks. Yet the Republican leadership turns a deaf ear to the request of the American people because the National Rifle Association does not want there to be background checks on people who are buying guns in our country.

More Americans have died from gun violence in the past 50 years on the streets of America than have died in all of our Nation's wars overseas in our entire history. Let me say that again. More people have died from guns in our own country in the last 50 years than all of our soldiers, sailors, Air Force, and marines have died going all the way back to 1776. That is how much of an epidemic this is in our country. It is an epidemic that now kills 33,000 people every single year in our country, but the Federal Government's investment in researching gun violence is zero.

Diabetes—76,000 U.S. deaths annually; they get \$170 million at the Centers for Disease Control. Flu—57,000 deaths a year; they get \$187 million for research. Asthma—3,600 deaths a year; they get \$29 million for research at the Centers for Disease Control. Gun violence—zero. An epidemic is ravaging our country, and the Republicans will not fund research to find this link between violence and the use of guns in our society, to do the research that can help us to reduce this carnage on the streets of our country. And because of an appropriations rider from the 1990s, the Centers for Disease Control hasn't conducted research into the causes of gun violence and how to prevent it. If 20 young children in Newtown had died of Ebola, we would have invested funding to study it. If 59 people in Las Vegas died of Zika, would we study it? Absolutely. But our country is suffering from an illness, and we have let it spread because we refuse to write a treatment plan.

The American Medical Association supports ending the ban on research. The American Public Health Association supports ending the ban on research. More than 141 groups want to end this ban on researching the link between guns and violence in our society.

The bill I have introduced with Representative MALONEY gives \$10 million to the Centers for Disease Control every single year. Shouldn't we be studying how to stop people from firing guns and give the medical, the scientific, and the public health community the resources they need?

We also need to develop new smart gun technologies that would improve safety and reduce accidental shootings. My bill would authorize grants to develop and personalize handgun technology to increase efficiency and decrease costs. If you can use a fingerprint to operate your iPhone, you should be able to do the same thing with your gun to make sure that safety is ensured, to make sure it is your thumbprint on that gun, that if your gun is stolen or lost, no one else would be able to use that gun. Does that make sense? Well, your thumb can work for your smartphone. Your thumb could also work for smart gun technology.

So this is where we are. We are at this critical point where some people are saying: Not now. It is inappropriate. We shouldn't be raising these issues.

But what we should be debating is what the American people want us to debate. Over 90 percent want background checks on anyone who buys a gun in our country to make sure they are qualified, to make sure they do not have something in their background that should disqualify them from owning a gun in our country.

Our debate here should really be about one thing: making the NRA stand for "not relevant anymore" in American politics. The task for the Republican Party is different. It will be whether they will kill these bills that would legalize more fully silencers being put on automatic weapons in our country, kill the concealed carry law, which is moving through the House and Senate driven by Republicans, and, instead, debate the kinds of things that make our country safer, the kinds of things that poll after poll is showing that the American people want us to do. That is going to be our challenge in the days and weeks and months ahead.

This is the time; this is the place. We are the people who must be conducting this debate to make sure we add an extra measure of safety that American families can rely upon.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, my colleague from Massachusetts has referred to the tragedy that we all watched unfold late on Sunday evening in Las Vegas, NV—the tragedy, the horror, the shock of so many. Alaska has felt the brunt of that tragedy as well. We lost two Alaskans; at least one other was injured. Mr. Adrian

Murfitt from Anchorage, a commercial fisherman, lost his life that evening. Dorene Anderson, who is a mom and self-described hockey promoter, will not be returning to Alaska with her family. Rob McIntosh, who is a realtor from the Fairbanks-North Pole area, was also injured. Our prayers are with him and with all of the families.

Whether they are from Alaska or from around the country, the tragedy, the loss, is just a shocking emotion that has been brought to this Nation. It is really horrifying on so many different levels. I express my condolences not only to the families of the Alaskans whom we have lost but to all of those who are suffering.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, I want to speak on another matter, and that is the tragedy related to natural disasters we have seen visited on our country, the devastating impacts that Hurricanes Irma and Maria have had on the U.S. Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico, the current relief efforts that are underway on those islands, and how we might help in the long term to rebuild, particularly as it relates to their electric grid and their power sector.

Mr. President, as the Presiding Officer serves on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I have the honor of being the chairman of that Committee, and that is the committee of jurisdiction for our territories.

Our committee's history dates back to 1816, when it was then called the Committee on Public Lands. The acquisition of Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Guam in 1898, through the Treaty of Paris, led to the creation of the Committee on Insular Affairs in 1899. The U.S. Virgin Islands were included in that committee's jurisdiction following their purchase from Denmark in 1917.

In 1946, the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Insular Affairs merged to form the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In 1977, the committees were again reorganized, leading to the current structure of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Our committee has had the proud distinction of working with the territories for the last 70-plus years. Certainly, following Hurricanes Irma and Maria, we are committed to upholding our responsibilities to the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Perhaps it is because I was born in a territory—I need to actually look this up; it may be that I am the only Member of Congress or Member in the Senate who was actually born in a territory—but I feel an affinity. One would not think there is much connection between a small island territory like Puerto Rico and the large landmass that we have in Alaska, but in many ways, Alaska is also islanded in the

sense that we are not part of the continental 48. So I do follow with great interest and care how Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are included.

With the current focus almost entirely on Puerto Rico right now, it can seem like a distant memory that only 2 weeks ago, before Hurricane Maria, we had Hurricane Irma, which hit the islands of St. Thomas and St. John as a category 5 hurricane. One category 5 is bad enough, but then to have a second category 5 hurricane hit just 2 weeks later, this time impacting the island of St. Croix, is almost unfathomable.

The devastation we have seen in both the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico can seem overwhelming. Relief operations for the islands are different from what you have with the mainland. When you recognize how you move to accommodate relief, everything has to be brought in by ship or by plane. You don't have the convoys of trucks rolling down the highway from an adjoining State. You don't have the ability to take alternative routes to reach the affected areas. Once goods are delivered to ports, for instance, it is another challenge, then, to get them from the port for inland distribution.

Even under normal operating conditions, moving the amount of containers that have flooded into the territories would be a challenge, but when you add into it the debris, the downed power lines, the washed-out bridges and roads, the lack of power, and the driver shortages, the challenges become colossal.

Then you have other limiting factors. You have competition for hotel rooms and other lodging as you bring in relief workers to go to the islands while refugees who have lost their homes try to leave. Again, the logistics are almost overwhelming; it is a logistical nightmare.

Despite these very considerable hurdles, we do see that progress is being made. According to recent reports from the Army Corps of Engineers, Federal and local response crews have been working to reopen the ports and runways. In some cases, we have seen sunken ships that need to be removed before a port can begin operations again.

In Puerto Rico, 13 of 16 ports are open or open with restrictions. In the U.S. Virgin Islands, five of nine ports are open or open with restrictions.

In addition, 15 of 17 priority dams in Puerto Rico have already been inspected. In the case of Guajataca Dam, it is in the process of being reinforced. The dam's spillway continues to erode. Rainfall has increased the water level in the reservoir. We have seen that the debris and the downed power lines need to be removed to allow helicopters to place 44 concrete barriers within the spillway channel. In fact, 900 super sandbags are on their way. Pumps and

piping are being procured to help decrease the water level. There are a lot of hands on deck there.

For electricity, as of October 1, 5 percent of customers in Puerto Rico have had their power restored. The Puerto Rico electric utility expects to have power restored to 15 percent of customers over the next 2 weeks.

I looked at this aspect of it and recognize that it is still pretty warm in Puerto Rico. I checked the weather this afternoon, and it is 87 degrees. Over the next couple of days, it will be 93 degrees. Making sure that folks have power, have an ability to keep fans, to have air conditioning—this is critical.

Assessments show significant damage to the transmission and distribution systems, so, again, a great deal of work is yet underway there.

In the Virgin Islands, 15 percent of customers in St. Thomas and 10 percent of customers in St. Croix have had their power restored. This includes the airports and the hospitals.

On the hospitals, I would note that both the hospitals in the U.S. Virgin Islands—one in St. Thomas and one in St. Croix—have sustained heavy damage and may need to be replaced. Again, long term, moving forward, this is critical infrastructure.

We do know that in the immediate term, the primary relief that Congress can provide is through our appropriations process. We will soon be considering another tranche of disaster relief funds so that those impacted by these hurricanes have the food, water, and medicine they need as recovery efforts continue.

Other options, such as making the rum tax cover-over payments permanent and increasing or lifting the cap on community disaster loans may also need to be considered as ways to get the islands back on their feet.

Another part of our responsibility, though, is to look at potential long-term solutions to persistent problems. In the case of Puerto Rico, it is their antiquated electric grid and power generation system.

I have had many conversations with many colleagues in these past couple of weeks. I am concerned that current disaster recovery rules may mandate that the damaged or destroyed entity be restored with similar material, compared to its condition prior to the disaster. What may seem like a good, general rule of thumb in some scenarios, like this one—I don't think it makes a lot of sense. Why would we consider spending hundreds of millions of dollars to rebuild what was an inefficient, unreliable electric power grid in Puerto Rico?

Making sure that we do right going forward is important for us. I am going to be meeting with officials with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. They have been tasked by FEMA with rebuilding Puerto Rico's electricity grid.

I am going to meet with the Army Corps and the Department of Energy to see if there is a way to modernize Puerto Rico's grid during its rebuild, whether by administrative or legislative action. I think we need to look at different considerations moving forward.

There has been a discussion about whether it makes more sense to bury transmission lines rather than rebuild towers. We need to look at microgrids and consider whether they should be developed to provide power to communities throughout the island even if the islandwide grid is down. This is something our committee has been keenly focused on—the application of microgrids and how they might be better utilized.

I would note on this matter that the urban area of Mayaguez is currently receiving power from the hydro-gas plant that is located within its municipality. It is essentially its own microgrid. But the damaged transmission lines prevent electricity from moving to other municipalities across the island.

There are other considerations, including the role that distributed generation plays. Can these Federal entities work with the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority, PREPA, to develop a demonstration project for the island that would make the grid more efficient, more reliable, reduce the cost of electricity to consumers? These are all things that need to be considered. We had a hearing in the Energy Committee this morning on energy storage technologies, and it was mentioned there that regional technology demonstrations might be particularly helpful for Puerto Rico at this time.

I intend to visit Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands with other Members a few weeks from now. We know President Trump is there today. We are going to wait until the situation has stabilized just a bit more to allow for these relief efforts to continue. When we have an opportunity to observe the situation ourselves, I think it is worth noting that we will, on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, be holding a hearing on the impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria on both Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and I anticipate we will be doing that in the coming weeks. We want to look at not only the damage caused and where recovery efforts stand but also lessons learned as well as opportunities moving forward as to how we can rebuild Puerto Rico's electric grid to better than it was before so it does have a resiliency and it does have a sustainability that I think is imperative moving forward.

We recognize that the islands have faced a real tragedy in this natural disaster, but, from this, can we work quickly to stabilize things in the short term but allow this to be an opportunity to think about Puerto Rico's

long-term energy future—an energy future that is more resilient and is more sustainable.

So our thoughts and prayers are with all who were impacted by these incredibly powerful storms as they dig out, as they rebuild, as they restart their lives, and just as we will take care of the people of Texas and Louisiana and Florida, I want to make sure the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands know we stand united with them during these exceptionally difficult times and that we will work with them as partners to make their islands stronger, more resilient, and better prepared for whatever the future may bring them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I would like to start by thanking Senator MURKOWSKI for her leadership as chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, on which I also serve, in addressing some of the long-term needs of Puerto Rico.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, the American people are relieved that the latest version of TrumpCare went down in defeat last week. We won this battle because millions of people made their voices heard, but the danger remains. We cannot grow complacent.

The President and his allies in Congress are hoping that in our relief, we will move on and pay attention to other things. With this President, I have to say, and this administration, there is always a fresh outrage to contend with. After his latest failure, the President has turned to sabotage and neglect to accomplish his goal of denying millions of people access to healthcare under the Affordable Care Act.

The danger is real. The President's continued threats to eliminate cost-sharing reduction payments that help reduce out-of-pocket costs for consumers under the ACA, for example, are already destabilizing health insurance in Hawaii and across the country.

This year, HMSA and Kaiser—two of Hawaii's largest providers of health insurance—proposed large rate increases for customers on the exchange in response to the uncertainty posed by the President's threats to eliminate the cost-sharing payments. These companies have been told to submit two rate proposals, one if cost-sharing remains in place and the other if these cost-sharing provisions are eliminated.

If the President eliminates cost-sharing payments, Hawaii residents could see an 8-percent increase in their premiums on the individual markets. This translates into millions of dollars more that Hawaii residents will need to pay. This is irresponsible, unacceptable, and completely within the President's power to prevent.

Unfortunately, the President isn't the only member of his administration intent on sabotaging the Affordable Care Act. The Secretary of Health and Human Services resigned in disgrace last week, but the work he set in motion at the Department to make it more difficult for people to sign up for insurance continues apace.

The administration has already shortened the open enrollment period from 90 days to 45 days and proposed massive cuts for advertising and call centers during this shortened window. To make matters worse, they are taking healthcare.gov down for so-called maintenance at peak times on the weekends so people have even less time to sign up for coverage.

The sabotage doesn't end there. The administration is also calling for a 40-percent cut in funding for navigators who help vulnerable communities find and secure coverage. In the past, organizations in Hawaii like We Are Oceania and the Legal Aid Society have received navigator grants to help enroll low-income Hawaii residents, COFA citizens, individuals with disabilities, and other underserved communities in programs under the ACA.

Last week, I had the opportunity to meet with Josie Howard, We Are Oceania's program director. Josie and her team navigate a multitude of language and cultural barriers to help COFA citizens who have been unfairly disqualified from Medicaid to enroll in the exchange. President Trump's determination to sabotage the ACA undermines the hard work Josie and organizations like We Are Oceania are doing to expand healthcare access to underserved communities.

We need to keep fighting back against the President's sabotage campaign, but we can also work together in Congress to improve our Nation's healthcare system and renew programs that millions of people depend on every year in our country.

On Saturday, Congress allowed funding for the Community Health Center Fund—CHCF—to lapse without being renewed. CHCs across the country will be forced to lay off staff, reduce hours of operations, scale back investments, or even close, denying healthcare coverage or services to millions of people in need all across the country.

Through the ACA, the CHCF provided increased funding for community health centers across the country to modernize facilities, hire new staff, and expand services in underrepresented communities. If Congress does not renew the program, community health centers will face a 70-percent cut in their Federal funding, and this will have a devastating impact for community health centers in Hawaii, like Malama I Ke Ola in Wailuku on Maui.

Thanks to the CHCF funding and the ACA's Medicaid expansion, Malama I Ke Ola has been able to expand the

services it provides to Maui residents and improve outcomes for thousands of people—particularly in the area of women's health.

In the years following the passage and implementation of the ACA, Malama I Ke Ola has worked to expand OB-GYN services at the clinic. With increased funding, the clinic has purchased new, high-definition ultrasound machines, hired new physicians, and upgraded its prenatal care facilities. The center recently signed a new contract with the University of Hawaii to provide overnight fetal medical services at the clinic instead of having to refer patients to large public hospitals on Oahu. Keeping these patients on Maui not only reduces overall healthcare spending but also allows patients to stay close to home and their families.

If Congress does not renew CHCF funding, this program—and hundreds of others across the State and country—will be at risk.

Congressional inaction has also threatened the future of the Children's Health Insurance Program—or CHIP—which provides health insurance to 9 million low-income children and mothers across the country and 27,000 in Hawaii. We should act as soon as possible to pass a bipartisan reauthorization that Senators HATCH and WYDEN negotiated in the Senate Finance Committee.

It seems as though every day the President tweets something new and outrageous to distract us from the true issues facing our country, whether it is the Mueller investigation or his decision to rescind DACA and place hundreds of thousands of DACA Dreamers at risk for deportation. This is a tactic the President has used to great effect during our many debates on healthcare. The President hopes we will be paying more attention to his attacks on NFL players or demeaning comments about the mayor of San Juan instead of his dangerous proposals to take healthcare away from millions of people in our country. We have to keep paying attention and keep our eyes on the ball. We have to keep speaking up and fighting back.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, after failing to throw 32 million Americans off of the health insurance they currently have last week, the Republicans are continuing their attack against the

working families of our country with one of the most destructive budgets in American history.

I know the American people today, for very good reason, are preoccupied with the horror of what happened in Las Vegas, and people are horrified about what has happened in Puerto Rico, but I would beg of the American people to please pay attention to the budget proposal and the so-called tax reform ideas brought by the Republican leadership in the Senate, as well as in the House.

This proposal would cause devastating economic pain for tens of millions of Americans by, on the one hand, giving incredibly large tax breaks for the wealthiest people in the country, while at the same time making it harder for our children to get a decent education, harder for the families of this country to get the healthcare they need, harder for families, literally, to put food on the table, harder to protect our environment, and harder for the elderly to live their retirement years with dignity.

This is the Robin Hood proposal in reverse. The Robin Hood principle in reverse is that instead of taking from the rich to help the poor, this proposal makes massive cuts in programs desperately needed by the middle class and working families of our country, precisely to give unbelievably large tax breaks to the people on top—the people who least need those tax breaks.

At a time of massive income and wealth inequality, where we have more inequality today than at any time since the 1920s and more inequality than almost any major country on Earth, where the very, very rich are becoming much richer and we have 40 million people living in poverty and tens of millions of middle-class families are going nowhere in a hurry, this Republican budget, according to the Tax Policy Center, at the end of 10 years, would provide 80 percent of the tax benefits to the top 1 percent.

Right now, today, the rich are doing phenomenally well. Everybody understands that. The middle class is shrinking. But according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, by the end of the decade, nearly 80 percent of the tax benefits in the Republican plan would go to the top 1 percent—under this plan, this Republican plan. The top one-tenth of 1 percent, the richest of the rich, would receive a tax break of over \$1 million a year.

At a time when so many of our families are struggling to put food on the table, struggling to figure out how to send their kids to college, struggling to figure out how to pay for childcare, we have a Republican tax proposal that would provide trillions of dollars in tax breaks to the richest people in this country.

This is a budget that would increase the Federal deficit by \$1.5 trillion over

the next decade. We have heard on the Senate floor my Republican friends talking about how worried they are about the \$20 trillion national debt and how high the deficits are. This proposal, designed to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country, would increase the Federal deficit by \$1.5 trillion over the next decade, and, by the way, this is a conservative estimate. There are those who think the deficit would go up a lot more than that.

This is a Republican proposal that eliminates the estate tax. What is the estate tax? Republicans name it the “death tax,” but let us be clear about what this tax is and who benefits from it. Despite Republican efforts trying to find farmers or ranchers who would benefit from it, this is not legislation designed to help farmers or ranchers. This is legislation designed to help the top two-tenths of 1 percent. So 99.8 percent of the American people will not benefit one nickel from the repeal of the estate tax. Only the wealthiest of the wealthy will benefit. If this Republican proposal to repeal the estate tax would go through, the Walton family of Walmart, the wealthiest family in America, would receive a tax cut of up to \$52 billion.

Does anybody for one second think that, at a time when so many of our people are struggling and when we have a \$20 trillion national debt, we should be passing legislation that gives the wealthiest family in this country up to a \$52 billion tax break by repealing the estate tax?

But it is not just the Walton family, of course. This is a budget that says that if you are the second wealthiest family in America, the Koch brothers—and this, by the way, is just coincidental, no doubt. I know it is amazing how these coincidences take place. The Koch brothers are a family who contributed hundreds of millions of dollars year after year to the Republican Party to elect candidates who represent the wealthy and powerful. Just coincidentally, that family would receive a tax break of up to \$38 billion.

People ask why the Koch brothers are contributing hundreds of millions of dollars every campaign cycle. That is a huge amount of money. That is a huge amount of money for normal families, but when you are the second wealthiest family and you have a tax break of \$38 billion, contributing a few million dollars every campaign cycle is pocket change and is a good investment.

This is a budget that will cut Medicare by \$450 billion. Right now in this country, we have millions and millions of seniors who are struggling to make ends meet. They can't afford their prescription drugs. They can't afford to keep their homes warm in the winter-time. Yet this Republican budget would cut Medicare by \$450 billion.

Now, the Republicans tried, time after time, despite massive opposition from the American people, to repeal the Affordable Care Act. In every one of their pieces of legislation, they made devastating cuts in Medicaid. Well, they are back again. Ostensibly, this is not a healthcare piece of legislation. It is a budget. It is so-called tax reform. There is \$1 trillion of cuts in the Medicaid Program. So if you were worried last week, 2 weeks ago, and 1 month ago about what the terrific Republican healthcare bills would do, stay worried because this bill will cut \$1 trillion over 10 years in Medicaid, resulting in at least 15 million Americans losing their health insurance.

Can you imagine a set of priorities that says that we are going to throw 15 million people off of health insurance in order to give tens of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest families in this country? Unbelievable.

It really is unbelievable.

This proposal not only adds to the deficit, not only makes massive cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, it also impacts the American people in many ways. We have a program in this country called the Women, Infants, and Children Program, and at a time when the United States has the highest rate of infant mortality of any major country on Earth, what we do to try to deal with that issue is provide help to low-income pregnant women and their babies after the babies are born. This Republican budget would make about \$6.5 billion in cuts to the WIC Program, eliminating nutrition assistance to over 1.2 million pregnant women, new moms, babies, and toddlers in Vermont and all over this country.

Here are the priorities: Tax breaks for the Walton family, for the Koch brothers' families, who are billionaires, and cuts in programs for low-income, pregnant women who want to have healthy babies.

At a time when the cost of childcare has skyrocketed all over this country—in the State of Vermont, it is a very serious problem; families cannot find affordable childcare—the Republican budget eliminates Head Start services for 25,000 children each and every year by cutting this program by about \$3 billion. In total, the Republican budget would cut more than \$5 trillion from education, healthcare, affordable housing, childcare, transportation, and other programs the working families of this country desperately rely upon.

Let's be clear about something else. This is not me talking; Republican economists are saying the same thing.

What is the theory underlying this whole approach of giving tax breaks to billionaires? The theory is that when you give tax breaks to billionaires and large, multinational corporations, somehow or another, they are going to start using the new revenue they acquire to invest in the economy and cre-

ate decent-paying jobs. This is the so-called trickle-down economic theory, and this is a theory that Senate Republicans and President Trump have embraced with this budget.

The fact is that anyone who looks at history understands that whole theory is a fraud. It has always been an abysmal failure. Since Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush slashed taxes on the wealthy and deregulated Wall Street, trillions of dollars in wealth have been redistributed from the middle class and working families to a handful of millionaires and billionaires. That is what trickle-down economics results in—a transfer of wealth from the middle class to the people on top—and that is exactly what this Republican proposal will do.

Today we have more wealth inequality than at any time since the 1920s. Unbelievably, the top one-tenth of 1 percent now owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. This budget would make a very bad situation worse, and it would increase the level of wealth inequality in America today.

As the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I intend to do everything I can to oppose this absurd set of priorities, and when I do that, I am speaking for the vast majority of the American people. Poll after poll after poll tells us that the American people do not think billionaires need more tax breaks. Poll after poll after poll tells us that the American people do not agree with the Republican leadership when they want to throw millions of people off of the health insurance they have. This is not a budget for the American people. This is not a budget for economic growth. This is a budget paid for and fought for by the Koch brothers and a handful of billionaires who will gain very handsomely if this budget were to be passed.

I would remind my Republican colleagues—and this is not a very radical idea—that we were elected to the Senate not just to represent a handful of billionaires; we were elected to the Senate to do our best for the middle class and working families of our country. This should not be legislation designed as payback for hundreds of millions of dollars in campaign contributions. We need to pass legislation that protects the interests of working families and the middle class and lower income people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

(Mr. STRANGE assumed the Chair.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING PETE DOMENICI

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I am joined today by my colleague from New Mexico, Senator HEINRICH. We thought

we would come to the floor together and talk about Senator Domenici, our former colleague who passed away recently.

Pietro Vichi Domenici was born to Italian immigrants in Albuquerque, NM, in 1932. He was a grocer's son. He worked in his parents' store and attended Catholic school. He graduated from our own University of New Mexico. He pitched in college on the Albuquerque Dukes' farm team, and he taught high school mathematics. He went to law school and built a law practice. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1973 and became New Mexico's longest serving Senator.

He was a husband, father, and grandfather. He married Nancy Burke right out of law school, and his beautiful wife of 59 years was key to his long and successful career. She is a good friend of ours, and we spent an hour with her in Albuquerque a little over a week ago. She is still very strong, and she is still very focused, as one would expect as a mother and grandmother of her children and grandchildren.

Pete Domenici was a statesman. He worked across party lines to find pragmatic solutions for the American people. New Mexicans will always remember him as one of the strongest fighters our State will ever know.

Senator Domenici and I belonged to different political parties, and we didn't always agree on things, but I always appreciated that he cared deeply about the issues, and he put the Nation and New Mexico's interests first as he saw them. I join all of New Mexico in thanking him and in mourning his passing.

Senator Domenici's math skills and his beginnings in local government served him well during his 36 years in the U.S. Senate. Anyone who has served in city government knows the importance of a budget. Sitting as chair or ranking member on the Senate Budget Committee for 22 years, he held the Federal Government to the same rigorous, logical standard. He mastered the complexities of the Federal budget and served longer in a leadership position on that committee than any other Senator. He was a budget deficit hawk and a realist. He understood that supply-side economics do not work and that big tax cuts will not result in growth leading to a balanced budget. He went up against his own party, and he went up against President Ronald Reagan on the same budget issue.

In the 1990s, he worked with President Clinton to produce a budget surplus for fiscal year 1998—the first surplus in our budget since 1969. His willingness to work with Democrats, his pragmatism, and his stature with his own party made it possible.

On the Budget Committee, he understood how to align New Mexico and national interests.

He recognized the potential of our National Labs—Los Alamos and

Sandia—and the potential they had for our State. He understood their importance to the national interest. He championed their work for decades. Our Labs provide thousands of good jobs in central and northern New Mexico, and the breadth and depth of their research and scientific contributions to our Nation are nothing short of astonishing. Pete Domenici played a critical role in the Labs' developments.

He also had a key appreciation of the importance to New Mexico and the Nation of our military bases. In 2005, Cannon Air Force Base in southern New Mexico was slated to close. This would have cost New Mexico lots of jobs and would have had a devastating impact on the overall economy of the State. Senator Domenici, along with the entire delegation and Governor Richardson, worked to secure a different and critical mission for Cannon Air Force Base. Today, the 27th Special Operations Wing is going strong at Cannon. Six thousand men and women are employed, and rural Roosevelt and Curry Counties benefit from the base's \$500 million economic impact.

Senator Domenici's fingerprints are not only all over the Budget Committee but are all over the Energy and Natural Resources Committee—which he chaired for 4 years in the early 2000s—and the Indian Affairs Committee, which I am fortunate to sit on today. He helped position the United States to be energy independent through the Energy Policy Acts of 2005 and 2007—the last time we really had bipartisan energy acts. He was a strong advocate on behalf of Tribes, working to advance Indian healthcare and resolve longstanding water rights disputes, protecting Native art from counterfeiting, and improving reservation roads.

My Uncle Mo talked a lot about the importance of being able to disagree without being disagreeable and to work together, if possible. Senator Domenici understood that while the delegation was divided by party, it was united in its love for New Mexico. He knew that New Mexico would be stronger if everyone worked together. It is partly thanks to him that our delegation continues a tradition of working together regardless of party.

Senator Domenici's commitment to bipartisanship did not end in 2009 with his Senate tenure; he continued to try to find solutions that worked for everyone as a senior fellow at the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington.

The Pete V. Domenici Institute for Public Policy at New Mexico State University in Las Cruces carries on his tradition through scholarship. The Senator said:

It's time for us to join together and take these [partisan] issues out of politics. The problems we face are so big, people from both sides need to sit down and say, "We can't approach this the normal way." Some great leadership is needed.

We could really use that commitment to bipartisanship in the Senate halls today.

Senator Domenici was in Washington for many years, but he never was out of touch with everyday New Mexicans. Whether it was the acequia repairs in the Espanola Valley, creating a port of entry at Santa Teresa, funding new fighter jets at Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque, establishing the Petroglyph National Monument, protecting Valles Caldera, forming the Hispanic Cultural Center and Museum in Albuquerque, Pete Domenici identified New Mexico's needs and came up with solutions.

Pete and Nancy had a special passion for people who live with mental illness, borne from his own family's experience. This is an issue that he and I talked a lot about and that our two families shared. He worked across the aisle for many years to achieve parity in insurance coverage between mental healthcare and medical services. Any family who experiences serious mental illness understands that the two should be treated the same and that adequate mental healthcare is absolutely necessary.

In 2008, Congress passed the Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act. That Federal law means that millions of persons with mental illness and substance abuse disorders have better access to the care they really need.

Senator Domenici spoke passionately and personally about mental health. He also did so on immigration. His mother originally immigrated to the United States illegally. During World War II, she was taken in a raid aimed at "Italian sympathizers." Those of us who were here during the immigration debates in 2006 remember his plainspoken and moving speech on the floor of the Senate, where he said:

I understand this whole idea of a household with a father who is American and a mother who is not, but they are living, working, and getting ahead. I understand that they are just like every other family in America. There is nothing different. They have the same love, same hope, same will and same aspirations as those of us who were born here have.

I couldn't agree more.

Pete Domenici, my good friend, son of Italian immigrant grocers, a great Senator, a great American, and a great New Mexican, thank you for your remarkable contributions. You leave an exceptional legacy for New Mexico and for the Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I am really proud to come to the floor today

to join my fellow Senator from New Mexico, TOM UDALL, to recognize the life and service of the longest serving Senator from our incredible State of New Mexico, Senator Pete Domenici.

Senator Domenici dedicated his entire life to the State and to the people he loved. He served our State in the Senate for 36 years. His decades of service to New Mexico left a lasting impact that will continue to be felt in every corner of our State for many years to come. Many in New Mexico called him Saint Pete because of how relentlessly he fought on the Appropriations and Budget Committees to secure resources for the people of New Mexico. We can still see the fruits of his labors at our State's National Labs, at our military installations, at our colleges and universities, and in water systems and community centers all over our State. That is because, while he worked on the forefront of major policy debates here in the Senate, Pete Domenici always put the interests of New Mexico above all else.

Like myself, Senator Domenici's first public service experience came on Albuquerque's City Council, then called the City Commission. And, at least in my experience, I know that working at that local level was an invaluable way to learn how to hear from diverse viewpoints and stakeholders and find ways to build consensus and get the results for your constituents that you hope to achieve. I have tried to bring that approach with me into the Senate, and I know that Senator Domenici was, in part, so successful because of the skills he learned there.

I am grateful for the example Senator Domenici set for all of us here in this body on how to advance important and complex policy goals in Washington with civility for our colleagues. Republicans and Democrats alike who worked with him on issues like the budget, energy, national defense, nuclear deterrence, and mental health parity still point to his dedication to bipartisan cooperation and compromise.

Although they didn't always see eye to eye, Senator Domenici, a Republican, and Senator Jeff Bingaman, a Democrat, who served New Mexico alongside him for the vast majority of his time in the Senate, always made a point of improving the lives of New Mexicans by working together. It set a great example for people like me to watch how the two of them worked together. Their spirit of cooperation across party lines is still present in our State's congressional delegation, and I believe Senator Domenici's focus on putting policy results above party politics still resonates today.

One of the greatest examples of this was Senator Domenici's work alongside two progressive Democratic lions of the Senate—Paul Wellstone and Ted Kennedy—to pass mental health parity

legislation. Senators Domenici and Wellstone didn't agree on many issues, but they found they both had close, personal experience with and a passion for mental health parity. Both Senators had close family members who had experienced the great challenges of finding a way to pay for mental health treatment. Insurance companies were not required to cover mental health and addiction treatment in those days in the same way they covered treatment for so many other illnesses and diseases. Because of that, most insurance companies simply didn't cover these essential services at all.

Starting in the mid-1990s, Senators Domenici and Wellstone worked together with mental health advocates to advance legislation to finally change that.

After Senator Wellstone was killed in a tragic plane crash, Senator Domenici kept up the fight for 6 more years with a new partner in Senator KENNEDY. The Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act was finally passed in October of 2008, only a few months before Senator Domenici's retirement from the Senate.

That is the type of bipartisanship, legacy, and statesmanship on behalf of the American people that I hope we will all remember for a long, long time to come. We should all try better to keep that spirit alive in the Senate today.

I join all New Mexicans and all Americans in mourning the passing of Senator Pete Domenici. Our thoughts, our deepest condolences, and our prayers are with his wife Nancy and all of his family and loved ones at this time of great loss, for their family and for the State. I am certain that Senator Domenici's legacy will not be forgotten in New Mexico and will not be forgotten in the U.S. Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we need tax reform that helps small businesses close these tax loopholes that are taking jobs overseas. Instead, we need to create those jobs at home. We need tax reform that puts money in the pockets of middle-class families in Michigan and all across the country, and we need an American budget that shows what we value as Americans.

Too often, we think of budgets as sterile numbers on a spreadsheet. In reality, budgets are about people. They are about the middle-class Cass City parents who are sitting down to do their taxes and feeling as if it is they, not the wealthiest 1 percent, who are carrying the heaviest burden. They are about helping small business owners in Pontiac, MI, family farmers in Cadillac, and Michigan companies that are creating good-paying jobs. They are also about ensuring that the most vul-

nerable among us—our children, senior citizens, people with disabilities—are valued and protected.

We cannot consider a budget without considering people. Will it help middle-class families thrive? Will it help small business owners grow? Will it help protect people who cannot protect themselves? Unfortunately, the Republican budget and tax plan suggest that we do not value people, plain and simple.

There are 47 million Americans who depend on Medicare—seniors and people with disabilities. Yet the budget resolution we will be considering tomorrow in the Budget Committee will cut \$473 billion from Medicare. For the low-income children, parents, seniors in nursing homes, and people with disabilities who depend on Medicaid, in that budget resolution, Medicaid would be cut by \$1 trillion.

We just went through this debate twice in efforts to gut healthcare, to gut Medicaid, which would take away healthcare from tens of millions of people. The American people said no, and the Senate said no—twice. Yet we are right back again. Here they go again on the budget resolution, putting forward huge—even bigger—cuts in Medicaid. This time, it is not just Medicaid, it is Medicare, which was not in the last two proposals that we rejected, because they hurt too many people by taking away their healthcare.

Now we have a budget resolution that will be coming to the floor of the Senate. I am assuming they will have enough votes. They certainly will not have mine or those of my Democratic colleagues, but if every Republican in committee votes for it, we will have on the floor a budget resolution that will cut Medicare by \$473 billion and Medicaid by \$1 trillion.

Why is that being done? It is being done to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest among us. In fact, 80 percent of the tax cuts would go to the top 1 percent. It would be 80 percent who would receive a cut of about \$200,000 a year—a cut. The majority of people in Michigan do not make \$200,000 a year, but this would be a tax cut of \$200,000 a year, on average. This is not what I was talking about before in our helping small businesses and middle-class families and closing tax loopholes that are taking jobs overseas. This is a straight-up, trickle-down tax cut that has not worked before in creating jobs. It creates a lot of deficits but not jobs, and people in my State are still waiting for it to trickle down to them.

Republicans are asking seniors, people with disabilities, children, and families to give up healthcare in order to fund a huge tax cut for the richest 1 percent, which will cost more than \$2 trillion. To me, that sounds like backwards budgeting for sure.

I do not often quote my friend from Kentucky, but Senator PAUL was absolutely right yesterday. He tweeted this:

This is a GOP tax plan? Possibly 30 percent of middle-class families get a tax hike? I hope the final details are better than this.

I do too. I hope that the final details are a lot better than this if it is going to be something that the people of Michigan will support and benefit from.

Under the Republican plan, a senior citizen in Saginaw, MI, who is making \$20,000 a year would get a tax increase; a married couple with two kids and an income of \$70,000 in Gaylord, MI, would get a tax increase; and a single mom with three kids in Battle Creek, MI, who works really hard every day in juggling and caring for her kids and who earns \$50,000 a year, which never seems to stretch far enough, would actually pay \$1,000 more in taxes because, under the plan, if you have more than one child, you will actually see your taxes go up because the personal exemption for each child will be taken away.

Senator PAUL is right. This is just plain wrong. I do have to give Republicans credit, though. They keep upping the ante. It wasn't even a week ago when they were trying to take healthcare away from people in Michigan and across the country with a plan that would increase costs and reduce healthcare. Now they are trying to take healthcare away from people who need it most by raising taxes on middle-income families and cutting Medicare, as well as Medicaid.

We do need tax reform. I would like very much to see the code simplified, but any tax proposal needs to meet three basic requirements to get my support. First, tax reform needs to be bipartisan, rather than coming up with this proposal in the budget resolution which, once again, just like healthcare, would be jamming something through on a partisan vote. It needs to be bipartisan. It needs to be thoughtful.

Those of us on the Finance Committee are thoughtful people. We worked for 2 years in bipartisan working groups on each section of the Tax Code, getting ready to have a thoughtful discussion and negotiation on real tax reform that would help small businesses grow—by the way, they are creating a majority of the new jobs—as well as making sure families in America who are struggling would be able to have a simplified Tax Code and a tax cut. So I am all for doing a bipartisan approach, but that is not what is happening here. That is not what will be put into the budget resolution tomorrow, and, unfortunately, it doesn't appear that it is what is going to happen in the Finance Committee.

The other reason for wanting to do this in a bipartisan way is that it is the only way to make sure it is permanent. If you use these truncated processes of reconciliation to try to jam something through, it is not permanent. I know from businesses in Michigan, large and

small, as well as families, that to be able to plan, they want to see some permanent changes, and doing it this way is not permanent.

Second, tax reform needs to help businesses create jobs right here at home. Over the last year, I visited more than 120 small businesses in Michigan, and I have seen for myself how they are driving my State's economy. I also know how challenging it can be for them to navigate the complex Tax Code. The owner of a small business shouldn't have to spend hours with an accountant instead of with her customers. We can fix that. At the same time, tax reform needs to preserve important incentives for manufacturers that are creating jobs here in Michigan and in our country.

I don't believe we have an economy unless somebody makes something or somebody grows something. We need to make sure that the tax policy that supports capital intensive companies remains intact, and we need to close the gigantic loopholes that incentivize our jobs going overseas.

I have one simple proposal. It is not everything, but it is a symbol of how bad the situation is. I have been trying to get it passed now for over 10 years here, and it keeps getting blocked and filibustered. It is called the Bring Jobs Home Act. It is very simple. The Tax Code right now allows a company moving overseas to write off all their moving costs. So the workers losing their jobs help pay for the move through their taxes. The community pays for the move through their taxes. It makes no sense to do that. My Bring Jobs Home Act would stop that and say that you don't get to write off the costs when you are leaving our country. However, if you want to come back, if you want to bring jobs home, we are happy to let you write off those costs, and we will give you an extra 20 percent tax credit to bring those jobs home. If you want to leave, you are on your own. That is what our Tax Code should say to businesses that are moving our jobs overseas.

The third important measure in tax reform is that it needs to put money in the pockets of hard-working families. Michigan families are working hard every day to make ends meet. For too long, working-class and middle-class families have watched as all of the benefits seem to flow to the wealthiest among us over and over and over. Middle-class families are stretched to the breaking point, and it is time they get a break.

That is what the President originally said. This was going to be a middle-class tax cut. Yet, when we run the numbers, it is just not true. For too many, they are going to see a tax increase. As I said before, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent. You can even break that down more with 0.1 percent, and it is shock-

ing that those individuals are going to get a million-dollar tax cut.

When you look at the majority of people in Michigan who work hard every day and don't earn \$200,000 or more, and you look at the fact that there would be a tax plan brought forward that would actually give a tax cut of \$200,000 a year, and someone with three children or four children would actually see their taxes go up—wait a minute—what is wrong with that picture?

Unfortunately, this budget and tax proposal falls short in a number of ways, beyond Medicare and Medicaid cuts and what is happening in terms of families. As I said before, it is far from bipartisan. As with healthcare, Democrats have been locked out of the process. Republicans have been meeting in secret—no Democrats allowed.

The Republicans are having to use this reconciliation process to force something that will not be permanent. There is little reason to believe that this will help American workers. As I indicated before, it will not close loopholes that are taking jobs overseas.

It doesn't benefit hard-working people and working families that are working really hard to make it every year, every week. It does not benefit them.

The Republican budget and tax proposal targets the most vulnerable. It isn't bipartisan. It will not stop offshoring. It will not benefit the middle class. There is one thing that it will do. There is one thing that those who analyze this agree upon. It will explode the deficit. The independent analysis shows that these proposals would increase the deficit by \$2.4 trillion. So there is \$2.4 trillion in lost revenues that would go to increasing the deficit.

Our friends across the aisle scoff at that. These tax cuts, they say, will pay for themselves. Although in our Finance Committee hearing today, when we asked both the Republican and Democratic experts who were testifying, no one said it would pay for the tax cuts—no one.

President Trump said this huge tax cut will be rocket fuel for our economy. But when you look at the 2001 tax cuts, there was no rocket fuel there. In the 2003 tax cuts, there was no rocket fuel there. In 2012, the State of Kansas had tax cuts that almost caused them to have to go to a 4-day school week for children because of the huge deficits. There was no rocket fuel there.

There are two things to remember about rocket fuel. It is unstable, and, if you are not careful, you will get badly burned.

Budgets aren't about numbers; they are about people. They are about middle-class parents wondering why the wealthiest get all the breaks and they get the bill. It is about a small business owner wondering why she can't run a bakery without hiring an accountant.

It is about seniors on disability wondering if Medicare and Medicaid will be there for them while they watch the 0.1 percent get tax breaks and there are future generations being stuck with the bill for tax cuts that will not pay for themselves.

Budgets are about people, and this budget fails them. It is time to work together across the aisle to do what is right, to make sure that the budget and tax proposals work for everybody, not just a privileged few, and that they help companies create jobs here at home and focus on policies to benefit our working families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES V. SANCHEZ-GOMEZ

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, last week I filed an amicus brief calling on the U.S. Supreme Court to hear and then overturn the ruling of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *United States v. Sanchez-Gomez*. I am proud to have been supported in this effort by all 15 sheriffs in my home State of Arizona, as well as the Western States Sheriffs Association and the National Sheriffs' Association.

I should mention that this is not a partisan issue we are talking about. We have sheriffs representing both parties in Arizona. Every sheriff in Arizona has supported this amicus—all 15.

This decision by the Ninth Circuit is just another example of a ruling that is well outside of the judicial mainstream. Unfortunately, in this case, their ruling dramatically undercuts effective border enforcement, and it creates a dangerous situation for law enforcement and the public. In this case, the Ninth Circuit ruled that it violates the rights of prisoners for marshals and other sheriffs or other courtroom personnel to employ commonplace, thoughtfully crafted courtroom safety policies in which prisoners appear before a judge, fitted with appropriate restraints. This is a significant change from common practice, and it conflicts with two other courts of appeals.

More troubling, the decision has prompted public safety concerns for Arizona and throughout the West. First, law enforcement will have no choice but to increase the number of officers needed to maintain the safety of individuals inside courtrooms. This means that more U.S. marshals and sheriffs will be spending their days in courthouses instead of pursuing violent fugitives or preventing street crime. Even with these increased numbers,

law enforcement officials have expressed concern over the high threshold they are now forced to attain in order to get permission to fit dangerous prisoners with restraints.

By putting these restraints on law enforcement rather than prisoners, this ruling limits the ability of sheriffs and U.S. marshals to ensure the safety of the judges, jurors, lawyers, prisoners, victims, and members of the public inside these courthouses around the country.

This decision also dramatically undercuts the ability of the Federal courts to process illegal immigration border crossing cases as part of Operation Streamline, the very successful border enforcement program that has worked so well in some parts of Arizona. By establishing a zero tolerance approach to illegal border crossings, Operation Streamline has made a dramatic difference in the number of illegal border crossings in communities like Tucson and Yuma.

This year, the Operation Streamline Program averaged around 45 individuals per hearing. Even with these high caseloads, the program could remain efficient, thanks in part to traditional courtroom safety procedures. They could take 40 prisoners at a time and process them if they were allowed to use the current courtroom practices. These old policies allow law enforcement to bring up to 75 individuals into the courtroom at once, but under the Ninth Circuit's decision to relax courtroom safety protocols, law enforcement officers are now forced to limit groups of prisoners before the court to no more than a handful at a time. This makes it increasingly impractical for judges to hear cases due to the amount of time required for law enforcement to move small numbers of prisoners in and out of the courtroom. There simply aren't the hours in a day.

I take the independence of the courts very seriously. That is why, when every sheriff in my State comes to me and says that there is a court ruling that is endangering their deputies and the public, I am going to urge that the decision be overturned by the proper authority.

This makes a difference in Arizona for another reason as well. We have a lot of older courthouses. Some of them are historic courthouses. These buildings simply aren't built for today's needs in terms of access for prisoners and the public within these courthouses. Sometimes they have to go in the same doorways and in the same hallways. If law enforcement and courtroom security personnel are not allowed to have standards in terms of prisoner restraint, then you endanger the safety of individuals visiting the courthouse and others. You are simply unable to process the number of cases that we have in Arizona, particularly near the border with regard to immigration cases.

I hope that the High Court, the Supreme Court, will grant cert here and examine this ruling. It really makes a difference in a State like Arizona.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this week on an island nation one-tenth the size of Rhode Island, more than 60 countries will gather at the fourth international Our Ocean Conference. Catalyzed by then-Secretary of State John Kerry, the United States hosted the premier international ocean conference in 2014 and 2016. Secretary Kerry's legacy continues with the Malta Conference now going on, hosted by the European Union, and that will be followed by scheduled conferences in Indonesia in 2018 and Norway in 2019.

Nations come to these conferences to share ocean conservation achievements and to pledge future efforts in sustainable fisheries, marine debris prevention, marine protected areas, maritime security, and climate change. At last count, conference organizers in Malta are anticipating more than 150 separate pledges from governments, NGOs, and the private sector. Since Secretary Kerry started it, the Our Ocean Conference has produced hundreds of commitments, totaling nearly \$10 billion and protecting nearly 4 million square miles of ocean. Though the oceans cover more than 70 percent of our Earth, they are often taken for granted. Oceans drive our weather, cool our planet, provide food and income for billions of people, and absorb much of our carbon dioxide emissions.

So for my 181st "Time to Wake Up" speech, I will return to the topic of what we are doing to our oceans. The oceans provide a hard-to-deny reminder of what is happening, thanks to greenhouse gas emissions, climate change denial, and America's legislative paralysis.

Physics and chemistry don't care about fossil fuel industry propaganda. It doesn't affect them at all. Science measures how our carbon pollution continues to drive unprecedented change in the Earth's oceans.

The oceans have absorbed about one-third of all the excess carbon dioxide emitted by human activity since the Industrial Revolution; that is, around 600 gigatons of carbon dioxide absorbed by the ocean. The effect of absorbing all that carbon dioxide is chemical, making ocean water more acidic at the fastest rate in 50 million years. Humankind has been on the planet only about 800,000 or so years, so 50 million goes way back.

This acidification is potentially calamitous for the ocean ecosystem. Off Washington, Oregon, and Northern California, 50 percent of pteropods were measured to have "severe shell damage," mostly from acidified sea water. If that species collapses, the bottom falls out of the oceanic food chain, with a cascading effect up to us at the top of the food chain.

Ocean acidification is causing real economic concerns on coasts all around the country. It is affecting Florida's reefs, for instance. Rhode Island's clambers, lobstermen, and aquaculture growers watch with real alarm the damage acidified seas are doing on America's northwest coast. Oyster hatcheries there experienced significant losses when new hatches were unable to grow their shells in the acidified seawater. Those hatcheries now need to buffer ocean water to keep the pH at a survivable level for baby clams, oysters, and other shellfish. Well, you can do that for your aquaculture lab, but you can't do that for the ocean. So it bodes well for the future of these shellfish.

In addition to the CO₂ the oceans have absorbed—30 percent of that—they have also absorbed heat. They have absorbed over 90 percent of the excess heat that climate change has trapped in our atmosphere, thanks to the operation of the greenhouse gases we have emitted. The oceans, in doing that, have conferred on us an extraordinary blessing because without their absorbing more than 90 percent of that heat—forget the 2 degrees Centigrade cap that we worry about—we would likely be already more than 36 degrees Centigrade hotter. That isn't just life changing; that is species-changing variation in our planet. When oceans absorb all of this heat, which is equivalent to more than a Hiroshima-style nuclear bomb per second going off, the principle of thermal expansion kicks in. As oceans warm, they expand, and as the world warms from the remaining heat, ice melts. So between the two, sea levels rise.

NOAA, in January, updated global sea level rise estimates based on the latest peer-reviewed scientific literature. Ice sheets and glaciers are melting faster than previously expected, raising global sea level rise estimates in this century—under the "we do nothing on climate change" scenario—by around 20 more inches on average.

Apply these findings to the U.S. coast, and the news gets particularly harsh for the northeast Atlantic coast, including my home State of Rhode Island. Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Management Council is now telling us that we need to plan for as much as 9 to 12 vertical feet of sea level rise by the end of this century. The refusal of the Republican majority to do anything serious about climate change is

going to have a big effect on the very map of my State.

This is the present Upper Narragansett Bay, including Providence up here, our capital city, down to Greenwich Bay down here, and Warwick on the west side. Over here, we have Bristol and Warren on the east side of the image, and it still looks actually very much like it did when early explorers first came to Rhode Island in the 1600s. And it looked very much like that for centuries before, when the Narragansetts and the Wampanoags lived here. But as climate change raises sea levels, all of this is changing rapidly.

The Coastal Resources Management Council has developed something called STORMTOOLS, which is an online simulation to model sea level rise and storm surge, so we can see how rising sea levels will affect my State.

This is the same image as that one. I will put one over the other so that you can see the match. Everything that is blue is land and is now submerged on these 9-to-12-foot sea level estimates. It all has changed quite dramatically. Warwick Neck breaks off and becomes Warwick Neck Island. Much of the town of Barrington here becomes a new salt lake. This is a bedroom community with a lot of wealthy people living in very nice homes, and it all goes under water. Down here, Bristol and Warren become an island, and off of them, Poppasquash Point becomes two islands. This continues all around the State. The map changes, and we become a Rhode Island archipelago. Look at Newport, Little Compton, Tiverton, Providence, Jamestown, Point Judith. Flooded areas in my State represent billions of dollars in losses to Rhode Islanders.

Of course, around the visibly flooded areas are the less visible areas where legal setbacks, flood zones, velocity zones, and other building restrictions prevent construction. In those areas that are still above water, it is still unbuildable because the property has become uninsurable, unmortgageable, or unsellable. That is a pretty hard hit to expect my State to take without objection.

It is not just Rhode Island; all sorts of changes are happening along America's coasts. Up in the Gulf of Maine, ocean waters are warming faster than nearly any other place on earth. A study published in *Elementa* last month found that summer temperatures in the Gulf of Maine last two months longer than in the 1980s. Longer, warmer summers benefit some species, but others get hurt, including what little is left of the iconic cod.

Native villages in Alaska and island communities in Louisiana and Maryland are facing tough decisions about abandoning traditional shorelands and islands and relocating. Around the world, entire nations are planning for

relocation as the ocean steadily rises over their island homes.

Layered on top of this sea level rise is the worsening risk of storm surge and flooding from hurricanes and other storms. The Presiding Officer does not need to be told about this. His State has experienced it firsthand.

This satellite image is a snapshot of this particularly destructive 2017 hurricane system. From the left to right, we see Hurricane Katia, Hurricane Irma—at category 5 strength—and Hurricane Jose down here.

As the recovery efforts continue for our citizens in Puerto Rico, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, and we look at hundreds of billions of dollars in disaster relief emergency spending, here in Washington we might want to think about helping coastal States around the country get serious about predicting what is coming, shoring up our coastlines, fortifying coastal infrastructure, and preparing for what climate change has in store for us.

Climate change is not the only way we are damaging the oceans. Each year, around 8 million metric tons of plastic waste enters our oceans from land. By 2050, we could see as much plastic in the oceans as fish in the oceans by weight, since plastics do not fully degrade in the ocean. They just break down into smaller and smaller pieces of plastic, and those travel the globe on ocean currents.

Plastic is now everywhere; on our beaches, in our oceans, ingested and entangling our wildlife. It is even in tapwater, salt, and other foods that we humans consume. Plastic waste has been found on remote islands, in deep-sea sediments, and in sea ice.

In an area previously inaccessible to researchers due to that sea ice, the Arctic is apparently releasing frozen plastic back into the oceans. That is how badly we are polluting our oceans. An international research expedition to the North Pole even found chunks of plastic littering that remote region.

Thankfully, there is interest in solving our ocean trash problem in the Senate. At last year's Our Ocean Conference, over \$1 billion was pledged to combat marine debris. Additional commitments are expected this year. Our Senate Oceans Caucus work parallels work around the world. The Senate Oceans Caucus is a bipartisan group. There are 36 of us. We have made marine debris one of our focus areas.

In August, by unanimous consent, we passed the Save Our Seas Act, a bipartisan bill to reauthorize NOAA's marine debris program and expand its ability to deal with severe marine debris events, where tsunamis or huge storms sweep enormous amounts of plastic garbage into the oceans and then ultimately onto our shores.

The bill asks the President to increase U.S. international efforts to reduce marine debris, including improv-

ing international waste management practices and improving research on plastics that will actually biodegrade in the ocean. It also directs the U.S. Trade Representative to start considering marine plastic debris—much of which comes from just a few countries—when dealing with them in future trade agreements.

We reinforced this piece of the bill recently in the National Defense Authorization Act, which we passed just last month.

The Save Our Seas Act garnered support from environmental NGOs, from corporations, from chemical trade groups, but there is still much more work to do. We have abused and ignored our oceans for far too long. The oceans are warning us in every way they know how, and we can't afford to ignore those warnings any longer. We must start taking serious action to respond to what we are doing to our oceans. I promise you, anybody who knows anything about oceans hears those alarm bells ringing. It is time for us to wake up.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Hargan nomination occur at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, October 4, and that if cloture is invoked, the Senate vote on confirmation at 3:15 p.m. with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

I further ask that, upon disposition of the Hargan nomination, the Senate vote on cloture on the Quarles nomination, and that if cloture is invoked, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at 10 a.m. on Thursday, October 5; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that the time on Wednesday evening be for debate on the Quarles and Cissna nominations, concurrently.

I further ask that the cloture vote on the Cissna nomination occur upon disposition of the Quarles nomination, and that if cloture is invoked, all time postcloture be considered expired and the Senate vote on confirmation with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be

considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

I further ask that following disposition of the Cissna nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Gingrich nomination, with a vote on cloture at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday; and that if cloture is invoked, the Senate vote on confirmation at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, October 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. For the information of all Senators, we have now locked in the following vote schedule: one vote at 11 tomorrow morning, two votes at 3:15 tomorrow afternoon, three votes at 10 a.m. on Thursday, and one vote at 1:45 on Thursday afternoon.

This will allow debate time on all of the pending nominations and accommodate important committee hearings that will be occurring off the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 351, 352, 353, 354, and 355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Halsey B. Frank, of Maine, to be United States Attorney for the District of Maine for the term of four years; D. Michael Hurst, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi for the term of four years; Jeffrey B. Jensen, of Missouri, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri for the term of four years; Thomas L. Kirsch II, of Indiana, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Indiana for the term of four years; and William J. Powell, of West Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of West Virginia for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Frank, Hurst,

Jensen, Kirsch, and Powell nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 357 and 358.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Stephen Censky, of Missouri, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture; and Ted McKinney, of Indiana, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Censky and McKinney nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY'S MAXWELL H. GLUCK EQUINE RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to mark the 30th anniversary of the University of Kentucky's Maxwell H. Gluck Equine Research Center. The city of Lexington, KY, known as the Horse Capital of the World, is the proud home to the Gluck Center dedicated to scientific research and education. Because of its cutting-edge research, the center is internationally renowned and a destination

for students, faculty, and members of the equine industry.

Since the center's founding in 1986, it has made significant contributions to the field of equine study. As part of the university's College of Agriculture, Food, and Environment, the faculty at the Gluck Center are also committed to the education of the next generation of veterinarians and researchers.

The Gluck Center's success would be impossible without the vision of its founder and namesake, Maxwell Gluck. With his wife, Muriel, the Glucks encouraged the university to establish the center and grow UK's connection to the equine industry, which is vital to the economy and culture of the Commonwealth.

I would like to extend my congratulations to the director of the Gluck Center, Dr. David Horohov, and the chair of the Gluck Foundation, Dr. Stuart Brown. Under their leadership, this center has continued to grow and earn acclaim from all levels of the equine industry. Their efforts, along with those of UK's administration, including President Eli Capilouto and college dean Nancy Cox, have helped to fulfill Maxwell and Muriel Gluck's vision.

To mark this milestone, the center is hosting a seminar and open house featuring the inaugural "Teri Lear Memorial Lecture," which will honor the life and scholarly legacy of Dr. Teri Lear, a beloved UK professor of veterinary science who passed away last year. Dr. Lear was one of the foremost experts of equine cytogenetics and helped lead the Horse Genome Project. This lecture series will continue to build upon the center's reputation for excellence in research.

In addition to the lecture, the Gluck Center will also host a celebration to honor one of its faculty members, Dr. Peter Timoney, for a career of international accomplishment in the field of equine infectious disease treatment. Dr. Timoney previously served as the director of the Gluck Center from 1989 to 2006 and is also the past president of the World Equine Veterinary Association. I would like to add my voice to the chorus of congratulations to Dr. Timoney for his accomplished career, and I look forward to his continued contributions to his field.

For 30 years, this center has helped lead in equine research. I am proud to join the UK community to celebrate the Gluck Equine Research Center and its many contributions to the Commonwealth of Kentucky and to the industry. I urge my colleagues to help me commemorate this occasion, and I look forward to many more achievements from the Gluck Center.

TRIBUTE TO TIMUEL D. BLACK, JR.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, sometimes, when I am asked to describe my

politics, I say, “I believe in the Gospel of Saints Paul”—Paul the Apostle, Paul Douglas, Paul Simon, and Paul Wellstone.

Paul the Apostle was, of course, one of the most important figures in the history of the early Christian Church. Paul Douglas, Paul Simon, and Paul Wellstone were Members of this Senate and champions of human rights and human dignity.

This Friday, another champion of human rights and human dignity—Dr. Timuel Black—will be honored by Citizen Action Illinois with its ninth annual Pauls Award, named for Paul Simon and Paul Wellstone.

I am lucky enough to have been friends with both Pauls—Simon and Wellstone. I am sure that they would have approved heartily of the decision to honor Dr. Black with an award bearing their names.

Dr. Timuel Black is a decorated World War II veteran, an educator, author, labor leader, civil rights activist, and historian—and a bender of the moral arc of the universe. He is a visionary and—for me and so many others—a personal hero.

Timuel Black was born in 1918, in Birmingham, AL—the son of a sharecropper and the grandson of slaves.

He was 8 months old when his family moved to Chicago—the first wave of the great migration of African Americans from the Deep South to the North. They settled in a part of town called the Black Belt, now known as Bronzeville.

He attended DuSable High School, a legendary all-Black public high school, where his classmates included Nat King Cole and John Johnson, who would go on to found Jet and Ebony magazines.

On his 23rd birthday, Japan bombed U.S. Navy ships at Pearl Harbor.

He served 2 years in a segregated U.S. Army. He participated in the Battle of the Bulge, the invasion of Normandy and the liberation of Paris, and he earned four battle stars.

He thought he had seen the worst of World War II—then he witnessed what had happened at Buchenwald, the Nazi concentration camp.

The horrors that he witnessed at that death camp changed his life.

For a time, he was filled with despair. Then he resolved to spend the rest of his life doing whatever he could to advance the causes of human rights and human dignity.

He returned to Chicago and earned an undergraduate degree from Roosevelt University and a master's degree from the University of Chicago.

He helped establish the Congress of Racial Equality. He also helped found a labor union that helped me work my way through college: the United Packinghouse Workers of America.

He began his professional career as a social worker, but he quickly discov-

ered that his real love was “teaching young men and women about the world they live in and how to be responsible citizens of that world.”

He spent more than 40 years as a teacher, including positions at DuSable and other Chicago public schools, as well as Roosevelt University, Columbia College Chicago and schools in the City Colleges of Chicago system.

Timuel Black was watching television in December 1955 when he saw “this good-looking man in Montgomery, Alabama.” He was so moved that he boarded a plane to meet him.

A year later, Tim Black convinced that young man to come to Chicago—the first time Dr. Martin Luther King would speak in the city.

In 1963, Dr. Black helped organize the Freedom Trains that carried thousands of Chicagoans to hear Dr. King and others speak at the foot of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC. He was there when Dr. King delivered his immortal “I Have a Dream” speech.

He was with Dr. King in 1966 when an angry mob jeered him in Chicago's Marquette Park neighborhood.

In 1983, Tim Black provided influential support to help elect another of his DuSable High School classmates, Harold Washington, the first African-American mayor of Chicago.

Some years later, a young community organizer who had just returned to Chicago with a Harvard law degree asked Professor Black to teach him about organizing people so they could create a better life for themselves and their children.

Over the years, Professor Black and that young organizer became good friends.

On January 20, 2009, it was my privilege to invite Professor Black and his incredible wife, Zenobia Johnson-Black, to be my guests as that community organizer swore an oath to become President of the United States of America—Barack Obama.

My friend, Paul Wellstone, had a beautiful definition of politics. He used to say: In the last analysis, politics is not predictions and politics is not observations. Politics is what we do. Politics is what we do, politics is what we create, by what we work for, by what we hope for and what we dare to imagine.

Dr. Timuel Black has witnessed injustice and inhumanity, but he has never stopped working to believe in a better world, and he has never stopped working to make that world a reality. He is a true inspiration, a Chicago treasure, and an American hero.

REFUGEE ADMISSIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last Friday, President Trump announced that he will slash our refugee admissions to 45,000 in fiscal year 2018—the lowest annual target since the passage of the

1980 Refugee Act. Instead of embracing our moral and legal obligation to address the worst refugee crisis in global history, as has been our tradition for decades, President Trump seems intent on relinquishing our role as the humanitarian leader of the world. The dimming of our beacon is not just a symbolic loss; tens of thousands of human lives are now placed at risk.

There is no rational basis for this shameful retreat. The administration's own analysis shows that refugees contributed a net benefit of \$63 billion to our economy between 2005 and 2014. National security leaders across the political spectrum, including former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen, are unanimous in their view that refugees are the most stringently vetted travelers to the United States. Our commitment to welcoming refugees plays a critical role in strengthening our alliances in areas of conflict.

The President stands alone in his disregard for the staggering suffering we are witnessing around the world. Last month, the Senate Appropriations Committee—on which I serve as vice chairman—unanimously approved a funding bill that demonstrates our unwavering commitment to refugees. It fully funds offices that are critical to the continuity of refugee programs and even provides a \$50 million increase to the State Department's refugee assistance and resettlement missions. Our bipartisan bill repudiates any claims by President Trump that the United States is unwilling to commit the resources required to fund a refugee program that honors our history as a refuge for the persecuted. Even the conservative Heritage Foundation has called on President Trump to set annual refugee admissions “based on historical refugee levels,” which have never dropped below 67,000 per year since the beginning of the Reagan administration.

I am proud that my own State of Vermont has welcomed and resettled approximately 7,500 refugees since fiscal year 1989. The city of Rutland was preparing to resettle an additional 100 refugees mainly from Syria last year and this fiscal year, until the Trump administration inexplicably halted certain refugee admissions and announced drastic reductions to the refugee resettlement program. Vermont and other States stand ready to do more to address this global crisis, but the leader of our country is shamefully directing them to do less.

Presidents have an obligation to protect our Nation's fundamental values. Presidents of both parties have long understood this. They have not forsaken our history as a nation founded by enterprising individuals seeking refuge and freedom from persecution. They have ensured that our policies do not betray our proud tradition as the humanitarian leader of the world.

This decision illustrates that President Trump is misinformed and that he has caved to the counsel of xenophobic voices seeking to hollow out our refugee program. By shutting our doors to thousands of innocent human beings fleeing persecution and tyranny, he misunderstands the history of the country he was elected to lead. I hope that he reconsiders his callous decision, as the law in fact empowers him to do, in light of emerging humanitarian concerns. Nothing less than our Nation's identity as an unwavering beacon of hope during the world's darkest chapters is at stake.

TRIBUTE TO RAINER WEISS, KIP S. THORNE, AND BARRY C. BARISH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences announced the awarding of the Nobel Prize in Physics to Rainer Weiss, Kip S. Thorne, and Barry C. Barish for "decisive contributions" to the observation of gravitational waves. This landmark discovery marks a giant leap forward in human knowledge, and I salute these Americans on their honor.

Over 100 years ago, Albert Einstein predicted that massive objects and energy could distort space-time. In order to detect these "ripples" in the fabric of space and time, known as gravitational waves, scientists worked over many years to develop the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-wave Observatory, or LIGO.

On September 14, 2015, scientists working at LIGO detected a "chirp"—a ripple in space-time. What was observed because of LIGO was the result of two massive black holes merging together over 1.3 billion light years away. This breakthrough discovery means that we now have an entirely new way of observing the universe.

This achievement would not have been possible without the leadership of Dr. Weiss, Dr. Thorne, and Dr. Barish, along with the countless scientists who helped with the project, including the National Science Foundation.

Two of the distinguished recipients hail from my home State. Dr. Thorne and Dr. Barish are professors at the California Institute of Technology, and I am proud of the role that Cal Tech played in making this discovery possible. I also recognize Dr. Weiss, a Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor, for his achievement.

On behalf of all Californians, I commend these physicists on a well-deserved honor and for all that they have done to push our knowledge of the universe forward. Let us hope that this discovery will continue to expand the horizon of human knowledge and lead to new efforts in humanity's never-ending quest for enlightenment.

Again, I congratulate these three distinguished Americans and their fami-

lies on this remarkable discovery and prestigious award.

TAIWAN'S 106TH NATIONAL DAY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, a week from today, on October 10, the Taiwanese people will celebrate their 106th Taiwanese National Day. I would like to take a few minutes to congratulate my Taiwanese friends on this important occasion.

Taiwan has long been a trusted friend of the United States and a valuable partner in the increasingly important Asia-Pacific region.

Taiwan is hugely important to Oregon. It is also one of Oregon's largest trading partners and a big export market for Oregon products like grain. Portland's annual Grand Floral Parade and Rose Festival host delegations from Taiwan. Portland, OR, and Kaohsiung, Taiwan, are sister cities.

These ties are both broad and deep, as I saw myself when I visited Taipei several years ago.

That was more than a year before Taiwan's historic 2016 election, but the Taiwanese people's commitment to democracy was already very much on display.

Because our people share values like freedom, respect for human dignity, and entrepreneurship, I am honored today to reaffirm the U.S.-Taiwan relationship.

I wish my friends, the Taiwanese people, a wonderful 106th National Day and a fortuitous year ahead.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the people and leaders of Taiwan on their National Day to take place on October 10. The United States and Taiwan have a long history of mutual trade and friendship that has promoted prosperity and security on both sides of the Pacific. The United States-Taiwan bilateral relationship continues to grow based on our shared democratic values and common strategic interests.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the people of Taiwan on their success and thanking them for their continued efforts to work with the United States on economic growth and security cooperation. The people of both the United States and Taiwan have much to celebrate.

TRIBUTE TO DONNA SACKETT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, government employment is often referred to as "public service." That phrase could not be more appropriate in the case of Donna Sackett.

Donna, a caseworker in my Utah office, is retiring after 22 years in the Senate. Given the caliber of person that she is, it is my privilege to share a bit about her.

Donna joined my team in 2014, bringing with her an unrivaled under-

standing of rural Utah. If you don't believe me, walk into any county meeting in rural Utah and ask about Donna Sackett. You will get a lot of smiles in return.

Donna built these personal relationships during her long residence in the State—she was born in Coleville, raised in Ogden—as well as past jobs with Governor Norm Bangert and Senator Bob Bennett.

Case work and constituent services work are not the right jobs for everybody. They require deep empathy and a delicate personal touch, as well as a good deal of resilience when dealing with sleepy government agencies, but they certainly were right for Donna.

As anyone will tell you, Donna is a wellspring of compassion. Early in her career as a caseworker in the Governor's office, her coworkers had to talk to her because she was working cases after hours and helping Utahns financially from her own pocket. Beginning caseworkers do not have a lot of money to give, as you might imagine, but like the widow in the Gospel story, Donna "cast in all that she had, even all her living," Mark 12:44.

That spirit of service still enlivens Donna Sackett. If someone comes to her with a problem, she will explore every avenue to put it right.

When an elderly Navajo man who had worked in uranium mining had trouble getting special healthcare through worker's compensation, it was Donna who helped him out. When Juab County had trouble with its wilderness boundaries, it was Donna who helped county officials with the realignment.

These two examples show that Donna was capable of tackling a wide range of problems. She was at home working on Social Security claims or public lands disputes. The important thing was that she could help. During a brief stint at FEMA, she even traveled to New York to help the people of that State recover from Superstorm Sandy.

Donna worked hard for others, and she had a blast doing it. Her coworkers in Utah dubbed her the "fun sheriff," not to be confused with the "fun police," because she would often round up staff members for office parties. If they were lucky, she would bring her award-winning salsa. Her love, enthusiasm, and excitement for life made her quick to laughter and friendship, while making her equally capable on her Harley-Davidson or the dance floor.

Of course, Donna's cheerfulness and sacrifice are not limited to her day job. She loves to teach the young as a primary teacher for her church ward and to serve her neighbors and family. She is a loving wife to Byra Sackett, a loving mother to three sons—Trever, Rodney, and Justin—and to her stepdaughter Karen. She is a loving grandmother and great-grandmother, and she cares for the afflicted, sometimes under her own roof. The time she spent

caring for her mother, son Trevor, and step-daughter Karen during the final stages of their lives demonstrated her conviction about the eternal nature of families.

If it wasn't plain enough already, let me say it plainer still: Donna Sackett is an inexhaustible source of love for others. She models Christ's love through her deeds.

In her job, as in her private life, Donna Sackett displayed a servant's heart. I will miss her dearly, and so will all the Utahns she touched over her valuable career in public service.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:00 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 289. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for recreation services on lands managed by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 965. An act to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park", and for other purposes.

H.R. 1547. An act to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interests to the City.

H.R. 2316. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to repeal provisions relating only to the Allegheny National Forest.

H.R. 2582. An act to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2937. An act to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to authorize partnerships between States and nongovernmental entities for the purpose of reclaiming and restoring land and water resources adversely affected by the coal mining activities before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 703 of the Social

Security Act (42 U.S.C. 903), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Social Security Advisory Board to fill the existing vacancy thereon: Ms. Nancy Altman of Bethesda, Maryland.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 289. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for recreation services on lands managed by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 965. An act to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1547. An act to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest to the City; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2316. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to repeal provisions relating only to the Allegheny National Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2582. An act to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2937. An act to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to authorize partnerships between States and nongovernmental entities for the purpose of reclaiming and restoring land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining activities before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2949. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Phosphoric Acid Manufacturing and Phosphate Fertilizer Production Risk and Technology Review Reconsideration" (FRL No. 9968-01-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2950. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendments to Procedure 6" (RIN2060-AS86) (FRL No. 9968-02-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate

on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2951. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances" (RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9959-81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2952. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Finding of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plans Required for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS; California; Sacramento Metro" (FRL No. 9966-86-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2953. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Kansas Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Construction Permits and Approvals Program" (FRL No. 9967-97-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2954. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Jersey, 2011 Periodic Emission Inventory SIP for the Ozone Nonattainment and PM2.5/Regional Haze Areas" (FRL No. 9968-05-Region 2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2955. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming; Negative Declarations" (FRL No. 9968-11-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2956. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Plans for Designated Facilities; New Jersey; Delegation of Authority" (FRL No. 9968-13-Region 2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2957. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9967-53-Region 6) received

during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2958. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule Trading Programs Replaced by Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Trading Programs" (FRL No. 9968-15-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2959. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 2011 Base Year Inventory for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Maryland Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9968-00-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2960. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; North Carolina Miscellaneous Rules" (FRL No. 9968-10-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2961. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Prevention of Significant Deterioration" (FRL No. 9968-22-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2962. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; GA; Emission Reduction Credits" (FRL No. 9968-17-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2963. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Delaware; State Implementation Plan for Interstate Transport for the 2008 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9968-20-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2964. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Delaware; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9967-99-Region 3) received during adjourn-

ment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2965. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to the In-Bond Process" (RIN1515-AD81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2966. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Import Restrictions on Archaeological and Ecclesiastical Ethnological Materials from Guatemala" ((RIN-1515-AE33) (CBP Dec. 17-14)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2967. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to imported foods for fiscal year 2016; to the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and Appropriations.

EC-2968. A joint communication from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Thefts, Losses, or Releases of Select Agents and Toxins for Calendar Year 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2969. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Department of Labor's 2016 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1906. A bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith in recognition of their contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1908. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1909. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a system to educate individuals approaching Medicare eligibility, to simplify and modernize the eli-

gibility enrollment process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1910. A bill to clarify membership requirements for the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1911. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1912. A bill to ensure that irresponsible corporate executives, rather than shareholders, pay fines and penalties; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

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

S. Res. 279. A resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 280. A resolution designating the week of October 2 through October 6, 2017, as "National Health Information Technology Week" to recognize the value of health information technology in transforming and improving the healthcare system for all people in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 146

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 146, a bill to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deferral of inclusion in gross income for capital gains reinvested in opportunity zones.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from

emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes.

S. 384

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 482

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 482, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1042

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1042, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude Segal Americorps Education Awards and related awards from income.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for meals.

S. 1108

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1108, a bill to amend title 4,

United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty.

S. 1110

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1110, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes.

S. 1274

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to direct the President to establish an interagency mechanism to coordinate United States development programs and private sector investment activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1568

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1568, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of President John F. Kennedy.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1595, a bill to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

S. 1766

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1766, a bill to reauthorize the SAFER Act of 2013, and for other purposes.

S. 1769

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1769, a bill to require a new or updated Federal website that is intended for use by the public to be mobile friendly, and for other purposes.

S. 1791

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1791, a bill to amend the

Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1847

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1847, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure that the needs of children are considered in homeland security, trafficking, and disaster recovery planning, and for other purposes.

S. 1867

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1867, a bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 1899

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1899, a bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am the Senator from Florida, along with my colleague MARCO RUBIO. We, of course, have been at the forefront of this terrible tragedy that is going on in Puerto Rico, and I want to comment on that.

By the way, speaking of bipartisanship, there is a good example. Senator RUBIO and I, when our State was hit by Irma, spent 3 days, going around together, showing that we were shoulder

to shoulder trying to help Floridians overcome the tragedy that had just befallen them. We dished out food together. We went and surveyed the floods. We went into the poor, little cities. We went and thanked university students who had rescued the elderly, the frail, when they were abandoned. We went all across the State. The day after the storm, we went first into the Keys to see the destruction there. Senator RUBIO and I have been joined at the hip.

When it comes to looking at what is happening in Puerto Rico, it is pretty obvious. Last week, a week had passed since the storm. In fact, the supplies were stacking up, but they were stacking up in the ports. They were not able to get out into the interior of the island. The two of us were pretty strong in our words; that you have to get the most capable organization in to do that when in fact it is almost like combat conditions, and that is the U.S. military.

Finally, Wednesday night of last week, they sent me a three-star general who started to get it organized. Now we are seeing it distributed out, but it is going to take more because it is an island that is just absolutely devastated. It is going to take a long time to recover, and it is going to take a lot more money.

Remember, these are our fellow American citizens. We saw the devastation in Florida. Now the continuing hardship is being tolled in Puerto Rico. It is a population where half are without drinking water, only 5 percent—and this is 2 weeks after the storm—of the electricity grid is restored, and cash is in short supply.

Whereas, in Florida we saw the flooded streets, the downed trees, the crushed cars, the flipped over mobile homes, limited access to critical supplies like gasoline. Property damage was everywhere, and it was the entire State. What we are seeing is—multiply that many fold, and that is what we are seeing in Puerto Rico.

We are working on a supplemental funding bill. Remember that right after the first storm in Texas, we passed a \$15 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill. That is going to run out within the next few days so we have to have another supplemental funding bill.

As you can imagine, now it is not just Texas and Florida, but it is the Virgin Islands, it is Puerto Rico, and there are some other States as well. We are going to need to help the people cover the cost of recovery, and we are going to need to jump-start the local economy in those areas hardest hit by the storms.

Today I am going to introduce a piece of legislation. I call it the National Disaster Tax Relief Act, which would give people affected by these storms some much needed tax relief.

This is in the shadow of the conversations taking place, as we speak, in a hearing—which I have just come from—in the Finance Committee about future reform of the Federal Tax Code.

The bill I am introducing today would do four things: One, it would let businesses and farmers immediately write off their cleanup costs, not just their replacement costs.

For example, the Florida citrus growers in the central part of the State—and it was finally going to be a good news story on our citrus crop—half of the citrus buffeted by the wind is on the ground.

Go further south into Southwest Florida, 75 percent of the citrus is on the ground. What this would do is allow the citrus growers to be able to, in the first year, write off the costs—expenses, in other words—of removing the downed trees, not just the cost of a new tree. That is especially important to citrus growers all over the United States because they are already hurting from a plant disease, a bacteria known as greening, which kills the citrus tree in 5 years.

Therefore, there are a number of these groves that have been abandoned, but it is valuable land. We need to give an incentive to the citrus grower to be able to go in and plow under that citrus growth and replant—the immediate expensing of that plowing under, plus the replanting of what we think are hardier varieties of citrus that are more resistant to this disease, this bacteria called greening. We think that would be a huge incentive to try to save the citrus industry not only in my State but in Texas, Arizona, California. There is citrus also in Louisiana and some in other Southern States.

The second thing the bill does is it gives taxpayers the ability to exempt State and local disaster mitigation payments from Federal taxes, and it lets them save for the next big storm tax-free. That would be in a catastrophe savings account.

It would allow people to save tax-free \$150,000 to cover things not covered by insurance. In Southwest Florida, there are a lot of seawalls that cave in, seawalls that are extremely expensive to rebuild and repair. This tax-free account would allow them to put away savings for that and other kinds of costs of remediation. They go out, and they try to save their home by getting tarps on the roof, making certain repairs until they can get the replacement, and the insurance can pay for it. Expensing of those items in the Tax Code would certainly be that incentive.

The bill also includes extra infrastructure financing for areas damaged by the storms; for example, help for low-income housing needs and other infrastructure needs that are so important to economic recovery.

The fourth thing the bill does is it includes tax incentives for Puerto Rico

and the Virgin Islands and extends tax benefits that are available on the mainland but not in the territories like the full child tax credit.

Why should we treat our American citizens in a territory any differently taxwise on a child tax credit than we treat our citizens on the mainland, the main 50 States? It shouldn't be. It doesn't make sense.

What is happening in Puerto Rico should concern every American. Governor Rossello has warned of a humanitarian crisis if we do not quickly move to alleviate this situation.

The Coast Guard is working with FEMA and others to bring in drinking water and other critical supplies as well. Additional work is being done to restore power. Generators are being shipped in to help manage the load at the airport, and there are 30 flights per day now, which is projected to grow to 60 flights in the coming days. Meanwhile, as the evacuations continue, we don't want to leave Puerto Rico in tatters. We have to rebuild. That is going to be an expensive cost to pay.

As we are going into a supplemental package for all of these storm-affected areas, and since the utilities in Puerto Rico were so out-of-date and so arcane, let's think creatively. In remote villages, let's supply photovoltaic cells to generate electricity as a backup because another storm is going to come and the power lines are going to go down. Let's think creatively as we help these areas rebuild.

We are working on this supplemental package to get additional aid to those suffering, and I am hopeful that what I have suggested here as a tax incentive will be a part of that conversation. Our country is hurting. We should be doing everything we can to help it heal.

Now, not only are we healing from coming out of some ferocious storms, but now we have another grim reminder that, in America, we are not treating each other as we would want to be treated. Something is wrong in the psyche of some, so that whatever the motivation is, there would be mass execution. I hope we will soon have a very serious conversation about the direction of this country.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1912. A bill to ensure that irresponsible corporate executives, rather than shareholders, pay fines and penalties; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Corporate Management Accountability Act, which request each publicly traded company to disclose its policies on whether senior executives or shareholders bear the costs of paying the company's fines and penalties.

In 2014, the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, William Dudley, gave a speech on Enhancing

Financial Stability by Improving Culture in the Financial Services Industry. In this speech, President Dudley said, "in recent years, there have been ongoing occurrences of serious professional misbehavior, ethical lapses and compliance failures at financial institutions. This has resulted in a long list of large fines and penalties, and, to a lesser degree than I would have desired employee dismissals and punishment. . . . The pattern of bad behavior did not end with the financial crisis, but continued despite the considerable public sector intervention that was necessary to stabilize the financial system. As a consequence, the financial industry has largely lost the public trust."

Since 2008, "banks globally have paid \$321 billion in fines . . . for an abundance of regulatory failings from money laundering to market manipulation and terrorist financing, according to data from Boston Consulting Group." Unfortunately, despite these fines, we continue to see disappointing behavior at our financial institutions, whether it is Wells Fargo betraying the trust of its customers by opening unauthorized accounts or it is Equifax endangering millions of consumers by compromising critical personal information. Indeed, in my home State of Rhode Island, nearly half the State may have been affected by the cybersecurity breach at Equifax. Given these and other breaches and lapses, it is clear that many financial institutions have a long way to go in rebuilding the trust of Rhode Islanders and the American people.

At the same time, it is also clear that more must be done than simply fining and penalizing financial institutions at the corporate level. Senior executives, many of whom are all too eager to take credit for a company's good news, must also take more responsibility for the bad news, especially if it is true that the buck stops with them. For example, the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission concluded "the financial crisis reached cataclysmic proportions with the collapse of Lehman Brothers," and yet, according to the Congressional Research Service, not a single senior executive officer at Lehman Brothers at the Federal level was charged, went to jail, or personally paid a Federal fine or penalty for the damage caused at Lehman Brothers that rippled through our economy in 2008.

According to Professor Peter J. Henning, who also writes for the New York Times in its White Collar Watch column, "a problem in holding individuals accountable for misconduct in an organization is the disconnect between the actual decisions and those charged with overseeing the company, so that executives and corporate boards usually plead ignorance about an issue until it is too late."

The Corporate Management Accountability Act I am introducing today is one attempt at helping to solve this problem. The bill asks publicly traded companies to disclose whether they expect senior executives or shareholders to pay the cost of corporate fines or penalties. This approach is supported by University of Minnesota Law School Professors Claire Hill and Richard Painter, who also served as President George W. Bush's chief ethics lawyer, as well as U.S. PIRG, Public Citizen, and Americans for Financial Reform.

Companies must do a better job of aligning executive incentives so that they are motivated to put their shareholders, and not themselves, first. I urge all my colleagues to join this legislative effort to hold senior executives accountable for their actions.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 279—RE-AFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND THE RULE OF LAW IN CAMBODIA

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 279

Whereas Prime Minister Hun Sen has been in power in Cambodia since 1985 and is the longest-serving leader in Southeast Asia;

Whereas the Paris Peace Accords in 1991 provided a vital framework, supported by the international community, intended to help Cambodia undertake a transition to democracy, including through elections and multiparty government;

Whereas the United States Government, for more than 25 years, has provided hundreds of millions of dollars in development aid and other types of assistance to the people of Cambodia and funded work in areas including civil society, capacity building for nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), global health, and the Khmer Rouge Tribunal;

Whereas, despite decades of international attention and assistance to promote a pluralistic, multi-party democratic system in Cambodia, the Government of Cambodia continues to be undemocratically dominated by the ruling Cambodia People's Party (CPP), which controls every agency and security apparatus of the state;

Whereas the leadership of Cambodia's security forces, including all of its top military and police commanders, sit on the Central Committee of the politburo of the CPP;

Whereas the CPP controls Cambodia's parliament and can pass legislation without any opposition, and has often passed laws that benefit its rule and weaken the capacity of the opposition to challenge it;

Whereas each of the five elections that have taken place in Cambodia since 1991 were not conducted in circumstances that were free and fair, and each were marked by fraud, intimidation, violence, and the government's misuse of legal mechanisms to weaken opposition candidates and parties;

Whereas, in 2015, the CPP-controlled parliament passed the "Law on Associations and Non-Governmental Organizations", known as LANGO, which gave the government sweeping powers to revoke the registration of NGOs found to be operating with a political bias in a blatant attempt to restrict the legitimate work of civil society;

Whereas, since the passage of LANGO, the Interior Ministry has announced that it was surveilling several civil society organizations and their employees for allegedly aiding Cambodia's opposition party, the Cambodia National Rescue Party (CNRP);

Whereas both the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and the International Republican Institute (IRI) have a long history in Cambodia, engaging local partners and building capacity for civil society, democracy, and good governance;

Whereas, on August 23, 2017, Cambodia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs ordered the closure of NDI and the expulsion of its foreign staff on allegations that it had violated LANGO and was conspiring against Prime Minister Hun Sen;

Whereas, on September 15, 2017, Prime Minister Hun Sen called for the withdrawal of all volunteers from the United States Peace Corps, which has operated in Cambodia since 2006 with 500 United States volunteers providing English language and healthcare training;

Whereas the Government of Cambodia in 2016 arrested four senior staff members of the Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association (ADHOC), as well as a former ADHOC staff member and official on the National Election Committee (NEC), and held them in pre-trial detention for 427 days until released on bail on June 29, 2017, in the wake of sustained international pressure;

Whereas the Government of Cambodia arrested activist and women's rights defender Tep Vanny in August 2016 and has kept her in prison for over a year;

Whereas the prominent Cambodian political commentator Kem Ley was assassinated on July 10, 2016, five days after a senior Cambodian general publicly called on the Cambodian Armed Forces to "eliminate and dispose of" anyone "fomenting social turmoil" in Cambodia;

Whereas Kem Ley had been a frequent critic of Prime Minister Hun Sen, fueling concerns that his killing was politically motivated and ordered by higher authorities;

Whereas the Government of Cambodia has taken several measures to restrict its media environment, including imposing a tax bill amounting to millions of dollars levied against independent media outlets that resulted in the closure of independent newspaper The Cambodian Daily in early September 2017;

Whereas the Government of Cambodia has ordered several radio stations to stop the broadcasting of Radio Free Asia and Voice of America;

Whereas the next general election in Cambodia is scheduled for July 29, 2018, and the CPP continues to use intimidation and misuse of legal mechanisms to weaken political opposition and media organizations in order to retain its power;

Whereas the Cambodian parliament in 2017 passed two repressive amendments to Cambodia's Law on Political Parties that allow authorities to dissolve political parties and ban party leaders from political activity, and which contain numerous restrictions tailored to create obstacles for opposition parties in an attempt to maintain the CPP's hold on power;

Whereas Kem Sokha, the President of the CNRP, was arrested on September 3, 2017, and charged with treason and conspiring with the United States Government to overthrow the Government of Cambodia, and if convicted faces up to 30 years in prison, which sets the stage for the CNRP to be dissolved;

Whereas the United States Embassy in Cambodia has publicly called for the immediate release of Mr. Sokha and the removal of restrictions on civil society;

Whereas the CNRP's previous leader, Sam Rainsy, remains in exile due to an outstanding warrant for his arrest in a politically motivated criminal case;

Whereas Human Rights Watch reported that local elections held in Cambodia on June 4, 2017, took place in a "threatening environment hostile to free speech and genuine political participation, leading to elections that were neither free nor fair";

Whereas international election monitoring groups reported fundamental flaws in the electoral process and violations of Cambodia's election campaign rules during June's local election;

Whereas the Interior Ministry of Cambodia demanded that two election-monitoring organizations cease their activities just months after the local elections for allegedly violating the LANGO law, which will allow the CPP to continue to increase restrictions on election monitoring as the 2018 national elections approach;

Whereas, despite irregularities in the electoral process, the CNRP made significant gains in local elections compared to previous cycles, making clear that national elections in 2018, if they are conducted freely and fairly, will be tightly contested;

Whereas national elections in 2018 will be closely watched to ensure openness and fairness, and to monitor whether all political parties and civil society groups are allowed to freely participate;

Whereas, on September 7, 2017, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate reported out the fiscal year 2018 appropriations bill for the Department of State and foreign operations (S. 1780), which restricted any funds to the central Government of Cambodia unless it has "ceased efforts to intimidate civil society and the political opposition in Cambodia, is credibly investigating the murder of social and political activists" and "is supporting the conduct of free and fair elections in Cambodia through a non-partisan election commission; fair election processes; open and inclusive participation, to include the return of exiled former opposition leaders and the release of jailed opposition leaders and civil society activists; respect for freedoms of assembly, speech, and the press, and credible post-election dispute resolution mechanism"; and

Whereas S. 1780 also includes language addressing the "inadmissibility of Cambodia officials who undermine democracy in Cambodia": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in Cambodia;

(2) condemns all forms of political violence in Cambodia, and urges the cessation of ongoing human rights violations;

(3) urges Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Cambodian People's Party to end all harassment and intimidation of Cambodia's opposition and foster an environment where democracy can thrive and flourish;

(4) urges the Department of State, in association with the Office of Foreign Assets

Control (OFAC) of the Department of the Treasury, to consider placing all senior Cambodian government officials implicated in the abuses noted above on the Specially Designated Nationals (SDN) list;

(5) urges the Government of Cambodia to free Mr. Kem Sokha immediately and unconditionally;

(6) calls on the Government of Cambodia to respect freedom of the press and the rights of its citizens to freely assemble, protest, and speak out against the government;

(7) supports electoral reform efforts in Cambodia and free and fair elections in 2018 monitored by international observers; and

(8) urges the President to communicate to the Government of Cambodia that if it ignores the recommendations of the international community and maintains the current restrictive and intimidating political environment, the United States Government will have no choice but to determine that the 2018 elections were not conducted freely or fairly because the results could not be an expression of the democratic will of the Cambodian people.

SENATE RESOLUTION 280—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 2 THROUGH OCTOBER 6, 2017, AS "NATIONAL HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WEEK" TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN TRANSFORMING AND IMPROVING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM FOR ALL PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES

Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 280

Whereas Congress has emphasized that the use of health information technology is essential to providing coordinated care, expanding access to care, and improving the quality of mental and physical health for all people in the United States;

Whereas health information technology is essential for improving patient care, ensuring patient safety, stopping duplicative tests and paperwork, and reducing healthcare costs;

Whereas Congress has recognized that the convergence of medical advances, health information technology, and high-speed broadband networks are transforming the delivery of care by bringing healthcare providers and patients together virtually, especially those patients who are in disadvantaged populations and areas;

Whereas the further development of precision medicine, which tailors medicines and treatments to the unique genetic blueprint, lifestyle, and environmental data of each patient, requires advances in health information technology to compare that data with the information of other individuals in order to predict illness and determine the best treatments;

Whereas Congress has recognized the need, and taken action, to modernize regulations in order to grow the health information technology market, improve the health of all people in the United States, create high-demand jobs, and stimulate market innovation; and

Whereas it is necessary to continue activities that are foundational to the trans-

formation of healthcare delivery in the United States, including—

(1) promoting innovation in health information technology;

(2) opening interoperability between systems and devices; and

(3) exchanging health information confidently and securely among different providers, systems, and insurers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 2 through October 6, 2017, as "National Health Information Technology Week";

(2) recognizes the value of information technology and management systems in transforming healthcare for the people of the United States; and

(3) encourages all interested parties to promote the use of information technology and management systems to transform the healthcare system of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have 12 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the political and security situation in Afghanistan.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Wells Fargo: One Year Later."

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a Business Meeting on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, beginning at 10:15 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10:30 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10 a.m. in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "International Tax Reform."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, in order to conduct a hearing entitled "The Every Student Succeeds Act: Unleashing State Innovation" on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 9:30 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing on the nomination of John M. Mitnick to be General Counsel, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight of the Administration's Decision to End Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals."

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate, on Tuesday, October 3, 2017 from 2 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a Closed Member Roundtable.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Energy is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 366 of the

Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
OCTOBER 4, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 4; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Hargan nomination, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:24 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SPENCER BACHUS III, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2019, VICE PATRICIA M. LOUI, TERM EXPIRED.

SPENCER BACHUS III, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2023, (REAPPOINTMENT)

JUDITH DELZOPPO PRYOR, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021, VICE LARRY W. WALTHER, TERM EXPIRED.

KIMBERLY A. REED, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021, VICE WANDA FELTON, RESIGNED.

CLAUDIA SLACIK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING

JANUARY 20, 2019, VICE SEAN ROBERT MULVANEY, TERM EXPIRED.

CLAUDIA SLACIK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2023, (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NEIL JACOBS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE MANSON K. BROWN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TIMOTHY KELLY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE BRENDA DANN-MESSIER.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

ERNEST W. DUBESTER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JULY 1, 2019, VICE CAROL WALLER POPE, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

DON R. WILLETT, OF TEXAS, TO BE A CIRCUIT JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE EMILIO M. GARZA, RETIRED.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DAVID CHRISTIAN TRYON, OF OHIO, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE DARRYL L. DEPRIEST, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 3, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

HALSEY B. FRANK, OF MAINE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

D. MICHAEL HURST, JR., OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JEFFREY B. JENSEN, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WILLIAM J. POWELL, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

STEPHEN CENSKY, OF MISSOURI, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

TED MCKINNEY, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR TRADE AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on October 3, 2017 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

SPENCER BACHUS III, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021, VICE LARRY W. WALTHER, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JUNE 19, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 3, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

October 3, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

GUN SAFETY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, what if the headline in the morning paper was slightly different? What if we had a disease that had killed 59 people yesterday and sickened over 500 others? Do you think the Nation would demand action?

If we had an outbreak every day that had over 100,000 people a year killed and injured, Congress would be in a frenzy. Yesterday, we found 2 minutes for a moment of silence, and we moved on.

Gun violence is a public health hazard every bit as important as any other disease or outbreak. Ours is the only developed country in the world that cannot protect our families from death and injury from guns on a massive scale.

After years of frustration in Congress and another school shooting in my district, I sat down with my constituents to go through, what are the things that we can do that would make a difference?

We understood that you cannot completely stop evil people. There is not a statute that is foolproof, but our statutes are filled with efforts to try to make things better.

Let's stop dealing with gun violence as a political issue and think about it as the public health epidemic that it is, already claiming over 12,000 lives in the United States this year.

We attacked auto death and safety in a resolute fashion. It didn't happen overnight that we made automobiles safer and our highways less dangerous, but we stayed at it with law enforcement, with engineering, and with research, and we cut the rate of death over half.

We are starting now to deal with massive addiction and overdose as a medical condition that requires treatment, not just law enforcement with harsh punishment.

My report outlined nine areas where we could take action. There are 26 bills in Congress now that deal with these items, and we haven't been able to deal with them meaningfully: no hearings and certainly nothing on the floor of the House.

There are provisions to keep guns away from the most dangerous users. Even members of the NRA support that. We can improve the mental health system. We can authorize and increase research into gun safety.

There is an outrageous provision in United States law that prevents the Centers for Disease Control to research gun violence that was authored by our late colleague Jay Dickey from Arkansas who, later in life, realized that was a horrific mistake. We ought to be able to understand and find ways to help prevent it.

We can control access to the most dangerous products. We can increase product safety for guns, which are inherently dangerous. We can empower healthcare professionals to deal with families to help prevent gun violence and understand what risks their families face, rather than outrageous provisions that seek to limit what healthcare professionals can do to deal with their patients. We can effectively regulate the sale of firearms. There should be no hidden sales where we do not have background checks.

This is all within our capacity. We can enforce existing laws, and we can mitigate the loss of life in shooting by helping provide more resources for first responders.

This isn't pie in the sky. This will do nothing to take away the rights of

Americans who want to target shoot or hunt. What it will do, is start the slow, steady process toward making our families safer and make sure that America is not the only developed country that cannot protect its families from gun violence.

GENERAL AVIATION

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to do a little myth-busting. Critics of the 21st Century AIRR Act are selling a myth that the 21st Century AIRR Act will be damaging and adverse to general aviation. This couldn't be further from the truth.

I am a regular general aviation user and a student pilot. My brother-in-law is a GA pilot. I would never support legislation that would be bad for my rural communities and the airports in those communities.

Let's address a few of those myths.

The nonprofit service provider for air traffic control will be prohibited from charging user fees to any segment of general aviation in contrast to the myths that are being sold out there.

The act also prohibits the ATC provider from restricting access to any airspace or any airport.

Further, any changes to access to airports or airspace would be subject to extensive government review and approval.

Additional funding is provided to community airports to assist them to continue to grow and be vibrant in our communities.

Critics would have you believe that general aviation will not have a seat at the table. Again, not true. The nonprofit board of directors designates a seat for community airports, as it designates a seat for general aviation, lease pilots, airlines, and air cargo.

The FAA, in a hearing, indicated it would take another 10 years and \$30 billion to update an air traffic control system from the archaic system we have now. When asked, they said that they hoped they would have it accomplished in 10 years. Hope is not a plan.

The Trump administration supports the 21st Century AIRR Act. Air traffic controllers support the 21st Century AIRR Act. Airline pilots support it. The airlines support it, and air cargo supports it. We can go through a long list, yet we continue to deal with myths being spun out there that somehow this is adverse to aviation.

We have an archaic air traffic control system that is hurting our Nation and that is damaging our economy. It is time to move beyond fear and myths.

Madam Speaker, I urge colleagues to move beyond those myths and see the 21st Century AIRR Act will benefit all users. Let's bring the bill to the floor, let's have a vote, and let's move the air traffic control system back.

PUERTO RICO, YOU ARE NOT ALONE

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, I just returned from Puerto Rico, and to start my remarks, I would like to say a few words in Spanish, the language of Puerto Rico, and then I will switch back to English.

I will provide a translation to the desk.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

My beloved Puerto Rico, you are not alone. We hear your cries for help and the full strength of the American government and military is finally coming to help.

It has been slow and no one has been as frustrated as I am that the response did not happen with the urgency and priority that Puerto Ricans—and every human being who is suffering—deserve.

I tell my colleagues what I saw and what you told me while I was there. I will work with them immediately, and make sure that this Congress treats Puerto Rico fairly and generously.

And I am not alone. The other Puerto Ricans and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus are working with the leadership of the House to put together an aid package.

Cities and towns, Mayors and Governors from across the country are making their communities available to you so that you have a safe place to be while the rescue and recovery and rebuilding continues.

And standing with the Mayor of Chicago just yesterday, he said he wants the City of Chicago to be a place where any and all Puerto Ricans who need a safe place can come and we will help you resettle.

You are not alone.

Mi amado Puerto Rico, no estás solo.

Oímos tus peticiones de ayuda, y la fuerza del gobierno y milicia estadounidense finalmente vienen a ayudar.

Ha sido despacio, y comparto tu frustración sobre una respuesta que no se dió con la urgencia y prioridad que los Puertorriqueños—y cualquier ser humano que está sufriendo—se merecen.

Les digo a mis colegas lo que he visto, y lo que me has dicho cuando estuve ahí. Trabajaré con ellos inmediatamente para asegurar que este

Congreso trate a Puerto Rico justa y generosamente.

Y no soy el único. Otros Puertorriqueños, y el Caucus Hispano están trabajando con el liderazgo de la Cámara para conformar un programa de ayuda.

Ciudades y pueblos, alcaldes y gobernadores a través del país, están abriéndote las puertas de sus comunidades para que tengas un lugar seguro mientras el rescate, la recuperación y la reconstrucción continúan.

Y ayer, presente con el alcalde de Chicago, él me dijo que quiere que la ciudad de Chicago sea un lugar en el cual todo Puertorriqueño que necesite un lugar seguro pueda llegar y reestablecerse.

Madam Speaker, I flew to Puerto Rico on Friday to see what was happening on the ground with my own eyes. Madam Speaker, it was worse than I imagined, and it broke my heart to see my beloved island so destroyed and so scared for its future and feeling so alone and isolated.

There were dead animals all over the place, and people were so desperate for food and water. Anyone who is sick or elderly is finding it hard or impossible to get medicine and medical care.

Things are improving day by day, and the number of helicopters flying missions of mercy to the interior of the island is increasing. But almost everyone has no electrical power. Almost everyone has little or no food and trouble finding it. Almost everyone has no water, and some are seeking water from unreliable or possibly contaminated sources.

At the same time, I also saw an amazing unity and toughness, a can-do spirit that my fellow Puerto Ricans have the ability to make a way where there is no way, to improvise, and, most importantly, to work together.

Any divisions of party or class that are right on the surface on a typical day in Puerto Rico, this faction versus that faction, all of that was blown away. The only status issue that matters for Puerto Ricans right now is the status of the SOS, save our souls. We need help, and plenty of it, now.

Yesterday, I spoke at a press conference in Chicago with Mayor Rahm Emanuel and leaders from Chicago, including Fire Commissioner Santiago and the head of Chicago's Office of Emergency Management and Control, a brigadier general in our National Guard.

The mayor announced that 22 Chicago firefighters, on their own dime, are going to Puerto Rico to help with the rescue and recovery efforts, including bringing equipment that may help communications to remote parts of the island.

The mayor also announced that, in Chicago, we want to be for Puerto Rico what Houston was for New Orleans

after Hurricane Katrina—a place of refuge where we will help you get settled, get your kids into school, get you the medical care you need, and make you feel welcome.

One thing I learned in Puerto Rico this weekend is that, in Chicago and in the rest of the U.S., we need to start thinking about evacuation in addition to rebuilding and recovery.

I have welcomed my own family into my home, and people I know across the country are welcoming relatives escaping Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. But we need to wrap up our commitment beyond the family-to-family informal relationships and look systematically at how we organize ourselves to meet the great need of our fellow citizens on the island in the Caribbean.

Rebuilding Puerto Rico—making her a strong and self-sufficient island nation of industrious and hardworking people again—will take years and require a long-term commitment from this Congress and this country so that the well-being of our fellow man on the island can be met.

So, Madam Speaker, let's roll up our sleeves and get to work. Once again, Chicago is there to welcome you, to enroll your kids in school, to get you medical attention, and to make sure you have a safe place until the recovery and rebuilding has been accomplished.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide a translation of his remarks to the Clerk.

A NEW ABSOLUTE AIRSPEED RECORD

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

Mr. KNIGHT. Madam Speaker, I am truly blessed to represent a district in southern California that is the home of so many historic feats.

Today, I would like to tell you about one of those feats that turned 50 years old today. October 3, 1967, is a date I will never forget, but it is probably a date I will never remember either because I was 9 months old.

On that date, a B-52 flew down the runway of Edwards Air Force Base with a small, white airplane tucked underneath her wing. A major who had thousands of hours in different platforms was the pilot of that airplane. He had been on several different programs and had been a test pilot for many years and was a graduate of the United States Air Force Test Pilot School. He was the pilot of that small, white aircraft.

The plan was simple on paper. It was to accelerate to 100,000 feet and achieve a Mach of 6.50. As the pilots at Edwards Air Force Base will also tell you, it is a profession that they go about, and they do this in a very professional

manner. The terms were 100,000 feet and 6.50, the ending was 102,100 feet and 6.72—a new airspeed record.

□ 1015

The interesting thing about this is that the air speed record had been set on November 18, 1966, by the same pilot and broken just 10 months later. That flight has now stood for 50 years.

If that pilot was here today, he would say that it is a travesty that that air speed record has stood for 50 years. In fact, I was standing with him on the 30th anniversary and he said just those same words: Why are we stuck where we were in the sixties? Why haven't we continued to push forward?

I believe he was right and I believe he would be right today. I hope that I am not standing here on the 60th anniversary talking about the same issue.

The great men of that era did some phenomenal things. They pushed the limits. They knew that the sky was no limit and that it was actually just a boundary that we needed to push forward.

There were 12 pilots in the X-15 program. I grew up with many of them or their kids. There was General Rushworth, Neil Armstrong, Bob White, Joe Walker, Bill Dana, Joe Engle, Scott Crossfield, John McKay, Milton Thompson, and Forrest Petersen. Mike Adams lost his life in the X-15 program in November 1967—the only one to lose his life in that program.

The pilot of the October 3, 1967, flight was my father, Pete Knight. He flew the aircraft 16 times, setting the air speed record several times, breaking it, and then achieving 4,520 miles an hour on October 3, 1967, which still stands today.

I think the lesson is that we have got to keep pushing. Technology is not out there for no reason. It is out there for us to grab and continue to achieve. Those records are made to be broken. We must continue to push in aerospace and in every endeavor we encounter. That is what America does and that is what we do for all of mankind.

I think this record was a great achievement, and I can tell you one quick story. I knew of this record when I was a small kid because my father pulled that Machmeter out of the X-15 after he set the record. That Machmeter sat on our television for every year of my life, until he was on his death bed. He said: I want that Machmeter to go to the Smithsonian. Which is exactly where we sent it.

This was something that was an achievement by many engineers, pilots, mothership pilots, and chase pilots, but it is something that is now 50 years old, and we need to continue to push.

DEVASTATION AND HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, any comments that I make in Spanish, I will provide translation in English.

Madam Speaker, I witnessed the devastation and humanitarian crisis this weekend when I traveled to the island of Puerto Rico with my colleague from Chicago, Illinois, LUIS GUTIÉRREZ.

As I traveled throughout the area, I met dozens of emergency workers from various cities around our Nation on their way to provide assistance to families in Puerto Rico.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

I had the privilege of travelling to Puerto Rico this weekend along with my colleague from the State of Illinois, Congressman LUIS GUTIÉRREZ, and witnessed the devastation caused by Hurricane Maria. But most importantly, I saw how the Puerto Rican people has united to work in restoring Puerto Rico from its current state. Thousands and thousands of people, including Mayor Carmen Yulín Cruz and the Governor, are compromised with the well-being of the Puerto Rican people. I saw firefighters and emergency workers at the Philadelphia airport trying to reach Puerto Rico to help their brothers and sisters. This has moved me and I understand the Puerto Rican people have a very big heart and immense solidarity.

Tuve el privilegio de viajar este fin de semana a Puerto Rico con mi colega del Estado de Illinois, Congresista LUIS GUTIÉRREZ, y fui testigo ocular de la devastación causada por el Huracán Maria. Pero más importante, vi cómo el pueblo puertorriqueño se ha unido a trabajar para levantar a Puerto Rico del estado donde se encuentra; miles y miles de personas, incluyendo la alcaldesa Carmen Yulín Cruz y el mismo Gobernador están comprometidos con el bienestar del pueblo puertorriqueño. Vi a bomberos, trabajadores de emergencia, en el aeropuerto de Philadelphia tratando de llegar a Puerto Rico para darle ayuda a sus hermanos; algo que me ha conmovido y que entiendo que el pueblo puertorriqueño tiene un corazón muy grande y una solidaridad humana inmensa.

Madam Speaker, I met with Puerto Rico Governor Ricardo Rossello and San Juan Mayor Carmen Yulín Cruz. It bewilders me how someone could criticize the mayor of San Juan, Puerto Rico, from a cozy clubhouse in a well-heeled golf course when she was chest deep in water contaminated with toxic fuels and human excrement, bringing help to those who need it in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

We discussed with them efforts currently under way and ways that the Federal Government and Congress can improve our response to address immediate and long-term goals to help re-

build the island of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands—let's not forget them.

Yesterday, I released a 10-point plan following my assessment, and I offer this as a solution to provide an immediate emergency relief package for the humanitarian crisis we are witnessing in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

It is my hope that we, as Members of Congress, will work together to find solutions quickly, as the lives of U.S. citizens and the efforts to rebuild have remained encumbered.

Madam Speaker, I call for an immediate \$20 billion emergency relief package for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Congress needs to act on a humanitarian emergency relief package for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands no later than this week. They cannot wait another week.

It is estimated that Puerto Rico will need \$85 billion for their recovery efforts. At a minimum, Congress need to enact a \$20 billion emergency relief package for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Also, I call for a hearing on Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands recovery efforts. A congressional task force for coordinated relief efforts must be put in place. The delayed response in Puerto Rico was egregious.

I join my colleagues in calling for a hearing on Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands recovery efforts and for a full assessment on how to mitigate delayed reactions in the future and a strategic plan on a long-term recovery effort not only for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, but for the entire Caribbean region that, unfortunately, stands on the pathway of natural disasters, including hurricane season.

As my colleagues have stated, the Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force resulted in a comprehensive plan developed by Federal and local stakeholders, which then helped aid the recovery efforts in U.S. and elsewhere. A similar plan is needed for all of the areas affected during this hurricane season.

We must also create a permanent waiver of the Jones Act for diesel and fuel. The latest 10-day waiver by the Trump administration is not nearly enough. The Jones Act needs to be waived for at least a year so that response and rebuilding efforts are not encumbered. I also call for a permanent waiver for diesel and fuel.

I also call for immediate deployment of the USS *Abraham Lincoln* aircraft carrier.

I joined 145 Members of Congress in urging the President to deploy the USS *Abraham Lincoln*.

We need to repair telecommunications and authorize the Army and engineers to repair hospitals.

Madam Speaker, I have four other points that I will later present to you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will provide a translation of his remarks to the Clerk.

POLITICAL COURTS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, the new term of the U.S. Supreme Court begins this week. I was a judge for 7½ years before I came to Congress, so I have great interest in their proceedings. It seems to me that our courts have become far too political over the last many years.

Up until the mid-1930s, most Federal courts seemed to try to stay out of politics and paid great deference to actions by Federal and State legislative bodies as being expressions of the will of the people.

For many years now, though, some Federal judges believe they should have been elected to Congress or to State legislatures. One of many examples involves the drawing of congressional, legislative, and local government voting districts. The word “gerrymandering” came into use in 1812, but it really has only been in very recent years that the Federal courts have become heavily involved in drawing specific lines in so many States.

If the court has a liberal judge, he or she will seemingly go to great lengths to throw out any lines that seem to benefit conservatives.

I was at the U.S. Supreme Court recently to introduce some lawyers from Knoxville. That day, the Court was hearing a challenge to some lines drawn by the Virginia Legislature. This is something that the Federal courts should really stay out of and leave to the State legislatures.

Also, opinions now are much longer than in the first 150 years or so, as some judges seem to believe they know almost everything.

Madam Speaker, what we really need is more judges at all levels who have a little more humility.

Many of the issues that the courts are dealing with involve freedom of religion. Our Founding Fathers came here to this country to get freedom of religion, not freedom from religion.

I think it was very sad that a very intolerant group from Wisconsin went to great lengths to get a Bible verse removed from the Knoxville Police Department. It seems that people who proclaim their tolerance the loudest are some of the most intolerant people in this country today, and aimed primarily at conservative Christians.

In *Zorach v. Clauson*, a 1952 U.S. Supreme Court case, Justice William O. Douglas wrote that the law should not prefer “those who believe in no religion over those who do believe,” and that there is “no constitutional require-

ment which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence.”

Justice Douglas was one of the most liberal Justices who ever served on the U.S. Supreme Court.

It surprises many when I tell them that we open every session of the House and Senate with prayer, that there is a prayer room in the center of the Capitol, and several Bible studies go on in the Capitol each week.

Madam Speaker, on an unrelated topic, because we are dealing with the budget proposals this week, I think it is ironic that the only President in the last 70 or 80 years who has tried to rein in defense spending is the only one who spent his career in the military: President Eisenhower.

I spoke out in every way and voted against most of the major initiatives of the Obama administration, but it was false to say that the military has been depleted.

We spend well over \$700 billion on defense and military construction each year. Last year, we spent \$177.5 billion on new planes, tanks, weapons, and equipment, and similar amounts to that for many years. Most of this equipment does not wear out after just 1 year.

In the book “Ike’s Bluff,” when Eisenhower was told he could not cut defense spending, he replied that if he told every general who reduced his budget that he would get another star, you would have to get out of the way of the rush.

He also said: “Heaven help us if we ever have a President who doesn’t know as much about the military as I do.”

Over 80 percent of those in Congress today have never served in our Armed Forces. I am proud to have been one who was privileged to serve.

Most of the Members of Congress today are afraid to oppose or even question wasteful defense spending for fear of some demagogue calling them unpatriotic or saying they are not supporting the troops. But, Madam Speaker, we need to wake up and realize that there is waste even in the Defense Department.

ENTERPRISE CARRIERS FROM MEXICO

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today, there are over 800 so-called enterprise carriers from Mexico operating heavy trucks long distance in the United States.

Now, what is wrong with that?

Well, Mexico doesn’t have any drug or alcohol testing of its commercial drivers. Mexico does not have a cen-

tralized database of commercial driver’s licenses and driving offenses, making it difficult, if not impossible, to attract and disqualify drivers who are unsafe and who would be disqualified here in the United States.

In Mexico, truck drivers are pretty much exploited and abused. They don’t even have hours of service rules. Some drivers will drive for 1 or 2 days straight.

In the United States, of course, we have very restrictive rules for safety on hours of service. Those laws, theoretically, apply to the 800 Mexican enterprise carriers operating in the United States.

However, how many hours did that person drive before they got to the border? Was it 24 or 48?

Then they cross over the border and they are limited.

Congress objected and voted multiple times by huge bipartisan majorities on legislation I supported to say: No, we do not want these Mexican trucks ranging about here in the United States until they can prove that they meet the same standards as our truck drivers.

We have had a few offenses. We don’t even put special scrutiny on these enterprise carriers. We have very few inspectors out there. But they have managed to rack up some pretty horrific records on a random basis that raise huge questions about their safety.

□ 1030

They had over 900 violations per driver that cannot read or speak the English language sufficiently to respond to official inquiries, a violation of the law; over 800 violations for brake-related issues—worn brake hoses, defective brakes, et cetera; and hundreds of other violations for tire treads, exhaust leaks, and oil leaks. One company was fined \$40,000.

There is only one way to solve this issue, and that is to modify the NAFTA agreement. Remember, this was authorized. They were given national treatment; that is, Mexico is treated the same as the U.S. They won, in one of those secret tribunals, a huge judgment against the United States.

The Obama administration caved in and allowed the door to be opened to these unsafe carriers operating in the United States. We can close that door again by just modifying NAFTA.

The Trump administration is approaching this issue perhaps as early as next week in the NAFTA negotiations, and this should be at the top of their agenda: we will not give them national treatment; they will have to meet our standards and prove that they have met our standards; they have to develop a meaningful driver’s license base; they will have to have drug and alcohol testing; they have to have hours of service. Then we can talk about whether or not they can operate in the United States.

We had a system before NAFTA. Mexican truck drivers would bring the trucks just over the border. They were limited in how far they could go. They would drop the trailers. U.S. truck drivers would pick them up.

Then there is one other issue here: Are we going to do to our trucking industry what we have done to so many in manufacturing? Are we going to drive down truck drivers' wages?

It is already a tough business, particularly for independent drivers. Are we going to make them compete with people who are earning 2 bucks an hour and don't have to meet the same rules as they do? That is not fair competition, and it is not good for the American people, not for the jobs or the safety on our highways.

So I am asking the Trump administration to hang tough on this issue and take away this national treatment that we are giving to Mexico, which does not have an equivalent system to the United States, and go to something that is based on reciprocity and equivalence. That would be a good change to the NAFTA agreement, which, of course, I opposed from day one.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this Friday is National Manufacturing Day. We celebrate Manufacturing Day annually in order to recognize the manufacturing industry's part in the growth and prosperity of the United States economy, as well as raise awareness of the important investment and career opportunities within the manufacturing sector.

Manufacturing Day started in 2012 as an annual celebration of modern manufacturing meant to inspire the next generation of manufacturers, and it has done just that. According to a 2016 survey of students who attended Manufacturing Day events, 89 percent were more aware of manufacturing jobs in their communities; 84 percent were more convinced that manufacturing provides careers that are interesting and rewarding; 64 percent were more motivated to pursue careers in manufacturing; and 71 percent were more likely to tell friends, family, parents, or colleagues about manufacturing after attending the event.

Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing industry impacts every community in the United States, and that is certainly true for Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. Pennsylvania has a rich history of being a manufacturing leader, especially our storied Pennsylvania Steel. The Commonwealth has been an important cog in the wheels of this country's industrial revolution

thanks to industries like iron, coal, and lumber, in addition to steel.

Our Pennsylvania farmers have fed and continue to feed generations of Americans, providing safe and nutritious food for all our neighbors.

From heritage companies to newer rising stars, we have a wide cross-section of products produced in the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight just a few.

Brookville Equipment Corporation in Jefferson County is the leading American manufacturer of diesel locomotive engines, street trolleys, and mining machinery. Brookville's mass transit resume includes fully refurbishing streetcars for cities, including New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

Since 1889, W.R. Case & Sons Cutlery Company has been fashioning handcrafted pocketknives and sporting knives in McKean County.

Zippo Manufacturing Company, makers of the world famous Zippo windproof lighter, owns Case Knives today. Zippo is another family-owned business, based in the city of Bradford, McKean County, since 1936.

Major leaguers have been swinging our fine Pennsylvania hardwoods thanks to Jefferson County company BWP Bats. BWP's slogan is "Built With Pride."

Huntingdon County's Bonney Forge has a state-of-the-art forge facility capable of manufacturing our entire line of forged steel fitting and forged steel valve products since 1875.

A new manufacturer is DiamondBack Truck Covers. Two Penn State students started this company in their garage in 2003. They make heavy-duty, utility-oriented, diamond plate aluminum truck bed covers for pickup trucks in Philipsburg, Pennsylvania, in Centre County.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a handful of the manufacturers in my district who produce quality, American-made products. As co-chair of the Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am proud that the manufacturing industry employs scores of career and technical education students in family-sustaining careers. These are great family-sustaining jobs.

As we celebrate National Manufacturing Day on Friday and draw attention to the roles manufacturers play in our communities, I commend all those who keep our economy booming through manufacturing.

STOPPING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today heartbroken and bone weary from the gun violence that continues to wrack our country. Just this year alone there have been 273 mass shoot-

ings, shootings with four or more victims. Every day we read of another child tragically lost.

Our Nation awoke yesterday to the horrifying news of yet another mass shooting, this time in Las Vegas. It is once more now the worst shooting in our Nation's history. This violence sears our hearts and leaves countless families forever tragically changed.

I extend my sincere condolences to all those who lost loved ones and send prayers of recovery to those wounded. Please know that the American people are grieving with you.

I am incredibly grateful for the extraordinary professionalism and bravery of law enforcement and first responders during this attack. But our words and prayers are not sufficient for the people of Las Vegas or the other victims of daily gun violence across our country. We owe them more. We must come together to tackle this epidemic with action. Enough is enough.

There is no one single solution to the gun violence now, nor are there any easy answers, but that must not stop us from making progress where we can. Incredibly, however, this body is set to consider rolling back some of the commonsense regulations we already have in place for gun safety.

It is inconceivable to me that this House is preparing to vote on legislation to weaken restrictions on the sale of silencers. Such sound suppressors make it more difficult for law enforcement officers to identify the point source of a weapon and to react to protect our public.

Why are we considering a bill that makes firearms more deadly and makes it more difficult for police to respond?

But that is not all. There is also a proposal to weaken State concealed carry laws with national reciprocity.

This dangerous legislation would undermine local safety laws and deny States their right to establish their own concealed carry safety standards. Requiring States to accept the concealed standards of every other State will effectively create a dangerous race to the bottom and leave the least restrictive State law as the effective national standard.

Mr. Speaker, we should be debating and voting on proposals that can reduce gun violence in our communities. We must not allow the difficulty of the path ahead prevent us from embracing solutions that move us in the right direction.

Earlier this year, I introduced the Ghost Guns Are Guns bill with my colleague, Congressman ESPAILLAT of New York. This bill will address the glaring loophole that allows gun buyers to bypass a background check by purchasing their weapons as unassembled kits online. These kits can be delivered to anyone's doorstep with all the parts needed to assemble a fully functioning, totally untraceable firearm.

The Ghost Guns Are Guns Act simply says that these weapons should be regulated like other firearms and require a background check like other firearms. More than 9 out of 10 Americans support background checks. This bill is a commonsense step forward, and I urge my colleagues to join me in seeking its passage.

We also face the problem of stolen guns. Last year alone, more than 18,000 guns were lost or stolen from Federal firearm dealers. Many of these stolen weapons were later used in violent crimes. That is why I introduced the SECURE Firearm Storage Act, to require all Federal firearm licensees to securely store their inventory when not open for business.

The Chicago Sun-Times said this bill was, "so obviously right, it's hard to believe it is even necessary." I agree, and I invite my colleagues to join me in passing this bill as well.

These are but two commonsense ideas. I am open to any and all ideas to make progress in reducing gun violence in our communities and helping make our communities safe—from universal background checks to making gun trafficking a Federal crime, to limiting access to high-capacity magazines and military assault weapons.

Enough is enough. We cannot allow this epidemic to continue. Together, we have the opportunity to save lives. I urge my colleagues to join me, and let's take this time to act.

21ST CENTURY AIRR ACT

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has just approved an FAA extension to fund the agency for 6 months, but our work is not done. We have a responsibility to pass a long-term FAA bill that ensures America remains a leader in aviation.

The status quo means American aviation manufacturing will lose out to competitors in Europe, China, Brazil, and Canada. We will lose jobs. It means the drone industry will continue to go overseas for testing and development. That is more lost jobs. The status quo means more delays and lost time for our passengers.

Let me read you a quote: "The FAA is the only agency of government worse at procurement than the Pentagon. Congress has tried to reform it; it didn't stick. We have got to try something different to get it to be more agile to give us 21st century equipment and software that we need."

Mr. Speaker, that is not my quote. I am quoting the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. And that, based on what he has said and what we have seen over the last 20 years, that is why it is time to reform the FAA.

With my Republican and Democratic colleagues, I have introduced H.R. 2997, the 21st Century AIRR Act. Like all major reforms, there have been false claims made against this bipartisan bill. The false issues I want to address are from general aviation.

My colleagues and I, including SAM GRAVES, worked with the general aviation community to include everything they have asked for in this bill. Not one of their legislative requests was excluded. In fact, Congressman GRAVES now supports the bill because of how far we went to address the needs of the GA community. We did so because general aviation is vital to our unique aviation system, and I would never sponsor legislation that harms my own rural community and the GA pilots and the several hundred GA pilots who live within it.

Here is what the general aviation community asked for:

They did not want to pay user fees to use air traffic control services, and they won't. All they have to do is look at page 83 in the bill. The only entity that will be able to change this is Congress, just like it is today.

They did not want any airspace restrictions. This bill prohibits airspace restrictions for the GA, and just look at page 114 to find that. In fact, GA doesn't have that guarantee today. Our bill actually puts that guarantee in law for the first time.

They wanted to fully fund the Airport Improvement Program. I want to fully fund the Airport Improvement Program, in part, because it helps my district and small- and medium-sized airports in rural communities around this country. AIP will be funded the way it has been in the past, and it will be, going forward, by the traveling public.

Currently, AIP funding is flatlined at \$3.3 billion a year, but over the course of the bill, we will raise that up to almost \$4 billion, and you will find that on page 7 of the bill.

GA wanted parity on the board, and they got it, the ability to nominate two board members. So the board will be balanced. It will include airports, pilots, controllers, commercial passenger carriers, cargo carriers, regional carriers, general aviation, business aviation, plus the government will put two seats on the board.

□ 1045

A super majority will choose two independent board members, and then they will choose a CEO.

Yet even when faced with these facts in black and white text, opponents of reform still claim these guarantees are not in the bill. Ask a member of the GA community what we can do to get their support, and they will say: "Nothing." They want to keep the status quo.

Unfortunately, a few Washington special interests that represent business

jets oppose this commonsense reform. Think about it this way: 850 million passengers will fly commercially every year, and that number will go to a billion over the next 10 years; this bill is real reform that will benefit them at no cost and harm to the business jet aviation; in fact, every person that flies commercially subsidizes business jets using the air traffic control system.

A small number of GA owners, the number is about 500,000, are opposing something that will benefit a billion passengers that will fly annually.

Another thing that was brought up is that we harm the defense of this country. That is absolutely not true. As a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, I would never do anything that would harm the defense of this country. And Secretary Mattis and Deputy Secretary of Defense Shanahan have been on the Hill, have written letters supporting our efforts to this fact.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this is not speculation. This reflects the very carefully drafted text of the bill that the House will vote on in the coming days. I encourage Members to read the bill and come to us with questions.

This bipartisan bill has broad and diverse support. For example, Heritage Action, the pilots and the air traffic controller union, and the flight attendants union all support this very bipartisan bill, a bill that will transform aviation in this country, keep us competitive, keep us safe, and keep us efficient.

I ask all my colleagues to support the bipartisan H.R. 2997.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we grieved for 59 Americans who were killed watching a concert and 527 people who were injured as bullets rained down on them. As horrible as it is, it is only an inflection point on the daily loss of life to gun violence.

We have had our grisly House ritual of expressing our heartfelt grief, followed by a moment of silence, but the moments have extended into years.

Families at home did not send us here for our thoughts and prayers. No one in this Chamber was elected to tackle our country's challenges with moments of silence.

We were elected to work together, to debate, to argue, even fight tooth and nail about the problems Americans are facing and what we can do to help, but that is not what we are doing here.

Even after the massacre of children and now the worst massacre by guns in American history, our Republican leaders continue to block debate on commonsense gun safety legislation that is

backed by Americans across the spectrum of political ideology.

Now we have had our moment of silence, so it is back to business as usual: Members of Congress who call a mass shooting evil and turn around and take cash from the gun lobby.

The leadership of this House is so enamored with silence that one of the only policies that they will talk about is silencing guns. Why would you endanger our police officers and families by remaining silent on solutions to reduce gun violence and promote a bill that deregulates silencers? There is only one explanation, and that is that the monstrous roar of the gun lobby is drowning out the voices of families, it is drowning out compassion, and it is drowning out common sense.

Many say there is nothing to be done. There is a falsehood that any common-sense solution will lead directly to Americans losing their guns and their Second Amendment rights. This is as pernicious as it is cowardly. This is the United States Congress. Americans think that we are strong enough to have this debate on reducing gun violence. Why don't we?

Don't shrug off the loss of life. Don't be complicit in the daily carnage of gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for each of us to stand up, to do our jobs, to come together and debate solutions, and to bring them to a vote. American families are counting on us, and they are watching.

BE A VOICE FOR UNBORN AMERICANS

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

As a father of three, a grandfather of three, and as a man of faith, I firmly believe that life begins at conception. As a surgeon and a scientist, I know that unborn children feel pain at 20 weeks, at the very latest at 20 weeks.

Scientific studies have found that a baby's first sensory receptors for pain are developed in the first 7 weeks. By 20 weeks, an unborn baby is so developed that they can hear music and respond to sounds, but, most importantly, a substantial body of medical evidence shows that he or she can feel and respond to pain.

Let there be no mistake: late-term abortion practices are gruesome and painful. These babies are dismembered limb from limb, yet the United States is one of only seven nations in the world that allows for elective late-term abortions. We are joining nations like North Korea and China that allow for elective late-term abortions. It is shocking to the conscience.

By passing the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and banning late-

term abortions after 20 weeks, we stand up to protect the innocent and the defenseless.

The Psalm says: "Children are a gift from the Lord." If we here today do not protect this gift, who will? If we do not shield unborn Americans from a death so painful and unimaginable, who will?

The responsibility falls to us. Let us embrace this solemn duty.

I spent my medical career doing everything I could to save the lives of the patients in my care. Now, as a legislator, I can help save people with my vote.

I invite the entire House to be a voice for unborn Americans and pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

MASS SHOOTINGS IN AMERICA

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I know you have heard the story. Sunday, in Las Vegas, 59 people at a concert were mowed down and more than 500 were wounded.

I know you have heard this story, too: last June, 49 cellphones on the floor of the Pulse Nightclub were ringing and ringing and ringing and were never answered.

What about this story: two years ago, eight students who just wanted to learn and their professor who was there to teach them were mowed down in their classrooms at Umpqua Community College.

And everyone knows that, nearly 5 years ago, the bodies of 20 elementary school children and 6 teachers lay in Sandy Hook Elementary School in what was then the unthinkable act of horror.

So here we are again with what was once unthinkable becoming mundane.

Mr. Speaker, how have we as a society become so debased, how have we strayed so far from what is right and what is just so that we hardly blink at the massacre of innocents in schools and movie theaters and classrooms and concerts and nightclubs? And it goes on and on and on.

So I ask you today, how many lives must be destroyed before Congress acts? Nine lives in Charleston showed us nine was not enough. Thirteen lives at Columbine showed us that 13 was not enough. Certainly 20 small children killed in their classrooms at Newtown? No. The 32 lives lost at Virginia Tech? Again, not enough. Forty-nine lives in Orlando? No. The more than 33,000 Americans killed each year by guns? No, that is not enough.

The fact that more Americans have died from guns in the United States since 1968 than on battlefields in all our wars since the American Revolution, is that not enough?

Now 59 people have been murdered in Las Vegas and hundreds more are left

struggling with injuries, both physical and mental, but the worst part—and believe me, I have trouble picking out the worst part—daily mass shootings have somehow become just ordinary.

The massacre in Las Vegas was the 273rd mass shooting in the United States this year.

Last year, I posted the name and photo of every single victim killed in mass shootings on the walls outside my office. There were 476 shootings, with 597 people killed and 1,734 wounded. Not enough. It is never enough.

That is how I learned about Tamia Sanders, who was 14 years old when she was killed while sitting on her porch next to her mother; about Antonio Hinkle, who was 32 when he was gunned down and killed at a cookout pushing children out of the way of gunfire; and about Willow Short, age two, who survived a heart transplant only to be slaughtered outside and alongside the rest of her family by her own father.

I stand before you filled with rage and sadness to say this has to stop. Moments of silence provide little comfort—frankly, no comfort. It is a show here to somehow suggest that if you make the headlines, we will give you a moment of silence, but for the 476 other mass shootings each year, we are not going to give you a moment of silence.

Do we really lack the courage of conviction? No. Other industrialized countries have seen no such blood-soaked streets.

By remaining silent, we are not just being cowardly, we are being complicit in these crimes.

Mr. Speaker, we must honor the dead by taking action. Now is the time for a vote, and we know what the vote is on.

Our human instinct is to try to find patterns and make sense out of the most horrific and senseless acts. Whether the shooters are terrorists or domestic abusers or the mentally ill, one pattern is the same: access to deadly weapons that can allow a lone gunman to lay waste to human life on a massive scale must stop.

This is why we must ban assault weapons that have, time and time again, caused mass bloodshed and the attachments that make them into automatic weapons that you can purchase for a mere \$50.

Automatic weapons are banned in the United States, machine guns are banned in the United States, but if you can buy a \$50 attachment and make it into a machine gun, how have we banned anything?

Let's make sure every gun purchase requires background checks rather than just 60 percent of gun purchases.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to do more than be silent.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE UNIFIED TAX REFORM FRAMEWORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some information about the Unified Tax Reform Framework that was released last week by Republicans in the House of Representatives.

I think it is important that, with all of the sad news coming out this week in the country, particularly in Puerto Rico and Las Vegas, we do share with the American people some information that will be so important to them long term and will help our economy get a good jump start.

Incidentally, last quarter, our economy grew at 3.1 percent, but very few people have heard about that, and it is important that we point that out.

Mr. Speaker, the material provided by the Ways and Means Committee is extraordinarily valuable, and I also would encourage people to go on the Ways and Means' website and on my website and on individual websites of Members to gain more information about this framework.

First, it lowers the rates for individuals and families. The framework shrinks the current seven tax brackets into three: 12 percent, 25 percent, and 35 percent. And actually, Mr. Speaker, many more Americans will pay no taxes as a result of the tax reform, because we are going to double the standard deduction and enhance the child tax credit.

□ 1100

The framework roughly doubles the standard deduction so that typical middle class families will keep more of their paycheck. It also significantly increases the child tax credit. It eliminates loopholes for the wealthy and protects bedrock provisions for the middle class. It repeals the death tax and alternative minimum tax.

Mr. Speaker, dying should not be a taxable event. It is important that we not tax people, particularly farmers and small businesses, at the death of a businessowner or farmowner.

It creates a new lower tax rate structure for small businesses. It will help to create jobs and promote competitiveness by lowering the corporate tax rate. So that Americans can compete on a level playing field, the framework reduces the corporate tax rate to 20 percent, below the 22.5 percent average of the industrialized world.

It will boost the economy by allowing for expensing of capital investments. The framework allows, for at least 5 years, businesses to immediately write off or expense the cost of new investments, giving a much-needed lift to the economy.

It moves to an American model for competitiveness. The framework ends the perverse incentives to offshore jobs and keep foreign profits overseas. It levels the playing field for American companies and workers by allowing the

profits achieved overseas to come back by imposing a one-time low tax rate on wealth that is already accumulated overseas so there is no tax incentive to keep the money offshore.

Mr. Speaker, we need to get our economy booming again to create jobs and to make our country much greater than it is today. I endorse this framework put out by the Ways and Means Committee and look forward to the work that is going to be done by the committee as it refines the framework and brings forth a bill for us to vote on.

WE CAN BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, we all awoke yesterday to a grim but familiar ritual. As we looked at our phones, we saw that dozens of people had been slaughtered in Las Vegas by a madman with a gun.

For the victims, the survivors, and their families, this is a nightmare come true, and my heart goes out to them and to the first responders and to the many people who rushed to help in that hellish situation. But now what?

The question can't be escaped, and it hits particularly hard those of us who live in the shadow of Sandy Hook, years ago, where 20 babies were killed, and we thought that that would be enough to cause this Congress to act—to act for sanity, to act for common-sense, to act for life. But it wasn't. And neither was Orlando, neither was San Bernardino, and now neither, I fear, will be the horrendous massacre in Las Vegas.

Let's be clear that no other tragedy that we face, not terrorists flying into buildings, not hurricanes which render entire islands without power and without hope, cause us to say: This is not a time to address this problem.

We ask ourselves: What can we do better? What can we learn? How can we stop this? Except on this issue. Orlando—Congress does nothing; Sandy Hook, 20 dead children—Congress does nothing; now Las Vegas.

What is happening right now is that conversations are happening in offices to figure out what the decent interval of time is between the deaths in Las Vegas and when we can introduce a bill that will make it easier for people to buy silencers. Not even the near fatal attack on one of our own, my friend STEPHEN SCALISE, was enough to cause us to seriously consider what we might do to staunch the flow of blood that characterizes this country, and this country alone.

Let's be clear. Let's be very clear about what we can do and what we don't want to do.

First of all, to all those who are listening to this and saying, "They just

want to take away my guns," no, we do not. I and those of us who stand for gun safety respect the Second Amendment. Many of us enjoy hunting. Many of us enjoy target practice. Many of us believe that perhaps you are safer if you can defend yourself. We have no interest in taking away anybody's guns.

We have interest in at least two things that have the virtue of being supported by the vast majority of Americans: universal background checks, the simple idea that, if you are going to exercise your Second Amendment rights and buy a weapon, we should check to see if you are violent, if you are a terrorist, if you are likely to do harm with that deadly weapon. That is a simple idea that has about 90 percent support in this country, and yet it will not be brought to this floor in what is known as the House of Representatives.

Do we represent or do we not?

There are other ideas. There has to be some limit on the firepower and the nature of the lethal technology that Americans can get access to. We saw in Las Vegas what very powerful weapons, perhaps modified to turn them into military-style weapons, can do to people and their bodies. I think most Americans would agree that there is some line—some line—between the weapons that we should have access to as a result of our Second Amendment rights and to do what we need to do and those weapons that can wreak the kind of havoc that we saw in Las Vegas.

Last year, after the shooting at the Pulse nightclub, I decided in desperation that I would not participate in any more moments of silence in this Chamber, that prayers and sympathy are fine, but this room can fix this problem. But this room and the people in it refuse to do so, even though we call ourselves Representatives, and we will not bring forward ideas that our constituents would support.

So today, in our despair, we must remember that our great struggles—suffrage, civil rights, healthcare—took decades for us to achieve. We can break the cycle of violence, but we have to act. We have no other choice.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Pastor Kevin McKee, Chapel on the Campus, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, creator of Heaven and Earth, sustainer of all things, grant this House the wisdom and courage to pursue justice in their legislation. Give them compassion and hope as they offer aid and relief to those who have suffered from the devastation of disasters. Give them unity that is necessary to achieve the highest levels of peace in our land.

Give the women and men of this Chamber the character and courage to pursue what is right and what is good. May they be able to discern what is best not only for their constituents, but for all Americans. Understanding the human condition and the mercy of God, may they work together to advance true liberty.

Be present today, O God of wisdom, to direct the affairs and deliberations of this honorable assembly and their committees.

This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KENNEDY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING PASTOR KEVIN MCKEE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Pastor Kevin McKee, who opened with the prayer this morning in this Chamber.

Kevin and his wife, Mary, have been amazing pillars in our community as we have been through extraordinary challenges associated with Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, and Isaac; a thousand-year flood last year; the worst oil spill in the Nation's history; the incredible shootings of five of our police officers last year; and racial divisiveness.

Kevin and Mary have been incredible at propping up our community and sharing the Word in eastern Europe, China, and around the United States. I want to thank both of them for their incredible service to our State, our Nation, and our community as we have been through these times of challenge.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SUPPORT FOR PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our prayers go to all victims of the Las Vegas massacre.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that I have been an advocate for pro-life values and protecting the rights of unborn babies. Today, the House will vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This will save the lives of babies who are too young to speak for themselves but who are old enough to feel physical pain.

I appreciate the success of South Carolina Citizens for Life, who work to give a voice to those who do not have one. With the great leadership of Executive Director Holly Gatling of the Midlands, Leon Wizorek of Barnwell, and Sally Zaleski of Orangeburg, this organization has been working to save lives.

As a cosponsor of the legislation with colleagues TRENT FRANKS, VICKY HARTZLER, MIA LOVE, and KAREN HANDEL, I am grateful to stand for life, upholding the conservative values and protecting the lives of our unborn babies. Every life is precious and has great value.

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

Thank you, Dr. Tom Price and Betty Price, for your successful service to American families.

CHIP AND CHC PROGRAM

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge swift reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program and the Community Health Center Program. CHIP keeps kids covered by providing basic healthcare to about 9 million children and pregnant mothers, including thousands of Oregonians.

The providers and families in our States deserve certainty that that

funding for these programs will be there when they need it. The lapse of these programs is already hurting our constituents and our communities.

At Virginia Garcia, a teaching health center in my district, payments for their residency program stopped abruptly. The clinic's executive director said that they cannot, in good conscience, stop these residencies, but they are very nervous about spending precious reserves when they had anticipated these grants would be fully funded.

There is no excuse for delay when it comes to the health of our children and families. We must continue common-sense investments in our Nation's health by reauthorizing the Children's Health Insurance Program and the Community Health Center Program immediately.

CONGRATULATING LIGO ON RECEIVING NOBEL PRIZE IN PHYSICS

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, when folks think of innovation and new technology, Louisiana often comes to mind.

We have been able to pioneer cell phone technology and have been involved in genetics and DNA. We have incredible naval technologies, with off-shore oil and gas at depths never before even contemplated. We have been able to power this Nation's economy.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, with the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory receiving the Nobel Prize in Physics for the discovery of and measurement of gravitational waves, Louisiana is recognized once again.

I want to give a shout-out to LIGO and Livingston Parish for their amazing discovery in 2015 and for being recognized with the Nobel Prize in Physics

CONGRESS MUST RESPOND APPROPRIATELY

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, Las Vegas, Nevada, 3 days ago—59 people dead, 527 injured, one shooter. It was the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. modern history.

Pulse nightclub, Orlando, Florida, 2016—49 people dead, 58 injured, one shooter.

Sandy Hook Elementary School, Newtown, Connecticut, 2012—20 kids aged 6 and 7 and 6 adults, all dead, one shooter. The one shooter killed his mother and then killed himself.

I have heard it said that the best gun control is a steady hand. Perhaps, but

a steady hand requires a healthy and sound mind. Assault weapons are designed to kill people, and to kill lots of people quickly. Their availability made massacres in Las Vegas, Newtown, and Orlando possible.

In the days ahead, we will learn much more about the shooter and his guns than about his victims—once again. My hope is that this Congress will use this information wisely and find the courage to respond appropriately. In this way, and only in this way, do we actually honor the victims.

RECOGNIZING OLD GREGG SCHOOL ON ITS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Old Gregg School Community and Recreation Center on its 10th anniversary. I recently had the opportunity to visit the repurposed school in Spring Mills and partake in the anniversary celebration.

For more than 80 years, the Old Gregg School building in Spring Mills educated children and young adults throughout the eastern Penns Valley in the time-honored values and responsibilities of community and service. The traditions of the historic Gregg Township School have been celebrated and expanded in the Old Gregg School Community and Recreation Center, which is now a multipurpose, nonprofit facility benefiting the entire Penns Valley community.

Old Gregg School Community and Recreation Center is regarded as a treasure in the heart of Penns Valley. It supports small businesses with affordable office space, offers athletic facilities for recreation, open space for meetings and events both indoors and out, and has well-maintained grounds and outdoor play areas.

Mr. Speaker, Old Gregg is an example of how to repurpose a space to benefit the entire community. It truly is a gem of Penns Valley that all residents treasure.

ENDING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, in mere minutes, one man took at least 59 lives, forever altered hundreds more, and left invisible, incurable scars on thousands.

On Monday morning, our Nation welcomed all of them into America's fastest growing community: families left with a gaping hole in their hearts caused by a bullet; a community that does not have the luxury of moving on

from gun violence after TV cameras leave, after the front pages fill with news stories; a community that includes families Black and White, rich and poor, big and small, Democrat and Republican.

Ending gun violence isn't political. It is personal. So we are now powerless. We are not helpless. We are not hostages to some political organization. We are not bystanders, as bullets tear through our concerts, prayer circles, elementary school classrooms, nightclubs, military compounds, and quiet neighborhoods.

This is up to us, every single American. This is our country, our home, and our families. We can decide that one person's right to bear arms does not come at the expense of a neighbor's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We must say, "No more."

PROTECTING LIFE

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers enshrined the guarantee of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They regarded life as a core promise and one that was to be protected. The Federal Government is responsible for protecting those rights, and currently we are failing at that responsibility.

As I speak in this body, America is one of only seven countries in the world that have legalized late-term elective abortion after 20 weeks. More specifically, it is estimated that approximately 13,000 late-term abortions are carried out in our country each year on healthy babies.

This is simply immoral and, as lawmakers, we have the ability to take commonsense measures to protect the unborn. The bill that we are voting on today, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, is one of those measures.

Mr. Speaker, every human being was given inalienable rights, chief among them being life itself. Governments are supposed to protect those rights. As a lawmaker, I plan to do so by supporting the bill before us today. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

RAW DEAL FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have once again presented a budget that is reckless, regressive, and reprehensible. It is a budget that would hurt working families, the middle class, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, and rural America. It is even a budget that would cut Head Start,

Meals on Wheels, and Special Olympics.

It is a raw deal for the American people. That is why Democrats are focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future. Democrats are focused on higher pay for the American people, lower costs for the American people, and providing the American people with the tools to succeed in the 21st century economy.

Democrats are focused on providing the American people with a better deal.

IN SUPPORT OF THE 21ST CENTURY AIRR ACT

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 21st Century AIRR Act gives a voice to rural America on aviation issues.

For too long, our aviation assets have been managed with little to no input from the citizens in the real world who are most impacted. The 21st Century AIRR Act benefits rural and small communities through local empowerment.

This bill enhances the Airport Improvement Program and ensures grant availability for small airports in the years ahead. These grants support infrastructure construction and rehabilitation critical to local and regional economic development.

The bill also promotes air traffic control tower technology. This promising concept has vast potential to allow rural airports to maintain tower service at a far lower cost and to actually bring service to airports that have previously been unable to support it.

The 21st Century AIRR Act is visionary, innovative legislation that will make the long-needed improvements to more efficiently serve American fliers and keep rural America connected to our aviation system.

□ 1215

WORKING TO PROTECT DREAMERS

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, instead of working to protect DREAMers, enacting commonsense gun safety legislation, or reforming our tax system to benefit hard-working Americans and not just the wealthy, I have to stand here and speak out against H.R. 36, another radical assault against women's health and reproductive rights, a bill that would deny care to women in the most desperate of circumstances, a bill designed to restrict a woman's access to a full range of healthcare services, and a blatant attempt to chip away at a woman's right to choose.

Congressional Republicans failed in their numerous attempts to strip healthcare away from everyone, so they will settle for just taking health decisions away from women.

We settled this issue 40 years ago. Women have the constitutionally protected right to manage their own bodies. I will continue to defend the woman's right to choose and vigorously oppose any and all attacks against that.

URGING SUPPORT OF MICAH'S LAW

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, at 20 weeks into a pregnancy, babies can hear music, respond to human voices, and, most importantly, they can feel pain. These are our children at their most vulnerable, yet current law continues to allow for abortions to take place even after this point in a pregnancy.

That is why I have been a strong supporter of Micah's Law, which is legislation that would prohibit abortion after 20 weeks.

This bill is not a partisan issue but, instead, a moral issue. By passing this law, every year we would be saving over 12,000 babies who can feel pain and hear our voices. It should be noted that this proposal has seen bipartisan support across the country. In fact, 60 percent of Americans support prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks, including 63 percent of those who consider themselves pro-choice.

This legislation is about nothing less than protecting those who cannot protect themselves. We remain one of only seven countries in the entire world that continues to allow abortions after 20 weeks.

We must act to change this. I urge my colleagues to join me today in supporting the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah's Law.

A CALL TO RENEW YOUR STATUS UNDER DACA

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this Thursday, October 5, is an important deadline: 154,000 young men and women have until this Thursday to renew their status under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA. Those 154,000 DACA recipients, whose authorization expires before March 6, 2018, must renew their application.

If you are one of them, please send in your application today. Under the new DACA rules, you are entitled to receive two more years of deferral, but only if

the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services receives your application by October 5. If you have not already sent in your application, send it in the fastest way possible. A regular first class stamp will likely not arrive in time.

My district is home to many DACA beneficiaries known as DREAMers. Do not wait. To all the other DREAMers, I say: Don't lose hope. You have the support of the vast majority of the American people, and we are fighting every day to get the Dream Act to the House floor.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL 4-H WEEK

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the first week of October marks the celebration of an organization very near and dear to my parents' hearts, as well as many friends. It is National 4-H Week. It is a time to reflect on the importance of youth development and mentoring within our communities. 4-H was founded to be focused on youth within rural and agricultural areas. It teaches essential skills and the importance of community service.

Today, 4-H has evolved into a global network covering over 50 countries. As the Nation's largest youth leadership organization, 4-H exemplifies the kind of learning, engagement, and leadership that is needed in our country. Their many programs focus on health, science, agriculture, and citizenship in a positive mentoring environment. The experience teaches young people leadership lessons, as well as the value of practical skills and hands-on learning.

HONORING ELAINE NEKRITZ

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated public servant, terrific mentor, and good friend, Elaine Nekritz, who retired this week as State representative for Illinois' 57th District.

For more than 14 years, Elaine has ably represented the communities of Buffalo Grove, Arlington Heights, Northbrook, Wheeling, Palatine, Mount Prospect, and Prospect Heights in the Illinois House of Representatives.

During this time, she has been an outspoken advocate for her constituents, a passionate defender of the environment, and a champion for women's rights.

Future generations in Illinois will benefit from Elaine's work to invest in infrastructure, including a high-speed rail link between Chicago and St. Louis.

Her smart backing of criminal justice reform ensures more young offenders have an opportunity to reform their lives through juvenile court.

The residents of the 57th District will miss her energy, dedication, and tireless communication with her constituents.

I am personally grateful for Elaine's service and wish her the best and her husband, Barry, the very best in whatever comes next.

HONORING PASTOR LORAN LIVINGSTON

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Pastor Loran Livingston and his wife, Sandra, in recognition of their 40 years of ministry at Central Church of God in Charlotte, North Carolina.

God has used the Livingstons to grow and lead a church that truly impacts the Charlotte community and the world. Each week, over 6,000 people gather together for a wonderful praise and worship experience, along with a dynamic biblical message from Pastor Livingston.

Under their leadership, the congregation actively serves those in poverty, provides help for women facing an unplanned pregnancy all the way through life, and programs to assist seniors. Central Church also hosts an annual 5K race to raise awareness in the fight against human trafficking.

If you want to address race relations in Charlotte, a good place to start is Central Church, where 40-plus nationalities worship together every Sunday hearing the love of Jesus.

Thank God for Pastor and Mrs. Livingston and their dedication to Christ, Central Church, the Charlotte community, and their various missions around the world.

SENDING CONDOLENCES TO NEVADAN FAMILIES AND VICTIMS OF LAS VEGAS SHOOTING

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the resilience of Nevadans, brave and caring, is in sharp contrast to the murdering of innocent victims we just witnessed.

Our hearts go out to the families of the victims throughout our country who were only interested in a peaceful and joyful evening.

One of those was Jennifer Irvine, a young San Diego lawyer who was killed in the attack. Let's also recognize the heroes, like Tyler Winston, a San Diegan who saved dozens of victims at

the concert by driving a makeshift ambulance and taking people to the hospital. Every single life lost to gun violence should elicit sorrow and action.

Mr. Speaker, then why is it so hard for us to talk about this? Why can't we come together in a bipartisan, bicameral way? Where is the concern?

We have had too many moments of silence in this Chamber for mass shootings.

Why are we not moved when people are dying in our districts daily?

The American people send condolences and they deserve action.

PROTECTING THE GOD-GIVEN SOULS OF THE UNBORN

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more important issue to get right than protecting the God-given souls of the unborn and their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I will never forget listening to the heartbeat of my first child, Nathan. I cried all the way to the car, praising God for this miracle, and the words of the Psalmist came to me: "You formed me in my inward parts; you knit me together in my mother's womb."

Currently, the United States is one of only seven developed countries that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks. That puts us on the same moral equivalent, in this regard, to China and North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36. I stand with the vulnerable and the voiceless, and I kneel in submission to the author of life and ask for His blessings on this country and this initiative.

HONORING PALM SPRINGS POLICE OFFICERS JOSE VEGA AND LESLEY ZEREBNY

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the lives of Palm Springs Police Officers Jose "Gil" Vega and Lesley Zerebny, who were tragically shot and killed 1 year ago in the line of duty.

Officer Vega lived by the mantra of "To Serve and Protect." He served our community for nearly 35 years and was just 2 months away from retirement when he was taken from his family and our community.

Officer Lesley Zerebny had recently returned to work following the birth of her daughter, Cora. Now a year old, Cora will never hold her mother. Lesley's community will always remember her as a fighter and a protector.

This weekend, the entire Coachella Valley community will honor their

memory by dedicating a 4-mile stretch of Highway 111 in their honor. I am proud of our community for supporting the Vega and Zerebny families. Let's come together to ensure they have what they need to mourn, recover, and prosper.

Officers Vega, Zerebny, and family: We honor you for your sacrifice, and we are grateful for your service. Officer Vega and Officer Zerebny, end of watch, October 8, 2016.

IN SUPPORT OF TAX REFORM

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H. Con. Res. 71. It has been said frequently that our Federal Tax Code today is more than 60 times longer than the Bible, and it contains none of the good news.

It has been more than 30 years since we updated our tax system, and many Americans are struggling to make ends meet, to find decent paying jobs and prepare for retirement.

No matter where I travel in my district, Mr. Speaker, Louisiana's Fourth District, I hear story after story about how our excessive Tax Code and burdensome regulations continue to hinder our businesses and stunt our economic growth.

Congress must act now and deliver a Tax Code that meets the current demands of the 21st century economy.

Fortunately, my Republican colleagues and I have put forth a framework to do exactly that. Our plan will create more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for working class Americans and small businesses.

When the people are allowed to keep more of their hard-earned dollars instead of turning them over to an already bloated Federal Government, we will unleash the free market again.

It is well past time we get our economy back on track, and passing meaningful tax reform is a crucial first step in completing that mission.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO RICHARD THELEN

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an incredible constituent in my district, Richard Thelen.

Seventy-two years ago, Mr. Thelen was aboard the USS *Indianapolis* with nearly 1,200 others when it was hit by two Japanese torpedoes and sank within a matter of minutes. He and 318 men of the crew survived 5 days in the ocean surrounded by sharks without

any food or drinking water. He defied truly remarkable odds.

After this ordeal, Mr. Thelen went on to finish high school and was honorably discharged from the Navy. He was a truck driver for more than 40 years and raised six children. Today, he is 89 years young, and it is a privilege to have him as a part of the Eighth District community.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform this body that I am prepared to introduce legislation to honor Mr. Thelen of Lansing, Michigan, and the rest of his shipmates, with the Congressional Gold Medal award.

As we remember the survivors of this terrible tragedy, those we lost, and the recent finding of the ship itself, we thank you, Mr. Thelen, for your valiant service to our country.

□ 1230

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to act quickly to reauthorize the Community Health Center Fund, which expired last week on September 30.

Community health centers provide cost-effective and accessible primary care, mental health counseling, and substance abuse treatment for over 27 million patients nationally, including over 200,000 of my constituents in Kentucky's Sixth District.

The upfront Federal investment in community health centers leads to savings down the road by fighting the cycle of opioid addiction, preventing more complex health conditions, and diverting patients away from higher cost centers of care, such as the emergency room.

I have visited community health centers in my district, including White House Clinics, Sterling Health Solutions, Family Care of Bluegrass, and HealthFirst Bluegrass, and I have witnessed firsthand what a difference these organizations make in providing much needed care to at-risk Kentuckians.

Without the support of the Community Health Center Fund, these CHCs may soon be forced to cut back services, lay off staff, or even shut down clinics.

Mr. Speaker, admittedly, there is a robust debate in this country and a wide diversity of opinion about healthcare reform, the ACA, and what repeal and replacing the ACA should look like, but we should all agree that community health centers are part of the solution.

PROTECTING THE UNBORN

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support to the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This legislation is crucial toward protecting the most vulnerable among us: the unborn.

As a doctor, it is my job to stay current with the latest medical research, and I have done so in my job in Congress, too.

The research overwhelmingly shows that children 20 weeks or less are capable of showing pain. This is brought forth by the fact that when an in-utero procedure is done, both the mother and the unborn child are given anesthesia. Not to do so allows that child to recoil in pain and show a stress response in the uterus.

I have heard, personally, as a physician, heartbeats in babies as early as 6 weeks of age in utero.

So this legislation is critical, it is needed, it is past due, and I urge my colleagues to support this.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 548 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 548

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 548, which provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This important bill protects and extends compassion to the most vulnerable among us, the unborn, by prohibiting abortions, with limited exceptions, after the point at which scientific evidence shows that an unborn child can feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, this really should be called Micah's bill in honor of a little boy named Micah Pickering, who was here on the Hill last week with his mom. He was born at 20 weeks old. And we saw, and we see from babies like Micah, that with the right medical care, babies born at 20 weeks can survive and grow into healthy adults.

Micah's mother spoke last week about her experiences: "When Micah was born, his eyes were still fused shut. His bones were not hardened yet. He couldn't breathe on his own. He was medicated to stay comfortable from pain. We were told not to touch his skin, as his skin was so sensitive it could hurt him and tear the skin. I was there to see his first set of hiccups, his first sneezes, and his first drop of milk placed on his lips. His first smile, his first laugh. He was alive. He was fighting. He wanted to live."

Today, Mr. Speaker, Micah is a healthy 5-year-old boy.

Babies like Micah at 20 weeks have well developed brains and central nervous systems, developed enough so that medical evidence has increasingly confirmed these babies feel pain, and not only pain, but intense and possibly excruciating pain.

Research also indicates that, after 20 weeks, an unborn baby's responses to painful stimuli are similar to adult responses, to the extent that when surgeons, Mr. Speaker, are performing in-utero surgery, corrective procedures on these unborn children, surgeons have seen babies flinch, jerk, and recoil from those sharp objects and incisions.

In response to this, Mr. Speaker, surgeons routinely now administer anesthesia to unborn children in the womb before performing surgery. This anesthesia has been associated with a significant increase in babies' stress hormone levels during medical procedures.

Mr. Speaker, late-term abortions, usually performed by inducing labor after the fetus has been injected with a lethal pharmacological agent or by the horrific practice of dismemberment, causing babies intense pain, should be illegal, and that is what this bill ensures.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this bill also takes important steps to protect women, providing exceptions for those cases of rape, and incest, and the life of the mother.

H.R. 36 also provides women with a cause of action, allowing them to sue

abortionists who don't provide protection for aborted babies who are born alive.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act protects the sanctity of life by ensuring protection from pain for the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a moral obligation of this House and of our government. Therefore, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 36.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, the Supreme Court issued its landmark *Roe v. Wade* decision. It reaffirmed the constitutionally protected right of every woman to safe and legal healthcare, including the right to choose.

When life puts a woman in even the toughest of circumstances, the highest court in the land said the decision that she makes should be hers, free from any interference from the government.

Roe v. Wade is a firewall that women rely on, but with every passing year and every new session of Congress, politicians have tried to chip away at it brick by brick, hoping it will crumble away.

Most politicians are not medical professionals. We shouldn't be meddling in healthcare decisions that should be made between a woman, her doctor, her family, and anyone else that she chooses to include. The American people are tired of politicians who are not doctors, often playing one on television with this medical decision.

This is the only medical procedure that Congress has made an attempt to regulate, the only one, and it says quite plainly: We can't trust women to make a decision; we have to do it for them. The majority tries to direct this over and over again.

The medical professionals whom we should be listening to all oppose this ban. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists call it a part of a legislative agenda that is "not based on sound science" and that "attempts to prescribe how physicians should care for their patients."

That certainly speaks it loudly.

The American Medical Association said that it "strongly condemns any interference by the government or other third parties that causes a physician to compromise his or her medical judgment as to what information or treatment is in the best interest of the patient."

Conservative political groups have also been pushing the bill to try to use it to run up the score in the next election. Why do they do it? Well, the main sponsor of this bill has admitted—and I hope everybody hears this; this is a

Congressman from Arizona who sponsors this bill, who admitted the abortion bans are, in his words, good politics—"it will cost some people the election, but it will cost more Democrats the election than it will Republicans. I am convinced that in very few districts in America someone will lose because they voted" for this ban. "And if that is the case, maybe they need a different district anyway," whatever that means.

That makes it as plain as day, as far as I am concerned, as to why, year after year, for 40 years, we have been confronted with this.

It is abhorrent to me, and it should be to everyone here, that matters of personal conscience are being reduced to who is up and who is down in the polls.

This bill is dangerous, and it is unconstitutional. The Supreme Court established in *Roe v. Wade*, and reaffirmed in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, that a woman has the unequivocal right to choose abortion care. This is the Constitution of the United States that we all justly revere.

Meanwhile, every Federal court that has reached a decision on bans like this in States has blocked it every time. This includes rulings striking down bans in States like Arizona, Idaho, Arkansas, North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us is nothing more than the latest attempt by the majority to pass off political posturing as proven science.

Now, after birth, strangely, this body exhibits scarce attention to the well-being of the child, and that is proven by the fact that you cut back on food stamps; Women, Infants, and Children care; daycare; Head Start; one after the other, the same group that couldn't find it in their hearts last Friday to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program before it expired, along with community health services, which again helps children. More than 9 million children in America get their health insurance through the program that expired.

The majority did absolutely nothing after 20 children, 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds, were shot and killed at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, 5 years ago. And funding, as I said, for both food stamps and the school lunch program is routinely cut.

I don't know anything else to call that but pure hypocrisy: We love it until it is born, and then it is somebody else's problem.

A 3-year-old girl in my district was recently killed by the adults she believed were supposed to take care of her. They abused her so violently that she was bruised from head to toe and was internally hurt. There were adults around, but not a single one helped her.

The Child Protective Services of Monroe County got two reports about

abuse and neglect, but the agency was too overworked and stretched too thin to act in time, which is another hypocrisy: We are not going to fund those programs enough so that little children would live. Three years old, and nobody lifted a finger to help this child. They did nothing to save her life.

This is just some of the reality that children face today. All too often, this Congress does absolutely nothing to address it. To truly care about children is to care for them long after they are born.

Now, we have taken up this bill before, and it was a one-house bill, never able to pass the Senate, and I sincerely hope this bill sees that same fate.

When the American people went to the ballot box, they were electing politicians, not somebody to meddle around with their medical needs. It is simply appalling. Just remind yourself that the only procedure that we deal with is the fact of a woman's right to choose, which is protected by the Constitution of the United States. Enough already.

Mr. Speaker, the majority acts like a group of elected physicians. It has some. They are quiet. It is shameful.

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

□ 1245

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not as an elected doctor, not as any elected thing except as a Member of Congress. But also I rise today as a father of a child who we were told before she was born that it would probably be best to kill her; that she had a disability, and it was probably best that there would be better choices for us to make in life than to not have her.

I rise today for Micah's bill simply for those that the statement has been made that once children are here, there are problems that are political choices and life circumstances. Those are things that we have to deal with and that we should actually look at, but those are only available for those who are lucky enough to have a birthday. This bill is really about a birthday. It is about giving the unborn a chance at life.

It is interesting to me today, Mr. Speaker, that many medical professionals who are against this bill also will choose to anesthetize those same babies in the womb because of their reaction to the procedure. They don't want to talk about that. They want to talk about something else.

But I simply come back to saying that this bill is about life. And maybe, it is said, that this is something we are talking about, a procedure, but it is

talking about life and it is talking about birthdays. It is talking about that life in that womb matters, and the potential from life until death is something that I believe God has given.

When we understand that, let's take it out of the realm of choosing a choice. We are standing here today and I am standing here today to take up for the rights of that baby in the womb and making sure that birthdays come, that life happens. When you look at someone like Micah and you understand that many people would have wrote them off as unviable, God had a different choice, and that is, today, that young boy that was on Capitol Hill last week.

But it doesn't take Micah for me. It just takes Jordan for me, my 25-year-old who just texted me just a few minutes ago to say: Daddy, I love you. Over 25 years ago someone told me and my wife that she was not worth having. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to stand for those still in the womb waiting for life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Kerri from New Jersey. This is her story.

With the help of a fertility specialist, Kerri and her husband were thrilled to be expecting their first baby in January of 2016. All of Kerri's tests and scans were looking great until the 20-week ultrasound.

Kerri recounts: Our ultrasound tech spent a lot of time looking at her heart, and, finally, the doctor from maternal fetal medicine came in.

As she scanned, she told Kerri and her husband that there were some severe brain and heart abnormalities. The doctor also told them the chest cavity was small and that the lungs were not developing properly. A few days later, a geneticist told Kerri and her husband that the baby had three copies of every chromosome, a very rare condition. The doctor informed them that infants born with this condition very rarely survive more than a few days after delivery.

According to Kerri: We both calmly made the decision to have an abortion. We did not want our little girl to suffer. We would much rather take on that suffering for her.

On behalf of Kerri, New Jerseyans, and women everywhere, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and vote "no" on H.R. 36.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to stand and support this rule that will allow for the passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which is also known as

Micah's Law. The underlying legislation will protect thousands of unborn babies from the excruciating pain of abortion.

Twenty weeks post-fertilization is an incredible milestone in pregnancy for moms and their unborn babies. Children at this stage in development have fingers and toes, and they have well-developed neurological structures that can feel pain. In fact, babies at this age are hypersensitive, feeling pain more acutely than you and me.

Preemies, children born at the beginning of the sixth month, just like Micah, can survive outside the womb. These babies are the future doctors, nurses, scientists, teachers, law enforcement officers in our country.

H.R. 36 protects this next generation of America's children. Our country is unified in protecting life at 20 weeks. Six in ten Americans support the pain-capable legislation, and 20 States have passed similar legislation.

Let's put an end to the abortion of these potential children. Let's support this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak for April and against this unconstitutional underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, her story is about one of the most complex and painful decisions a woman can face, but it would have been even more painful if this bill that we are debating, which is opposed by the American Medical Association, was the law at the time.

Eighteen weeks into her pregnancy, she and her husband discovered that their baby had a birth defect, a lethal skeletal dysplasia, and was incompatible with life. The baby would never be able to breathe on its own. The baby would either die in utero or die immediately at birth. She was heartbroken. She went to other doctors for more tests. These tests took additional weeks. Tragically, the tests confirmed the diagnosis.

At 21 weeks, April had an abortion. With this bill, the Federal Government would compel every woman like April against their will to carry to term a fetus that they knew would either be stillborn or would suffer and die at birth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to heed the gavel.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36, Micah's Law, which I proudly co-

sponsored. It is said that nations are judged by how we care for our weakest members. There are no more vulnerable than a preborn child, whom, unfortunately, we fail to protect.

The United States is one of only seven nations that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, when science confirms that the babies feel pain. Accompanying us on this list are China and North Korea, nations with disturbing records of human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, this is not simply about a medical procedure. It is about life. Micah Pickering was born at 22 weeks. He is now a happy, healthy kindergartner. There is a lot of talk around here about life. This bill is about life. It is not about being lucky enough to have a birthday. It is about giving every child the opportunity to grow, and we are responsible for them. We should take that action seriously.

I cosponsor the bill, I vote for the bill, and I urge everyone support Micah's Law.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for my constituent, Allie, because we should not be playing politics in Congress with women's health choices and with the family decisionmaking rights of all Americans.

Last spring, Allie and her husband were thrilled to learn that she was pregnant with their second child. A few months later, they found themselves heartbroken in a doctor's office in order to terminate a pregnancy that they had so badly wanted.

Everything had gone smoothly until about 12 weeks, when a routine test returned with extremely abnormal results. Allie and her husband hoped for the best and waited several more weeks until they could perform an amnio.

Sadly, the results of the amnio were unbearable. They found that the fetus had grown from a compromised cell line. There were multiple genetic anomalies that would result if the pregnancy continued to term in a child with extraordinarily grave and untreatable physical, cognitive, and developmental problems.

The news was crushing and the decision was agonizing, but Allie knew the path forward for her family was clear. She would become part of the tiny group of women having abortions after 20 weeks, less than 2 percent of all abortions.

But Allie's story doesn't end with the decision that she and her husband made. Because she is a Federal employee, the Hyde amendment prevented her insurance from covering her abortion services. Fortunately, Maryland is a State where we respect women's choices, and Allie was able to go to a clinic and she paid \$900 out of pocket.

Allie recovered quickly from the procedure and she was able to get preg-

nant shortly thereafter. This summer, Allie and her husband were thrilled to welcome a beloved second child into their family.

Mr. Speaker, Allie has one thing to say to lawmakers here today: We made the choices that are best for our family, and I trust all women to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming majority of Americans—some 60 to 64 percent, according to pollsters—support legal protection for pain-capable unborn children at, at least, the 20th week, or about 5 months.

Today we know that unborn babies not only die, but suffer excruciating pain during dismemberment abortion, a cruelty that rips arms and legs off of a helpless child. Even Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy, the swing vote on the court in the Stenberg vs. Carhart decision said: "The fetus, in many cases, dies just as a human adult or child would. It bleeds to death as it is torn limb from limb."

He points out that, with a D&E dismemberment abortion, "the fetus can be alive at the beginning of the dismemberment process and can survive for a time while its limbs are being torn off."

Mr. Speaker, even if pain wasn't present, dismembering a child is violence against children, and it is inhumane. But these babies at this age actually suffer.

Dr. Robert White, a professor of neurology at Case Western Reserve University, has said: "An unborn child at 20 weeks is fully capable of experiencing pain. Without question, abortion is a dreadfully painful experience for that child."

Dr. Colleen Malloy, a professor at the Division of Neonatology at Northwestern, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee said: "When we speak of infants at 20 weeks post-fertilization, we no longer have to rely on inference or ultrasound imagery because such premature patients are kicking, moving, and reacting and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit."

Again, these children are there being assisted, and if you touch them, if you try to dismember them once they are born, they will feel the pain. In like manner, an unborn child at 20 weeks' gestation will feel the pain. She points out that she would never, ever commit such cruelty to a child.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation, H.R. 36.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mr. Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, after what has happened in the last couple of days, this terrible tragedy in Las Vegas, this Congress should be spending every minute focusing on what we were sent here to do: taking action to enact common-sense safety measures to reduce gun violence.

But what do we hear on that subject from the leadership on the Republican side?

Nothing. But what we get is yet another attack on the individual rights of women in this country to make decisions about their own healthcare, about their bodies, about themselves.

Those sorts of decisions should be made between a woman and her doctor. This has been confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. People in Washington, D.C., sitting in this Congress, should not be able to interfere in the private health decisions that women can only make for themselves.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

□ 1300

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to send my love and prayers to the victims and the family members of those who were hurt in Nevada.

I would also like to plead to the American people today to be good to one another. We have enough people out there outside of our country trying to hurt us. We have enough natural disasters trying to tear down our homes and tear up our lives that we don't have to do that to each other.

I rise today as an American, as a wife, and mainly as a mother to address some of the double standards that we have in this country. As a member of the Select Panel on Infant Lives, I learned that Federal law increases criminal penalties for crimes involving pregnant women. These laws give protections to the mother and her unborn child—rightfully so.

However, this begs the question: When does the unborn have a right to protection just like their mother?

Obviously, this is an important issue.

Why is abortion not considered murder and killing a pregnant woman a double homicide?

Martin Luther King, Jr., said this about the civil rights movement: "The Negro cannot win as long as he is willing to sacrifice the lives of his children for comfort and safety." How can the dream survive if we murder our children?

Each human life should be protected under the rule of law. Each life that feels pain should be free from being tortured.

I cannot believe that we are here on the floor of the House, the people's House, continuing to plead and advocate for life. I am asking that we sup-

port H.R. 36 and help provide these protections for our unborn.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Dr. Jennifer and her patients. This is their story.

Dr. Jennifer's patients come from my home State of California. They were a married couple on their second pregnancy. They were so excited to grow their family. But they discovered, at 22 weeks, that the fetus was severely growth-restricted, had no fluid around it, had a cardiac anomaly, and would not survive the pregnancy. Although this was a wanted pregnancy, they chose to terminate the pregnancy at 23 weeks rather than prolong the suffering of the mother and her fetus.

Dr. Jennifer wants lawmakers to know that abortion restrictions would have forced her patient to carry this pregnancy until the fetus died in the womb, despite the medical advice that their baby would not survive to term. H.R. 36 and policies like it deny families their constitutional right to a choice about how they want to move forward with medical decisions that impact their bodies and their families.

On behalf of Dr. Jennifer and her patients, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop these bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah's Law, is of utmost importance. Not only does the bill recognize the common humanity and inherent rights that we share with the most vulnerable members of our society, it offers our Nation an opportunity to prevent excruciating pain for those same members, and it will stop a form of violence that has gone on for too long. This bill is a step forward in reversing a culture of violence and restoring a culture of life.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that passage of this legislation will save 2,750 children per year. That is 2,750 girls and boys who will have a chance to contribute to our society.

If you want to facilitate a culture of life, vote for this bill. If you want to begin to prevent violence in our country, vote for this bill. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Jessica. This is her story.

Jessica's second pregnancy was difficult. At about 12 weeks, she discovered she was bleeding. After weeks of calls with midwives, visits to specialists, and numerous tests, it wasn't

until 22 weeks, 5 days into her pregnancy when she was told the tragic news that her baby had a rare birth defect and would likely not survive through the two surgeries she would have needed. Jessica made the difficult, heartbreaking decision to end her pregnancy.

Under this bill, there would be nowhere for Jessica to turn. Jessica wants lawmakers to know, in her own words: "I am so incredibly thankful that my daughter never had to suffer. . . . I am still grieving and I think I always will be. Having an abortion was the most compassionate choice I had available to me. My daughter deserved compassion."

A decision like Jessica's should be between the woman and her doctor, no one else. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

We come here today, of course, as Members of Congress, but as we look at what happened in our country the last several weeks, one of the things that has been lauded very much is first responders, those who are rushing to the scene to help people who have been affected, who are going through pain and suffering.

I would like you to consider today's legislation and the rule, as we are first responders. We stand for life. We stand for the ability, as a people, and there is no other nation in the world like the American people who respond when other people are in trouble, when they are suffering, when they are in pain, when their lives are in danger. And yet we turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to what we are doing to these children. These are little boys and little girls waiting to be born.

If we do not stand for them, who will stand for them?

If we are not the first responders, who will be the first responders?

If it is not us in the people's House who go beyond the hypocrisy of a political statement and go about the reason we are here—it is the people's House because we defend those people—let us be the first responders when it comes to pain and suffering. Let us pass this bill and stop this inhuman activity that we are doing.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about pain here today.

Let's talk about Leslie and her husband, who found out that they were pregnant and were thrilled. Unfortunately, the pregnancy did not go well. Tests revealed that Leslie's fetus' brain never divided into two separate hemispheres, giving her child no chance for survival. Let's talk about pain.

By the time the test exposed this tragic news, Leslie was over 20 weeks pregnant, but she lived in a State without an abortion ban. Now she lives in Wisconsin, where abortions after 20 weeks are illegal. Had she lived there during this time, she would have been forced to deliver a baby and be pregnant for 20 more weeks, compounding the emotional horror of the experience. Let's talk about pain.

In Leslie's own words: "I still mourn my daughter every day, but I cannot begin to understand how a position that would rather see me dead and neither of my sons ever born just to prolong a tragically doomed pregnancy can be called 'pro-life.'"

On behalf of Leslie, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans and stop the pain.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we should talk about pain on the floor today because, when you talk to physicians and OB/GYNs, they will tell you that, if they are doing work, if they are doing an amniocentesis, then that baby feels pain, that baby responds, that child in the womb.

So I would encourage my colleagues, talk to Dr. ROE, talk to some of the OB/GYNs who serve in this Chamber, because they fully understand, as we understand, that the gift of life is not something that comes through the law. That is a natural gift. That is a gift of God. And that child who is receiving that life, who is held in the womb, if they are poked or prodded or there is an uncomfortable situation, they experience pain. That is why this legislation is referred to as the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I encourage support of this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that the House keeps the District of Columbia from spending its own funds for low-income women who want to end a pregnancy at even 1 week.

But today I rise for Christy Zink, a District of Columbia resident who was a mother of one, soon-to-be mother of two. However, at 21 weeks, an MRI detected a fetal anomaly regarding her unborn son's brain. A critical part of the brain of the fetus had simply not developed. She decided to end the pregnancy at almost 22 weeks.

On behalf of Christy Zink, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTINGER).

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-

Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which I was among one of the first co-sponsors. God bless Representative TRENT FRANKS for his tireless leadership.

This is a commonsense, pro-life bill that prohibits late-term elective abortions on unborn babies after 20 weeks postfertilization. At this tender age, they can feel the excruciating pain of abortion.

America has always been a beacon for human rights. Yet, according to a 2014 report by the Charlotte Lozier Institute, the U.S. is among just seven countries that permit elective abortion past 20 weeks. These countries include China and North Korea.

Our Nation suffers an egregious offense to be listed with North Korea and China, two oppressive regimes that show no respect for human life or human rights in allowing the killing of these precious babies as they endure these cruel abortions.

This bill is important, as we speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. As an engaged and active member of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus, I fully support this bill, as I stand for life.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Rose from Michigan.

In Rose's first pregnancy, which was planned and very wanted, severe brain abnormalities were detected in the 22nd week. She made the decision, she said "I will take that risk," because the doctor said there was a 70 percent chance that the child would be able to function. But at 28 weeks, the doctor made an analysis that said a severe brain condition with a life expectancy under 4 years, with severe seizures and limited development.

We are talking about suffering now. The baby would have problems swallowing, breathing, even smiling. The baby would never be able to communicate or control her body. And today we are talking about suffering.

Rose made the choice between a short, painful life and peace. She chose the latter.

Rose says: "I believe we made the most compassionate and loving choice we could for our baby, but the grief was initially overwhelming."

On behalf of Rose, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

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

I think that it is important to acknowledge the pain of the cases that those on the other side of the aisle are mentioning. But I would note, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no mention, no discussion on the other side of the aisle about the pain that these babies feel, and that when you are in a situation like the ones that have been

described, what is happening is those babies are being subjected to really, oftentimes, a horrific procedure. The question is, because a baby is found to have some chromosomal anomaly, to have some very severe handicap, whether or not they deserve to be subjected to the pain we now know they feel.

□ 1315

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have seen work done by Northwestern University that demonstrates that the pain that these young preemies feel may, in fact, be even worse than the pain that older babies feel, because the pain inhibitors develop later in life than the pain receptors do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not to ignore the challenges and the issues involved here with respect to the pain that these babies feel. I would also note, Mr. Speaker, that the CBO, in a very unusual step, has assessed that this bill itself would save 2,750 lives annually. That is something that the CBO doesn't often do, but it is very important for us to recognize.

I don't think we can have a discussion about this bill, about these issues, without acknowledging the pain that these babies feel, and I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to focus on that as well.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what my colleague is saying, but there is no scientific evidence or proof that an unborn fetus feels the pain. That is one of the reasons we are not discussing it over here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding. For over 40 years, the landmark Supreme Court decision, *Roe v. Wade*, has stood as a bulwark protection for women's reproductive rights and healthcare rights.

Now, in 2017, House Republicans are leading yet another unconstitutional, dangerous, and outright assault on women's health and privacy. This extreme bill not only takes aim at *Roe v. Wade* by lowering the ban on abortion to 20 weeks, it goes even further by promising to throw doctors in jail. This is a cynical, repugnant effort by Republicans to pander to a far-right base while jeopardizing women's health—all for a political payoff.

At the same time this House is considering a measure restricting a woman's right to choose, we have not found time to assist 3.5 million American citizens who are suffering and dying in Puerto Rico. You call that pro-life? I

urge Republicans: listen to the majority of Americans who support a woman's right to privacy and a safe abortion. Reject this shameful bill.

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

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that the scientific evidence is extensive in terms of the pain that these unborn babies feel. In particular, the standard of care, Mr. Speaker, for babies who are born prematurely, as well as for babies who are patients in vitro, is to provide anesthesia. And that standard of care is based upon evidence that these babies have pain receptors, that these babies react to pain, and that they feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, I think the notion that there is no scientific evidence for this is flat wrong. I don't think we can ignore the example of babies like Micah, babies who are born, babies who grow up to lead very full and healthy lives and who deserve a chance.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as individuals and as Representatives, elected Representatives, it is our obligation, in fact, to do everything we can to protect these babies, and that is what this bill is about.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a doctor.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, like every physician, I took an oath to do no harm and make every decision in the best interest of my patients in the emergency department.

That oath drives every choice a doctor makes, whether it is prescribing medications, treating chronic illnesses, and even choosing how best to triage and treat a trauma patient. H.R. 36 would stand in the way of a doctor's ability to best care for their patients. This bill would force doctors to ignore the symptoms that they have learned through years of training and practice that show a patient's condition could become a more serious medical condition.

Can you imagine going into your doctor's office as a pregnant woman and being told your twins would not live and that giving birth could rupture your uterus, causing severe bleeding? That is what happened to Phil and his wife from Missouri. They learned at week 21 that she was at risk of a ruptured uterus and that the twins would die because of twin-twin transfusion syndrome.

Phil said: "Decisions about abortion need to be made with families and the best medical information available." I couldn't agree more. A physician's sole focus should be the health of their patient, not the consequences of an arbitrary law that has no basis in medical evidence, and no basis that this bill is even necessary or that it will improve health outcomes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, that is why, as a physician and a father, I oppose this legislation. We need less bureaucratic obstacles that get in the way of a doctor caring for their patients. We cannot interfere with a provider's ability to deliver the best care for their patients.

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

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, which deals with children as well. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people, children, who are Americans in every way except on paper.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), to discuss our proposal.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, President Barack Obama, under his executive powers, established the DACA program which temporarily protected immigrants who were brought to the U.S. as children from potential deportation.

Our Nation made a promise to DREAMers that by coming out of the shadows, following the rules and laws of our great land, they would not be deported to a foreign country that they never knew or barely remembered.

DREAMers came to the United States under no volition of their own as young children, making this country the only home most have ever known. DREAMers have jobs, pay taxes, and contribute to the prosperity of our Nation's economy. Since its implementation, the DACA program has added over 50,000 jobs to our economy. Ninety-three percent of DREAMers are currently employed.

Over the next decade, DACA beneficiaries are projected to contribute \$460 billion to our Nation's GDP; \$24.6 billion in Medicare and Social Security; and an estimated \$2.5 billion annually for State and Federal contributions.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York. However, on September 5, President Trump announced he would end DACA and look to Congress to develop a legislative solution for DACA recipients.

Well, Congress has a solution. It is H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. We have heard about it from sea to shining sea. The Dream Act would allow DREAMers to earn lawful permanent residence with a pathway to citizenship. It would also give them the opportunity to continue contributing to their communities by encouraging them to pursue higher education, work for at least 3 years, or serve in our United States military.

To qualify under the Dream Act, a person must graduate from high school, pass a background check, demonstrate proficiency in the English language, and not have a felony or any other serious crime that could pose a threat to our country. With the DACA set to expire, now is the time for Congress to act.

We must bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote because Congress has been silent for too long. DREAMers are doing their jobs. What we ask is that Congress does theirs. It is time for Congress to do its job and pass the Dream Act without delay.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe Americans are compassionate people. I also believe Americans are angered by injustice, and I know Americans are eager to protect the defenseless.

In a past hearing before the Judiciary Committee on this bill, Dr. Maureen Condic said in her testimony: "Imposing pain on any pain-capable living creature is cruelty. And ignoring the pain experienced by another human individual for any reason is barbaric."

H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, gives us a chance to choose compassion by preventing abortions from taking place if the child is 20 weeks or older. Science proves that not only can these children feel pain, but since their pain inhibitors are undeveloped, they feel pain even more intensely than we can. In Dr. Condic's words: "We simply have to decide whether we will choose to ignore the pain of the fetus or not."

Mr. Speaker, I am choosing not to ignore their pain. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this compassionate bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority keeps trying to take the women's personal decision and put it in someone else's hands. Over the years, they have tried to

allow bosses to make the healthcare decisions for their employees. They pushed a bill that would allow women to die if an emergency room employee coming to her aid had a “conscientious objection” to performing an abortion that would save her life.

Today, they are trying to pass an abortion ban that would put up even more obstacles and prevent women from receiving safe and legal abortion, which is protected by the Constitution.

The bill before us today strikes at the heart of *Roe v. Wade*. Opponents of the Supreme Court decision have been clear and outspoken that that is precisely their goal. The ban on abortions after 20 weeks does not contain reasonable exceptions for victims of rape and incest. The legislation flies in the face of what the American people—women and men—want us to be doing.

The majority must have quickly forgotten the national Women’s March that took place in January. Millions of persons across the country and around the globe marched in the largest day of protest in our Nation’s history. More than half a million people took to the streets right here in the Nation’s Capital. They sent a message to the majority to respect their rights, including their right to choose.

If people sometimes ask women why we are still marching and calling and writing about the four decades after the Supreme Court’s *Roe v. Wade* decision, which it has since upheld, it is because of bills like this. We constantly have to refight the battles our mothers and grandmothers won for us. This legislation, again, is proof of that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question to the rule and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his work on this issue and for introducing this important bill. It is undeniable that we have a much better understanding today of life inside the womb than we did at the time of the passage of *Roe v. Wade*.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle express a commitment to science in all cases except where it matters most, in those cases that involve the preservation of human life. They don’t want to talk about babies. They don’t want to talk about the horrific procedures that we are dealing with today, and we have to. It is our obligation to.

Mr. Speaker, our country has banned partial-birth abortion in a decision that was upheld by the Supreme Court, and I would just urge my colleagues to look at the decision in that opinion, *Gonzales v. Carhart*, the decision written by Justice Kennedy: talking in specific, quoting a nurse, talking about the reaction of a 26-week-old baby who

was a victim of partial-birth abortion, what their physical reaction is, the mother of little babies reading that, and the description of what happens to a baby when they are killed—watching their hands expand and then contract, as any mother of a newborn infant has watched many times.

It is truly horrific, and I think, as a society, Mr. Speaker, we have to be willing to face the exact nature of what it is we are talking about. We have an obligation as elected Representatives, Mr. Speaker, to protect the lives of these unborn babies. This legislation would do that.

We have a moral obligation, and it is our job. It is in the interest of the States to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we do everything possible to protect life.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a bill that would protect babies at moments when we know they can feel pain in the womb. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of both the rule and of H.R. 36 so that we can continue to protect and save lives.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 548 OFFERED BY
Ms. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote

against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Gianforte	Moolenaar
Aderholt	Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Allen	Gohmert	Mullin
Amash	Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Amodel	Gosar	Newhouse
Arrington	Gowdy	Noem
Babin	Granger	Norman
Bacon	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Banks (IN)	Graves (LA)	Olson
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Barr	Griffith	Palmer
Barton	Grothman	Paulsen
Bergman	Guthrie	Pearce
Biggs	Handel	Perry
Bilirakis	Harper	Pittenger
Bishop (MI)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Poliquin
Black	Hensarling	Posey
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Blum	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hill	Renacci
Brat	Holding	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Budd	Hurd	Rokita
Burgess	Issa	Rooney, Francis
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Thomas
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	J.
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Chabot	Jones	Ross
Cheney	Jordan	Rothfus
Coffman	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Cole	Katko	Royce (CA)
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Russell
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Comer	King (IA)	Sanford
Comstock	King (NY)	Scalise
Conaway	Kinzing	Schweikert
Cook	Knight	Scott, Austin
Costello (PA)	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Labrador	Sessions
Crawford	LaHood	Shimkus
Culberson	LaMalfa	Shuster
Curbeo (FL)	Lamborn	Simpson
Davidson	Lance	Smith (MO)
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Smith (NE)
Denham	Lewis (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Dent	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
DeSantis	Love	Smucker
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Stefanik
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Duffy	MacArthur	Stivers
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Taylor
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Tenney
Dunn	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Emmer	Massie	Thornberry
Estes (KS)	Mast	Tiberi
Farenthold	McCarthy	Tipton
Faso	McCaul	Trott
Ferguson	McClintock	Turner
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Upton
Fleischmann	McKinley	Valadao
Flores	McMorris	Wagner
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Walberg
Fox	McSally	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Walker
Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Walorski
Gaetz	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Gallagher	Mitchell	Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—184

Adams	Fudge	Napolitano
Aguilar	Gabbard	Neal
Barragán	Gallego	Nolan
Bass	Garamendi	Norcross
Beatty	Gomez	O'Halleran
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Rourke
Beyer	Gottheimer	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Panetta
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Grijalva	Payne
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Perlmutter
F.	Heck	Peters
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
Brown (MD)	Himes	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Bustos	Huffman	Polis
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jayapal	Quigley
Carbajal	Jeffries	Raskin
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Keating	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Rush
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kildee	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Conyers	Lawrence	Serrano
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Lee	Shea-Porter
Costa	Levin	Sherman
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Sinema
Crist	Lieu, Ted	Sires
Cuellar	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cummings	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Suozzi
DeFazio	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,	Takano
Delaney	M.	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
DelBene	Lynch	Torres
Demings	Maloney,	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Vargas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doggett	Matsui	Vela
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Velázquez
F.	McEachin	Visclosky
Ellison	McGovern	Walz
Engel	McNerney	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meeks	Schultz
Española	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Esty (CT)	Moore	Watson Coleman
Evans	Moulton	Welch
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bridenstine	Johnson (OH)	Rosen
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Speier
DesJarlais	Kihuen	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Long	Titus
Garrett	Loudermilk	
Gutiérrez	Richmond	

□ 1353

Messrs. TED LIEU of California, O'HALLERAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, CARSON of Indiana, CARBAJAL, TAKANO, GARAMENDI, and RUSH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 546.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Gaetz	McSally
Aderholt	Gallagher	Meadows
Allen	Garrett	Meehan
Amash	Gianforte	Messer
Amodel	Gibbs	Mitchell
Arrington	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Babin	Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)
Bacon	Gosar	Mullin
Banks (IN)	Gowdy	Murphy (PA)
Barletta	Granger	Newhouse
Barr	Graves (GA)	Noem
Barton	Graves (LA)	Norman
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Nunes
Biggs	Griffith	Olson
Bilirakis	Grothman	Palazzo
Bishop (MI)	Guthrie	Palmer
Bishop (UT)	Handel	Paulsen
Black	Harper	Pearce
Blackburn	Harris	Perry
Blum	Hartzler	Pittenger
Bost	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Poliquin
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe
Brooks (IN)	Hill	Reed
Buchanan	Holding	Reichert
Buck	Hollingsworth	Renacci
Bucshon	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Budd	Huizenga	Roby
Burgess	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Byrne	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Hurd	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney, Francis
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Rooney, Thomas
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	J.
Cole	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Roskam
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Ross
Comer	Katko	Rothfus
Comstock	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Royce (CA)
Cook	King (IA)	Russell
Costello (PA)	King (NY)	Rutherford
Cramer	Kinzing	Sanford
Crawford	Knight	Scalise
Culberson	Kustoff (TN)	Schweikert
Curbeo (FL)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Davidson	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Sessions
Denham	Lamborn	Shimkus
Dent	Lance	Shuster
DeSantis	Latta	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (MN)	Smith (MO)
Donovan	Lipinski	Smith (NE)
Duffy	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Love	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Stefanik
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Emmer	MacArthur	Stivers
Estes (KS)	Marino	Taylor
Farenthold	Marshall	Tenney
Faso	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Ferguson	Mast	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Tiberi
Fleischmann	McCaul	Tipton
Flores	McClintock	Trott
Fortenberry	McHenry	Turner
Fox	McKinley	Upton
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Valadao
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—187

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bridenstine
Crowley
DesJarlais
Deutch
Johnson (OH)

Johnson, E. B.
Kihuen
Long
Loudermilk
Marchant

Rosen
Smucker
Titus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1359

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 547.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

EARLY HEARING DETECTION AND INTERVENTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 652) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 652

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM FOR EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING NEWBORNS, INFANTS, AND YOUNG CHILDREN.

(a) SECTION HEADING.—The section heading of section 399M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 399M. EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING NEWBORNS, INFANTS, AND YOUNG CHILDREN."

(b) STATEWIDE SYSTEMS.—Section 399M(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(a)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "NEWBORN AND INFANT" and inserting "NEWBORN, INFANT, AND YOUNG CHILD";

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—
(A) by striking "newborn and infant" and inserting "newborn, infant, and young child"; and

(B) by striking "providers," and inserting "providers (including, as appropriate, education and training of family members).";

(3) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking "newborns and infants" and inserting "newborns, infants, and young children (referred to in this section as 'children')"; and

(ii) by striking "and medical" and all that follows through the period and inserting "medical, and communication (or language acquisition) interventions (including family support), for children identified as deaf or hard-of-hearing, consistent with the following:";

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) by striking "Early" and inserting the following:

"(A) Early";

(ii) by striking "and delivery of" and inserting "and delivery of,";

(iii) by striking "by schools" and all that follows through "programs mandated" and inserting "by organizations such as schools and agencies (including community, consumer, and family-based agencies), in health care settings (including medical homes for children), and in programs mandated"; and

(iv) by striking "hard of hearing" and all that follows through the period and inserting "hard-of-hearing children.";

(C) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:

"(B) Information provided to families should be accurate, comprehensive, up-to-date, and evidence-based, as appropriate, to allow families to make important decisions for their children in a timely manner, including decisions with respect to the full range of assistive hearing technologies and communications modalities, as appropriate.

"(C) Programs and systems under this paragraph shall offer mechanisms that foster family-to-family and deaf and hard-of-hearing consumer-to-family supports.";

(4) in paragraph (2), by striking "To collect" and all that follows through the period and inserting "To continue to provide technical support to States, through one or more technical resource centers, to assist in further developing and enhancing State early hearing detection and intervention programs.";

(5) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) To identify or develop efficient models (educational and medical) to ensure that children who are identified as deaf or hard-of-hearing through screening receive follow-up by qualified early intervention providers or qualified health care providers (including those at medical homes for children), and referrals, as appropriate, including to early intervention services under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. State agencies shall be encouraged to effectively increase the rate of such follow-up and referral."

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH.—Section 399M(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary";

(B) by striking "to complement an intramural program and" and inserting the following: "or designated entities of States—

"(i) to develop, maintain, and improve data collection systems related to newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation (including audiologic, medical, and language acquisition evaluations), diagnosis, and intervention services;"

(C) by striking "to conduct" and inserting the following:

"(ii) to conduct"; and

(D) by striking "newborn" and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: "newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs and outcomes;

"(iii) to ensure quality monitoring of hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs and systems for newborns, infants, and young children; and

"(iv) to support newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs, and information systems.";

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking the matter that precedes subparagraph (A) and all that follows through subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(B) USE OF AWARDS.—The awards made under subparagraph (A) may be used—

“(i) to provide technical assistance on data collection and management, including to coordinate and develop standardized procedures for data management;

“(ii) to assess and report on the cost and program effectiveness of newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs and systems;

“(iii) to collect data and report on newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening, evaluation, diagnosis, and intervention programs and systems for applied research, program evaluation, and policy improvement;”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively, and aligning the margins of those clauses with the margins of clause (i) of subparagraph (B) (as inserted by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph);

(C) in clause (v) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph)—

(i) by striking “newborn and infant” and inserting “newborn, infant, and young child”; and

(ii) by striking “language status” and inserting “hearing status”; and

(D) in clause (vi) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph)—

(i) by striking “sharing” and inserting “integration and interoperability”; and

(ii) by striking “with State-based” and all that follows through the period and inserting “across multiple sources to increase the flow of information between clinical care and public health settings, including the ability of States and territories to exchange and share data.”;

(d) COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION.—Section 399M(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “consult with” and inserting “consult with—”;

(B) by striking “other Federal” and inserting the following:

“(A) other Federal”;

(C) by striking “State and local agencies, including those” and inserting the following:

“(B) State and local agencies, including agencies”;

(D) by striking “consumer groups of and that serve” and inserting the following:

“(C) consumer groups of, and that serve,”;

(E) by striking “appropriate national” and inserting the following:

“(D) appropriate national”;

(F) by striking “persons who are deaf and” and inserting the following:

“(E) individuals who are deaf or”;

(G) by striking “other qualified” and inserting the following:

“(F) other qualified”;

(H) by striking “newborns, infants, toddlers, children,” and inserting “children,”;

(I) by striking “third-party” and inserting the following:

“(G) third-party”; and

(J) by striking “related commercial” and inserting the following:

“(H) related commercial”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “States to establish newborn and infant” and inserting the following: “States—

“(A) to establish newborn, infant, and young child”;

(B) by inserting a semicolon after “subsection (a)”;

(C) by striking “to develop” and inserting the following:

“(B) to develop”.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION; RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATION.—Section 399M(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “which” and inserting “that”;

(2) by striking “newborn infants or young”; and

(3) by striking “parents” and inserting “parent’s”.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Section 399M(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “(1)” and all that follows through “to procedures” and inserting the following:

“(1) The term ‘audiologic’, when used in connection with evaluation, means procedures—”;

(B) by striking “to assess” and inserting the following:

“(A) to assess”;

(C) by striking “to establish” and inserting the following:

“(B) to establish”;

(D) by striking “auditory disorder,” and inserting “auditory disorder,”;

(E) by striking “to identify” and inserting the following:

“(C) to identify”;

(F) by striking “options.” and all that follows through “linkage” and inserting the following: “options, including—

“(i) linkage”;

(G) by striking “appropriate agencies,” and all that follows through “national” and inserting the following: “appropriate agencies;

“(ii) medical evaluation;

“(iii) assessment for the full range of assistive hearing technologies appropriate for newborns, infants, and young children;

“(iv) audiologic rehabilitation treatment; and

“(v) referral to national”; and

(H) by striking “parent, and education” and inserting “parent, family, and education”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (2) through (5);

(4) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “refers to providing” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) providing”;

(B) by striking “with hearing loss, including nonmedical services,” and inserting “who is deaf or hard-of-hearing, including nonmedical services”;

(C) by striking “ensuring that families of the child are provided” and inserting the following:

“(B) ensuring that the family of the child is—

“(i) provided”;

(D) by striking “language and communication options and are given” and inserting the following: “language acquisition in oral and visual modalities; and

“(ii) given”; and

(E) by striking “their child” and inserting “the child”;

(5) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection), by striking “(3)” and all that follows through “decision making” and inserting “The term ‘medical evaluation’ means key components per-

formed by a physician including history, examination, and medical decisionmaking”;

(6) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “refers to” and inserting “means”;

(B) by striking “and/or surgical” and inserting “or surgical”; and

(C) by striking “of hearing” and all that follows through “disorder” and inserting “for hearing loss or other medical disorders”; and

(7) in paragraph (5) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “(5)” and all that follows through “refers to” and inserting “(5) The term ‘newborn, infant, and young child hearing screening’ means”;

(B) by striking “and infants” and inserting “, infants, and young children under 3 years of age”.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 399M(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-1(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “such sums” and all that follows through the period and inserting “\$17,818,000 for fiscal year 2018, \$18,173,800 for fiscal year 2019, \$18,628,145 for fiscal year 2020, \$19,056,592 for fiscal year 2021, and \$19,522,758 for fiscal year 2022.”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “such sums” and all that follows through the period and inserting “\$10,800,000 for fiscal year 2018, \$11,026,800 for fiscal year 2019, \$11,302,470 for fiscal year 2020, \$11,562,427 for fiscal year 2021, and \$11,851,488 for fiscal year 2022.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I really want to thank our Members on both sides of the aisle, and especially the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), who has an identical bill, the House companion bill to this one.

S. 652 revises the Public Health Service Act’s expanding access to critical resources for the deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns and young children. It will boost training of healthcare professionals in helping these young parents and ensure that, in turn, they can help educate the patient’s family members.

This bill will also deliver relief to parents and caretakers of young children that have hearing loss, granting them important resources to aid in their care.

Again, the Health Subcommittee vice chair, BRETT GUTHRIE, is the author of the House companion. When the House today approves this legislation, which I assume it will, that means this bill will go to the President's desk and be signed into law. This is really important work that the Energy and Commerce Committee is doing, once again, in a big and bipartisan way. It is an important bill that will expand access to critical resources for deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns and young children.

By updating and reauthorizing HRSA and CDC grants to help States treat children with hearing loss, we are doing our work to achieve better outcomes for patients.

I am particularly pleased about the potential to harness new and improved data collection systems to improve access. You know, if we can better understand what is happening with patients on the ground, we can make better decisions about where to allocate resources to help recruit more providers and improve coordination of care for children with hearing loss.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the work of the Health Subcommittee and the Members who have put so much into this legislation, and I look forward to the House passing it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act authored by two of my Energy and Commerce Committee colleagues, Mr. BRETT GUTHRIE from Kentucky and Ms. DORIS MATSUI from California. I thank Chairman WALDEN and Chairman BURGESS for their help. I also thank Senators PORTMAN and Kaine from the Senate.

It is vital that the House reauthorize the early hearing detection and intervention initiative for an additional 5 years because it provides the all-important newborn and infant hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention.

The bill will provide vital resources to the Health Resources and Services Administration to run a grant initiative and allow the Centers for Disease Control to conduct hearing loss research.

According to data from the CDC, 1.4 babies out of every—I don't know how you get 1.4—but 1.4 babies out of 1,000 that were screened were found to have a prevalence of hearing loss. And as a mother, I know how important it is to determine if your child has any level of hearing loss as early as possible so that a parent can determine the best treatment to allow their child to live a full and happy life.

My home State of Florida has required newborn screening since October 1, 2000. We need to keep this going. According to the most recent State data in Florida, 98 percent of all newborns

in Florida will be screened within the first month. That is absolutely vital to detect any problem early in their lives.

So let's work together. Extending this newborn screening initiative for another 5 years ensures that babies will continue to have access to this vital hearing screening, and we can make sure that kids across America get the healthcare that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again thank my colleagues, Representatives GUTHRIE and MATSUI and Senators PORTMAN and Kaine, for leading the charge on this important effort. I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan S. 652.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to be in strong support of S. 652, the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2017, sponsored by Senator PORTMAN from Ohio. This legislation has been championed in the House by my friend, the vice chair of the Health Subcommittee, Representative BRETT GUTHRIE, as H.R. 1539.

The bill does have strong bipartisan support and, in fact, passed this House unanimously in the last Congress. Federal support for early hearing detection and intervention programs across the country help identify children with hearing loss and directs them to early intervention services.

This program is a model of how government at different levels and public and private agencies can and should work together. In addition to improving upon current programs, this legislation improves the recruitment, retention, education, and training of qualified personnel and health providers to identify and assist young children with hearing loss.

This bill emphasizes the importance of the Health Resources and Services Administration, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health partnering together to improve outcomes and strengthen the early hearing detection intervention program. I commend Representative GUTHRIE for spearheading this initiative on the House side.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), the primary cosponsor of the bill. And I thank her for championing the healthcare of children across America.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1539, the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2017, which I coauthored with my colleague, Congressman GUTHRIE.

The Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention Program established almost 2 decades ago has been life-chang-

ing for those born deaf or hard of hearing. A member of my staff in Sacramento, Devin, was born hard of hearing but didn't receive a screening at birth. For the first few years of her life, she appeared to be struggling to keep up with her peers.

It wasn't until Devin reached the middle of kindergarten that her teacher suggested she get her hearing tested. After receiving her diagnosis, Devin's family was able to seek out tools and resources to help her catch up to her classmates in school.

Devin's story illustrates the importance of early detection and intervention. We know that a child's development in the first few years of their life can have a major impact on their well-being later on.

By extending this program through our legislation, we are ensuring that infants continue to have access to hearing screenings at birth so their parents can make informed choices about their care and management early on.

We have come so far in increasing the number of babies who are screened every year. By passing this legislation, we are continuing that progress.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman GUTHRIE, for his leadership on this issue, and I ask for everyone's support.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the author of the bill and the vice chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

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

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) and I have worked on a lot of issues together, and it is always a pleasure to work with her and to move important things forward. I know a lot of times you see a lot of big issues need to be addressed, but a lot of things are getting done here in the House.

Today, once we pass this bill, it goes to the President. It is coming back from the Senate, so it goes to the President.

My interest in this is when I was in the General Assembly of Kentucky, the Governor had a big proposal dealing with children in the first 3 years of their life and was looking at a lot of money to be spent. And I remember doing research on a site. I found a report from a doctor from Vanderbilt, and I went down and met with her. So there has been a lot of debate on the research of some of the things that we were looking at moving forward.

She said: In normal stimulation, a child is going to rise to their ability.

But she did say this: If you took a healthy baby and put it into a closet with no light, and it couldn't hear, and pull it out 3 years later—which obviously you couldn't do that—it wouldn't

be able to see and it would never be able to develop its hearing because the brain does start adjusting at a young age.

That is why you can learn a language far better as a child than you can as an adult.

□ 1415

So I was driving back, and part of what Governor Patton of Kentucky had proposed was screening, eyesight screening, and early childhood hearing detection as part of the bill. So a lot of us were saying: "What do you do with mandates?"

I was driving back, and I remember thinking, well, if you were born and you can't see well, if you were born and you can't hear well, then isn't that the same thing as being put in a dark closet? Because if you don't figure out till you show up to school that you can't hear well, then you have lost those first 3 to 5 years of ability and lost language ability for a lifetime.

So for the small amount of money that it actually costs, we passed and authorized, in Kentucky, mandated screenings. One is for eyesight, which my son got caught in going into kindergarten. That is the first time you can really test them, when we gather them, but you can test newborns at birth. If you can find a newborn at birth that has a hearing impairment and get it corrected, it will develop just like all the other healthy children, so why not do it?

So I got to Washington, D.C. It is a national program. It is not something I came up with. It was authored before, so we are here today to reauthorize it.

I just want to point out this program is a success. In 2000, 40 percent of newborns were screened for hearing loss. That number rose to over 86 percent in 2011. In 2015, CDC has reported that roughly 97 percent of infants are screened for hearing loss. Think of the difference that makes in these children's lives when we catch them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman MATSUI. I want to thank Senator KAINE from Virginia and Senator PORTMAN from Ohio for taking the bipartisan lead in the Senate. I thank them for their hard work.

I am proud to say, when we take this vote today, it doesn't go back to the Senate. It goes to the President, and we look forward to his signature and continuing this in moving forward. I have been honored to be part of this.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BURGESS for yielding.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to thank my Energy and Commerce colleagues, especially Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. MATSUI. I urge approval of this bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan bill to reauthorize the Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention Program.

If this law were around when I was a newborn, we might have caught my hearing loss at a younger age. I don't want kids to go through what I have gone through. Representative GUTHRIE said it about his child. I had vision problems, too.

We want to give these children an opportunity to succeed. That is why we are here in this Congress. That is why it makes it worthwhile to make a difference in a person's life. All they are asking for is an opportunity to succeed. So now as a user of hearing aids myself, I was proud to cosponsor the bipartisan bill, the House version introduced by my colleagues, Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. MATSUI.

Studies have shown that important language development skills are learned prior to a child's third birthday, as hearing and language are closely linked. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, 33 children are born every day with hearing impairment, making it the most common congenital condition in the United States. If left undiagnosed, a child can risk developmental challenges and setbacks.

Since its inception in 1999, the Newborn Hearing Screening and Intervention Program has improved the lives of numerous children. Over its first 15 years, the percentage of newborn babies screened every year increased from 40 percent in 2000 to approximately 96 percent of infants in 2015.

The bill builds on this legacy of success, allowing for vital screenings and monitoring to continue, while improving timely follow-up for infants to receive the care they need—key to healthy development.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

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

Mr. Speaker, all these children are asking for is an opportunity to succeed.

I had difficulty hearing in the classroom. I don't know how I got through, but I did. I had a hard time seeing the blackboard. I don't know how I got through my math, but I did.

Again, this is why we are here: to make a difference.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of this important legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 652.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING GIRLS' ACCESS TO EDUCATION IN VULNERABLE SETTINGS ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2408) to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2408

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act" or the "Protecting Girls' Access to Education Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) At the start of 2017, more than 65,000,000 people have been displaced by disasters and conflicts around the world, the highest number recorded since the end of World War II, of which more than 21,000,000 people are refugees.

(2) More than half of the population of displaced people are children and, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, nearly 4,000,000 school-aged displaced children lack access to primary education.

(3) Education offers socioeconomic opportunities, psychological stability, and physical protection for displaced people, particularly for women and girls, who might otherwise be vulnerable to severe forms of trafficking in persons (as such term is defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(9))), child marriage, sexual exploitation, or economic disenfranchisement, and contributes to long-term recovery and economic opportunities for displaced people and for the communities hosting them.

(4) Displaced children face considerable barriers to accessing educational services and, because the duration of such displacement is, on average, 20 years, such children may spend the entirety of their childhood without access to such services.

(5) Despite the rising need for such services, less than two percent of global emergency aid was directed toward educational services in 2016.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is critical to ensure that children, particularly girls, displaced by conflicts overseas are able to access educational services because such access can combat extremism and reduce exploitation and poverty; and

(2) the educational needs of vulnerable women and girls should be considered in the

design, implementation, and evaluation of related United States foreign assistance policies and programs.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) partner with and encourage other countries, public and private multilateral institutions, and nongovernmental and civil society organizations, including faith-based organizations and organizations representing parents and children, to support efforts to ensure that displaced children have access to safe primary and secondary education;

(2) work with donors to enhance training and capacity-building for the governments of countries hosting significant numbers of displaced people to design, implement, and monitor programs to effectively address barriers to such education;

(3) incorporate into the design and implementation of such programs measures to evaluate the impact of the programs on girls, with respect to the reduction of child marriage, gender-based violence, and severe forms of trafficking in persons (as such term is defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(9))); and

(4) coordinate with the governments of countries hosting significant numbers of displaced people to—

(A) promote the inclusion of displaced children into the educational systems of such countries; and

(B) develop innovative approaches to providing safe primary and secondary educational opportunities in circumstances in which such inclusion is not possible or appropriate, such as schools that permit more children to be educated by extending the hours of schooling and expanding the number of teachers.

SEC. 5. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR DISPLACED CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development are authorized to prioritize and advance ongoing efforts to support programs that—

(1) provide safe primary and secondary education for displaced children;

(2) build the capacity of institutions in countries hosting displaced people to prevent discrimination against displaced children, especially displaced girls, who seek access to such education; and

(3) help increase the access of displaced children, especially displaced girls, to educational, economic, and entrepreneurial opportunities, including through the governmental authorities responsible for educational or youth services in such host countries.

(b) COORDINATION WITH MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to coordinate with the World Bank, appropriate agencies of the United Nations, and other relevant multilateral organizations to work with governments in other countries to collect relevant data, disaggregated by age and gender, on the ability of displaced people to access education and participate in economic activity, in order to improve the targeting, monitoring, and evaluation of related assistance efforts.

(c) COORDINATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to work with private sector and civil society organizations to promote safe primary and secondary education for displaced children.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

During the five-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the

Secretary and the Administrator shall include in any report or evaluation submitted to Congress relating to a foreign assistance program for natural or manmade disaster relief or response the following information (to the extent practicable and appropriate):

(1) A breakdown of the beneficiaries of such program by location, age, gender, marital status, and school enrollment status.

(2) A description of how such program benefits displaced people.

(3) A description of any primary or secondary educational services supported by such program that specifically address the needs of displaced girls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to recognize Congressman STEVE CHABOT and Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY on the Foreign Affairs Committee for their work on this important issue of protecting girls and protecting their access to education, especially in vulnerable settings.

We all know that education is a critical driver of upward social mobility for these young girls, for economic growth, for overall stability in terms of a society. As we confront an increasing number of conflicts around this globe, education has got to remain a very key component of U.S. foreign assistance.

Around the world today, there are 27 million children who are out of school in conflict zones. Half of all children in refugee camps do not have access to primary education.

With many recent conflicts that have lasted, now, a decade, we are now seeing entire generations of children that fail to receive even the most basic education; and even if they are eventually able to return home, they carry back those deficits in terms of what they have not learned, and those deficits can last a lifetime. So this is a humanitarian crisis with real strategic implications.

In Syria, for example, an estimated 4 million children are out of school in an environment warped by constant violence. Refugee children outside of Syria are placing tremendous strains on the educational systems, and I have seen this in countries like Jordan, in Lebanon, in Turkey.

As we have seen in crisis situations around the world, the lack of stable

educational opportunities make these children more vulnerable: more vulnerable, especially for girls, to exploitation; more vulnerable, especially for boys, to radicalization.

Girls face unique barriers to education in conflict zones. In these afflicted countries, girls are 2½ times more likely than young boys to be out of school. They frequently encounter cultural barriers that prevent them from seeking an education, and they often lack safe routes to that little school and back home from that school.

Promoting girls' access to education reduces their risk of falling victim to gender-based violence or to early marriage or to human trafficking. It is also the just thing to do.

H.R. 2408, the Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act, authorizes the State Department and authorizes USAID to enhance existing education programs for displaced children and to especially be engaged with girls.

The bill calls on the State Department and USAID to coordinate efforts with the private sector as well, with civil society groups, with multilateral organizations, to collect relevant data to improve the effectiveness of these programs that we are engaged in.

Finally, the bill would require that the State Department and the USAID include data on education programs for displaced children in any report to Congress on disaster relief and recovery efforts so that we are aware that they are engaged in addressing this issue.

We must strengthen the role of education in humanitarian assistance. Refugees and other displaced persons live on a knife edge of despair. Without access to education, children in conflict zones, especially girls, are more exposed to violence, to exploitation, and even to radicalization.

By helping to realize their innate potential, education gives these children hope, hope for today, and it gives them critical skills for tomorrow so that they can contribute to their homes, their communities, and so that they can contribute to the next generation. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill.

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

Mr. SIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our chairman on the Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE, and our ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL, as well as the authors of this bill, Mr. CHABOT of Ohio and Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Both of these Members have worked hard on the bill to expand access to education around the world. I agree with them that this is an important priority for our foreign policy.

When children are able to get basic education, it pays massive dividends down the road. Those girls and boys grow up with great opportunity, and they play a bigger role in their economies and their communities.

We have seen research that, when children can learn about certain issues like nonviolent civic engagement, support for violence drops. That adds up to stronger and more stable countries and better partners for the United States.

Children belong in a classroom, Mr. Speaker, no matter where they happen to be born, but in too many places, that access just doesn't exist. What happens then?

We know in places like the Middle East, in north Africa, violent extremists are happy to fill in the void, to recruit and indoctrinate the next generation with their hateful and violent ideology. This problem is especially acute among refugees of displaced populations.

Mr. Speaker, 3.7 million schoolchildren under the U.N. refugee agency's mandate have no school to go to. Some countries are trying to tackle this challenge, like Lebanon, where the government has taken steps to enroll Syrian refugees in schools, but the need is just too great. Out of 500,000 school-age refugees, nearly half are out of school.

This bill aims to help address those really desperate situations. It calls for the USAID to ramp up access to these children, and particularly young girls. It will help us gather more data to assist government and NGOs that are also grappling with this problem, and it authorizes the Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator to prioritize this issue, to work with multilateral organizations, and to seek out partners in the private sector and civil society that will bring innovative new approaches to expanding access to education. This bill will put more young girls in the classroom in places around the world where this help is badly needed. I am glad to support it.

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

□ 1430

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and is the author of this legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, Chairman ROYCE has been a strong proponent of this, as has ELIOT ENGEL. I want to especially thank ROBIN KELLY for her leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2408, a bipartisan bill that aims to provide a safe education for millions of children, especially girls, who live in the most dangerous and unstable places across the globe.

As a parent and now a grandparent, a former teacher, I know that education

physically and mentally empowers our children.

Unfortunately, millions of children receive no education due to the circumstances which are beyond their control. This is particularly true for the growing number of displaced people across the world, as it is exceedingly difficult for children in conflict zones to receive a primary or secondary education. Armed conflicts across the world, particularly in places like Syria and now Burma, have led to the internal displacement of millions of women and children, and forced them to literally flee their own homes.

There are currently 65 million people displaced worldwide, and at least 21 million are refugees. They are out of their own countries. This is the highest number since World War II, and the number has been steadily rising since 2011.

Many of the displaced people are survivors of human rights abuses and violence. Half of these victims are under 18 years of age. They are children and in the most formative years of their lives. If they are not given the opportunity to succeed, they will be subjected to a lifetime of conflict and instability.

Education is a key component to helping lift these vulnerable children out of the depths of poverty. Access to education not only gives children the opportunity to grow and learn, but also offers safety and shelter from violence, extremist ideology, human trafficking networks, and a relentless cycle of abuse.

There is no question that access to education provides stability and consistency to children living in extremely unstable conditions, especially girls.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2408, the Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act, along with ROBIN KELLY from Illinois. I again want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for their leadership in this area.

This bipartisan legislation will move us in the right direction by making access to primary and secondary education a priority with our State Department and USAID. It aims to directly benefit displaced children, specifically girls, and will help to address one of the world's greatest challenges facing refugees across the globe.

This legislation also encourages greater international coordination and leverages existing resources by promoting education for refugees where they are through local schools.

The Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act will ensure that millions of child refugees will have an opportunity to reach their highest potential, even those in the most tumultuous conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee and a real champion for women and girls.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and the leaders of our committee for their bipartisan efforts. It is very appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan legislation that directs the State Department and USAID to support programs and educate displaced children, with a special focus on girls.

When you look at the horrors of the world, from South Sudan to Burma, to Syria, think about the fact that there are 55 million displaced children, 28 million refugee children that have been uprooted from their homes due to violence and poverty, and making up half of all the refugees.

Here is the thing. What happens when a young person has no hope, no education, no future potential of a good job to one day take care of their family? Will they become victims of trafficking or vibrant members of society? Will these millions of children become our friends or foes? Will the communities they live in be our trading partners or havens for terrorists?

Around the world, only a quarter of refugee children are enrolled in secondary school, and the number, as my colleagues have pointed out, is even worse for girls. Just seven girls for every ten refugee boys are enrolled in secondary school. We are talking about a lost generation.

In Syria alone, over 5,000 schools have been destroyed. Just ask a young lady named Muzoon. She is known as the Malala of Syria. At age 15, she fled her besieged home in Syria. When she was told to bring only her essentials, she packed a suitcase full of books because she knows, "That education is a shield that we can use to protect ourselves in life." She even went door to door in refugee camps to convince parents to keep their daughters in school instead of pressuring them into early marriage.

Muzoon knows and we know that when girls are educated, they lead to healthier, more productive lives that enhance the economy and the peacefulness of their societies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this fine legislation.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE; Ranking Member ENGEL; and, in this case, especially Congressman ALBIO SIRES, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, for once again helping to bring another important bipartisan Foreign Affairs measure to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of the Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act. My good friend, STEVE CHABOT, has been a real leader in Congress when it comes to ensuring that girls around the world have the opportunity to achieve a better future for themselves through access to education.

Mr. Speaker, I am a former Florida certified teacher. I understand the value of education. Mr. SIRES from New Jersey is also a former teacher. We heard from Mr. CHABOT, who is also a former teacher. We understand how important education is to future success.

Right now, sadly, Mr. Speaker, there are 65 million displaced people around the world, and about half of that population is under 18. This bill before us prioritizes State and USAID efforts to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children, with a specificity to helping displaced girls.

Unfortunately, sometimes young girls fall victim to exploitation, to trafficking, or they get married off, sold off, without having the opportunity to determine their own future; something that we might take for granted in this glorious country. That is why Mr. CHABOT's bill is so important. We need to reach out to those young girls. We need to have them have access to primary and secondary education so that they can increase their own chances for a prosperous future, Mr. Speaker.

Access to education, I know, empowers young people, and it will especially empower young girls. It will offer them a chance at socioeconomic opportunities that heretofore have been closed to them. It offers them stability. It offers them empowerment.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to pass Mr. CHABOT's bill. We have got to do more to ensure that displaced people, especially young girls, have access to education. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure. I urge our partners in responsible nations around the world to join us in prioritizing our efforts toward access to education for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL, and I especially thank my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am also a former certified teacher, and expanding access to education is critical in combating terrorism. When we increase opportunities through education, we help more girls and boys by giving them the tools to think critically and resist those who mean to harm us. We are helping to give these children an alternative with the possibility of positioning them to make further positive impact on their communities and their countries.

Time and time again we have seen the results of what happens when chil-

dren are not provided a better path: extremism, radicalism, and terrorism.

This is one of our best opportunities to provide a more safe and secure world not only for them, but also for us, too.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Congressman CHABOT and Congresswoman KELLY for their hard work. I support this bill, and I urge all Members to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are surrounded here by former teachers today who have brought this bill, who have worked with us to bring this bill to the House floor, and we understand their impulse to reach out to these young children and try to see to it that they have an equal chance out in the world.

This is something that teachers do, and this focus on young girls, especially young girls in the most vulnerable situation, as a result of conflict in those regions making them at risk for trafficking, for exploitation or being child brides, these former teachers understand the importance of having a program directed specifically to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT); the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY); certainly, ALBIO SIRES, our ranking member on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee; and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, of course, as chairman, for helping to ensure that international humanitarian efforts are prioritizing this issue of access to education for girls.

By improving coordination between the State Department, USAID, the private sector, and multilateral organizations, what this bill is going to do is to improve the chances that these young lives will be able to blossom above the ashes of war, above these conflicts that rage in these spots around the world, so that they might reach their full potential. If they do, they will be able to help the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask every Member for their support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2408.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICARAGUAN INVESTMENT CONDITIONALITY ACT (NICA) OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1918) to oppose loans

at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1918

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs convened a congressional hearing on December 1, 2011, entitled "Democracy Held Hostage in Nicaragua: Part 1" where former United States Ambassador to Nicaragua Robert Callahan testified, "First, that Daniel Ortega's candidacy was illegal, illegitimate, and unconstitutional; second, that the period leading to the elections and the elections themselves were marred by serious fraud; third, that Daniel Ortega and his Sandinista party have systematically undermined the country's fragile governmental institutions."

(2) According to the Organization of American States (OAS) report on the Nicaraguan 2011 Presidential elections, the OAS recommended that the Government of Nicaragua take a number of steps to improve its electoral systems, including accrediting poll watchers to ensure political parties and civil society are represented to observe elections, and redesigning the structure of the Nicaraguan electoral council to allow proper registration of the electorate.

(3) On January 25, 2012, a press statement from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said: "As noted by international observers and Nicaraguan civil society groups, Nicaragua's recent elections were not conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and the entire electoral process was marred by significant irregularities. The elections marked a setback to democracy in Nicaragua and undermined the ability of Nicaraguans to hold their government accountable."

(4) According to the Department of State's 2015 Fiscal Transparency Report: "Nicaragua's fiscal transparency would be improved by including all off-budget revenue and expenditure in the budget, auditing state-owned enterprises, and conducting a full audit of the government's annual financial statements and making audit reports publicly available within a reasonable period of time."

(5) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015: "In 2011 the Supreme Electoral Council (CSE) announced the re-election of President Daniel Ortega Saavedra of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in elections that international and domestic observers characterized as seriously flawed. International and domestic organizations raised concerns regarding the constitutional legitimacy of Ortega's re-election. The 2011 elections also provided the ruling party with a supermajority in the National Assembly, allowing for changes in the constitution, including extending the reach of executive branch power and the elimination of restrictions on re-election for executive branch officials and mayors. Observers

noted serious flaws during the 2012 municipal elections and March 2014 regional elections.”

(6) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015 in Nicaragua: “The principal human rights abuses were restrictions on citizens’ right to vote; obstacles to freedom of speech and press, including government intimidation and harassment of journalists and independent media, as well as increased restriction of access to public information, including national statistics from public offices; and increased government harassment and intimidation of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations.”

(7) The same 2015 report stated: “Additional significant human rights abuses included considerably biased policies to promote single-party dominance; arbitrary police arrest and detention of suspects, including abuse during detention; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions with arbitrary and lengthy pretrial detention; discrimination against ethnic minorities and indigenous persons and communities.”

(8) On June 7, 2016, the Department of State's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor posted on social media: “Disappointed government of Nicaragua said it will deny electoral observers requested by Nicaraguan citizens, church, and private sector . . . We continue to encourage the government of Nicaragua to allow electoral observers as requested by Nicaraguans.”

(9) On June 14, 2016, President Ortega expelled three United States Government officials (two officials from U.S. Customs and Border Protection and one professor from the National Defense University) from Nicaragua.

(10) On August 1, 2016, the Department of State issued a press release to express grave concern over the Nicaraguan government limiting democratic space leading up to the elections in November and stated that “[o]n June 8, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court stripped the opposition Independent Liberal Party (PLI) from its long recognized leader. The Supreme Court took similar action on June 17 when it invalidated the leadership of the Citizen Action Party, the only remaining opposition party with the legal standing to present a presidential candidate. Most recently, on July 29, the Supreme Electoral Council removed 28 PLI national assembly members (16 seated and 12 alternates) from their popularly-elected positions.”

(11) On November 7, 2016, the Department of State issued a press release stating: “The United States is deeply concerned by the flawed presidential and legislative electoral process in Nicaragua, which precluded the possibility of a free and fair election on November 6. In advance of the elections, the Nicaraguan government sidelined opposition candidates for president, limited domestic observation at the polls and access to voting credentials, and took other actions to deny democratic space in the process. The decision by the Nicaraguan government not to invite independent international electoral observers further degraded the legitimacy of the election.”

(12) In November and December of 2016, the Board of Executive Directors of the Inter-American Development Bank postponed consideration of a policy based loan of \$65 million to the Government of Nicaragua due to the efforts of the United States mission that expressed serious concerns of the absence of transparency, systemic corruption, and the lack of free and fair elections in Nicaragua.

(13) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016: “[A]ctions by the ruling Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) party resulted in de facto concentration of power in a single party, with an authoritarian executive branch exercising significant control over the legislative, judicial, and electoral functions.”

(14) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016 in Nicaragua, “The November 6 elections for president, vice president, national assembly members, and representatives for the Central American parliament did not meet the conditions of being free and fair . . . The November 6 presidential and legislative elections were marred by allegations of institutional fraud and the absence of independent opposition political parties. National observers and opposition leaders claimed rates of abstention from 60 to 70 percent.”

(15) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016: “Companies reported that bribery of public officials, unlawful seizures, and arbitrary assessments by customs and tax authorities were common . . . The courts remained particularly susceptible to bribes, manipulation, and other forms of corruption, especially by the FSLN, giving the sense that the FSLN heavily influenced CSJ and lower-level court actions.”

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support—

- (1) the rule of law and an independent judiciary and electoral council in Nicaragua;
- (2) independent pro-democracy organizations in Nicaragua;
- (3) free, fair, and transparent elections under international and domestic observers in Nicaragua; and
- (4) anti-corruption and transparency efforts in Nicaragua.

SEC. 4. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any loan for the benefit of the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or promote democracy, unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to—

- (1) hold free, fair, and transparent elections overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers;
- (2) promote democracy, as well as an independent judicial system and electoral council;
- (3) strengthen the rule of law;
- (4) respect the right to freedom of association and expression;
- (5) combat corruption, including investigating and prosecuting government officials that are credibly alleged to be corrupt; and
- (6) protect the right of political opposition parties, journalists, trade unionists, human rights defenders, and other civil society activists to operate without interference.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written report assessing—

- (1) the effectiveness of the international financial institutions in enforcing applicable program safeguards in Nicaragua; and

(2) the effects of the matters described in section 2 on long-term prospects for positive development outcomes in Nicaragua.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “international financial institution” means the International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Development Association, International Finance Corporation, Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, African Development Bank, African Development Fund, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa, and Inter-American Investment Corporation.

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the day after the earlier of—

- (1) the date on which the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the requirements of subsection (a) are met; or
- (2) 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive this section if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES.

The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the OAS to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the OAS to strongly advocate for an Electoral Observation Mission to be sent to Nicaragua in 2017 to observe the possibility of credible elections.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

The Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development should prioritize foreign assistance to the people of Nicaragua to assist civil society in democracy and governance programs, including human rights documentation.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON CORRUPTION IN NICARAGUA.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), shall submit to Congress a report on the involvement of senior Nicaraguan government officials, including members of the Supreme Electoral Council, the National Assembly, and the judicial system, in acts of public corruption or human rights violations in Nicaragua.

(b) FORM.—The report required in subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex. The unclassified portion of the report shall be made available to the public.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the world has watched with great concern, with mounting horror, actually, as Venezuela suffers economic ruin amid a potential crisis that has eroded democracy, and that threatens to destabilize the region. Meanwhile, less noticed, Nicaragua continues to violate the region's democratic values by failing to conduct fair and transparent elections and by denying Nicaraguans freedom of expression and freedom of association.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the leadership of chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN; and the chairman and ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Mr. DUNCAN; and the ranking member, Mr. SIRES, in bringing this measure to the floor.

□ 1445

This legislation will require U.S. representatives at international financial institutions to use the vote and influence of the United States to oppose any loans to Nicaragua unless the country has shown a willingness to respect the human and democratic rights of its citizens.

Nicaragua's authoritarian President Daniel Ortega, and that's the same Daniel Ortega who lost the Presidency in 1990, has tightened his grip on power by weakening government institutions and the opposition and ensuring power for himself and his family by excluding international election observers.

By requiring that the Secretary of State certify that Nicaragua has taken steps to provide election transparency and combat corruption before the United States votes to provide the Government of Nicaragua with loans, we help ensure that taxpayer money is not used to line the pockets of corrupt authoritarians, or to derail the legitimate democratic rights of the Nicaraguan citizens.

We need only to look to Venezuela to see that the consolidation of state power and organized crime and corruption actually go hand in hand. As a region, we must stand in strong opposition to authoritarianism and corruption in Nicaragua, while not punishing the people of Nicaragua. And it is this point of not punishing the people of Nicaragua that also we have to include in this measure; and for that reason, and because of this, the authors of the

bill have insured a carve-out, and that carve-out exempts all loans that are for humanitarian purposes.

So this bill stands squarely with the people of Nicaragua and their hopes for freedom and democracy and the rule of law. Its passage is just one way that we can demonstrate this support. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the measure.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 1918, the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2017, as amended.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1918, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1918, as amended, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1918, the Nicaragua Investment Conditionality Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1918 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together

as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 1918, the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act, also known as the NICA Act.

I want to start by thanking Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and my chairman on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, JEFF DUNCAN, for their efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

I also would like to thank my good friend from Florida, ILEANA ROSELEHTINEN, who has worked tirelessly for decades and never backs down when it comes to standing up against authoritarian regimes and human rights violators.

We are here today to stand up against Daniel Ortega and his constant pursuit of gaining absolute political control over the Nicaraguan people. Daniel Ortega and his family continue to amass wealth while the Nicaraguans remain the second poorest country in the Western Hemisphere.

Ortega has spent years winning sham elections, eliminating political opposition, and now has his wife take the role of Vice President. If you need any more convincing of his intentions, Ortega continues to strongly defend Nicolas Maduro, the Venezuelan dictator whose regime shoots unarmed protestors in the streets, jails the opposition, dissolved Congress, and has brought what should be one of the richest countries in Latin America to the brink of collapse.

Being a corrupt democracy in name only cannot go without consequences. This bipartisan legislation makes it clear that the U.S. will not stand by and watch Ortega trample the people's human rights defenders and stomp all over democracy, while getting rich at the expense of the Nicaraguan people.

H.R. 1918 calls on the U.S. Government to oppose loans at international financial institutions for Nicaragua unless the Nicaraguan Government takes some effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections and commits to upholding democratic principles.

Congress and the administration need to work together and find ways to empower the Nicaraguan people and defend against Ortega's hostile behavior towards innocent civilians. It is my hope that this bipartisan legislation will pass the Senate and quickly be signed into law.

I thank the chairman and ranking member once again and their staff for all their help in bringing the NICA Act to the floor. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill to hold the Ortega regime accountable for its actions.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, and is the author of this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 1918, the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act, also known as the NICA Act, and I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for working with my office to bring this important measure to the floor today.

I also want to thank my legislative “brother,” “mi hermano,” the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES), who is the Democratic lead on this legislation, because his leadership on all things related to human rights is admirable, and his steadfast support for the people of Nicaragua has been unwavering.

I also want to thank the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee Chairman JEFF DUNCAN. He has been helping us in leading the effort and bringing attention to the human rights abuses that are sadly occurring in Nicaragua.

This legislation before us, Mr. Speaker, is straightforward, and it is simple. There have been a lot of exaggerations about what this bill does and what this bill doesn't do.

Our bill is aimed at leveraging America's influence and conditioning our vote at any of the international financial institutions for Nicaragua until the leadership in that country takes significant steps to restore democratic order.

I think that we would all agree, as Members of the United States Congress, that to have democracies in our region is beneficial; and to have strong governance and strong rule of law and a strong independent judiciary, these are all values that we share and that the people throughout the hemisphere would like to have that in their countries as well.

So let's go over, just briefly, what are some of the conditions in this bill. And please, as I go through them, ask yourself: Is that a damaging condition, or is that something that would help the people? Not whether it helps the ruling class, the rich guys, the fat-cat bankers, not whether it helps the regime or the government in power, whether it helps the people of those countries.

So let me go through the list, Mr. Speaker. This bill has as conditions:

To promote democracy. Promoting democracy, promoting an independent judicial system. Those are wonderful values. Promoting an independent electoral council, so that the ruling party doesn't steal elections;

Strengthen the rule of law so that you don't have corrupt judges deciding

in favor of the rich guys and against the poor of the country;

Fighting corruption, including investigating and prosecuting government officials who are credibly alleged to be corrupt, who go against the people of Nicaragua and further enrich those who wish to do damage to the country.

What else does the bill do? Well, one of the conditions is that it protects the right of political opposition parties. Don't we want that, political opposition parties; journalists who are trying to get the truth to the Nicaraguan people just as they do here to the American people; trade unionists; human rights defenders and other civil rights advocates to operate without interference. Isn't that what we want for all countries to have?

These conditions, Mr. Speaker, they are not unheard of; in fact, they are similar to what this country has already passed, what this Congress has already passed for the Northern Triangle countries of Honduras, of Guatemala, and of El Salvador. And now we want to do that for Nicaragua, so it is intended to help the people of Nicaragua.

This bill has safeguards in place to ensure that humanitarian assistance continues to be provided to address basic human needs. Humanitarian assistance will continue.

Some of those basic needs that we talked about, such as free and fair elections, they are not being met today due to the failed leadership in Nicaragua. And who does that help? Well, it helps the leaders, and it hurts the people when you don't have free and fair elections. We want to help the people of Nicaragua.

Now, reports have surfaced that the Nicaraguan electoral council is giving away identity cards, so that minors, underage individuals can be allowed to vote. Nicaraguans who are not on the electoral rolls are also being allowed to vote.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that there will be no way to determine if the individual voted more than once, and that is exactly how the status quo wants it; the fat-cats, they like it so that they can stay there and they can manipulate the results of the elections.

We are also seeing civil society leaders publicly expressing their concern regarding the deterioration of human rights in Nicaragua. As a result of speaking out against the government, they have been targeted for persecution. You speak out against the government, you are going to have some false charges thrown at you.

And what about the indigenous communities? They have also expressed their concern regarding land grabs by the government. Violence is breaking out as the Nicaraguan military is being dispatched to squash the peaceful protests by these indigenous communities.

So let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, just what kind of leadership structure we are dealing with in Nicaragua. The Russians have set up operations in Managua, they are proud of it, they put it in the front pages, and that poses a threat to U.S. national security interests.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Nicaragua continues to offer its unconditional support to Nicolas Maduro and his dictatorial regime in Venezuela. And according to congressional testimony, Venezuela's entity, PDVSA, has also used its subsidiary in Nicaragua, which is called Albanisa—and I will give the exact letters of those names—to launder money.

So, Mr. Speaker, if Venezuela's Maduro is using Nicaragua in order to evade U.S. sanctions, we need to take a closer look at these ties. We need to hold people accountable because all of that hurts the people of Venezuela and the people of Nicaragua. It helps the government, but it doesn't help the people.

That is what this bill does. We want to hold the Nicaraguan Government accountable, just like we have done in other countries, as I said, in Central America. This is not something new, out of whole cloth, that we have invented. It has worked, and it has truly helped the people.

Now, earlier this year, Mr. SIRES and I, we traveled to Honduras, we traveled to Guatemala, and we saw firsthand how conditioning our support for these countries works and has been extremely effective.

Has it hurt those countries? It has not. It has worked. It has strengthened their democracy. It has strengthened the rule of law, the independent judiciary.

So placing conditions incentivizes countries to do the right thing, and it makes institutional reforms, as needed, to improve the livelihood of their citizens.

So I know that the Nicaraguan Government does not like this bill, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people of Nicaragua would like to know that the United States Congress stands with them as they call for reforms that promote democracy, that strengthen the rule of law, that fight corruption, and that protect the rights of all political opposition parties, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern with H.R. 1918, the Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act of 2017.

Today, I stand with the people of Nicaragua and the people of south

Texas. Nicaragua has been our partner to the south. They work with us to combat drug trafficking, limit irregular migration, and make our region and our world a safer place. Nicaragua today is the safest country in Central America.

□ 1500

I agree, we must be vigilant in monitoring Nicaragua's transition to democracy. However, we must recognize that enacting this bill could have serious consequences on the region.

NICA could strain our alliance with Nicaragua, and it could lead to instability, irregular immigration to the United States, to my border district, and an increase in criminal activity. My district was ground zero for the last immigration surge, and I would like to prevent that from happening again.

Nicaragua has its economic and political challenges, but it has taken steps to address poverty, climate change, and to grow its economy. How can we, in good conscience, support a measure that would punish the poorest country in Central America and the second poorest in the Western Hemisphere?

Moreover, Nicaragua stands with America and our allies against the rogue nation of North Korea. We cannot compare Nicaragua to Venezuela.

While we must hold countries accountable, we should bring them in rather than shut them out. We have the ability to guide these nations to embrace democracy and condemn bad actors.

Lastly, I want to make clear that this is not an endorsement of the Sandinistas or any other regime. Today I speak for the less fortunate in Nicaragua who suffer the most from NICA.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues to find a solution to this complex issue.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important, when we consider the challenge that we have here, the Carter Center was involved in Nicaragua trying to oversee the election there. They came to the conclusion that the election was not transparent. The elections were not fair in Nicaragua.

The European Union was engaged in trying to monitor those elections. Again, the same conclusion.

The Organization of American States, it is the standard or it is the organization representing all of the governments in this hemisphere, they again raised the same issue.

When we think what we are trying to do here, the goal is, first, any loans that go to the benefit of the people of Nicaragua, that is exempt anyway. From the humanitarian standpoint, we want them to have the loans. But if we are going to make a loan that benefits

the head of state or the government and, as part of that, we put the same conditions that the OAS puts on member loans, the same conditions that we put on other countries with respect to the rule of law or with respect to transparency and free and fair elections, I don't think that that is unusual in the least. As a matter of fact, those are the conditions we apply.

The attempt to focus on this and our frustration with it is to give that added boost, just as the Carter Center is trying to do, just as the European Union is trying to weigh in, just as the OAS is suggesting as we go forward that there be these reforms and transparency. I think it is proper that this institution does the same. I think the carve-out we put in the bill for humanitarian aid addresses the other issues.

So from that standpoint, I think it is necessary for us to do what we can at this time to nudge this back toward free and fair elections.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and mi hermana from Florida, my sister, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for their work on this bipartisan measure and for their commitment to democracy in the Western Hemisphere. They have skillfully crafted the NICA Act to hold President Ortega accountable, while ensuring that the Nicaraguan people do not suffer. I am glad that we are advancing this measure, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In summing up here, the focus of this legislation is clearly to seek to end a practice which many in the international community find a vexing one, and that is it tries to ensure that the loans that are given to the Government of Nicaragua meet certain democratic benchmarks before issuing any loans that would specifically benefit those in the government. There is a carve-out, as I shared, for any humanitarian loans.

I think the reason this approach has gained bipartisan support is because the United States, in this instance, will be engaged still, but engaged in a way where we are not encouraging corruption. I say that because it pushes Nicaragua to allow for free and transparent elections, and that should be our goal. That is the goal of other election observers who have been involved in the past and have expressed their concerns about the state of play there.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1918, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 3, 2017, at 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 396.

That the Senate passed with amendment H.R. 1616.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

MUNICIPAL FINANCE SUPPORT ACT OF 2017

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1624) to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as level 2A liquid assets, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1624

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Municipal Finance Support Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended—

(1) *by moving subsection (z) so that it appears after subsection (y); and*

(2) *by adding at the end the following:*

“(aa) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS.—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—For purposes of the final rule titled ‘Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards; Final Rule’ (79

Fed. Reg. 61439; published October 10, 2014) (the ‘Final Rule’) and any other regulation which incorporates a definition of the term ‘high-quality liquid asset’, the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall treat a municipal obligation that is both liquid and readily marketable (as defined in the Final Rule) and investment grade as of the calculation date as a high-quality liquid asset that is no lower than a level 2B liquid asset.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) INVESTMENT GRADE.—With respect to an obligation, the term ‘investment grade’ has the meaning given that term under part 1 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(B) MUNICIPAL OBLIGATION.—The term ‘municipal obligation’ means an obligation of a State or any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of a State or any political subdivision thereof.”

(b) AMENDMENT TO LIQUIDITY COVERAGE RATIO REGULATIONS.—Not later than the end of the 3-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall amend the final rule titled “Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards; Final Rule” (79 *Fed. Reg.* 61439; published October 10, 2014) to implement the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of much-needed legislation that would simply fix a 2014 rule by financial regulators and allow municipal bonds to be considered as level 2B liquid assets, at a minimum, for purposes of calculating total high-quality liquid assets, or HQLAs, under the liquidity coverage ratio. The Municipal Finance Support Act is a bipartisan piece of legislation that passed unanimously out of committee, showing its clear need.

Municipal securities are frequently issued by the transportation, housing, and healthcare authorities of State and local governments to raise funds to pay for projects ranging from bridges and schools to hospitals and recreational facilities. Excluding municipal securities from treatment as HQLAs will result in higher borrowing costs for State and local governments during times of economic stress.

Furthermore, there is no reason why high-quality liquid bonds issued by the United States and municipalities should receive a lower standing than

foreign sovereign debt with equivalent or, frankly, even lesser credit quality and market liquidity.

Finally, disincentivizing financial institutions from holding investment-grade municipal securities could cause banks to retreat from the \$3.8 trillion market, thereby forcing State and local governments to scale back pending projects on roads, schools, and other infrastructure projects financed with the bonds. Classifying investment-grade municipal securities as HQLAs will ensure low-cost infrastructure financing remains available for State and local governments.

Although the Federal Reserve has issued an amended rule allowing municipal bonds to count as HQLAs for some banks, neither the OCC nor the FDIC have acted to follow the Fed’s lead in amending their HQLA definitions to include these municipal securities. Their inaction creates a split regulatory system in which the treatment of municipal securities for the purpose of measuring the liquidity of the bank’s holdings depends entirely upon who the regulator is.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1624, offered by Mr. MESSER and Mrs. MALONEY, represents a bipartisan effort to ensure that certain financial institutions will continue to hold municipal securities, while also supporting the spirit of an important bank guardrail in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

Bank regulators promulgated the liquidity coverage rule to ensure that megabanks have a minimum number of assets that they could sell, even in the worst markets. The rule permits banks to count assets like Treasury securities, GSE debt, and investment-grade corporate securities towards the pool. Regulators found that these securities could be sold even in stressed environments, thereby allowing a megabank to weather the storm of an economic crisis. This rule, known as the liquidity coverage rule, is an important tool for banking regulators to guard against the type of contagion we saw during the financial crisis.

However, the bank regulators excluded all municipal securities because they concluded that municipal securities, as a class, are difficult to sell in stressed markets. This may be generally true, but the investment-grade debt of my State of California has lots of buyers and sellers and has a liquidity profile similar to many corporate securities. So it makes sense that, if there are municipal securities like California’s debt that meet the same eligibility standards as other corporate securities, they should also be counted

toward a bank’s liquid assets under the rule.

The Federal Reserve quickly recognized this problem and has since adopted a correction to permit bank holding companies under its jurisdiction to treat municipal securities that are liquid, market ready, and investment grade the same as similar corporate securities.

This bill, as amended, takes the relief adopted by the Federal Reserve and extends it to banks regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It isn’t clear to me just how many municipalities will benefit from this legislation, and I imagine most would not, but even if only a handful of our States and cities qualify, the bill is worth passing because it could help to reduce financing costs for those governments.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mrs. MALONEY’s hard work and bipartisan efforts on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my coauthor on this bill, Congresswoman MALONEY, for her great leadership on this legislation, as well as Chairman HUIZENGA, Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, and the entire Financial Services Committee team for their hard work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare occasion in Washington when Republicans and Democrats can come together and get behind a change to the banking regulations, but we stand here today behind H.R. 1624 because the banking regulators, frankly, well, they messed it up. They created a rule that gives foreign municipalities a competitive advantage over our American cities and towns, and this advantage is hurting our communities.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is really quite simple. It will help cities and towns in my State and across the United States save money on roads and bridges and schools. President Trump has made rebuilding our infrastructure a priority for our Nation, and this bipartisan bill paves the way for this type of investment by lowering the price tag for roads and bridges.

H.R. 1624 reverses a backwards banking regulation that makes it more expensive for U.S. municipalities to finance infrastructure projects. Specifically, the bill will amend the regulation to enable more banks to hold municipal bonds to cover their liquidity requirements. This change should reduce the cost of borrowing for cities and towns across the country. Ultimately, this bill helps taxpayers by making it cheaper to finance infrastructure projects.

H.R. 1624 will help blue States and red States alike, and that is why you have seen such overwhelming bipartisan support for this in the Halls of Congress. The bill passed the Financial Services Committee unanimously this summer, and very similar legislation passed the Chamber by a voice vote last year.

□ 1515

Still we have got more work to do, and there is now momentum in the Senate to get H.R. 1624 across the finish line.

The bill is also supported by numerous outside advocacy groups, including the National Governors Association, the Government Finance Officers Association, the National League of Cities, the National Association of State Treasurers, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and even the State treasurer from my home State of Indiana, my good friend, Kelly Mitchell.

Mr. Speaker, today we take the first step in this process in the House toward reversing this backwards regulation, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Mr. MESSER for his leadership on this legislation.

He is absolutely correct. He worked very closely with Mrs. MALONEY. This is a bipartisan bill. He correctly stated that we do sometimes get together and work on issues in ways that we can be helpful, not only to our constituents in general but to cities and towns. We have talked an awful lot about wanting to improve our infrastructures, and this is one way that it certainly can be done.

I would like to point out again the Federal Reserve's role in this because of the way that they recognized the problem and what they did to adopt a correction to the problem. So this bill again, as amended, takes the relief adopted by the Federal Reserve.

Again, this is a case where we had Members who understood this problem, moved forward on it, and recognized that the Federal Reserve also recognized the problem. When you have several entities who have recognized a problem, it certainly makes good sense and good public policy for everybody to come together to correct it. So with the Federal Reserve having come forward and adopting this relief, it means that it is extended to banks regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Again, I wish I could say that every city in the United States would benefit from it, but not all will. Not all need it. But for those who do, I think it is important for us to recognize that when we have the opportunity to come together and to help any part of our

country, and when it is very easy to do so, I think we should do it. So I am very pleased that we have been able to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who is the lead Democratic cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for her leadership on this issue and so many others.

I strongly support the bill, and I would like to thank my good friend from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for his leadership.

We introduced this bill in order to level the playing field for our cities and States by requiring the banking regulators to treat certain municipal bonds as liquid assets, just like corporate bonds, stocks, and other assets.

As a former member of the city council in New York, I know firsthand the importance of municipal bonds. They allow States and cities to finance infrastructure, build schools, pave roads, and build subways. They are all financed with municipal bonds.

Unfortunately, in the banking regulators' liquidity rule—which requires banks to hold a minimum amount of liquid assets—they chose to allow corporate bonds to qualify as liquid assets, but completely excluded municipal bonds—even municipal bonds that are just as liquid and high-grade as corporate bonds.

This makes no sense, and it effectively discriminates against municipal bonds and cities. A municipal bond that is just as liquid as the most liquid corporate bond would not be counted as a liquid asset under the rule just because it was issued by a municipality rather than a corporation.

The Fed has already recognized this error and has amended its rule to fix the problem. But the OCC, which regulates national banks, is still refusing to amend its rule and insists on favoring corporations over municipalities. So Mr. MESSER and I introduced this bill because this kind of arbitrary discrimination against municipalities cannot be allowed to continue.

So in sum, this bill levels the playing field for cities and States in a way that maintains the safety and soundness of our banking system. The bill passed the Financial Services Committee 60-0 in July, and last Congress the bill passed the full House by a voice vote.

So I urge my colleagues to, once again, support this bipartisan legislation which is critically important for our States and our cities.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1624. I commend my ranking member from the Sub-

committee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments, Mrs. MALONEY, as well as the work from my colleague from Indiana.

This is a commonsense, no-nonsense, bipartisan solution to a mistake that was made by regulators. We need to grant clarity and harmony to those who are borrowing those dollars, those municipalities, States, and cities, as well as the investors and those who hold these bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I am pleased that we can support H.R. 1624, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill requires federal banking regulators to define municipal obligations as liquid, readily marketable and investment grade.

Defining municipal securities in this way will allow financial institutions greater flexibility to manage their liquidity requirements and use their capital resources more impactfully and effectively. In short, this bill goes a long way to strengthen the liquidity risk management of banks, savings associations, and bank holding companies.

This bill does all this by redefining what qualifies as "High Quality Liquid Assets". Currently HQLAs are defined as U.S. Treasuries, Government Debt, Investment Grade Corporate Debt, and Excess Reserves held by the Fed. Notably absent from that list are Municipal Securities.

Better public policy calls for such securities to be redefined as HQLAs. This is important, because Municipal Securities are issued for vital purposes such as transportation projects, housing developments, healthcare and recreational facilities, as well as bridges, schools and hospitals.

The current exclusion of Municipal securities from the HQLA definition reduces the eligible pool of potential purchasers of municipal issuances. This results in increased borrowing costs for our state and local governments, especially during times of economic stress. Simply put, high quality liquid municipal bonds (issued by U.S. states and local governments) should not be viewed as inferior to that of foreign sovereign debt. In fact, our domestic municipal issuances often have superior credit quality and market liquidity than do many foreign issuances.

The exclusion also discourages banks and other financial institutions from holding investment grade municipal securities and is causing many bank holding companies and national banks to retreat from investing in such securities, thereby forcing state and local governments to scale back spending on roads, schools, and other infrastructure projects.

Various former governors of the Federal Reserve have already suggested that some local and state debt is comparable to that of very liquid corporate bonds. Chairman Yellen herself has frequently declared her support of the expanded treatment of municipal securities as HQLAs.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, our states and local governments expect to confront an infrastructure spending gap of over \$2 trillion dollars over the next 10 years. Let's pass this bill now so that the American people get the country they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1624, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as no lower than level 2B liquid assets, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING RESOURCES, OFFICERS, AND TECHNOLOGY TO ERADICATE CYBER THREATS TO OUR CHILDREN ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 782) to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 782

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology To Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017" or the "PROTECT Our Children Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN TASK FORCE PROGRAM.

Title I of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 17601 et seq.) is amended in section 107(a)(10) (42 U.S.C. 17617(a)(10)), by striking "fiscal year 2018" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 782, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today that we are voting to reauthorize the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to End the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003, or the PROTECT Act.

The PROTECT Act authorizes local law enforcement task forces to combat crimes against children online. These internet crimes against children, or ICAC, task forces have been absolutely crucial in the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of internet crimes against children. The program was developed in response to the increasing number of children and teenagers using the internet, the proliferation of child sexual abuse images available electronically, and heightened online activity by predators seeking unsupervised contact with potential underage victims.

Since the ICAC program's inception in 1998, more than 589,000 law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and other professionals have been trained on techniques to investigate and prosecute ICAC-related cases. More than 709,000 complaints of alleged child sexual victimization have been reviewed resulting in the arrest of more than 73,000 individuals. There are now 61 co-ordinated task forces representing over 4,500 Federal, State, and local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies.

The need for these ICAC task forces has never been greater. The use of the internet by children is only increasing, and so are the crimes committed against them. Law enforcement officers are encountering new types of crimes such as sextortion, that create new complexities in their investigations.

I would like to take a moment to commend Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida and Mr. SMITH from Texas for introducing the companion bill in this House. During his tenure as Judiciary Committee chairman, my friend, LAMAR SMITH, was a tireless advocate on behalf of our Nation's children.

Children are our most precious resource, and we must be vigilant in ensuring their protection. As a father and grandfather, I can think of no more important role we can play than protecting our children.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first, before I start, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Florida for her consistent work on this legislation. For those of us who have served, we certainly are well aware of the work that has been done, and I have been very privileged on the Judiciary Committee to join with her work, and I just want to congratulate her on that.

As we begin, let me also take just a moment to acknowledge, again, the massacre that occurred on Sunday night in Las Vegas, Nevada. As I was pondering the actions of this body last evening with a moment of silence, I wondered whether that—although it is of much reverence—whether that, in

fact, will heal the wounds of those who lost their loved ones or those who are still mending—the 500-plus who were in the hospital and have been in the hospital.

So before I speak to S. 782, I want to make it clear that I think it is crucial that the letter that both Mr. CONYERS and I signed regarding asserting jurisdiction on the silencer bill is crucial. And as well it is crucial that this body does more than this, in essence, a moment of silence to heal the wounds of those who are now speechless about the loss of their loved ones. And as well it might be time to take a knee or to kneel, but it is time to pass legislation.

I would hope that we would pass legislation that has been offered, the King-Thompson bill, and a number of other legislative initiatives that many of us have.

With that, I rise in support of S. 782, the Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017.

This legislation will reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program by amending the language in section 105(h) of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, introduced by then-Senator Joe Biden.

This bill authorizes appropriations for this program in the amount of \$60 million for each fiscal year from 2018 through 2022. These figures are consistent with current appropriated levels.

We have a special responsibility to protect our young people. For that reason, I support S. 782, a bill that will provide adequate resources to help eradicate the cyber threats that continue to threaten the lives of our children.

I support this important bipartisan measure for several reasons. First, it will facilitate more comprehensive investigation into violent acts perpetrated against innocent children.

□ 1530

The task force program creates a co-ordinated group of investigative task forces representing 3,500 Federal, State, and local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies.

Second, this bill will provide support to officers that will allow them to better identify these threats, conduct investigation and training, and enforce the laws.

The task force is particularly important because it becomes a specialty entity that deals with saving our children.

The task forces aid local and State law enforcement in creating and implementing effective responses to technologically facilitated child sexual exploitation and internet crimes against children.

As the internet becomes more sophisticated and there are those who would want to be bad actors and utilize this

very important national/international asset, this task force is crucial. They provide law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies with guidance on victim support, forensic investigations, training and technical assistance, prevention, and community education—all crucial elements to a holistic approach to stopping the attack on our children, stopping the sexual exploitation on our children, and stopping the internet crimes against our children.

In the Judiciary Committee today, we were dealing with another aspect of this issue, which is sex trafficking and human trafficking.

This is an important component, again, to giving our children back their innocence and letting them be strong in the knowledge of the love and affection the Nation has for them and protecting them as they grow and thrive.

Finally, this bill will provide the technological resources to detect online threats in real time and provide a platform on which law enforcement can operate in order to bring these perpetrators to justice.

Just this morning, the Judiciary Committee, as I indicated, held a hearing regarding online sex trafficking. We are all in agreement that we must eradicate this threat to our young people and that we must take action against other victimization of children that can occur online. This legislation is, in fact, a key element of that. Although we still have work to do to address these problems, this bill is a good start.

For the foregoing reasons, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 782, the “Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017.”

This legislation will reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program by amending the language in section 105(h) of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, introduced by then-Senator Joe Biden.

This bill authorizes appropriations for this program in the amount of \$60,000,000 for each fiscal year from 2018 through 2022. These figures are consistent with current appropriated levels.

We have a special responsibility to protect our young people.

For that reason, I support S. 782, a bill that would provide adequate resources to help eradicate the cyber threats that continue to threaten the lives of our children.

I support this important bipartisan measure for several reasons.

First, it will facilitate more comprehensive investigation into violent acts perpetrated against innocent children.

The Task Force Program creates a coordinated group of investigative task forces representing 3,500 federal, state and local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies.

Second, this bill will provide support to officers that will allow them to better identify these threats, conduct investigation and training, and enforce the laws.

The Task Forces aid local and state law enforcement in creating and implementing effective responses to technologically facilitated child sexual exploitation and internet crimes against children.

They provide law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies with guidance on victim support, forensic investigations, training and technical assistance, prevention and community education.

And finally, this bill will provide the technological resources needed to detect online threats in real-time and provide a platform on which law enforcement can operate in order to bring these perpetrators to justice.

Just this morning, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing regarding Online Sex Trafficking. We were all in agreement that we must eradicate this threat to our young people, as we must take action against other victimization of children that can occur online.

Although we still have work to do to address these problems, this bill is a good start, and for the foregoing reasons, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 782, the Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017, and thank my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who has worked so diligently on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes appropriations for this program in the amount of \$60 million for each fiscal year from 2018 through 2022. These figures are consistent with current appropriated levels.

We must continue to protect our children from the daily threats that permeate the electronic platform and endanger the well-being of our children.

Earlier this morning, as has been said, the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing addressing these very problems. As ranking member of that committee, I vow to continue my commitment toward eradicating this infectious poison that has claimed the innocence of so many of our youths.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and others on these very important issues. That is why I support the measures put forth in this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who has been a key supporter and advocate for this important legislation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman

from Texas for her commitment, for her work, and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I spent 5 years as a proud member of the Judiciary Committee. I miss it and I hope to return one day to add on to my responsibilities as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I also thank Mr. GOODLATTE for his leadership and solid, consistent support for this program over the last decade.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 782, Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act—or the PROTECT Our Children Act—because at this very moment there are thousands of children out there waiting to be saved.

Our children deserve, as we all agree, a future that is healthy, prosperous, bright, secure, and, most of all, safe. That is, of course, what every parent cares about the most: the safety of their children. But, sadly, our children are vulnerable when they are online.

With the proliferation of the internet and wireless technology, online child pornography has become an epidemic, and I don't use that term lightly. The ever-increasing reach of the modern internet has facilitated an exploding, multibillion-dollar market for child pornography.

Tragically, the demand for this criminal market can only be supplied by graphic new images, and these images can only be supplied through the sexual assault of more children. Let's not forget that these are not just heinous photos or images. They are, simply put, crime scene photos created by a thriving industry that uses children as sexual commodities.

Ten years ago, I introduced H.R. 3845, the Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2007—or PROTECT Our Children Act of 2007.

At a House Judiciary hearing on that bill, my colleagues will remember we heard from a very brave young woman, Alicia Kozakiewicz. She had been abducted by an internet predator when she was just 13 years old. She was held captive in his dungeon basement and sexually tortured for 4 days.

The FBI found Alicia because the Virginia Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force—or ICAC—had the technology to lift the digital fingerprints of this perpetrator's crimes. They were able to discover the location where he held her captive, chained to the floor, connected to a collar around her neck. Internet crimes officers tracked the IP address back to his door and literally rescued Alicia from death.

I remember Alicia's testimony like it was yesterday because it moved many of the members of that committee, including myself, to tears. Over the course of that next year, we learned a lot about these types of offenders: who they are, how they operate, and, most importantly, where they are.

We saw detailed law enforcement maps that showed the locations of hundreds of thousands of sexual predators, over half of whom had actual child victims waiting to be rescued.

That number might lend people to think: Come on, that has to be an exaggeration. It is not. I have seen the evidence before my eyes: hundreds of thousands of sexual predators, each on a computer uploading pictures of child victims that they are sexually assaulting. Those maps described the truly harrowing environment.

Congress did what it was supposed to do. We acted. We passed H.R. 3845 and, the following year, passed its companion, S. 1738. This legislation established the National Internet Crimes Against Children—or ICAC—Task Force Program, a specialized group of law enforcement officials dedicated to the protection of our children.

In 2009 and 2010, Congress funded the ICAC Task Force at close to their full authorization levels of \$50 million per year. The task forces grew from 42 to 61, and arrests and child rescues doubled.

Literally thousands more predators were apprehended and children rescued. An untold number of sexual assaults were prevented by virtue of the fact that the most dangerous offenders were sitting behind bars, where they could no longer harm our children.

In 2011, however, the ICAC Task Force budget was slashed, cut from \$50 million to where it is today at \$27 million. So, with all due respect, I have to correct my colleagues. We are not funding the ICAC Task Force at authorized levels.

This cut remains intact, despite the fact that, as of August 2017, law enforcement has seen nearly a half million unique IP addresses trafficking in sexual abuse images in the U.S. That is hundreds of thousands of separate online sexual predators, and that number is only from January 2017 to August 31, 2017.

Even more heartbreaking, law enforcement officials tell us that the victims are getting younger, most under the age of 10, and the abuse is getting more sadistic. According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, 44 percent of the images, Mr. Speaker, they viewed in 2016 depicted sexual torture.

Law enforcement also tells us that only 7 percent of the top 100 traders on peer-to-peer networks trading these types of images are even under investigation.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just unacceptable; it is tragic. We owe our children much better than that. They deserve our help and a Congress that will do whatever it can to ensure their health and safety.

S. 782, the Senate version of a bill that I introduced in March of this year with my colleague and friend, LAMAR

SMITH, as the chairman kindly thanked us, reauthorizes the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force.

According to estimates, half of the arrests made by ICAC teams lead us to the door of a hands-on offender and, thus, a child waiting to be rescued.

The PROTECT Our Children reauthorization before us today will help us continue to provide the safety net we so desperately need by allowing these highly successful ICAC Task Forces to continue to support State and local law enforcement agencies.

While I applaud House leadership for making sure this crucial child rescue program and funding is not allowed to expire, I beseech my colleagues to also make sure that the ICAC Task Forces are fully funded. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I press for that every year.

We have to do better. We have to get as close to the authorization level as we can, because we actually rescue children with the more resources we put into this.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, we must give the protection of these children our full focus and efforts. Please think about these precious babies being victimized. If you are a parent—and many of us are—God forbid if it was your own child. It could be any of our children, because of the prevalence of our children being online.

Let's give these ICAC teams the resources they need to rescue as many children as possible. If we do that, thousands more innocent children will be protected from these unspeakable crimes. There, but for the grace of God, go our families and children.

I thank my Republican lead cosponsor, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, for teaming up with me again to reauthorize this for yet another 5 years for this critical issue. I urge my colleagues to support the PROTECT Our Children Act reauthorization.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the full committee and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for very instructive and important statements, particularly the plea that Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ made that we must reauthorize and, more importantly, fund these task forces, because they do, in fact, save lives.

Let me acknowledge the chairman of this committee for the collaboration on this bill, and let me again emphasize that we must make sure that it is authorized at the amount of money needed.

If there is ever an unfortunate and tragic example, it is that of the story of Alicia. She represents the Johnnys

and Marys and Tommys and Shirleys and Quamis and Lateshas and others across the Nation who fall victim to this kind of cruel and almost inhuman attack on our children, innocent as they are, smart as they are, using the internet as they do online for any number of reasons, but then wooed by a dastardly person who wants to do them harm.

The task forces that are now based upon knowledge, expertise, commitment, passion, and with number of staffing that they need, can really be for not only prevention, but the intervention to stop our children from falling victim.

So I ask my colleagues to support S. 782, the Providing Resources, Officers, and Technology to Eradicate Cyber Threats to Our Children Act of 2017—or the PROTECT Our Children Act—as quickly as possible so that it can move to the President's desk and, as well, that we continue the pathway not only of intervention and prevention, but completely ceasing the online violence against our children because we have been able to ensure that these individuals, in large numbers, are brought to justice. By that very point, they cease to survive and thrive on the internet.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of S. 782, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their strong bipartisan support and our staff on both sides of the aisle for their outstanding work on this very important legislation to reauthorize a program that I am very, very familiar with.

The sheriff of Bedford County, Virginia, has been a leading advocate for this program and has provided services in his sheriff's department that have protected thousands of children not just in our immediate region in southwest Virginia, but all across the country.

I am very, very familiar with the work that goes on, day in and day out, of training law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and others, as well as the detection and prosecution of individuals who would commit these heinous crimes. This bill has done as much as any I know to keep children safe on the internet.

This law and this bill are important to reauthorize for another 5 years. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 782, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ELDER ABUSE PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 178) to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 178

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—SUPPORTING FEDERAL CASES INVOLVING ELDER JUSTICE

Sec. 101. Supporting Federal cases involving elder justice.

TITLE II—IMPROVED DATA COLLECTION AND FEDERAL COORDINATION

Sec. 201. Establishment of best practices for local, State, and Federal data collection.

Sec. 202. Effective interagency coordination and Federal data collection.

TITLE III—ENHANCED VICTIM ASSISTANCE TO ELDER ABUSE SURVIVORS

Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate.

Sec. 302. Report.

TITLE IV—ROBERT MATAVA ELDER ABUSE PROSECUTION ACT OF 2017

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Enhanced penalty for telemarketing and email marketing fraud directed at elders.

Sec. 403. Training and technical assistance for States.

Sec. 404. Interstate initiatives.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 501. Court-appointed guardianship oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009.

Sec. 502. GAO reports.

Sec. 503. Outreach to State and local law enforcement agencies.

Sec. 504. Model power of attorney legislation.

Sec. 505. Best practices and model legislation for guardianship proceedings.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the terms “abuse”, “adult protective services”, “elder”, “elder justice”, “exploitation”, “law enforcement”, and “neglect” have the meanings given those terms in section 2011 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397j);

(2) the term “elder abuse” includes abuse, neglect, and exploitation of an elder; and

(3) the term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

TITLE I—SUPPORTING FEDERAL CASES INVOLVING ELDER JUSTICE

SEC. 101. SUPPORTING FEDERAL CASES INVOLVING ELDER JUSTICE.

(a) SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE.—

(1) ELDER JUSTICE COORDINATORS.—The Attorney General shall designate in each Federal judicial district not less than one Assistant United States Attorney to serve as the Elder Justice Coordinator for the district, who, in addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

(A) serving as the legal counsel for the Federal judicial district on matters relating to elder abuse;

(B) prosecuting, or assisting in the prosecution of, elder abuse cases;

(C) conducting public outreach and awareness activities relating to elder abuse; and

(D) ensuring the collection of data required to be collected under section 202.

(2) INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall, with respect to crimes relating to elder abuse, ensure the implementation of a regular and comprehensive training program to train agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the investigation and prosecution of such crimes and the enforcement of laws related to elder abuse, which shall include—

(A) specialized strategies for communicating with and assisting elder abuse victims; and

(B) relevant forensic training relating to elder abuse.

(3) RESOURCE GROUP.—The Attorney General, through the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, shall ensure the operation of a resource group to facilitate the sharing of knowledge, experience, sample pleadings and other case documents, training materials, and any other resources to assist prosecutors throughout the United States in pursuing cases relating to elder abuse.

(4) DESIGNATED ELDER JUSTICE WORKING GROUP OR SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, shall establish a subcommittee or working group to the Attorney General's Advisory Committee of United States Attorneys, as established under section 0.10 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, for the purposes of advising the Attorney General on policies of the Department of Justice relating to elder abuse.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ELDER JUSTICE COORDINATOR.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate an Elder Justice Coordinator within the Department of Justice who, in addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

(1) coordinating and supporting the law enforcement efforts and policy activities for the Department of Justice on elder justice issues;

(2) evaluating training models to determine best practices and creating or compiling and making publicly available replication guides and training materials for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges,

emergency responders, individuals working in victim services, adult protective services, social services, and public safety, medical personnel, mental health personnel, financial services personnel, and any other individuals whose work may bring them in contact with elder abuse regarding how to—

(A) conduct investigations in elder abuse cases;

(B) address evidentiary issues and other legal issues; and

(C) appropriately assess, respond to, and interact with victims and witnesses in elder abuse cases, including in administrative, civil, and criminal judicial proceedings; and

(3) carrying out such other duties as the Attorney General determines necessary in connection with enhancing the understanding, prevention, and detection of, and response to, elder abuse.

(c) FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(1) FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ELDER JUSTICE COORDINATOR.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission shall designate within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission an Elder Justice Coordinator who, in addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

(A) coordinating and supporting the enforcement and consumer education efforts and policy activities of the Federal Trade Commission on elder justice issues; and

(B) serving as, or ensuring the availability of, a central point of contact for individuals, units of local government, States, and other Federal agencies on matters relating to the enforcement and consumer education efforts and policy activities of the Federal Trade Commission on elder justice issues.

(2) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and once every year thereafter, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General shall each submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report detailing the enforcement actions taken by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, respectively, over the preceding year in each case in which not less than one victim was an elder or that involved a financial scheme or scam that was either targeted directly toward or largely affected elders, including—

(A) the name of the district where the case originated;

(B) the style of the case, including the case name and number;

(C) a description of the scheme or scam; and

(D) the outcome of the case.

(d) USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

TITLE II—IMPROVED DATA COLLECTION AND FEDERAL COORDINATION

SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, shall—

(1) establish best practices for data collection to focus on elder abuse; and

(2) provide technical assistance to State, local, and tribal governments in adopting the best practices established under paragraph (1).

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall publish the best practices

established under subsection (a)(1) on the website of the Department of Justice in a publicly accessible manner.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or obligate compliance with the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 202. EFFECTIVE INTERAGENCY COORDINATION AND FEDERAL DATA COLLECTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, on an annual basis—

(1) collect from Federal law enforcement agencies, other agencies as appropriate, and Federal prosecutors' offices statistical data related to elder abuse cases, including cases or investigations where one or more victims were elders, or the case or investigation involved a financial scheme or scam that was either targeted directly toward or largely affected elders; and

(2) publish on the website of the Department of Justice in a publicly accessible manner—

(A) a summary of the data collected under paragraph (1); and

(B) recommendations for collecting additional data relating to elder abuse, including recommendations for ways to improve data reporting across Federal, State, and local agencies.

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—The data collected under subsection (a)(1) shall include—

(1) the total number of investigations initiated by Federal law enforcement agencies, other agencies as appropriate, and Federal prosecutors' offices related to elder abuse;

(2) the total number and types of elder abuse cases filed in Federal courts; and

(3) for each case described in paragraph (2)—

(A) the name of the district where the case originated;

(B) the style of the case, including the case name and number;

(C) a description of the act or acts giving rise to the elder abuse;

(D) in the case of a scheme or scam, a description of such scheme or scam giving rise to the elder abuse;

(E) information about each alleged perpetrator of the elder abuse; and

(F) the outcome of the case.

(c) **HHS REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, on an annual basis, provide to the Attorney General statistical data collected by the Secretary relating to elder abuse cases investigated by adult protective services, which shall be included in the summary published under subsection (a)(2).

(d) **PROHIBITION ON INDIVIDUAL DATA.**—None of the information reported under this section shall include specific individually identifiable data.

TITLE III—ENHANCED VICTIM ASSISTANCE TO ELDER ABUSE SURVIVORS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The vast majority of cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older adults in the United States go unidentified and unreported.

(2) Not less than \$2,900,000,000 is taken from older adults each year due to financial abuse and exploitation.

(3) Elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation have no boundaries and cross all racial, social, class, gender, and geographic lines.

(4) Older adults who are abused are 3 times more likely to die earlier than older adults of the same age who are not abused.

(5) Up to half of all older adults with dementia will experience abuse.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) elder abuse involves the exploitation of potentially vulnerable individuals with devastating physical, mental, emotional, and financial consequences to the victims and their loved ones;

(2) to combat this affront to America's older adults, we must do everything possible to both support victims of elder abuse and prevent the abuse from occurring in the first place; and

(3) the Senate supports a multipronged approach to prevent elder abuse and exploitation, protect the victims of elder abuse and exploitation from further harm, and bring the perpetrators of such crimes to justice.

SEC. 302. REPORT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the collection of statistical data under section 202(a)(1) begins and once each year thereafter, the Director of the Office for Victims of Crime shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that addresses, to the extent data are available, the nature, extent, and amount of funding under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601 et seq.) for victims of crime who are elders.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of victims' assistance, victims' compensation, and discretionary grants under which elder abuse victims (including elder victims of financial abuse, financial exploitation, and fraud) received assistance; and

(2) recommendations for improving services for victims of elder abuse.

TITLE IV—ROBERT MATAVA ELDER ABUSE PROSECUTION ACT OF 2017

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Robert Matava Elder Abuse Prosecution Act of 2017".

SEC. 402. ENHANCED PENALTY FOR TELEMARKETING AND EMAIL MARKETING FRAUD DIRECTED AT ELDERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 113A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the chapter heading, by inserting "**AND EMAIL MARKETING**" after "**TELEMARKETING**";

(2) by striking section 2325 and inserting the following:

"§ 2325. Definition

"In this chapter, the term 'telemarketing or email marketing'—

"(1) means a plan, program, promotion, or campaign that is conducted to induce—

"(A) purchases of goods or services;

"(B) participation in a contest or sweepstakes;

"(C) a charitable contribution, donation, or gift of money or any other thing of value;

"(D) investment for financial profit;

"(E) participation in a business opportunity;

"(F) commitment to a loan; or

"(G) participation in a fraudulent medical study, research study, or pilot study,

by use of one or more interstate telephone calls, emails, text messages, or electronic instant messages initiated either by a person who is conducting the plan, program, promotion, or campaign or by a prospective purchaser or contest or sweepstakes participant or charitable contributor, donor, or investor; and

"(2) does not include the solicitation through the posting, publication, or mailing of a catalog or brochure that—

"(A) contains a written description or illustration of the goods, services, or other opportunities being offered;

"(B) includes the business address of the solicitor;

"(C) includes multiple pages of written material or illustration; and

"(D) has been issued not less frequently than once a year,

if the person making the solicitation does not solicit customers by telephone, email, text message, or electronic instant message, but only receives interstate telephone calls, emails, text messages, or electronic instant messages initiated by customers in response to the written materials, whether in hard copy or digital format, and in response to those interstate telephone calls, emails, text messages, or electronic instant messages does not conduct further solicitation.";

(3) in section 2326, in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "or 1344" and inserting "1344, or 1347 or section 1128B of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7b)"; and

(B) by inserting "or email marketing" after "telemarketing"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2328. Mandatory forfeiture

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The court, in imposing sentence on a person who is convicted of any offense for which an enhanced penalty is provided under section 2326, shall order that the defendant forfeit to the United States—

"(1) any property, real or personal, constituting or traceable to gross proceeds obtained from such offense; and

"(2) any equipment, software, or other technology used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate the commission of such offense.

"(b) **PROCEDURES.**—The procedures set forth in section 413 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853), other than subsection (d) of that section, and in Rule 32.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, shall apply to all stages of a criminal forfeiture proceeding under this section."

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) The table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 113A and inserting the following:

"113A. Telemarketing and email marketing fraud 2325".

(2) The table of sections for chapter 113A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2327 the following:

"2328. Mandatory forfeiture."

SEC. 403. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATES.

The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and in coordination with the Elder Justice Coordinating Council (established under section 2021 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397k)), shall create, compile, evaluate, and disseminate materials and information, and provide the necessary training and technical assistance, to assist States and units of local government in—

(1) investigating, prosecuting, pursuing, preventing, understanding, and mitigating the impact of—

(A) physical, sexual, and psychological abuse of elders;

(B) exploitation of elders, including financial abuse and scams targeting elders; and

(C) neglect of elders; and

(2) assessing, addressing, and mitigating the physical and psychological trauma to victims of elder abuse.

SEC. 404. INTERSTATE INITIATIVES.

(a) **INTERSTATE AGREEMENTS AND COMPACTS.**—The consent of Congress is given to any two or more States (acting through State agencies with jurisdiction over adult protective services) to enter into agreements or compacts for cooperative effort and mutual assistance—

(1) in promoting the safety and well-being of elders; and

(2) in enforcing their respective laws and policies to promote such safety and well-being.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS ON INTERSTATE COMMUNICATION.**—The Executive Director of the State Justice Institute, in consultation with State or local adult protective services, aging, social, and human services and law enforcement agencies, nationally recognized nonprofit associations with expertise in data sharing among criminal justice agencies and familiarity with the issues raised in elder abuse cases, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit to Congress legislative proposals relating to the facilitation of interstate agreements and compacts.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. COURT-APPOINTED GUARDIANSHIP OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ELDER JUSTICE ACT OF 2009.

Section 2042(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397m–1(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “(and, in the case of demonstration programs described in paragraph (2)(E), to the highest courts of States)” after “States”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “(and the highest courts of States, in the case of demonstration programs described in subparagraph (E))” after “local units of government”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D), the following new subparagraph:

“(E) subject to paragraph (3), programs to assess the fairness, effectiveness, timeliness, safety, integrity, and accessibility of adult guardianship and conservatorship proceedings, including the appointment and the monitoring of the performance of court-appointed guardians and conservators, and to implement changes deemed necessary as a result of the assessments such as mandating background checks for all potential guardians and conservators, and implementing systems to enable the annual accountings and other required conservatorship and guardianship filings to be completed, filed, and reviewed electronically in order to simplify the filing process for conservators and guardians and better enable courts to identify discrepancies and detect fraud and the exploitation of protected persons; or”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

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

“(3) **REQUIREMENTS FOR COURT-APPOINTED GUARDIANSHIP OVERSIGHT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.**—

“(A) **AWARD OF GRANTS.**—In awarding grants to the highest courts of States for demonstration programs described in paragraph (2)(E), the Secretary shall consider the recommendations of the Attorney General

and the State Justice Institute, as established by section 203 of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10702).

“(B) **COLLABORATION.**—The highest court of a State awarded a grant to conduct a demonstration program described in paragraph (2)(E) shall collaborate with the State Unit on Aging for the State and the Adult Protective Services agency for the State in conducting the demonstration program.”;

(5) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section), by inserting “(and, in the case of demonstration programs described in paragraph (2)(E), the highest court of a State)” after “a State”;

(6) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by inserting “(or, in the case of demonstration programs described in paragraph (2)(E), the highest court of a State)” after “State” each place it appears.

SEC. 502. GAO REPORTS.

(a) **ELDER JUSTICE RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review existing Federal programs and initiatives in the Federal criminal justice system relevant to elder justice and shall submit to Congress—

(1) a report on such programs and initiatives; and

(2) any recommendations the Comptroller General determines are appropriate to improve elder justice in the United States.

(b) **REPORT ON ELDER ABUSE AND INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL ENTERPRISES.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) Federal Government efforts to monitor—

(A) the exploitation of older adults of the United States in global drug trafficking schemes and other international criminal enterprises;

(B) the extent to which exploitation of older adults of the United States by international criminal enterprises has resulted in the incarceration of these citizens of the United States in foreign countries; and

(C) the total annual number of elder abuse cases pending in the United States; and

(2) the results of intervention by the United States with foreign officials on behalf of citizens of the United States who are elder abuse victims in international criminal enterprises.

SEC. 503. OUTREACH TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

The Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on efforts by the Department of Justice to conduct outreach to State and local law enforcement agencies on the process for collaborating with the Federal Government for the purpose of investigating and prosecuting interstate and international elder financial exploitation cases.

SEC. 504. MODEL POWER OF ATTORNEY LEGISLATION.

The Attorney General shall publish model power of attorney legislation for the purpose of preventing elder abuse.

SEC. 505. BEST PRACTICES AND MODEL LEGISLATION FOR GUARDIANSHIP PROCEEDINGS.

The Attorney General shall publish best practices for improving guardianship proceedings and model legislation relating to guardianship proceedings for the purpose of preventing elder abuse.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 178, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 178, the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act, takes several steps to protect American seniors from financial exploitation and physical abuse. This legislation promotes the investigation and prosecution of perpetrators who prey upon seniors, enhances data collection, and provides resources for robust elder abuse prevention programs.

Some estimate that approximately 1 in 10 senior citizens are abused annually, but only 1 in 23 cases of elder abuse are reported to authorities each year. At least \$2.9 billion is taken from older adults each year due to financial abuse and exploitation.

The abuse of these vulnerable victims causes devastating physical, mental, emotional, and financial consequences to the victims and their loved ones, and we must combat this injustice.

This bill requires each U.S. Attorney's Office to appoint an elder justice coordinator and requires the FBI to provide specialized training to agents relating to the investigation of elder abuse crimes. It mandates that both the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission designate an elder justice coordinator.

It strengthens criminal laws to ensure that offenders who seek to exploit seniors through fraudulent email marketing are appropriately punished, and it enhances data collection on crimes against senior citizens so we can one day understand the full scope of this problem.

I believe it was Mahatma Gandhi who said: “A nation's greatness is measured by how it treats its weakest members.” We must ensure that appropriate measures are taken to protect our senior citizens, and that is precisely what this bill aims to do.

This bill passed the Senate unanimously, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in similar fashion.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the committee, for his work on this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 178, the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his excellent work in this area.

This legislation would increase protections for elder abuse victims, which is very important, as a vast majority of cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older adults in the United States often go unreported and unaddressed.

Each year, nearly \$3 billion is taken from older adults due to financial abuse and exploitation, and this is happening across all racial, social, economic, gender, and geographic lines.

This important measure increases protections for victims by, first, ensuring support for Federal cases involving elder abuse. This support will include the requirement that the Attorney General designate at least one assistant United States attorney to serve as an elder justice coordinator in every judicial district to prosecute, train, assist with, and conduct public outreach on elder abuse.

Additionally, this measure would also require that the Executive Office for United States Attorneys operate an elder abuse resource group and a working group to advise the Justice Department on elder abuse issues.

Secondly, this measure would require the establishment of best practices for local, State, and Federal data collection to focus on elder abuse, including, for example, the total number of Federal investigations of elder abuse and locations where cases are filed.

Findings under this legislation include the fact that older adults who are abused are three times more likely to die earlier than older adults of the same age who are not abused, and that up to half of all older adults with dementia will experience abuse.

For these reasons, a third component of this measure that I find extremely important and valuable is the enhanced victim assistance to elder abuse survivors. This measure would require that an annual report be submitted to Congress on the funding under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 for victims of crimes who are elders.

And finally, this measure adds a new definition of "telemarketing and email marketing" under the telemarketing statute to protect victims of such scams, which typically involve elders.

We must do everything possible to support victims of elder abuse and prevent the abuse from occurring in the first place. And so for these several reasons, I am very pleased to support the bill with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the elder abuse problem has dev-

astating consequences to the victims as well as their loved ones, and it is an affront to America's older adults. It involves the exploitation of some of our most vulnerable citizens.

This measure includes a multipronged approach to prevent elder abuse and exploitation, protect the victims of elder abuse and exploitation from further harm, and bring the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. Accordingly, I am pleased to urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to again thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work on this important legislation to help protect senior citizens from crime.

I know, from experience, that there are many, many senior citizens who become victims of online, on-telephone, and other forms of fraud perpetrated upon them; and this legislation helps to provide resources and appropriate punishments, to detect the people who perpetrate these crimes and to bring them to justice, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 178.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 548, I call up the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 36

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act".

SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ENACTMENT.

Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Pain receptors (nociceptors) are present throughout the unborn child's entire body and nerves link these receptors to the brain's thalamus and subcortical plate by no later than 20 weeks after fertilization.

(2) By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch. After 20 weeks, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that

would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human, for example, by recoiling.

(3) In the unborn child, application of such painful stimuli is associated with significant increases in stress hormones known as the stress response.

(4) Subjection to such painful stimuli is associated with long-term harmful neurodevelopmental effects, such as altered pain sensitivity and, possibly, emotional, behavioral, and learning disabilities later in life.

(5) For the purposes of surgery on unborn children, fetal anesthesia is routinely administered and is associated with a decrease in stress hormones compared to their level when painful stimuli are applied without such anesthesia. In the United States, surgery of this type is being performed by 20 weeks after fertilization and earlier in specialized units affiliated with children's hospitals.

(6) The position, asserted by some physicians, that the unborn child is incapable of experiencing pain until a point later in pregnancy than 20 weeks after fertilization predominately rests on the assumption that the ability to experience pain depends on the cerebral cortex and requires nerve connections between the thalamus and the cortex. However, recent medical research and analysis, especially since 2007, provides strong evidence for the conclusion that a functioning cortex is not necessary to experience pain.

(7) Substantial evidence indicates that children born missing the bulk of the cerebral cortex, those with hydranencephaly, nevertheless experience pain.

(8) In adult humans and in animals, stimulation or ablation of the cerebral cortex does not alter pain perception, while stimulation or ablation of the thalamus does.

(9) Substantial evidence indicates that structures used for pain processing in early development differ from those of adults, using different neural elements available at specific times during development, such as the subcortical plate, to fulfill the role of pain processing.

(10) The position, asserted by some commentators, that the unborn child remains in a coma-like sleep state that precludes the unborn child experiencing pain is inconsistent with the documented reaction of unborn children to painful stimuli and with the experience of fetal surgeons who have found it necessary to sedate the unborn child with anesthesia to prevent the unborn child from engaging in vigorous movement in reaction to invasive surgery.

(11) Consequently, there is substantial medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain at least by 20 weeks after fertilization, if not earlier.

(12) It is the purpose of the Congress to assert a compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain.

(13) The compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain is intended to be separate from and independent of the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage of viability, and neither governmental interest is intended to replace the other.

(14) Congress has authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Supreme Court's Commerce Clause

precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

SEC. 3. PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

“SEC. 1532. PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION.

“(a) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful for any person to perform an abortion or attempt to do so, unless in conformity with the requirements set forth in subsection (b).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ABORTIONS.—

“(1) ASSESSMENT OF THE AGE OF THE UNBORN CHILD.—The physician performing or attempting the abortion shall first make a determination of the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child or reasonably rely upon such a determination made by another physician. In making such a determination, the physician shall make such inquiries of the pregnant woman and perform or cause to be performed such medical examinations and tests as a reasonably prudent physician, knowledgeable about the case and the medical conditions involved, would consider necessary to make an accurate determination of post-fertilization age.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN ABORTIONS.—

“(A) GENERALLY FOR UNBORN CHILDREN 20 WEEKS OR OLDER.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the abortion shall not be performed or attempted, if the probable post-fertilization age, as determined under paragraph (1), of the unborn child is 20 weeks or greater.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply if—

“(i) in reasonable medical judgment, the abortion is necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, but not including psychological or emotional conditions;

“(ii) the pregnancy is the result of rape against an adult woman, and at least 48 hours prior to the abortion—

“(I) she has obtained counseling for the rape; or

“(II) she has obtained medical treatment for the rape or an injury related to the rape; or

“(iii) the pregnancy is a result of rape against a minor or incest against a minor, and the rape or incest has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to either—

“(I) a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse; or

“(II) a law enforcement agency.

“(C) REQUIREMENT AS TO MANNER OF PROCEDURE PERFORMED.—Notwithstanding the definitions of ‘abortion’ and ‘attempt an abortion’ in this section, a physician terminating or attempting to terminate a pregnancy under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) may do so only in the manner which, in reasonable medical judgment, provides the best opportunity for the unborn child to survive.

“(D) REQUIREMENT THAT A PHYSICIAN TRAINED IN NEONATAL RESUSCITATION BE PRESENT.—If, in reasonable medical judgment, the pain-capable unborn child has the potential to survive outside the womb, the physician who performs or attempts an abortion under an exception provided by subpara-

graph (B) shall ensure a second physician trained in neonatal resuscitation is present and prepared to provide care to the child consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (E).

“(E) CHILDREN BORN ALIVE AFTER ATTEMPTED ABORTIONS.—When a physician performs or attempts an abortion in accordance with this section, and the child is born alive, as defined in section 8 of title 1 (commonly known as the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002), the following shall apply:

“(i) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED.—Any health care practitioner present at the time shall humanely exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to a child born alive at the same gestational age in the course of a natural birth.

“(ii) IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Following the care required to be rendered under clause (i), the child born alive shall be immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

“(iii) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician's office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of this subparagraph must immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency or both.

“(F) DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) DOCUMENTATION PERTAINING TO ADULTS.—A physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B)(ii) shall, prior to the abortion, place in the patient medical file documentation from a hospital licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, a medical clinic licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, from a personal physician licensed by the State, a counselor licensed by the State, or a victim's rights advocate provided by a law enforcement agency that the adult woman seeking the abortion obtained medical treatment or counseling for the rape or an injury related to the rape.

“(ii) DOCUMENTATION PERTAINING TO MINORS.—A physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B)(iii) shall, prior to the abortion, place in the patient medical file documentation from a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse that the rape or incest was reported prior to the abortion; or, as an alternative, documentation from a law enforcement agency that the rape or incest was reported prior to the abortion.

“(G) INFORMED CONSENT.—

“(i) CONSENT FORM REQUIRED.—The physician who intends to perform or attempt to perform an abortion under the provisions of subparagraph (B) may not perform any part of the abortion procedure without first obtaining a signed Informed Consent Authorization form in accordance with this subparagraph.

“(ii) CONTENT OF CONSENT FORM.—The Informed Consent Authorization form shall be presented in person by the physician and shall consist of—

“(I) a statement by the physician indicating the probable post-fertilization age of the pain-capable unborn child;

“(II) a statement that Federal law allows abortion after 20 weeks fetal age only if the mother's life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury,

when the pregnancy was the result of rape, or an act of incest against a minor;

“(III) a statement that the abortion must be performed by the method most likely to allow the child to be born alive unless this would cause significant risk to the mother;

“(IV) a statement that in any case in which an abortion procedure results in a child born alive, Federal law requires that child to be given every form of medical assistance that is provided to children spontaneously born prematurely, including transportation and admittance to a hospital;

“(V) a statement that these requirements are binding upon the physician and all other medical personnel who are subject to criminal and civil penalties and that a woman on whom an abortion has been performed may take civil action if these requirements are not followed; and

“(VI) affirmation that each signer has filled out the informed consent form to the best of their knowledge and understands the information contained in the form.

“(iii) SIGNATORIES REQUIRED.—The Informed Consent Authorization form shall be signed in person by the woman seeking the abortion, the physician performing or attempting to perform the abortion, and a witness.

“(iv) RETENTION OF CONSENT FORM.—The physician performing or attempting to perform an abortion must retain the signed informed consent form in the patient's medical file.

“(H) REQUIREMENT FOR DATA RETENTION.—Paragraph (j)(2) of section 164.530 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall apply to documentation required to be placed in a patient's medical file pursuant to subparagraph (F) of subsection (b)(2) and a consent form required to be retained in a patient's medical file pursuant to subparagraph (G) of such subsection in the same manner and to the same extent as such paragraph applies to documentation required by paragraph (j)(1) of such section.

“(I) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) IN CASES OF RISK OF DEATH OR MAJOR INJURY TO THE MOTHER.—Subparagraphs (C), (D), and (G) shall not apply if, in reasonable medical judgment, compliance with such paragraphs would pose a greater risk of—

“(I) the death of the pregnant woman; or

“(II) the substantial and irreversible physical impairment of a major bodily function, not including psychological or emotional conditions, of the pregnant woman.

“(ii) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.—Notwithstanding the definitions of the terms ‘medical treatment’ and ‘counseling’ in subsection (g), the counseling or medical treatment described in subparagraph (B)(ii) may not be provided by a facility that performs abortions (unless that facility is a hospital).

“(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION IN CASES OF REPORTS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—The requirements of subparagraph (B)(ii) do not apply if the rape has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to a law enforcement agency or Department of Defense victim assistance personnel.

“(iv) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN STATE LAWS.—

“(I) STATE LAWS REGARDING REPORTING OF RAPE AND INCEST.—The physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) shall comply with such applicable State laws that are in effect as the State's Attorney General may designate, regarding reporting requirements in cases of rape or incest.

“(II) STATE LAWS REGARDING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT.—The physician who intends to perform an abortion on a minor under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) shall comply with any applicable State laws requiring parental involvement in a minor's decision to have an abortion.

“(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(d) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—A woman upon whom an abortion in violation of subsection (a) is performed or attempted may not be prosecuted under, or for a conspiracy to violate, subsection (a), or for an offense under section 2, 3, or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

“(e) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

“(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—A woman upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted in violation of any provision of this section may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

“(2) CIVIL ACTION BY A PARENT OF A MINOR ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—A parent of a minor upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted under an exception provided for in subsection (b)(2)(B), and that was performed in violation of any provision of this section may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation obtain appropriate relief, unless the pregnancy resulted from the plaintiff's criminal conduct.

“(3) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

“(A) objectively verifiable money damages for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation;

“(B) statutory damages equal to three times the cost of the abortion; and

“(C) punitive damages.

“(4) ATTORNEYS FEES FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

“(5) ATTORNEYS FEES FOR DEFENDANT.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff's suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

“(6) AWARDS AGAINST WOMAN.—Except under paragraph (5), in a civil action under this subsection, no damages, attorney's fee or other monetary relief may be assessed against the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted.

“(f) DATA COLLECTION.—

“(1) DATA SUBMISSIONS.—Any physician who performs or attempts an abortion described in subsection (b)(2)(B) shall annually submit a summary of all such abortions to the National Center for Health Statistics (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Center’) not later than 60 days after the end of the calendar year in which the abortion was performed or attempted.

“(2) CONTENTS OF SUMMARY.—The summary shall include the number of abortions performed or attempted on an unborn child who had a post-fertilization age of 20 weeks or more and specify the following for each abortion under subsection (b)(2)(B)—

“(A) the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child;

“(B) the method used to carry out the abortion;

“(C) the location where the abortion was conducted;

“(D) the exception under subsection (b)(2)(B) under which the abortion was conducted; and

“(E) any incident of live birth resulting from the abortion.

“(3) EXCLUSIONS FROM DATA SUBMISSIONS.—A summary required under this subsection shall not contain any information identifying the woman whose pregnancy was terminated and shall be submitted consistent with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d-2 note).

“(4) PUBLIC REPORT.—The Center shall annually issue a public report providing statistics by State for the previous year compiled from all of the summaries made to the Center under this subsection. The Center shall take care to ensure that none of the information included in the public reports could reasonably lead to the identification of any pregnant woman upon whom an abortion was performed or attempted. The annual report shall be issued by July 1 of the calendar year following the year in which the abortions were performed or attempted.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

“(1) ABORTION.—The term ‘abortion’ means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

“(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

“(B) to intentionally terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—

“(i) after viability to produce a live birth and preserve the life and health of the child born alive; or

“(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

“(2) ATTEMPT.—The term ‘attempt’, with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in performing an abortion.

“(3) COUNSELING.—The term ‘counseling’ means counseling provided by a counselor licensed by the State, or a victims rights advocate provided by a law enforcement agency.

“(4) FACILITY.—The term ‘facility’ means any medical or counseling group, center or clinic and includes the entire legal entity, including any entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such facility.

“(5) FERTILIZATION.—The term ‘fertilization’ means the fusion of human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

“(6) MEDICAL TREATMENT.—The term ‘medical treatment’ means treatment provided at a hospital licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, at a medical clinic licensed by the State or operated under authority of a Federal agency, or from a personal physician licensed by the State.

“(7) MINOR.—The term ‘minor’ means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

“(8) PERFORM.—The term ‘perform’, with respect to an abortion, includes inducing an abortion through a medical or chemical intervention including writing a prescription for a drug or device intended to result in an abortion.

“(9) PHYSICIAN.—The term ‘physician’ means a person licensed to practice medicine and surgery or osteopathic medicine and surgery, or otherwise legally authorized to perform an abortion.

“(10) POST-FERTILIZATION AGE.—The term ‘post-fertilization age’ means the age of the

unborn child as calculated from the fusion of a human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

“(11) PROBABLE POST-FERTILIZATION AGE OF THE UNBORN CHILD.—The term ‘probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child’ means what, in reasonable medical judgment, will with reasonable probability be the post-fertilization age of the unborn child at the time the abortion is planned to be performed or induced.

“(12) REASONABLE MEDICAL JUDGMENT.—The term ‘reasonable medical judgment’ means a medical judgment that would be made by a reasonably prudent physician, knowledgeable about the case and the treatment possibilities with respect to the medical conditions involved.

“(13) UNBORN CHILD.—The term ‘unborn child’ means an individual organism of the species homo sapiens, beginning at fertilization, until the point of being born alive as defined in section 8(b) of title 1.

“(14) WOMAN.—The term ‘woman’ means a female human being whether or not she has reached the age of majority.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1532. Pain-capable unborn child protection.”

(c) CHAPTER HEADING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER HEADING IN CHAPTER.—The chapter heading for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “**Partial-Birth Abortions**” and inserting “**Abortions**”.

(2) TABLE OF CHAPTERS FOR PART I.—The item relating to chapter 74 in the table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “**Partial-Birth Abortions**” and inserting “**Abortions**”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 36.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, also known as Micah's Law.

This bill prohibits most elective abortions at 20 weeks after fertilization and thereafter. That is the beginning of the fifth month of pregnancy. That is the point in a pregnancy when a substantial body of medical evidence shows that a baby in the womb can feel pain.

H.R. 36 is humane legislation for innocent babies and for mothers. It includes exceptions for the life of the mother and exceptions in the case of rape and incest. Additionally, this bill

imposes criminal liability only on the medical professional performing that abortion, not on the mother.

Mr. Speaker, there is broad consensus within the medical community babies at 5 months in the womb are not only able to feel pain, they can hear music. They can even respond to human voices.

America is one of only seven countries in the world that still allows elective late-term abortions, joining North Korea and China.

Today, we understand so much more about a baby's development during a pregnancy. Voluntarily terminating the life of an innocent baby when we know that baby can feel pain can no longer be acceptable, and a majority of Americans agree.

Hearts and minds are changing. How many of us have marveled at the vivid sonogram images of a soon-to-be-born son, niece, or grandchild? How many of us have been amazed and so very grateful that babies born early, as early as 20 weeks, have a very real chance of survival?

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, this bill reflects today's medical understanding about a baby's ability to feel pain. Micah's Law reflects those changing hearts and minds of Americans. Micah's Law reflects the higher aspirations of this Nation, a truly moral nation, to foster a culture of life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 36.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks today by extending my condolences to the family and friends of the 59 individuals killed in the shooting in Las Vegas, and I express my best hopes for the recovery of the more than 500 persons who were injured.

This Congress has a responsibility to find a way to prevent tragedies like this, as well as the daily incidents of gun violence in our communities, but instead of considering legislation to prevent gun violence, the House is spending today pushing a 20-week abortion ban that will disproportionately hurt women and families who face some of the most medically complex situations imaginable.

So it is with great pleasure that I oppose H.R. 36, because it is a dangerous and far-reaching attack on a woman's constitutional right to choose whether or not to terminate a pregnancy.

Roe v. Wade's basic holding is that a woman has a constitutional right to have an abortion prior to the fetus' viability, which is generally considered by the experts to be around 24 weeks from fertilization. By banning previability abortions, H.R. 36 is a direct challenge to Roe.

Another serious flaw, in my view, of H.R. 36 is that its narrow rape exception completely misconstrues the difficult challenges that survivors of sexual assault face and the very real reasons why a rape or incest may go unreported. So by requiring that a rape or incest survivor provide documentation to corroborate her statement that she was raped, the bill's sponsors seem to be saying that maybe women cannot be trusted to tell the truth about sexual assault, and they certainly cannot be trusted to make their own private healthcare decisions.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous and mean-spirited legislation.

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

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), my esteemed colleague, the Judiciary Committee chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, since the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade, medical knowledge regarding the development of unborn babies and their capacities at various stages of growth has advanced dramatically.

To give you a sense of how much technology has advanced, the issue of The New York Times announcing the Roe v. Wade decision, in 1973, contained ads for the latest in technology, including a computer the size of a file cabinet that you could rent for \$3,000 a month that only had a fraction, thousandths, of the memory of a modern cellphone, and a basic AM radio that was as big as your hand.

At the time, there was nothing like the stunningly detailed images of unborn children that are so commonly celebrated on social media today.

Close to 45 years later, in the age of ultrasound pictures, the same newspaper reported on the latest research on the pain experienced by unborn children, focusing on that of Dr. Sunny Anand, an Oxford-trained neonatal pediatrician who held an appointment at Harvard Medical School.

As Dr. Anand has testified regarding abortions: "If the fetus is beyond 20 weeks of gestation, I would assume that there will be pain caused to the fetus. And I believe it will be severe and excruciating pain."

Congress has the power, and the responsibility, to acknowledge these developments in our understanding of the ability of unborn children to feel pain by prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks' pregnancy postfertilization, the point at which scientific evidence shows the unborn can experience great suffering. The bill before us does just that, and, in doing so, it saves lives.

In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office is so confident that this bill would save lives that it took the rare step of estimating the

number of lives that would be saved if this bill is enacted. The CBO conservatively estimates that this bill would save over 2,000 lives each year, giving America the gift of thousands more children with all the wondrous human gifts they will bring to the world in so many amazing forms for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Judiciary Committee member TRENT FRANKS for introducing this vital legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill both on behalf of unborn children and on behalf of the voters you represent, who overwhelmingly support this legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time to speak on this important subject. While it is important, it is also embarrassing somewhat to us, because I listen to the other side, and the first thing that the chairman does over here is he shows a New York Times ad. And because of The New York Times ad at the time of Roe v. Wade, he suggests that we should turn over Roe v. Wade because it is antiquated.

Well, in 1791, the Second Amendment was adopted, and we had pistols, and we had guns that you could shoot one bullet at a time; and yesterday, we had a man in Las Vegas with guns who could shoot "da da da da da da da da da" and kill 59 people and wound 500.

If you get me an ad from 1791, those weapons were not in that ad, but do they talk about changing the Second Amendment, do they talk about protecting Americans from that type of violence? No. They come here and talk about protecting the unborn, forgetting about the rights of women guaranteed them by Roe v. Wade, the law of the land, which is the law of the land that says viability comes at 24 weeks.

They talk about what they say are medical experts and a substantial body of medical evidence. What they don't tell you is the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists are against this bill, and there is no medical group or medical society in this country that is for this bill, but they know more about medicine and about pain for the unborn than do the doctors and the scientists.

They bring this to us, an unconstitutional bill, an unconstitutional bill that the CBO estimates will cost us from \$65 million to \$335 million over 10 years. Their concern about the budget goes out the window.

The truth of the matter is this goes back to the Rules Committee debate on this bill. We were told: It is popular; the polls show people want this.

This is a political bill that has had no hearing in the Judiciary Committee, had no markup in the Judiciary Committee. That is called regular

order, something we were promised by the Speaker, a new day in Congress. We were going to have opportunities for both sides to debate, the kind of things JOHN MCCAIN, a great American hero, sees as wrong in the Senate, which is just as wrong in the House: two sides coming together to debate, to vote, to amend, to discuss. No.

It comes straight to the floor because it is politically popular, more politically popular this week than having a bill to allow for silencers for weapons, which was going to be the bill du jour for this week, but it was pulled.

Instead, we got this unconstitutional law that flies in the face of *Roe v. Wade*, takes rights away from women and treats them without exceptions that are necessary to make a law proper concerning rape and incest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The bottom line is, this bill is unconstitutional, an attack on women's rights, an attack on the Constitution, and we should be looking at changes in our laws about guns and violence, at least mental health, something to respond to what happened in Las Vegas, instead of another moment of silence.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), my colleague and the lead sponsor of Micah's Law.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, for the sake of all of those who founded this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be, and for the sake of all of those since then who have died in darkness so that all of us as Americans could walk in the light of freedom in this moment, it is so very important that those of us who are privileged to be Members of this United States Congress pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation, said: "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only object of good government."

The phrase in the Fifth Amendment encapsulates our entire Constitution. It says, no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The 14th Amendment says, no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of all innocent Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are really all here, and yet today a great and tragic shadow looms over America.

More than 18,000 very-late-term abortions are occurring in America every

year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their little, pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia or Federal protection of any kind; this in the land of the free and the home of the brave. It is the greatest and most insidious human rights atrocity in the United States today.

Almost every other major civilized nation on Earth protects pain-capable unborn babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them, and yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

Madam Speaker, it seems like we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of a past generation. And how is it that sometimes we are so staggeringly blind when it comes to facing and rejecting the worst atrocities in our own time?

Today, Madam Speaker, I am especially thankful, because the winds of change are now beginning to blow and the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America.

There is a new leader who lives in the White House, and he is deeply committed to protecting the least of these, our little brothers and sisters.

Madam Speaker, today we are poised to pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber. No matter how it is shouted down or what distortions or deceptive what-ifs, distractions, divisions, gotchas, twisting of words, twisting of subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, this bill is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand, and ultimately it is a bill all humane Americans will support if they truly understand it for themselves.

□ 1615

Madam Speaker, this will be a vote that all of us remember for the rest of our lives. It will be a time now for the U.S. Senate to find the courage and humanity to take a stand for these, the most helpless of all human victims. The Senate's action will be considered in the annals of history and, I believe, in the counsels of eternity itself.

Madam Speaker, passing this bill really shouldn't be so hard because, in spite of all the political noise, protecting little pain-capable, unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue and it is not a Democratic issue. It is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

It is time for the Members of the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate to open our

eyes and our souls and remember that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are really all here. It is time for us, all of us as Americans, Madam Speaker, to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little pain-capable children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), the co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and also Ms. JAYAPAL for allowing me to speak today.

Madam Speaker, I rise for my former district director Chris and his wife, Bridget. This is their story.

Bridget was pregnant with their very much-wanted second child. After the 20th week, they were stunned to learn that the brain stem of the fetus was not attached, and if the baby even survived, then the newborn would likely die within hours. Doctors told the family, if they wanted more children, it would be a good idea to end the pregnancy. After consulting with their minister, they decided to do so.

The happy ending is that a year or so later another child was born, and she is happy and healthy today.

As co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus, I know that difficult circumstances always surround these highly personal decisions, and I don't think that the U.S. Congress is the body that should impose its opinion.

Just imagine the horrible choices families would have to make if H.R. 36 became law. Ninety-nine percent of abortions are conducted before the 20-week mark. Virtually all the rest are just like this situation.

Madam Speaker, I urge the body to reject this bill and to move on to important issues that are facing this country.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership.

I would also say to the last speaker, this affects that 1 percent that she was referring to.

Madam Speaker, life is precious. We are reminded of this in ways wonderful; we are reminded of this in ways difficult. Today, I rise in support of life. I rise in support of Micah's Law. I rise in recognition that advancements in technology today both reveal more about the stages of life as well as show us the promise for preserving it.

As unpleasant as it may be, technology reveals something to us about suffering. It now shows us that the unborn can feel pain inside the womb.

The science is in and the science is real. At 20 weeks old, ultrasound images reveal that unborn babies respond

to unwanted stimuli—to pain—the same exact way adults do: they recoil; they contract.

In cases of abortion, these unborn babies are feeling pain. They suffer. That is really hard to hear, and it is really hard to say. But now that we are seeing scientific evidence and proof that these babies are in pain, the question is: What do we do about it?

We can't claim ignorance. Their pain is no longer invisible to us, and we cannot say, as a society, with a good and upright conscience, that we can just continue to ignore it.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, sponsored by our colleague TRENT FRANKS, protects these babies by restricting abortion to 20 weeks after fertilization occurs, the point at which science has proven a baby can feel pain.

It is easy to turn a blind eye to the pain of others. For a moment, you think that if we just ignore it, it will go away and it doesn't exist. But our hearts and our minds are always going to remind us.

We cannot stop the pain of the world by turning away from it. We must not turn away from the pain of the most vulnerable among us, the ones who have nowhere to run to.

Madam Speaker, our humanity shines brightest when we stand up for those who are suffering, when we protect people from pain. I simply ask my colleagues, I implore my fellow Americans, let's be moved by this suffering. Let's also be inspired by life.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly urge a "no" vote on H.R. 36, and I rise today for Gina.

Gina, who lives in Seattle, found out at her 20-week ultrasound that the baby had multiple fetal anomalies, both cardiac and brain, that were fatal. The baby would either die before birth or within the first few days or weeks of life.

Gina decided to end the pregnancy, her constitutional right to make decisions about her own body. If Gina were in a different State with restrictive laws, she would not have been able to get the evidence-based and compassionate care that she deserved. This important, very personal decision was made between Gina and her doctor.

The Supreme Court has made it clear that it is her right, and yet our Republican colleagues continue to try to take that right away from Gina and other women in her position.

This bill not only takes healthcare decisions out of the hands of patients, but, Madam Speaker, it could penalize doctors with up to 5 years in prison for performing these abortions. This is unconscionable.

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

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, Gina and all women deserve to have access to care that is comprehensive and compassionate. Madam Speaker, on their behalf, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop these bans and support women like Gina to continue to have their constitutional rights and to make decisions about their own bodies.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

The United States currently stands alongside North Korea, China, and Vietnam as one of only seven countries that allow elective abortion to occur after 20 weeks postfertilization.

At this point in their life, unborn babies have a well-developed brain and nervous system as well as pain receptors. This fetal development is observed by surgeons who routinely see these unborn children react to pain. In fact, doctors administer anesthesia to these children in the womb during fetal surgeries.

I am proud to support this bill, also known as Micah's Law, because we must care for these unborn children, not cruelly inflict pain and deny them their inherent dignity by treating them as objects.

One day, I hope that a cultural life will take hold in the United States and that all children will be protected under the law. However, until that day comes, it remains my solemn duty to stand up for life. Regardless of the length of this journey, I will continue to speak for those who cannot.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to protect the Nation's most vulnerable children and ensure they are not subject to unimaginable pain and to affirm life by voting in favor of this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Phil and his wife, to tell their story.

Phil and his wife tried to get pregnant for several years. After fertility treatment, they were thrilled when his wife finally became pregnant with identical twins. Sadly, their twins were diagnosed with twin-twin transfusion syndrome, a deadly complication.

At week 21, Phil and his wife learned the devastating and frightening news that not only would both twins die, but that without an abortion, his wife was

at serious risk of suffering a ruptured uterus.

Their options were limited. Their doctor could not perform an abortion because he was affiliated with a Catholic hospital, and Phil's wife was unable to fly due to her high-risk pregnancy. Instead, they drove from their home in Missouri to Kansas to terminate the pregnancy by induced labor and delivery.

Phil and his wife were devastated. After the twins' deaths, Phil participated in a baptism and grieved their loss.

Phil wants lawmakers to know: "Decisions about abortion need to be made with the families and with the best medical information available." As he rightly puts it: "There is no one-size-fits-all situation for all pregnancies." Placing government limitations on the constitutionally protected healthcare options of American women and their families will only add heartache and tragedy to these most difficult and painful decisions.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of Phil and his family, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.)

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia for her leadership on this legislation, and I rise to support life.

Madam Speaker, this is about the values that define us as Americans. We see the potential in every life, and that includes the unborn. The Micah Act is life-affirming legislation that shows compassion for the baby and the mom.

Ten years ago, I received tough news that our son had Down syndrome, an extra 21st chromosome. The doctors told us it would be a long road ahead.

Today, I see more clearly. Too often others try to define a baby's future before they are even born. Part of being an American is not letting others define us.

I look at our son, Cole, and I see a healthy 10-year-old working his way through fifth grade. His life is different than we imagined—in a good way. He lights up a room. People are drawn to him. He plays sports and is in Cub Scouts. He is living a full life with huge potential.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this legislation that reflects our values and protects the sanctity of life, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding the time to me.

Madam Speaker, more than 40 years ago, the Supreme Court held that

women have the constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy prior to viability or at any time to protect the life and health of the mother. This bill is flatly unconstitutional on both counts.

The Supreme Court has blocked every other 20-week ban because 20 weeks is well before the point of viability. Further, the bill includes no exception for the health of the mother, only waiving the ban if a woman's life is at imminent risk, in clear violation of a woman's constitutional rights.

Shamefully, the bill places new and cruel restrictions even on women accessing abortion after rape or incest.

Once again, the Republicans are proclaiming the falsehood that 20-week-old fetuses can feel pain, contrary to the conclusions of every reputable researcher in the field.

What about women like Danielle from New York, who found out in the 29th week of her pregnancy that her baby's brain was dangerously deformed and that, if she and the baby were to survive the pregnancy, the baby would only live a short, extremely painful life.

Danielle and her husband had two young children and faced a heart-breaking decision: Should they put Danielle and their family through the pain and suffering of a dangerous pregnancy and birth and allow their baby to suffer and die in pain, or should she terminate the pregnancy and mourn their baby as a family?

The Constitution guarantees Danielle the right to make that choice with her family and her doctors. It does not grant that right to the politicians sitting in this room.

□ 1630

I will close with Danielle's words: "What my husband and I experienced was just so horrible. Unless people have walked in my shoes, they don't understand. I did what was right for my son and my family, and it's no one else's business."

On behalf of Danielle, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this horrible bill. We must stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman and physician from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, as a proud cosponsor, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Before coming to Congress, I worked as an OB/GYN physician for over 30 years, where I had the tremendous privilege to see life at all stages of development. Today's technology, like 3-D and 4-D ultrasound, has given us a window into that miracle that shows the unborn child is a living, feeling human being.

Due to medical achievements, premature babies are surviving and thriving after being born earlier and earlier, including babies born at or before 20

weeks, the 20-week cutoff by this bill. I can give you case after case. I have watched these children grow up in my hometown.

As a physician who has delivered almost 5,000 babies, it is unconscionable to me that our government allows innocent lives capable of feeling pain and enjoying life to be terminated. It is our responsibility as legislators to stand up and protect these lives who do not have a voice. This bill is an important step toward that goal, and I vote for life.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Stephanie from my district. This is her story.

Stephanie and her husband were building their family. They had one beautiful daughter when she got pregnant for the second time, a planned and wanted pregnancy.

But at 19 weeks, Stephanie got heart-breaking news. Her fetus had a devastating fatal birth defect. Based on her age, medical history, and test results, she was strongly advised to terminate the pregnancy.

Stephanie ultimately decided not to carry the pregnancy to term. She told me, through tears, that her daughter needed her mother, and it wasn't worth the risk. It is a profoundly difficult situation for any family, but it was their decision.

H.R. 36 punishes women like Stephanie. It takes personal medical decisions out of families' hands and lets politicians decide. It also places a cruel burden on survivors of sexual assault and child abuse. It is unacceptable.

On behalf of Stephanie, I urge my colleagues to vote "no." We must stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to address the House of Representatives on this issue, as I seek to do on each pro-life issue that we have come before this Congress.

This is a powerful piece of legislation that has had a lot of hands on it to produce good work; and the difference in this debate that you hear here, Mr. Speaker, is anecdotes on this side, looking for exceptions that might sway, somehow, the people on the side that understand the rule is this: life begins at the moment of conception.

Human life is sacred in all of its forms, and these little babies that are 20-weeks mature can and have and do survive outside the womb, and they can feel pain inside the womb. And doctors that are doing surgery on pregnant mothers give anesthetic to those children because they don't want them flinching in the womb and suffering while they do the surgery.

How can we support a ghastly procedure of abortion on demand to end the

life of the miracles that we need to put this country in the right condition?

Sixty-five percent of the babies 22 to 26 weeks old survive that are born premature. As I said, we know they feel pain.

So I applaud everyone who has done the work on this. I stand solidly with the entire pro-life movement we have in this country. We have a long ways to go to get to where we need to be, but this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to share Denise's story. Already a mother of two young children, Denise was expecting her third child. Until her 20-week scan, all her tests had come back perfectly. Her entire family was eagerly awaiting a baby boy.

The scan revealed that her son's brain had several severe deformities. He was also showing signs of other complications. It was the most painful and devastating day of Denise's life.

She spoke to numerous doctors and specialists. She spoke to her family and sought the guidance of counselors and professionals.

Ultimately, she and her husband decided to end the pregnancy. But finding a provider and arranging for the procedure was very difficult. There was not a single doctor in Virginia she could go to.

Denise, as a grieving mother in the middle of an absolutely emotional crisis, found herself desperately calling doctors and hospitals all over the country to access the medical care she needed. Thanks to a family friend, she was ultimately able to find a provider in a major city within driving distance. H.R. 36 would have denied her that chance.

On behalf of Denise and others like her, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because our family will welcome its first grandchild in the coming months. This is her 17-week ultrasound, and I cannot wait to meet her. This child is already known by her mother, Julia, quoting Psalm 139: "For You created my inmost being; You knit me together in my mother's womb."

Mr. Speaker, this child is a gift from God, a gift that we have far too often abandoned in this country.

Today, we know so much more. We know that, after 3 weeks, my granddaughter had a heartbeat. After 7 weeks, she began kicking her mother, like any good Wagner child would. By week 12, she could suck her thumb, and at week 20, my granddaughter knew the sound of her mother's voice and could feel pain.

Mr. Speaker, I stand for life, from conception to natural death. I stand for H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. And on behalf of my granddaughter, I will continue to fight for the day when abortion is not only illegal, but it is unthinkable.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for Dr. Danielle. Here's her story.

Dr. Danielle recently had three patients drive from North Carolina to Washington, D.C., to access abortion care. One patient from Winston was diagnosed with Edwards' syndrome just before 20 weeks. Edwards' syndrome has no treatment, and it is usually fatal before birth or within the first year of life.

Given the 72-hour waiting period in North Carolina, the patient would have passed State limits for when she could access abortion. She had to drive more than 6 hours to the Washington, D.C., area for her care.

North Carolina already has an awful 20-week ban. We don't need this ban nationwide.

On behalf of Dr. Danielle and the women she helped, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. Stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, last week I had the pleasure of meeting a young boy named Micah Pickering. He was cute and shy and, you know, as young boys often are, he would give me a high five, play around and run to where everybody had to catch him.

Now, he gave me this bracelet. You see, it says: "Miracles for Micah." And you know what? He is a miracle. He is strong. He was born prematurely at only 20 weeks. He spent the first 128 days of his life in a neonatal intensive care unit.

Though he could fit in the palm of your hand, his parents couldn't hold him at first. His skin was so sensitive, the slightest touch would cause little Micah intense pain. It didn't matter where he was. If he was in that intensive care unit, or if he was still waiting for that expected date to be born, he could feel, and he wanted to live.

The fact is that children at 20 weeks feel pain. Science increasingly shows it. The European Journal of Anesthesiology describes how it is critical to administer anesthesia during fetal surgery procedures.

You know, a standard text on human development, Patten's Foundations of Embryology, shows how the basics of the nervous system are formed by week 4.

Dr. Ronald Brusseau, of Boston's Children's Hospital, wrote that by week 18, children have developed sensory receptors for pain.

Two independent studies in 2006 used brain scans and showed unborn children respond to pain. These children have noses, eyes, and ears. You can hear their heartbeats and feel them move. They are human.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—I like to call it Micah's Law—is called what it is because children like Micah feel pain. Those children are strong, just like Micah is strong, and those children should be protected.

Now, I have to admit, Madam Speaker, across the aisle I do hear some beautiful speeches filled with compassion for the voiceless, the defenseless, and the marginalized. They are trying to speak for those who can't speak for themselves.

But what about Micah? What about the thousands of others like him, the same age he was born? What about the millions who were never given a chance?

Look into Micah's face—I think we all should—and tell me he isn't human. Look at him when he was born and tell me that child doesn't have a right to live.

We should care for the voiceless, for those whose cries of pain are never heard. We should care for the defenseless, for those who will only be saved if we act to protect them.

We should care for the marginalized, for those who have their very humanity denied, even as their noses, eyes, ears, and heartbeats, every movement are visible testaments of their lives.

These children need love. Their mothers need love. Let's end the pain. These children are suffering, so let's end the pain. These children want to live, so let's end their pain.

Micah is a beautiful kid, and there are millions of Micahs who will never smile; Micahs who will never walk; Micahs who will never scrape their knees and get into trouble; Micahs who will never learn to read; Micahs who will never fall in love and have children of their own; Micahs who will never have the chance to tell their mother and father: "I love you."

We will never know those Micahs. Our lives are poorer because their lives were cut short. But there are more. Instead of pain—instead of pain—we should fill them with love.

□ 1645

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise for Tori. This is her story:

Tori and her husband planned her pregnancy carefully to make sure that her maternity leave worked with her graduate studies, and they were thrilled that the plan right for their

family came together and they were pregnant.

At 20 weeks, during a routine ultrasound, they were devastated to learn that the fetus carried a rare disorder that resulted either in the death of the infant shortly after delivery, or a very shortened lifespan wrought with profound disability. Their situation was now out of control. It is one decision that no parent ever wants to have to make.

Their decision was agonizing: end the pregnancy after 20 weeks or watch their child die or suffer.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of Tori, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, a former abortionist, Dr. Levatino testified before Congress and described how he and other abortionists actually kill helpless babies. He killed 1,200 of them. He said: "Imagine, if you can, that you are a pro-choice OB-GYN like I was. Using a Sopher 13-inch clamp with rows of ridges or teeth, grasp anything you can inside the womb. Once you grasp something inside, squeeze on the clamp, set the jaws and pull hard—really hard. You feel something let go, and out pops a fully formed leg about 6 inches long. Reach in again and grasp anything you can, and out pops an arm. Reach in again, and again, and again with the clamp, and tear out the spine, the intestines, the heart and lungs."

Even if pain wasn't present, Madam Speaker, dismembering a child is violence against children, and it is inhumane. But these babies actually suffer excruciating pain during the abortion.

Dr. Colleen Malloy from Northwestern University has said: "In today's medical arena, we resuscitate patients at 20 weeks and are able to witness their ex-utero growth. I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 36.

Overwhelming majorities of Americans—some 60–64% according to pollsters—support legal protection for pain-capable unborn children.

Today we know that unborn babies not only die but suffer excruciating pain during dismemberment abortion—a cruelty that rips arms and legs off a helpless child.

A former abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino, testified before Congress that he had performed 1,200 abortions—over 100 late-term abortions up to 24 weeks.

Dr. Levatino described what the abortionist actually does to the helpless child. "Imagine if you can that you are a pro-choice obstetrician/gynecologist like I was." Using a Sopher 13" clamp with rows of ridges or teeth, "grasp anything you can" inside the womb. "Once you've grasped something inside, squeeze on

the clamp to set the jaws and pull hard—really hard. You feel something let go and out pops a fully formed leg about six inches long. Reach in again and grasp anything you can . . . and out pops an arm.” He noted that “a second trimester D&E abortion is a blind procedure.” He said, “Reach in again and again with that clamp and tear out the spine, intestines, heart and lungs.”

Madam Speaker, even U.S. Supreme Court Justice Kennedy gets it. In his dissent to the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2000 *Stenberg v. Carhart* decision, Justice Kennedy observed that in D&E dismemberment abortions, “The fetus, in many cases, dies just as a human adult or child would: It bleeds to death as it is torn limb from limb. The fetus can be alive at the beginning of the dismemberment process and can survive for a time while its limbs are being torn off.” Justice Kennedy added in the Court’s 2007 opinion in *Gonzales v. Carhart* that D&E abortions are “laden with the power to devalue human life . . .”

Even if pain wasn’t present, dismembering a child is violence against children and inhumane. But these babies actually suffer.

Dr. Robert White, professor of neurosurgery at Case Western Reserve University said an unborn child at 20 weeks gestation “is fully capable of experiencing pain . . . without question, (abortion) is a dreadfully painful experience . . .”

In an expert report prepared for the U.S. Justice Department, Dr. Kanwaljeet S. Anand, a pediatrician specializing in the care of critically ill newborns and children who has conducted intensive research of pain and stress in the human newborn and fetus said: “. . . the human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by the fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children . . .” Why? Dr. Anand points out that “the highest density of pain receptors per square inch of skin in human development occurs in utero from 20 to 30 weeks gestation . . . Thus, a fetus at 20 to 32 weeks of gestation would experience a much more intense pain than older infants or children or adults.”

Dr. Colleen Malloy, assistant professor, Division of Neonatology at the Northwestern University, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee said: “When we speak of infants at 20 weeks post-fertilization we no longer have to rely on inferences or ultrasound imagery, because such premature patients are kicking, moving and reacting and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.”

Dr. Malloy went on to say, “in today’s medical arena, we resuscitate patients at this age and are able to witness their ex-utero growth.” She says “I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment or cardiac injection.”

In an undercover video released by David Daleidan, a Planned Parenthood Medical Director explains that before beginning a late abortion she completes a clinical documentation form that says “I intend to utilize dismemberment techniques for this procedure.”

Notice the words—“dismemberment techniques”—in order to “extract the fetus in multiple parts.”

But seriously, we’ve known much of this for years. In 2006 I authored the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act that garnered 250 votes in favor—including 40 Democrats—to 162 against. I remember thinking on the day of the vote: “how can anyone vote to refuse to make child pain information part of informed consent?”

Congressman TRENT FRANKS has authored four extraordinarily important bills over the years to actually protect pain-capable babies in federal law from the violence of abortion including Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Acts that passed the House of Representatives in 2013 and again in 2015. Tragically, President Obama vowed to veto this child protection legislation and the Senate failed to even pass it. However, should the House pass H.R. 36 today and if the Senate passes it as well, President Trump has said he would sign it.

Not only will babies be protected by federal law at five months and the pain suffered by these babies averted, but H.R. 36 requires that a late abortion permitted under limited circumstances provide the “best opportunity for the unborn child to survive” and that “a second physician trained in neonatal resuscitation” be “present and prepared to provide care to a child” to the same degree as the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002.

Thus, “any health care practitioner present at the time shall humanely exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to a child born alive at the same gestational age in the course of a natural birth.”

Moreover, “following the care required to be rendered . . . the child born alive shall be immediately transported and admitted to the hospital.”

Sixteen states have enacted pain-capable unborn child laws that closely parallel the bill before us today. These include Ohio, Texas, Nebraska, Idaho, Oklahoma, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Arkansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, South Carolina, Kentucky and Kansas.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that my colleagues respect unborn children as our nation’s littlest patients who like any other patient may need diagnosis and benign interventions to treat disability or disease.

And preemies are surviving earlier and healthier as technology and medical science advance. Micah Pickering is a healthy 5 year old today. He was born prematurely at 20 weeks and was the size of this M&M candy bag. Micah is the face of the pro-life movement. That is why the bill before us today is “Micah’s Law.”

A recent study of nearly 5,000 babies published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* confirmed that nearly a quarter of the premature babies born at 22 weeks survived. (Let me note that the 22 weeks gestational age referred to in the study is equivalent to 20 weeks fetal age using the age dating system employed by H.R. 36).

Researchers at Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP) are developing a technology that they hope—in a decade—will be the new standard of care for extremely premature in-

fants. Building a bridge between the mother’s womb and the outside world, the artificial wombs provide a soft, sterile, fluid filled environment for the child to continue to grow.

The babies we seek to protect from harm today may survive if treated humanely, with expertise and compassion—not the cruelty of the abortion.

Four years ago, Pennsylvania abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murder, conspiracy to kill and involuntary manslaughter and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Even though the news of Gosnell’s child slaughter was largely suppressed by the mainstream media, many of my colleagues may remember that Dr. Gosnell operated a large Philadelphia abortion clinic where women died and countless babies were dismembered or chemically destroyed often by having their spinal cords snipped—all gruesome procedures causing excruciating pain to the victim.

The Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, Micah’s Law, is needed now more than ever because there are Gosnells all over America, dismembering and decapitating pain-capable babies for profit. The bill protects kids from preventable pain—and death.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, it is always hard for me to understand why our colleagues on the other side of the aisle embrace junk science, whether it is around global warming, where 99 percent of the scientists say, yes, it is happening, or in this case.

We have the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists from 2010 indicating that “connections from the periphery to the cortex is not intact until 24 weeks. The cortex is necessary for pain perception.”

In 2012, ACOG, in the *Journal of American Medical Association* embraced that statement. So the vast majority of physicians and scientists say there is not pain perception at 20 weeks.

But let me talk about Dr. Jenn and Sammi. Sammi was 17, terrified, and pregnant when she went to a “clinic” that ended up being a crisis pregnancy center. The center gave Sammi a free, private ultrasound, which was actually broadcast throughout the clinic for all to see—a violation, I might say, of HIPAA. When Sammi said she wanted to end the pregnancy, the center called her almost daily saying she would die, get sick, and go to hell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SPEIER. The center also lied about her due date, telling Sammi it was too late for an abortion. Finally, Sammi called her mom, who flew her to California to see Dr. Jenn.

On behalf of Dr. Jenn and Sammi, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 36.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, Maddie Brinckerhoff was an early feminist author and lecturer from the Midwest, where I live, and she had this to say about abortion: "It is evidence that either by education or circumstances that she"—the woman—"has been greatly wronged."

In this spirit, Madam Speaker, I think there is an opportunity here to perhaps bring Congress together around a humane proposition that requires thoughtful but necessary reflection on the deepest meanings of pain.

We all know pain. But pain teaches us profound lessons about suffering, sacrifice, patience, and the redemptive healing possibilities of encountering one another in our vulnerability as humans living in the interdependency of community. Pain is something from which we naturally recoil, but it also enables us to build compassion toward those who are weak, or dependent, or alone.

Madam Speaker, in letting our natural impulse to respond to another who is in pain, we can grasp what it means to be truly ourselves, to be truly human, and to care deeply about everyone, and to really internalize what is at issue here.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 36, which is a nationwide 20-week abortion ban. I would like to share a story about Lindsey, a woman from California.

Lindsey ended her pregnancy at 24 weeks, after a devastating diagnosis. When Lindsey had her 12-week ultrasound, everything looked completely normal. But the picture was different at the 21-month anatomy scan. Lindsey and her husband learned that their baby girl had lethal skeletal dysplasia. Lindsey sought out additional opinions from three maternal-fetal specialists. They all agreed that her lungs were not developing properly and she would not survive. Lindsey and her husband chose to end the pregnancy at 24 weeks.

Lindsey wants lawmakers to know: "If I had to carry her to term, she would not have survived. As her mother, it is my right to spare her suffering, and that is what I did."

The cruel ban on the floor today would only make these heart-wrenching situations worse for families like Lindsey's. On behalf of Lindsey, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. Republicans should stop playing politics with women's lives and focus on the real problems facing this government and this country, and stop interfering in the private lives of women. We must stop this ban.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to imagine what could be more important than establishing who is protected under the law and who is not; who is given a chance of life and who is denied it.

As technology continues to evolve, the more we can celebrate the ability we have to save a baby at just 20 weeks after conception is truly remarkable. I remember when I first became a nurse some 40 years ago. I vowed to devote myself to the welfare of those committed to my care, whether they were born or unborn. I am still committed to that today. And 40 years later, the science tells us that after 20 weeks of pregnancy, unborn babies are able to feel pain inside the womb.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act protects those who cannot protect themselves when handed a death sentence.

Madam Speaker, there are currently seven countries in the world that allow elective late abortions, countries such as North Korea and China.

Why in the world is the United States on a list of countries characterized as human rights abusers?

Our Nation can do better than that.

I have seen how special care is given to reduce the pain of these precious premature babies at 20 weeks in the NICU. Unborn children in the womb at this stage should be protected, too, and we must pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act to give these unborn children a chance to see the light of day.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 11½ minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Georgia has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Emilia. This is her story:

Eighteen years ago, Emilia was pregnant with her second child. She was happily married, financially secure, and eager to welcome a new baby into her family. After Emilia's baby was diagnosed with Down syndrome, she was even more determined to raise her baby with love and compassion.

Imagine her devastation when, after a 20-week ultrasound, the baby was diagnosed with fetal hydrops and a battery of tests revealed her baby would not survive to term. Emilia made a wrenching decision to terminate her pregnancy rather than have her baby suffer.

Emilia's hospital didn't provide abortion services, so she went to Boston and had to pass through a wall of picketers that told her she was a murderer.

In the waiting room, she realized every other patient had the same story: no one was carrying a healthy

baby. Every woman there was experiencing profound loss.

Under a 20-week ban, none of these moms can make a decision for their families with their doctors. We would make that decision for them in Congress.

On behalf of Emilia, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the ban.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative HANDEL for yielding.

As a former minister and as an American, even as a human being, I believe that every boy and girl is conceived with God-given potential and unique talents and abilities—abilities they will use to serve others and make a difference.

Let me put it this way: I know a young man named Luke. Luke's mother was in for a surprise when, at only 24 weeks into her pregnancy, her baby boy decided it was time to meet the world. To make a long story short, Luke worked through complications with his family, and he serves in our district office in North Carolina.

Every life is an opportunity. Every life is precious.

A little earlier we were challenged by the accusation that Republicans only are concerned about budget. It goes out the window when it comes to this issue.

You know what?

You are right. We don't put a price on life. We cherish it.

Madam Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Donna. This is her story:

She said it was a miracle. At age 41, she was finally pregnant. Early blood tests and ultrasound showed a healthy fetus. Donna was filled with the joy of an expectant mother. Then tragedy struck. Her fetus stopped growing at 26 weeks. An ultrasound showed anencephaly, a fetus without a brain, a fetus that could not sustain life on its own.

Madam Speaker, this 20-week abortion bill is cruel punishment for women like Donna, forcing them to face weeks of pregnant agony with no hope for the life that they so wanted. This is a bill that inflicts pain, not stops it, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, as the father of 5 and the grandfather of 13, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 36,

the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, also known as Micah's Law, named after Micah Pickering.

Micah was born prematurely at 22 weeks of age. In fact, the same age and exact stage of development that the current despicable policy permits for legal, on-demand abortion.

After receiving intensive care in his infancy, Micah is now an active, healthy, and happy kindergartner. Micah is living proof that we need to pass H.R. 36. Congress needs to take this crucial step to ensure the protection of thousands of innocent lives every year, innocent lives just like precious Micah.

The scientific evidence is overwhelming that, by at least 20 weeks of age, unborn babies can feel excruciating pain during typical abortion procedures. This is both cruel and inhumane. As Members of Congress, it is our duty and our moral obligation to pass this commonsense legislation.

We must protect the most defenseless. Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical bill to protect the sanctity of every human life. God knows it is time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Eva, an Oregon doctor who is one of the compassionate providers women turn to when facing an unintended or dangerous pregnancy.

Oregon has rejected restrictions on abortions, but because of bans or restrictions in other States, Dr. Eva provides healthcare services, including abortion, to women from around the country.

□ 1700

One patient was a high school senior who could not get an abortion in her home State. She spent weeks saving every penny she could to buy a plane ticket and pay for the procedure.

Instead of making women fly across the country, instead of debating this bill, and instead of cutting programs like the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have done, we should be focused on preventing unintended pregnancies, and we should be expanding access to comprehensive reproductive care, something the Oregon Legislature did when they passed the landmark Reproductive Health Equity Act.

Madam Speaker, when abortion is banned, it does not go away. It drives women to unsafe back alleys and to dangerous self-induced abortions. We must stop efforts to stand between women and their healthcare providers. Please vote "no" on H.R. 36.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the

Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Multiple scientific studies indicate that, by 20 weeks after fertilization, an unborn child's brain and nervous system have developed sufficiently for that child to feel pain. The United States stands among only a handful of nations that permit elective abortions after 20 weeks. It should pain us all that we fall into the same camp as North Korea and China.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will moderate our extreme position and ensure we protect the most vulnerable, like Micah Pickering, a lively 5-year-old I met last week. Micah was born prematurely at the same age children would be protected under H.R. 36. Micah was able to survive and thrive after spending nearly 4 months in the neonatal intensive care unit. He is now in kindergarten, and I found out when talking to him that we share a love of Legos.

The bottom line is this: 20 weeks is halfway through a pregnancy. It is too late to end the life of an unborn baby. It violates what Americans want, it violates science, and it violates our country's most enduring values.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of Micah's Law, H.R. 36.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise for a second time today in strident opposition to H.R. 36.

This bill is unconstitutional, and it is an overt attempt to challenge women's constitutional right to a safe and legal abortion.

It is really disturbing that funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers has expired, but yet this majority is focusing on doubling down on their crusade against women's healthcare.

Let's talk about pain a little bit here. What is especially painful about this bill is that there is an exception in this bill for rape victims only when they report to law enforcement officials, thus resurrecting the debunked legitimate rape argument.

Many women can't report rape for a variety of reasons, probably also including the sanctimonious social stigma that their Congressman or Congresswoman would place upon them. So this bill underhandedly revictimizes vulnerable rape survivors.

Madam Speaker, I am a survivor of rape. That is painful. This bill is a cruel and ruthless attempt to undermine women and attack our rights to govern our bodies, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this unconstitutional bill.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

We have a responsibility to defend the most vulnerable in our Nation, and that is exactly what this legislation does: it protects unborn children from abortion at 5 months.

It is truly disheartening that I have to beg many of my colleagues to support a bill like this when it is scientifically proven that unborn babies feel pain after 5 months. Premature infants in the NICU are protected from pain. Children in the womb should be protected from pain also.

I will always fight for the right to life, and I believe we have a responsibility to defend all innocent lives. In fact, this is close to home. I have four children: one son and three daughters. I have had to see both my wife and each one of my daughters experience difficult pregnancies and make difficult choices. I can't imagine life without my four children and my 12 beautiful grandchildren.

Every child should be given a chance at life. New life is created by God, and we must give a voice to these precious babies who cannot speak for themselves. Our Nation can and must protect the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman CONYERS for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, today I rise for Katie in California and in support of women everywhere who have relied on access to safe abortion procedures in their lifetime.

When Katie and her husband found out as newlyweds that Katie was pregnant, they were overjoyed. Eighteen weeks later, they discovered that the fetus had multiple severe health problems, including spina bifida and a tethered spinal cord. This news was heart-breaking, and Katie and her husband made the decision to end the pregnancy at 22 weeks.

Katie wants lawmakers in Washington to know that it is not their right to make this decision for her or other women. She says that it is a horrific situation, and until you have been through it, you have no idea, and you can't make that decision for someone else.

On behalf of Katie, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 36. We must stop the bans.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

It is a long title for a bill; however, we are talking about protecting unborn children. As it has been obvious here today, it is always difficult to talk about this issue, but when we talk about pain-capable unborn children, we are referring to, in particular, children who are still in the womb at 20 weeks.

As it has been pointed out by my colleagues time and time again, scientists have proven that unborn children, even at 20 weeks old, are capable of feeling pain. The goal of this legislation is to protect these children by ensuring that they cannot be aborted.

Today, if a physician performs an in utero surgery on a 20-week-old unborn child, the standard protocol for the child is to be treated as a patient, not just a blob of tissue. That child would be given an injection of pain medication before the surgery, and this is above and beyond the anesthesia given to the mother before the surgery.

These babies have demonstrated to medical experts that they respond to painful stimuli because they flinch and they recoil from sharp objects.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation when it comes to the floor. Let's do the right thing and protect unborn children.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is a senior member on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS and I can remember the same type of hearings and the same type of legislation many years ago, again denying women their constitutional rights. I can see as clear as I can see you, Madam Speaker, the women who were sitting and begging us not to undermine them, their doctor, and their faith.

So I rise today to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: You have got it wrong. There are no mass abortions. There is no call for mass abortions. The women that are undergoing these procedures are women who have prayed and who have looked to their faith, their doctor, and their family.

So I oppose this bill because it puts the lives of women at risk, it interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and it diverts attention from the real problem facing American women. Let us reauthorize SCHIP. People are crying about that in my district. How outrageous.

One of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances. It is these women who receive the 1.5 percent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

What number did I say? 10? 20? 1.5, and this is not diminishing the aspects of this.

But it is those women who have prayed. They have sought doctors'

help, and they, as well, have sought their family's consultation.

We are making a mockery of these women. These women are not standing on the street corner saying, "I want to have an abortion." They have a serious situation, like April Salazar.

At 18 weeks, she and her husband found out that their baby had a lethal diagnosis, and if she carried the pregnancy to term and he was born alive, he would die shortly from suffocation. It is not pain of getting him out—he would die. April hoped the news wasn't true, so she requested more tests to confirm the diagnosis. At 21 weeks she had an abortion. This bill would have stopped April.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This would have stopped April, her husband, her family, her God, and her doctor from making the decision.

Even the exceptions are bogus because you frighten these women. The idea of Jeni, in my home State, where they had a 2-day waiting period listening to a mandatory script about abortion and a sign-off from two separate doctors. Once you start this, you are taking it away from women who have sought their faith leader, their doctor, and their family.

This is a bad bill. We need to do some important things. I would hope with the carnage of Las Vegas, to save lives, we would ban assault weapons and we would not have that gentleman having 42 guns in his home and in his possession. That is what we need to fight to save lives, not this bill that undermines the rights of women and their faith and their doctor.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the "Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act" and the underlying bill.

I opposed this irresponsible and reckless legislation the last time it was brought to the floor.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, puts the lives of women at risk, interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and diverts our attention from the real problems facing the American people.

A more accurate short title for this bill would be the "Violating the Rights of Women Act of 2017."

Instead of resuming their annual War on Women, our colleagues across the aisle should be working with Democrats to help rebuild the ravaged communities hit by hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Madam Speaker, we could and should instead be voting reauthorize the important SCHIP program that has helped families get on their feet for years.

Instead of voting to abridge the constitutional rights of women for the umpteenth time, we should bring to the floor for a first vote comprehensive immigration reform legislation or legislations repairing the harm to the Voting

Rights Act of 1965 by the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

The one thing we should not be doing is debating irresponsible "messaging bills" that abridge the rights of women and poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances.

It is these women who receive the 1.5 percent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

Women like Jeni from Texas, who, at 21 weeks, was told that her fetus had multiple severe defects.

Jeni could end the pregnancy or wait for the fetus to miscarry or die.

There was no way that the pregnancy would end in a live, healthy baby.

Jeni and her husband chose to terminate the pregnancy, but because they live in Texas, they were forced to endure several cruel restrictions: a two-day waiting period, listening to a mandatory script about abortion, and a sign-off from two separate doctors.

Madam Speaker, every pregnancy is different.

No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family.

These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose H.R. 36 because it lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a state could not prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

By prohibiting nearly all abortions beginning at "the probable post-fertilization age" of 20 weeks, H.R. 36 violates this clear and long standing constitutional rule.

Madam Speaker, the constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

I strongly oppose H.R. 36 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this unwise measure that put the lives and health of women at risk.

I would like to include in the RECORD stories from two women:

April Salazar, New York: "It would have been too hard for me to carry to term, and it seemed pointless to make the baby suffer too when she would never survive."

At 18 weeks, April and her husband found out that their baby had lethal skeletal dysplasia. He would never be able to breathe on his own. If she carried the pregnancy to term and he was born alive, he would die shortly after of suffocation. April hoped the news wasn't true, so she requested more tests to

confirm the diagnosis, which took two weeks. At 21 weeks, she had an abortion. April shares her story because she has found that it can change opinions. Several people she knows personally who previously had been anti-abortion told her that they would have done the same thing she did.

Julie Bindeman, Maryland: "Everything about a later termination is already so incredibly difficult even just picking up the phone to make the appointment. The 20-week ban adds another hurdle. It's just cruel."

Julie's doctor told her and her husband that their son's brain had a serious abnormality, a diagnosis that they confirmed with tests, more ultrasounds, and an MRI. If the baby survived birth, he would never speak, walk, or have conscious thoughts based upon what had developed in his brain. Julie and her husband decided to end the pregnancy, and the soonest they could get the appointment was at 22 weeks. Julie could not find a surgeon in Maryland at that time willing to perform the procedure, so she had to be induced for labor and delivery. Her baby was born alive and died very shortly after.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, for the past 25 years, I have had the privilege of delivering over 5,000 babies. I am absolutely convinced that babies can feel pain at 14 weeks. At 16 weeks, they can recognize their mom's voice, their brother's voice, and their sister's voice.

Once or twice a year, I have been in that delivery room and have been forced to deliver a very premature baby, a 22-week or a 24-week baby. We are doing everything we can to save the life of that baby, calling in pediatricians and anesthesia people, doing everything heroically possible.

How can we live in a world where we are trying to save that baby's life in one room, and just down the road there are people killing that baby, tearing it apart limb by limb and decapitating it? What type of a world do we live in these days? How can both of those situations exist in this same country?

We have to ban these late-term abortions.

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

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Our Nation has long recognized that we are all endowed by our creator with certain inalienable rights, chief among them is the right to life. I am unapologetically pro-life because all human life has dignity and should be protected, especially the lives of defenseless unborn children.

Today the House is taking a critical but seemingly uncontroversial step forward in protecting life by prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy,

or put another way, when unborn children can feel pain.

Currently, the United States is one of only seven countries worldwide, including North Korea, that still allow late-term abortions. This bill would end these horrific procedures.

I pray that one day our Nation will protect all unborn children, but this important bill is a big step forward towards that goal.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

□ 1715

Mr. ENGEL. Today, I rise for Dr. Erica of New York. This is her story.

Dr. Erica's patient was raped by an unknown assailant. The patient's emotions surrounding the pregnancy were extremely complex. She desperately wanted to have a child but felt guilt, shame, and isolation after being raped.

She ultimately decided to continue the pregnancy. She believed it would help her grieve and grasp onto something positive after such a traumatic experience.

But then the patient went in for a scan at 20 weeks and was devastated to learn that the fetus had multiple lethal anomalies. This patient had to face yet another agonizing decision. Ultimately, she decided to end the pregnancy.

Thankfully, Dr. Erica was able to help this patient through the most difficult time in her life. I want to share her words: "As a physician, it is my job to guide the patient through the risks, benefits, and alternatives of all options available to her. It is not my job to place judgment on patients that only serve to punish women who are already suffering, and it certainly is not the job of the legislature to interfere with the patient-physician relationship."

On behalf of Dr. Erica and the women she helps, I urge my colleagues to vote "no." We must support every woman's right to make reproduction choices for herself.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, this legislation does stir a great number of emotions in me. I do know what it is to protect life, take life, and to see life lost, and our role should always be to protect the innocent.

But I also know that our role as a society has been to subsidize the genocide of our unborn, and that reflects how desensitized we have become to the true value of a child each year, as we kill hundreds of thousands of the most innocent among us: unborn children who smile, who grab, and who are self-aware and feel pain.

If we truly are what we do, then who are we if we purposely bring unthinkable pain to a baby boy or baby girl just before their life is snuffed out of them?

This legislation is a leap forward for our collective conscience as a nation, and it is a strong step forward in returning value to life that we see, especially the most unique life that exists out there: that special creature that was created by God.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Georgia has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, as a proud cosponsor of this legislation, I rise towards the end of this long debate to reiterate a central idea: the reason behind this legislation is because of what we stand for as Americans.

The Declaration of Independence, as we know, is our Nation's birth certificate, and it states very succinctly in the second paragraph what has come to be known as the American's Creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The reason that the Founders put the right to life first, listed as our most fundamental freedom, is because they understood that we are made in the image of a holy God.

Our creator, who gave us those unalienable rights, is the one who made each and every one of us. Because of that, there is a central truth that comes through: every single person, every single life, is of inestimable dignity and value. Your value is not related in any way to where you went to school, what you make for a living, how good-looking you are, how talented you are, what your fortune was in life, whether or not you have a physical disability. Your value is inherent in who you are as a creation of the God who made you.

That is the reason we stand for this. It is the reason the bill is so important. We urge our colleagues to support it today.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, H.R. 36 is a dangerous and unconstitutional bill that demonstrates a fundamental distrust of women to make private decisions that are best for themselves and their families. It is, therefore, unsurprising that this legislation is strongly opposed by the Nation's leading civil rights organizations, the medical profession, and women's groups.

In addition, 36 religious organizations noted in a letter to Members opposing this bill that the decision to end

a pregnancy must be left to an individual woman, in consultation with her family, doctors, and any others she chooses to involve, in keeping with her personal beliefs.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to please oppose this dangerous legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HANDEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we have heard many impassioned stories this afternoon.

Much has changed since *Roe v. Wade* was upheld in the 1970s. We have made extraordinary medical advances. Today, we know with great certainty that babies in the womb, starting at the fifth month of pregnancy, do indeed feel pain.

It is extraordinarily heartbreaking when an unborn baby is diagnosed with a severe and life-threatening abnormality, still that baby deserves a right to life and right to dignity.

My sister was born with no esophagus and given little hope to live. By the grace of God and a miracle, within just weeks of her birth, a new technology, a new treatment came forward. Today, she is the proud mother of my two nieces.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill. It is a just bill. It is a moral bill to do what we are called to do, not just as Americans but as human beings: to protect lives of the most innocent.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support and urge every colleague to vote in support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

H.R. 36 would prohibit the performance or attempted performance of an abortion after 20 weeks, and harshly punishes physicians who violate the law. This bill has narrow exemptions for the life of a mother (rape and incest) but there are no exemptions in the bill for conditions where the fetus has conditions or diagnoses that are incompatible with life.

We have spent the entirety of this Congress defending women's reproductive rights and fighting against plans that would eliminate funding and access to the health care providers of a woman's choosing. This bill is yet another attack on a woman's right to decide what is best for her and her body. A woman, not a politician, must be able to make health decisions that are best for her own circumstances.

H.R. 36 ignores that every pregnancy is different and compromises a woman's right to the health care she is legally entitled to. It punishes women who are already in difficult situations. The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that neither a state nor the federal government can ban safe and legal abortion services pre-viability.

I support a woman's legal right to opt for or against an abortion. The decision is private. It's a matter of faith and it's a matter of conscience, and our Constitution recognizes this.

What I do not support is a bill that takes away a woman's Constitutional right. The

Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a shameful attempt to impose a radical political agenda on women. It strips away their individual liberties and puts their health at serious risk. This bill is wrong, this bill is dangerous, and this House should reject it.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, the science is clear, as dismemberment abortion procedures pull children apart limb from limb, the baby feels pain. The baby recoils as the instruments get closer. The fight or flight instinct is there. If that isn't proof of life, I don't know what is. These late term abortions must end.

My position on this matter is well-known. It has long been my mission to protect the unborn.

A vast majority of Americans agree, late term abortions are wrong. Period. Full stop.

This bill isn't just for the sake of the babies. This bill protects their mothers. At 20 weeks, this horrendous procedure is risky and subjects mothers to serious dangers.

Lives are at stake, both for mothers and their babies.

I support this bill, and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in both chambers to do the same. Thank you Mr. FRANKS for introducing this important piece of legislation.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise for Dr. Liz. This is her story. Laura and Mark, a couple in Connecticut, sought prenatal care from Dr. Liz. When Laura was 20 weeks pregnant, they came in for an ultrasound.

The couple was devastated when the scan showed that their baby was affected by anencephaly, meaning absence of brain development. Dr. Liz remembers watching the joy and laughter leave Laura and Mark as they absorbed this news.

They sought refuge with their families and clergy, and jointly made the difficult decision to end the pregnancy rather than endure 20 more weeks, a delivery, and the certain death of the child soon thereafter.

Every family should be able to make their own decisions about reproductive health. Instead, this bill puts the federal government squarely between a woman and her doctor. It even threatens providers like Dr. Liz with five years in jail if they perform a legal, constitutional, and sometimes medically necessary procedure.

H.R. 36 is nothing more than a cruel attempt to deny women their constitutional rights. The Ninth Circuit struck down Idaho's 20-week ban in 2015, and also struck down a similar law from Arizona in 2013.

We must stop the attacks on women's health. I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 36.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This bill would prohibit late term abortions on unborn babies who can feel pain. As we now know, babies can feel pain as early as 20 weeks. This means during dismemberment abortion and induction abortions, babies feel the pain from these procedures, while in the womb. We are one of seven countries that still allows late term abortions, putting us in the company with North Korea and China.

In fact, one of my staffers great niece was born at 26 weeks, weighing just 2 lbs, 11 oz.

It's unconscionable that we allow babies such as her niece to be aborted. This bill is one step closer to achieving our goal of protecting these innocent lives. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to protect the sanctity of life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 36 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 6, line 21, insert after "life" the following: "or health".

Page 6, beginning on line 22, strike "whose" and all that follows through "conditions" on page 7, ending in line 3.

Page 11, line 20, insert after "life" the following: "or health".

Page 11, beginning on line 21, strike "by" and all that follows through "injury" on line 22 and insert "or".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 36, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I am a mom. I have two wonderful children. I am so very proud of them because both of them have decided to pursue careers that will save lives. My daughter, Hannah, currently lives in Africa, working for an NGO to fight poverty and AIDS. My son, Fred, is a doctor at Northwestern.

Looking around this room, I see many other moms. We know the amazing joy that comes with parenthood. Most of us have been fortunate that our children were born without complications. Unfortunately, for some women, this is not always the case.

Throughout this debate, Members have been sharing the stories of women who wanted to be moms, but who found themselves in unimaginable situations and who were forced to make one of the most gut-wrenching decisions of their

lives—whether to terminate her pregnancy due to health risks.

This is much like one woman from Michigan, who I will call Pam.

Pam was already raising children and was excited and proud to be pregnant with another child. But Pam's pregnancy was causing her heart to fail. She consulted with multiple specialists, who all told her that her own health was in jeopardy if the pregnancy continued.

Pam's doctors advised her that the safest option was to terminate the pregnancy. But it was a very difficult decision for Pam and her family to make, as anyone in this room can surely imagine.

Pam, of course, had to think about her children, her family, and her own life. Imagine what that decision must be like. Just take a moment and think about that.

Now, imagine finding out that politicians in Washington, D.C., have told Pam that she was not allowed to make that decision on her own, with her family. Imagine that: politicians putting her health in jeopardy, telling a woman and her family that the government was going to criminalize a doctor providing her care, that her children might not have a mother while growing up. That is what this bill would do.

As currently written, H.R. 36 shows no concern for the long-term health of the mother, her future ability to bear children, or her ability to care for her family. This bill would force women to carry pregnancies to term, even when their health is at risk. Even if the fetus has no chance of survival, this bill would require a woman to go to full term. Imagine what that would be like.

Madam Speaker, my amendment simply adds the health of the mother to the existing exemptions in this bill.

Without my amendment, H.R. 36 devalues the health and well-being of women and puts their life at risk. It tells our mothers, our daughters, our nieces, and our granddaughters that decisions about their long-term health are not their own.

This is not the first bill that has been brought to the floor that shows disregard for women and their families. This bill fits a disturbing pattern.

Just this year, the House has considered legislation that tells women that they need to get their employer's permission if they want affordable birth control.

The House has considered bills that would eliminate women's essential health benefits, like maternity care and mammograms.

The House has considered legislation to cut funding for women's healthcare centers.

The House has also considered legislation that would allow insurance companies to charge women higher premiums and label pregnancy as a pre-existing condition.

Tomorrow, we will consider a budget that decimates programs that are critical to the health and welfare of women and families so that we can give a massive tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent.

Just take one moment to think about those priorities.

Madam Speaker, bills like this one disrespect and devalue women. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to share my strong support for the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah's Law.

My colleagues who oppose this bill adamantly defend a mother's ability to have a late-term abortion and a doctor's ability to perform it. But, Madam Speaker, I have heard no mention of the third person in the room: the unborn baby.

I am astounded that the opposition chooses to focus solely on the two individuals who can speak for themselves, with no mention of the one who cannot. That is exactly what we are here to do today. We are here to speak up for those who can't speak for themselves. We are here to defend those who cannot defend themselves.

Our bill seeks to do this by restricting abortions after 20 weeks, or at the 6th month of pregnancy, the point at which research shows the unborn babies can feel pain.

Last week, I, too, had the opportunity to meet the little boy this bill was named for: Micah Pickering. As many of you know, he was born at 22 weeks and spent 4 long months in intensive care.

□ 1730

Micah survived, and this year he is in kindergarten. You see, children like Micah, who are born prematurely, are treated as patients. Special care is given to reduce their pain and increase their chances for survival, just as it should be.

So, Madam Speaker, my question to those who would oppose this bill is this: What is the difference between a baby born at 6 months outside the womb and a baby at 6 months inside the womb? How can one be treated like a miracle they are created to be and the other be treated like medical waste? If a baby like Micah can survive outside the womb given the appropriate care, shouldn't we give other babies like him the same protection and chance to live?

I have listened to my colleagues on the other side call this bill extreme. I say to oppose this bill is extreme. If we

won't stop abortions at 6 months of pregnancy when a baby feels pain, when will we stop them?

We have to draw a line somewhere. To say aborting a little baby who can actually feel the pain of the procedure being forced upon them crosses the line is a gross understatement.

Madam Speaker, I am unapologetically pro-life, and I oppose abortion at any stage. I will always fight to grant greater protections for life under the law. As a society, I pray that we will start assigning greater value to life at all stages in this country.

Madam Speaker, so often we get caught up in the policies of this issue and we forget that these are babies, for goodness' sake. They feel pain, and we need to protect them. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and join me in supporting this underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing S. 782.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 238, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—187

Adams	Clay	Engel
Aguilar	Cleaver	Eshoo
Barragán	Clyburn	Espallat
Bass	Cohen	Esty (CT)
Beatty	Connolly	Evans
Bera	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Beyer	Cooper	Fudge
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Costa	Gallego
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Garamendi
Bonamici	Crist	Gomez
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Gonzalez (TX)
F.	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Green, Al
Brown (MD)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Bustos	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	DeGette	Hanabusa
Capuano	Delaney	Hastings
Carbajal	DeLauro	Heck
Cárdenas	DelBene	Higgins (NY)
Carson (IN)	Demings	Hoyer
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Deuth	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Jayapal
Chu, Judy	Doggett	Jeffries
Ciçilline	Doyle, Michael	Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA)	F.	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY)	Ellison	Kaptur

Keating	Meng	Schneider	Renacci	Scott, Austin	Upton	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer	Ross
Kelly (IL)	Moore	Schrader	Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Valadao	Gosar	MacArthur	Rothfus
Kennedy	Moulton	Scott (VA)	Roby	Sessions	Wagner	Gowdy	Marchant	Rouzer
Khanna	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David	Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Walberg	Granger	Marino	Royce (CA)
Kildee	Nadler	Serrano	Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Walden	Graves (GA)	Marshall	Russell
Kilmer	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Walker	Graves (LA)	Massie	Rutherford
Kind	Neal	Shea-Porter	Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Walorski	Graves (MO)	Mast	Sanford
Krishnamoorthi	Nolan	Sherman	Rokita	Smith (NE)	Walters, Mimi	Griffith	McCarthy	Scalise
Kuster (NH)	Norcross	Sinema	Rooney, Francis	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)	Grothman	McCaul	Schweikert
Langevin	O'Halleran	Sires	Rooney, Thomas J.	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)	Guthrie	McClintock	Scott, Austin
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Slaughter	Ros-Lehtinen	Smucker	Wenstrup	Handel	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Roskam	Stefanik	Westerman	Harper	McKinley	Sessions
Lawrence	Panetta	Soto	Ross	Stewart	Williams	Harris	McMorris	Shimkus
Lawson (FL)	Pascrell	Speier	Rothfus	Stivers	Wilson (SC)	Hartzler	Rodgers	Shuster
Lee	Payne	Suozi	Rouzer	Taylor	Wittman	Hensarling	McSally	Simpson
Levin	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)	Takano	Tenney	Womack	Herrera Beutler	Meadows	Smith (MO)
Lewis (GA)	Perlmutter	Takano	Royce (CA)	Thompson (PA)	Woodall	Hice, Jody B.	Meehan	Smith (NE)
Lieu, Ted	Peters	Thompson (CA)	Russell	Thornberry	Yoder	Higgins (LA)	Messer	Smith (NJ)
Loeb sack	Pingree	Thompson (MS)	Rutherford	Tiberi	Yoho	Hill	Mitchell	Smith (TX)
Lofgren	Pocan	Tonko	Sanford	Tipton	Young (AK)	Holding	Moolenaar	Smucker
Lowenthal	Polis	Torres	Scalise	Trott	Young (IA)	Hollingsworth	Mooney (WV)	Stefanik
Lowe	Price (NC)	Tsongas	Schweikert	Turner	Zeldin	Hudson	Mullin	Stewart
Lujan Grisham, M.	Quigley	Vargas				Huizenga	Murphy (PA)	Stivers
Luján, Ben Ray	Raskin	Veasey	Bridenstine	Kihuen	Rosen	Hultgren	Newhouse	Taylor
Lynch	Rice (NY)	Vela	Foster	Long	Titus	Hunter	Noem	Tenney
Maloney,	Richmond	Velázquez	Himes	Long	Titus	Hurd	Norman	Thompson (PA)
Carolyn B.	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky		Loudermilk		Issa	Nunes	Thornberry
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Walz				Jenkins (KS)	Olson	Tiberi
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Wasserman				Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo	Tipton
McCollum	Rush	Schultz				Johnson (LA)	Palmer	Trott
McEachin	Ryan (OH)	Waters, Maxine				Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Turner
McGovern	Sánchez	Watson Coleman				Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Upton
McNerny	Sarbanes	Welch				Jones	Perry	Valadao
Meeks	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)				Jordan	Peterson	Wagner
	Schiff	Yarmuth				Joyce (OH)	Pittenger	Walberg
						Katko	Poe (TX)	Walden
						Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	Walker
						Kelly (PA)	Posey	Walorski
						King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Walters, Mimi
						King (NY)	Reed	Weber (TX)
						Kinzinger	Reichert	Webster (FL)
						Knight	Renacci	Wenstrup
						Kustoff (TN)	Rice (SC)	Westerman
						Labrador	Roby	Williams
						LaHood	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
						LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
						Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Womack
						Lance	Rohrabacher	Woodall
						Latta	Rokita	Yoder
						Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Francis	Yoho
						Lipinski	Rooney, Thomas J.	Young (AK)
						LoBiondo		Young (IA)
						Love		Zeldin
						Lucas		

NAYS—238

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

NOT VOTING—8

□ 1755

Messrs. BUCSHON, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and DENHAM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia and KEATING changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 548.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 189, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—237

Abraham	Buck	Denham
Aderholt	Bucshon	DeSantis
Allen	Budd	DesJarlais
Amash	Burgess	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Byrne	Donovan
Arrington	Calvert	Duffy
Babin	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Bacon	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Banks (IN)	Chabot	Dunn
Barletta	Cheney	Emmer
Barr	Coffman	Estes (KS)
Barton	Cole	Farenthold
Bergman	Collins (GA)	Faso
Biggs	Collins (NY)	Ferguson
Bilirakis	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Flores
Black	Cook	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Fox
Blum	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Bost	Crawford	Gaetz
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Gallagher
Brat	Culberson	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Curbeo (FL)	Gianforte
Brooks (IN)	Davidson	Gibbs
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gohmert

NOES—189

Adams	Crist	Hastings
Aguilar	Crowley	Heck
Barragan	Cummings	Higgins (NY)
Bass	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Huffman
Bera	DeFazio	Jackson Lee
Beyer	DeGette	Jayapal
Bishop (GA)	Delaney	Jeffries
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	Demings	Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan F.	Dent	Keating
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Brown (MD)	Deuth	Kennedy
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Khanna
Bustos	Doggett	Kildee
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael F.	Kilmer
Capuano	Ellison	Kind
Carbajal	Engel	Krishnamoorthi
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Kuster (NH)
Carson (IN)	Espallat	Langevin
Cartwright	Esty (CT)	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Evans	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Foster	Lawrence
Chu, Judy	Frankel (FL)	Lawson (FL)
Ciilline	Frelinghuysen	Lee
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Levin
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Gallego	Lieu, Ted
Cleaver	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Clyburn	Gomez	Lofgren
Cohen	Gonzalez (TX)	Lowenthal
Connolly	Gottheimer	Lowe
Conyers	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham, M.
Cooper	Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray
Correa	Grijalva	Lynch
Costa	Gutiérrez	Maloney,
Courtney	Hanabusa	Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Slaughter	Bishop (MI)	Emmer	Kustoff (TN)	Quigley	Scott (VA)	Tsongas
Matsui	Polis	Smith (WA)	Bishop (UT)	Engel	Labrador	Raskin	Scott, Austin	Turner
McCollum	Price (NC)	Soto	Black	Eshoo	LaHood	Ratcliffe	Scott, David	Upton
McEachin	Quigley	Speier	Blackburn	Espallat	LaMalfa	Reed	Sensenbrenner	Valadao
McGovern	Raskin	Suozi	Blum	Estes (KS)	Lamborn	Reichert	Serrano	Vargas
McNerney	Rice (NY)	Swalwell (CA)	Blumenauer	Esty (CT)	Lance	Renacci	Sessions	Veasey
Meeks	Richmond	Takano	Blunt Rochester	Evans	Langevin	Rice (NY)	Shea (AL)	Vela
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)	Bonamici	Farenthold	Larsen (WA)	Rice (SC)	Shea-Porter	Velázquez
Moore	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)	Bost	Faso	Larson (CT)	Richmond	Sherman	Visclosky
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Tonko	Boyle, Brendan F.	Ferguson	Latta	Roby	Shimkus	Wagner
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Torres	Brady (PA)	Fitzpatrick	Lawrence	Roe (TN)	Shuster	Walberg
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas	Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Lawson (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Walden
Napolitano	Sánchez	Vargas	Brat	Flores	Lee	Rogers (KY)	Sinema	Walker
Neal	Sarbanes	Veasey	Fortenberry	Floresberry	Levin	Rohrabacher	Sires	Walorski
Nolan	Schakowsky	Vela	Poster	Fox	Lewis (GA)	Rokita	Slaughter	Walters, Mimi
Norcross	Schiff	Velázquez	Brooks (AL)	Foxx	Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Thomas J.	Smith (MO)	Walz
O'Halleran	Schneider	Visclosky	Brooks (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Wasserman
O'Rourke	Schrader	Walz	Brown (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski	Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Brownley (CA)	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Ross	Smith (TX)	Waters, Maxine
Panetta	Scott, David	Schultz	Buchanan	Fudge	Loeb	Rothfus	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Pascarell	Serrano	Waters, Maxine	Buck	Gabbard	Love	Rouzer	Smucker	Weber (TX)
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Watson Coleman	Bucshon	Gaetz	Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Soto	Webster (FL)
Pelosi	Shea-Porter	Welch	Budd	Gallagher	Lowe	Royce (CA)	Speier	Welch
Perlmutter	Sherman	Wilson (FL)	Burgess	Gallego	Lucas	Ruiz	Stefanik	Wenstrup
Peters	Sinema	Yarmuth	Bustos	Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Ruppersberger	Stivers	Westerman
Pingree	Sires		Butterfield	Garrett	Lujan Grisham,	Rush	Suozi	Williams
			Byrne	Gianforte	M.	Russell	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)
			Calvert	Gibbs	Luján, Ben Ray	Rutherford	Takano	Wilson (SC)
			Capuano	Gohmert	Lynch	Ryan (OH)	Taylor	Wittman
			Cárdenas	Gomez	MacArthur	Sánchez	Tenney	Womack
			Carson (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,	Sanford	Thompson (CA)	Woodall
			Carter (GA)	Goodlatte	Carolyn B.	Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
			Carter (TX)	Gosar	Maloney, Sean	Scalise	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
			Cartwright	Gottheimer	Marchant	Schakowsky	Thornberry	Yoho
			Castor (FL)	Gowdy	Marino	Schiff	Tiberi	Young (AK)
			Castro (TX)	Granger	Marshall	Schneider	Tipton	Young (IA)
			Chabot	Graves (GA)	Mast	Schrader	Torres	Zeldin
			Cheney	Graves (LA)	Matsui	Schweikert	Trott	
			Chu, Judy	Graves (MO)	McCarthy			
			Cicilline	Green, Al	McCaul			
			Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	McClintock			
			Clarke (NY)	Griffith	McCollum			
			Clay	Grijalva	McEachin			
			Cleaver	Grothman	McGovern			
			Clyburn	Guthrie	McHenry			
			Coffman	Gutiérrez	McKinley			
			Cohen	Handel	McMorris			
			Cole	Harper	Rodgers			
			Collins (GA)	Harris	McNerney			
			Collins (NY)	Hartzler	McSally			
			Comer	Heck	Meadows			
			Comstock	Hensarling	Meehan			
			Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Meng			
			Connolly	Hice, Jody B.	Messer			
			Conyers	Higgins (LA)	Mitchell			
			Cook	Higgins (NY)	Moolenaar			
			Cooper	Hill	Mooney (WV)			
			Correa	Holding	Moore			
			Costa	Hollingsworth	Moulton			
			Costello (PA)	Hoyer	Mullin			
			Courtney	Hudson	Murphy (FL)			
			Cramer	Huffman	Murphy (PA)			
			Crawford	Huizenga	Nadler			
			Crist	Hultgren	Napolitano			
			Crowley	Hunter	Neal			
			Cuellar	Hurd	Newhouse			
			Culberson	Issa	Noem			
			Cummings	Jackson Lee	Nolan			
			Curbelo (FL)	Jayapal	Norcross			
			Davidson	Jeffries	Norman			
			Davis (CA)	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes			
			Davis, Danny	Jenkins (WV)	O'Halleran			
			Davis, Rodney	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke			
			DeFazio	Johnson (LA)	Olson			
			DeGette	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo			
			Delaney	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone			
			DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Palmer			
			DelBene	Jordan	Panetta			
			Demings	Joyce (OH)	Pascarell			
			Denham	Kaptur	Paulsen			
			Dent	Katko	Payne			
			DeSantis	Keating	Pearce			
			DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi			
			DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter			
			Deutch	Kelly (PA)	Perry			
			Diaz-Balart	Kennedy	Peters			
			Dingell	Khanna	Peterson			
			Doggett	Kildee	Pingree			
			Donovan	Kilmer	Pittenger			
			Doyle, Michael F.	Kind	Pocan			
			Duffy	King (IA)	Poe (TX)			
			Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Poliquin			
			Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger	Polis			
			Dunn	Knight	Posey			
			Ellison	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)			
				Kuster (NH)				

NOT VOTING—7

Bridenstine	Long	Titus
Himes	Loudermilk	
Kihuen	Rosen	

□ 1802

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

PROVIDING RESOURCES, OFFICERS, AND TECHNOLOGY TO ERADICATE CYBER THREATS TO OUR CHILDREN ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 782) to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 3, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—417

Abraham	Babin	Bass
Adams	Bacon	Beatty
Aderholt	Banks (IN)	Bera
Aguilar	Barletta	Bergman
Allen	Barr	Beyer
Amodei	Barragán	Bilirakis
Arrington	Barton	Bishop (GA)

NAYS—3

Amash	Hastings	Massie
Biggs	Kihuen	Rosen
Bridenstine	Long	Titus
Hanabusa	Loudermilk	Tonko
Himes	Meeks	
Jones	Rooney, Francis	

□ 1810

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROSEN. Madam Speaker, on October 3rd, on rollcall votes 546, 547, 548, 549, and 550, I was not present because I was tending to my community in Las Vegas, in the aftermath of the deadliest mass shooting in United States history. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall vote 546, "Nay" on rollcall vote 547, "Yea" on rollcall vote 548, "Nay" on rollcall vote 549, and "Yea" on rollcall vote 550.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 71, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-339) on the resolution (H. Res. 553) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for

fiscal years 2019 through 2027, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RESTRICTING ABORTIONS AFTER 20 WEEKS

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, a measure that will restrict abortions after 20 weeks.

Substantial scientific evidence has proven that abortions inflict pain on unborn children who have reached the age of 20 weeks. It has also been proven that, at 20 weeks, an unborn child is capable of surviving outside the womb.

Just last week, I had the honor of meeting Micah Pickering, who had been born prematurely at 20 weeks. Micah is now a vibrant 5-year-old boy who is living a full and healthy life.

Currently, the United States is one of only seven countries that allow abortions after 20 weeks. This bill is a commonsense measure that will protect our next generation and end the egregious practice of late-term abortions.

During my time as a member of the New York State Assembly, I was the prime sponsor of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and was honored to champion this bill in an effort to protect the most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to protect the sanctity of life by voting "yes" on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

□ 1815

WHAT A RENEGOTIATED NAFTA COULD MEAN FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, I held a field hearing in Ohio to hear firsthand accounts from American workers and farmers and all our constituents on what a renegotiated NAFTA could mean for jobs in Ohio and America.

At the end of my remarks, I will include in the RECORD the testimony of Roger Wise, of the Ohio and National Farmers Union, and Nick "Sonny" Nardi, of the Teamsters Local 416 in Greater Cleveland.

Roger discussed the loss of American jobs to low-wage workers south of the border, and Nick emphasized the need to overhaul U.S. trade policy, including outlawing child labor, with stronger labor rights and true enforcement, calling for a tri-national Labor Secretariat to hear and resolve labor issues.

I am grateful for their contributions, as only by listening to those who have witnessed the effects of bad trade agreements can we move forward and bring jobs back to America and prevent exploitation of workers abroad.

TESTIMONY OF ROGER WISE, OHIO AND NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

(August 3, 2017 NAFTA Remarks)

Good afternoon. Thank you Rep. Kaptur, Elizabeth of the Citizens Trade Campaign and President Mark Payne, Local 1250 for hosting this very timely event about this very important topic.

My name is Roger Wise and I am a 4th generation full-time family farmer and have been so for more than 40 years. I am here today on behalf of the Ohio and National Farmers Union. NFU is the oldest active farm organization in the country, advocating since 1902. Ohio has been chartered since 1934.

Nationally we represent over 200,000 family farmers and ranchers and fishers. Here in Ohio we tout 2500 of those members. Four of them are here with me today, Marge and Mardy Townsend from Astabula County, and of course Congresswoman Kaptur.

The Farmers Union organization works through grassroots driven policy to improve the well-being and quality of life for family farmers, ranchers, fishers and rural communities. Each year at our national fly in we bestow on like-minded members of Congress our most prestigious award, the Golden Triangle. Rep. Kaptur has received it more than 25 years running, more than any other legislator; and we are grateful for her support.

I remember vividly when the Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz declared the United States would plant "fence row to fence row" and we would export our nation to prosperity and feed the world along the way. That 70's expansion lasted only a few years because American farmers soon produced massive surpluses, interest rates, inflation and input costs skyrocketed, prices plummeted and competing countries developed their own farming techniques. The farm cries of the 80's began and lasted for the next 25 years. Farm program payments accounted for 50% of farm income. The mantra was that profit came in "economies of scale", and we must "get big or get out". Many family farmers and ranchers did exactly that, some by choice, many by the force of the bank.

Trade agreement seeds were planted and gathered momentum in the 80's.

NAFTA was the poster child. Assurances were given that no jobs would be lost, in fact, many more would be created; and the economies of the United States, Mexico and Canada would explode for the benefit of the people in all 3 countries. President Clinton signed on to the agreement ensuring us this would be the economic model for the world.

Now, 25 years later we know the rosey assumptions and predictions did not play out in reality like they did on paper. American workers lost their manufacturing jobs to low wage Mexican workers who were also decimated product quality eroded, unions were decimated, family farmers either quit or were forced out of business, the middle class began to shrink and the trade deficit began to climb.

Agriculture, however, through it all was championed because the United States consistently enjoyed trade surpluses primarily from corn and soy exports. Unfortunately though, family farmers, ranchers, and consumers did not benefit from NAFTA. With the exception of the boom year 2008-2013,

which were due to the Renewable Fuel Standard, not NAFTA, close inspection reveals vertically integrated multi-national companies reaped the profits while farmers in all 3 countries saw margins decline to the point of non-profitability; and all the while our trade deficits soared. Additionally, trade deals opened the door to consolidation and mega-mergers which led to less competition, non-competitive markets, higher costs, fewer choices and reduced research and development. An example of the latter is herbicide weed resistance.

For decades Country of Origin Labelling, "COOL" has been the signature issue the Farmers Union. We pushed for its passage with great vigor because it benefits producers and 95% of consumers support it. Simply, it requires beef pork and poultry to be labeled with the country from which these products came. Rep. Kaptur has been indefatigable promoting this issue. In fact, she is more steadfast supporting and promoting COOL than any congressperson in D.C. and we are grateful for her efforts. This requirement is not unique and this virtually all of our trading partners have a form of COOL and all of them are WTO compliant.

Our coalition efforts paid off in 2002, when COOL was included in the Farm Bill. Unfortunately, special interests, uncaring about its popularity and practicality, lobbied to prevent its funding and the measure was not implemented. Our efforts continued and in the 2008 Farm Bill COOL was mandatory and it became law of the land.

Again special interests went to work to derail the law. They challenged it 3 times in Federal Court and lost each time. Undeterred and well financed, Canada and Mexico were coerced into filing suit with the WTO. Ironically, the tribunal was chaired by none other than Mexico. With the deck clearly stacked against us, our case was lost and Congress, under bogus threats of economic reprisals repealed COOL.

For NAFTA to be meaningfully renegotiated, re-instating COOL must be a high priority for the benefit of farmers and consumers.

Food production and its safety are national security issues as well as an economic ones. Trade agreements have led to reduced border inspections of food imports. Further, these agreements have deemed other countries less stringent safety regulations adequate for our import inspections. This relaxing of regulations puts our farmers and ranchers at a disadvantage because our products are routinely of higher quality.

Currency manipulation and the overvalued U.S. dollar makes our exports more expensive relegating us to the supplies of last resort which also adds to the trade deficit.

Farmers and ranchers were not helped by America's withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement. Farmers are poised to help mitigate climate change both here and around the world through conservation, carbon sequestration and other initiatives to assure sustainability for decades to come. Climate change must be part of any meaningful trade agreement based on public funded, peer reviewed science based research.

To conclude, the record must be clear. NFU is not anti trade or protectionist. We are keenly aware that the economy is global and trade is a critical component of world economics. We do, however, believe that trade deals should benefit farmers and workers in all countries. Living wages, competitive markets, with safety and welfare in the work place guaranteed; and all nations must strive for a clean and healthy environment

to preserve our planet for centuries hence. Only then will trade be fair and our deficit decline.

Thank you,

NAFTA FIELD HEARING WITH REP. MARCY KAPTUR

TESTIMONY OF NICK "SONNY" NARDI,
PRESIDENT, TEAMSTERS LOCAL 416

Good afternoon. My name is Sonny Nardi and I am president of Teamsters Local 416 in Cleveland.

In May 2000, 320 Teamsters got laid off from the Mr. Coffee plant in Glenwillow, about 20 miles east of here. Their jobs went to Mexico because of the North American "so-called" Free Trade Agreement.

My Local, Teamsters 416, lost hundreds of jobs to NAFTA

—120 jobs at HOSPECO on 79th and Carnegie in Cleveland,

—60 jobs at Muller Electric on Pain Avenue in Cleveland

—96 jobs in Bedford Heights, The Mr. Coffee Filter Division

—115 jobs at Blue Coral Car Wax in Maple Heights

These were all good paying jobs with benefits and many were inner city jobs, workers could walk to work and had much tenure.

Most of these guys, because their production jobs were simply shifted to Mexican plants, were eligible for some federal benefits under a narrow NAFTA program called "Trade Adjustment Assistance," or TAA. Here in Ohio, under NAFTA TAA, more than 150,000 workers have been certified as lost their jobs due to offshoring—plant relocation like Mr. Coffee—or because of increased imports from Mexico and Canada that reduce production and jobs at American companies.

But, as everybody knows, the TAA totals are the tip of the iceberg because that program certifies only the manufacturing jobs that we have lost because of NAFTA—not the services jobs that depend on a strong manufacturing base.

So, when you factor in those jobs, as well as the manufacturing jobs Ohio has lost due to our flawed and failed so-called "free trade" policies, than Ohio. And, on a personal note, as a longtime northern Ohio Teamster leader, there aren't many Local unions that have been decimated, the way 416 has, by NAFTA.

And on another point of personal privilege, I want to say that American workers, not just here in Cleveland but all over the country, have had no better friend, no greater ally, than Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur.

Some folks here are probably too young to remember the NAFTA Accountability Act back in the mid-90s. That was Marcy Kaptur shining a legislative light on the NAFTA disaster even as the jobs were staring to flow south.

That's why this field hearing is so important and that's why the renegotiation of NAFTA is an historic opportunity.

So I want to spend a couple of minutes on how we can overhaul the NAFTA to begin to repair the damage. Specifically, I want to describe some things that must be included in a new NAFTA, new Chapters, as well as some old parts of NAFTA that must come out.

But let me be really clear at the outset: if the Trump trade team does not renegotiate NAFTA in a thorough way that works for workers, then the US should quit the deal altogether.

I can't speak for the other folks on this panel today, but the Teamsters demand a complete overhaul of the NAFTA model. No cut-n-paste of the Trans-Pacific-Partnership, no tweaking around the edges. We want a

NAFTA upgrade that puts in interests of working families first and foremost.

To achieve this goal, the top priority has to be a new Labor Rights Chapter to replace the weak and unenforceable side agreement added to NAFTA to get Congress to support ratification in 1993.

When it comes to North American worker rights, we've got to level the playing field, so Mexican workers and union organizers have the same rights we take for granted up here. That will reduce the incentive for corporations to relocate jobs down there, if they can't oppress labor or avoid collective bargaining.

The new NAFTA must prohibit child labor and forced labor and protect the freedom of association and the right to bargain collectively through independent unions. Further, those fundamental labor rights must be enforceable by the same or better trade sanctions that protect commercial interests.

Moreover, a truly modernized NAFTA should establish a process to determine basic living wage rates in all regions of all free countries and an enforcement mechanism to guarantee a decent standard of living, including to save for retirement.

All these basic labor rights and the sanctions that protect them and the commitment to living wage must be enforced by an independent tri-national labor secretariat that can hear labor cases and resolve them on behalf of all workers, including migrant workers.

Last point on labor: this new NAFTA chapter will serve as a template for future negotiations, so it is crucial that America get it right this time.

Another new chapter that must be part of the NAFTA replacement model is Currency. One of the reasons we could not support the TPP was the previous administration refused to include enforceable disciplines against currency manipulation.

America has learned the hard way how our trading partners manage their currencies against the dollar to increase their exports to us (and limit imports from us), which increases our trade deficits, which costs American jobs. We're not saying that Mexico or Canada is currently manipulating their currencies. But we are saying that a replacement trade model that we will support must finally address the issue of currency misalignment.

Let me finish by mentioning a couple bad NAFTA provisions that must come out during renegotiation.

The first is Government Procurement, which is NAFTA chapter 10. It has undermined "Buy American" laws by requiring the federal government to treat foreign bidders as if they were US bidders. To Buy American is to Hire American; that's how it works, and we want our jobs back and our tax dollars spent at home.

Going into these new NAFTA talks, the U.S. should retract all procurement commitments that undermine responsible bidding standards and all domestic or local preferences. Teamsters and taxpayers from both sides of the partisan divide support "Buy American"—and we don't want the new NAFTA to weaken that economic policy, especially as we look forward to the infrastructure investment that this country needs so badly.

The second thing that must come out is the controversial system of private corporate courts that protect foreign investors. NAFTA's chapter 11 introduced so-called "investor-state dispute settlement" (ISDS) into our "free trade" deals, giving foreign companies superior rights over U.S. firms.

ISDS undermines the rule of law and facilitates offshoring by creating unique privileges and secretive arbitration chambers in which foreign investors, but not American firms, can challenge laws the claim will cut profits.

A third bad provision, of particular interest to the Teamsters, is in Chapter 12, which deals with trade in services. The old NAFTA opened up American highways to unsafe Mexican-domiciled long-haul carriers.

We and our allies like Advocates for Highway Safety, the Sierra Club and the Owner-Operator Independent Truckers, have fought for many years, in the Congress and in the courts, to keep that provision from being fully implemented.

The original intent of the NAFTA negotiators was to keep US interstates closed to Mexican carriers until the safety of the trucks and drivers could be certified. That never happened. Accordingly, we call on the new NAFTA RE-negotiators to end this controversy once and for all. The new NAFTA should require Mexican-domiciled trucks to transfer their loads to US trucks in the 20 mile wide border commercial zone.

In conclusion, I have named two new chapters that must be included in NAFTA 2.0 and three bad aspects that must come out—five reforms that will keep and create middle class jobs and help America lead the way towards a new trade policy program, a template for all future international commercial agreements.

But, seeing as we are enjoying the hospitality of our UAW brothers and sisters here in Local 1250, I want to mention one last NAFTA fix.

The Rules of Origin for autos and auto parts should be beefed up. The "regional value content" should be raised and all loopholes closed. In order to enjoy the low tariffs and NAFTA market access, all cars and trucks that are made in the three countries should not have components that are made in other countries where wages are suppressed by companies that oppress workers and pay them less than their labor is worth.

That solidarity is what this opportunity is all about. Autoworkers and Steelworkers and Machinists and Teamsters, the labor unions that have had the worst experience under NAFTA and now have the greatest stake in real overhaul in its renegotiation. We must stand in solidarity with our brothers and sisters in the independent unions in Canada and Mexico. And, in turn, all of labor must stand in solidarity with environmental activists, consumer advocates and the family farmers.

Together, we have been fighting NAFTA and its expansion for a generation. Now we can work together, with our allies in Congress, to finally fix it.

Thank You

HONORING JIM POWELL ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Jim Powell, of Johnson City, Tennessee, for his 80th birthday.

In addition to being a successful businessman, Jim has devoted his life to many worthy endeavors, such as helping students achieve their dreams of attending college.

Growing up, Jim never dreamed of going to college until a teacher helped him apply for a scholarship to the University of Tennessee. Eleven years later, Jim and his wife, Sandy, opened Powell Construction Company, which has been successfully operating for the past 48 years and employs more than 500 people.

All of this wouldn't have been possible without the kind encouragement of Jim's teacher. In an effort to pay that kindness forward, Jim created the Powell Foundation, which has provided over 4,000 scholarships to the University of Tennessee and to East Tennessee State University.

Our community is a better place to live and work because of Jim and Sandy Powell. Jim exemplifies the Volunteer spirit. I commend him for his selfless contributions to east Tennessee, and wish him nothing but the best on his 80th birthday.

Happy birthday, Jim.

HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE LAS VEGAS SHOOTING

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of one of my constituents, Michelle Vo, who lost her life in Sunday's mass shooting in Las Vegas.

Michelle was described by her friends and family as an ambitious, hard worker, known for her charisma and fierce independence. She embodied the American Dream in every single way. Her middle name, My, means "America" in Vietnamese.

Her mother emigrated from Vietnam and raised Michelle and her sisters near San Jose. Michelle would go on to graduate from UC Davis before moving to Eagle Rock, in my district, to work as an insurance agent in nearby Pasadena.

My heart goes out to Michelle Vo, her family and friends, and the other victims of the Las Vegas shooting.

I am heartbroken and angry about the events in Las Vegas. These incidents are far too common in our country, and it is my sincere hope that Congress takes action to lessen these types of tragic events.

OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS RUN TO DANGER, NOT AWAY FROM IT

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation stands in mourning over the tragedy in Las Vegas. No one ever wants to be in that situation. But it, once again, reminds us that, when there is danger,

our law enforcement officers run to it, not away from it.

We are going to hear many stories from that tragedy in Las Vegas, but many of them will concern those brave law enforcement officers who, at the risk of their own life, protected and saved the lives of many, many others.

So, as we mourn the tragedy in Las Vegas, let us always remember and be thankful for those law enforcement officers who protect us each and every day.

DREAMERS ARE AMERICANS TOO

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Leonardo Reyes of Salem, Oregon, and urge Speaker RYAN to put forth a clean Dream Act bill.

Leo is an undocumented Oregonian. His mother brought Leo and his siblings to Oregon when he was 10 years old. His mother was a victim of domestic violence and felt she needed to get as far away from her husband as possible to keep Leo and his siblings safe. His mother left everything she knew in Mexico in order to pursue a better life for her children.

Leo has attended Davis Elementary School, Reynolds Middle School, McKay High School, graduated from Chemeketa Community College, and is currently pursuing a bachelor's degree in interdisciplinary studies at Western Oregon University.

He works full-time helping senior citizens and individuals with disabilities access healthcare and food benefits. Additionally, Leo was a cofounder of the Oregon DACA Coalition, which raises awareness in the community by empowering Oregon youth to engage in our democratic process.

Leo considers himself an American, and I do too. He believes that being an American is a set of values and ideals which we all hold dear.

We need to pass a clean Dream Act bill that will recognize Leo and over 800,000 DREAMers as equal members in our community.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time we go after the perpetrators of online sex trafficking. A recent investigation revealed what I have been saying for years, that websites like backpage.com knowingly facilitate human trafficking due to existing law which has been wrongly interpreted and allows these sites to get away without criminal liability.

That is why I am cosponsoring legislation to specifically allow States to investigate and prosecute websites that facilitate sex trafficking. H.R. 1855 is bipartisan legislation that will empower law enforcement to combat online sex trafficking more effectively.

This is an important step forward in the fight to end the suffering of 12-, 13-, and 14-year-old girls and boys—children—who are the victims of sex trafficking.

So, Mr. Speaker, law enforcement needs more tools to put an end to the heinous practice of exploitation and modern-day slavery, and clamping down on backpage.com's ability to advertise young girls for sex is crucial and critical to holding them accountable.

IT IS TIME TO REAUTHORIZE THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in 1997, with a very, very bipartisan budget reconciliation deal, we passed a magnificent statement about this Nation's commitment to children, and that was the Children's Health Insurance Program that all of us were so very proud of. It started in 1997 as the first real health reform since Medicare and Medicaid, and millions of children were able to get healthcare. Maybe at that time their parents could not, but they could be covered: children with sickle cell, children with heart defects, children with various hereditary or genetic diseases who were impacted, children with cancer, leukemia, all of these children, or children injured on a playing field, children could be covered.

It is time to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program. In fact, I call upon the leadership to be able to establish martial law so that we can pass the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program coming this week before we go home.

The Democrats have been pushing. The leadership of the Democrats have been pushing. They have been asking for the passage of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

I can tell you that those, Mr. Speaker, impacted by the hurricanes, they need that healthcare. I ask for its passage.

VIRGIN ISLANDERS ARE AMERICANS TOO

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, Hurricanes Irma and Maria have wreaked havoc on the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and numerous Caribbean nations. Although the full extent of the

two hurricanes' impact has yet to be assessed, it is clear that the damage from these storms is unparalleled.

The people of the Virgin Islands have lost their homes and possessions. Business has been lost, along with hospitals, schools, and utility systems.

In the coming months, I ask that all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle approve the full amount of funding and support needed for short- and long-term relief.

For example, tomorrow, the Energy and Commerce Committee will consider legislation to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program for 5 years. I ask my colleagues to remember the people and children of the Virgin Islands.

Just over one-third of the children of the Virgin Islands lived below the poverty level even prior to Hurricanes Irma and Maria. After the hurricanes, our antipoverty needs will grow exponentially.

We need Medicaid and CHIP provisions to provide the Virgin Islands with additional funding and higher rates of Federal matching funds so that poor Americans and children in the Virgin Islands can remain covered. This, in addition to further changes to Federal program requirements, will help the Virgin Islands with the resources it needs to build.

So I urge my colleagues to please remember that Virgin Islanders are Americans too, just the same as constituents elsewhere across the country.

GOING FORWARD AS AMERICANS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there are so many things on the minds of Americans: three hurricanes in a month, disasters in Houston, Florida, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands. We just heard our colleague from the Virgin Islands speak of the problems that that island has. Millions of Americans harmed in so many ways, lives lost, just yesterday, the tragedy in Las Vegas.

It is hard not to focus only on those issues, but in many, many ways, Las Vegas aside, the issue of the hurricanes and what we will do as Americans going forward is on my mind and, I suspect, on the minds of many.

As we review and as we figure out how to deal with those disasters and how we rebuild, I would like us all to keep in mind that our goal, in addition to bringing these economies back together again, putting people back in their homes, their businesses, and the infrastructure, that we keep in mind that we ought to be looking for better

jobs and better wages for all Americans—and certainly for those in the low- and middle-income brackets—and a better future.

We think about Puerto Rico and their future. How do we make it a better future? Well, we certainly know that there is a problem in much of America, stagnation of wages, so higher pay becomes critically important.

We need to deal with the cost issues that go into this, and we need to make sure that all Americans, wherever they may be, in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Washington, Virginia, wherever, that they have the tools to compete.

So today we are going to take 1 hour, and we are going to talk about ideas that need to be discussed here in the House of Representatives: legislation, existing programs such as the Jones Act, shipbuilding, and the like.

□ 1830

I would like to ask my colleague, BRENDAN BOYLE, to begin the discussion with a bill that he and his colleagues, or our colleagues, are introducing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Before I have the opportunity to speak about that, I just want to say briefly what a contrast we see between the Republican tax plan that was released last week and the bill that my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), and I will be talking about.

The Republican tax plan that was released last week, I think everyone has acknowledged by now that it is a massive giveaway to the wealthiest 1 percent. The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center estimates that 79.7 percent of the top 1 percent would get the benefit.

But what most people don't realize is that, under that same tax plan, many middle class families and working class families would see their taxes go up, not down. The same nonpartisan Tax Policy Center estimates that 30 percent of middle class families would see their taxes go up.

We did an estimate of my district in northeast Philadelphia, and suburban Philadelphia. A majority of middle class and working class families in my district would see their taxes go up, all to pay for a massive tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent. That is wrong.

Now, contrast that approach with what we are introducing this week, and I especially praise the leadership of my colleague, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, who was the first one to introduce this idea. We are introducing the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act. It has always bothered me, as someone

who has seen jobs leave my district and go overseas and go abroad, that our Tax Code gives an incentive for that sort of behavior; that a company like Mondelez International that closed the factory that existed for more than half a century in Philadelphia, and shipped over 300 jobs to Mexico, that they are able to claim a few tax deductions while doing that.

The Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act closes those deductions, and it takes the money and devotes 100 percent of it to benefit those responsible employers, those companies that are providing jobs here at home in America, that are well paid with good benefits.

Now, my colleague, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, will go into greater detail about some of the aspects of the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act. But I really think that this should be a bipartisan bill. It is a chance for our colleagues on the other side, even this administration, that says it is concerned about losing American jobs overseas, to join with us on the Democratic side of the aisle. Support the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act and reject the sort of Wall Street-driven tax cockamamie ideas that give a massive tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent and require working class and middle class families to pay for it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for his thoughts. I started off with a better deal, better wages, better jobs, or jobs at all. The Make It In America agenda, which we have been talking about here for 5 or 6 years, long before President Trump came along, involves tax policy. I am bringing to our attention tonight a tax issue that will create jobs in America and, frankly, no longer promote the offshoring of jobs.

Another piece of our puzzle on making it in America, and better wages, better jobs, and better future, is something that has been much discussed in recent days, particularly with regard to the Puerto Rican situation, and that is the Jones Act.

Joining me tonight to discuss the Jones Act, why it is important to America, why it is a major job opportunity and continuation for American mariners, American shipowners, as well as America's shipyards, is Ms. JAYAPAL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. It was wonderful to see the gentleman out in Seattle exploring our maritime sector.

We are very proud of the maritime industry. And in the State of Washington, and in my district, the Seventh Congressional District of Washington State, sometimes people know about us for Boeing airplanes, but they really

should know us for our national deep-water port and all of the maritime that we have there.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, since Hurricane Maria hit Puerto Rico last month, residents have been without power. Many of them have not had access to relief supplies, including food and water. Many have lost their lives. It has been heartbreaking to watch. We all stand united in pushing this administration to do everything possible to ensure that the people of Puerto Rico have access to relief supplies and that the administration is doing everything it can to assist and rebuild.

These are American citizens, and we have an obligation to do everything we can to help after this devastating hurricane.

The reason I am here today is to join my colleague, the gentleman from California, because in the wake of Hurricane Maria, we did see a false narrative spreading through the media and social channels about the Jones Act. It caused us to reflect on the fact that perhaps not everybody knows the history of the Jones Act. Not everybody understands exactly what it does and how it supports so strongly American jobs that benefit so many of us.

There are people who thought that perhaps the Jones Act was to blame for the fact that supplies were not making it out of the docks and into Puerto Rico, and so I am very grateful to the gentleman from California, and Republican colleague across the aisle, Representative HUNTER, for holding an informal hearing on this very topic and inviting in shipbuilders, shipping companies, as well as the maritime labor industry to tell us a little bit about what was happening in Puerto Rico.

And so this is an opportunity, really, for us to talk about what the Jones Act means, because when you are talking about Make It In America, when you are talking about better wages, better jobs, and a better deal for the American public, then the Jones Act, in many ways, is the epitome of exactly that.

The Jones Act has been in effect for nearly 100 years and inspired by cabotage laws that were in place since the first session of Congress in 1789. The law requires that when goods are shipped via water between two points in the United States, they must be shipped on U.S.-made vessels that are owned and operated by Americans.

This is where the critical industry comes in. In terms of Puerto Rico, the Jones Act is not the reason that the distribution of relief supplies has been slow to move in Puerto Rico. In fact, reports are that thousands of containers containing fuel, emergency housing, food, water, and other essentials are trapped at the Port of San Juan. To date, at least 11,300 containers with millions of pounds of relief supplies have been delivered.

To put this in perspective, just one such state-of-the-art container ship arrived in Puerto Rico just 3 days after Hurricane Maria made landfall, carrying more than 35 million pounds of cargo, the equivalent of about 1,900 cargo planes. You can see here on the chart that the Jones Act current capacity is 22,000 TEUs with a maximum carrying capacity of 1.079 billion pounds.

So just imagine that the additional surge capacity, as of now, is 5,430 TEUs with a max carrying capacity of 258 million pounds. So the issue has not been that ships are not delivering. Our American ships are delivering supplies. But unfortunately, because of the infrastructure, the destruction to the roads, and the issues around refrigeration across the island—unfortunately, warehouses have been destroyed—there is nowhere to store those products, and there is no refrigeration.

So what we are seeing is the capacity at the docks continuing to increase. So over the next 2 weeks alone, Jones Act vessels will deliver more than 9,000 containers to Puerto Rico, including at least 3,300 FEMA loads full of relief cargo.

So despite these volumes, the residents of Puerto Rico are suffering, not because ships aren't being able to deliver there, but because of the lack of infrastructure that I mentioned, lack of refrigeration, all of those things.

So currently, the point that is very important, I think, for everybody to understand is that American flagships have the capacity to meet Puerto Rico's relief cargo needs, and the emphasis needs to be on moving cargo from the Port of San Juan into the island, and focusing on rebuilding the infrastructure that has suffered because of this devastating hurricane.

Mr. Speaker, some have called for an outright repeal of the Jones Act despite these facts. Why should Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle support the Jones Act? Because it is incredibly important to our country's economy and to the maritime industry, which supports nearly 500,000 jobs and is responsible for over \$92 billion in gross economic output each year.

So in my home State of Washington, which ranks sixth in the country for Jones Act jobs, this law supports over 16,000 jobs and helps generate approximately \$1.1 billion in labor income. More than 19 million tons of cargo originate from my home State of Washington every year, and the State imports more than 28 million tons annually. Without these jobs, our economy would suffer tremendously.

In my district, Washington's Seventh Congressional District, the Jones Act directly supports nearly 2,000 jobs, indirectly supports more than 6,500-related jobs. And to be clear, everywhere in the country where we have Jones

Act jobs, they are better jobs, better wages, and a better future for our Americans across the country.

Shipyard jobs pay incredibly well. They earn workers about 45 percent more than the national average for private sector jobs. And this is an area, as we saw in the hearing that was had, this is an area where business and maritime labor, our merchant marines, are proud to work together to make sure that we provide for the national security of our country through the Jones Act, and also that we provide these deep investments in good-paying union jobs.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we have to invest in Puerto Rico by providing comprehensive relief, including water and food and housing and medical care, and we have to do everything we can to rebuild the infrastructure. But at the same time, we must make sure that we continue bipartisan support for this bedrock maritime law.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the State of Washington for very clearly laying out why the Jones Act is good for all of us.

We held a hearing today, an extensive hearing on the maritime industry and on the Jones Act in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, and it was laid out with facts and figures, many of those behind you on the chart. There has been a lot of talk about the Jones Act somehow harming Puerto Rico. The fact is, the truth is exactly the opposite.

The Jones Act allows for three American shipping companies using American ships with American mariners to deliver twice a week—each of those companies—twice a week on what amounts to a milk run from Jacksonville, Florida, to Puerto Rico, all the goods and services that they need.

With the hurricane having happened, these three companies are providing all of the FEMA, all of the emergency aid, and they have additional capacity that has not yet been used in delivering the goods and services that Puerto Rico needs in the wake of the hurricane.

In addition to that, the Jones Act is not just between the islands of Puerto Rico, Guam, or Hawaii. It is the inland waterways of America—the great Mississippi River system, all of the barges and tugs and the rest. If the Jones Act didn't exist, we would have companies, mariners, and sailors operating in the heart of our country from everywhere in the world. This is a major national security issue beyond what we will talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) so very much for participating in this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) to carry on with these issues.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for yielding. He has done a great job of really making Congress aware and the American public aware of just how important the Jones Act is to our country.

There have been a lot of misconceptions out there, a lot of reports on the news that were just quick to pick up on a sound bite. But the fact of the matter is, when you talk about trade, when you talk about taxes, labor, and other things that you have added, national security, it is the Jones Act that is keeping all of those things going strong in America. I just really appreciate the gentleman doing that.

When we talk about middle class jobs in this country, there has been a lot of talk in this country about how we have lost a lot of middle class jobs over the last 20 years.

□ 1845

These jobs, because of the Jones Act, have been protected, and we need to make sure that we keep those jobs here in America going strong.

I am so glad that the gentleman also cleared up the confusion about what was really going on in relation to Puerto Rico, that American ships were doing what they were supposed to be doing, and that there were other issues on why people weren't getting supplies. The American public needs to know that.

When the gentleman starts talking about minimum wage, middle class wages, obviously, the Merchant Marines, the mariners out there who work on these cargo and container ships, help keep that middle class strong in America.

One of the reasons why they are able to do that is because many of those jobs related to the Jones Act, as the gentleman knows, are union jobs. The people who run those unions work very hard to make sure people have good wages and that they have good benefits so they can take care of their families and be able to send them to college.

As the gentleman knows, I have talked with the gentleman before, and he heard Representative BOYLE earlier, who is also the co-chair of the Blue Collar Caucus, talk about how important these issues are to us, and I know as well as Mr. GARAMENDI and everyone else within our caucus.

I just want to point this out very briefly. According to the Center for Economic and Policy Research, unionized workers are compared to their nonunionized counterparts in showing that their wages are 14 percent higher on average. Again, if you have jobs that are paying 14 percent higher on average, we need to protect those jobs because we want people to have more spending power to be able to make our economy strong and great, not less spending power.

The union wage premium is even larger for some demographic groups that, on average, receive lower pay, including workers of color and those without a college education. According to the Center for American Progress Action Fund, unions increase workers' benefits really substantially. Ninety-four percent of union workers have access to retirement benefits while only 65 percent of nonunion workers do.

As the gentleman knows, we discuss Social Security in this Chamber quite often, and how we are going into our retirement years and whether or not we are going to be able to take care of ourselves when we are no longer able to perform certain physical functions is obviously something that is very important.

Union workers are 28 percent more likely to have health insurance and pay a lower share of premiums for it. They are also 54 percent more likely to have a retirement plan than nonunion workers at workplaces. Union women in the United States are more likely to take parental leave, which is also more likely to be paid.

Again, whether it is the Jones Act or Davis-Bacon, we need to make sure that in this country we keep these jobs going strong and that we keep the conversation going in that direction.

Again, I just want to thank the gentleman for the work that he has done to raise awareness on this issue. We need to continue to talk about this just so the American public understands just how important this is to our economy and to our society as we continue to grow our workforce into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. VEASEY very much for bringing to our attention the role of the unions in maintaining wages throughout the United States. If we are looking for a better deal, better jobs, better wages, and a better future, certainly the union members in the maritime industry will—and have been able to—achieve that.

The great risk is legislation may be moving through the Senate and the House that would terminate the Jones Act and, along with it, some 400,000 jobs in the United States, 100,000 of those directly in the shipyards that are building these American-built ships for the intercoastal and for the brown water, the river transportation, as well as the open ocean transportation.

So we have got something here that is very important, and that is Make It In America, a better deal for Americans comes through the Jones Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. VEASEY very much for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that my colleague from Chicago, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, is here once again to pick up on something we talked about earlier in our

Make It In America agenda. If she would look here, number two on the Make It In America agenda is taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) to talk about taxes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just pick up on something that Congressman VEASEY said, but first let me just thank the gentleman from California for his relentless push to make sure that we have good jobs in America, that that is part of our better deal. We are not just talking about jobs. We are talking about good jobs.

I wanted to just say that when it comes to women, if women want equal pay for equal work now, join a union. There aren't any union contracts that say: Oh, we are going to pay men up here and women over here, not 79 cents on the dollar for a woman in a labor union.

So I encourage my friends—my sisters—to join a union.

MARC VEASEY and BRENDAN BOYLE are both the co-chairs of what we call the Blue Collar Caucus. I am part of it. Notice my blue collar today.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is properly dressed for the Blue Collar Caucus.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud member of that caucus because workers, as we know, are just not getting a fair deal right now in today's economy. The U.S. is the richest country in the world and in the history of the world. We are richer than we have ever been. Now, most people don't actually feel that because the ordinary worker has not seen any wage growth in the last 2, maybe 2½ or 3 decades. The income gap between top executives and the average worker is bigger than ever. At the same time, corporations are raking in record profits as they ship jobs overseas.

So, obviously, it is time for us to fix the economy that is rigged against America's working families. We can start with our Tax Code or end with our Tax Code or in the middle with our Tax Code. We need to do something about our Tax Code.

So today I am joining with Congressmen BOYLE and VEASEY to introduce—we introduced just a few minutes ago—the Patriot Employer Act, and that is H.R. 3925. It is a first step toward fixing a broken tax system.

Instead of giving tax breaks to companies that offshore jobs and that pay poverty wages, our bill encourages businesses to create good jobs here at home.

Here is how the bill works. We reward patriot employers with a tax credit for each employee's wages. To qualify for the patriot employers tax credit, a business must fulfill the following checklist:

One, invest in American jobs, no offshoring or tax inversion schemes;

Two, pay living wages;

Three, contribute to workers' retirement security through a defined benefit or defined contribution plan;

Four, provide quality health insurance;

Five, provide paid leave;

Six, and lastly, have practices in place to support employment of our troops, our veterans, and people with disabilities.

There is a companion bill that was introduced by Senator SHERROD BROWN, and I am sure he will get more cosponsors.

Small businesses, under 50 employees, can qualify for the tax credits by meeting only some of these criteria.

Unlike the Trump-GOP tax giveaway proposal, our bill is responsible. It pays for the new tax credits by closing existing tax loopholes that incentivize corporations to invest overseas. I think most Americans get that there is actually an advantage now for companies who decide to take their jobs out of the United States.

Under the current Tax Code, multinational corporations get to defer taxes on overseas earnings until they bring those profits back to the United States. Through creative accounting, corporations essentially get to avoid taxes in perpetuity. That is forever.

At the same time, those corporations can deduct interest expenses on investments overseas, such as building a new manufacturing plant somewhere. That is totally backward. We are rewarding corporations that are avoiding U.S. taxes and offshoring American jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, excuse me for a moment, forgive me for interrupting, but the gentlewoman said something that caught my attention.

American corporations that build a factory in China are able to deduct that cost of that factory against their American taxes?

Unbelievable. Unbelievable.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. That is exactly right, Mr. Speaker. If a corporation deducts interest expenses on investments overseas, and that would include building a new manufacturing plant offshore somewhere.

So we don't want to be rewarding corporations that are avoiding U.S. taxes and offshoring American jobs and giving them benefits. So the Patriot Employer Act fixes that. It raises taxes on corporations that offshore and reduces taxes on businesses that invest in good, American jobs.

The President talks about America first. This is exactly the kind of thing that we should be doing. Let's not create incentives to take those jobs away. But still, the Trump-GOP tax plan is a betrayal of American workers. I don't know if he knows that. It does nothing to raise wages. In fact, 80 percent of the plan's tax cuts would go to the top 1 percent of earners.

At the same time, 30 percent of middle class families—\$50,000 to \$150,000—

would actually see a tax increase under the plan.

As for corporate taxes, it doubles down on the problem in the current Tax Code. While our current Tax Code lets multinationals put off paying taxes on offshore profits, the new Republican plan would give permanent tax breaks for offshoring.

The Republican tax plan means less revenue for investments that grow the middle class, like education and infrastructure, which we need so badly, which he said he wanted to do. We want to do it with him. It means more jobs shipped abroad. For many middle class families, it would mean a smaller paycheck.

So we are offering a different path. The Patriot Employer Act, together with stronger unions and greater public investment, offers a real solution to the growing inequity in our country.

There are responsible businesses in our country. If a business pays fair wages and provides good benefits, we should support that. We shouldn't make them compete with corporations that don't.

In the end, it is a question of whose side are you on: the offshoring corporation or the American worker?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to reject tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and multinational corporations, and to invest in American workers and not offshoring.

So I just want to thank the gentleman from California so much for letting me come today and talk about this new bill that was introduced. I think it is totally consistent with our better deal, better wages, better future, and better jobs for America. I thank Congressman GARAMENDI so much for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so very much for bringing the voice of Chicago to the floor on a very good piece of legislation. I believe that has already gone across the desk, and I didn't get a chance to sign on to it before the gentlewoman put it across the desk, but I will forgive the gentlewoman for that.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to come to the gentleman right now and get his signature.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As a proud member of the Blue Collar Caucus, I thank the gentlewoman for both wearing blue and bringing a message from that caucus. It is extremely important.

The Make It In America agenda, which we have been talking about here for at least the last 8 or 9 years, has all of these pieces. The gentlewoman talked about trade, taxes, infrastructure, education, and labor—all the pieces of this puzzle.

As we discussed today, there are programs that are clearly going to be at risk. If the Jones Act somehow gets repealed or gets waived or otherwise is made less effective, then there are

some 400,000 jobs in American shipyards across the Nation that will be lost. These are shipyards in Philadelphia, the Gulf Coast, and out in the West, as we heard Ms. JAYAPAL talk about Seattle.

San Diego has a major shipyard, the NASSCO shipyard. These are places where the Jones Act allows for American ships to be built not in China, but, rather, in America. Make It In America. The Jones Act does that.

Mr. Speaker, I will give you a couple of examples. One of the companies that ships goods from Jacksonville, Florida, to Puerto Rico is the TOTE shipping company. They recently spent nearly \$400 million on two of the most advanced clean energy ships anywhere in the world.

□ 1900

These ships were built in San Diego. They are LNG-powered, natural gas-powered ships, and they are now plying the Jacksonville-Puerto Rico trade twice a week, back and forth.

Crowley is another company operating in that same area, again, twice a week, back and forth. They, too, will soon have LNG-powered ships operating in that area—ships built in America with American workers and American steel, American engines, and the rest.

So this is critically important. There are 100,000 jobs in the shipyards. If we repeal the Jones Act, they are gone and, along with it, the ability of the American shipbuilding industry to supply commercial ships to move critical national security men and equipment wherever it needs to go in the world.

The U.S. military is dependent on the American merchant marine system to move 90 percent of the personnel, equipment, supplies, tanks, artillery, and all the rest around the world. We have huge airplanes. They are essential. We see those operating in Puerto Rico now. But they are not supplying the great mass of goods and services that are needed.

So the plea from all of us who understand what the Jones Act is really about is to say don't do away with this critical piece of America's infrastructure.

At the hearing today, I heard my Republican colleague, Mr. HUNTER, chairman of the committee, quote the great free market idol, Adam Smith.

All too often, the free marketers of the world read those paragraphs that serve their purposes, but if they were to read the next few paragraphs in Adam Smith's work, "The Wealth of Nations," they would read that Adam Smith said very clearly at the period of time he was writing that it was absolutely essential for the British Government to protect the British merchant marine and the British maritime industry.

That same admonition should come to the American Congress the same

way: protect this vital industry, protect the merchant marines.

We do not want and we cannot have foreign ships, foreign tugboats, foreign barges operating up and down the Mississippi River.

What are they carrying? They are carrying gasoline, diesel oil, natural gas, volatile substances. They are carrying cement. They are carrying grain.

Do you want to have Yemeni sailors on the Mississippi? Do you want to have ships owned by China, tugboats, barges owned by China on the Mississippi River?

If that is what you want, then do away the Jones Act, because that is exactly what would happen. If you want good American wages with good American mariners operating on the inland waterways through the Gulf Coast and up the East Coast, if that is what you want, then you better keep the Jones Act.

If you do away with the Jones Act, it is guaranteed we will have the elimination of the American maritime industry.

If you want American ships operating on the West Coast from Seattle to Anchorage, then you better keep the Jones Act, similarly with Hawaii and Guam.

Most of all, do you want to have the United States military phone China and say: We need to ship a few things to the South China Sea to deal with your encroachment on the islands in the South China Sea; gee, Mr. China, would you please send us some ships so that we can put the military equipment on those ships? Is that what we want?

For those men and women here in this Congress and the Senate that want to do away with the Jones Act, think about it. If you do away with the Jones Act, you do away with the American merchant marine. Then this country relies upon China, the largest ship-owning nation in the world, or maybe sailors from wherever. What background would they have?

So let's pay attention here. Adam Smith said to the British Government: Maintain the cabotage laws. Do not allow the maritime industry for Great Britain to go away.

So we should be paying attention to the master of the free market system, who wasn't totally for the free market but understood the necessity of protecting certain industries that are critical to the future of a country.

One more thing is on my mind. Two years ago, the Congress of the United States decided that we ought to, for the first time in some 50 years, export our crude oil. We have been exporting natural gas in the form of liquefied natural gas for some time. We added to that the export of oil.

Is that strategic national asset on American ships with American sailors? The answer is no. But if we passed a

couple of paragraphs of law and required, as we once did with the North Slope oil when that opened up in the sixties, that that oil be transported on American-built ships with American sailors, if we were to reinstitute that law for just a small percentage of the strategic national asset, crude oil and natural gas, just a small percentage of that on American-built ships with American sailors, we could build ships in America. Not just a few ships, but over the course of the next 20 or 30 years, 50 or 60 ships, providing thousands upon thousands of jobs in our American shipyards.

Right now, where are those ships built? China, Japan, and Korea, but not in America. We ought to pay attention to the 1960 law that opened up the North Slope of Alaska that required that oil from Alaska be on American-built ships with American sailors. That lasted for almost 40 years. Then slowly, slowly it was set aside. Now that oil is on ships that are built in China, Korea, and Japan.

If we want good-paying jobs in America, if we want a better future, if we want better jobs, if we want an opportunity for Americans to earn a good middle class wage in the shipyards on the ships, then maintain the Jones Act and think seriously about a law that would create even more jobs in American shipyards.

We will soon be introducing a bill called the Energizing American Maritime Act. Using a strategic national asset that we are now able to export, natural gas and oil, we require that a small percentage of that—not 50 percent, not 70 percent, not even 40 percent, but maybe 20 percent—be on American ships with American sailors.

There are many, many things we can do to create good-paying jobs in America. The Jones Act is one such law that has been in place for nearly a century. It served America well and will continue to serve America well if we maintain it and if we don't allow waivers that simply blow holes in that law, and if we take a strong Make It In America agenda. The President likes to talk about it, but talk is cheap. Legislation makes that talk real.

Trade policy, taxes: We just heard about the patriot tax encouraging American businesses with real tax incentives and discouraging American businesses that want to offshore the jobs.

Energy policy: I think I just talked about energy policy a moment ago. Put that oil and natural gas on American ships.

Labor: Good-paying jobs in the shipyards, good-paying jobs on the ships.

Education: The maritime academies provide the education that is necessary to do that.

Infrastructure: Freight movement, the ports, channels deepening, maintaining the locks on the Mississippi

and the Ohio. Infrastructure, again, good-paying jobs.

We can do a lot. It takes laws and it takes men and women on the Democratic side and the Republican side that come together and say: We can do this. We can do this for America and for America's workers.

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

WESTERN CAUCUS: WILDFIRES

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring this Chamber's attention to the devastating wildfires that have ravaged the Nation this year.

The National Interagency Fire Center reports that there have been 49,563 fires that have burned 8,422,251 acres so far in 2017. Wow. Another 80 million throughout the country are at high-risk status, including one-quarter of the 193 million-acre National Forest System.

Though the Forest Service has spent a record \$2.3 billion to fight fires in 2017, these resources are being spent on the back end.

Mr. Speaker, the country has literally been on fire, particularly Western communities. It is far past time that this Chamber pass H.R. 2936 and get serious about combating catastrophic wildfires before they get started.

Mr. WESTERMAN's bipartisan bill adopts a forward-thinking, active management strategy and also provides allocation reforms that would cease the practice of fire borrowing.

I will likely have more comments later, but we have a few folks pressed for time, so I am going to end my comments there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), my friend.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman's efforts to be able to highlight the threat from wildfires that we are having in the West.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, the aftermath of Hurricanes Harvey and Irma have dominated our news cycles. Our hearts certainly go out to the people who have been impacted as they rebuild their lives and continue to work

to ensure that they have the resources they need.

When we hear the term “natural disaster,” most of us probably think of hurricanes, tornadoes, or earthquakes. Unless you come from the Western United States, you probably don’t think of wildfires as a natural disaster. But they are, and they have devastating effects.

Wildfire season is a part of life in the West, but this year’s fire season is shaping up to be the worst in history. Years of mismanagement of our national forests have led to conditions where fires are burning longer and hotter than ever before.

We need to address this problem on two fronts: one, through better forest management; and, two, by updating wildfire response so it is more in line with the Federal response to other natural disasters.

On the forest management front, we need to give the Forest Service the tools to engage in actual forest management. This means removing the dead and downed timber that serves as a fuel source for either man-made or naturally occurring fires, empowering local foresters and land managers to identify and designate areas of high risk, and supporting collaboration between all levels of government.

These principles are laid out in the Resilient Federal Forests Act by my colleague, Mr. WESTERMAN from Arkansas. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

We must also reform the Federal budgeting process for wildfire prevention and the suppression efforts. For too long, the process the Federal Government has used to allocate money to fight catastrophic wildfires has undermined forest management efforts that could prevent these types of fires from igniting in the first place.

Under current law, if firefighting costs exceed an agency’s budget, it must shift money from non-firefighting accounts to make up the difference. Last year, the Forest Service had to transfer \$700 million from other budgeted line items to cover firefighting costs, which brought the agency’s total firefighting efforts to about 55 percent of the entire budget.

You would think that firefighting wouldn’t be the biggest line item in the budget for an agency tasked with maintaining healthy forests. It is critical that we treat wildfires like other natural disasters after an agency’s wildfire suppression funds are exhausted. The cost of any extraordinary firefighting that goes beyond the agency’s annual budget should be funded through a budget cap adjustment similar to what is used by FEMA for other natural disasters.

It is my hope that we can continue to bring more attention to wildfires that are burning across the West and the impacts they are having on our com-

munities, and also that we can work together to advance policies that better support forest management and fire prevention and suppression efforts and forest health.

□ 1915

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the vice chairman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, who I consider a friend and one of the great leaders in the Congress, for leading this Special Order and for bringing this important matter before the Chamber.

2017 will go down as the worst wildfire season in history. My home State of Utah has definitely felt the effects. In June, the Brian Head fire burned more than 71,000 acres in my State. It burned for nearly a month, creating more than \$36 million in damage. And that doesn’t count the millions—indeed tens of millions of dollars it took to fight the fire.

While the fire was burning through my district, I was able to meet with local, State, and Federal leaders to take a tour of the fire and to survey the damage and to try to find a solution. The images I saw as I toured this fire were truly heartbreaking. Dozens of evacuated homes, burned homes, ruined forests, firefighters and volunteers who were working day and night to try to contain the fire, ash-filled lakes.

I took more than an hour in a helicopter to fly around the circumference of this fire. As I was flying around looking down, thinking about, among other things, the wildlife that had been devastated by this fire, I wondered: How long will it take for us to recover from this, for this beautiful landscape to recover?

And I can promise you this, it will not happen in my lifetime.

My family owns a ranch, and almost 70 years ago, we had a similar fire. You can still see the scars from that fire, which is several generations now.

One incident manager told me: “In 29 years of fighting fires, I have never seen a fire move so fast, burn so quickly and so hot that it could not be controlled or fought head-on.”

You have to wonder: Why is that?

The answer is very unfortunate. It is due to mismanagement.

Current mismanagement—and it is mismanagement—has left our forests vulnerable to insects and disease that make for a ripe forest for catastrophic fires. These heavy-handed regulations paralyze forest managers so they can’t accomplish the critical tasks that are necessary for proper forest management.

This failure to treat high-risk areas and to remove hazardous buildup has left our land susceptible to fires that grow in size, severity, and cost.

So you have to ask yourself: What is the answer? How do we stop this? How do we stop it from happening again?

And the answer is really quite simple. Federal policies have contributed to recent catastrophic fires, and wildlife management begins with proper land management.

That is why I support Representative WESTERMAN’s bipartisan Resilient Federal Forests Act, which allows agencies to do this work so that we can prevent these catastrophic wildfires.

I look forward to the House passing this important legislation. Let us bring back the beauty of our forests. Let us bring back the health of our forests. Let us prevent these catastrophic fires that rage out of control.

I thank Mr. GOSAR for bringing this again to the floor.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Utah, who has seen the challenging aspects and destruction from the fires, for his remarks.

I also now want to acknowledge my friend from Montana, who is actually still seeing the ravaging of the fires. In fact, Seeley Lake, Montana, set a record for the worst air quality ever recorded there, 18 times greater than the EPA safe particulate limit. Wow, that is a record that we have got to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for bringing the attention of the House to this important matter.

This summer, we had catastrophic wildfires in Montana. We burned 1.2 million acres. That is the equivalent of the size of the State of Delaware. I have seen this destruction firsthand. I visited with incident commanders and firefighters on five separate wildfires this summer.

In Lincoln County, the air quality was so unhealthy that teachers provided masks to the kids in school so they could breathe.

In August, I had Secretary Zinke and Secretary Perdue come to Montana and tour the Lolo Peak fire, one of the most expensive fires that was fought this summer.

I have worked to bring relief to Montanans. In July, emergency relief for farmers and ranchers was provided by opening up the C.M. Russell recreation area to grazing. We had hungry cows left from pasture being consumed and grass available. It was a commonsense solution to put those two together.

Also in July, we successfully urged FEMA Director Brock Long to reconsider their denial of one of our fires and declare Montana eligible for emergency funds. For these two things, I am thankful.

So the negative impact has been severe. And while there has been some relief, including welcome rain and snow, we can’t rely on that. Again, this summer, over a million acres burned in

Montana alone; we lost two firefighters; livelihoods were threatened; wildlife habitats were destroyed; smoke hung in the air; and ash rained down on our homes and our cars.

Air quality reached dangerous levels in our communities. In fact, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Montana donated 150 air filters to our schools so our children could breathe.

I have also seen firsthand the positive results of managed forests. Just 2 weeks ago, I toured a BLM forest near Miles City, Montana, and showed the effect of treating and managing forests. A fire burned in 2015 through a forest through the crowns, and when it reached a forest that had been managed, the fire quickly dropped into the undergrowth, burned through the grass, but none of the trees were lost.

In the untreated forest, there is just dead trees that won't recover in our lifetime. In the treated area, all of the trees survived. In fact, when an overgrown forest is thinned, more surface water came back, there is better habitat for wildlife, and we just have a better result.

I saw that also on the Roaring Lion fire, which occurred in the Bitterroot Valley in 2016, where, there, private property owners had managed their private property. When the fire on public land reached there, it was quickly extinguished and hundreds of homes were saved.

So the benefits of properly managed forests are clear. We have healthier forests. There is more wildlife, more hunting, more recreational opportunities, more good-paying jobs, and wildfires are less severe.

One of the biggest problems we have is litigation. We need more collaborative projects, but litigation is one of the greatest problems. Parties come to the table in good faith, they work collaboratively only to be overturned by court action by radical environmental extremists.

The Stonewall Vegetation Project in Lincoln, Montana, is a good example. Here, the Forest Service worked together with local landowners over a 8-year period to develop a collaborative forest management project. Once it was approved a year ago, the lawyers swooped in, arguing the project would disrupt lynx habitat. The judge overturned the decision. Fires raged this summer. Now there is no more habitat for lynx, and all that carbon has been released into atmosphere.

Benefits of forest management are clear. As I have mentioned, healthier forests, more wildlife, more hunting, jobs, and less severe fires. It is time to act. We can't control the weather, but we can control how we manage our forests. It is time to reform our forest management by passing BRUCE WESTERMAN's Resilient Federal Forests Act, and we also must put common-sense guardrails on the Endangered

Species Act to reduce frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana, who I am sorry to see have such a hard time this year in forest management, for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK), my friend and colleague.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GOSAR of the Western Caucus for arranging this Special Order tonight and especially for his exemplary leadership as chairman of the Western Caucus.

The wildfire crisis facing our forests across the West comes down to a very simple adage. Excess timber comes out of the forest one way or the other. It is either carried out or it burns out, but it comes out.

When we carried out our excess timber, we had healthy resilient forests and we had thriving, prosperous communities. Excess timber sales from Federal lands not only generated revenues for our mountain communities, but created thousands of job.

But in the 1970s, we adopted laws like the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act that have resulted in endlessly time-consuming and cost-prohibitive restrictions and requirements that have made the scientific management of our forests virtually impossible.

Timber sales from our Federal lands has dropped 80 percent in the intervening years, with a concomitant increase in forest fires. In California alone, the number of saw mills has dropped from 149 in 1981 to just 27 today.

Timber that once had room to grow healthy and strong now fights for its life against other trees trying to occupy the same ground.

Average tree density in the Sierra Nevada is three to four times the density that the land can actually support. In this weakened condition, trees lose their natural defenses to drought and disease and pestilence, and they ultimately succumb to catastrophic wildfire.

Three years ago, an estimated 25 million trees in the Sierra fell victim to these stressors. Two years ago, that number doubled to 50 million trees. Last year, more than 100 million dead trees are now waiting to burn in the Sierra.

Well, after 45 years of experience with these environmental laws—all passed with the promise that they would improve our forest environment—I think we are entitled to ask: How's the forest environment doing?

All around us the answer is damning. These laws have not only failed to improve our forest environment, but they are literally killing our forests.

The same politicians responsible for these failed laws have recently con-

jured up two new excuses. One is climate change. The other is that we are putting out too many fires.

Putting out too many fires?

That invites an important question: Exactly which fires did they propose that we allow to burn?

Perhaps the King fire that almost wiped out the towns of Georgetown and Foresthill on its way to Lake Tahoe in 2014?

Or perhaps the Detwiler fire this year that almost wiped out the town of Mariposa on its way to the Yosemite Valley?

Or any one of the more than 1,000 fires in the Sierra that CAL FIRE has put out this year, any one of which could have grown into a megafire but for the vigilance and competence of our fire agencies?

Which of these fires would they allow to burn into a conflagration?

True, controlled burns play an important role in clearing out underbrush, but as firefighters bitterly complained to me at the command center at the Detwiler fire this year, these same laws make it virtually impossible to get permits to do the controlled burns.

The other reason that we hear is climate change. Well, let's put that to the smell test. Throughout our vast forests, it is often very easy to visually identify the property lines between well-managed private forests and the neglected Federal lands.

Now, I have seen it myself on aerial inspections. The private managed forests are green, healthy, and thriving. The neglected Federal forests are densely overcrowded and often scarred by fire because we can't even salvage the fire-killed timber while it still has value. You can literally tell from the condition of the forest where the property line is. How clever of our climate to know exactly what is the boundary line between private and government lands.

And if carbon dioxide is the problem, doesn't it make sense to mill fully grown trees to sequester the carbon and replace them with young, growing trees that absorb much higher levels of carbon?

But, again, these same laws prevent this.

This is not complicated. Our forests are catastrophically overgrown. Drought is a catalyst. It is not the cause. In overgrown forests, much snow evaporates in dense canopies and cannot reach the ground. The transpiration volume in an overgrown forest is a big problem in a normal rain year; in a drought, it becomes lethal.

Pestilence is a catalyst; it is not a cause. Healthy trees can naturally resist bark beetles; stressed trees cannot.

□ 1930

A properly managed forest matches the tree density to the ability of the land to support it, but we cannot properly manage our forests because of the laws now in place.

Mr. WESTERMAN's Resilient Federal Forests Act and other measures will restore proper scientific management of our national forests, but we are running out of time to enact them, because we are running out of forests to save.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for yielding today, I thank him for his leadership, and I thank him for arranging this hour tonight.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his thoughts. He brought up some specific facts that need reiteration just because they are so plentiful.

The Forest Service only harvested 2.5 billion board feet in 2016, compared to over 10 billion board feet in 1990. To make matters worse, litigation and other challenges have caused a significant reduction in active sawmills nationwide from over 1,300 in 1995, to just over 220 today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding and for his leadership on this, and to my other colleagues from the West, who understand what we face, the problems we face, and what has happened to our forests.

I stand united with all of you in the Western Caucus, because this is something we have done some work on in the past and then we have been stalled out, especially in the last 8 years. I know that President Trump stands with us, wanting to pass legislation, get it down to his desk so he can sign it so we can begin to be better stewards of our great public forests, these public forest lands important to all of us.

As we saw painfully this summer, smoke chokes our citizens, it chokes children. Literally, in my district, elementary school children had to be sent home because of the smoke in their schools because of forest fires.

In Oregon, we have seen some of the worst fires in our State's history. It seemed as if every day came with new reports of more fire, more smoke. While this year's fire season has been particularly intense and devastating, images like these are nothing new for Oregonians. Each summer, smoke has filled our skies in Oregon year after year after year. Vast swaths of our land in our beautiful State are charred.

Unlike private forest owners, the State of Oregon, which I am very proud to be a resident of, and our forest policy and tribal lands and county lands, after a fire, they go in and clean it up, they replant, they get a new, healthy, young forest growing, which if you are concerned about reducing carbon emissions, you want healthy trees, because they actually sequester carbon. Burned, dead, decaying old trees actually emit carbon.

So we can do good things for the ecology of our world by planting new

trees after a fire. We will talk about that in a minute.

Smoke inhalation has become a health hazard for Oregonians in their communities. I can't tell you how many in my communities, day after day after day, were given warnings by our health authority that the air was too dangerous to breathe, that it was unhealthy to breathe.

A recent study found that wildfires contribute three times as much fine particulate matter into the air as previously thought, and this definitely can cause respiratory problems and make it difficult to breathe, as the citizens of our great State found this summer.

Wildfires also pollute our atmosphere with carbon. In 2002, the Biscuit fire in southwest Oregon burned more than 500,000 acres, half a million acres. The carbon dioxide emitted during that fire amounted to almost one-quarter of the carbon dioxide emitted in the entire State of Oregon this year.

By the way, we have burned 678,000 acres this year in Oregon at a cost of more than \$340 million to fight those fires, State, local, and Federal costs, mostly Federal.

Tomorrow, the Energy and Commerce Committee, which I chair, will hold a hearing to take a look at the air impact of fires, in part because I have constituents who have seen that, in some cases, fires are not aggressively fought if they are in certain federally designated areas, wilderness areas. There is a temptation, apparently, to not use all our tools, and to instead let them burn. That doesn't take into account what happens to air quality and the health of our citizens when fires are allowed to ravage and burn.

So we will take a look at the issues involving air quality and pollutants emitted into the atmosphere and discuss how better management of our forests could help prevent catastrophic fires and actually protect our airshed and our health.

Each of us today faces a similar situation. Devastating fires ignite across the West as fuel loads build across our public lands—Mr. MCCLINTOCK did a great job laying that out—while broken Federal forest policy stands in the way of better management, healthier air, protection of our habitat and our watersheds and our streams and our forested communities.

8.2 million acres burned this year. By the way, my colleagues, that is an area larger than Maryland, it is three-and-a-half or so times the size of, I believe, Puerto Rico, which has been wiped out. We talk about the devastation and disaster there and in the Virgin Islands and every other place, but somehow we sort of overlook the fact that we lose this almost every year in our West and in our forested land.

Communities watched their mills close, meanwhile, as Federal policy and

lawsuits and litigation has prevented proper management of our forests. So we have lost our jobs, we have lost our infrastructure, we have lost the revenues for our schools, and, in some cases, for basic services like law enforcement.

Now, promises that somehow recreation and outdoor activities would replace those good family-wage jobs, tourism, they are falling short, because guess what, events are being canceled because now the fires are destroying the airshed.

Constituents of mine have been sending photos this year about some of the fires. This one right here is from Mike, who was returning from a hunting trip just a few weeks ago. This was the Eagle Creek fire burning in the scenic Columbia River Gorge area between Cascade Locks and where I live in Hood River.

We had an evacuation notice within a half a mile of where I live on Rand Road. It was level 1, but they had them higher than that as you got closer to this fire.

Meanwhile, events like Cycle Oregon, its 30th anniversary, canceled because of the smoke; Sisters Folk Festival canceled because of the smoke. Down in Ashland, the Oregon Shakespeare Theater, world-renowned festival, they had to cancel nine of their shows at a cost of \$400,000 direct revenue loss, not to mention the concerns they have about indirect loss, people who didn't show up for other performances, and might even affect their annual sales.

People are really tired of this. They expect this Congress to take action to try and protect and become good stewards of our national forest land, but this picture tells you what we faced. The Columbia Gorge, where I grew up right near here, I can't remember a time the freeway was closed as long as it was this summer. We had to go over across the river to Washington to our good friends on Highway 14. All the freeway traffic was diverted there, and there is still one lane here that can't pass, because now we are worried about mudslides and rockslides and trees coming down the hillsides.

We need to get back to positive, active management in our Federal forests.

Five years in a row, the U.S. House has enacted legislation, sent it over to the Senate, that would give our professional foresters, our scientists, the tools that they clamor for and need to better manage our forests and reduce the overloading of debris, of dead and dying trees, open up these stands to what they should be naturally, get back in balance with nature. Every year this goes over to the other body, and somehow it never comes back. That has to change.

So tonight, I thank my friend from Arizona who organized this. He knows what forest fires are like in Arizona.

My colleague from Washington, my colleague from California, myself, our colleague from Montana, we have dealt with this year after year after year. Now, more than half of the Forest Service budget is spent fighting fire. That is not what we should do as a matter of bad policy.

We need to change Federal policy. We need to let our scientists manage these forests, restore jobs to our forested communities, protect our airsheds, our watersheds, and get back in balance. So I commend my colleagues in the Western Caucus for moving this forward.

I just finished a very positive meeting with the Speaker of the House, who is committed to helping us on this matter. I look forward to us having the opportunity to vote on the Resilient Federal Forests bill and get our Senate colleagues on board as well.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman so greatly for his indulgence in coming down and expressing the problems that have been faced in Oregon and thank him for the timely hearing tomorrow in Energy and Commerce. We certainly appreciate it.

We need to enlighten all Americans as to the tragedy that is going on in our public Western lands.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope they will tune in tomorrow and watch the testimony at that hearing. I think they will get a better understanding of what the people in our districts have faced. For a month this summer, schools had to be closed, festivals canceled, people choking, going to the hospitals. This is serious stuff, and we need to address it.

Mr. GOSAR. I want to highlight one thing that the gentleman actually brought to attention. Catastrophic fires also cause significant damage to the environment. Robust data from NASA has concluded that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total vehicle emissions in an entire State over the course of the year. Phenomenal. We just have to make sure people understand.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. WALDEN. We appreciate it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my dear friend.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, my good friend, Mr. GOSAR, for holding this Special Order and for giving us the opportunity not only to address the House on this very important issue, but also to address our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this year alone, over 8 million acres have burned across our

country. And get this: ten times that, another 80 million acres, are considered high risk to threat of catastrophic wildfires.

If this doesn't amount to a national disaster, nothing does. If we don't acknowledge that it does, this will only continue to devastate our rural communities across the Nation.

The previous speaker, my friend from Oregon, talked about the impact of the health to people living in these communities. I could attest to you myself, living in central Washington, we had smoke where the visibility was less than a quarter of a mile for weeks at a time. I knew people who had chronic coughs as a result of this smoke. Myself, get this: I had to come back to our Nation's Capital for my cough to clear up over our August break. The air was that bad.

So, Mr. Speaker, this evening, as you have heard from my colleagues from across the Western United States, as we gather to draw attention to this devastation, these catastrophic wildfires, what they pose to our communities, so States from Arkansas to Arizona, from Colorado to California, Montana to New Mexico, from Wyoming, from Oregon, to the great State of Washington, we are here to stress the importance of addressing the broken funding systems as well as the lack of resources that are necessary to adequately prevent and then suppress and fight these wildfires.

So we gather to highlight the dire need to reform the mismanagement of our Federal forests, which leads to the exacerbation of this devastation. Mr. Speaker, we gather to give voice to our often forgotten communities and our constituents.

Now, you have heard these Special Orders before. We as Members of Congress take these good opportunities to simply speak about a problem and bring light to its actuality, to let people know about it, but tonight is different, because my colleagues and I are here not just to talk about this, not just to highlight the major problem of wildfires across the country, but, in fact, we bring good news as well. We offer solutions to this important issue.

So this evening, I rise in support and urge support of two provisions originating right here in Congress, the people's House, to address these issues.

First of all, H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, which is sponsored by my good friend from the State of Arkansas, Mr. WESTERMAN, which addresses the disastrous consequences of catastrophic wildfires by utilizing tools the Forest Service and other agencies can use to reduce the threats that are posed by wildfires, by insects, by disease infestation, and dangerous old forest overgrowth that serve as a tinderbox for wildfires.

This legislation would enable the necessary management techniques to

address our forest health crises and significantly improve the resiliency of our Nation's forests.

On top of that, H.R. 167, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, which is sponsored by my good friend and colleague from Idaho, Mr. SIMPSON, fixes the way that we budget for wildfire suppression by treating these catastrophic wildfires like any other natural disaster, which they are.

Currently, agencies like the Forest Service are forced to borrow funding from accounts outside of their firefighting in order to address these fire suppression costs. This has become known as fire borrowing. This tool was intended to be an extraordinary measure, but in the past 8 of the last 12 years, the Forest Service has had to move funds from other operating accounts to fight these fires.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is systemic, it is dire, and we must address it.

□ 1945

The Wildfire Disaster Funding Act is a necessary solution to solve the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth district of the State of Washington, which I am proud to call my home, has been devastated by wildfires in recent years, from the Carlton Complex Fire of 2014, which at the time was the largest in State history, to the Okanogan Complex Fire, which only the next year surpassed that record. In addition to that, we lost three firefighters in the process.

Our communities know what it means to live with the overwhelming consequences of continual disastrous wildfires year after year after year, and it doesn't have to be this way. We can solve this problem.

My colleagues and I gather tonight to shed light on this problem and to offer solutions and to let our constituents know that we will not give up in this effort.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the two speakers have now brought up the issue that the House has repeatedly passed resolutions and ideas in regards to funding and taking care and mitigating our forest tragedy. There is an old adage around here that the Democrats may be the opposition, but the Senate is always the enemy. What we are here to do is light a fire under the Senate. Their talk is cheap; their actions speak. So let's light a fire.

To do that, I now yield to the gentleman whose Resilient Federal Forests Act is the topic for this evening, H.R. 2936.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for his leadership in setting up this Special Order

on the importance of proper forest management, proper forest management on our Nation's Federal lands. I would also like to thank him for his unwavering support of my bill, H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017.

It is my sincere hope that we see H.R. 2936 move off the floor of the House with strong bipartisan support and then move through the Senate and get it on the President's desk so he can sign this and we can start the process of reversing something that has been going on for many years.

As a person educated in forestry, I can tell you that forests grow slowly. We almost don't recognize the change in the forest because it happens so slowly over time. But given enough years, we see what has happened to our timberland out West. I have a map here of all the forest fires that we have seen out West this summer.

We didn't just get to this point overnight. It happened over a series of years. It happened when, back in the 1990s, I believe, we had an overreaction to probably some forest management practices that weren't the best that they could be. The pendulum swung way too far, and we got in a position where, what I say is, we were loving our trees to death, and we stopped managing our trees.

But we kept putting fires out, and fire is nature's natural way to manage overgrown forests. So what we have seen happen over time is we have seen more insects and disease infestations. As these trees grow closer together and fill the growing space, they start competing for water; they start competing for sunlight; they compete for nutrients; they become weak, and they become susceptible to insect attacks; they become susceptible to disease; and then they die. We get lightning strikes or we get fires to get out, and then we are dealing with a catastrophic event.

But it doesn't have to be this way. If we would employ sound forest management practices, we can do a lot to mitigate the intensity and the number of these fires.

As we look at issues that are created with these fires, we know that this has been the worst fire season on record, but it broke the record that was set in 2015 as the worst fire season on record. I predict that, if we don't start managing our forests now, in the next coming years we are going to see new worst fire seasons on record.

This is a process that will continue to get worse unless we address the problem. It is to the point where it is going to take time to reverse what has happened and to get the forest back into a healthy state.

I was notified this week about a sheep farmer down here in southeast Wyoming, in Torrington, who was a young guy getting into the business, and he lost five sheep. He took them to

the veterinarian to do a postmortem analysis and found out they died from smoke inhalation.

Now, the fire that was creating the smoke that was drifting down there was about 800 miles away in Montana. If it is causing that kind of health risk to sheep, what is it doing to the residents that live out here? I know that there have been schools closed, there have been people who have to stay indoors, but this creates a health risk. It is more than just a risk to healthy forests. It is a risk to healthy humans.

We have got another map here, and this shows the smoke drift on a particular day. I believe this was September 14. This is a map that was produced by NOAA, and you can see where the fires were, and you can see how the winds carry the smoke. The red shows the most intense areas of smoke, the lighter green the intermediate, and then the darker green shows where the least smoke intensity was.

This map really illustrates how fires in certain areas, the smoke gets picked up by the wind and gets carried to different places across the country.

When I look at this map of the Western United States—and me being from Arkansas, some might ask: How do these fires affect forestry in Arkansas?

Well, we have talked about fire borrowing. When we take money from one account in the Forest Service budget and put it in the firefighting account, that takes money away from management practices that could take place on the forest in Arkansas and other places to the east where we don't have as many catastrophic fires. On top of that, we see how the smoke drift affects many, many parts of the country.

When we think about the smoke, what is that smoke? It is mainly carbon. One of the main purposes of a healthy forest is to fulfill the cycle of photosynthesis, where it pulls carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere, takes that in through the leaves, converts it into sugars, and releases oxygen back into the air. The forests clean the air except when they are burning at the rate that they are burning right now, at 8.5 million acres of our Federal timberland that went up in smoke, putting hundreds of millions of tons of carbon into the atmosphere. If we want to talk about taking carbon out of the atmosphere, the solution to that is a healthy forest.

But not only do forests clean the atmosphere, they clean the water. The more ground cover we have, the more water gets filtered as it goes into the ground, as it goes into streams.

But overstocked forests can also prevent water from actually getting into the ground table and getting into streams. In areas in the West where we are having water shortage problems, proper management of forests can help to alleviate those problems.

We are not talking about clear-cutting. I get so tired of people saying,

"All they want to do is clear-cut our Federal forests." We don't want to clear-cut the Federal forests. We want to manage them. We want to use practices like thinning from below, where we take out small stock, where we take out the smaller trees. Some of it is merchantable; some of it is not. We can produce timber that can be used in the rural areas where it is grown to help the economies out there.

But the end goal is to have a healthy forest with larger trees spaced further apart without all the fuel ladders going down to the ground so that, when a fire moves through these areas, it burns at a low temperature through the ground. And guess what. That creates great wildlife habitats when we do that.

There are so many benefits of having a healthy forest, and as a forester, a forester who was trained at a school that was started by Gifford Pinchot, who is the father, along with Teddy Roosevelt, of our Federal forests, it is embarrassing to me what has happened to our Federal lands across this country.

Roosevelt and Pinchot talked about conservation. They talked about leaving our resources in better shape than we found them in. Right now, we are not doing that. We are allowing the lack of management to destroy these resources for future generations. We are allowing the lack of management to emit hundreds of millions of tons of carbon into the atmosphere and also take that vegetation away that provides wildlife habitat, that provides a filter for clean water, and that provides timber that is pulling carbon out of the atmosphere.

We can do better than this. We have provisions in the Resilient Federal Forests Act to allow the Forest Service to actually manage the timber. We require them to do a no-management analysis, because when you look at the dynamic nature of a forest, if you say, "We are not going to do anything," well, you just made a management decision.

Again, the trees are living, growing organisms. Even though the Forest Service says, "We are not managing it," they are going to continue to grow. They are going to fill the growing space. If we continue to suppress fire, the fuel load is going to get worse, and we are going to have more and more forests subject to catastrophic wildfire of, I believe it is, 192 million acres of Federal timberland in this country. About 60 million acres right now, according to the Forest Service, is subject to catastrophic wildfire.

It is time to act. We have waited too long, and the problem continues to get worse. It will continue to get more severe as time moves on if we don't start intervening now.

Mr. GOSAR, I want to again thank you for putting this together, for the efforts that you are putting forth so

that we can take a proactive stance to make not only our air cleaner by not having all these catastrophic wildfires, but to conserve our forests so that they are healthy, so that they are functioning the way that they should be.

I want to thank you again for all that you are doing, the work for the Western Caucus and all the members here, realizing, on both sides of the aisle, how important it is that we do the right thing, that we pass H.R. 2936, and that we start addressing this problem now.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his excellent leadership. He is very modest.

Listen, folks, I made a comment. Around here in Washington, D.C., we talk about the Democrats being the opposition and the Senate being the problem. Well, as you know, this is a very bipartisan bill. He is very modest.

Let's go back through what H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, actually does.

It allows for the streamlined review of projects up to 30,000 acres if the management strategy is put forward by collaborative stakeholders. Imagine that, something so simple.

It also requires litigants opposing active management projects to propose an alternative proposal as opposed to just saying "no." "No" isn't a solution. It is what you are for.

It removes incentives for extreme special interest groups to file frivolous lawsuits—boy, once again, coming to the table with a solution.

It empowers local stakeholders and decisionmakers. So often we overlook the people on the ground, on Main Street, who have to live with the consequences for bad policy decisions.

It also empowers Tribal communities to be part of the solution and to help reduce the risk of wildfire. We see this time and again, that the Native Tribes that are in charge of their forests have pristine management practices.

H.R. 2936 also maintains current protections for our environmentally sensitive areas, including wilderness and roadless areas. What a concession.

We need to be clear about larger risk areas and get to these in a more timely manner that we really want to handle.

This bill is good for forest-dependent species as it allows for improvements to their habitat.

This bill adopts a forward-thinking, active management strategy that combats dangerous wildfires before they get started, which includes reforms that would end the practice of fire borrowing.

I want to thank the gentleman for his excellent piece of legislation. It is time that it moves forward.

Once again, it is not the House that is the problem, but our colleagues across the street. Once again, talk is cheap; actions speak. Americans need help.

The fact that these disasters are quite natural might lead one to think they are inevitable, but according to forestry officials and experts, it is our stunted Federal forestry management and underfunded and misallocated Forest Service accounts that are to blame.

□ 2000

Our system is broken. These fires start naturally and decimate our natural ecosystems, but the ultimate cause at the level of their severity and recurrence is manmade.

The facts about the relationship between management and wildfires speak for themselves. Forest Service data indicates that active forest management reduces wildfire intensity, while improving forest health. In spite of this, only 1 to 2 percent of high risk areas are actively treated and subject to forest management.

The United States Forest Service expends too many resources fighting fires after they break out to work to prevent them in any significant way before they start. By performing routine thinning, culling hazardous fuels on the forest floors, and conducting controlled burns, they could accomplish exactly that, but such a course of action would require ample resources and wise allocation. As you could guess, my professional diagnosis is that both of those are in short supply.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle are able to hear what I say next. If you care about carbon emissions, you should care deeply about this issue, no matter where you live in the country, no matter where you live.

NASA data shows that one wildfire can emit more carbon in a few days than total vehicle emissions in a State for the whole year. To put it in perspective, controlled burning releases roughly 10 percent as much, and is only one part of an overall active management strategy.

So the correct choice in this situation is obvious: we spend a little more on the front end so that we can save ourselves much of the economic, environmental, and familial displacement costs on the back end. These costs are year after year, and they are catastrophic when they are left untreated.

Treatment is the right course of action, but it requires a little bit of planning, due diligence, and yes, action on our part. I know Congress is a big fan of the word, but when you look at the track record, Congress isn't a big fan of actually acting.

In response to this dire situation, Members of Congress from across the country will be sharing their thoughts and experiences within their home States. They will be discussing this during the year, and this past year of terrible wildfires. These are stories that need to be recounted.

They will also be speaking about the solutions that we have come together

with, for forestry officials and stakeholders across the country. Tackling this problem has become a collaborative and holistic national policy effort, and the policy proposals we have produced are reflective of this fact. They are also bipartisan.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can't let this just be a rhetorical exercise. We are united in demanding Congress do something. This Chamber has the knowledge and aptitude to deliver policy solutions. Now we need the political will to turn that knowledge into congressional action. Only then will huge portions of the country finally see some relief from these disasters.

When your home is on fire, it is straightforward, it is a nonpartisan issue. You call the fire department, and after the problem is dealt with, you make sure that you eliminate what caused the fire so that you don't see it again.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was on fire this year, and I demand that we, as this Chamber, unite in the same spirit of decisive problem solving as we do for our natural disasters. Let's put these fires out, and then let's stop the brunt for next year's fires before they start.

In my four terms as a Congressman from Arizona, I have had to witness the largest catastrophic fire in Arizona history, and also the most catastrophic life-taking, the Yarnell fire. The first was the Wild Well fire in northeast Arizona, and the second was the Yarnell fire that is now in the movie theaters that took the lives of 19 firefighters. That is a travesty.

This is something that gives when it is managed right. The people back home know the right answer. Let's give them the tools, the working power, and the policy that allows them, instead of being victims, to be stalwart solutions for a policy that gives back.

As the gentleman from Arkansas said, as Teddy Roosevelt said: Leave our natural resources better than we found them.

Mr. Speaker, the speakers tonight shared their stories. We want America to hear those loud and clear. These are natural disasters no different than hurricanes, but these, in one case, are different. They are manmade.

Let's bring this commonsense policy that Mr. WESTERMAN has put forward. He is a true advocate and smart in regards to those reforms; that is why we want to make sure that H.R. 2936 gets moved through this Chamber, and then put the onus back on the Senate, so that we actually reward the people for good policy and making sure that the victims are turned upside down and made stalwart solution makers.

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

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH
BIRTHDAY OF FANNIE LOU HAMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the

Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I am privileged to rise in support of recognizing a true hero in not only the State of Mississippi, but this country as a whole. Her name is Fannie Lou Hamer. Fannie Lou Hamer will be 100 years old this week. I am happy to say that part of who I am can be attributed to my association with Ms. Hamer.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into my message, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and my friend, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, for organizing this important Special Order hour honoring his fellow Mississippian, Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer.

Yesterday, *Cosmopolitan* published an article written by Zerlina Maxwell, aptly titled "Trust Black Women." In the article, Maxwell, a fellow New Jerseyian, quoted her colleague, who said: "Black women have been a part of every great movement that has happened in this country. We always show up."

Tonight, we celebrate the birth of Fannie Lou Hamer, a black woman who, like many of us, always showed up. In 1964, Fannie Lou Hamer showed up at the Democratic National Convention to speak on behalf of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and highlight the hurdles, both physical and political, that were preventing Blacks in the South from showing up at the ballot box.

During her testimony, she recounted her 26-mile journey to Indianola, Mississippi, to register to vote at the county courthouse where seven other men and women were looking to do the same. On the way, they encountered coordinated opposition from local and State law enforcement and men and women who sought to deter them from exercising their right to vote.

Upon returning home, Fannie Lou Hamer found that she had been fired from her job. According to *The New York Times*, she said: "They kicked me off the plantation; they set me free. It is the best thing that could happen. Now I can work for my people."

That same year, Fannie Lou Hamer ran for Congress as a candidate from Mississippi's Second Congressional District. And even in her defeat, Ms. Hamer continued to show up and work for her people.

In 2014, 50 years after her testimony and her run for Congress, residents in New Jersey's 12th Congressional District elected me, the State's first ever African-American woman to represent them here in the House of Representatives.

During my freshman term, I joined my two amazing colleagues, Represent-

ative ROBIN KELLY of Illinois and Representative YVETTE CLARKE of New York, to form the first ever Congressional Caucus on Black Women and Girls, a body of elected officials who work to ensure that Congress shows up for us.

And in 2016, I stood at the Democratic National Convention, standing on the shoulders of Ms. Hamer's legacy, and proudly told America that this Nation is stronger when everyone has a chance to succeed.

Ms. Hamer would beam with pride knowing that my colleagues and I continue to beat back hurdles placed at the feet of minorities and the poor that restrict their access to the vote.

Ms. Hamer, however, would be very sad to know that, instead of being fired for trying to exercise the right to vote, they change polling places or amend requirements for valid identification. It is the same game, she would recognize, it is just different tactics.

I am honored to stand here to honor the birthday of Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer, walk alongside her footsteps of greatness and, like she so often did, lift as I climb. We as women, and women of color, have to be the standard bearers we have been and continue to be. We have always and will continue to fight for what is right and what is necessary, even if we must do this alone.

As we battle back against the racism, the sexism, and the bigotry that runneth over in this administration, we must always be awake, alert, and to show up.

Today, in honoring the birthday of Fannie Lou Hamer, we simultaneously celebrate the strength of women, the ways we can encourage one another to be our sisters' keepers, and continue to build a future for the next generation of women ready and waiting to show up and to lead.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentlewoman from New Jersey that I had the opportunity to meet Ms. Hamer as a young college student at Tougaloo College. Facts about it, one of the first campaigns I worked on as a college student was Ms. Hamer's campaign for Congress, even though, as the gentlewoman indicated, she lost. But I now represent the Second District of Mississippi, and it was Ms. Hamer's spirit that still lives on.

In Sunflower County, Mississippi, the majority of the population is African American. At the time she registered to vote, we had no African Americans elected officials in Sunflower County. I am happy to report to you now that the sheriff is African American; the chancery clerk, the circuit clerk, four of the five county supervisors are African American; so Ms. Hamer's work has not been in vain.

As you also indicated, the Devil is busy creating tricks to disenfranchise people—voter ID, closing voting polls,

making it more difficult for people in rural areas to get to the polls to vote, especially in areas where you don't have public transportation.

So, Ms. Hamer's 100th birthday should be spent rededicating ourselves to her legacy. One of the things that everyone loves to quote is Ms. Hamer's words that she is "sick and tired of being sick and tired." Well, that goes a long way, especially given the administration we are being challenged with here in Washington now. Hopefully, Ms. Hamer's spirit will live on.

Congresswoman KAREN BASS and myself visited Ms. Hamer's grave this past Saturday in Ruleville, Mississippi, and it was very touching. The community, in her death, has really embraced not only she, but her husband, Pat, and created a monument downtown Ruleville to her memory.

When I was a freshman Member of this body, I named the post office in Ruleville, Mississippi, after Ms. Hamer, and I am happy to say that the mayor of Ruleville, Mississippi, now is an African-American female.

So Ms. Hamer's legacy, her involvement with SNCC, her involvement with the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, all those things have made not just Mississippi, but this country a better place—affordable housing, all those things that she wanted, access to not only healthcare, but access to affordable healthcare, many of those items she talked about.

As a Christian woman, she believed in nonviolence, but she also believed in direct action. She was assaulted in the Winona, Mississippi, jail for advocating the right to vote.

□ 2015

In spite of what she encountered, she served as a shining example of what a truly committed individual can accomplish.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not ever have the pleasure and honor of meeting her in person, but I remember watching television during that Democratic National Convention, which was taking place in my home State in the great city of Atlantic City.

I remember the conscious bearing energy that evolved around all of that activity, and it made me very proud. And I would say that, indeed, Fannie Lou Hamer's work has not gone, has not been in vain. But she also is smiling down knowing that what she started, you are continuing on, and that you are serving in the very district that she loved enough to fight for way back when.

It is my honor to know you, and to know that you have been touched by

her. So that means that with less than 6 degrees of separation, I have been touched by her, and that is my blessing.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say to the gentlewoman that that 1964 Atlantic City Democratic National Convention set the tone for opening up the Democratic Party to people of all races and colors because Mrs. Hamer challenged the all-White makeup of the Mississippi delegation by saying Black people couldn't participate. They were systematically excluded from the selection process, and she appealed to that convention to do better.

I am happy, as you know, to report that the convention heard Mrs. Hamer and decided that an all-White delegation from the State with the highest percentage of African Americans in the country could not be justified. So the delegation was not only integrated at the convention, but, for a time, we shared the chairmanships of the party. We had a co-chair that was White and a co-chair that was African American. So Mrs. Hamer's spirit still lives on.

One of the real issues that really touches most of our hearts is that she was a very humble person. She had the kind of spirit in her delivery that you just had to pay attention to. She had the aura when she walked in a room that whatever you were doing, you had to stop and pay attention to this very simple person who came in. But every time she opened her mouth, something very prophetic would come out.

So for a lot of individuals who think that Fannie Lou Hamer's time has come and gone, I think it is fitting and proper that at this 100th birthday celebration, we recommit ourselves to many of the things that Mrs. Hamer stood for: inclusion; not leaving people out because they don't live in the big house on the hill; to make sure that our children receive the best education possible. All of those things Mrs. Hamer was noted for.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is vitally important on this 100th anniversary of Ms. Hamer's birth to also recognize that we are still fighting for the unfettered access to the vote, and that here in Congress, we have the opportunity to eliminate barriers and to fix the problems with the Civil Rights Act that just negatively impacts access and unfettered access to voting. There are just so many fundamental things that we could be doing today that honor the work that she did and that she gave her life's work to.

In closing for me, I want to just say that I thank the gentleman so very much for doing this because I know

that there are people who listen to these moments of Special Orders hours on C-SPAN, or catch it in some other form. It is important for our communities to recognize just how significant this woman's role was in ensuring that they have the access to the things that they have access to today, and to demand their right to vote, and to exercise that right to vote every chance they get.

I am very grateful for the gentleman carrying this message this evening.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the very kind comments. But to talk about Mrs. Hamer and her work is easy. It speaks for itself. I am very privileged, as I indicated, to have known her, to have participated in a number of meetings.

One of the other things that I realized, she didn't—as we used to say, there were no big Is and little yous. She saw everyone the same. It didn't matter whether you belonged to the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, or the Black Panther Party, or the Deacons for Defense and Justice. You still had room at the table under Mrs. Hamer's tutelage. Many of us are privileged to have known her in that way, and we try to pattern our lives after her.

The National Council of Negro Women really worked very hard with Mrs. Hamer in producing affordable housing and to making sure that farmers cooperatives could be developed in the Mississippi Delta. Because as some would choose to forget, Mrs. Hamer was put off the plantation that she lived on because she was encouraging people to register and vote.

But those were the times that we all lived in, and we saw it. When I ran for Congress, there were people who worked on farms who were required to work overtime so that they couldn't go to the polls before they closed. So there are a lot of things that we saw during Mrs. Hamer's time. The tricks are still being played.

So it is in the spirit of Fannie Lou that we pay tribute tonight to her. It is in that spirit of Fannie Lou that we wish her a happy 100th birthday. But it is also in her spirit that, as they say in South Africa, “the struggle continues,” “a luta continua.”

I know in the Congressional Black Caucus we call ourselves the conscience of Congress. We have to be. If we don't speak up for many of the people that Mrs. Hamer loved the most, who will? We were sent here to care for the opposition on behalf of the people who can't afford to hire lobbyists; on behalf of the people who can't get on a plane and fly to Washington and talk to their congressperson; on behalf of the little child who not only is struggling to get into the Head Start program, but whose parents are having a hard time.

So our representation as members of the Congressional Black Caucus is predicated on many of the things that Mrs. Hamer stood for in her lifetime. We can't ever forget her spirit. We can't ever forget her energy. And even though we have the opportunity as Members of Congress to meet people from all over the world, one of the things that she used to say is: “You know, I walked among kings, but I have always kept the common touch.”

It is in that spirit that I appreciate the gentlewoman helping me carry forth this time for Mrs. Hamer as she celebrates here 100th birthday. If the gentlewoman has some closing comments or something she would like to add, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to note that there was an amazing demonstration of people in front of the Supreme Court demanding that we do something about gerrymandering because that is another way of negatively impacting the impact of one man and one vote.

So it is, again, fitting to be honoring this woman who gave her life's work to ensuring that everybody who was eligible to vote was given the right to vote; to eliminate any obstacles that were placed in their way so that we could open up opportunities to elect people who would be fair in the policies that are important; to ensure that there is equality of opportunity in this country for all people, predicated upon their ability to do the intellect and their willingness to work hard, therefore, the content of their character versus the color of their skin. So it is indeed an honor to have shared this moment with you. Thank you for the invitation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Thank you very much Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN for your participation.

The last point I would like to make is, in Mrs. Hamer's day, it was poll tax. It was: How many bubbles are in a bar of soap? How many grains of sand are on the beach?

Now it is moving the polls in the interest of saving money, but you are disenfranchising people who don't have the ability to go further. It is the gerrymandering of districts so that you have the richest people in an area in the same district as the poorest people in that area. There are no real communities of interest.

If I am worried about paying the light bill or the rent, then there is a great possibility that I won't go vote. But if I own a house and own a car and know where my next meal is coming from, I will go vote. So we have what we call communities of interest, and Mrs. Hamer talked about that.

So, again, we wanted to make sure that this week did not go by without giving Mrs. Hamer her due recognition

for her 100th birthday. There will be a lot of other activities after this Special Order hour in memory of Mrs. Hamer.

We have a movie that will be produced talking about her life and legacy and her contribution to this great country of ours. I look forward to that as well as making sure that our children and grandchildren understand who this great woman was and what she meant to this country of ours and so many of us who pattern after her. So, again, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to President Trump's lack of concern for the thousands of Americans affected by the hurricanes throughout the U.S. and most recently in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, which has reminded us of the devastation Hurricane Katrina caused. Instead of showing compassion to those suffering, the president and his administration have condemned African-American athletes and a Black, female sports commentator for exercising their constitutional right to protest and voice their opinions.

Today, I stand with the athletes who choose to take a knee during the national anthem and those who speak out fighting against racial inequality that still persists throughout this country.

I suggest President Trump spends less time tweeting discriminatory comments and more time focusing on the issues of our country.

Tonight, I recognize a civil rights hero whose work is no small part of the reason I and many other African-American members of Congress are able to stand before you today.

Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer was born in 1917 in Montgomery County, Mississippi. During the civil rights era, Ms. Hamer, at the age of just 6-years-old joined her family picking cotton on the plantation of W.D. Marlow in Sunflower County, Mississippi.

Though, she began to pick cotton at a young age, Ms. Hamer was able to complete many years in school learning how to read and write, which helped her serve hundreds of African-Americans throughout her life.

In the 1960s, Ms. Hamer joined the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, an organization providing African-Americans the opportunity to register to vote. Ms. Hamer taught Black Mississippians how to read and write in order for them to pass discriminatory literacy tests designed to prevent Black Americans from registering to vote.

In 1962, Ms. Hamer along with 17 Black Mississippians traveled by bus from Ruleville, Mississippi, to Indianola, Mississippi, to register to vote. Upon arrival, the group was blocked from entry by local law enforcement. But, Ms. Hamer and one of her fellow travelers were able to fill out a voter application and take the literacy test, but due to discrimination the two were unable to register. This did not deter Ms. Hamer's passion and willingness to fight racism throughout Mississippi.

On the group's way back to Ruleville, the bus was stopped by local police officers and the driver was arrested. In that very moment of racism and trail, Ms. Hamer began to sing Negro spirituals leaving a clear message to her oppressors that she would never give up.

Her leadership was a beacon of hope for so many Black Mississippians that in 1964, Ms.

Hamer ran for Congress to represent Mississippi's Second Congressional District as a Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party candidate, a party which she founded to promote equal rights for African-Americans in Mississippi.

During the 1960s, very few women especially women of color threw their hat into the ring for a Congressional bid. Her willingness to run in Mississippi at that time was and continues to be a powerful act in itself. Though she was unsuccessful, her speeches, messages and visits to African-Americans around the state resonated.

Ms. Hamer provided inspiration for me to work for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, while I attended Tougaloo College continuing Ms. Hamer's work to get African-Americans across Mississippi registered to vote. I remember volunteering for Ms. Hamer's Congressional campaign and getting inspired to serve the people of Mississippi. Today, I represent Mississippi's Second Congressional District, and I cannot help but think that Ms. Hamer is smiling down on me. Her courage and brilliance is one of the reasons I stand on this floor today.

I am honored to be able to give time to honor a legend and civil rights icon. Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer's legacy will forever live on, and I stand here today along with my colleagues to pay homage to a true hero.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me first begin by thanking my friend and colleague Rep. BENNIE THOMPSON for leading today's effort in honoring the life and legacy of Fannie Lou Hamer. October 6th marks the 100th anniversary of her birth in Montgomery County, Mississippi.

An honorary member of Delta Sigma Theta, Fannie Lou Hamer dedicated her life to the fight for civil rights. Born in 1917, she was the daughter of sharecroppers and the youngest of 20 siblings. By the age of six, she was helping her family in the cotton fields.

Fannie Lou Hamer was a woman of courage. She used her voice to raise awareness about the plight of African Americans in the Mississippi Delta. She was a woman of strength who was able to channel the injustices committed against her into activism.

Working for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Hamer helped African Americans register to vote and worked to end segregation.

After attempting to register to vote herself in August 1962, Hamer lost her job and was kicked out of her home. The following year, she and fellow activists returning from a training workshop were unjustly jailed and severely beaten. While the beating left permanent damage, the officers were later acquitted by an all-white jury.

Hamer was also a trailblazing political activist. She helped to found the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and the National Women's Political Caucus. She almost derailed the re-election of President Lyndon Johnson and changed the Democratic Party's delegate selection process. In 1968, she would become the first African American to serve as an official delegate at a national-party convention since Reconstruction and the first woman ever from Mississippi.

Although unsuccessful in her bids for elected office, Hamer remained committed to voting rights and antipoverty efforts. She filed a lawsuit to push forward desegregation efforts in local schools, led the cotton pickers resistance movement and helped to bring a Head Start program to her community.

Fannie Lou Hamer's contributions to the American Civil Rights movement and our nation are undeniable. As then UN Ambassador Andrew Young eulogized at her funeral, "None of us would be where we are now had she not been there then." His words still ring true 40 years later.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

August 2, 2017:

H.R. 3364. An Act to provide congressional review and to counter aggression by the Governments of Iran, the Russian Federation, and North Korea, and for other purposes.

August 4, 2017:

H.R. 3298. An Act to authorize the Capitol Police Board to make payments from the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund to employees of the United States Capitol Police who have sustained serious line-of-duty injuries, and for other purposes.

August 16, 2017:

H.R. 2210. An Act to designate the community living center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Butler Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the "Sergeant Joseph George Kusick VA Community Living Center".

H.R. 3218. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

August 18, 2017:

H.R. 374. An Act to remove the sunset provision of section 203 of Public Law 105-384, and for other purposes.

H.R. 510. An Act to establish a system for integration of Rapid DNA instruments for use by law enforcement to reduce violent crime and reduce the current DNA analysis backlog.

H.R. 873. An Act to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2430. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

August 22, 2017:

H.J. Res. 76. A joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the

Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission.

H.R. 339. An Act to amend Public Law 94-241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands.

August 23, 2017:

H.R. 2288. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

September 8, 2017:

H.R. 601. An Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

September 12, 2017:

H.R. 3732. An Act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2017 and 2018 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries.

September 15, 2017:

H.R. 624. An Act to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on Federal documents sent by mail, and for other purposes.

September 27, 2017:

H.R. 3110. An Act to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the term of the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

September 29, 2017:

H.R. 3819. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3823. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution, of the Senate of the following titles:

August 12, 2017:

S. 114. An Act to authorize appropriations and to appropriate amounts for the Veterans Choice Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to improve hiring authorities of the Department, to authorize major medical facility leases, and for other purposes.

September 14, 2017:

S.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to address the threats posed by those groups.

September 15, 2017:

S. 1616. An Act to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Bob Dole, in recognition for his service to the nation as a soldier, legislator, and statesman.

September 29, 2017:

S. 1866. An Act to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules and authority to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated in the campus-based aid programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 due to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, to provide equitable services to children and teachers in private schools, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and tomorrow on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 396. An act to make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 28, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3819. To amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first, second, and third quarters of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 14 AND SEPT. 16, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bill Huizenga	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Hon. Jeff Duncan	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Raead Haddad	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Rebecca Ulrich	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Brian Skretny	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Claire Figel	9/14	9/16	Canada		739.00						739.00
Committee total					5,173.00						5,173.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CHILE, PERU, AND GUATEMALA, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 15 AND SEPT. 22, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Roskam	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. David Price	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Bill Flores	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Susan Davis	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Dina Titus	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Tom Rice	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Steve Knight	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Norma Torres	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Janice Robinson	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Mark Epley	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Jeff Billman	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Justin Wein	9/15	9/17	Chile		1,026.00		(3)				1,026.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. David Price	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Bill Flores	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Susan Davis	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Dina Titus	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Tom Rice	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Steve Knight	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Norma Torres	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Janice Robinson	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Mark Epley	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Jeff Billman	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Justin Wein	9/17	9/20	Peru		1,081.00		(3)				1,081.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. David Price	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Bill Flores	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Susan Davis	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Dina Titus	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Tom Rice	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Steve Knight	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Norma Torres	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Janice Robinson	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Mark Epley	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Jeff Billman	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Justin Wein	9/20	9/22	Guatemala		575.96		(3)				575.96
Committee total											24,146.64

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM, Sept. 28, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. William F. Shuster	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00						312.00
Hon. Bruce Westerman	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00						312.00
Hon. Robert Woodall	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00						312.00
Fleming Legg	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00						1,288.06
Holly Lyons	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00		976.06				1,126.81
Mathew Sturges	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00		814.81				312.00
Chris Vieson	3/30	3/31	Canada		312.00		814.81				1,126.81
Committee total					2,184.00		2,605.68				4,789.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, Sept. 15, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUN. 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Alex Burkett	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Blake Farenthold	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Garret Graves	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Sam Graves	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Keith Hall	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Justin Harclerode	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Fleming Legg	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Caryn Lund	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Collin McCune	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Mark Sanford	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. William F. Shuster	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Albio Sires	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
Hon. Randy Weber	4/7	4/8	France		449.00						449.00
CMTE Expenses							4,287.00		5,801.00		10,088.00
Alex Burkett	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Blake Farenthold	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Garret Graves	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Sam Graves	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUN. 30, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Keith Hall	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Justin Harclerode	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Fleming Legg	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Caryn Lund	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Collin McCune	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Mark Sanford	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. William F. Shuster	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Albio Sires	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
Hon. Randy Weber	4/8	4/10	Latvia		479.87						479.87
CMTE Expenses							802.77		874.46		1,677.23
Alex Burkett	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Blake Farenthold	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Garret Graves	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		4,782.78				5,352.70
Hon. Sam Graves	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Keith Hall	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Justin Harclerode	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Duncan Hunter	4/9	4/12	Poland		762.92		9,436.42				10,199.34
Fleming Legg	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Caryn Lund	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Collin McCune	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Mark Sanford	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. William F. Shuster	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Albio Sires	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
Hon. Randy Weber	4/10	4/12	Poland		569.92		60.12				630.04
CMTE Expenses							1,527.07		4,745.25		6,272.32
Alex Burkett	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Blake Farenthold	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Sam Graves	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Keith Hall	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Justin Harclerode	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Duncan Hunter	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Fleming Legg	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Caryn Lund	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Collin McCune	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Mark Sanford	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. William F. Shuster	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Albio Sires	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Randy Weber	4/12	4/14	Netherlands		736.92						736.92
Hon. Peter DeFazio	5/7	5/15	Greece, Bosnia, Albania, Macedonia, Kosovo, Italy		3,022.38						3,022.38
Hon. Mike Bost	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Norman Alex Burkette	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Barbara Comstock	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Rodney Davis	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Kathy Dedrick	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Peter A. DeFazio	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Jeff Denham	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Blake Farenthold	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. John Faso	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Drew Ferguson	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Hon. Garret Neal Graves	5/25	5/26	Ottawa, Canada		360.00						360.00
Committee total											74,542.72

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, Sept. 15, 2017.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2744. A letter from the Acting Director, Program Development and Regulation Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Water and Waste Loans and Grants (RIN: 0572-AC36) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2745. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRL0, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Establishment of TRICARE Select and Other TRICARE Reforms [Docket ID: DOD-2017-HA-0039] (RIN: 0720-AB70) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2746. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2016 report on mining activities, pur-

suant to the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2747. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Standard for Infant Bouncer Seats [Docket No.: CPSC-2015-0028] received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2748. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Refrigerant Management Regulations for Small Cans of Motor Vehicle Refrigerant [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0213; FRL-9968-68-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT43) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2749. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxathiapiprolin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0049; FRL-9966-68] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2750. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter: Revision of Federal Implementation Plan Requirements for Texas [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0598; FRL-9968-46-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT16) received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2751. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluoaxastobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0727; FRL-9966-09] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2752. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluazifop-P-Butyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0878; FRL-9966-67] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2753. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Iowa Air Quality Implementation Plans; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0517; FRL-9968-66-Region 7] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2754. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0267; FRL-9968-62-Region 7] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2755. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R02-OAR-2015-0498; FRL-9968-64-Region 2] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2756. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R02-OAR-2016-0413; FRL-9968-63-Region 2] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2757. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; California [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0411; FRL-9968-38-Region 9] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0215; FRL-9968-34-Region 3] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to Ozone Offset Requirements in Davis and Salt Lake Counties [EPA-R08-OAR-2016-0620; FRL-9968-74-Region 8] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2760. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0398; FRL-9968-51-Region 3] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2761. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 2011 Base Year Inventory for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Baltimore, Maryland Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0396; FRL-9968-54-Region 3] received September 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2762. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — 340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation (RIN: 0906-AB11) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2763. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2764. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting three (3) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2765. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2766. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2767. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2768. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting three (3) notifications of a designation of acting officer, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2769. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2770. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2771. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9184; Product Identifier 2016-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-19032; AD 2017-19-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2772. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0524; Product Identifier 2016-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-19034; AD 2017-19-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2773. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights in Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region (FIR) [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0768; Amendment No.: 91-?] (RIN: 2120-AL07) received September 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 553. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027 (Rept. 115-339). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3913. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESTES of Kansas (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 3914. A bill to remove the limitation imposed as a result of receiving funding under the Land and Water Conservation Fund on the conversion of Lake Afton Park in Sedgwick County, Kansas, to a use other than public outdoor recreation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 3915. A bill to clarify membership requirements for the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 3916. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to vest in the Secretary of the Interior functions under that Act with respect to species of fish that spawn in fresh or estuarine waters and migrate to ocean waters, and species of fish that spawn in ocean waters and migrate to fresh waters; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 3917. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend funding for the special diabetes program for Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SIRE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 3918. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend public safety officers' death benefits to fire police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3919. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3920. A bill to establish a Medicare demonstration program on the use of third-party interest-free payment arrangements to reduce Medicare hospital part A bad debt claims; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3921. A bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 3922. A bill to extend funding for certain public health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3923. A bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3924. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend funding for the special diabetes program for type I diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 3925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to Patriot employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 3926. A bill to provide for an extension for community health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3927. A bill to amend title XXI to allow for the blending of risk pools of children's health insurance buy-in programs with the risk pools of State child health plans under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 3928. A bill to ensure that patients receive accurate health care information by prohibiting misleading and deceptive advertising or representation in the provision of health care services, to require the identification of the license of health care professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3929. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program to provide payments to communities in which a nuclear power plant that has ceased generating electricity and that stores spent nuclear fuel on-site is located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VELA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 3930. A bill to establish the Office of Hurricane Harvey Small Business Recovery Grants in the Small Business Administration to compensate certain small business concerns for substantial economic injury suffered as a result of Hurricane Harvey in August 2017; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3931. A bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 3932. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for increased Puerto Rico Medicaid payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 3933. A bill to establish and reinstate certain reporting requirements regarding efforts to recruit, hire, and retain health care professionals for the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3934. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude from creditable wages and self-employment income wages

earned for services by aliens illegally performed in the United States and self-employment income derived from a trade or business illegally conducted in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3935. A bill to provide for an extension of funding for the National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3936. A bill to forgive the indebtedness of the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 554. A resolution recognizing the life and legacy of Richard (Dick) Gregory and honoring his contributions to the civil rights movement and to American comedy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3913.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. ESTES of Kansas:

H.R. 3914.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2
Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 3915.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution states the Congress shall have the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 3916.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 and clause 18.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 3917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 3918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution which states, "(t)he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the indian tribes."

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 3922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 3924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. BUCHSHON:

H.R. 3928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 3929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 3931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 3932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 3933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 3934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 102: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 103: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 113: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 173: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 184: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 233: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CRIST, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 392: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 431: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 445: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 502: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 535: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 564: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 638: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. GARAMENDI.

- H.R. 673: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 741: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 747: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 788: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 792: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 807: Mr. MCNERNEY and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 810: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 820: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 821: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 866: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 897: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 927: Mr. HIMES and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 1017: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1036: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1038: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1046: Mr. COOPER and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 1090: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1099: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1116: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1133: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1148: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1155: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DENT, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1158: Mr. TONKO and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1178: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 1204: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1225: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1267: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 1278: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1279: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1284: Miss RICE of New York and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1291: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1295: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 1299: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1316: Mr. KING of New York and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1374: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1378: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1409: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1456: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1457: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1472: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1478: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1494: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1539: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1626: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1655: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1730: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1731: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1734: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1753: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1762: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1773: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1810: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1815: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1847: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1865: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1872: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1874: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1889: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1896: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1897: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1898: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1951: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1953: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1955: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1957: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1991: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2023: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 2051: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2054: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2095: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2123: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 2147: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2148: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 2206: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2228: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 2310: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2327: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 2388: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2391: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2408: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2418: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2432: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2434: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2482: Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2587: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2591: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 2598: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2623: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 2633: Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2641: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2663: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 2666: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 2739: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2748: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2790: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2856: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2865: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2887: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2899: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2901: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2938: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2957: Mr. HURD.
H.R. 2996: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2999: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3006: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3030: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3042: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3108: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3138: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3145: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3153: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 3165: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3174: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3199: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3220: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 3238: Ms. NORTON and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3271: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3282: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3316: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3320: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3331: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3342: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 3347: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3365: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 3395: Mr. LOBIONDO and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3397: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3400: Mr. POLIS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BEYER, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 3441: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BUDD, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 3452: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3467: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3472: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3513: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 3528: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3529: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3530: Ms. MOORE and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3533: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 3548: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BACON, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 3552: Ms. NORTON and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3588: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 3596: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3606: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3622: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3623: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3632: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3635: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UPTON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3679: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3680: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3703: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3711: Mr. NORMAN and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3739: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3744: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3751: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 3758: Mr. HIMES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3759: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KATKO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3767: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3770: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 3774: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3784: Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3792: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3798: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3806: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3810: Mr. BERA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 3817: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3822: Mr. BABIN and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3827: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3832: Mr. BOST, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 3847: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3852: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3862: Mr. HECK, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3875: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 3878: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3882: Mr. PALLONE.

H.J. Res. 31: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.J. Res. 53: Mr. COOPER.

H.J. Res. 74: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H. Res. 129: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. KINZINGER.

H. Res. 142: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Res. 220: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H. Res. 276: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 283: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 359: Miss RICE of New York.

H. Res. 361: Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 367: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of

California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. DELANEY.

H. Res. 370: Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 466: Mr. COLE and Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 490: Mr. LANCE.

H. Res. 529: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. BERGMAN.

H. Res. 550: Mr. KENNEDY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING DEBBIE MERRILL

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate Debbie Merrill on her retirement. A committed public servant, Ms. Merrill faithfully worked to represent her constituents and our country on Capitol Hill for over 43 years.

Ms. Merrill learned the value of public service at an early age. Her father, a Native American from the Sioux tribe, served our country in the U.S. Army. After his honorable discharge, he attended college with help from the G.I. Bill. He later served in the U.S. House of Representatives Appropriations Committee as a career staffer. Debbie credits the federal help of the G.I. Bill with providing her family a path to success, saying that her career choice was a way for her to "give back to the country that gave [her] family so much."

Over the course of Ms. Merrill's notable career, she worked for five Democratic Congressmen. In 1974, she was hired for her first job in Congress as a legislative assistant to Congressman Clement Zablocki of Wisconsin. She went on to work for Congressmen Nicholas Mavroules and Marty Meehan of Massachusetts. In 1994, she joined Congressman Sam Farr's office as Legislative Director. Among her many efforts on behalf of the people of California's 20th congressional district, she was instrumental in establishing in Marina the country's first joint-from-inception Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs clinic; supporting the opening of the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery; and creating Team Monterey, a collaborative team environment for local defense and national security entities as they seek federal investment. Ms. Merrill served in Congressman Farr's office for over 20 years, until his retirement. She proudly joined my staff after I was sworn in this past January, and swiftly got my office off the ground. Her presence proved invaluable as she led our junior staffers in her capable hands, ensuring that once she retired, I was left with a knowledgeable and strong legislative team. Her background on defense, veterans, transportation, and housing issues was exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Debbie Merrill for all she has done to serve the people of the central coast of California, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, and to serve our country. I wish her the very best in her retirement and in all her future endeavors.

HONORING JACOB BRIAN AHART

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Brian Ahart. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 394, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob Brian Ahart for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America, and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE 106TH
NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 106th National Day of Taiwan on October 10, 2017.

For decades, the United States and Taiwan have enjoyed a fruitful partnership that continues to this day. Taiwan is the United States' 10th largest trading partner and 8th largest export market for U.S. agricultural products, which has direct ties to Hoosier. Recently, Taiwan's Agriculture Goodwill Trade Mission to Washington, D.C. and my home state of Indiana culminated in a \$2.8 billion procurement agreement between Taiwan and U.S. grain producers. I applaud the mission's success and look forward to continued collaboration with Taiwan.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, and in wishing Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day.

RECOGNIZING CHILDREN'S CAR-
DIOMYOPATHY AWARENESS
MONTH

HON. BRENDA L. LAWRENCE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Children's Cardiomyopathy

Awareness Month and to honor the memory of one of my constituents who lost his life far too early to a truly devastating condition.

Pediatric cardiomyopathy, a chronic and degenerative disease of the heart muscle, is the leading cause of sudden cardiac arrest in children. My constituent, Kyle John Rymiszewski, was diagnosed at birth with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, which thickens the heart muscle and restricts blood flow around the body. He courageously fought it for years until his heart of gold stopped beating at the young age of fifteen. In memory of their son, Kyle's parents, Ken Rymiszewski and Aimee Cowher, founded the Kyle John Rymiszewski Foundation to increase awareness of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and to fund critically needed research to improve treatment outcomes. Other organizations like the Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation also further this work and help families care for children with cardiomyopathy. I commend these organizations for their tireless work to give our children a better chance at life.

It is important that we recognize Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month and continue to spread awareness about this disease. Over forty percent of children diagnosed with cardiomyopathy will either die or undergo a heart transplant within the first two years of their diagnosis. Despite this, little is known about the causes of this disease and there currently is no cure for it. Although patients with the four different types of cardiomyopathy have varying symptoms, each case poses major challenges and dangers. During this month and beyond, we must commit to spreading information and resources to help identify at-risk children and avoid preventable tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in spreading awareness of this disease and supporting children like Kyle who suffer from pediatric cardiomyopathy.

RECOGNIZING HON. KEITH
FUDENNA ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague, Congressman RO KHANNA, I rise to recognize the Honorable Keith H. Fudenna on the occasion of his retirement after 28 years of serving as a judicial officer at the Fremont Hall of Justice.

Keith comes from a family that is dedicated to service. His father, Harold Fudenna, worked with U.S. intelligence forces in the South Pacific. Harold intercepted the message that exposed the location of Admiral Yamamoto, the Japanese military officer who planned the Pearl Harbor attack.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

Following in his father's footsteps, Keith graduated from the University of California, Berkeley with a degree in mechanical engineering in 1971. He continued pursuing his education at the University of California, Hastings College of Law and earned his juris doctorate in 1974.

Keith was admitted to the State Bar of California in 1974, marking the beginning of his service to the community through both the public and private sectors. He began work at the Fremont City Attorney's Office before transitioning to private practice from 1981 to 1990.

After his time in private practice he became a Court Commissioner for the Fremont-Newark-Union City Municipal Court for seven years. In 1997, he was appointed Judge of the Municipal Court by Governor Pete Wilson. Keith was the first Asian American judge to serve on the Fremont-Newark-Union City Municipal Court.

Following his appointment, he was elected judge of the Superior Court of California. During his time as a Superior Court judge he has handled a variety of assignments, including criminal trials and arraignments.

Throughout his life, Keith has actively served his community outside of the courtroom. He has worked on the Board of Managers for the Fremont-Newark YMCA, the Board of Directors for the National Japanese American Historical Society, and as a member of the California State Bar Committee on Ethnic Minority Relations.

Keith Fudenna has served Alameda County and our country selflessly for more than 40 years. We congratulate Keith on a long and successful career, and we wish him health and happiness in retirement.

HONORING BYRON JAMES ARNOLD

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Byron James Arnold. Byron is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Byron has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Byron has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Byron has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Byron rebuilt and replaced an entrance sign to Our Lady of Mercy Country Home in Liberty, Missouri, that had been damaged in a car accident.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Byron James Arnold for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America, and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes Monday, October 2, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on roll call votes 544 and 545.

HONORING ARMY VETERAN CHARLES DIETRICH ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor decorated Army veteran Charles LeRoy Dietrich of Pekin, Illinois, on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

Mr. Dietrich was inducted into the U.S. Army on February 15, 1946 at Ft. Sheridan in Chicago, Illinois at the age of 18. After attending basic training at Fort Eustis, Virginia, he was assigned to Fort Warren in Cheyenne, Wyoming for specialized training as a railroad brakeman. Mr. Dietrich was honorably discharged in August 1946, then reenlisted and was promoted to the rank of Private First Class. After receiving security clearance, Mr. Dietrich was assigned to the military police and security details at Los Alamos, New Mexico. While there, he was promoted to the rank of T4 Sergeant and was presented with a World War II Victory Medal for his service. Mr. Dietrich was honorably discharged in September 1947.

The dedicated military service of veterans such as Charles Dietrich makes me especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again honor Army veteran Charles Dietrich for his extraordinary military service during World War II and wish him a very happy 90th birthday.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. FLINT

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Mr. Mitchell Flint—a beloved husband, father, and former U.S. Navy fighter pilot—who passed away on September 16, 2017, at the age of 94.

Mitchell Flint was born on June 27, 1923, in Kansas City, Missouri, and attended Westport High School, where he took part in the school's Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, graduating with honors. His father, Harry, was also a decorated U.S. fighter during World War I and introduced Mitchell to his lifelong love of flying.

Mitchell enlisted in the U.S. Navy at the age of 18 to serve as a fighter pilot in the U.S.

Navy's World War II effort. He served on the aircraft carrier USS *Wasp* under the command of Admiral John S. McCain Sr., and earned three Air Medals and eight Navy Unit Commendations. After six years of service in the U.S. Navy, he continued flying for sixteen years in the United States Navy Reserve, ultimately achieving the rank of Commander.

Inspired by his Jewish heritage and the plight of Europe's Holocaust survivors, Mitchell then volunteered as an American fighter pilot in Israel's first aviation unit that fought in the 1948 Arab-Israeli War. He was one of the founding members of the Israeli Air Force's first fighter squadron and helped train Israel's first military pilots. In 1949, he flew in Israel's First Independence Day Parade and for the first time Israel's entire fighter squadron of 12 fighter planes got in the sky at the same time, led by future Israeli President Ezer Weizman. Mitchell pulled up the rear and was the last plane from his squadron to fly over that day. Prophetically, Mitchell was the last living pilot of that group of flyers.

After his military service, Mitchell moved to Los Angeles, attended law school at UCLA, and became an attorney while continuing to fly. He practiced law for nearly 60 years and was the President of the Hollywood Bar Association. At the age of 90, Mitchell was honored by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu during ceremonies recognizing the 65th anniversary of the birth of Israel.

Mitchell is survived by his wife of 59 years, Joyce, and sons, Michael and Guy, whom I hope take comfort in the way Mitchell lived his life as a patriotic, selfless and caring Veteran who served his nation and its ally, Israel. May his memory be a blessing to us all.

HONORING THE VETERANS CONSORTIUM PRO BONO PROGRAM 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Veterans Consortium Pro Bono Program as they celebrate 25 years of service to our veterans community.

Since 1992, the Veterans Consortium has provided over \$100 million in pro bono services working on five thousand individual cases.

As our veterans return home from military service, it is critical they receive the benefits and care they deserve and need. The tireless efforts of the Veterans Consortium representing veterans at the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims is an essential aspect of our promise to support service members as they transition to civilian life.

As the Ranking Member of the House Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Subcommittee, I commend the member attorneys of the Veterans Consortium Pro Bono Program for their generosity and unwavering commitment.

HONORING RYAN DeCAMP

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan DeCamp. Ryan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 374, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ryan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Ryan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Ryan is the 350th Eagle Scout in his troop's history.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Ryan DeCamp for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America, and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING MARGARET BARGER
ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY**HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish a Happy 100th Birthday to Margaret Barger of New Richmond, OH.

Throughout her 100 years of life, Margaret has been an incredible member of our community here in Ohio's Second District. It's people like her who set the example of how life should be lived to its fullest.

A retired school teacher, Margaret has spent her life dedicated to the life and improvement of her community and those around her.

Her public service and spirit is an example to others is admired.

Margaret has made New Richmond a better place throughout her lifetime, through her kindness and dedication to all.

Happy Birthday Margaret.

RECOGNIZING DETECTIVE PAUL
GRUDZINSKI**HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Detective Paul Grudzinski, 76th Precinct Community Affairs Officer who is retiring after 30 years of service to the people of New York City.

A model of successful police and community relations, Detective Grudzinski has always put the needs and safety of New Yorkers above all else. A fixture in the Cobble Hill, Carroll Gardens, Red Hook and Gowanus communities, he is known and valued by many.

First appointed to the New York City Transit Police Department on April 28, 1987, Detective Grudzinski joined the NYPD shortly after in 1989. Throughout his career, Detective Grudzinski has reached many milestones. Since 2001, he has served as the Precinct Community Affairs Officer, and was promoted to Detective Specialist in 2007 and Detective 2nd Grade in 2016.

It was always the mission of Detective Grudzinski to get to know the neighborhoods and residents that he served. An expert local problem solver, he has always been aware of the often too common gap between police and residents, and he has worked tirelessly to close it.

I send my best wishes to Detective Grudzinski and his family, as he's recognized at his last 76th Precinct Community Council meeting on October 4, 2017. A life of dedication and honor, I wish Detective Grudzinski a happy retirement and thank him for his service.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
MATTHEW PARKER**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Matthew Parker of Rock Island, Illinois, who devoted his life to serving his country and community, and who sadly passed away in August of last year.

Matthew served in the Navy during World War II. After his service in the Navy, he worked at IH Farmall in Rock Island for 39 years and also operated his own business, Parker Janitorial Services, with his wife, Katherine, for 33 years. He served as a trustee for Rock Island Township for more than 35 years. He was also a member of the Rock Island County NAACP and the Martin Luther King Center Active Club, among several other organizations. Matthew was civically engaged as a precinct committeeman for 23 years, and was a longtime community activist.

During his life, Matthew was honored numerous times for his dedication to service. In 2005, Matthew Parker was awarded the John Williams Community Award for his contributions in making the region a better place to live. In 2008 he received the Excellence in Public Service Award from Township Officials of Illinois for his work in the Rock Island Township. Most recently, in September 2017 the Matthew Parker Gardens were dedicated at Rock Island Township's 2nd Annual Township Days to honor Matthew for his decades of service as a trustee.

It is because of dedicated and selfless leaders such as Matthew Parker that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally recognize the late Matthew Parker on his extraordinary work and service in our community.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL
GARY L. SAYLER, USAF (RET.),
ADJUTANT GENERAL—IDAHO**HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Major General Gary L. Sayler, an extraordinary leader with 45 years of selfless service, appreciative leadership, constructive mentorship, and exceptional meritorious service.

Born and raised in North Dakota, Major General Sayler entered the ROTC program at North Dakota State University, graduating in 1971 with a Bachelor of Science degree in history and a commission as a second lieutenant in the United States Air Force.

He entered undergraduate navigator training at Mather Air Force Base, California, in June 1971. As a second lieutenant, he received F-4 weapons system formal training at George Air Force Base, California, graduating in December 1972. He immediately deployed to Vietnam as a squadron weapons systems officer at Udon Royal Thai Air Force Base, Thailand. In November 1973, he was assigned as a squadron weapons systems officer at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico. While assigned at Holloman, he met his future wife, Shari, who was also serving at Holloman as a Nurse.

Major General Sayler joined the Idaho Air National Guard in 1977 where he has served in numerous positions of increasing responsibility and command until he was designated the Fighter Wing Commander. Upon promotion to Brigadier General in 2004, he was assigned as the Assistant Adjutant General and Commander of the Idaho Air National Guard. In January 2010, Governor Otter appointed him to serve as the Adjutant General and Commanding General of the Idaho National Guard.

Major General Sayler's service to Idaho as the Adjutant General has been extraordinary. The forceful guidance, as well as outstanding and dedicated efforts of General Sayler are significantly displayed by the strategic direction of all National Guard forces and emergency managers in the State of Idaho. He led the organization through weapons platform changes, unit conversions, and disaster assistance, always posturing the Idaho Military Division for continued viable, relevant future missions that fit both our nation and Idaho's needs.

Under his leadership, the Idaho National Guard has provided outstanding support during recent state activations in support of wildland firefighting and statewide flood operations. He provided the same remarkable support when the Idaho troops deployed in support of Operations ENDURING FREEDOM, NEW DAWN, and Combined Joint Task Force—Horn of Africa. Additionally, his leadership during the 116th National Training Center (NTC) rotation facilitated superior operational results. He was the driving force behind formulating and implementing National Guard Youth Challenge and STARBAS programs for the State of Idaho. He worked tirelessly

promoting programs for Idaho youth providing alternative paths to success. Furthermore, the overall readiness of the 124th Fighter Wing gave credence to the outstanding mission results and professionalism they showed in their recent Southwest Asia deployment.

General Saylor has placed command emphasis on preparing and taking care of deployed Idaho Guard members. His unparalleled support of Family Support, Yellow Ribbon, and Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve programs has greatly benefitted the individuals who have recently returned from deployment and the families who welcomed them home.

General Saylor authored the first joint consultation agreement with the sovereign tribes of Idaho, recognized at the national level by both the Army and Air National Guard as the baseline for Government-to-Government Tribal Consultation.

General Saylor is an outstanding and highly respected officer recognized nationally for his many contributions to mission accomplishment during 45 years of dedicated service to our nation, the United States Air Force, and the great State of Idaho.

It is a great honor to congratulate General Saylor on his remarkable career of achievement that will leave a lasting legacy to the State of Idaho. General Saylor represents the best of the many talented people in the Idaho National Guard whose knowledge and skill have been essential to keeping our nation and the State of Idaho strong and secure. I thank General Saylor for his service to our nation, and congratulate him on his many accomplishments and retirement.

HONORING BROCK ROHLFS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Brock Rohlf. Brock is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Brock has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Brock has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Brock has led his troop as the Assistant Senior Patrol Leader, earned the rank of Tom-Tom Beater in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say, and become a Brotherhood Member of the Order of the Arrow. Brock has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Brock designed and completed a concrete sidewalk and a ramp from the Life Unlimited Facility to the Immacolata Manor's north room gathering space in Liberty, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Brock Rohlf for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America, and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING JOHN WHITEHURST

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent of mine, John Whitehurst, who is on a trip to Japan this week in honor of his father, U.S. Army Major Collin Whitehurst, Jr., who died as a prisoner of war (POW) during World War II. John Whitehurst is in Japan as a guest of the Japanese government, along with a delegation of former POWs and their families.

Major Whitehurst was born in Richmond, Virginia in 1914 and grew up in Cincinnati, Ohio. In 1934, he received an appointment to the United States Military Academy (USMA) at West Point where he was a pistol marksman and a member of the Chapel Choir and Glee Club. After graduation, Major Whitehurst was assigned to Fort Thomas, Kentucky, with Headquarters Company, 10th Infantry Regiment. It was there, in December 1939, that he married Rose Eva Knuebel, an officer's daughter.

In June 1940, Major Whitehurst sailed to the Philippines, where he was first stationed near Manila, then on the island province of Bohol, and later on the island of Leyte. After the United States entered the war in December, 1941, Major Whitehurst was assigned to the staff of the Commanding General of the Visayan-Mindanao Force, Major General William F. Sharp on Mindanao. On May 10, 1942, under the threat of a massacre of all the POWs on the Philippine island of Corregidor, General Sharp reluctantly surrendered his forces on Mindanao.

After being held at Camp Casisang, Major Whitehurst and the other POWs on Mindanao were moved to the Davao Penal Colony No. 502. During his 21 months of imprisonment at Davao, Major Whitehurst and the acting Episcopal chaplain sought to lift the spirits of the camp, organizing and training a choir for religious services.

Following a brief period of agricultural labor at a Cabanatuan, Philippines work site, Major Whitehurst and nearly 1,800 other prisoners were loaded onto the Japanese *Arisan Maru*, known as a "hell ship." While in transit to Japan, the convoy was attacked by American submarines and the *Arisan Maru* was torpedoed and sunk. Only nine of the POWs survived—Major Whitehurst was among those who tragically died.

In a letter to Major Whitehurst's parents following his death, General Sharp wrote: "Your son was a fine, loyal officer who did excellent work while serving with my Command. He was always cheerful and willing; he made a lasting impression on all with whom he came into contact. Collin's spirit never wavered during the long months of his imprisonment. We few still living who knew him cherish his memory." On October 25, 2004, 60 years and a day after Major Whitehurst's death, the Whitehurst family dedicated a memorial marker in Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery commemorating his life and service.

John Whitehurst, Major Whitehurst's only son, has helped keep his father's memory and

patriotism alive. John, who was born in Manila, has lived most of his life in Texas. A passionate social worker, John has also taken time to attend American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor Memorial Society conventions since 2002, and serves on the organization's Board of Directors. Twice, he has returned to the Philippines, including a visit for the dedication of the Hell Ship Memorial at Subic Bay.

I wish Mr. Whitehurst a fulfilling trip to Japan this week, and I offer him and his entire family my gratitude for his father's service and tremendous sacrifice for the United States.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MODEL CITIES

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50th Anniversary of Model Cities, a provider of essential community services for low-income residents in Saint Paul, Minnesota. Born to meet a growing need for high-quality health care for low-income residents in the capital city's historic, predominantly African American Rondo neighborhood, Model Cities has grown and evolved over the past five decades into a dynamic development organization focused on fully integrating human services while working to improve economic conditions for all.

Model Cities has led the way adapting as necessary to address changing community challenges. From its beginning in the basement of St. James AME Church, the organization broke through barriers to improve the lives of people coming through its doors. Early leaders like Mary Stokes, an African American nurse, who served as the center's first coordinator of volunteer medical and dental services, helped set the standard of care and outreach to the community. Mrs. Timothy O. Vann, another trailblazing African American woman and a graduate of the University of Minnesota, became the first project director in 1971. Upon her retirement, Dr. Beverley Oliver Hawkins became the new Executive Director in 1984 and continues to lead Model Cities.

Today, Model Cities looks a little different than it did at the beginning. As part of its evolution to meet the needs of the community, the health center became a separate organization and in 2003, changed its name to Open Cities Health Center. Model Cities continues to deliver a broad range of critical community services that strengthen our community: culturally competent family support services, youth program services, homebuyer education and community-based development. One of the community development efforts that is currently taking shape, Business Revitalization and Ownership for a Working Neighborhood (BROWNstone), aims to revitalize an area in Saint Paul's Frogtown neighborhood along University Avenue and Metro Green Line Light Rail Transit, while also adding 35 units of affordable rental housing, as well as retail, office, and community space.

For 50 years, Model Cities has been a vital partner in our community, lifting up families

and individuals in need to access opportunities to improve their lives. As Model Cities commemorates this 50th anniversary year, please join me in recognizing the selfless contributions of the staff and volunteers who have delivered these vital services for our community.

**WILLIAM HANNAH RETIRES FROM
LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS AND
TRAINMEN UNION**

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exceptional career of General Chairman William Hannah of the Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen Union, a Division of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, who retired on October 1, 2017.

Bill Hannah gave his heart and time to the Labor movement working on better working conditions for the membership for over 35 years and 46 years in the industry. He began with Southern Pacific Railroad in May of 1971, was promoted to Engineer in 1978, and was a member of Division 5 from 1979 to 1981.

Bill became a charter member of Division 56 in 1981, and is still a proud member in good standing. For over 35 years he was a union leader for the Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen Union as a Local Chairman of Division 56 from 1982 to 2001 and a General Chairman from 2001 to Oct. 1, 2017, covering 18 divisions and covering over 2000 members.

For over 16 years, he was involved in On-property Negotiations, as well as arbitration involving discipline, claims, rules and wages on the Union Pacific and Pacific Harbor Lines.

On Behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate and thank Bill Hannah for his 35 years of service to his committee. Bill is a true professional in every sense of the word, and I wish him the best of luck as he embarks on a new chapter in his life.

HONORING THE 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF VALLEY GRANGE NO. 1360 IN YORK COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my sincere congratulations to the members of Valley Grange No. 1360 on its 110th Anniversary.

Valley Grange No. 1360 was officially chartered on October 7, 1907. The Grange is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, fraternal organization that advocates for rural America and agriculture. Family and community are its foundations and the Grange was the first national organization to give full voice and vote to women.

Valley Grange No. 1360 has been a leader in the Grange organization, producing two Pennsylvania State Grange Masters—J. Lu-

ther Snyder and Carl Meiss; two National Grange officers—J. Luther Snyder and Fae Snyder—and it is the home of several past State Grange officers and youth ambassadors.

Valley Grange No. 1360 has also been very committed to its community throughout the years, supporting organizations such as 4-H, the Boy Scouts, the local Little League and has contributed to countless charitable endeavors.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I thank the members of Valley Grange No. 1360 for their dedicated service to their community and congratulate them on their 110th Anniversary. We wish them continued great success in the years to come.

**HONORING STANLEY, THE
ENGLISH BULLDOG**

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Stanley, an English Bulldog in my district, who has become an inspiration to many of my constituents and continues to serve his community.

Stanley was born with a bilateral cleft lip, requiring the need for surgery to tooth problems and holes in his sinus passages. The community came together and raised the funds for the surgery. Now, Stanley goes to schools and community events and has become a source of inspiration for kids with his anti-bullying message. Stanley has also recently joined with the American Childhood Cancer Organization to form the first local chapter of the Founding Hope program, helping to raise funds and awareness to help children with cancer get the support they need.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Stanley and the Pack family for their continuing service to their community, and for serving as an inspiration for children who face bullying and cancer diagnoses.

**IN HONOR OF COMMISSIONER
LUKE POPE STRONG, JR.**

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I pay tribute to an outstanding civic leader and public servant of Georgia, a pillar in the Colquitt County community, and a friend of longstanding, Commissioner Luke P. Strong, Jr. Commissioner Strong passed away on Sunday, September 24, 2017. A funeral service was held on Friday, September 29, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. at Lakeside Assembly of God in Moultrie, Georgia.

Commissioner Strong was born on April 4, 1947, to the union of Luke Strong, Sr. and Mamie Brown-Strong. He was a product of the Colquitt County School System and graduated

from the historic William Bryant High School in 1964. After graduation, he received a greater calling upon his life when he enlisted in the United States Army. He served proudly and honorably for five years. But, this was not the only calling that he would receive in his lifetime. He attended Gupton-Janes School of Mortuary Science in Atlanta, Georgia. He also was a graduate of the ABAC Police Academy and served as a police officer for one year at the McRae Police Department and four years as a deputy with the Montgomery County Sheriffs Department. He then served, alongside his father, as the Vice-President of Strong Enterprises.

In 1986, he was elected as the first and only African American Colquitt County Commissioner, which launched a historic career in public service that would lead him to become the longest seated elected official in Colquitt County. In 1995, he founded Luke Strong and Son Mortuary, L.T.D, which has grown to be one of the leading funeral establishments in South Georgia.

Shirley Chisholm once said that, "Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth." Commissioner Strong paid his rent and he paid it well. He gave his time and talents to many social and civic organizations to include: the Moultrie Colquitt Branch of the NAACP, The Georgia Association of County Commissioners, Georgia Association of Black Elected Officials (GABEO), The National Association of County Commissioners, The Moultrie Men's Club, American Legion Post 533, and Moultrie Technical College Board of Directors. In 2016, he was the recipient of the Ram Round-Up and Community Service Award. Commissioner Strong was also a God fearing man. He was a member of the Grant Chapel A.M.E. Church where he was a member of the Board of Stewards, Board of Trustees and the Sons of Allen.

The great agricultural chemist George Washington Carver once said that, "How far you go in life depends on your being tender with young, compassionate with aged, sympathetic with striving and tolerant of the weak and the strong. Because someday in your life you will have been all of these people." Commissioner Strong never forgot this lesson and was a man who would give you the shirt off of his back. He never advertised what he did for others, but was the true epitome of "Servant Leadership."

On a personal note, Commissioner Strong and his family have been dear friends to my wife Vivian and me for many years and I will miss the wise counsel that he imparted to me over the years.

Commissioner Strong has accomplished much in his life but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of his family. His legacy lives on through his wife, Betty, his six children, four grandchildren and all of those that he touched in a very special way.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with a multitude of other people all across Georgia, salute Commissioner Luke Pope Strong, Jr. for his outstanding public service and his everlasting commitment to improving the quality of the Colquitt County community.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest condolences to Commissioner Strong's family during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on October 2, 2017, I missed the following votes due to a flight delay. Had I been present, I would have voted:

On Roll Call Vote 544, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and pass H.R. 1547, I would have voted Aye.

On Roll Call Vote 545, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and pass H.R. 965, I would have voted Aye.

TRIBUTE TO REX BROWN

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Rex Brown, a friend and beloved member of the Decatur community, who passed away earlier this month.

After finishing law school in 1957, Rex moved his family to Decatur where he built his career as the Senior Partner at his firm Brown, Hawkins, & Basola. He was a recipient of the Board of Governor's Award from the Illinois State Bar Association and enjoyed teaching Business and Real Estate Law at Richland Community College.

Not only was Rex well-respected as a lawyer in Decatur, but also as a prominent community member with a passion for serving his neighbors. He served as Chairman of the Macon County Board from 1971 to 72. As Chairman, he commissioned and created the Macon County flag and seal and instituted their display in the county's courtrooms. He was a part of over twenty community organizations and committees, including the Lincoln Trails Council for Boy Scouts, Optimist Club, Elks Club, the Metro Decatur Chamber of Commerce, and the YMCA.

I am thankful for the many contributions Rex made to the Central Illinois community during his lifetime. He has made an impact on many people and will be truly missed. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Marilyn, and their family during this time.

THE HEARTS OF TEXAS ARE UPON US

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my neighbors in South Texas who continue to experience the devastation of Hurricane Harvey. Our hearts and prayers go out to all of those families for their lost loved ones and those who have been displaced by the storm. We stand with Texas this day and every day. I include in the RECORD this poem penned in their honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

The Hearts of Texas are upon us
All here to so remind us
All in our hearts to so find us
All in what we do in our time this
As their faith and hope,
and compassion come into view
Reminding us what is true
All in this land of that old Red, White, and Blue

For in this our country tis a thee
There has and will always be
Such men and women of great faith as these
Who bond together all in their darkest times
of need

Who built The West all in this creed
While, against all odds helping this Nation
to succeed

And that's what Texas has always been
agreed

So means to me
Neighbor helping neighbor continually
Who are color blind and can not see
Brothers and Sisters reaching out a hand in
their time of need

With smiles upon the faces in what their love
begins to breed

Built on the bedrock of God, Country, and
cherished Family

Shining throughout this day across our
country tis of thee

Teaching us what we need
Catching on from sea to sea

Like The Cajun Navy who they helped in the
midst of their tragedy

Showing us that giving is better than taking
As this giant heart we call Texas has so
awakened

With another heroic chapter written in their
history

Whether, remembering The Alamo,
in times of war Texas has always battled for
victory

And that's why everything is bigger in Texas
you see

As Hearts of Texas are upon you and me
So clearly on this day for the world to see
Teach your children about them and what a
real American can be

All in their most patriotic hearts which
bleed

Red, White, and Blue
For what is true

In Texas today you're watching some of
America's real Who's Who

As TEXAS STRONG comes into view
Yea, The Hearts of Texas are upon us

To teach us all and to so remind us
About faith and courage, and how not to be
discouraged and make it through

All in this wonderful nexus that we call
Texas True Of God, Family, and Country
in all they do

And yes there will be many dark days ahead
For all those who have died and bled

With homes and lives ripped apart let it be
said

But in America,
Texas Faith and their pioneer spirit has al-
ways led

With their hearts to get through the storms
Take a knee now and say a prayer for them
all so very warm

And remember all the courage and faith and
humanity which will live on

And what the human spirit can accomplish
in hearts so worn

All in their most heroic Texan hue
All in their lessons they have taught to me
and you

Bringing our Nation together,
all in this beautiful song of Texas Strong
they do

Because, on this day we understand what is
True,

as The Hearts of Texas are upon us for all to
view.

HONORING ERNEST FREDERICK SCHOWENGERDT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ernest Frederick Schowengerdt. Mr. Schowengerdt, a World War II veteran, is celebrating his 95th birthday on September 2, 2017.

In 1944, Mr. Schowengerdt joined the Navy to become a pilot and serve his country during World War II. After his discharge in 1945 he continued his passion for flying and got his pilot's and aircraft mechanic's licenses at the Lambert Field Airport in St. Louis. He also continued helping at his family farm in Cham-
ois, Missouri, until the Missouri River's flood-
ing took its toll in 1958. Mr. Schowengerdt continued his career as a plant engineer for the Central Electric Power Plant and later as the Director of Plant Management for Lake Ozark General Hospital where he worked with the Missouri Hospital Association and Nuclear Energy Commission in disposing of hazardous and radioactive wastes.

Mr. Schowengerdt has had many life-long interests and passions. He has been involved in music for 76 years, playing numerous band instruments. Mr. Schowengerdt was also a passionate civil servant as he served 2 terms in the Chamois city council and four years as the Osage County Republican Committeeman. He helped organize the Rural Fire Department of Chamois, was the American Legion president, and was involved in many more boards and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in wishing Mr. Ernie Schowengerdt a happy 95th birthday, and thanking him for his lifetime of dedication to his family, community, and his country.

CELEBRATING TAIWAN'S
NATIONAL DAY**HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO**

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish the people of Taiwan and Americans celebrating Taiwan's National Day this October 10th a Happy Double Ten Day.

Over the past 40 years, this key partner in the Asia-Pacific has transformed itself into a high-tech, multiparty democracy which is a significant contributor to the global economy. This is chiefly due to the hard work of the 23.5 million people on Taiwan who value education, science, and progress, and whose young people are not only plugged into global cultural trends, but are also contributing to them. Taiwanese are also the third largest tourist group to Guam and a cornerstone of our island's economy.

Americans share these values, which is why we have also contributed to Taiwan's success not only through our support and friendship, but through the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances, cornerstones of our relations with Taiwan. Our security relationship is an integral element of United States engagement in the Indo-Asia-Pacific and we must continue to work cooperatively together. The people of Guam, neighbors to Taiwan, understand and appreciate the need for strengthening alliances and partnerships in the region.

Two recent events have served to remind me of the imagination and drive of our two peoples—the end of our spectacular Cassini mission to Saturn, and the successful launch this summer of Taiwan's Formosat-5—the latter being the first Taiwan's first major indigenously-developed remote sensing satellite, which will be engaged in Earth observation for the next five years. We are expanding our knowledge of our small planet, our solar system, and the universe at large. Whatever the challenges this planet is presented with in future years, I am confident that our two, talented peoples, along with likeminded societies across the globe, will be able to meet them.

This is a day to celebrate, and to be optimistic. I ask my colleagues to join me in recommitting ourselves to the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, and in wishing Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day.

PAM O'TOOLE TRUSDALE

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my constituent and friend Pam O'Toole Trusdale, on the occasion of her retirement as Executive Director of the National Association of Trailer Manufacturers (NATM). Pam is a longtime resident of my district and lifelong Kansan, attending Parsons Senior High and Washburn University. She joined NATM in 1998 and served as its Executive Director for nearly twenty years. Her leadership

has enabled NATM to grow significantly from a small group of horse and livestock trailer manufacturers into a strong voice for trailer safety.

During Pam's tenure, NATM's membership has added more than 700 trailer manufacturers and component suppliers which collectively employ more than 419,000 American workers. NATM's staff has similarly grown over the years and the Association moved in 2013, to accommodate their growth in staff, to a new headquarters in Topeka, Kansas. Recognizing the importance of engaging in the legislative and regulatory process, Pam led the development of NATM's advocacy in Washington, D.C., which brings trailer manufacturers to visit Congress and federal agencies each year. In working closely with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, she has helped facilitate education and communication about emerging issues. Pam has also worked to develop relationships with other industry groups and has helped create a strong coalition of advocates in the name of NATM's mission of improving trailer safety.

Among Pam's many accomplishments was the development of NATM's Compliance Verification Program, which brings NATM consultants to all trailer manufacturer member facilities biennially to ensure they have processes in place to build trailers in accordance with federal safety standards and industry best practices. Under Pam's leadership, NATM members voted unanimously to make this important program a requirement for membership in the Association. Beyond this program, Pam has overseen the development of additional technical resources and educational programming to help member companies continue to have the tools to comply with regulations as well as grow their own businesses.

In addition to her work at NATM, Pam is an active participant in the Topeka community. She has served on the Board of Regents at Washburn University, has been a leader with the Kansas Society of Association Executives and a member of the Stormont-Vail Foundation Advisory Board. Pam is the proud mother of three and grandmother of eight. I want to thank Pam for her tireless commitment to trailer safety, and years of service to NATM and the Topeka community. I wish her and Tom many happy years of retirement.

IRAQ AND SYRIA GENOCIDE EMERGENCY RELIEF AND ACCOUNTABILITY

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I held a hearing on the need for aid to be provided for victims of religious and ethnic persecution in Iraq and Syria. In August 2014, ISIS began committing genocide against Yazidis and Christians in Iraq. Three years later, they are still not receiving the assistance they need from the United States and so their survival in their ancient homelands is in jeopardy.

Two consecutive Secretaries of State and the Congress declared ISIS was responsible

for genocide. This year, the President and Vice President declared the genocide and committed the Administration to provide relief to the surviving religious and ethnic minority communities. In the final appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2017, Congress required the State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development to fund the assistance promised by the Administration.

But career staff at the State Department and USAID have ignored the law and thwarted the will of the President, the Congress and the people we represent. These bureaucrats have refused to direct assistance to religious and ethnic minority communities, even to enable them to survive genocide. This obstruction is unacceptable and I urge Secretary Tillerson and new USAID Administrator Green to put an end to it.

I chaired my first hearing on atrocities against religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq or Syria in September of 2013. The hearing today was the 10th I have chaired focused in whole or in part on their plight. Last September I introduced bipartisan legislation, co-authored by my good friend ANNA ESHOO, explicitly authorizing the State Department and USAID to identify the needs of these communities and fund entities, including faith-based entities, effectively providing them with aid on-the-ground. Even though the U.S. already has the authority to provide such assistance, we were aware some in the bureaucracy inaccurately claimed they lacked the authority and so we wanted to remove this excuse. It was also important to have a detailed authorization as the foundation for forth-going appropriations. This bill would also set an important precedent for how the U.S. should respond to future crises in which religious and ethnic minorities are targeted for atrocity crimes.

Partially informed by my trip to Erbil last December to meet first-hand with genocide survivors, we reintroduced this legislation as H.R. 390 almost immediately after the start of the new Congress, with even stronger support from both sides of the aisle and many Yazidi, Christian, accountability and human rights groups and leaders. The House passed it unanimously in early June and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed it unanimously on September 19. There has been no subsequent action in the Senate. The appropriations bill for fiscal year 2017 has expired and the situation on-the-ground is deteriorating for these endangered communities. I respectfully ask the Senate to immediately pass H.R. 390.

This hearing explored the urgent crisis for Christian and Yazidi genocide survivors, especially in Iraq, what the Administration can do now to enable them to survive, and what the consequences will be for these communities and our national security if we fail to act. We heard from several of our witnesses, helping these communities survive and return to their homes will reduce threats from Iran. It will also deny ISIS a major propaganda victory and recruiting tool.

I should note the State Department and USAID were invited to testify. They were unavailable.

Our first witness was known to many of you, my dear friend for many years, the former Representative for the 10th district of Virginia,

Frank Wolf. He is testified today as the Distinguished Senior Fellow at 21st Century Wilberforce Initiative and he visited Northern Iraq this August. In his written statement, Congressman Wolf warns "if bold action is not taken by the end of the year, I believe a tipping point will be reached and we will see the end of Christianity in Iraq." About the Yazidis, he reports although "Sinjar has been liberated from ISIS since the fall of 2015 . . . it is currently controlled by multiple different militia groups . . . few families have been able to return and few aid groups work in the area."

Congressman Wolf also raised the alarm about Iraq-backed militias filling the post-ISIS liberation vacuum as part of Tehran's "goal of creating a land-bridge from Iran [to] allow Iran to move fighters, weapons and supplies to aid Hezbollah and other terrorist groups" and offered several concrete policy recommendations the Administration and Congress should heed.

Our second witness was Shireen, a Yazidi survivor of ISIS enslavement. She wrote in her statement for the record this "captivity under ISIS . . . was like hell. They performed an abdominal surgery on me . . . and I am suffering from the effects of it . . . They committed all kinds of atrocious crimes against us including mass killing, sexual enslavement, and forced conversion."

Shireen also wrote "19 members of my family and my relatives are missing. They may be killed or still in captivity but we don't know anything about them . . . We are still waiting for action and the liberation of thousands of Yazidis from ISIS captivity." She warns that "Yazidis, Christians and other religious minorities, especially the non-Muslim minorities, cannot survive in Syria and Iraq under the current conditions. Without serious action from you and the world governments, many of these people will continue to flee their ancient homelands of Syria and Iraq."

Our third witness was Lauren Ashburn, Managing Editor and Anchor of EWTN News Nightly. She travelled to Northern Iraq earlier this year and has continued to report on the crisis. Her story-telling and video, rooted in more than 20 years as a journalist, has helped tell the stories of heroism, indomitable faith, and survival. As she reported in her written testimony for the hearing "Christians in Iraq are on the brink of extinction . . . The United States is the only nation in the world that can provide concrete aid to rebuild the community that I saw in shambles."

Our fourth and final witness was Stephen Rasche, Legal Counsel and Director of IDP Resettlement Programs for the Chaldean Catholic Archdiocese of Erbil, and Legal Counsel and Chief Coordinator for the Nineveh Reconstruction Committee. Mr. Rasche testified before a hearing I chaired of the Helsinki Committee last September, and he reported in his written testimony today, "I regret to say that we have still yet to receive any form of meaningful aid from the U.S. Government . . . While we have found the political appointees much more willing to help us since January, the fact is that even after the better part of a year, they have been unable to move the bureaucracy to take meaningful action."

The Obama Administration channeled all U.S. funding for stabilization in Iraq through

the Funding Facility for Stabilization, administered by the UN Development Program, and the current Administration has continued this policy. Mr. Rasche testified in his written statement "While status reports from UNDP work in Nineveh purport to show real progress in the Christian majority towns, on the ground we see little evidence of it. Work projects are in most cases cosmetic in nature, and much of that cynically so . . . In effect, U.S. taxpayers are financing the spoils of genocide."

As an alternative option for U.S. assistance, he details the Nineveh Sustainable Return Program, an initiative of the ecumenical Nineveh Reconstruction Committee to repair homes damaged or destroyed by ISIS. The Program has already rebuilt several thousand homes and enabled thousands of Christian families to return, mostly funded by the Knights of Columbus and Aid to the Church in Need, with some additional funding from the Government of Hungary. Last month, the Nineveh Reconstruction Committee USA submitted a proposal to USAID to ensure the project can be completed and many more families can return.

I strongly support this time-sensitive proposal and call on USAID Administrator Mark Green to ensure a decision is made about it soon. Because of the resistance among career staff at USAID to directing assistance to religious and ethnic minority communities, even though they were targeted for genocide, it is imperative officials appointed by the President are part of the review process and that the final decision be made by Presidential appointees. I included this proposal as part of the hearing record.

As Mr. Rasche warns in his written testimony, "Today, as I speak to you, we are caught fully exposed and at-risk, finding ourselves at a critical historical inflection point, foreign aid decisions over which will determine whether Christianity, and religious pluralism—vital to the U.S. national interest and regional security—will survive in Iraq at all."

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. JUDITH TUCKER

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to an exceptional community leader, an outstanding citizen, and a dear friend of longstanding, Ms. Judith Tucker, on the occasion of her retirement.

A native of West Point, Georgia, Judith attended Spelman College before transferring to Columbus College, where she received her bachelor's degree in General Business.

Judith previously served as a marketing officer for Columbus Bank and Trust Company and the Vice President of Product Development at Synovus Financial Corporation. After working for Synovus Financial Corporation, Judith joined the board of Midtown Incorporated where Mayor Teresa Tomlinson served as the Executive Director. After developing a solid

business relationship, Tomlinson hired Judith as MidTown's Director of Community Affairs, and together they increased the organization's membership from 24 to 100 members. When Tomlinson ran and won in the 2010 mayoral election for the City of Columbus, she appointed Judith to be her Executive Assistant, and for more than 7 years, Judith has done a tremendous job in upholding the highest standards of professionalism, honesty, and affordability.

Ms. Tucker's distinguished civil service has been mirrored by her extensive involvement in her community. In conjunction with her professional accomplishments in government, Ms. Tucker served on a several boards, including the boards of NeighborWorks for Columbus and the Columbus Symphony Orchestra. She also belonged to a number of prestigious organizations, such as Girl Scouts of Historical Georgia, the Gracious Ladies of Georgia, and the Kiwanis Club of Columbus.

Judith Tucker's faith has always instilled within her a desire to positively shape the community in which she lives. As the Chair Pro-Tem of the Board of Trustees at St. James A.M.E., she regularly incorporates her faith into her commitment to public service.

She has accomplished much throughout her life, but none of this would be possible without the grace of God and the inspiration, love and support of her son, Kenneth Tucker, and her grandson, Tristan Tucker.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get; you make your life by what you give." The greater Columbus area is a better place because of Judith Tucker and her tireless commitment to making our community stronger. As a woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise are unparalleled, but her heart for helping others utilizing these qualities has made her life's work truly special.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 700,000 citizens of the 2nd Congressional District, in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Ms. Judith Tucker upon the occasion of her retirement from an outstanding career of public service.

CELEBRATING THE NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note the upcoming National Day of Taiwan, which falls on October 10th. I extend my best wishes to the people of Taiwan as they prepare for this important day, and also offer my best wishes for the day itself.

As a Member of Congress, I am proud of the actions we have taken through the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) and the Six Assurances in helping to make it possible for the people of Taiwan to build the strong, prosperous, and democratic society they enjoy today. Our bilateral relationship is as strong as ever, and I am confident it will continue to be in the years to come.

Trade between the United States and Taiwan exceeded \$65 billion in 2016, a sign of close economic cooperation and friendship. Recently, Foxconn, a Taiwan-based company, made an announcement that they were expanding in to the United States through new facilities. I look forward to working towards closer trade ties and a renewed commitment for economic prosperity.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in a message of continuing friendship to the people of Taiwan, and in wishing them a Happy Double Ten Day.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF
DR. STEPHEN A. RALLS

HON. A. DREW FERGUSON IV

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the retirement of Dr. Stephen A. Ralls.

Dr. Ralls has served as the Executive Director of the American College of Dentists for the past 20 years, one of the longest serving leaders in the organization's 100-year history.

The American College of Dentists was founded on August 20, 1920, in response to serious problems facing the profession. The group works to elevate the standards of dentistry, encourage graduate study and grant fellowship to those who have done meritorious work. The American College of Dentists is nonprofit and apolitical, and has long been regarded as the "conscience of dentistry."

As a dentist myself, I deeply appreciate the contributions of this organization, and, particularly Dr. Ralls, to the field of dentistry. Their work has elevated the field and calls on all dentists to excel.

I want to extend my gratitude to Dr. Ralls for his commitment to the American College of Dentists and the greater community of dentistry. I congratulate him on his retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF LENOX

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Town of Lenox, Massachusetts on the occasion of its 250th anniversary. Over the course of its storied history, Lenox has been home to people and events which have greatly contributed to the vibrancy of our country's traditions and culture. Located in the heart of the Berkshire Mountains, the town is a wonderful representation of Western Massachusetts and the beauty it holds.

Lenox was named after Charles Lennox, the Third Duke of Richmond, who was known and respected for being an advocate of the interests of American colonists in the British House of Lords. The town lived up to the legacy of

its namesake as an active participant in the Revolutionary War. In less than a decade after its first town meeting in 1767, Lenox was represented before the Royal Governor of Massachusetts by Colonel John Paterson, who would go on to play a central role in paving the way for the birth of the United States of America.

Since then, Lenox has contributed generously to the notable history and culture of not only Massachusetts, but also that of our nation. The region's rustic beauty helped Lenox develop into a lively artists' colony, attracting creative minds the likes of which included writer Nathaniel Hawthorne, photographer James Van Der Zee, and novelist Edith Wharton. The town has facilitated the preservation of The Mount, Ms. Wharton's country estate, which is a National Historic Landmark and welcomes tens of thousands of visitors annually. Lenox is also renowned for its cultivation and encouragement of the musical arts through the annual Tanglewood Music Festival, as well as the Tanglewood Estate which has served as the summer home for the Boston Symphony Orchestra since 1937. The town also boasts the new international campus of Shakespeare and Company, a popular theater group and world-famous center for creative excellence in the arts.

Mr. Speaker, the Town of Lenox, Massachusetts has been a place of historical importance and cultural renaissance since its founding in 1767. Additionally, its admirable promotion of the arts is certainly worthy of recognition. Lenox is a place of outstanding character and I am proud to represent them in the U.S. House of Representatives. As the town celebrates their 250th anniversary with a town-wide parade, I wish them all the best and continued prosperity.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACTIVIST, MS. FANNIE LOU HAMER

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the civil rights icon and voting rights activist, Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer. Ms. Hamer is fondly remembered and admired for her activism during the Civil Rights Movement while speaking out against the injustices that African Americans faced in Mississippi and across the United States.

Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer was born in Montgomery County, Mississippi, to a family of impoverished share croppers. At just six years old, her family expected her to work in the fields, which she continued to do for most of her early life until she was fired for trying to register to vote.

At 37 years old, Ms. Hamer launched her career in political activism, which soon became her chief mission in life. Ms. Hamer attended a meeting hosted by the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) where she first registered to vote and became a field worker on the voter registration

committee. In 1964, she attended the Democratic Convention in Atlanta and eventually helped found the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Ms. Hamer became one of the faces of the civil rights struggle in Mississippi.

While the Voting Rights Act of 1965 codified what Ms. Hamer fought so hard for in our country, there still remains much to do. Before the 2016 election, 14 states adopted new voter laws under the guise of combating voter fraud, which essentially created new barriers to voting for tens of thousands of low-income citizens and citizens of color. Later, the Supreme Court decision in *Shelby v. Holder* left many across the nation without their fundamental right to vote by reversing a key formula used in the Voting Rights Act to hold states accountable. On May 11, 2017, President Trump issued an executive order that would create an "election integrity" commission, which has been stated to combat voter fraud, but in reality will lead to a repeat of the egregious mistakes of our past.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Hamer's persistence and diligence in her fight for voting rights was integral to the Civil Rights Movement and the eventual passage of legislation that protected the right to vote for all citizens. We must continue to remember her struggle, as the struggle continues even to this day. By honoring Ms. Hamer's legacy, we can learn from the mistakes of our past and recognize those who had fought for a better future.

FANNIE LOU HAMER—
NEVERTHELESS, SHE PERSISTED

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of an American hero, Fannie Lou Hamer. A leader in the Civil Rights Movement, Fannie Lou Hamer faced down racism, violence, prison, and more in her fight for the right to vote. This week marks what would be Hamer's 100th birthday, giving us an opportunity to reflect on Fannie Lou's legacy, her persistence in the face of adversity, and what her story means for our country today.

For those of you who are not familiar with Hamer's story, Fannie Lou was born in 1917 in Mississippi, the youngest of 20 children. Her family worked as sharecroppers in Mississippi, and at the age of six, Fannie Lou joined them picking cotton.

It was in 1962, after nearly forty years of working in the fields that Fannie Lou Hamer tried to register to vote. For African Americans in Mississippi during the Jim Crow era, registering to vote was an act of extraordinary courage. This was a time when black men and women, mothers and daughters, and fathers and sons were beaten and lynched by white mobs with no legal repercussions.

Fannie Lou knew these dangers, but nevertheless, she persisted. In August of 1962, she traveled to Indianola, Mississippi to register to vote. When she returned home after registering, she was fired by the owner of the plantation she worked on, who had warned her against registering.

But nevertheless, she persisted. Leaving the plantation, Fannie Lou traveled the South, working with the Civil Rights movement, teaching African Americans to read and helping them register to vote. One day, on her way back from a literacy workshop, Fannie Lou was arrested on false charges and jailed. In jail, police beat Fannie Lou to within an inch of her life with a blackjack. It took Fannie Lou more than a month to recover, and the beating would scar her both mentally and physically.

But nevertheless, she persisted. Over the next decade, Fannie Lou Hamer took her fight

for the right to vote to the national party. From humble beginnings, she challenged the President of the United States, Members of Congress, the Democratic Party, and lawmakers at every level to confront the realities of racism in the United States and to build a democracy inclusive of all Americans.

Time and again, she faced violence and she faced institutions built on decades of racism. But nevertheless she persisted.

Today, I stand, not only to honor the courage and accomplishment of Fannie Lou Hamer, but to offer her story as inspiration to

the Americans today who are fighting to make our country a better place to live. As we work to turn back new discriminatory voting laws, as we speak out for a more affordable health care system for all Americans, as we take a stand on issues like police brutality, we must persist.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman THOMPSON for organizing Members today in honor of Fannie Lou Hamer. We can never allow her work or her legacy to be forgotten.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 4, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we are grateful that Your will prevails when reliance on humanity is futile.

Give our Senators the wisdom to understand that without Your help, they cannot succeed. Today, use them to work and act to accomplish Your purposes on Earth. Help them not to repay evil with evil but plant seeds of goodness that will bring a harvest of joy.

Arise, O Lord. Lift Yourself up in these dangerous times to bring Your peace to our hearts. Help us to remember that You save the upright in heart, and Your justice will sustain us. Keep us from conceiving troubles and embracing falsehoods, as we focus on loving and serving You.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, Chairman HATCH held another hearing on a subject that is incredibly important to the economic future of our country: tax reform.

For too long, our economy has failed to live up to its full potential. For too long, Americans have suffered through stagnant paychecks, a lack of steady work, and retirement that can seem to slip further away by the day. These are the forgotten men, women, and families of the last decade. For many Americans living on the coasts, working in Silicon Valley, or in finance, the recession of 2008 to 2009 may seem like just a moment in history, but for too many Americans, the last 10 years have been a lost decade where our economy has stumbled along and opportunities have declined for American workers and their families.

Tax reform represents the single most important thing we can do today to get our economy back on track and give American workers a leg up. It is our once-in-a-generation opportunity to replace an outdated tax code that holds us back with one that works for American families and small businesses. We want to lower taxes and simplify rates. We want to expand job creation and grow paychecks. Put another way, we want to take more money out of Washington's pocket and put it in yours. That is the essential goal of tax reform. That is our message to the American people. It is what I believe. It is what Chairman HATCH believes. It is what Chairman ENZI believes as well.

Chairman ENZI has an important role to play in this process, too, because later today he will lead his committee in marking up a comprehensive budget for fiscal year 2018 that will help our country achieve balance by reining in Federal spending. It will also help our economy grow, and one of the ways it will do so is by providing legislative tools to advance tax reform. I thank the Budget Committee for all its good work so far, and I look forward to its continued efforts to get our fiscal house in order and our economy back on a path to solid growth after the lost decade of disappointment I just spoke about.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this week, I filed cloture motions on four qualified nominees for various agencies throughout the Federal Government. I shouldn't have had to. In different times, we may have even con-

sidered them on voice votes. But this is where we are, and now it is time to advance and confirm them as soon as possible.

Later this morning, the Senate will consider Eric Hargan to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. As the people of Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands continue to recover from a series of devastating hurricanes, Mr. Hargan's expertise in disaster response and public health will help the Department respond to these crises. I look forward to confirming Mr. Hargan soon so he can help coordinate multiple agencies under his supervision to respond to the hurricanes, deliver relief, and help save lives.

After that, this afternoon we will take up the nomination of Randal Quarles, the President's nominee to help oversee the Federal Reserve System. Mr. Quarles brings with him both domestic and international financial experience from multiple administrations, and he will be a strong guide for our Nation's monetary policy. We also intend to confirm Mr. Quarles to the position of Vice Chair for Supervision. This is an essential role created by Dodd-Frank, and it is critical that Mr. Quarles begin this work over at the Fed.

Tomorrow, the Senate will confirm Lee Francis Cissna to be Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Mr. Cissna has a wealth of experience in immigration policy, serving in senior policy positions in both the Bush and Obama administrations and then working for the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He was voted out of committee with bipartisan support. I look forward to his confirmation to this important role.

Then we will consider Callista Gingrich, whom the President has nominated to be our Nation's Ambassador to the Holy See. Ms. Gingrich's work will continue the strong relationship between our Nation and the Vatican, building upon shared values, goals, and global responsibilities.

I thank each of these nominees for their willingness to serve our Nation. They are each well qualified and suited for their role. I look forward to the Senate confirming them very soon.

TRIBUTE TO DR. TOM APPLETON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to congratulate Dr. Tom Appleton of Lexington, KY, on his retirement from the History Department at Eastern Kentucky University. One of Kentucky's

premier historians, Tom has spent his career writing about the Commonwealth's rich heritage. He joined EKU's faculty in the fall of 2000, and over the years, he has left a positive imprint on his students, his field, and his State.

He has also proved to be an invaluable resource for me. A number of years ago, I began a series of talks focused on former U.S. Senators from Kentucky. In each speech, I have tried to convey a bit of political history through the lives of these distinguished individuals. Tom's counsel has been invaluable in my work to prepare these speeches and pay tribute to some of Kentucky's prominent political leaders.

Before joining EKU's faculty nearly 20 years ago, Tom spent more than two decades at the Kentucky Historical Society. It certainly shows. Even the TV show "Jeopardy" has used him as a historical resource. Tom has been the co-editor of six books on the history of the American South, including a groundbreaking look into the lives of Kentucky women, and he is currently working on a biography of Kentucky's own A.B. "Happy" Chandler, who served as Governor, Senator, and baseball's second commissioner. Tom's passion for Kentucky's rich history is obvious.

He has been a wonderful friend and resource for me, a real champion and advocate for our Commonwealth, and has made a lasting impact on the next generation through his teaching. As one former student recalled, "Dr. Appleton's mission in teaching Kentucky history was less about imparting facts and dates and more about ensuring that students departed the class with an enhanced understanding of the rich cultural tapestry of Kentucky. He admonished students to be worthy of the proud legacy of our Commonwealth's great statesmen, military leaders, writers, and sports legends." That is a legacy to be proud of.

After his final semester of teaching, Tom could be forgiven for wanting to retire from his work as a historian altogether, but that is not Tom. He plans to continue his research and writing about the lives and events that shaped our home State, and I plan to continue reading his fascinating take on our shared Kentucky heritage.

I wish Tom well, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Tom Appleton on a truly remarkable career.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Hargan nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand the administration intends to submit its first request for disaster aid for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands today. It is a good first step, but it is just the start of the financial aid we will need to provide to the American citizens in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

I urge my colleagues to work quickly to add additional and urgent funding for recovery, like community development block grant dollars, just as we did for Texas after Hurricane Harvey, with the understanding that an additional and more comprehensive request for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Florida, Texas, and the western wildfires will be coming from the administration once the damage assessments are complete.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. President, returning to the events in Las Vegas on Sunday, we cannot let this American tragedy, another in a long line of American tragedies, fall out of our hearts and minds too quickly.

Let us pledge to be there for the families of the 59 Americans who were killed and the over 500 Americans who are still injured and recovering. Seeing the pictures of so many of these beautiful, young people in the prime of life—young, excited about the world, some of them newly married, some of them a little older with young children—breaks your heart. So not just today or this week, but in the weeks

and months to come, let us pledge to continue to show our gratitude to those firefighters and cops, the emergency and medical personnel, and all the other first responders who rushed to the scene. Let us pledge to remember the acts of everyday heroism that are a beacon of light in this moment of darkness: the lines to give blood that stretched around the block at 6 a.m., the teachers who went to school the day after the shooting to try and give their students a sense of normalcy. I hope these are the things President Trump highlights in his visit to Las Vegas today.

And one more thing: President Trump has an opportunity to wrench his party out of the grasp of the NRA and get our country and our Congress to start talking about commonsense gun safety reforms. Before President Trump ran for office, he repeatedly supported several sane, rational gun safety measures, including the assault weapons ban and longer waiting periods to purchase a gun. As recently as 2012, President Trump supported President Obama's response to Sandy Hook. In the wake of Sandy Hook, President Obama called for action. In the wake of Las Vegas, President Trump should do the same.

We have heard it over and over again: Now is not the time to talk about gun safety because it would politicize the tragedy. My friend the majority leader said no less than three times at his press conference yesterday that it is premature and inappropriate to talk about any legislative solutions to the epidemic of gun violence.

As Martin Luther King said in his letter at the Birmingham Jail, "not now" means never. "Wait" means never. That is what he said: Wait means never.

The Republicans don't want to talk about it today, tomorrow, next week, next month, or next year. We know why they don't want to talk about it. They know the country is totally against their view. It is not political out in the country. Over 90 percent of Americans support universal background checks. A significant majority of Republicans support them. That is not political, I would say to my friend the majority leader.

It is political for him because he is afraid of the NRA, a powerful lobby that is off to the extreme. It is not political for American people or for Republicans. They are for it. Over 70 percent of gun owners support background checks for private sales and at gun shows. The only place where this is political is here, and that is because the NRA, the gun manufacturers, and their powerful lobby make these folks afraid—afraid to do the right thing. They know it is the right thing.

The NRA and these lobbies are the swamp the President is talking about. President Trump talks about the

swamp, groups of lobbyists who thwart the will of the American people. That is what the NRA does.

So I say to the President, Mr. President, you have an opportunity to buck the NRA, buck the gun lobbyists, buck the swamp, and lead this country in an adult conversation about gun violence. The President can and should bring the parties together—the leaders of this Congress—and let both sides know he is ready to address this issue head-on and talk about sensible, moderate measures of gun safety and, above all, background checks.

The President's visit is an important one today. He should be going. He should seek to provide comfort to the families and express gratitude to our first responders. But he should take it one step further. Call us together, lead this Nation in a debate about rational, moderate gun safety laws. Get us started on the work that so many Americans are desperate for us to do.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on one final matter, the Republican tax plan, we Democrats have long said that we are willing to work with our Republican colleagues on tax reform, and we laid out our principles early on so that there would be no mistake about them. We wanted tax reform to be deficit neutral. It shouldn't increase the deficit. For every reduction in rate, they ought to close a loophole. We wanted it to go through regular order, not the way healthcare did, not reconciliation, but work with us. You would get a much more sensible product. Most importantly, we didn't want to give a tax cut to the top 1 percent. They are doing great already. God bless them. They don't need any more tax relief. It is the middle class that does. But the framework the GOP released last week violates all three of these commonsense principles, vastly favoring the wealthy over working Americans.

I have spoken several times about tax breaks for the rich included in this package—lowering the top rate from 39 to 36 percent, repealing the estate tax, opening up a gaping tax loophole for hedge fund managers, wealthy Wall Street firms, lobbyists, and law firms by lowering the rate on passthroughs so that these rich people would pay only 25 percent on their personal income tax while other people pay a lot more.

This morning, I want to highlight not only how the Republican plan favors the rich but also sticks it to the middle class. This is something that the Acting President pro tempore has brought up.

Just this week we found a bombshell contained within the GOP resolution they are using to pass tax reform. The Republicans plan to cut Medicare by \$473 billion and Medicaid by more than \$1 trillion. It can be a little hard to find, but it is right there in the GOP

budget—\$473 billion for Medicare, \$1 trillion for Medicaid.

If you are an older American, if you have a family in a nursing home or someone in treatment for opioid addiction and you think the GOP plan doesn't affect you, think again. The AARP—not a political organization, it simply represents the interests of the elderly—sent a letter yesterday opposing this Republican plan, the one in the House, and I think we have one in the Senate as well. It is the same group that represented senior citizens and fought the debacle on healthcare that the Republicans proposed.

The Republicans are proposing to pay for their giant tax cut to the rich by gutting Medicare and Medicaid. That is the bombshell this week. That is the nugget that will destroy their whole plan. Americans are so against those kinds of cuts.

Amazingly, it is just like the inverse of the Republican plan on healthcare. In each case, they gut healthcare for Americans who need it most to pay for taxes for Americans who need it the least.

The healthcare plan focused on cuts to Medicaid but snuck in tax cuts for the rich. This plan focuses on tax cuts to the rich and sneaks in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

The GOP budget is another page out of the same playbook. The GOP plan contains another punch to the gut of the middle class.

This is what the Acting President pro tempore, I believe, spoke about yesterday.

In the form of the repeal of the State and local deduction—44 million Americans take the State and local deduction. That is one-third of all taxpayers. This is not just a small, rarified group in California or New York. It is across the country. They get an average of several thousand dollars off their taxes each year. That includes 40 percent of taxpayers making between \$50,000 and \$75,000 per year and 70 percent of taxpayers earning from \$100,000 to \$200,000.

This is a middle-class tax deduction worth several thousand dollars a year, and the GOP tax plan yanks it away. Taking it away means double taxation on middle-class families.

For many families, this will not be offset by a larger standard deduction in the GOP plan. Largely due to the elimination of State and local, the Tax Policy Center estimates that 30 percent of those making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 and 60 percent of those making between \$150,000 and \$300,000 will see a tax increase with the GOP plan, and that is after doubling the standard deduction. By the way, don't think that it is just a few States; the numbers are astounding across the country, as folks in every State claim this deduction. I say to my dear friend the chairman of the Finance Committee that 35 percent of Utahns take this deduction, 33 per-

cent of Georgians, and 32 percent of Coloradoans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of how many taxpayers are affected in every State by removing State and local deductibility and how much it will cost them on average.

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

FIGURE 7.—PERCENTAGE OF TAX UNITS THAT USE THE SALT DEDUCTION AND THE AVERAGE DEDUCTION BY STATE

State	% with SALT Deductions	Average SALT Deduction*
MD	46	\$12,931
CT	41	19,664
NY	41	17,850
DC	40	16,442
VA	37	11,288
MA	37	15,571
OR	36	12,616
UT	35	8,251
MN	35	12,954
NY	35	22,169
CA	34	18,437
GA	33	9,158
RI	33	12,434
CO	32	9,017
DE	32	9,194
IL	31	12,523
WI	31	11,653
NH	31	10,121
WA	30	7,402
IA	29	10,163
HI	29	9,905
NC	29	9,587
PA	29	11,248
AZ	28	7,403
MT	28	9,357
ID	28	8,862
ME	28	11,431
NE	28	11,088
SC	27	8,765
VT	27	12,407
MO	27	9,648
MO	26	9,886
OH	26	10,444
KY	26	9,955
AL	26	5,918
KS	25	9,425
NV	25	5,989
OK	24	8,201
MS	23	6,302
LA	23	6,742
TX	23	7,823
IN	23	8,756
FL	22	7,373
NM	22	7,091
AR	22	9,106
WY	22	6,306
AK	21	4,931
TN	21	5,611
ND	18	6,864
WV	17	9,462
SD	17	6,098

* Calculated as SALT deduction amount divided by number of SALT deductions.

Mr. SCHUMER. I urge my colleagues to look in the RECORD and see how it affects them. You are fooling yourself if you think that you are not affected by the State and local deductibility.

Of course, if you are a family of four in one of those States, the repeal of State and local could be a killer because, again, you would lose the personal exemption. The larger the family, the greater the loss of exemption.

I want to make one final point on tax reform. This is related to two people whom I know, and I knew one of them before he ever arrived in Washington. I have to make this point because what I heard them say over the weekend just turned my stomach. It was astounding. It was awful.

Over the weekend, we heard some pretty extraordinary claims from Republican legislators and Cabinet officials about what the GOP tax plan was all about, but Gary Cohn and Secretary of the Treasury Steve Mnuchin deserve a special admonition.

Chief White House economic adviser Gary Cohn actually said: "The wealthy are not getting a tax cut under our plan." That is not a surmising of what he said; that is a direct quote. "The wealthy are not getting a tax cut under our plan." Comments like that should make everyone's head spin. According to the Tax Policy Center, the top 1 percent would reap 80 percent of the benefits of the GOP plan. The top 0.1 percent—the folks who make more than \$5 million a year—would get a break of more than \$1 million a year.

Some might argue, of course, that it will cause economic growth. I do not think that it will, but at least make your real argument. Do not hide it. You know that the American people do not agree with you. That is why you hide it.

Only in Wonderland, where down is up and up is down, could Gary Cohn's comments be believed. It is something like out of the Ministry of Truth from George Orwell's "1984," which would be to cut the top rate by 4 percent and repeal the estate tax—yes, no tax cuts for the wealthy. Bunk. It is why the Washington Post gave Gary Cohn four Pinocchios for his statement. If they had allowed more Pinocchios on the scale, I am sure he would have gotten them. He earned them, unfortunately.

What about Secretary Mnuchin? His lack of credibility resembles Gary Cohn's. He said that he believes the GOP plan would reduce deficits by \$1 trillion. "We think there will be \$2 trillion of growth. So we think this tax plan will cut the deficits by a trillion dollars." Mnuchin's claim is fake math at its worst. As was written in the Washington Post, no serious economist, liberal or conservative, believes that a tax cut boosts economic growth so much that the tax cut pays for itself, let alone adds \$1 trillion in revenue as Mnuchin claims. Four Pinocchios were given by the Washington Post. I am sure that he too—Steve Mnuchin—would have earned more Pinocchios.

Gary Cohn and Steve Mnuchin claim to be economic experts, and they both used to work at Goldman Sachs. If they had used this kind of math at Goldman Sachs, they would have been shown the door a long time ago. As I said before, they should know better, and they do know better. They ought to stop deliberately misleading the American people. It demeans them. It demeans the administration. It demeans the debate in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls be divided equally between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I did not get a chance to hear the distinguished Democratic leader's remarks, for Chairman HATCH and I were in the Senate Finance Committee. We managed to pass, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, the Children's Health Insurance Program—a vital program for 9 million kids. So that is a bit of good news in that this important piece of legislation is advancing. I do know that the Democratic leader touched on a number of very important issues, particularly some of these comments that have been made by top advisers to the President with respect to taxes.

I am struck by the fact that Mr. Gary Cohn, the President's top economic adviser, said last week that middle-class folks were going to get \$1,000 in tax relief—set aside the fact that that does not look to be true for a number of middle-class folks who have kids. I am also struck by the comment that followed. Mr. Cohn said that not only are middle-class families going to get \$1,000 worth of tax relief but that they would be able to go buy cars or remodel their kitchens. You just think to yourself, with that kind of tax cut, that you would be buying a very small car or remodeling a very small kitchen. The fact is, that is not, in my view, a comment that reflects a real understanding of what middle-class folks in America are going through. I don't see very many of them buying cars for \$1,000 or remodeling their kitchens for \$1,000.

That comment was accompanied by the comments of Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin, who not only said a couple of days ago that tax cuts would pay for themselves—a statement that was contradicted by Republican economists yesterday in the Senate Finance Committee—but that there would be something like \$1 trillion left over. Mr. Mnuchin continues to make the case that there is somehow a magical growth fairy here in the American economy that nobody else knows about, including Republican economists.

I am one who believes that behavior does matter, and I am going to talk about a bipartisan approach to taxes in a minute—a responsible, bipartisan approach to taxes, not one that helps the 1 percent or creates a huge new deficit or that kind of thing. I think that you will generate some revenue, and Doug

Elmendorf said that when he was the head of the Budget Office, but it is not going to generate hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars, as in the case of what Mr. Mnuchin is talking about, which is something like \$2 trillion. There is no economic support for that.

You have the President's economic team and his top advisers trying to defend the indefensible, and I will go into that more a little bit later today.

Right now, I think it is important that we have a response that I am going to deliver to the distinguished majority whip, who is a member of the Finance Committee, who made some comparisons between the Republican plan and the bipartisan legislation that I wrote—after months and months of hard work—with two of our former Republican colleagues, Senator Gregg and Senator Coats. Senator Coats is now a member of President Trump's Cabinet.

The comparison that somehow the Republican plan is like the bipartisan approach that I wrote—these extreme ideas in the Republican plan—is not just a bit of a stretch or a little off base; there is absolutely no comparison—none—between the bipartisan proposal and the extreme Republican plan. The distinguished majority whip, in my view, offered a complete and total misrepresentation of what the two proposals are all about, and I am going to illustrate this in two ways—first, with respect to the policy.

The Republican tax cut framework green-lights the entire wish list for major multinational corporations and the wealthy. There is a massive corporate tax cut that overwhelmingly benefits shareholders. When it comes to international taxes, there is a pure territorial system with barely a nod to the kind of tough rules that are needed to protect workers and the middle-class folks in the center of our tax base.

There is, in the Republican plan, a brand-new passthrough loophole. It is as big as the Grand Canyon. It is the Grand Canyon of loopholes in the Republican tax proposal, which invites tax cheats to skip out from paying their fair share to Social Security and Medicare.

The Republican plan eliminates the estate tax, which today only touches estates worth more than \$11 million or \$5.5 million for a single individual. The top rate goes down, and the bottom income tax rate goes up. When doing the math on what the Republicans have on offer, we are looking at upwards of \$4, \$5, \$6, or \$7 trillion in tax giveaways to the most fortunate.

It is a different story under the Republican proposal if you are middle class. You probably have a lot of unanswered questions. All you know right now is that it virtually guarantees that, in order to pay for the giveaways to the wealthy and corporations, current middle-class tax breaks are going

to be on the chopping block—the personal exemption, incentives for retirement savings, education, and home ownership, to name just a few. From everything we know, when you set up these kinds of extreme approaches, when you raise the parts of the Tax Code that are a giveaway to those at the top, what you see is the middle class getting hurt.

Instead of tripling the standard deduction, which is what we did in our bipartisan bill, the Trump people double it, but then they take away the personal exemptions for working-class folks. So unlike our proposal, where the middle class can count on hundreds and hundreds of dollars in their paycheck when you triple the standard deduction, under the Republican proposal, they give it with one hand by doubling the standard deduction and take it away with the other hand by eliminating the personal exemption. So you have a very stark difference between the bipartisan proposal that I offered with Senator Coats, a member of the President's Cabinet, and what the Republican extreme plan is all about.

The bottom line is that the Republican plan seeks to raise those parts of our Tax Code that are all about the middle class, and they are doing it to pay for the giveaways for those folks at the top. That is not what we did in the bipartisan plan at all. Any middle-class person can sit at their kitchen table and look at the bipartisan plan that I was involved with and see how the middle class wins. They get hundreds and hundreds of dollars more in every paycheck by tripling the standard deduction, and they can see how they as middle-class folks—say, who make \$70,000 and have a couple of children—lose under the Trump proposal.

Now there are other differences between our bipartisan plan and what the Big 6 and the Trump administration want. The bipartisan plan was scored as revenue neutral by authoritative independent tax experts. It made the Tax Code more progressive. The fact is, what we offered—Senator Coats, Senator Gregg, and I—was an actual bill. It was the product of weeks and months of work.

Senator Gregg and I—and I think it is fair to say that all Senators may not be aware of this, but Senator Gregg was a top economic thinker with whom the majority leader consulted—sat next to each other for months in order to put together what is still the first and only comprehensive Federal bipartisan tax reform plan since 1986. It was an actual bill. It wasn't four pages of rhetoric.

In the spring we got one page. It was shorter than your typical drugstore receipt. Now I guess we are up to four pages, when you take out all this kind of white space. Our bill was an actual bill and was designed to give everybody in America a chance to get ahead, not

just those in the 1 percent, not just those who have real clout and power.

I have always said that this is the heart of the difference. We have two Tax Codes in America. We have one for the cops and the nurses. It is compulsory. Their taxes come right out of their paychecks—no Cayman Islands deal for them. Then we have another Tax Code for the high flyers—the fortunate and well-connected. They can pretty much pay what they want when they want to. The bipartisan proposal that I wrote with Senator Gregg and Senator Coats helps the first group, the cops and nurses, but it was also fair to everybody. It gave everybody a chance to get ahead. The Republican plan is another big gift to that second group, the group that can decide what they are going to pay in taxes and when they are going to pay it. So we really couldn't have two proposals that are more different.

The fact is, the Republican framework looks less like a real effort at tax reform than a shameless attempt, in effect, to accommodate the President's boast about the biggest tax cut ever. The bottom line is that it is a giveaway to those at the top, and it robs from the middle class.

The differences don't just end with these specifics that I have described here. We took a fundamentally different approach. With Senator Gregg and Senator Coats, we were digging into the cobwebs of every dark corner of the Tax Code. We brought together principles on which both sides had to find common ground with a lot of sweat equity.

If you are going to write a partisan bill, you can go off on your own and do your thing. The fact is, if Senators Gregg, Coats, and I had written separate bills on our own, they would have looked very different, but the bill we wrote together, starting with Senator Gregg and I, was the first comprehensive bipartisan tax proposal in a quarter century. Senator Coats, to his credit, did yeoman's work in updating it. There is no comparison from a process standpoint between that bipartisan work that was done to update the system of more than a quarter century ago and the Republican tax cut framework.

The majority leader said from day one, at the beginning of the year, that he didn't want Democratic input on tax reform. He said: We are just going to do it on the "our way or the highway" approach with reconciliation. Reconciliation is a rejection of bipartisanship through and through.

I note that the Presiding Officer is the tallest Member of the Senate, along with Senator STRANGE, and I talked fairly frequently with our former colleague Senator Bradley, who was another tall Democrat on the Finance Committee with a much better jump shot than me. He has described

the bipartisan efforts of 1986, with key officials in President Reagan's administration, Jim Baker and Don Regan, who spent months talking to Democrats—months and months—before anything happened. That is not what happened here. The specifics are very different, and the process is very different.

Recently, my Democratic colleagues and I came forward with our principles for reform, and it was just a matter of a few hours before Leader MCCONNELL rejected them in the media. One administration official actually said that tax reform would be worse if it included Democratic ideas, and the "go it alone" mentality is pretty obvious when you look at the framework that came out last week.

The tough questions haven't been answered. For those at the top, it is all sweet and no sour. There was not a single shred of Democratic input in the framework—not one Democratic fingerprint anywhere to be found. The administration officials in charge of selling it to the public are, in my view, executing a con job on the middle class.

So I wanted to come here today to highlight some of the recent comments that the Senate Democratic leader has made with respect to some of these out-of-touch comments we have heard recently from key administration officials, like Gary Cohn and Steve Mnuchin, and I wanted to make sure that Senators heard—after the comments of the Senate Republican whip—that they now know that there is no comparison, none, between the bipartisan proposal that I had the honor to write with Senators Coats and Gregg, which brought the two parties together, and the framework that came out last week that forced even more polarization between the parties. The reality is that this Republican proposal, this tax cut framework, is so radically skewed toward the wealthy and the big corporations, that it makes Ronald Reagan's landmark reform look like the work of rabid socialists.

So I appreciate the chance to set the record straight by outlining the differences between a recent bipartisan bill with two influential Republican Senators with whom I had the honor to work and the extreme Republican framework that came out last week. These plans are not just trillions of dollars apart based on the numbers. It is clear they are written with entirely different goals in mind.

Our view is that tax reform ought to be about giving everybody in America the opportunity to get ahead. What we have said is that, instead of it being an "our way or the highway" partisan approach, we ought to be doing—particularly in the area of tax reform—what has a storied history. The key to a successful tax reform, based on that history, is working in a bipartisan way.

I will close with the comments about the Democratic principles, which is that we are not going to give relief to the people at the 1 percent, we are not going to break the bank, and we are going to focus on the middle class. Those principles don't even go as far as ideas advanced by President Reagan, where he said that we are going to treat income from a wage and income from investment in the same way.

I close by way of saying this. No. 1, the distinguished Republican whip is wrong when he compares the bipartisan bill I have been a part of to what the administration's tax framework is all about. No. 2, the right way to do this is to focus in a bipartisan way, not through partisanship only. The principles that we have outlined on our side, when you compare them, do not even go as far as some of the ideas embraced by the late President Reagan.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the scheduled 11 a.m. vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James M. Inhofe, Tom Cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the

Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blunt	Flake	Paul
Boozman	Gardner	Perdue
Burr	Graham	Portman
Capito	Grassley	Risch
Carper	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rounds
Collins	Hoeven	Rubio
Coons	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	King	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cantwell	Leahy	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Franken	Nelson	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Heller	Menendez
Cortez Masto	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

The majority whip.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, beginning today, the Senate Budget Committee will take the next step in our effort to enact pro-growth tax reform, this time by marking up a budget resolution.

The committee's work follows the release last week of our unified framework—the tax blueprint on how to create jobs and how to put more money back in the pockets of the hard-working Americans who earn it.

Even though the framework is just 1 week old, there are some who are imagining the worst-case scenario. Rumors are spreading like wildfire. Last week, the Tax Policy Center fanned the flames when it published a report analyzing the plan—which, I want to emphasize, hasn't been written yet. Let me say that again. The Tax Policy Center published a report criticizing a plan which hasn't been written yet.

This alleged or so-called nonpartisan think tank has looked into its crystal

ball and now claims to be able to see the future, and it said the future doesn't look very good. The tax plan, it says, will be a resounding flop. Well, give me a break. I, for one, am sick and tired of this sort of pessimism parading as expertise—people talking about things they know nothing about and claiming to be the experts. It is pretty common here, in Washington, DC, you might have noticed.

It is not helpful to assume the worst prematurely and to condemn this important exercise before we are even starting, and it is irresponsible to masquerade biased, partisan analysis as somehow objective.

As the Wall Street Journal wrote a couple of days ago, in response to the Tax Policy Center's economists, they made at least two baseless claims: first, that our proposal would "reduce federal revenues by \$2.4 trillion over the first ten years and \$3.2 trillion over the subsequent decade"; second, the top 1 percent of taxpayers would "receive about 50 percent of the total tax benefit."

These statistics were pretty quotable and indeed raged like a prairie fire across the news media in our country, especially when the media is predisposed to believe the worst, without any question or semblance of skepticism. After all, the Tax Policy Center's report made for easy headlines, reciting the same tired refrains we have all heard before that are all too predictable; that, somehow, our tax plan is only designed to help the rich.

Apparently, the temptation was just too great to resist, even though the report didn't have a real author since no self-respecting economist wanted his or her name attached to it. As the Wall Street Journal pointed out, however, last week's tax blueprint was just that—a starting place, a plan, a framework, and nothing more. It excluded many important data points which would be important to a real analysis.

For example, the income ranges for the three consolidated tax brackets, those weren't in the blueprint. The value of the expanded child tax credit and when it would be phased out, that wasn't in the blueprint either, and you would need to know that information in order to make a reasoned, logical analysis. The blueprint also doesn't mention tax rates for small businesses and what deductions will be eliminated as part of the base broadening.

As we all know, an army of lobbyists, lawyers, and other folks have, since 1986, larded the Tax Code with a wide variety of deductions, credits, and other special preferences. What we need to do is clear out some of that thicket so we can lower the rates for everybody, so everybody gets a tax cut, and I mean everybody.

It is not going to be easy because we can imagine that army of lobbyists descending upon Capitol Hill trying to

protect the special deals they were able to carve out of the Tax Code since 1986, but we have to do it.

None of these facts that would be important in order to conduct a reasoned and objective analysis was included in the framework, but all of them would have great potential to greatly move the final numbers. These, and many other details, are essential for any honest fiscal assessment of changes in our Tax Code.

When will we begin to see some of those numbers? We need to pass the budget resolution out of the Budget Committee this week—which we will. Then, after Columbus Day, we will come back and have a debate and a vote-arama to pass the budget resolution, which will equip us with the technical tools we need in order to pass a reconciliation bill.

Then the real work is going to be occurring in the Finance Committee on this side of the Capitol, where we will take the chairman's mark—the original bill which Senator HATCH will introduce at the committee—which will fill in a lot of these details. I predict that will be sometime around the third or maybe fourth week of this month.

Then we are going to have an amendment process. The real question in my mind is, Will our Democratic colleagues participate and make this a bipartisan bill? I hope they will.

I also want to mention two other related points that deserve mention but which were left out of the Tax Policy's report. One is, the committees in Congress will actually have the ability to come up with the details I mentioned. That will happen in the Ways and Means Committee in the House and in the Finance Committee in the Senate. There will be, as there should be, discussion, deliberation, and compromise as the normal legislative process works out.

There have been many around Capitol Hill who have said we don't have enough "regular order." What that means is, we need to conduct the normal legislative process and have the committees actually do what they are designed to do—which is to have hearings and vote on amendments and pass the bill out so it is available to be heard on the floor of the Senate. Then the Senate has a chance to amend it, vote on it, and debate it.

The second point I want to make is, any analysis of tax reform must consider what will be the impact on economic growth that will result from it. As the Journal stated, if the rate of GDP growth speeds up from the Obama administration's pace of 2 percent a year to 3 percent, incomes would rise and revenues would increase to the Treasury by some \$2.5 trillion. That is what is most often overlooked, including by some of the people who score these bills.

If we are successful in passing pro-growth tax reform and tax cuts and we

can get this sleeping giant of an economy awake and roaring again just to get it to 3 percent—which is below the average growth of the economy over the last three decades—just at 3 percent, it would put \$2.5 trillion more in the Treasury. That would be great because it would help us not only pay our bills, it would help us pay down the deficit and the debt.

Obviously, these are important factors to acknowledge. The best way to accomplish meaningful tax reform is to lower rates and simplify provisions across the board, to give Americans more take-home pay and have to spend less time hiring somebody just to complete their tax return. We can't simply throw up our hands, do nothing, and accept the status quo because American workers and job creators can't afford the status quo.

I am optimistic about the framework that has been released and look forward to working with my colleagues on the Finance Committee in the days and weeks ahead. What we have now is a useful starting point, and we need to fill in the blanks—and we will—so then we can have a debate based on the facts, not based on somebody's wild, fevered imagination about what the tax bill might look like.

One last point on that. We have the highest tax rate in the world for corporations and businesses. This used to be something that even the President of the United States, Barack Obama, back in 2011 acknowledged and said we need to reduce that in order to be competitive globally. We know too many of our jobs are moving overseas.

I mentioned yesterday that IBM, one of the largest businesses in the world, has more employees in India than they have in the United States. Now, there are probably varied reasons for that, including our Tax Code. Some of it is access to highly trained workers, lower costs of operation, and the like, but our Tax Code is a self-inflicted economic wound for our country, and the people who pay the price are the people whose wages are stagnant or people who are looking for a job and can't find one. We need to put more money back in their pocket, let them keep more of what they earn, and get this economy growing again.

PROTECT OUR CHILDREN ACT

Finally, just yesterday, the House passed a bill I introduced with Senators BLUMENTHAL, KLOBUCHAR, and HELLER called the PROTECT Our Children Act. This bill helps to stop the exploitation of children across the country and over the internet by reauthorizing the Internet Crimes Against Children, or ICAC, Task Force Program.

The Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force is a national network of 61 coordinated entities that represent 3,500 Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies that investigate and prosecute child predators.

They develop victim support programs, provide training and technical assistance, and advance forensic methods.

They also help facilitate community education to make parents more aware of this threat against all of our children so we can prevent internet crimes against children before they even happen. This is an issue I have cared about for a long time, starting with my service as attorney general of Texas. I saw firsthand how vulnerable children can quickly become victimized at the hands of some truly despicable individuals. I also learned about the resources it takes to stop and prosecute these predators. Like the Presiding Officer, who also served as attorney general, we know that not all of our jurisdictions have access to the same sort of expertise and resources so it is important to have this resource in order to help them investigate and prosecute these crimes.

Back in 2000, when I started it in Texas, we called it the Internet Bureau. It is kind of a quaint title these days. Now I think they call it the Cyber Crime Unit, but we call it the Internet Bureau to fight internet crimes like child pornography. Tragically, in this day and age, the internet provides a safe harbor for too many people who want to use it for their own nefarious purposes. It can be a difficult arena for our law enforcement to navigate, but this bill ensures that they will have the resources to fight cyber crimes and keep our communities safe by reauthorizing programs until 2022.

I am happy the House has now acted, and I am thankful for the work of my colleagues from Connecticut, Minnesota, and Nevada for joining me in this effort. I look forward to working expeditiously to ensure that we repass this legislation in the Senate as soon as possible.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a subject that has been on our minds in recent weeks and months and, in fact, years; that is, healthcare—one of the most complex and confusing but important topics that we have to consider.

Before I get into the bulk of what I want to address, I want to make the point once again that as we are debating healthcare and debating who pays, how much they pay, whether it is the ACA or Medicare or Medicaid or private insurance or private pay, we also have to begin a serious discussion about the underlying cost of healthcare.

Regardless of who is paying, it is going to break us. If healthcare continues to grow in cost as it has over the last 20 years, it is going to eat the Federal budget, family budgets, individual budgets, and it is going to be something we absolutely have to address. Usually around here we don't address something until it is a crisis.

I would argue, as we are approaching 20 percent of GDP, with \$1 out of every \$5 in the country being committed to healthcare costs—more than twice as much as most other countries in the world, far more than any other country in the world—we have to address this issue.

Arguing about who pays is not going to solve the problem. That is important because in the interim, that is what is going to protect our citizens' coverage and what is going to protect our citizens from a healthcare disaster, a healthcare crisis.

I want to preface my remarks with—I think this is something we all need to be thinking about—how do we move beyond the discussion we are having now, not that it is unimportant, but we also need to move beyond the discussion and start talking about the underlying cost and why is it that Americans are paying virtually twice as much as anyone in the world for healthcare per capita—or as a percent of GDP or however you want to calculate it—without noticeably better results? In fact, most worldwide studies indicate the results of our healthcare system are not as good as those in many other countries.

It would be one thing if we were paying a lot of money and getting absolutely superior care across the board in our country, but that is not the case. In measurements such as infant mortality, longevity—standard basic healthcare indicators—we are not doing very well. Yet we are paying twice as much. There is something wrong with that, and we have to address it.

I want to talk about the Affordable Care Act. I want to start with the point that it is the law of the land. It is the law of the land.

I am rising today in sadness but also in anger because there is a lot of talk about the Affordable Care Act collapsing, imploding. It is not collapsing. It is being mugged. It is being stabbed in the back. It is being sabotaged deliberately and consciously by the actions of the administration.

I want to emphasize that this isn't about ideology. It is not about politics. It is not about who wins and who loses or which party is up or who voted or who didn't. This is about people. It is about people in Maine. It is about people, many of whom got care for the first time under the Affordable Care Act; lobstermen, small farmers, small businesspeople, individuals finally had a shot at reasonably priced healthcare.

It is not perfect by any means. I would never argue that. In fact, I have

been working on proposals since the day I got here on how to improve it, how to fix some of the problems, how to make it better, how to have the effects be less intense on some parts of our economy. It is the law of the land. The impacts of what we do here or don't do here fall on real people—real people, in my case, in my home State of Maine.

The Affordable Care Act is not collapsing; it is being sabotaged. Here is a partial list.

In January, during the period of the last open enrollment, one of the first acts of the new administration was to cut the advertising on television, advising people that they had this healthcare option. Cut the ads, that is No. 1. That was in January.

Then they announced they were going to minimize the enforcement of the personal mandate. If you tell somebody you are not going to enforce something, that is an invitation to not abide by it, to not pay any attention to it. People can argue about whether that is desirable, but that is the law. To announce that administratively you are not going to enforce it, again, what does that do? It reduces the number of people who are going to get healthcare. That, in turn, undermines the individual market, and that, in turn, makes it less financially viable. That is a deliberate act that will undermine the viability of this law.

In April, there began a series of what turned into seven different threats from various people in the administration to not make the legally mandated CSR payments—the cost-sharing reduction payments—which are not bailouts to insurance companies but which were designed as part of the law to hold the rates down and to hold the deductibles down for those people buying coverage under the Affordable Care Act. Continuously threatening the reduction or the elimination of these payments has created an uncertainty in the marketplace that is now coming home to roost.

Just last week, Anthem announced they are leaving the Maine marketplace. They cited a number of reasons, but one of the chief reasons was the uncertainty created by whether these payments are going to be made.

Recently, the HELP committee had a series of hearings on this subject. They had a bipartisan group of Governors. They had a bipartisan group of insurance commissioners, health experts from across the country. I was at all but one of those hearings. I believe I am right in saying it was unanimous that we must ensure the continuation of the CSR payments in order to stabilize the market and reduce premiums projected to increase this coming year.

The number nationally is estimated to be about 20 percent—a 20-percent increase attributable to the failure to ensure that the CSR payments will be

made because an insurance company, if they are setting rates, has to factor into their rates the risk of these payments not being made. The testimony is—it depends somewhat on the State, but roughly a 20-percent increase is attributable to just this fact.

If we could pass legislation here—unfortunately, we missed the deadline, but we may be able to work on that because the deadline was just last week. But if we could simply ensure those payments are made, that in itself would lower rates by 20 percent next year on a silver plan.

By the way, if those CSRs aren't made and the rates go up, ironically, that means the mandatory payments of subsidies to individuals under the Affordable Care Act will also go up. So it will cost the Treasury money—additional money not accounted for, roughly \$200 billion over the next 10 years.

What else has gone on? In May, there was another one from the head of the Office of Management and Budget. The administration has not decided whether to pay the CSRs. That is a big red signal to the insurance companies: You can't count on this, so you better raise rates. In May, the budget was released. In the budget, there were drastic cuts in the call centers for the Affordable Care Act, in the in-person assistance, and in marketing. And just for good measure, they announced they were cutting the enrollment period in half, from 3 months to 6 weeks. What possible reason can there be to do that, except that you want fewer people to sign up? That is called sabotage—reducing from 3 months to 6 weeks.

Then, all along, the Health and Human Services Department has been monkeying around with the website, taking down explanatory material about the Affordable Care Act, taking down material indicating why this would be a good deal for people and, instead, putting up critical material.

On August 31, the administration announced reductions in outreach of 90 percent and cuts in assistance to people trying to navigate this system by 40 percent. This is complicated material. Any of us who have signed up for insurance—we all have the Affordable Care Act. Most people don't know that. But we had to go on the website and choose a policy for ourselves. It is hard, it is complicated, and to take away the people who are in the communities helping people work through these various decisions and weigh the different policies, the deductibles, and how to compare them is the same as taking away the coverage. It is an act of sabotage.

The most recent one I just learned about this morning. This is amazing. The Affordable Care Act is based on a website, healthcare.gov. We all know it had terrible problems when it started. There is no excuse for that. I was critical of it at the time. Those were problems that were not intentional.

Now intentional problems are being created. This is the one that really gets me. I just learned this morning that every Sunday during the bobtail enrollment period, the 6-week enrollment period, the website is going to be closed for 12 hours for maintenance. Isn't that amazing? For 12 hours on the one day of the week when many working people are going to have an opportunity to try to understand this system and enroll, they are going to be down from midnight Saturday night until noon on Sunday, the middle of the day on Sunday.

I want to go back to the beginning. This isn't about ideology. This is about seeing that the laws are faithfully executed. That is why they call it the administration. The administration is supposed to administer the laws, not unadminister them.

We are talking about people. Why does anyone want to have fewer people with insurance? I am at a loss to understand the motivation. I can understand if you don't like the ACA. If you don't like the ACA, let's work together and find ways to improve it and change it, but figure out how to keep people with health insurance.

The uninsured rate in America has fallen 50 percent because of the Affordable Care Act. That is an enormous achievement. It is one that should be celebrated, not sabotaged. That is what is so puzzling to me about this: fewer people with coverage and higher costs to the Treasury.

We can do better than this. These are all things the administration in good faith can say: OK, we don't like the ACA, but we are going to move beyond the politics of this and try to help people get the coverage they desperately need.

This is about real people's lives. This is about lifting the threat, the cloud of a healthcare disaster, both physically and financially, from families across America. We are talking about millions of families—not tens of thousands but millions of families. I don't get why we are deliberately trying to undermine and sabotage something that is so meaningful to so many people. As one can tell, it makes me angry. Mostly, it makes me sad because I know people in Maine who have benefited, who have gotten coverage, who did not have it before and who will not have it if this is taken away—people who need those navigators to help them, people who need to be able to use the website on a Sunday morning, people who need to have rates that are lower because the CSRs have been funded, and we are not continuously raising the uncertainty of that piece of this law.

We can do better. This is about the health of our people. I cannot think of anything more important. We can have different ways of getting there, but right now we have a law that is in place, and until we change it—and we

should change it; we should fix it—we should administer it straight up, straightforwardly, as it was written and as it was intended. This is too important for politics, and it is too important for ideology. This is all about people and their health.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Utah.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, last week I joined with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the National Economic Council, our Senate majority leader, the Speaker of the House, and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee in releasing a unified framework for tax reform.

This is a big step in the ongoing effort to overhaul our Nation's miserable Tax Code. I have been in the Senate awhile, and I can only remember a few times when the White House and the House and Senate leadership were in agreement on an issue as complicated as tax reform so the current state of affairs is pretty remarkable. Still, as we made clear in the framework document, this is only a step; it is not a final product.

The House and the Senate tax-writing committees will be tasked with putting together legislation that is aimed at meeting the goals and principles that are outlined in the framework. Therefore, as the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, my top goal at the moment is to produce a comprehensive tax reform bill that can get at least 14 votes in the committee because, without that, there likely will not be any tax reform. Yet, before we can get to that point, we have to pass the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution.

Make no mistake, the budget resolution is critical to our tax reform efforts. If we are going to move a tax reform vehicle in the current environment, we need a resolution in place with a workable reconciliation instruction that will allow us to produce a bill of sufficient size and scope to give middle-class taxpayers a pay raise, grow our economy, and create more American jobs.

As we all know, the Budget Committee will begin marking up its resolution later today, and it will include the type of instruction we need in order to produce a bill that will fix our broken tax system, boost economic growth, and give a pay raise to middle-class Americans.

I am grateful for the leadership of Chairman ENZI and all of our colleagues on the Budget Committee for their work in crafting the resolution, and I urge everyone who supports tax reform, whether he is in Congress or elsewhere, to support the budget resolution.

Once again, that is the next big step in this process, and it is an absolutely

essential step. Once that is done, the Finance Committee will be able to move forward on crafting and marking up a tax reform bill.

Some have said tax reform is a do-or-die moment for the GOP. I wholeheartedly believe that to be true, not just because we might lose an election or that our poll numbers might go down, it is that Republicans have promised, for some time now, that we will deliver meaningful, comprehensive tax reform that will spur economic growth, increase wages and well-paying jobs, and simplify our existing system. We need to deliver on that promise and not just because we will suffer politically if we do not. We need to deliver because the cost of doing nothing—the cost of maintaining the status quo for the foreseeable future—will be too much for the American people and our economy to bear.

The last major overhaul of our Tax Code was 31 years ago, and in many respects, our current tax system was built for the economy of 1986 and is ill-suited for the needs of today. In the last 31 years, we have seen a dramatic increase in international trade and expanded globalization. We have seen the fall of the Soviet Union and the collapse of most centrally run economies, and of course we have seen the development and rapid expansion of the internet, which has, in many respects, remade the entire world several times over.

America no longer has a competitive Tax Code. Instead, we have a Byzantine system with exceptionally high rates and an array of overlapping and often less-than-effective deductions, exclusions, and credits. This is not just a parade of horrors trotted out by Republicans, these problems have been acknowledged by a number of prominent Democrats, like Presidents Clinton and Obama, not to mention our current Senate minority leader and the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN.

We all know the system is not working. Still, in many respects, we have politics as usual around here when we talk about tax reform. While both parties have supported reforms in the recent past, including a number of reforms that are included in the framework, we are already hearing the same, tired arguments that come up every time Republicans want to talk about tax reform.

According to the opponents of reform, our "plan" will cut taxes on the superrich. Our "plan" will raise taxes on the poor. Our "plan" will harm the middle class. Our "plan" is a giveaway to greedy corporations. These are some pretty odd claims given that as of right now, no completed "plan" exists. We have a framework, and we are not calling it that simply for PR reasons. We have some basic principles and targets that the leaders have agreed upon, but

as the framework makes clear, the Finance and Ways and Means Committees have been tasked with filling in the details and writing legislation.

Here are just some of the details that are not included in the framework:

Income thresholds for individual tax brackets. The framework includes rate targets for three brackets, but the breakdown of those brackets is still to be determined.

The size of the enhanced Child Tax Credit. The framework anticipates an increase, but it does not specify an amount.

The existence and rate of the highest bracket. Our document leaves room for the creation of a fourth bracket at the high end, but it does not include any rate target.

Safeguards to prevent abuse of the separate pass-through rates.

These are just some of the key details that need to be filled in.

My point is, no one can make any definitive statements or make any credible estimates about the fiscal impact of the plan until the committees do more work. Still, that has not stopped people from trying.

Last week, the left-leaning Tax Policy Center released an unattributed “analysis” of the framework that appeared to confirm a number of blanket claims that critics have made about our “plan.” As we all know, left-leaning pundits, liberal media outlets, and many of our friends on the other side seem to love the TPC, apparently because the TPC is willing to provide estimates and analysis about tax plans without waiting for all of the boring details.

We all remember well when the TPC wrote Mitt Romney’s tax plan for him and claimed that he wanted to raise taxes on the middle class to finance a tax cut for the top 1 percent. Their analysis of the Romney plan—a plan that was not yet in existence beyond a broad set of principles—became the gospel for our friends on the other side, and their estimates were repeated time and again; never mind the fact that they did not have nearly enough evidence to support their assertions.

The TPC appears to be on the same track with regard to the unified framework. I guess they think they can get away with it again. Maybe they can. I don’t know. The TPC’s document from last week included a relatively precise estimate of lost revenue that they claim would result from the framework. It also estimated how much of the tax benefit of the framework would go to the top 1 percent of earners, again with a fair amount of precision. How they got to these results is, certainly, to me, a mystery.

There is simply no way for the TPC or anyone to deliver these kinds of specific estimates with the information that is provided in the framework. To get their estimates, they filled in blanks with numbers from other proposals, added a pile of exceptionally pessimistic and biased economic assumptions, and came up with a tax plan that, for all intents and purposes, is their own. Just because they say this analysis was performed on the unified framework and was not just a plan they made up themselves does not suddenly make their estimates credible.

Still, I expect to hear a lot about the TPC’s “analysis” in the coming weeks. Some will treat their estimates as fact, and I expect we will see them cited in a few campaign commercials before too long. Breaking from any notion of professional accountability, the TPC’s “analysis” was, according to the TPC’s report, authored by the TPC’s staff. Evidently, no one in an organization that describes itself as “nonpartisan” wanted to put their name on a document that would be used in such a partisan manner, but let’s be clear. We cannot separate this kind of speculative “analysis” from the way it is being used by our friends on the other side. It has become fodder for more of the same partisan attacks.

In going forward, I hope the TPC and other think tanks will acknowledge the still undefined features of the framework, including the commitment to maintaining the current progressivity of the Tax Code, which will require adjustments in order to achieve. I think groups like the TPC can be helpful if they avoid the partisan criticisms and focus on shedding light and providing accurate assessments of various proposals. Everyone who has an interest in these issues should wait and let the tax-writing committees do their work.

In the Finance Committee, we are going to write a committee bill. Any Member who is sincerely interested in working with us will get a chance to contribute, whether he is a Republican or Democrat. We are going to have a markup during which the bill will be debated and amended in the light of the day. Thereafter, I expect that we will have a fair and open amendment process on the floor. Despite some odd claims to the contrary, the Joint Committee on Taxation will score the bill.

At the end of the day, people will be free to disagree with the final bill and to vote against it, but no one will be able to credibly claim that the legislation was written behind closed doors or that the American people did not get a chance to see what was in the bill and read accurate accounts of its fiscal and economic impacts.

I want to work with anyone who is willing to come to the table in good faith. I think the framework puts forward a number of general proposals that both parties can support. There is fertile ground for bipartisanship here if my Democratic colleagues are willing to set aside some of the unreasonable preconditions that they have put on their involvement in tax reform. The last time I checked, both Republicans and Democrats supported tax relief for low- and middle-income families. The last time I checked, reducing our uncompetitive corporate tax rate was a bipartisan objective. The last time I checked, both Republican and Democratic voters were in need of higher wages, more jobs, and a more competitive economy.

This is going to be a difficult process, whether it is bipartisan or partisan. There is a long list of sacred cows in our Tax Code, each of them with a constituency that will fight to keep them in place. We are going to have to eliminate a number of tax deductions and credits if we are going to be fiscally responsible, including a number of provisions that are, under the current system, pretty popular in certain segments of the country. The framework specifies two deductions that should stay in place because they benefit many in the middle class and they are designed to achieve important policy goals. Everything else is currently on the table, including items that I have personally championed in the past.

We have already seen stories about how Republicans are already divided on the fate of the State and local tax deduction. Make no mistake—that is a pretty popular deduction, particularly among Democrats, but it has some Republican supporters as well. I would remind my colleagues who are adamant about preserving the State and local tax deduction that the benefits of that particular provision skew heavily toward higher income earners, especially those living in high-tax cities and States. So if our main goal is to help the middle class, I would hope that there won’t be many Senators who will fall on their swords in order to keep this particular deduction in place.

Still, nothing is set in stone, and most items are currently still up for negotiation. The State and local tax deduction is, like virtually every other tax provision, currently on the table, and we may very well have to pare it back one way or the other. We need to see how the numbers work out before we can speak definitively on this or any other tax policy item.

Before I conclude, let me just say that this is a once-in-a-generation opportunity. There is currently more momentum in favor of tax reform than at any other time in the past three decades. All of us should be willing to take advantage of this opportunity. All of us should be able to give in order to get a final bill done that will make sense and will get us back on track. I am hopeful that we can have a bipartisan effort here, but whether we do or don't, I intend to see that we get tax reform done and that we get it done in the best interest of our country, the best interest of our people, and above all, the best interest of the middle class.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I come to the floor today for the second time this week to highlight the tragic human cost of gun violence. I will speak today about just one victim, but of course we are thinking as well about the 58 victims in Las Vegas. Not counting the killer in that total, the last count was 58 victims and well over 500 injured.

We have some sense of the gravity of the violence that played out in Las Vegas. I am not sure any of us can fully understand it, and some of us will never quite understand what happened there, but I think we have to dedicate ourselves to taking action. I will get to that in a moment.

REMEMBERING GERARD GRANDZOL

Madam President, today I am here to honor the memory of Gerard Grandzol, a resident of Philadelphia who lost his life to gun violence last month as he protected his 2-year-old daughter from carjackers. This was truly a senseless tragedy, one that took a father from his wife and two young daughters, one that robbed the Spring Garden neighborhood in Philadelphia of a man who was a beloved member of the community, and I think that is an understatement.

Gerard was known as Gerry. His wife Kristin and their 2-year-old daughter had welcomed a second baby girl into their family this past July.

In addition to raising his family and working at a legal recruiting firm, Gerry dedicated his time and energy to making his community a better place. As a member of the Spring Garden Civic Association, he was the go-to guy in his community, in the words of Philadelphia City Council president Darrell Clarke. Gerry was an avid hockey player, the neighborhood handyman, and the person who would

man the grill at block parties and repair bikes for kids in the neighborhood. His neighbors and friends have spoken of his happy, magnetic personality and his willingness to help others.

You can tell how important Gerry was to his family, friends, and community. You can tell what an impact he had on the people he met because thousands of people lined up at the Cathedral Basilica of Saints Peter and Paul a few weeks ago to pay their respects to Gerry and to celebrate his life. The people who knew him are keeping his memory alive on his Facebook page, where they shared pictures of Gerry hiking, painting, playing hockey, full of life and surrounded by friends and family.

This is a man who became yet another victim of gun violence last month after he refused to give a pair of robbers his car keys because his 2-year-old daughter was in the back seat. This was a truly senseless act of violence that has shaken his family, friends, and his community. Two suspects in this terrible crime are now in custody, and I hope that proceedings in the justice system in Philadelphia can provide some measure of relief, some measure of comfort, and, we pray, even closure to the Grandzol family. Whatever relief it might provide, justice can't heal every wound. It can't bring Gerry back to Kristin, their daughters, and their family, friends, and neighbors. But we can make sure his memory lives on in the way we treat each other, and I hope we can honor Gerry's life by dedicating ourselves to improving the lives of our neighbors and working together to solve problems.

One thing I hope we can do here on the specific issue of gun violence is to work on legislation and policy that will at least—at least—reduce the likelihood that someone like Gerry will lose his life. It is part of a longer conversation. I won't get into the list of issues we should be working on—some of those I have outlined already—but we can't simply, as we often do, express condolence and pay tribute that is appropriate to those whose lives have been lost and those who may have been injured in Las Vegas and so many other places around the country. We have to do more than that. We can't stop with those expressions—those appropriate and essential expressions of sympathy and solidarity and commendation for the great work of law enforcement and emergency personnel. We have to do more than that.

Today, as we remember Gerry, we offer not only condolences but we offer prayers to his wife Kristin, to their daughters, and to the family and friends of the Spring Garden neighborhood in Philadelphia.

Once again, stopping there is not enough. There are plenty of examples of people who have lost their lives in a city like Philadelphia or in cities

around the country that may not add up to the 58 deaths, may not add up to 500-plus injured, but when you take just one life—in this case, the life that we highlight today, Gerry's life—it is reason enough to come together to work on new approaches, commonsense approaches to, as I said before, reduce the likelihood. No one is suggesting that we can pass something that will be a magic wand to take away all of these acts of violence, but we shouldn't throw up our hands and say there is absolutely nothing we can do to reduce the likelihood that people will lose their lives due to an act of gun violence. I refuse to accept that as an American, that there is nothing we can do legislatively to reduce that likelihood or even, God willing, to substantially reduce the likelihood.

So when we are thinking about Gerry today, I hope we can commit ourselves to action and debate and maybe even reach consensus on legislation and policy to move forward in the right direction.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

TAX REFORM

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I would recommend to this body something that is obvious to all of us. Our economy is stuck. We are in a bad spot of just treading water. Over the last 11 years, our gross domestic product—that is how much our economy is growing—has been 1.9 percent, and 1.9 percent is a tiny change.

Just to give you a perspective, over the last 100 years, there has not been a single decade when we have not had a year without at least 3 percent growth, until the last decade. Literally, our economy, is typically growing; that is, more jobs are being added, people are making more money, there is more happening, and we are selling more internationally. In America, over the last 100 years, it has just slowly grown and grown and grown until the last 10 years, and, then, it has flattened out. We are stuck.

Now, when I was younger, we had a record player in the house. Now, for all of you under 40, I would explain that a record player is kind of like a CD player, only it was larger and made of vinyl. But if I say that, then, all the under-20 crowd will say: What is a CD player?

Let me just say this. The big black pieces of vinyl that played music at my house occasionally would get stuck. The record needle would land in the same groove and play the same part of the song over and over. It was my job, as the youngest one in the house, to go over to the record and bump it and get it out of that. Our economy needs that.

We need to be able to get over to our economy, which is stuck in the same groove at 1.9 percent in this incredibly low-growth rate, and give it a bump.

Now, that bump can come in a lot of ways: increasing international trade would be a great help, engaging more internationally, keeping our regulations common sense and as nonintrusive as possible so that small businesses and medium-sized businesses aren't panicked all the time of what the Federal Government is going to do to them with a new regulation. Just keep them common sense and simple.

How about making sure that there are fewer Federal forms and that the Federal forms that people have to fill out not only are simple to do but they don't duplicate over multiple different agencies. It would be good if people who worked in small, medium, and large businesses spent more time selling products than they did filling out a form for some Federal bureaucracy that is never going to read that form anyway.

The obvious way to be able to bump the record needle in our economy right now is tax reform. It is not the main thing that is going to do everything, but it is a pretty big element. If we can get tax reform done, it actually gives our economy a little bit of a boost. Now, I have folks that will say: How does that make a difference? When you do tax reform, why does that actually increase economic activity?

Well, quite frankly, people around the country and in my State of Oklahoma are struggling to be able to save money because their wages aren't growing at the same speed that everything else is going up in price. So people need to be able to save more money and to be able to have more money to be able to spend.

Also, we need to create more jobs and we need to get companies going again and actually developing more jobs. If people can actually get a job, if people can make more money at that job, and if people actually have more take-home pay, they spend a little more, they save a little more, and the company expands a little more. If each place does that a little bit, it dramatically increases our economy around the country, and we know it because we feel it.

Making the Tax Code simpler for every person in every business means people don't have to pay as much to have their taxes done. Maybe you can do your own taxes because it would be simple enough to do it, and it wouldn't cost so much. Accountants who work for businesses could go back to working for their businesses to see how they can make their businesses more efficient rather than spending all of their time just on tax policy.

I think we should follow the lead of the President on this. The President made a very clear statement. He said: Let's help our companies compete, but to do that we have to also knock down barriers that stand in the way of their success. For example, the President said:

Over the years, a parade of lobbyists have rigged the tax code to benefit particular companies and industries. Those with accountants or lawyers to work the system can end up paying no taxes at all. But all the rest are hit with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and it has to change.

So tonight, I'm asking Democrats and Republicans to simplify the system. Get rid of the loopholes. Level the playing field. And use the savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years.

Did I fail to mention that the President who said that is President Obama? President Obama did, right down the hallway, in 2011, in his State of the Union address. That is what he said we should do: simplify the system, lower the corporate tax rate, and be able to deal with all of the loopholes that are in the system.

This shouldn't be a partisan issue. Everyone sees this, Republicans and Democrats alike.

So my focus is this. How do we actually get this done and not make it into a partisan food fight here but actually do what is right for the American people and help bump the economy to be able to help get us going again?

In my State—whether you live in Valliant, Gotebo, Healtown, Sayre, Muskogee, Tulsa, Oklahoma City, or Lawton—this matters because everyone unfortunately pays taxes. Everyone knows it is a necessary thing, but we want to have it as simple as possible and to have it as low as possible, and we want to make sure it is as fair as possible.

So the framework has been presented this past week. It is a simple framework for how we deal with tax policy. It talks about consolidating our rates. We have seven rates now. We would drop that down to four rates. There would be a 0-percent rate, a 12-percent, a 25-percent, and a 35-percent rate.

Now, some folks have asked me about the 0-percent rate, because a lot of Americans say one simple thing: Every American is an American, and every American should pay a little bit in taxes. I would agree, by the way. But every American is paying some taxes. For those folks at the lowest end of the scale, I would propose dropping the rate to zero for them on income taxes, but they are paying their fair share in property tax, in gas tax, and in sales tax. They are helping their local fire department and their local police department. They are paying for the roads that are federally subsidized, based on their gas tax. They are paying taxes, but if they are not at a rate and at an income high enough to be able to survive at that rate, then let's drop theirs to 0 percent for income tax. They will keep some of the other taxes so they can still contribute to society and still be a part of this great Nation.

Dropping those rates down to the lowest bracket being 0 percent for income tax, then 12 percent, 25 percent,

and 35 percent is a pretty standard rate. Quite frankly, this is something that was proposed in the Simpson-Bowles proposal before, which was a bipartisan proposal, for it to be able to come out, on how we can reform the system.

Eliminating the alternative minimum tax—do you want to talk about a complicated tax code? Basically, we have two Tax Codes. We have the standard Tax Code, and then we have the alternative minimum tax. Everyone who does their taxes has to do them twice to be able to evaluate which one of the codes they actually fit into. Now, if are using an electronic system, you lose track of it because the electronic system on the computer is doing that for you. But the AMT dramatically increases the complexity of the code. We should do away with that.

If we want to be able to protect the folks who are in the lowest bracket, then let's double what is the standard deduction. Right now the standard deduction is about \$12,000. Let's double that to about \$24,000. That \$24,000 amount for families would mean that the first \$24,000 of income that you would make as a family would fall into that 0-percent bracket. So you are paying zero income tax to the Federal Government until you make more than \$24,000. That protects a lot of families in the lowest end of the bracket to make sure they are not falling into this.

Quite frankly, in Oklahoma, most Oklahomans just use the standard deduction. They don't itemize. Doubling the standard deduction would mean that for a lot of those specialized deductions that everyone else gets, it actually flattens that out. It makes it fair. The No. 1 thing I hear from people when they fill out their taxes is not only that they filled them out and turned them in, but they say: I have no idea whether I did them right. It was so complicated, and I don't know if it is right. Then, the second thing they say, though, right behind that, is this: Why is it that, when I read through the hundred pages of instructions on the 1040 form, every deduction seems to be for someone else?

So let's increase the standard deduction so everybody gets a flatter, simpler, and fairer system, and let's keep the biggest of the deductions that most Americans use, like the charitable deduction or the mortgage interest deduction. If there are any two deductions that most people use, it is those two. So let's protect those two in the system.

As for reducing the corporate tax rate, I have folks say that it only benefits the biggest businesses. I always smile and say: Those are actually people who employ people. If you reduce the corporate rate, that means they are more competitive internationally and that means they are not having to

move their corporate headquarters overseas.

For years, as a nation we have used the carrot-and-stick approach on trying to keep businesses here in the United States; that is, if they go overseas, beat them with a stick and try to punish them for trying to move. Why don't we use the carrot approach? Why don't we find out why they are moving overseas and fix that? Many of these companies are moving overseas because of the very high corporate tax rate here in the United States. Let's fix that. Over the decades, many of our competing nations have done that. We should fix that. That increases the number of jobs, that increases economic activity, and that keeps American jobs in America.

We should deal with the child tax credit and continue to be able to protect that for families.

We can deal with how we do expensing. Now, if you don't run a business, that doesn't matter much to you. But if you are the one who owns the small business, you understand how expensing works. If you have a cost to your business this year and if you can't write it off in this year, you have to expand that out, and you know that slows you down.

Here are the basics. If you are running a small business and you need to buy a new pickup for your business, if it takes you years to be able to depreciate that out, you are slower to do it. But if you know you can depreciate it out this year in your business, you are more likely to buy that. So that business buys a new truck this year. Well, that not only benefits that business in having new equipment, but it also benefits the Ford dealership down the street that actually sold them the truck, and it benefits all of the people in the area who helped supply that vehicle. So it trickles down through the rest of the economy.

There are ways to be able to accomplish all of these things and to be able to be as simple as we possibly can be.

There has been a lot of conversation about worldwide taxation as well. People seem to get confused on that area because most people don't live in that world. Here are the basics of it: Right now, if you are an American company and you are selling things overseas and doing business overseas, when you make a profit overseas and you try to bring that money back, you get taxed overseas at their tax rate, which you should, in that country you are making the product and selling it, but you get taxed again when you bring it back to the United States. We are the only country that does it that way.

If we will just simplify the system, it will actually encourage companies to be able to stay in America and then do business all over the world rather than moving their company out of America. It is a simple way to be able to do it,

and it is a way that we can do and should do. You will hear the term "repatriation," and that is really what it is about. It is Americans being able to move their money from overseas accounts back to the United States and get that money moving.

There was a lot of conversation about the stimulus plan back in 2009 trying to get almost a trillion dollars of government money—that is money from you and me—and to be able to move that around in a stimulus package. Let me give you the figure. Right now, it is estimated that American companies have about \$2.5 trillion of private money parked overseas that they are not going to bring back to our economy because of the high cost of the tax coming back. If we were able to change that system, \$2.5 trillion of private money would move from overseas back into the United States. What effect would that have on our economy? I would stipulate that it would be a pretty dramatic effect that it would have on our economy.

We can fix this. We can resolve this. This shouldn't be as hard as we are making it, and it can be a bipartisan approach to be able to address some basic things—taking care of our families, making sure we are watching out for those who are in poverty, simplifying the code, making sure deductions aren't for a few but that they are spread out across the way that we handle it, protecting things like charitable giving and the mortgage interest deduction and things that most Americans use. These are the parameters we are trying to be able to work through over the next couple of weeks.

Hopefully in the coming months, as we work through all the details in the committee process with amendments and coming to the floor and being able to fight our way through the process, we will be able to actually get to a decision that will help us long term as a nation. This is something that can and should be resolved. It is one of the issues I have to raise to this body again.

This body has had a hard time actually moving on the biggest issues we face as a nation because the rules of this body prohibit us from debating them. The rules haven't changed over the past multiple decades, but the way we operate has. The American people are ticked about it, and rightfully so. The Senators in this body are frustrated with it. May I remind us that the rules of the Senate are set by the Senate? So if we are frustrated with the rules, we should address them.

Many of you have heard me speak about this in the past.

There are three basic rule changes that I think will change dramatically how business gets done in the Senate. The biggest one is the filibuster rule. We have two filibusters for every single bill that comes up. There is one at the

beginning. You have to get 60 votes to start debate; you have to get 60 votes to stop debate; then the bill passes with 51. That needs to change. We should take away the first 60 votes at the beginning. We should be able to get onto a bill. Regardless of whether it is Republicans or Democrats in the majority, the majority party should be able to bring up a bill and debate it without being stopped. Let's bring up any issue and actually debate it. Let's not inhibit debate in this body. If we can't find agreement, keep the 60 votes at the end of it so we can keep the debate going until it gets resolved, but we should be able to debate the issues.

The second big issue is that we have to deal with nominations in an appropriate time period. Currently, my Democratic colleagues are forcing the long periods of time in debate for every single nominee who comes up. I had folks say that is what Republicans did in the past. That is actually not true. This is the first time it has happened like this.

This week, we are going to move four nominees for the President in 1 week—four. Under the current structure, it will take 11 years for President Trump to get his staff. Let me give you a barometer of where things have been in the past. As of yesterday, President Trump had 153 confirmations. At this same point, President Obama had 337 total. President Bush had 358 total at this same point. President Trump is not getting his nominees heard, and they are being slow-walked through the process.

We have to fix that. A simple way to fix it is to allow only 2, 4, or 8 hours of debate, not this protracted 30 hours of debate per nominee. It is already a resolved issue. Everybody knows it. These individuals have already gone through committee. They were already voted on in committee. By the time they get to the floor, it is resolved. The 30 hours of debate time is purely delay tactics. We should be able to resolve that within 2, 4, or 8 hours total.

Here is a radical idea: If we want to get the Senate going again, we can agree to a rule change that would allow for what is called dual-tracking. We would do nominations in the morning and legislation in the afternoon. Right now, we can only do one thing at a time in the Senate, so while we are waiting on a nomination vote, everything waits until that is done. It slows down the process. Why can't we do nominations in the morning and legislation in the afternoon?

There are basic rule changes that will help that are not partisan issues. They are designed to get the Senate moving regardless of who is in the majority. We have to resolve this long term. If we don't, the American people will continue to be frustrated, and we as Senators will continue to be frustrated.

DETENTION OF DR. ANDREW BRUNSON

Madam President, this weekend is an anniversary I don't like bringing up. One year ago this weekend, a gentleman named Dr. Andrew Brunson was detained in Turkey. He has been a pastor in Turkey for more than 20 years, and he is a U.S. citizen. He has faithfully served the people of Turkey for two decades. A year ago this weekend, he was picked up by local authorities and was detained for months and months without charges. He was just swept up and held.

Things are changing rapidly in Turkey right now. Turkey is not the same NATO ally and friend of the United States that they have been. The leadership of Turkey is radically changing the nature of that very open democracy and is shutting it down to become more and more of an authoritarian government. American citizens who do business there, who do mission work there, who have friends and family there, need to be aware that Americans are being swept up and detained without charges and held. In the case of Dr. Brunson, he has been held for a year. I have to warn fellow Americans that Turkey is not necessarily a safe place to do business in and travel to anymore.

Right now, Turkey has the authority to release Dr. Brunson. He is an American citizen and a pastor. They have the ability to do that.

Recently, the Appropriations Committee passed an amendment in an appropriations bill giving additional authorities to our State Department to take action against Turkish officials who hold American citizens like this and to put specific sanctions on those individuals. I hope that in the days ahead, our State Department will use that tool in their toolbox to apply pressure on the Turkish people to not impose arbitrary detention on U.S. citizens. We can push back on the Turks.

I hope that in the days ahead, the Turkish Government turns back around to more of an open democracy. They have been a nation in the past that was historic for their stand for religious liberty and democracy in that region. We would like to see a Turkish ally that still stands for religious liberty and the protection of all citizens in the days ahead.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

TAX REFORM

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, I followed the Senator's comments with respect to taxes and the debate over tax reform with considerable interest. I will just tell you, my goodness, how I wish we could have what the Senator called an uninhibited process with respect to the debate over tax reform. I have written an actual bipartisan tax reform bill

with our colleague who is now part of the Trump administration, Senator Coats.

Unfortunately, what our colleague laudably called for is not on offer. The Senate majority leader has said that he intends to use reconciliation—the most partisan process for considering tax reform. When we were talking about healthcare, which is one-sixth of the economy, we had the same process—reconciliation, all partisan. Now we are talking about taxes that involve the whole economy, and we are seeing the Senate majority leader say once again that it is his intent, his preference, and his plan to use that same process. I sure wish the world was like my colleague has called for because I have written a bipartisan plan.

What is so striking is that the Senate majority leader has called for 20 hours of discussion, which is essentially what you get with reconciliation, as opposed to what happened when Ronald Reagan and a big group of Democrats got together in 1986 and spent a whole month on tax reform.

So before the Senator leaves—and it is a pleasure to serve with him on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence as well—I sure wish the world was along the lines of what my colleague has called for. Perhaps he can use his intellect and energy to persuade the Senate majority leader to use that process on taxes because that is what some Democrats have called for.

I can just tell my friend, given my interest in the subject, which goes back well over a decade—we have a bipartisan proposal written, coauthored by a member of the President's Cabinet, so we would very much like to have what the Senator is talking about.

Madam President, I rise now to oppose the nomination of Eric Hargan to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. This is the No. 2 position at HHS, the chief operating officer. Of course, with Secretary Price's departure, Mr. Hargan would fill the top spot if he is confirmed.

My concern is that I don't have any confidence that Mr. Hargan is going to lead the Department in a different direction than it took under Dr. Price. Last week, the country watched as more and more details emerged about Secretary Price's travel. In my view, the flights were an abuse of office.

In my view, from the very outset, there was reason to be concerned about Secretary Price and how he would handle the public trust. Ever since our committee received the Price nomination, it was clear that he had a little trouble following the rules when it served his own personal interests rather than taxpayers. He used insider information from a fellow Congressman to get a sweetheart stock deal that made him hundreds of thousands of

dollars. He frequently bought stocks in industries that he was overseeing as a Member of Congress. He pushed healthcare legislation that benefited industry insiders rather than patients.

He was confirmed on a party-line vote, and it wasn't very shortly after that that he proceeded to go forward with what I and others consider a sabotage campaign that, in effect, has been executed since day one. He was a top salesman for TrumpCare. He came before our committee and made countless other public appearances in which he willfully misrepresented the massive scale of the harm TrumpCare would have done to American healthcare. He also appeared on national television and argued, in effect, that healthcare funding cuts aren't actually cuts. He denied that individuals would lose health coverage or see increases as a result of TrumpCare, even after there were independent analysis showing that was wrong. Then, of course, he flew about the country scaring folks who just wanted affordable healthcare.

As far as the President's promise to bring down the high prices of prescription medicine—that was a promise the American people heard stop after stop on the campaign trail in 2016. That promise is nowhere to be seen or heard from at this point. It is my hope that the President's next pick to lead Health and Human Services will follow through on what the American people were told in the campaign they were going to get—lower the cost of healthcare and get our citizens covered—but that nominee hasn't been put forward.

In the meantime, Mr. Hargan's nomination has him in line to serve as Acting Secretary. I will tell you, having examined the record as closely as I could, I don't think there is any reason to believe Mr. Hargan would deviate from Secretary Price's ideological agenda that included a constant effort to undermine and in my view sabotage the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. This campaign is driving up premiums and confusing Americans who just want to be able to see a doctor and get affordable healthcare services.

I am going to tick through some of the actions the administration has taken that would undermine the upcoming open enrollment period and the effect that is going to have on our people's healthcare costs.

First, just a few weeks into his tenure, Secretary Price cut the enrollment period. This is the period during which Americans sign up for health insurance. We are talking about a private marketplace. I am really struck by this debate about the role of government. We are talking about a private marketplace where private healthcare plans offer coverage. Secretary Price cut the enrollment period for private healthcare in the private marketplace

in half. People across the country used to be able to sign up for healthcare from the beginning of November until the end of January, and now they have literally half that time. That is going to cause a whole lot of disruption for people who are working hard and living their lives rather than trying to follow every little press account from Washington, DC.

Let's imagine for a moment a 29-year-old who just got locked out of the healthcare system because he has had a 3-year routine of signing up for health insurance around the new year. That is exactly the kind of individual the private insurance market needs to attract in order to hold costs down—a young person who is probably signing up right toward the deadline.

Then think of the single mom with two kids who marked January 30, probably with a big, bright pen on her calendar because she cut it close to the end of enrollment last year. Her life is busy enough. She doesn't read trade publications from health industry sources to see what is happening with open enrollment. Because of the early enrollment cutoff, this mom and her family, who just want affordable, private healthcare from the private marketplace, are going to be locked out.

The Department of Health and Human Services is taking the healthcare.gov website offline for maintenance on all but one Sunday during the open enrollment period. The fact is, Sunday has been one of the most popular times for well-meaning assistance groups to help folks get signed up at community centers. It is like the State Department of Transportation blocking the highways and digging up the blacktop with construction crews every Monday morning during the peak commute time. It is just the opposite of common sense.

The Department is kneecapping the programs that are designed to get highly trained people. These are folks called navigators, and what they do is get out into the communities and go to various places where they know a lot of folks aren't signed up, and they help them get signed up.

The Department of Health and Human Services has slashed the budget for getting the word out, including zeroing out the budget for TV ads. That has been a big factor in getting enrollment up in the past.

Let's be clear about what the Department has done under Secretary Price's leadership. They have been working overtime to make it harder for people to get healthcare, plain and simple.

The sabotage doesn't really end with just making enrollment a headache. The administration continues to dangle the threat of cutting off cost-sharing payments as if it were a political gain without consequences in the real world. In State after State after State, insurers have made it clear that this

gamesmanship is causing premiums to go up. If the payments are cut off, families will face premium increases of hundreds of dollars or more, and it is all because they are searching for a political trophy.

I want to talk about what this means for private sector healthcare. When you have the President and the previous Secretary of Health and Human Services pouring gasoline on the fires of uncertainty in the private health insurance marketplace, it makes it very hard for insurers to make the calculations that are involved in spreading risk and getting people signed up and pricing products.

The reality is, an administration that says they really care about the private sector—the President continually says that he is from the business community and he wants to be sensitive to private sector economic forces. The last thing you would do is pour all this uncertainty into the private healthcare landscape, which is what they have been doing with the gamesmanship in terms of whether they are going to pay these cost-sharing payments so that folks who face big deductibles and extra prices for medicine and the like would know there is going to be help in their health plan for those costs.

The Secretary was out jetting all about, spreading falsehoods about the private healthcare landscape. Sometimes he would say that it would be collapsing, and I would say: We know a lot of people who are trying to stabilize it, but you are making it harder by pouring all this gas on the fires of uncertainty.

While this was going on, they were also neglecting to work with States. For example, Oklahoma designed a re-insurance system intended to stabilize the private insurance market and control costs, and they sought a waiver application to the Department of Health and Human Services. But the Department of Health and Human Services didn't get around to approving it in time to help Oklahomans in 2018, so the State just pulled their application.

I have been a strong supporter of these waivers. I authored a provision in the Affordable Care Act, the innovation waiver, 1332. For the Secretary to not work with Oklahoma in a timely way and in a way that would stabilize the private insurance market is not what those of us on this side are in favor of.

There is no reason to believe Mr. Hargan would come in and clean up the mess. In my view, many States want to see stable or reduced premiums this coming year, but so far the Department is just marching in lockstep with the status quo. The President apparently is committed to continuing this kind of mismanagement and willful wrongdoing. Mr. Hargan has made clear what his stance is on the Afford-

able Care Act in plenty of public statements.

Beyond this question of undermining the Affordable Care Act, we were also particularly troubled that Secretary Tom Price shared the Trump administration's abysmal record of responding to oversight letters from Congress, especially the Democrats. As far as I can tell, some of this is shared on both sides.

I think this is profoundly undemocratic, and our obligation to perform oversight as Members of Congress is derived from the powers laid out in the Constitution, in article I. The issues we raise in oversight inquiries to the Department of Health and Human Services relate directly to the well-being of people in North Carolina, in Oregon, and everywhere in between. I don't think Senators on either side, Democrats or Republicans, do it for sport. But the administration's behavior is not that of a government that sees itself as answerable to the public—either that or it just doesn't have good answers as to why it constantly, constantly is out there undermining private health insurance markets to make it harder for people to get affordable healthcare. Either way, they aren't doing their jobs, and they aren't putting the interests of the American people first.

Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed concern about the Department of Health and Human Services stonewalling important oversight issues presented by Members on both sides. Chairman HATCH and Senator GRASSLEY are two very senior Republicans. Chairman GRASSLEY and Chairman HATCH deserve a lot of credit for calling out the Trump administration on this lack of responsiveness to basic oversight.

The fact is, what our committee has heard is basically a lot of sweet talk from nominees about how, of course, they are going to be responsive, and then they go out, and it is business as usual. We see them for that confirmation hearing, and there is not much of any kind of response when we ask the questions.

I will not support Mr. Hargan's nomination today. In my view, under Tom Price and this administration, the Department of Health and Human Services has done a miserable job of working to improve the health and well-being of the American people. The irony is, it seems that one of the objectives from day one was to set out and try to accomplish that, to make it appear that there were problems when the Affordable Care Act was being implemented. Instead of rolling up their sleeves and tackling it, the idea was to try and get an ideological trophy: Let's tell the American people that everything about the Affordable Care Act is horrible so we can get it repealed.

The Affordable Care Act is far from perfect. In fact, when we were debating

it, I had an alternative plan. We had seven Senators on both sides of the aisle. It was a bipartisan plan, but that is history.

The Affordable Care Act has made an enormous difference for millions of Americans. What we ought to be doing is working together to improve it. There are plenty of ways in which this Senate and an administration that really want to accomplish that can work together in a bipartisan way.

What I have been more interested in than any other aspect of public service is to work in a bipartisan way on healthcare. That has been my No. 1 interest. So nothing would please me more than to be able to say: OK. We have an official who is going to break with the past and, instead of trying to make the implementation of the Act as bad as possible, is prepared to roll up his or her sleeves and make it as good as possible. Unfortunately, that person is not Mr. Hargan. I urge a no vote.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF RANDAL QUARLES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today we are considering the nomination of Randal Quarles to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Since 1984, Mr. Quarles has revolved between the public and private sectors. He was most recently the director of the Carlyle Group from 2007 to 2013, and then founded Cynosure Group, an investment management company.

I appreciate Mr. Quarles' willingness to serve the public once again, but I don't think he is the person we want in this important role at the Federal Reserve.

The financial crisis devastated communities in my State and across the country—devastated in terms of lost jobs, foreclosed homes, and evaporated savings. We have made a lot of progress in the 7 years since we passed Wall Street reform. The Vice Chair of Supervision at the Federal Reserve, a position created in Dodd-Frank, is supposed to look out for our financial system and make sure that our financial system is sound.

Mr. Quarles served as Treasury's Under Secretary for Domestic Finance in the years leading up to the 2008 financial crisis. It was his job to coordinate oversight of the financial industry. Many of his statements, however, leading up to the crisis were far too credulous. He seemed to believe whatever the banks were telling him. They were far too credulous when it came to industry claims that we simply need

not worry; the economy is in good shape and we don't have to worry about a credit bubble.

In the early 2000s, while at the Treasury Department, Mr. Quarles espoused the following view of the role of regulators in financial markets. It is a long quote, and I will quote him directly:

Markets are always ahead of the regulators, and frankly that's how it should be. It's analogous to the advice that my father provided me that "if you don't miss at least two or three planes a year, you're spending too much time in airports." If the regulators aren't a little behind the market in a few areas at any given time, they would be stifling innovation and evolution. The regulators' task is to promote investor protection, while ensuring that prudential and supervisory activities do not stifle efficiency gains. For effective regulation, the regulators must work with the markets.

I am not sure where to start on picking that apart. More importantly, it is showing that someone who says that shouldn't be in charge of financial regulation at the Federal Reserve.

He said at his Senate nomination hearing: "That is probably the most unfortunate use of language that I ever made, and I do not stand behind that statement." That is what he said when presented with these words at his confirmation hearing. He made other similarly unfortunate statements in the years leading up to the financial crisis.

In 2006, as Under Secretary for Domestic Finance, he discussed the prospects for an impending financial crisis. This was before things looked really, really bad. He said:

How would our current financial system stand up to this sort of canonical crisis? On the whole, I would say that the U.S. economy is well positioned to weather such a re-trenchment in risk-taking.

This was about a year and a half before the economy began to implode. He was in a high position in the Treasury Department, and he had access to all of the information he might possibly want, and he said that the "economy is well positioned to weather such a re-trenchment."

In the same speech, on the potential harm posed by increases in mortgage payments for families with exotic mortgages he said:

While that is certainly a large number, it represents only a small hit to aggregate personal income. Moreover, market reports indicate that borrowers using such non-traditional mortgages tend to be upper income individuals that can manage a sizable increase in their mortgage payment.

He concluded by saying, again, in 2006:

Fundamentally, the economy is strong, the financial sector is healthy, and our future looks bright. We will surely face challenges in the future, but we can take comfort in the knowledge that our economy and financial system have proven remarkably resilient to all manner of adverse shocks in the past.

That was a lot of comfort to the millions of Americans afflicted by the financial crisis.

My wife and I live in Cleveland, in ZIP Code 44105. The year after Mr. Quarles made that statement and the economy started to really tank, my ZIP Code had more foreclosures than any other ZIP Code in the United States. I know what that does to a neighborhood.

I am not confident Mr. Quarles took to heart the costly lessons of the financial crisis. He seems far too ready to relax the rules for Wall Street and those who protect consumers. He is another example that this administration, which said it wants to drain the swamp, instead looks like a retreat for Goldman Sachs executives. The number of people on Wall Street who have influence on our government is just far and away worse than we have ever seen it.

Putting Mr. Quarles—who should know better but apparently doesn't, from his statements—at the Federal Reserve, in charge of financial regulation, is just the wrong thing. In 2015, when asked about Dodd-Frank, he said:

The macro issue is that the government should not be a player in the financial sector. It should be a referee. And the practice, and the policy, and the legislation that resulted from the financial crisis tended to make the government a player. They put it on the field as opposed to simply reffing the game.

How could he think that, when he was part of the government when it didn't do its job and didn't do the job that regulators are supposed to do? In response to questions for the record at his nomination hearing, he stated: "My approach to policy making, and particularly to regulation, has been that the discretion of policy makers, and particularly of regulators, should be as constrained as possible."

He is really saying: Let Wall Street do what it wants to do; let Wall Street run the financial sector of our economy, and government regulators should sort of step aside.

As vice chair for supervision and as a Member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, Mr. Quarles will be making decisions about risk-based capital, leverage and liquidity requirements, resolution plans, concentration limits, risk committees, stress tests, and other important safeguards put into place after the crisis for the Nation's largest banks. The crisis showed we need strong financial watchdogs, not, as he said, "constrained" ones. If confirmed, I am not sure who Mr. Quarles will be working for, taxpayers and working families or Wall Street.

Let me close by reminding my colleagues that, last Congress, the Banking Committee refused to consider President Obama's nominees to the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Quarles is the first nominee President Trump has chosen. There are currently three other vacancies. The term for Chair of the Federal Reserve expires early next year. Because of that, President Trump

will likely fill at least five of the seven Federal Reserve Board seats, which are 14-year terms.

Again, if the first one is someone who is so close to Wall Street, what does that tell you about who is in the White House? What does it tell you about the advisers in the White House? What does it tell you about that executive retreat for Goldman Sachs I talked about in the White House?

If all the nominees to the Federal Reserve are like Mr. Quarles, average Americans may once again pay the price. We can't return to a time when financial watchdogs are asleep on the job.

There seems to be a collective amnesia in this body, in the White House, and in the Banking Committee about what people in our country went through in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012, which was, in large part, because of the influence of Wall Street in our government. We can't let that happen. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose the nomination of Mr. Quarles to the Federal Reserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am not aware of any Missouri constituents, for whom I work, who wouldn't like to see a tax code that was simpler, fairer, that did more to create jobs, that was better for individuals, and one that they understood. I don't have anybody come up to me and say: What can we do to complicate the Tax Code further, or what can we do to make us less competitive, or how much more of my money would you like to have to do what you think the government ought to do? I don't have anybody say that to me.

We are now at a time when we have the tools available. We have the focus available that will allow us to move in the right direction. For almost a decade now, hard-working families and hard-working individuals have had to deal with a below-average economy and with below-average wage growth in that below-average economy. Surely, we don't want that to be the new normal.

I kept hearing the last 3 or 4 years that 2 percent growth is what we should expect now. The growth since World War II has averaged 3.4 percent for over 70 years. Suddenly, we were told: No, 2 percent is the best we can do.

I understand that, even counting the Great Depression, growth in the entire

20th century was over 3 percent. What do we need to do to get our economy growing in a way that creates better opportunities and better jobs?

Why would it create better jobs? Because you have people who are looking for workers who are more eager to pay and keep a workforce in a growing economy than you do in an economy that is not growing. You have people who understand they can compete better if they have a workforce that is the workforce they want rather than the workforce they just happen to get and that there is competition for that workforce. So our goal here in tax reduction and tax reform should be to help families and individuals keep more of their hard-earned money, to empower people to invest in their own future in ways that we currently are not encouraging or just simply not allowing because we don't let them take enough of their money home from work that they make at work, and to make it easier for families to see a pathway toward success and not to penalize people when they make the right decisions.

The tradition has always been this: If you want more of something, you don't tax it. You don't regulate it. You encourage it.

We need a tax code that encourages more success, that encourages higher take-home pay and better jobs. Most people don't realize that the individual income tax is still the biggest source of Federal money. More than half of all Federal taxes collected come from the income tax.

One of our goals should be how do we get more taxpayers and not how do we make more from the taxpayers we have. Perhaps the greatest voluntary compliance in the history of the world is how Americans have complied with the income tax system.

The more Americans think the system is fair and understandable and everybody else is being treated the same way they are being treated, they are much more likely to comply with that system than a system where they hear: Well, some company made a lot of profit, but because of the complexity of the Tax Code, they paid zero taxes, or this neighbor has figured out that and that neighbor has figured out that, and because of the Tax Code, you work just as hard as they did, but the Federal Government somehow got a lot of your money because you hadn't set up your tax planning in the right way.

Tax planning doesn't need to be that difficult. Right now the Tax Code has seven individual rates. We are proposing three individual rates, which maybe could go to four, but that would still be barely half the number we have, even if it got to four. There are seven individual rates, and there are more than 100 deductions, credits, and exclusions that people use when they fill out their tax form. American peo-

ple collectively pay billions and billions of dollars just to figure out how much of their money the Federal Government is going to get.

Most people would like to have the certainty of a postcard form that you fill out, but instead they see this system that has gotten increasingly complex, often not indexed for inflation. So you start with something that you think is only going to apply to a few people, and, before you know it, it applies to a whole lot of people.

I think that when the alternative minimum tax was added to the Tax Code, there had been 155 wealthy individuals who hadn't paid any income tax. So the Federal Government decided, and Congress decided, that we are going to put the alternative minimal tax in to be sure those 155 people, who are clearly wealthy people, are going to pay income tax. No matter how much they have gamed the tax system, they are still going to pay an alternative minimum tax. This was just a few years ago.

By 2015, the 155 had gone to 4.4 million people who paid the alternative minimum tax. It is unbelievably successful if you are trying to collect people's money in a way they don't understand. It is not very successful if all you were trying to do was to prevent 155 wealthy people a couple of decades ago from being able to not pay any tax at all. They took a shot at 155 people and wound up hitting 5 million.

That is unacceptable. That is not what the Tax Code is supposed to do. We need to work hard to simplify that. There are 14 pages of instructions that tell you or, more likely, your tax preparer how to comply with the alternative minimum tax guidelines.

I don't have the one page with me, but I was handed the one page of instructions for the Tax Code from 1913. By the way, the estimate was that not only not many people would pay it, but nobody would ever pay it because you didn't pay anything unless you made at least \$3,000, which in 1913 was a lot of money. But it was one page of instructions. Now we have 1 page of index to the 100 pages of instructions, and 14 of those pages are just for the alternative minimum tax. When you fill the form out, there are 64 different lines that you use to calculate now how almost 5 million people are impacted by a part of the Tax Code that was designed for 155 people.

We can do a better job. We can do a better job of being sure that hard-working families get to take home more of the money they have earned with that hard work. We can also do a better job with the rest of the Tax Code to make sure we are creating the kind of opportunity for us to compete as a country, for us to compete as a nation, for us to be more fairly aligned with the other countries in the world that we compete with, and to make sure

those hard-working families have better jobs with more take-home pay to start with.

If you are working hard for a living—and Americans do; we are a working country—the best of all circumstances is that you have a better job than you used to have and less money comes out of every dollar you make than used to come out of every dollar you make, and that needs to be our goal. Whatever we do on the individual side needs to be focused on that. Whatever we do on the job-creating side needs to be focused on that. If we do that, we will not have the people we work for come in complaining: What have you done? The Tax Code is too simple now. It is too easy to fill out my tax form. I am walking out on Friday with more money than I used to walk away with, and, oh, by the way, they tell me there is a better job about to develop that I can apply for.

That is what we ought to do. I hope we keep focused on that and get this tax bill passed this year.

I think the Senator from Georgia has come to talk about this same topic, along with Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri. I make the point that I have enjoyed the last 19 years serving with him in the Congress of the United States. He was elected 2 years before me to the House of Representatives. I came a little bit later, but I preceded him in the Senate in 2004. He has been great to work with.

The Show Me State of Missouri is an awful lot like my State of Georgia. They are proud of their country. They are proud to be Americans. They are proud of the chance to have an opportunity to make an honest living and want to be a part of a country that continues to grow and have prosperity for the future.

We had a hearing in the Finance Committee yesterday where there was an interesting study I had not seen before. It had been done by a Harvard student, who I assume was correct. Ninety percent of the people born in the 1940s ended up making more than their parents did when they went to work. But only about 40 percent of the people born in the 1980s will end up making more than their parents did, meaning that as we have gone along the way since World War II, we have taken more and more away from the opportunity in the earning level and more money has gone to different places, like taxation.

Personally, I think the Finance Committee and the leadership of the Big 6, so to speak, have done us a great favor to open the debate on tax reform in America. Unlike some of the debates we have had recently, this debate is open-ended. We are starting with a

framework, not an absolute dictate but a framework. We are talking about an opportunity we have to see if we can lower the burden of taxes on the American people, while incentivizing the American people to work more, to make more, and to earn more.

There are two ways to increase revenue to the government. First, you can increase the rate of taxation. But then you are not necessarily taking in any more money. You might incentivize somebody to go somewhere else. The other way is to improve the opportunity to make money and the atmosphere in which people make money so they invest their time and effort and they grow their revenue, which grows the revenue of the United States of America.

The proposal in the framework before us has any number of outlines and any number of targets. The four things I want to focus on are these. One is the middle class. I have gotten tired of hearing this reference to dividing us as Americans by class. We are all Americans. Regardless of our station in life, we are all important. The code ought to be important to every single person who is an American and, if they can come to this country, to improve their life, raise their children, and live a good life.

I am not into a class society. I am into an opportunity society. If you take a look at this proposal, for those people you put in the middle class today, it proposes lower rates, less brackets, and more opportunity to gain wealth in the future through work, through investment, and through earnings.

Second, this framework encourages job creation. I know that people are always demonizing the rich. Most people who are rich are people providing people who aren't rich with jobs. I don't think it is bad to provide people with jobs. I think it is good to provide them with jobs. We need a Tax Code that incentivizes the creation of jobs.

The focus on the passthrough rate, which is talked about by the Big 6, may lower the passthrough rate to 25 percent. It is a job-creating proposal that works.

I have run a sub-S corporation. I have been a partner in limited partnerships. I have known people who have had sole proprietorships. I have known people who have had independent operations. They all pay their taxes at the regular, ordinary tax rate on the individual. They don't pay at the corporate rate. They pay at what is called the passthrough rate, where the profits at the end of the year of the partnership or the LLC or the sub-S corporation flow in a K-1 to the individual and are taxed at the ordinary income tax rate; whereas, corporations in C-corps, or stock-held companies, pay a top rate of 35 percent.

That rate is being proposed to go to 25 percent conceptually. If that goes to

20 percent and the 25 percent rate is applied to passthroughs, we will have a good environment in which companies can form investments, form new companies, make investments of those companies, build opportunity, and, in turn, build jobs. So it motivates America to create more jobs. With jobs come income. With income comes money. With money comes investment. At the end of that comes profit, which ends up being taxed, which is revenue to our country, and it increases.

We also need to recognize that we are not as competitive as we used to be, in large measure because of the code we have, not because we are not competitive people. America is the most competitive environment in the world in which to do business. Americans by themselves were explorers to get here. Americans by themselves are investors and inventors. Americans by themselves are risk-takers. We want to improve in every competitive opportunity we have, but the current code we have suppresses competitiveness.

This proposal by the Big 6 takes us to a territorial tax system. We are one of the few countries in the world that taxes the old-fashioned way. The territorial system is the way in which most of the world competes, and we are the biggest competitor within the rest of the world. It is time we put an end to a company making a dollar in Delhi, India, on a product they made there and sold there, pays the Indian tax, and then brings it back into America and has to pay the differential on the American tax as well. It is time we did what the territorial tax does, which is to tax the money where it is earned; therefore, you will never have to do repatriation again, and you will never have to talk about offshore tax havens again because the Tax Code will not induce those things to happen. Instead, people will pay the tax where it is earned, bring the money back here to hire people, invest, build new products, and then take them overseas and sell them. There is nothing more important than going to the territorial tax system. I am excited about this.

Have you ever thought about this?

If you were the president of a major American corporation and it was coming to the end of the year and you were getting ready to have your stockholders' meeting for the year and you were looking at ways to show how the stock could grow and how, next year, you were going to improve the profits of the company and, in turn, the net of the company and, in turn, the dividends to the stockholders—right now, if you have a home office in America, that is your principal office, and you are taxed at 35 percent in America. If you have a competitive company that is in Ireland and it is taxed at 12½, it just might cross your mind: If I move my headquarters from America to Ireland, I could take my stockholders and

put 18 percent or 20 percent—or whatever the differential is—on the bottom line for them. When your Tax Code causes people to think about things like that, you are predicting a future for a country that is not as bright, as rich, or as important as it should be.

Lastly, everybody thinks I am a city slicker because I am from Atlanta, but I did grow up working on a farm in Fitzgerald, GA, and Ocilla, GA. I love farmers and I love farms. I know one of the proposals of the Big 6 is to do away with the remainder of the estate tax that is still with us. A few years ago, we exempted all estates at \$5 million or less from the estate tax. Now it is \$5.49 million because the index has been used on inflation. The tax rate used to be 55 percent, and it is now 40. Yet, in my State of Georgia, with the effective application of the income tax, the tax is about 46 percent. So, for round figures and argumentative figures, for someone who dies in our State, after the first \$5 million, he pays a tax closer to 50 percent.

A lot of people say that is rich people taking a benefit of the Tax Code. I don't call being dead in order to collect a tax benefit a good idea. I do not think that that is a benefit to me at all because the estate tax is on somebody's estate who passes away, who pays that tax for the people who would inherit the assets. Those are normally the children or the spouses or maybe the employees with whom they work in their companies.

Have you ever thought about this?

If somebody were taxing you at 50 percent or close thereto and you file your first estate tax return after you are dead, then if this were the value of your estate, you would be telling the government: OK, you get this half, while my children, my wife, my family get the other half. A year later, when you go back to the well—or a generation later—those kids who inherited the business will have to go back and pay taxes, and a quarter of it will be gone. So, in two generations, you took an asset that was worth a lot and reduced it to 25 percent of what it was worth. You are incentivizing people to liquidate something that was paying taxes on an ongoing basis and pay a onetime exit in terms of an estate tax. That is backward thinking.

What we should do is take those things people have worked for and striven for and tried their best to build and have an incentive for them to take that and leave it to their heirs and leave that company in a tax-paying mode or that farm in a tax-paying mode so America benefits and they benefit as well. Just because you are not taxing something does not mean you are not taking advantage of your company or the benefit of that item. By abolishing the estate tax, you will actually put more money, over time, in the Treasury of the United States of

America in taxes than you ever will by taxing the one-time 50 percent.

So as we enter this debate—and I have been joined on the floor by a number of my colleagues who, I know, want to talk—let's talk about what benefits the American people, what incentivizes innovation and competition, what puts more money in the pockets of middle-class Americans today but also creates more people in the middle and upper classes in the future, not because we gave them anything except an opportunity, a fair place to compete, and that competitive drive that only people in the United States of America have, possess, and will always use to the benefit of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it is always such a privilege to come to the floor and hear Senator ISAKSON, of Georgia, speak, as he speaks so eloquently. He comes here and makes perfect points. He was talking about the tax system looking to the future. What we have is a tax system that looks backward, regrettably. A number of years ago, we had a Treasury Secretary named Bill Simon, who said: "The Nation should have a tax code that looks like someone designed it on purpose." That is what we are trying to do now—have a Tax Code that looks like it was designed on purpose.

The person who really understood this was Ronald Reagan. As we take a look at tax proposals, it is not about taxes; it is about much more—about a better life for the American people. Ronald Reagan said that tax reform is the door to a bigger future and, I would add, to a brighter future. He said it was the door to a future as big and hopeful and full of heart as the American dream. That is what we are talking about here today, a bright, big future, as big and bright as the American dream. That is what we are aiming at with this plan, a big and hopeful future for all Americans.

It all starts with increasing the amount of money Americans get to keep in their pockets as a result of their hard-earned paycheck dollars. That is the most important thing. That is what families are concerned about. That is what I hear about every week-end in Wyoming. Under the outline the Republicans have proposed, every working man and woman in this country will be better off. That is our goal, to make everyone better off and to make the country better off, more prosperous, with a strong, healthy economy. That is what we are hearing about today on the floor and what we heard about from the Senator from Georgia.

When we cut the amount of money people have to pay in taxes, it is essentially like giving them a raise. That is what this is about, giving people a

raise. We want working people to keep more of their hard-earned money. One of the ways you can do that, which is very popular, is by doubling the standard deduction. It is easy math to do. The current standard deduction is around \$12,000 for a couple who files jointly. The Republican proposal doubles it to \$24,000. That means the first \$24,000 of a couple's income will not be taxed at all.

Beyond that, we are going to reduce the number of tax brackets. People will like that. It is so complicated, the system we have now. We will move people into lower brackets. Isn't that what we are trying to do? Yes, it is. If you used to be in a bracket and paid 25 percent, there is a pretty good chance that a significant amount of your income is going to be moved down to the 12-percent range. For most people, that is like getting a big raise when they take a look at their paychecks at the end of the week. That is what Republican tax relief looks like.

The second thing we want to do is to actually make it a lot simpler. We talked about lowering the number of brackets, making it simpler for everyone who does their taxes. The instructions you get now from the IRS for the 1040 tax form are 106-pages long, and that is if you just limit yourself to the instructions. Remember that there are 15 different worksheets to fill out just so you can fill out your 1040 form. When more people take the standard deduction, they can save a lot of time and not have to go to the 15 worksheets and the 106 pages of instructions. They get that standard deduction, which has now doubled, making it a lot easier, with a lot less time having to be spent on taxes.

What else are we going to do?

We want to cut out a lot of the loopholes and complicated rules so most people will be able to just fill out a form on a single page. Think of the hours that is going to save families—the millions and millions of hours—when you multiply it across the country. Plus, think of the stress people will not have to be living under in their wondering if they actually followed the instructions properly. When you call the IRS help line, you get different answers from different people with whom you talk. It is hard to get a single answer because the complicated system makes it hard to get the answer right. So you end up with the expense of hiring lawyers, tax accountants, and people who can help you navigate a complicated system.

People are looking for simpler lives, more free time, and more money of their own they can keep, not complicated government forms so the government takes more of their money. There is a lot of room for us to improve the simplicity of the tax system and the actual challenges that come from filling out the forms.

The third thing we want to do with the plan, of course, is to get the economy growing faster so it is a strong and healthy economy, with more prosperity and higher take-home pay in the paychecks. With that, you will actually get an economy that creates more jobs and has more people working, which is a big part of tax reform. It is a direct benefit for American families. When you cut taxes on small businesses, they can afford to hire more people or they can use the extra money to pay their workers more. There is a lot that can be done to reach that level of prosperity—in individual paychecks as well as in having more people in the workforce.

Under the outline the Republicans released last week, the top rate for most small businesses is going to drop from almost 40 percent down to 25 percent, allowing the businesses to pass on those savings to their customers and the savings to their employees. Larger businesses are going to get a tax break too. The idea is to lower taxes for everyone.

When you take a look at it from a business owner's standpoint, 70 percent of the cost of corporate taxes actually does not get paid by a corporation; it gets paid by the people who work for those businesses. If we cut taxes, more of that money is going to go to the workers. You will have higher wages, better benefits, and more jobs, and businesses will actually be able to lower their prices. Every time there is a tax increase, a business has to raise the cost of a product to be able to collect that tax and send it to the government. I would rather have that money go into the pockets of the people who are shopping in the store or using that business rather than into the pocket of the Federal Government.

Senator ISAKSON was talking about something called repatriation and the amount of money businesses are taxed that do some business overseas. If we can cut the taxes they pay on the money they earn overseas, it means those businesses can bring back that money to the United States and spend it here. How much is it? Right now, about \$2.6 trillion is sitting overseas because those businesses get taxed twice—once on the business done overseas and then once on the business done when they bring those profits back to the United States. When we get that money back, that is going to help grow the economy here as well. It makes sure the American Tax Code ought to be helping American businesses and the American economy, not helping foreign countries. We need to get that money back and put it to work in the United States.

Those are all of the things the Republicans are proposing. It means more money in the pockets of American workers, and it means simpler taxes and more jobs for American workers.

Isn't that what we are looking for? Isn't that what prosperity means for America? Isn't that what a healthy economy means—job growth and the sort of things that happen when we get the kind of tax reform we have proposed?

I want to address one other thing I have heard over the past couple of days as our plan has come out. I have heard some Members on the other side of the aisle say that under the Republican plan, certain people will win more than others. Under the Republican plan, the goal is for everyone to win. The American economy will win. When we have a growing economy, people keep more of their hard-earned money. That is the goal. That is why the President and the Republicans in Congress wanted to take up tax relief right now in the first place. We need to do this to help all American families.

This gets back to Ronald Reagan, in that tax reform—tax reductions, tax relief—means a big and hopeful future for all Americans. That should be the goal. It should be the goal of every Member of the U.S. Senate. It should be the goal of every American. We want to make taxes fairer and simpler and lower for everyone.

There are too many people in Washington right now who want to use America's tax laws to punish or reward one group of Americans or another. Too many people in Washington want to use this debate over tax reform to stir up conflict and resentment. We hear it already in the Democrats' talking points. There are some Democrats in this Senate who think that is good politics. Well, it is terrible policy and terrible for the direction of our country and economy.

The tax plan the Republicans have released this last week does nothing to change who bears the burden of taxes in the country. People who are fortunate and have high incomes will pay their fair share; people who make less will pay less. That is how the Tax Code is spread today. Nothing in this plan changes that.

We have a lot of work ahead of us. We have to figure out the exact income levels for each of the tax brackets and the size of some of the tax credits families get. These are all important details. That is the kind of debate we are going to be having—the markup on the budget and the mathematics of the tax bill coming through committee.

I am so grateful to Senator HATCH and members of the Finance Committee for all of the hard work they will be putting into this over the next several weeks.

I will refer back to the quote of the Treasury Secretary, Bill Simon, who said: "The nation should have a tax code that looks like someone designed it on purpose." This is our chance. We need to make sure we take full advantage of it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I rise to speak about our country's need for tax reform. As our previous speakers have indicated, this is a critical time in our country, and we have an opportunity to make some good decisions that will impact our Nation for literally generations to come.

Reforming our Tax Code is a top priority not only for myself but for many of my colleagues and the President. We are committed to delivering tax reform that will provide more jobs, bigger paychecks, and a fairer tax system for the American people.

Over the 8 years of the previous administration, economic growth averaged a paltry 1.5 percent annually, which is about half of the post-World War II average. This anemic growth has led to stagnant wages and, according to the Joint Economic Committee, has cost families an average of \$8,600 in income on an annual basis. It is no wonder that half of the American public says they are living paycheck to paycheck. This is simply not acceptable.

Even more concerning, the Congressional Budget Office is projecting economic growth to remain under 2 percent over the next 10 years if we do not act. If that happens, let me just share with you the real concern. If we allow economic growth to stay under 2 percent, then we will literally bring in revenue based upon the size of our economy. If we allow economic growth to move at a paltry 2 percent or less, then we won't have the revenue to pay our bills.

Today, right now, we are looking at trillion-dollar deficits. Yet, if we take a look at where the dollars are going, they go basically—looking at our entire budget, about 28 percent of the money that we spend today is found within the 12 appropriations bills that make up the defense and the non-defense discretionary side of the budget. All of the remaining items, making up 72 percent, are in areas of mandatory payments—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt. If we don't do anything and if we continue on this same path, with the type of growth we have, then we can expect that within 9 years now, by the year 2026, our country's 250th birthday, 99 percent of all of the revenue we take in will go into Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt. That means there will be only 1 percent remaining for defense of our country, roads, bridges, research, education, and all of those other items that many people really want to see and that help us to move ahead as a country.

We have to make changes now that will allow our country's economy to grow and prosper the way it used to.

The way we believe we do that is by changing our Tax Code, changing the regulatory environment in the United States, and sending the message back to the businesses that this is the place where they want to do business. They don't have to leave our shores in order to actually make a profit and be able to keep that profit.

It is our intention to deliver policies that will jolt our economy, allow hard-working families to keep more of their paychecks, and provide financial opportunities to lower and middle-class families. Tax reform is a vital component of this.

Our current overly complicated Tax Code is more than 70,000 pages in length. It takes Americans more than 8.1 billion hours each year to file their taxes. A fairer, simpler Tax Code will grow the economy, increase wages for American families, improve American competitiveness overseas, and provide much needed certainty for our business community.

It has been 30 years since our Tax Code was last reformed. The rest of the industrialized world has learned from America what it takes to be competitive. They have seen what our tax rates have become. They have lowered their tax rates. They are now inviting businesses to their shores rather than to ours. Businesses that can go anywhere in the world they want to are not choosing America as their location anymore. We have to change that because when they come back, they bring good-paying jobs with them. They keep the profits here, which are reinvested within our borders rather than overseas, and that adds to a growing economy here, which allows us more revenue through even lower tax rates.

The average corporate rate in the United States today is 39 percent, compared to 25 percent by our foreign competitors. This puts American businesses at a disadvantage right out of the gate. We must reform the tax rate to one that incentivizes businesses to remain here in America and keep good-paying jobs from going overseas. Doing so will unleash the full potential of this American economy.

One thing we can all agree on is that taxes are too high and that the tax rate, no matter who you are, should be lowered. Allowing all American families to keep more of their hard-earned dollars by taking them out of the hands of Washington and putting them back into their pocketbooks will result in a more prosperous America. That means more people investing in America long term. When our economy is healthy, every American will feel the positive effects.

I am encouraged by the ongoing discussions and progress being made to alleviate the tax burden on American businesses and American families, and I will continue to work with anyone serious about lowering taxes and reform-

ing the code to provide a much needed boost to our sluggish economy. The American people deserve better than the uncertain growth and burdens still lingering from the previous administration.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak today. Like last week, I didn't plan on speaking on this subject, so my staff is probably wondering once again what their boss is going to say. But I was thinking that maybe we could translate a little bit of what we are trying to do with tax reform, because we talk about tax rates, exemptions, exceptions, and simplification—all this stuff that is important because it gets baked into the bill—but we don't spend a lot of time explaining why we are trying to do what we are doing.

The last time we had real, meaningful, impactful tax reform was back in 1986. That is when Republicans and Democrats came together and decided that the stagnant economy that I grew up in—I graduated from high school in 1978. I didn't immediately go to college. I moved away from home when I was 17 years old, and I was working. It was an economy that was not unlike today's. In many respects, it may have been a little bit worse. The environment was the same. Iran was behaving badly, and Russia was behaving badly. We had sort of the same sort of global environment that we have today. We had the threats that we have to confront every single day, and we had the threat to the future of a generation. I mean, literally, people had no earthly idea, if they were getting an education, whether they would be able to get a job because the job-creation numbers when I was 26 years old were terrible. People were worried about whether they could pay for college.

So why are we doing tax reform? We are doing tax reform because it is time for the American economy to grow back to what it is capable of doing, what it has done in the past.

We need tax reform so we can create economic expansion that lets us pay down our debt, which many people in the military say is the single greatest threat to our national security.

We need tax reform and we need to grow the economy because we owe it to this generation to have the same opportunities that I did.

It can be done, but we have to do it probably through reconciliation because right now, even though many of the proposals that we are putting forward—the tax rate and the kinds of policies we are putting forward have been supported by our colleagues and many of my friends on the other side of the aisle. For some reason, they don't

make sense anymore. They made sense back in 1986 when Democrats and Republicans joined together to do tax reform. If you were in your midtwenties then, you saw prosperity unlike anything we have seen right up to today. That was the last time we saw great growth in our economy. We need to get back to providing those same sorts of opportunities.

People will tell you that we are not giving a cut to the little guy or the working man. Well, one thing you don't see when you see the percentage rates that we are talking about on individual tax rates that we are targeting is that there will be tens of thousands of people who will pay zero taxes. There is a actually a zero tax bracket. There are people who, because of the exceptions and exemptions that we are proposing, will actually fall below having a Federal tax liability. We need to talk about that.

We need to recognize that we have to provide relief to the entire spectrum, from the businesses that hire people and create jobs to the working families and the people who don't make enough where we can take any more away from them because they need it to pay their bills. They need to pay their electric bills, their utility bills, their school tuition, and all the other things that working families are struggling to do today, just as I was struggling to do back in 1986.

So I hope this Congress will deliver on the promise we made last year to cut taxes, to get this economy moving again, and to provide the same opportunities for the generation going to school and the people who aren't in school, who are struggling to make a living—the same opportunities that I got when I was that 26-year-old back in 1986. We can do it. I know we can do it because we have done it before. It is a promise we made and a promise we need to keep.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I want to speak today with regard to a month we set aside—or I should say the equivalent of a month that spans two different months—as National Hispanic Heritage Month.

As many know, the United States is home to more than 56 million people of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, comprising over 17 percent of the Nation's total population. We set aside September 15 to October 15 to mark National Hispanic Heritage Month. This month is a reminder of the vibrant culture and substantial contributions that people of the Hispanic community have made to our Nation. Although we have only a 30-day time period as a designation, we recognize the contributions made by Latinos in this country every

day, not just between September 15 and October 15.

I have held a number of meetings with Latinos and Latino leaders this past year in Pennsylvania and here in Washington and recently just a couple weeks ago, as well, to discuss issues of concern to Hispanic Americans and Latinos. The resounding theme I heard from Pennsylvanians is the strong economic drive that Latinos and Hispanic Americans share.

As the second fastest growing minority in the United States, the Hispanic community's economic power continues to grow. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy both in Pennsylvania and across the Nation. Latinos are 1.4 times more likely than the general population to become entrepreneurs. In fact, Latinos own some 3.3 million businesses in the United States, accounting for more than 40 percent of all minority-owned businesses. Together, these businesses generate almost \$500 billion in economic activity. Overall, the Latino community accounts for a combined \$1.3 trillion in economic activity. Their contributions are projected to top \$1.7 trillion by 2020—from \$1.3 to \$1.7 trillion in just a few years.

Last month, I was proud to join many of my Senate colleagues in designating the week beginning September 18 as National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week. This resolution recognizes the achievements and goals of the 472 Hispanic-serving institutions, known by the acronym HSI. These HSIs are throughout the Nation, and they improve their local communities and play a vital role in expanding access to college for students across the country. These HSIs represent 13 percent of nonprofit colleges and universities. Yet they enroll 63 percent of all Latino students. These Hispanic-serving institutions are located in 18 States and Puerto Rico. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the resolution which recognizes the important work these institutions play in expanding access to higher education for everyone.

This year, Hispanic Heritage Month has become a month of advocacy and action. I would be remiss if I didn't mention the Dream Act. This issue has been on the forefront in recent discussions, not only among the Latino community, the Hispanic-American community but with many of my constituents across the board, and I am sure that is true in every Senate office. Dreamers shared with me the hard work and struggles they have endured to be successful in this country. Ending DACA, in my judgment, is wrong. First of all, it is wrong to break a sacred promise to hundreds of thousands of people living in our country, young people who were promised by their government, if they came forward, they would be protected. Ending DACA would be breaking that sacred promise.

In Pennsylvania alone, estimates say that ending DACA would cost the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania nearly \$357 million per year in GDP losses to our State, and that is according to the Center for American Progress. Ending DACA would result in the loss of \$460.3 billion—not million but billion—from the Nation's GDP over the next decade, again according to the Center for American Progress.

So it would be a betrayal to violate this covenant with hundreds of thousands of young people, and it is really a bad move for the economy of my State of Pennsylvania and the economy of our Nation.

I was proud to vote for the DREAM Act in both 2007 and 2010, and I hope the Senate will have a clean vote on the Dream Act soon. We should be focused on humane and commonsense solutions that keep our Nation safe as well as allowing it to thrive. Hispanic Americans are a vital part of the fabric of American society.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, The most powerful words in our Constitution are the first three words: "We the People." It sets out the mission statement for our Nation, or, as President Lincoln put it, a nation "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Our Founders did not start out our Constitution with "we the powerful" or "we the powerful and privileged." They didn't proceed to say that our form of government is all about the powerful and privileged ruling for themselves to make themselves richer at the expense of everyone else.

Thus, going back to the foundation, the vision of our Nation is appropriate because our Republican colleagues have put forward a document—a budget—with a tax plan that is all about government for the powerful. It is all about self-serving government for the privileged. There is nothing about fighting for a foundation for ordinary people to be able to thrive here in the United States of America.

Indeed, the plan put forward by my Republican colleagues is a plan fit for a king living in a gilded castle—maybe fit for King Trump living in Trump Tower, but certainly not for working Americans living and striving to build the wealth of America. No, this is not a plan for them. This is a plan for the King Trumps of our Nation, who believe they can deceive the country again and again by putting forward an

argument that they are going to do something to help the people while writing it for themselves.

We can take a look at this and realize that the President himself leads that effort to do the sales pitch when he unveiled his tax plan at the National Association of Manufacturers last week. President Trump said: "My plan is for the working people." He said: "There's very little benefit for people of wealth." And he went on to say: "I don't benefit. I don't benefit." He repeated it twice.

Well, as soon as you look at the tax plan, you see that this is wrong. He sent out his other Secretaries to reinforce his message. Secretary Mnuchin showed up on the shows and said: "The objective of the President is that rich people don't get tax cuts." Well, that is a little bit of lawyerly work there. He didn't want to confront the reality that this plan is all about tax cuts for the wealthy. So he said the objective wasn't to do that.

Well, let's talk about the reality. The bottom third economically here in America get zero help from the tax provisions in this plan—none whatsoever. Plus, the broader budget slashes Medicaid by about \$473 billion—you know, the one thing that has improved for working people. It has been tougher in a blue-collar communities to get a full-time job. It has been tougher to get a living wage. It has been tougher to save for retirement, with pensions disappearing and employer-supported retirement and savings plans disappearing.

One thing got better, and that is access to healthcare, thanks to ObamaCare. In my State, over half a million Oregonians gained access to healthcare. It didn't just help them; it helped everyone. The uncompensated care rate went way down in hospitals and way down in clinics, which meant stronger clinics and stronger hospital services for everybody in the State. Everyone benefited.

So the one thing that has improved for working America the Republicans in this Chamber wanted to rip it away—stomp on it, destroy it, shred it. They couldn't bear the thought that working Americans might finally have affordable, quality healthcare. They couldn't stand the vision of healthcare as a right. They wanted to return it to healthcare being only for the wealthy and the healthy, but not for ordinary working people.

Well, the bottom third is totally unhelped—in fact, hurt by this plan. How about the middle third? For the middle third—25 percent of the middle third—taxes go up, not down. The tax bracket goes from 10 percent to 12 percent. For the seniors in middle America, this plan takes a trillion dollars away from Medicare. Not only do my Republican friends hate having healthcare for working people, but

they want to destroy healthcare for older Americans at the same time.

So if the bottom third doesn't benefit and the middle third has taxes going up, who benefits here? Simple answer: It is the billionaires. The millionaires and billionaires of America are those whom this plan is written for.

Well, let's just look at the provisions that cost so much money to the Treasury. The alternative minimum tax is wiped out. Remember how the rich and powerful rigged the system so they were paying no taxes at all? We here in America established an alternative minimum tax, saying that, if you are wealthy, with a ton of money coming in the door, you should pay at least a little. The one tax return we have for President Trump shows he paid taxes because of the alternative minimum tax. That is the only reason he paid taxes.

So when President Trump says he doesn't benefit, clearly that is wrong. If he knows it is wrong, it is a lie. Let's just say he is either incredibly ignorant or trying to be incredibly misleading about the fact that this would benefit him enormously to get rid of the alternative minimum tax.

What is the second thing it does? Where it raised the tax rate at the lowest bracket for working Americans, it lowers the tax rate for the wealthiest Americans, from 39.6 percent to 35 percent. That is a huge reduction that benefits people at the very top, wealthy enough to be paying in the top bracket. Certainly, President Trump, by his own description of his own affluence, would be in that category. So clearly, he benefits enormously from that.

The third huge provision is getting a special rate for passthrough entities. Let's say you own a big development, like a shopping complex or a Trump Tower, and it generates a lot of money and you pass it through to pay your personal taxes from your limited liability corporation. Well, instead of being charged 39.6 percent, the current rate, or 35 percent, at the lower rate or at the corporate rate, no, you get this special deal on this passthrough of 25 percent. So you paid an enormous amount less.

Who benefits from this? Well, the people who own LLCs and pass through huge amounts of money are the ones who benefit from this. Who has a lot of LLCs? Who has, by various estimates, hundreds and hundreds? I heard an estimate that the President has over 500 LLCs. So if the President has hundreds and hundreds of LLCs, passing through income that is lowered from a 39.6-percent rate to a 25-percent rate—basically, a 15-percent reduction—he benefits enormously from this, as do all of his millionaire and billionaire friends.

Finally, there is the estate tax. This one, I have to admit, President Trump doesn't benefit from today because he

hasn't died. But when he dies, his estate would benefit massively. If he is taking out insurance to be able to pay his tax bill when he dies, then he has to take out less insurance. In that case, it does benefit him today. Most wealthy individuals do have that kind of insurance investment to pay the estate tax. A very small number of Americans fall into this category, and that very small number have a whole team of financial planners. That means that, yes, even though, technically, he wouldn't pay the tax benefit until he dies, he pays less for the preparation of paying that. As for the AMT, the lower tax bracket, the passthroughs, and the estate tax, the President benefits enormously from every single one.

There you have it. There is nothing for the bottom third. The middle third get hit with Medicare being slashed, and also with an increase in taxes for a good share of them, but the billionaires at the top benefit enormously. Let's be fair. The President understands this. His advisers understand it. His Cabinet is full of the types of individuals at the very top—the 1 percent, the 0.1 percent—full of the richest Americans. They wrote this plan for themselves and to hurt the rest of America. That is shameful.

There is another provision that the President has put in that probably helps himself, and that is cutting the corporate tax rate to 20 percent. It is keeping with the President's demonstrably false statement that the United States is the most taxed nation in the world. That is simply not true, as a percentage of GDP. We have seen the share of tax revenue that companies pay decline.

Here we have the argument that somehow there will be prosperity because we reduce the tax rate. Let's look at those companies that already pay less than 20 percent in corporate taxes because of the big difference between the nominal rate—the stated rate of corporations—and the reality of what they actually paid. A report from the Institute for Policy Studies analyzed 92 U.S. corporations that paid less than 20 percent in corporate taxes. Did they find that these firms have medium job growth of 20 percent? No. Ten percent? No. Five percent? No. Zero? No. It is negative 1 percent. There is negative job growth even though these companies paid less than 20 percent in corporate taxes, while the private sector job growth over those years as a whole was 6 percent positive. So those paying less than 20 percent had negative 1 percent growth, while the entire private sector grew with job growth at 6 percent. In fact, during that period, these 92 firms that were studied—in fact, just a fraction of them, or 48 of them together—eliminated basically about half a million jobs. They had very low taxes.

The argument is that they will do more because they don't have to pay as

much taxes. They will expand the number of people they hire. But instead, they slashed half a million jobs—just 48 of these firms that pay less than 20 percent.

What happened to the CEOs of those firms? Their salaries went through the roof. Part of the plan here is that you cut as many people as you can, and you have a net profit increase. Sometimes, even when you don't, you get a big increase.

So if we take this as a model of what the President wants to achieve, he wants to empower other companies to follow this track of having this model of slashing hundreds of thousands of jobs and jacking up the salaries of the already richest CEOs in the country. Who were these companies?

AT&T had an effective tax rate of 8 percent. Wouldn't that be nice for middle-class Americans, to have an effective tax rate of 8 percent? While they had that beneficial 8 percent tax rate, they slashed 80,000 jobs and doubled their CEO's pay to \$28.4 million. Think of how many ordinary working people would have a better life if they raised their pay by one dollar an hour. But no, the CEO slashes 80,000 jobs and raises to pay himself \$28.4 million.

How about GE, which boosted its CEO's pay nearly \$18 million in 2016, while cutting 14,700 jobs over 9 years and achieving a negative tax rate? A negative tax rate—get that. They didn't pay a dollar to the National Treasury—not a dollar. They had a negative tax rate. The company got more money back from the government than it paid in taxes.

How about ExxonMobil? Between 2008 and 2015, they had an effective tax rate of 13.6 percent. That is way below 20 percent. In that time period, did we see a significant growth in the number of people they employed because they got this hugely beneficial 13.6 percent tax rate? No, we did not. In fact, they cut their global workforce by a third. At the same time, the CEO of that company, who just happens to be our Secretary of State at the moment, saw his compensation grow to \$27.4 million.

The record shows that these companies that are getting these low tax rates are slashing their employees and boosting their CEO salaries. Is that the model that makes for a prosperous middle-class America, slash jobs and a dramatic increase of inequality in this country?

That is why this entire tax plan and the budget are so diabolical. It is everything contrary to "we the people." It is a vision of basically hijacking the National Treasury to inflate the wealth of the wealthiest in America, while doing as much harm as possible to working Americans, laying down a model on the corporate side of rewarding companies for slashing hundreds of thousands of jobs and inflating the salaries of their CEOs.

Here is the question every Member of this Chamber should ask: Is your priority adding more zeros to the bank balances of millionaires and billionaires? Is that your mission? Are you at work here not representing the people of your State but just millionaires and billionaires? If you are, then you should be full-throated supporting the Republican tax plan and the Republican budget on the floor of this Senate. But if you believe in the mission of the United States of America, the “we the people” mission of providing a foundation for families to thrive across this land, then there is no choice but to take this budget and this tax plan and shred it, destroy it, burn it, put a stake through its heart in every way possible.

I, for one, believe in this mission of “we the people.”

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are many lobbyists around Capitol Hill. They perform the important task of informing Members and their staff about issues that are going to come before us. Some of them are volunteers, and some of them are paid very handsomely.

There is a special group of lobbyists who are roaming the corridors of Capitol Hill in the House and Senate today and tomorrow. They are young people from across the United States. Many of them are college students, and all of them have one thing in common: They are Dreamers. They are young people who came to the United States under the age of 18, many of them 2 years old, 4 years old, brought here by their parents. They grew up in this country. They went to our schools. Some of them were excellent students. Many of them have gone on to college—at their own expense many times. Some have even enlisted in our military. They have a nagging problem. The problem is that they are not legally citizens of the United States. They don't have legal status in the United States, and so the uncertainty about that status has led many of them to wonder what their future will be.

About 5 years ago, President Obama, at my urging, issued an Executive order that changed their lives. It was called DACA. It gave them a chance to come forward and register with the government, submit themselves to a criminal background check, get fingerprinted, pay a \$500 fee, have their background looked at in detail, and gave them a chance to stay in the United States for 2 years at a time, and in that 2-year period not be subjected to deportation and be able to work.

Four weeks ago, President Trump announced that the DACA Program was going to be rescinded. Many of these young people don't know what their future will be from this point forward. A number of them came out to the steps of the Capitol this afternoon to talk about their lives. Two in particular I wanted to mention.

Nathali Bertran from Columbus, OH, is a student who graduated from college after great sacrifice and has gone on to become an engineer. She is currently working in the Columbus area for a global automotive company. She has a bright future if she is allowed to stay in the United States. She doesn't know the answer to that because we haven't come up with a replacement for DACA, which was rescinded by President Trump.

Jesus Perez is from Tulsa, OK. He had given up on a college education and a future, and then DACA came along, and he decided he wanted to be a doctor. He is on his way. He has finished community college. He is now about to complete his studies at Oklahoma State, and he wants to go to medical school. He works as a transporter and a surgical orderly in a hospital to make enough money to stay in school. His future is completely in doubt because of the uncertainty around what is going to happen to those who were protected by DACA.

I have said many times that these young people were brought here by their parents. They didn't make the decision. I don't want to look negatively on their parents. If I were given a choice of skirting the law or even breaking the law to save my child's life or to give them security and safety, I know what I would do. I also know what these parents did. But the kids themselves were not in on that decision process.

Now, all they are asking for is a chance to be a part of the only country they have ever known. They got up in the classroom every day at school and pledged allegiance to the only flag they ever knew, and most of them can sing only one national anthem, the anthem of the country they believe is their own, the United States. That is an important part of this conversation.

If we believe in fairness and justice in America—and I think we do—we want to be fair and just to these young people. If they have not done something in their lives that is dangerous, such as commit a crime, for example, that is serious, they ought to be given a chance. If they are willing to go to school or to work or to enlist in our military, why wouldn't we welcome them in so that they can be a part of our future, as they should be. The alternative, in many cases, is to ship them back to a country they cannot remember or never really knew, to a language they don't speak. That is not the right outcome.

I want to thank LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina. He is my Republican cosponsor of the Dream Act. Senator GRAHAM has been a stalwart. He and I may disagree on an issue every other day, but on this issue, we agree. We agree that America should step forward and do the right thing for these young people.

I hope these lobbyists—I will use that term—who are Dreamers, who are roaming the Halls of Congress, will make the same impression on my colleagues that they made on me—that their special lives and their special future will make this Nation a better Nation in the years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hargan nomination?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blunt	Flake	Paul
Boozman	Gardner	Perdue
Burr	Graham	Portman
Capito	Grassley	Risch
Carper	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rounds
Collins	Hoeven	Rubio
Coons	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	King	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cantwell	Leahy	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Franken	Nelson	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran Heller Menendez
Cortez Masto McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, James Lankford, Jerry Moran, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Corker	Gardner
Barrasso	Cornyn	Graham
Bennet	Cotton	Grassley
Blunt	Crapo	Hatch
Boozman	Cruz	Heitkamp
Burr	Daines	Hoeven
Capito	Donnelly	Inhofe
Carper	Enzi	Isakson
Cassidy	Ernst	Johnson
Collins	Fischer	Kennedy
Coons	Flake	King

Lankford
Lee
Manchin
McCaskill
McConnell
Moran
Muskowski
Nelson
Paul
Perdue

Peters
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Shaheen
Shelby

Strange
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Warner
Wicker
Young

NAYS—33

Baldwin
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Casey
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken

Gillibrand
Harris
Hassan
Heinrich
Hirono
Kaine
Klobuchar
Leahy
Markey
Merkley
Murphy

Murray
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Stabenow
Udall
Van Hollen
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran Heller Menendez
Cortez Masto McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDONESIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about a recent report by the Secretary of State concerning, among other things, impunity within Indonesia's military. This has been a concern of mine, and of many others, for decades. Senate Report 114-290, which accompanies division J of the fiscal year 2017 Consolidated Appropriations Act, requires the Secretary of State to submit a report on steps taken by the Indonesian military to, No. 1, deny promotion, suspend from active service, and/or prosecute and punish military officers who have violated human rights, and to refine further the military's mission and develop an appropriate defense budget to carry out that mission; No. 2, cooperate with civilian judicial authorities to resolve cases of violations of human rights; No. 3, implement reforms that increase the

transparency and accountability of the military's budget and operations, and achieve divestment of military businesses; and No. 4, allow unimpeded access to Papua; respect due process and freedom of expression, association, and assembly in Papua; and release Papuans and Moluccans imprisoned for peaceful political activity.

The Secretary submitted this report on September 12, 2017, and the information it contains is both disturbing and disappointing.

Indonesia became a democracy after many years of brutal, corrupt dictatorship under President Suharto. He had the unwavering support of the Indonesian military, which was responsible for widespread atrocities not only against Indonesian citizens who opposed Suharto but later against the people of East Timor and Papua. He was also a Cold War ally of the United States.

Suharto is gone, and Indonesia has changed for the better. It remains an important ally of the United States, but no democracy can achieve its potential without an independent judiciary and security forces that are professional and accountable or that fails to defend such fundamental rights as freedom of expression and association.

While the Indonesian military is no longer the criminal enterprise it was during the Suharto period, impunity for past crimes remains the norm. As the Secretary of State's report notes, the Government of Indonesia continues to take inadequate steps to hold members of the Indonesian military accountable for human rights violations. One stark example includes the re-emergence on active duty and promotions of several former members of the Special Forces' Rose Team, who were convicted in 1999 of kidnapping pro-democracy activists. In another deplorable incident, the Government of Indonesia appointed as the head of the Armed Forces Strategic Intelligence Agency a military officer who was convicted in 2003 for the murder of prominent Papuan civil society leader Theys Eluay.

Furthermore, military-related entities, such as foundations and cooperatives, continue to hold large amounts of land and other properties and businesses, despite the government's claim that the military has largely divested itself of private enterprises.

Military personnel are still not subject to civilian judicial authorities. Instead, they are tried by military tribunals which lack transparency and often grant much shorter prison sentences than any credible judicial authority would deem appropriate. Although four district courts are authorized to adjudicate cases involving human rights violations, none of them have heard or ruled on any human rights cases since 2005.

Simply authorizing changes or espousing rhetoric without following up

with tangible action makes a mockery of the concept of reform.

Other findings in the report are also illustrative of a resistance to reform. For example, the report states, “Indonesian law provides that military prosecutors are accountable to the Supreme Court. In practice, however, they are responsible to the Indonesian Armed Forces for the application of laws.”

With respect to the Moluccas and Papua, the report states that “according to international NGO reports, approximately 10 Moluccan independence activists, who were arrested in 2007, remain in custody . . . In January 2015, a court sentenced Simon Siya, a leader in the Moluccan independence movement, to five years in prison on treason charges. He remains in prison. The court also sentenced seven others to two-to-three years for displaying a banned separatist flag during a peaceful pro-independence demonstration in 2014 . . . NGOs in Papua continued to report widespread monitoring of their activities by intelligence officials as well as indirect threats and intimidation.”

Accusing people of being traitors and imprisoning them for peacefully supporting self-determination is itself a violation of human rights.

Indonesia has come a long way since the dark days of President Suharto, but when it comes to military reform, it has fallen far short. In January 2018, it will be 10 years since Suharto's death; yet the military remains a largely opaque, unaccountable institution that has not even acknowledged the extent of its responsibility for past crimes. That needs to change.

REMEMBERING AUGUST “GUS” SCHUMACHER, JR.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to August “Gus” Schumacher, Jr., who passed away on September 24. Gus was an altruist who dedicated his life to discovering ways to help both farmers and those who are hungry, both here in the United States and abroad. His integrity, creativity, and his great courage over decades to sustain a passionate commitment to assisting the poor and hungry, as well as our farmers and rural communities, leaves an immeasurable legacy that will not soon be forgotten.

I have known Gus since his days in Massachusetts. From the first time I met him, it was clear his passion was infectious. He brought that passion and his creative ideas to us here in Congress when he was the Massachusetts secretary of agriculture. It was that passion that propelled Senator Kerry and me to craft the first legislation—which became law—to create a farmers’ market coupon demonstration project in 10 States. In 1988, the first year of

the demonstration program, we secured \$2 million in the Agriculture appropriations bill for the Women, Infants and Children, WIC, Farmers Market Demonstration Project. I was—and remain—proud that Vermont was one of those 10 States chosen for the initial WIC Farmers Market Demonstration Project. Now, nearly 30 years later, the program helps over 7 million nutritionally at risk women, infants, and children across the United States. None of this would have been possible without Gus’s brilliant innovation, determination, and leadership.

Gus put into action his innovative ideas first in Massachusetts and then across the country and around the world with his work at the Foreign Agricultural Service and as Under Secretary of Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service. His work led to a greater emphasis on organizing direct marketing, farmers’ co-ops, farmers’ markets, crop diversifications, and expanding opportunities for farmer-owned packaging, distributing, and processing facilities. More recently, his leadership and endless resourcefulness was on display through his work at Wholesome Wave. For Gus, the only things that mattered were that there were struggling farmers and hungry people who needed help. It did not matter where because Gus understood that hunger transcends all languages and cultures.

We were fortunate to have Gus come to Vermont several times, both during his work at the USDA and Wholesome Wave. During his visits with the USDA’s Foreign Agriculture Service, Gus’s unflinching public service was always on display. He came to meet with the farmers, the food processors, and the dairy co-ops. He came to help Vermonters improve their lives, and I will always be grateful for that.

His recent passing reminds all of us of the need to continue his fight. The fight for the hungry, for our farmers, and for the constant work of more fully realizing America’s potential as both a great and a good nation. Gus believed, as should we all, that hunger should not exist in this country. We have the food and know-how to end it. Gus offered creative solutions to fight it. Now we need the political will to do it.

I ask unanimous consent that the September 27 Washington Post obituary that describes Gus’s life and career be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 27, 2017]

GUS SCHUMACHER, A FORCE IN THE FARM-TO-TABLE MOVEMENT, DIES AT 77

(By Bert Barnes)

Gus Schumacher, a fourth-generation farmer and third-ranking official at the Agriculture Department, told the story of his epiphany about food hundreds of times.

It was the end of a summer afternoon in 1980 at a farmers market in Boston, and he

was helping his brother load up his truck with unsold produce grown on their family property in Lexington, Mass. The bottom fell out of a box of pears, scattering the fruit into the gutter.

There, a young mother with two little boys eagerly gathered them into the folds of her unhemmed shirt. She was a single mom, she explained, dependent on food stamps, which back then made fresh fruit and vegetables prohibitively expensive for her. The pear spill was a bonanza.

For Mr. Schumacher, he would say later, it was a seminal moment in his life. He grew up on a farm, and it had never occurred to him that parents would find it hard to provide their children with fresh fruit and vegetables.

He would change it, he told himself.

Mr. Schumacher—who in a 50-year career also served as the Massachusetts commissioner of food and agriculture, a food project manager and agriculture development officer for the World Bank and finally a co-founder of a nonprofit group that tries to improve affordable access to fresh, locally grown food—died Sept. 24 at his home in Washington. The cause was an apparent heart attack, said his wife, Susan Holaday Schumacher. He was 77.

Since that farmers-market epiphany, Mr. Schumacher helped make food assistance programs more generous in allowances for fresh fruit and vegetables. He also became a force in the farm-to-table movement, encouraging restaurants and retail stores to buy produce locally.

In 2013, Mr. Schumacher received the James Beard Foundation’s Leadership Award for “his lifelong efforts to improve access to fresh local food in underserved communities.”

In Boston, the Globe wrote about a time several years ago when Mr. Schumacher, dining out at tony Hamersley’s Bistro, sat down at a table, reached into a brown paper bag and pulled out a shiny, ripe red tomato. He asked for a serrated knife, olive oil and a plate, then proceeded to make himself a salad.

“Who’s this guy who’s making his own salad?” chef-owner Gordon Hamersley wanted to know. His own tomatoes came from California. Where had Mr. Schumacher’s come from? “Twenty minutes from your doorstep,” Mr. Schumacher said.

That scene, or a version of it, would play over and over again between 1984 and 1990 when Mr. Schumacher was agriculture chief for Massachusetts. He was always asking chefs whether they knew any farmers who could supply them food directly. He created market coupon programs for seniors and low-income families with children. He chastised breakfast diners for serving English jellies instead of American ones.

“Gus was instrumental in bringing two seemingly obvious groups together who never talked to each other—chefs and farmers,” Hamersley told the Globe. “He’s basically the architect of chefs featuring locally grown produce. As always, there was a team of people with him, but he was sitting in the chair.”

The Washington Post reported on Mr. Schumacher’s work with refugee and immigrant farmers all over the United States. He encouraged them to grow and market their native vegetables, such as amaranth. From New England, the New York Times reported, Mr. Schumacher made personal deliveries of Asian greens that included pea tendrils, Chinese chive blossoms and Cambodian spear-mint to the Washington restaurant TenPenh.

August Schumacher Jr. was born in Lincoln, Mass., on Dec. 4, 1939. He grew up on a

farm in Lexington, and his father was one of the largest parsnip growers in Massachusetts. His grandfather and great-grandfather were farmers in New York City. They grew winter vegetables in glass-enclosed hot-houses.

Mr. Schumacher graduated from Harvard University in 1961 and attended the London School of Economics.

Over his career, he had a variety of consultancies, served as Massachusetts agriculture chief from 1984 to 1990 and was the USDA undersecretary of agriculture for farm and foreign agricultural services from 1997 to 2001.

Since 2008 he had served as founding board chairman of Wholesome Wave in Bridgeport, Conn., which seeks to increase access to affordable, locally grown fruits and vegetables.

His first marriage, to Barbara Kerstetter, ended in divorce. Survivors include his wife of 25 years, Susan Holaday Schumacher of Washington; a stepdaughter, Valarie Karasz of Brooklyn; and two grandchildren. A stepson, Andrew Karasz, died earlier this month.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 210, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 211, on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 212, on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Randal Quarles to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Had I been present, I would have voted nay. •

CONFIRMATION OF HALSEY FRANK

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the confirmation of Halsey Frank to serve as the U.S. Attorney for the District of Maine. Mr. Frank has 30 years of experience working for the U.S. Department of Justice in Washington, DC, and in Maine, and he is highly qualified to assume this crucial law enforcement position. I thank the Senate for swiftly confirming him.

Mr. Frank is an intelligent, highly competent, experienced law enforcement professional. Mr. Frank has served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney for Maine for the past 17 years, during which he has shown an in-depth knowledge of our country's criminal justice system and significant experience in both criminal and civil law. In this role, he has prosecuted Federal crimes related to fraud, drugs, white-collar of-

fense, violence, civil rights, and environmental violations. He has defended the United States in civil cases and handled numerous appeals. Prior to his current post, Mr. Frank was an Assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, one of the country's largest offices, where he worked on a wide range of civil and criminal matters. He is presently a resident of Portland, ME, and a graduate of Wesleyan University and Boston University School of Law.

Based on his demonstrated proficiency and character, I have every confidence that Mr. Frank will successfully lead and coordinate local and Federal law enforcement activities in Maine to faithfully uphold our Nation's laws and ensure public safety and order. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Mr. Frank has shown a strong commitment to public service, and I am confident that he will serve the State of Maine and our Nation very well.

CONFIRMATION OF RALPH R. ERICKSON

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to support the confirmation of U.S. district judge Ralph Erickson to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Mr. Erickson received the support of both of his home State Senators, Democrat HEIDI HEITKAMP and Republican JOHN HOEVEN. Both HOEVEN and HEITKAMP submitted their blue slips for Mr. Erickson, and the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously voted to advance his nomination to the full Senate.

I hope Mr. Erickson's confirmation reinforces the importance of bipartisanship and the importance of maintaining the blue slip process. The Judiciary Committee has used the blue slip process since at least 1917, and the process is integral to maintaining the bipartisan nature of the Senate. Under both Presidents Obama and George W. Bush, even when a party had unified control of the Presidency and the Senate, if a home State Senator objected to a nominee, the nomination did not proceed. There have been recent discussions to suspend the blue slip tradition in order to force nominations through the Judiciary Committee. I encourage my colleagues to reject any such measures and to continue in the blue slip tradition.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:22 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 178. An act to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 652. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 36. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1624. An act to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as no lower than level 2B liquid assets, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1918. An act to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2408. An act to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 782. An act to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 36. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1624. An act to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as no lower than level 2B liquid assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1918. An act to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2408. An act to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2970. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B) Ethnicity and Race Information Collection" ((RIN3170-AA65) (Docket No. CFPB-2017-

0009)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2971. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2972. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Planning for Research and Test Reactors and Other Non-Power Production and Utilization Facilities" ((Regulatory Guide 2.6, Revision 2) (NUREG-1537 and NUREG-0849)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2973. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Guides: 'Conduct of Nuclear Material Physical Inventories' and 'Statistical Evaluation of Material Unaccounted For'" (NRC-2017-0196) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2974. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Physical Inventories and Material Balances at Fuel Cycle Facilities" (Regulatory Guide 5.88, Revision 0) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2975. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment Under Section 956(c) of Certain Property Temporarily Stored in the United States Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria" (Notice 2017-55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2976. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017-2018 Special Per Diem Rates" (Notice 2017-54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2977. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Guidance Related to Obtaining and Reporting Taxpayer Identification Numbers and Dates of Birth by Financial Institutions" (Notice 2017-46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2978. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Replacement Period for Livestock Sold on Account of Drought" (Notice 2017-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate

on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2979. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Replacement Period for Livestock Sold on Account of Drought" (Notice 2017-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2980. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017-2018 Special Per Diem Rates" (Notice 2017-54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2981. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2982. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2983. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2984. A communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-2985. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Electric-Powered Vehicles; Electrolyte Spillage and Electrical Shock Protection" (RIN2127-AL68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2986. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region (FIR)" (RIN2120-AL07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2987. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amend-

ment of Class E Airspace; Falls City, NE" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9593)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2988. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Arkadelphia, AR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0182)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2989. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mason, MI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0722)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2990. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pauls Valley, OK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0184)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2991. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Plains, MO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0165)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2992. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (12); Amdt. No. 3764" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2993. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (82); Amdt. No. 3763" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2994. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (106); Amdt. No. 3761" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on

September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2995. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (99); Amdt. No. 3762" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2996. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0339)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2997. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0809)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2998. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0560)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2999. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-0451)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3000. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0533)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3001. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0808)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3002. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0308)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3003. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Ameri-King Corporation Emergency Locator Transmitters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6673)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3004. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; B/E Aerospace Protective Breathing Equipment Part Number 119003-11 and Part Number 119003-21" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0439)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3005. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9184)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3006. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8177)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3007. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0524)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3008. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0525)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3009. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0529)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3010. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness

Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation Turboshift Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2011-0961)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3011. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0608)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*David J. Redl, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2018.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

*Timothy Gallaudet, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

*Howard R. Elliott, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.

*Walter G. Copan, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Bruce J. Walker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability).

*Steven E. Winberg, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Fossil Energy).

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*John Marshall Mitnick, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1913. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to make the native sod provisions applicable to the United States and to modify those provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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

S. 1914. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to strengthen rules in case of competition for diabetic testing strips, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1915. A bill to provide for the development and use of technology for personalized handguns, to require that all handguns manufactured or sold in, or imported into, the United States incorporate such technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1916. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1917. A bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize a grant program to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras and securely storing and maintaining recording data for law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1919. A bill to end the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1920. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 281. A resolution urging the President of the United States to allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration and to reject any claims for the continued

postponement of the full public release of those records; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 282. A resolution commending the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 283. A resolution designating the week beginning October 15, 2017, as "National Character Counts Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 284. A resolution calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2017 as "National Dyslexia Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 251

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 251, a bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board in order to ensure that it cannot be used to undermine the Medicare entitlement for beneficiaries.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive co-insurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 832

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 832, a bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to require the Secretary

of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1498

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1498, a bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive American women's history museum, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1632, a bill to establish an additional fund in the Treasury to meet existing statutory obligations to reimburse costs reasonably incurred as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum, and for other purposes.

S. 1706

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1706, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1724

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1724, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a new tax credit and grant program to stimulate investment and healthy nutrition options in food deserts, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to strengthen border security, increase resources for enforcement of immigration laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1774, a bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their

right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1823, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1869

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1869, a bill to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator.

S. 1874

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1874, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish certain demonstration grant programs relating to the demonstration of advanced distribution systems, smart water heaters, vehicle-to-grid integration, and granular retail electricity pricing, and for other purposes.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the flexibility, efficiency, and reliability of the electric grid, to increase the competitiveness of the United States economy, to protect consumers, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 1876

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1876, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to advance energy storage deployment by reducing the cost of energy storage through research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 211

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr.

MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 211, a resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

S. RES. 245

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 245, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 280

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 280, a resolution designating the week of October 2 through October 6, 2017, as "National Health Information Technology Week" to recognize the value of health information technology in transforming and improving the healthcare system for all people in the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 281—URGING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ALLOW FOR THE FULL PUBLIC RELEASE OF ALL REMAINING RECORDS PERTAINING TO THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY THAT ARE HELD BY THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION AND TO REJECT ANY CLAIMS FOR THE CONTINUED POSTPONEMENT OF THE FULL PUBLIC RELEASE OF THOSE RECORDS

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of the resolution urging the President of the United States to allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration and to reject any claims for the continued postponement of the full public release of those records, be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. RES. 281

Whereas May 29, 2017, marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of President John F. Kennedy;

Whereas nearly 54 years have passed since the tragic assassination of President Kennedy on November 22, 1963;

Whereas the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 (44 U.S.C. 2107 note; Public Law 102-526) (re-

ferred to in this preamble as the "Records Collection Act"), directed all Federal agencies to transmit to the National Archives and Records Administration all records in their custody related to the assassination of President Kennedy;

Whereas former President and ninth Director of Central Intelligence George H.W. Bush declared in his signing statement for the Records Collection Act that "[b]ecause of legitimate historical interest in this tragic event, all documents about the assassination should now be disclosed";

Whereas the Records Collection Act established the Assassination Records Review Board to ensure that Federal agencies complied with the law;

Whereas the Records Collection Act established a deadline 25 years after enactment for the full public disclosure of all assassination records whose disclosure was postponed or that were subject to redaction;

Whereas the 25-year deadline for the full public disclosure of all remaining assassination records is October 26, 2017;

Whereas the Assassination Records Review Board uncovered records that were withheld from the staff of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the House Select Committee on Assassinations, and other Government entities;

Whereas the former Chairman of the Assassination Records Review Board has publicly commented that records held by the National Archives and Records Administration should be made public;

Whereas the National Archives and Records Administration holds approximately 3,100 fully redacted records and approximately 31,000 partially redacted records concerning the assassination of President Kennedy;

Whereas Congress declared in the Records Collection Act that all Government records related to the assassination should be preserved for historical and governmental purposes and eventually disclosed to enable the public to become fully informed about the history surrounding the assassination;

Whereas Congress declared in the Records Collection Act that legislation was necessary because the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act (section 552 of title 5, United States Code) by the executive branch prevented the timely public disclosure of records relating to the assassination of President Kennedy;

Whereas public opinion surveys suggest that a large majority of the American public supports the full release of all remaining assassination records;

Whereas Congress recently reaffirmed its commitment to transparency, accountability, and the public disclosure of Government records by enacting the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-185; 130 Stat. 538), which codifies a presumption of openness;

Whereas there is legitimate interest from the academic community, historical researchers, and the general public in having access to withheld records for research purposes and general knowledge; and

Whereas the National Archives and Records Administration was formed to preserve and document Government and historical records and to increase public access to those documents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate urges the President of the United States to—

(1) allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration; and

(2) reject any claims for the continued postponement of the full public release of those records.

SENATE RESOLUTION 282—COMMENDING THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION AND ITS STAFF FOR WORKING TO COMPLY WITH THE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY ASSASSINATION RECORDS COLLECTION ACT OF 1992 AND RELEASE ALL RECORDS RELATED TO THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY BY OCTOBER 26, 2017

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of the resolution commending the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017, be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. RES. 282

Whereas the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 (44 U.S.C. 2107 note; Public Law 102-526) directed the National Archives and Records Administration (commonly known as “NARA”) to establish a collection of records to be known as the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection (referred to in this preamble as the “Collection”);

Whereas the Collection includes all Federal Government records relating to the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy, including records of Presidential commissions, congressional committees and investigations, executive branch agencies, and the judiciary, in addition to a variety of donated historical materials;

Whereas NARA has compiled a JFK Master System database of 319,106 documents comprising 5,000,000 pages of assassination-related records, photographs, motion pictures and recordings, and artifacts; and

Whereas the processing team at NARA, including archivists and technicians from the Special Access and Freedom of Information Act staff, staff from the Office of Innovation, and Public Affairs staff, have worked diligently to fully release records related to the assassination of President Kennedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 283—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING OCTOBER 15, 2017, AS “NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 283

Whereas the well-being of the United States requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry of good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent, as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas, more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas, although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play a role in determining the future of the United States;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values, which form the foundation of a democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of youth reflect the character and conduct of society, and, therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those that have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into teaching activities; and

Whereas the establishment of “National Character Counts Week”, during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups,

and other organizations focus on character education, is of great benefit to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning October 15, 2017, as “National Character Counts Week”; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups—

(A) to embrace the elements of character identified by local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship; and

(B) to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 284—CALLING ON CONGRESS, SCHOOLS, AND STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES TO RECOGNIZE THE SIGNIFICANT EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF DYSLEXIA THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED, AND DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2017 AS “NATIONAL DYSLEXIA AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 284

Whereas dyslexia is—

(1) defined as an unexpected difficulty in reading for an individual who has the intelligence to be a much better reader; and

(2) most commonly caused by a difficulty in phonological processing (the appreciation of the individual sounds of spoken language), which affects the ability of an individual to speak, read, and spell, and often, the ability to learn a second language;

Whereas dyslexia is the most common learning disability and affects 80 percent to 90 percent of all individuals with a learning disability;

Whereas dyslexia is persistent and highly prevalent, affecting as many as 1 out of 5 individuals;

Whereas dyslexia is a paradox, in that an individual with dyslexia may have both—

(1) weaknesses in decoding that result in difficulties in accurate or fluent word recognition; and

(2) strengths in higher-level cognitive functions, such as reasoning, critical thinking, concept formation, or problem solving;

Whereas great progress has been made in understanding dyslexia on a scientific level, including the epidemiology and cognitive and neurobiological bases of dyslexia; and

Whereas early screening for and early diagnosis of dyslexia are critical for ensuring individuals with dyslexia receive focused, evidence-based intervention that leads to fluent reading, promotion of self-awareness and self-empowerment, and the provision of necessary accommodations that ensure success in school and in life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize that dyslexia has significant educational implications that must be addressed; and

(2) designates October 2017 as “National Dyslexia Awareness Month”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 17 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "An Examination of the Equifax cybersecurity breach."

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold an Executive Session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room Hart 216.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room Dirksen 406, to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael Dourson, Matthew Leopold, David Ross, and William Wehrum to be Assistant Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency; and Jeffery Baran to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, after the first vote scheduled at 11 a.m., in room S-216, to hold a business meeting to consider the following nominations: Bruce J. Walker and Steven E. Winberg, to be Assistant Secretaries of Energy.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room Dirksen 215, to consider favorably reporting the Keep Kids' Insurance Dependable and Secure (KIDS) Act of 2017.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 9:15 a.m., to hold a briefing "Ordered Departure of Personnel from the U.S. Embassy in Havana, Cuba."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the ses-

sion of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10:30 a.m., to hold a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 3 p.m., in room Dirksen 406 to conduct a hearing entitled "Department of Labor and National Labor Relations Board Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. for a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room Hart 216, to conduct a business meeting considering the following: S. 943, Johnson-O'Malley Supplemental Indian Education Program Modernization Act.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room Hart 216, to conduct an oversight hearing entitled "Doubling Down on Indian Gaming: Examining New Issues and Opportunities for Success in the Next 30 years."

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

The Committee on Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room Dirksen 226 to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on pending nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 9 a.m. in room Dirksen 562, to conduct a hearing "Still Ringing off the Hook: An Update on Efforts to Combat Robocalls."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017 at 2:30 p.m. in room Hart 219 to hold a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE

The Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere is authorized to meet during the session of Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 11 a.m., to hold a hearing "The Future of Iraq's Minorities: What's Next after ISIS."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVACY, TECHNOLOGY AND THE LAW

The Committee on Judiciary Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law is authorized to meet during the session of Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room Dirksen 226, to conduct a hearing "Equifax: Continuing to Monitor Data-Broker Cybersecurity."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern Nissa Koerner be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIRING THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY TO SUBMIT A REPORT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 222, H.R. 1117.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1117) to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1117) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1992 LOS ANGELES CIVIL UNREST

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 147 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 147) commemorating the 25th anniversary of the 1992 Los Angeles civil unrest.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution

be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 147) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 27, 2017, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 283, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 283) designating the week beginning October 15, 2017, as "National Character Counts Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 283) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL DYSLLEXIA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 284, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 284) calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2017 as "National Dyslexia Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2017

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 5; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Quarles nomination, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:29 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 4, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ERIC D. HARGAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 4, 2017

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 4, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HARVARD RAPE VICTIM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, graduating from high school and going to college is an important goal for many, many American teenagers. College offers the promise of an education, new friends, and new experiences.

When parents drop their children off at their new dorms, they are entrusting those universities with the well-being of their kids. The dark reality is that, in many cases, this trust is woefully misplaced.

Mr. Speaker, approximately one in five women are sexually assaulted in college. That is one out of every five of our daughters, sisters, and friends. This shocking statistic would lead most people to assume that colleges have extensive protections to support those people on campus who may be sexually assaulted. This is just not the case.

Last year one of these victims published an anonymous op-ed at Harvard about her attack. The title of her article was, "It's Me, One of Your Statis-

tics." She described the night of her attack.

A friend invited her to his dorm room to study for an upcoming science midterm test. She thought nothing of it, but when she started to become uncomfortable, she decided it was important for her to leave. But he did not let her leave. He sexually assaulted her.

After the attack, she ran to a friend's room for help. She refused to shower, knowing that she had to immediately get a rape kit done. Assuming the university would be able to help her, she called their health services department, but the news she received from them shocked her. Harvard University Health Services didn't provide rape kits. They didn't provide any post-rape care whatsoever. There was nothing they would or could do for her. The university essentially threw up their hands and just turned her away.

She was forced to call an Uber and paid someone to drive her to the hospital across town. But once she arrived, there was no staff at the hospital trained to deal with sexual assault victims or trained to collect forensic evidence.

Sexual assault forensic examiners, or SAFEs as they are called, are specifically trained to properly collect forensic evidence from victims and provide the victim with care and support that is sensitive to the trauma that they have experienced. She had to wait over 3 hours for somebody to arrive. This is unacceptable, and it is sad.

It is estimated that less than 25 percent of victims of rape report their crimes. They fear this exact scenario, that they will be turned away, dismissed, ignored, or not believed.

To address this problem I have introduced legislation that would require a hospital to provide access to a sexual assault forensic examiner or have a plan in place to quickly get a victim to a nearby hospital that can provide forensic services.

This bill is named for Megan Rondini. It is called the Megan Rondini Act, in honor of a 21-year-old sexual assault victim who was denied proper post-rape treatment at a hospital in Alabama. This bill will ensure victims can access the care that they need.

Megan's hospital didn't have a sexual assault nurse examiner on staff either, so when she reported the rape to the authorities, the authorities did not believe her. Anguished, Megan returned to Texas, despondent, and tragically took her own life. The only thing she knew for certain in her case was that

she was failed by the university, the hospital, and the law enforcement agencies.

Universities should have a sexual assault victim advocate on staff—all universities. A SAFE should be available for victims at a nearby hospital, and law enforcement must quickly analyze sexual assault kits because there are hundreds sitting on the shelves all over the country that have never been tested.

Mr. Speaker, sexual assault victims are people. They are mainly young people at universities. As the Harvard student said, they are not just statistics on a hospital spreadsheet. Society can no longer ignore the silent, painful cries for help of victims of rape on our college campuses anymore. These days need to end.

And that is just the way it is.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DR. VIRGINIA KIMBROUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great American, Dr. Virginia Kimbrough Newell, who will celebrate her 100th birthday on Saturday, October 7. Dr. Newell has spent her entire lifetime in service to others as a civil rights activist, elected official, mentor, and friend.

Dr. Newell was born in Advance, North Carolina, to William and Dinah Kimbrough. She graduated from historic Atkins High School in Winston-Salem and received a degree in mathematics from Talladega College in Talladega, Alabama. She received her master's degree from New York University and a doctorate in education from the University of Sarasota in Sarasota, Florida.

After receiving her doctorate, Dr. Newell returned to her beloved North Carolina and taught mathematics at Washington High School and J.W. Ligon High School in Raleigh. Dr. Newell later joined the faculty at Shaw University in Raleigh as an associate professor of mathematics.

In 1965, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Newell joined Winston-Salem State University as a mathematics professor. She taught at that institution for 20 long years and served as chair of the mathematics department. Acknowledging her tremendous contributions to the university, the computer science center bears her name.

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

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

A dedicated public servant, Dr. Newell served as Winston-Salem city alderman for 16 years, where she focused on the needs of her constituents and advocated for those who were often without a voice. In recognition of her selfless advocacy, the city of Winston-Salem has named a street and walking trail in her honor.

Virginia Kimbrough married George Fisher Newell, a distinguished science professor, a marriage that lasted 46 long years. Two daughters were born to the marriage, my friend, Dr. Glenda Newell-Harris, and Dr. Virginia D. Banks. She is blessed with six grandchildren: Brittany, Phillip, Mary, Matthew, Mark, and Todd.

Dr. Newell is a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, and is a platinum member of The Links, Incorporated. She is an Alpha Bette, which is a wife of an Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity man, and an Archousa, which is a wife of Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity. She has been a faithful member of First Baptist Church in Winston-Salem for more than 50 years.

Dr. Newell is, without a doubt, a visionary trailblazer who has positively impacted the lives of so many. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the people of my congressional district, I wish Dr. Virginia Kimbrough Newell a very happy 100th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), who is from the 12th District of North Carolina.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the phenomenal Dr. Virginia K. Newell, a mathematician, author, civil rights activist, teacher, elected official, mentor, and my Alpha Kappa Alpha soror.

Dr. Newell is an asset to North Carolina. We celebrate her 100th birthday today and honor her legacy as a voice for the voiceless.

A native of the triad, Dr. Newell graduated from Atkins High School in Winston-Salem before attending Talladega College in Alabama. She earned her master's degree from NYU and her doctorate of education from the University of Sarasota.

As an educator, she touched the lives of countless students at Washington and Ligon High Schools in Raleigh, Yale Summer High School, Shaw University, and Winston-Salem State University. As chairwoman of the mathematics department at WSSU for 20 years and later as professor emeritus, Dr. Newell is credited with bringing computers to that campus.

In Winston-Salem, Dr. Newell sought to make the greatest difference she could. She was elected as city alderwoman, serving for 16 years and always placing her constituents' needs first. She led numerous voter registration drives and co-chaired the Shirley Chisholm for President campaign in North

Carolina. Even after retirement, Dr. Newell served as mentor and tutor to hundreds of students who continue to thank her for her firm approach and for expecting nothing but the best from them.

Dr. Newell's hard work and dedication to her students, constituents, and North Carolina is admirable and noteworthy. Indeed, she is a phenomenal woman, and I wish her a very happy 100th birthday.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. GEORGE HAMILTON

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. George Hamilton, who passed away on August 4, 2017, at 88 years old.

Mr. Hamilton graduated from the University of Georgia School of Pharmacy and owned and operated his own private pharmacy. He was the owner of Hamilton's Apothecary in the heart of downtown Savannah, where he was the primary pharmacist for many citizens of Savannah.

It wasn't just his products that brought in his customers, but the genuine care that he showed for people. He opened his business mainly because of his genuine love for neighbors and community. If someone could not afford to purchase their desperately needed medicine, he would give it to them for free. He also stocked his store with basic groceries to keep the elderly people who lived near his store from having to make a long walk to the grocery store.

Aside from being passionate about his profession, Mr. Hamilton watched, with his children, his beloved Georgia Bulldogs play almost every Saturday.

I thank Mr. Hamilton for his dedication to the Savannah community and the profession of pharmacy. He will truly be missed.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. HERMON BUTLER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Hermon Butler, Sr., who passed away on August 21, 2017, at 81 years.

Mr. Butler was a man who wore many hats in the Pembroke, Georgia, community. He worked at a barber shop for many years before serving as a Bryan County probate judge.

During his judgeship, he hosted three or four city-famous roadside feasts a year, where he cooked quail, venison, chicken, barbecued pork, and low country boil on the courthouse grounds. His events became extremely popular and eventually garnered the title of Cafe, more specifically, the Road Kill Cafe, because of the large amount of choices he served. He served not only courthouse staff and law enforcement, but people from across Pembroke and the State of Georgia, including some of the State's highest officials.

He retired in 2000, and his roadside feasts were special for anyone who was lucky enough to attend.

Mr. Butler certainly will be missed.

RECOGNIZING REAR ADMIRAL UPPER HALF RANDY CRITES

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rear Admiral Lower Half Randy Crites for his promotion to Rear Admiral Upper Half. Rear Admiral Crites currently serves as commander of Submarine Group 10 at Kings Bay Naval Base in the extreme southern portion of the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Since he signed up to serve in 1985, Rear Admiral Crites has proven himself as an outstanding leader. Among his many accomplishments, he completed four patrols while commanding the submarine USS *West Virginia* that dissuaded enemies from potentially threatening our country.

It would be impossible for me to overstate the work that Rear Admiral Crites is doing at Kings Bay Naval Base, and I trust that he will succeed in his new assignment and make an even greater contribution to the safety of our Nation in his position. The First Congressional District of Georgia appreciates Rear Admiral Crites' patriotism and dedication to the United States.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last week we honored and welcomed back STEVE SCALISE to this Chamber, victim of a horrible shooting aimed at him because he was a Congressman. It could have been any one of us.

Today the Democrats spoke on the steps of the Capitol about the need for reasonable gun law reform, and with us was Gabby Giffords, who was shot in 2011 because she was a Congressperson doing her job.

Congressman JOHN LEWIS had said that you can't go to a movie theater, you can't go to a concert, and you can't go to school and feel safe. You can't be a public official and feel safe.

What happened in Las Vegas where 58 people were murdered and over 500 injured calls on the United States Congress to take action to protect the American people.

□ 1015

This is the time to act for reasonable, commonsense gun reform laws. Former Deputy Prime Minister of Australia Fischer, who, in 1996, after the greatest mass shooting in Australian history, led an effort to reform the Australian laws, sent a missive to President Trump suggesting this is the time for him to act and to do something very important for American society. He said: It can be done.

After those killings in Australia, they passed laws that made automatic and semiautomatic weapons illegal. They had a buyback program that bought back over 600,000.

After the 1996 effort, which was difficult but successful, Australia has not had a killing of over five people. Prior to 1996, they had 15 or 16 shootings of that nature.

Everyone recognizes Australia's success. We need to do something besides just having continued moments of silence.

Yesterday, on a bill on this floor about the unborn taking precedence over the rights of women, quite a few Republicans came to the floor and talked about pain to the unborn and loss of their potential for life. But none have talked about the pain of the 500 who were injured and the 58 lives that were lost.

We could pass laws to eliminate bump stocks that, apparently, this murderer used to make his weapon into, effectively, an automatic weapon, where you can shoot hundreds of bullets at a time, which he did. Bump stocks should be illegal. Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN had a bill to make them illegal in 2013, and she has one again.

We need better background checks and to make sure the mentally ill don't get guns. Unfortunately, in this Congress, in February, we passed a law that President Trump signed with passion and a flare that eliminated a rule that said that the Social Security Administration would send the names of people who couldn't manage their own financial affairs to a bureau to see to it that they were on a list so they couldn't buy guns.

If you can't successfully manage your own financial affairs, should you have a gun?

I would submit not. But that bill was passed on a partisan vote and signed by the President, making it easier for people to get guns when the Social Security Administration has found they cannot manage their own affairs.

The same for the no-fly, no-buy list. If you are considered too much of a security threat to fly on an airplane, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. The arguments we heard against that were about due process.

Has anybody brought a bill to give the people on the no-fly list due process? Has it come to the floor?

No. It won't. It makes sense to have a no-fly list. They also should be the people that can't buy guns.

We shouldn't have semiautomatic weapons. Automatic weapons are illegal. The bump stocks make regular weapons automatic weapons.

The CDC is prohibited by law from doing a study to see if there is a connection between gun violence and mental health or our country's health. That law should be repealed. We shouldn't fear the CDC study.

High-capacity magazines also shouldn't be permitted, and law enforcement should be protected from armor-piercing bullets.

I hope that we can act to save American lives.

REFORMING AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 21st Century AIRR Act, a comprehensive act to reauthorize the FAA and reform air traffic control.

Our aviation system was once the best in the world, but, unfortunately, America is no longer first in flight. Ask anyone who flies. They know our aviation system is plagued with inefficiencies. These range from indirect routes that send us all over, trying to get from one point to another; seemingly endless delays; and time wasted on the tarmac, hoping to take off to head to your destination.

These delays and congestion cost travelers and our economy an estimated \$25 billion a year.

You may have heard that argument that there is nothing we can do; 50 percent of our air traffic delays are caused by bad weather.

Well, underlying that is 50 percent of our delays are caused by bad weather because you have to space out aircraft further and differently when the weather is inclement.

Why is that?

Well, in many cases, we are using World War II radar technology to keep track of modern aviation. In fact, over 400 air traffic control facilities were built before the invention of the internet and 9 of them are old enough to collect Medicare if they were a live human being. Think about that. They are that old.

Questions have been asked: Why haven't we simply fixed the problem?

After all, taxpayers and passengers have poured billions of dollars into the FAA to modernize that system over the last 30 years, yet we have little to show for it.

As President Clinton pointed out nearly 20 years ago, "part of the problem is our outdated technology . . . but a more fundamental problem is also how the FAA operates."

I couldn't agree more.

We recently had a hearing regarding air traffic control, and the FAA was asked: What does it take to get to a modern air traffic control system like is used in other parts of the developed world?

I was told: If we had 10 more years and \$30 billion more, we would hope to have the project done.

I come from private business. Hope is not a plan.

The 21st Century AIRR Act would replace a Federal entity that has proven itself to be ineffective with an independent, not-for-profit board tasked with modernizing our air traffic control system. They would have one duty: providing the safest, most efficient air traffic control service to all users.

Contrary to critics, our board would be balanced. It would be comprised of users of the system. All are represented equally.

Quickly, let me bust a few myths here.

Critics argue that transferring air traffic control services from the FAA to a new entity would be a free giveaway of Federal assets.

Well, first, let me state they are not Federal assets. They are our assets. We paid for them. Everyone in this Chamber has paid for them. Every taxpayer has paid for them. They are owned by the people.

Most of these assets are so old and outdated that, in many cases, they are actually a liability. There are many facilities that are actually environmental brownfields.

A number of FAA facilities no longer meet OSHA standards, yet, somehow, some of the critics claim that these are valuable Federal assets. In fact, users are going to pay to update this air traffic control system. They will pay for the equipment, staff, and technology to finally update a system that we have been trying to do for over 30 years.

Many in this Chamber talk about refocusing the Federal Government, reducing it back to its core missions, reducing government back to what it does best. This bill does just that.

Mr. Speaker, after billions of dollars and decades of Federal bureaucrats' fruitless efforts to modernize our air traffic system, it is time for change. It is time for real reform.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does exactly that. Let's bring the bill to the floor. Let's achieve real reform, rather than just talking about it.

ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I have received a lot of calls in my office in the last few days. Some are offering help to the people of Puerto Rico, but many are from moms and dads hoping to hear from their children, from children hoping to hear from their moms and dads, from grandchildren worried about an elderly grandparent who is still in Puerto Rico.

Two weeks after the hurricane hit Puerto Rico, there are people who have not been heard from and people who are calling for help, but have not received it yet.

I have had Members of Congress, State and local officials, and people

from all over the country call me to tell me about someone who needs help getting out of Puerto Rico. Their mom is still in Puerto Rico, or a cousin is on dialysis and has not been heard from, and can I help them get to a hospital on the mainland.

These calls are heartbreaking because they are all about U.S. citizens who should be treated better 2 weeks after a calamity, even a devastating calamity like Hurricane Maria.

Most of the calls have been from my constituents in Chicago. Here is one example that was summarized to me by one of my staff members in Chicago.

She said:

Congressman, I received a call from—I won't give her name—she lives here in Illinois, but has an aunt who is in a hospital in Guaynabo, Puerto Rico, who is very ill with cancer. She is requesting assistance from our office to get her aunt out of Puerto Rico so she can receive treatment in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, if you take a look at my Facebook page, you will see the same sort of thing.

Manny writes:

The municipality of Arecibo, a coastal town in the northern part of Puerto Rico, has not received help. I spoke to my family there via text and she said the situation there is dire.

Yanny writes:

Please don't forget Aibonito. The people there are hungry, thirsty, and there are many sick who need medicine. Thank you.

I just spoke 10 minutes ago to Maria in Chicago. She said:

Congressman, I haven't heard from my parents in Cayey.

Mr. Speaker, it is tragic. These messages break my heart. I don't know what to tell people, except to say that help may be on the way soon. Of course, that is not good enough.

I have no explanation for why it is not already there. It certainly is not the fault of the brave men and women who work for FEMA and the Armed Forces. I spent a lot of time with them in Puerto Rico while I was there, and they are working hard. They are tired. They are facing the difficult task of finding and feeding people.

From what I saw in Puerto Rico this last weekend, what I am hearing from my constituents, and what I am hearing from my family and friends, we need to seriously ramp up the use of full capacity and capabilities of the U.S. Government, including the U.S. military, to rescue people.

They don't need paper towels tossed at them like T-shirts at a sports arena. They need helicopters, bridges, cell towers, and generators. This is why I was, frankly, horrified by our President's performance yesterday on the island.

He said that Puerto Rico was making his budget out of whack, as if the monetary cost of saving lives is what we should be focusing on, or that an agenda that cuts taxes is really as important as saving people's lives in danger.

From the beginning, he has focused on the cost of saving Puerto Ricans, not the moral duty to save them. He has essentially said that Puerto Ricans are sitting around looking for handouts and not helping themselves, which is not at all what I saw in Puerto Rico this past weekend, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, the President said we should all feel proud because only 16 people have been listed as officially killed by Hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico.

Really? We should feel proud?

He said that a real tragedy like Hurricane Katrina killed many more people. Thousands, he said.

So I guess he is saying: Hey, only 16. Why the big fuss?

That number doubled overnight, by the way. Everyone understands that it will go up further still when contact is made with all parts of the island.

I look at it a little differently. To me, it is almost like Hurricane Maria posed a test to the United States of America and to our President. The hurricane said: I am going to take 34 souls. That is 34 too many, but that is what I am going to take. Now I am leaving it up to you, America, Mr. President, and you the people in Congress to tell me what you will do to prevent that number from going any higher. Are you getting medicine to the sick? Are you evacuating the aunt with cancer or the cousin on dialysis? Are you providing safe drinking water and flights to safety?

Mr. Speaker, I don't think today's body count is the right metric to look at, but, rather, we should be challenging ourselves to make sure it doesn't go higher.

The most serious event in Puerto Rico's modern history may not qualify as a significant disaster to our President, but let us not sit back and allow the body count to change the President's mind. We just can't wait that long.

21ST CENTURY AVIATION REFORM

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of serving on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and I rise today in support of the 21st Century Aviation Innovation, Reform, and Reauthorization Act. We call it the AIRR Act in the committee.

H.R. 2997 is a unique opportunity in a bipartisan way to do something big together for the American people.

I know we hear that a lot in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but so often it seems like it is just out of our reach. That is not the case today.

Under Chairman SHUSTER's leadership on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. Speaker, my

colleagues and I have worked to craft the kind of bold, forward-thinking reform that America's 21st century aviation system needs. It is in reach today to make that the law of the land.

When we sit together to reauthorize the FAA, Mr. Speaker, it isn't just about attending to the Nation's business of ensuring safety of air travelers across the country. Of course, that is a priority, but it is an opportunity to implement the kind of innovative reforms that we have seen across the globe and that America needs to reestablish itself as the world's aviation leader.

□ 1030

We have an opportunity together to deal with a bloated bureaucracy, to reduce taxpayer costs, to improve efficiency all in an industry that is designed to prioritize customer's experience and customer service.

Mr. Speaker, Americans pioneered air travel, and we remain the safest aviation system on the planet. But our own outdated bureaucracy, our own outdated rules are standing in the way of American innovators and making air travel more time consuming, more costly, and safety innovations more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, with this legislation, we have a chance to empower our innovators, to better serve our travelers, and to preserve the world's finest commitment to safety, as we always have.

As is the case, Mr. Speaker, with any heavy lift, with any big task, there are always concerns in keeping America's system safe and the American people safe a highest among those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, what you need to know today is that with the support of General Mattis, with the support of the Department of Defense, the AIRR Act has focused on preserving the primacy of preserving national security in our aviation infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has the support of those dedicated public servants at the Pentagon because it has been sensitive to these issues. It maintains the DOD's access and management of airspace. It doesn't allow user fees that are charged to passengers to be passed onto taxpayers through the DOD. It leaves intact the President's and the DOD's proper authorities to manage this space.

In addition, it provides unequivocal definitions about the importance of defense to the American people and balances the needs of general aviation with the needs of the Department of Defense. The oversight will always remain with the FAA, with the DOT, and with the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, after we preserve national security, we turn our attentions to the general aviation community. And if you have talked about this bill at all with any of your constituents back home, Mr. Speaker, you heard the

concerns of the general aviation community about what it will mean to them to completely reform America's air traffic control system.

Mr. Speaker, we have to balance the role of government oversight and accountability with private innovation. Our bill is designed to empower those innovators but to preserve the protections that GA has today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer you to a graphic. You will find it at the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's website. It is transport.house.gov. You can't see it from where you sit, but I have line by line the law that we are talking about, the bill that we are talking about, the reforms that we are talking about, and how it protects our friends at the general aviation community.

No fees. No new fees for our friends in general aviation, Mr. Speaker. If you have a doubt about that, look at section 9313, you will see "charges and fees may not be imposed for air traffic services provided."

Continuing airspace and airport access, Mr. Speaker, so important to American citizens involved in general aviation, again, I refer you to chapter 907: "General rights of access to airspace, airports. . . . The Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary to ensure that an air traffic services user is not denied access to airspace or air traffic services. . . ."

The stakeholder board, Mr. Speaker, the cooperatizing of air traffic services that we have seen done so successfully in Canada where they say they are getting twice the safety and modernization input for half the cost, getting it done in a third of the time, having done away with their bloated bureaucracy, the stakeholder board, Mr. Speaker, is defined by general aviation nomination. Transport.house.gov, Mr. Speaker.

PASSING COMMONSENSE LAWS REGARDING FIREARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, I stood on the east steps of this ornate building, and I now rise in the hall of this august body to call for action on an issue that has languished for far too long. Specifically, Congress needs to pass commonsense reform of our laws regarding firearms.

I applaud our concerns for broader background checks, but broader background checks must be as effective as they are efficient. It is true that our current technology allows us to be efficient enough for background checks to be completed within 3 days, and over 90 percent of them are.

But what happens to that less than 10 percent? And why aren't they com-

pleted within that timeframe? Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a perfect world. Our public servants are not perfect and the consuming public is not either. Public servants occasionally make mistakes, and some consumers intentionally make misrepresentations.

No matter how good our technology is, sometimes the process requires more than 3 days to ferret out dishonest and ill-intended purchases. We need to close the gaping loopholes in our gun laws. We need to close the internet sale/gun show loophole that allows gun purchases to evade restrictions in place when purchasing a weapon through a licensed dealer.

We need to close the loophole that allows individuals on the terrorist watch list to purchase firearms. We need to close the loophole that allows domestic abusers to purchase guns. We need to close loopholes that allow semiautomatic weapons to be effectively turned into illegal automatic weapons.

The so-called bump stocks that allow the retrofitting of semiautomatic firearms to make them fully automatic should not be legal.

The Las Vegas shooter had several of these devices that enabled the firing of hundreds of rounds per minute. The purchasing of fully automatic weapons has been significantly restricted in this country since the 1930s, because weapons of war should have no place in our civil society. Give us a vote to close this loophole.

We need to close the Charleston loophole that allows purchases of firearms without the completion of a background check. My Background Check Completion Act will do just that and prevent another tragedy like the Emanuel AME Church shooting that took the lives of nine worshippers more than 2 years ago. Give us a vote to close this loophole.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to pass commonsense reforms of our laws regarding firearms. Give us a vote.

GRATITUDE FOR PASSAGE OF MICAH'S LAW

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful that yesterday this Chamber passed the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah's Law. I am especially grateful to everyone who actually voted for it and had the courage and the humanity to do so.

In the years to come, no matter what else they do in this Chamber, I believe they will look back on that day as a day they stood for those who cannot protect themselves, for the least of their little brothers and sisters.

Mr. Speaker, it was just over 4 years ago that one Kermit Gosnell was convicted of killing a mother and mur-

dering innocent late-term, pain-capable babies in his grisly torture chamber clinic even after they were born.

When authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report: "Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it 'snipping.' Over the years, there were hundreds of 'snippings.'"

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2-feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this screeching noise, and it "sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, this can't be America.

Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent children just like the one I just described. And yet there was and still is no Federal protection for any of them, and if he had killed these pain-capable babies only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in many of these United States of America.

Now, supporters of abortion on demand have tried for decades to deny that unborn babies ever feel pain, even those, they say, at the beginning of the sixth month of pregnancy, as if somehow the ability to feel pain magically develops the very second the child is born.

Now that we have passed Micah's Law, Mr. Speaker, voices who have long hailed the merciless killing of these little ones as freedom of choice, freedom will now grow louder than ever, especially the ones who profit from it most.

I pray when Senators hear those voices, they will search their own souls and remember the words of President Abraham Lincoln when he said: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and under a just God, cannot long retain it."

Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln called upon us to remember that magnificent declaration of America's Founding Fathers, and said: ". . . their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the Divine image and likeness was sent into the word to be trodden on, and degraded, and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity, that when in the distant future some men, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that "their posterity"—that is us, Mr. Speaker—

“might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their Fathers began.” Wow.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to these little babies is real, and all of us here know that in our own hearts. So let me close with a final wise counsel from Abraham Lincoln, who stood so strongly for human dignity, and it desperately applies to all of us in this moment.

He said: “Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered, in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation.”

Mr. Speaker, what if the words of the American Declaration of Independence really are true? What if there really is a creator? And what if these little pain-capable human beings really are his children?

HONORING BERTHA MCMORRIS

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a privileged tribute to a longtime resident of my district and a true friend of mine, Bertha McMorris, in honor of her 80th birthday.

Though a Chicagoan by birth, Miss Bertha is also so very much more. She is a proud graduate of the DuSable High School and the Chicago Teachers College.

Miss Bertha is a dedicated public servant who spent more than 20 years at the U.S. Department of Education. In addition to her work as a public servant, Miss Bertha spent nearly a decade working at the Rainbow PUSH Coalition and is currently the proprietor of the newly founded Rainbow PUSH store.

She also spent time as a past leader of Happy Companion, Incorporated, a community service organization founded by her late sister, Ms. Winifred Jackson.

□ 1045

For over 60 years, Miss Bertha has been a resident of the West Woodlawn community, which is located in my district. She has been a lifelong and faithful member of the Berean Baptist Church of Chicago, where she is currently a trustee of the church's credit union.

Miss Bertha is also the proud mother of Mr. Lamell McMorris, a very successful entrepreneur and founder and chief executive officer of the Perennial Strategy Group and Perennial Sports and Entertainment Group. Lamell manages an in-house team of experienced government and public relations

professionals, lawyers, and sports agents, offering a multitude of services to clients in a wide range of disciplines and specialty areas.

Even today, Mr. Speaker, Miss Bertha stays very active, has a very big heart, and is so very kind to everyone whom she meets. She is aptly described as someone who brings cheer, who brings joy wherever she goes. She is indeed our own merry matriarch of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that by my coming to the floor today, that this very small gesture can bring a big smile to her face and help Miss Bertha enjoy her birthday a little bit more.

To you, Miss Bertha, we all say happy 80th birthday, and may you have many more, and God speed.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF TOM MCNAMARA

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, this last week on Sunday, southern Illinois, the State of Illinois, and I believe this Nation mourned with the family and friends of a friend of mine by the name of Tom McNamara.

About 2 weeks ago, we lost this local hero who spent decades on the front line of law enforcement combating the drug trade.

Tom began his career in Carbondale as just a local police officer with the department while he was in college. Over the years, he became an author, instructor, investigator, an expert witness, and an undercover agent. Even after retirement, he continued to serve the public as an adviser to local police departments that are still fighting the drug trade.

I came to know Tom, the good friend that he is, on November 23, 1988.

Mr. Speaker, you might ask, how in the world would you remember the day that you first met someone?

Well, I can remember that day because it was the day after my youngest daughter was born. Tom then was the head of what was known as the MEG unit—Metropolitan Enforcement Group—a drug task force that had been assigned, and he had been an undercover agent for quite some time.

And my sister actually was the secretary for that unit. So she had brought Tom over to see the new baby. While my wife was out of the room and I was in the room by myself, Tom came in. When he came in, he was introduced to me, and I told him how glad I was to finally meet him. Tom is a very big man, and at the time, he was an undercover agent, so his hair was grown out, his beard was grown out, and he was actually undercover in a motorcycle gang. He was all dressed in black, which he commonly did—actually, always did.

When my wife returned to the room, he is leaning over the top of the bassinet there where our daughter lay, looking at the baby. My wife came in and had this startled look on her face because she didn't see me and my sister in the room, and instantly she kind of had that mother reaction to try to protect a child. All of a sudden my sister jumped up and said: It is okay. This is Tom McNamara. Tom McNamara is a police officer.

Her first words to Tom, who, as I said, became a very good friend with me and very good friends with her: Well, I want to let you know that I would not run to you in an alley if I am in trouble at night. You would not be the one I would run to.

He said: Then that is good. I am doing my job.

Tom McNamara taught other police officers the dangers and concerns. He served proudly as a police officer and as an undercover agent, but he also studied in great detail the harmfulness of certain drugs.

When I was a State legislator, he came to me in 1997 and said: Mike, I need to talk to you and then-Senator Luechtefeld. I need to explain to you about a drug that is so awful, that if a mother and a father would use it, it would make them not have any concerns for the safety of their children, because they are so focused on trying to get more of this drug. And they can actually make it in their kitchen. They can make it in their cars.

That was methamphetamines. That was when we first started drafting laws in the State of Illinois, under Tom's guidance, to try to deal with the meth problem that still exists.

Tom was also one of the first leaders that realized that there were these drugs like bath salts and all of these that are being used.

I don't even know how many people Tom McNamara has saved over the years. We will never know, I am sure, let me tell you, because of his ability and his willingness to work and always to stand in the back, not to be recognized, sometimes for his own safety. But, Mr. Speaker, he did it for the betterment of this Nation, and that is why I stand to recognize him today.

I thank his wife, Judy; his daughter, Rachel; his son-in-law, and their children for giving up this man to serve us, and serve us so well, for all the lives that he saved.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few floors from here, I am in the Homeland Security Committee, and we are addressing issues dealing with the security of this Nation. And in my remarks on the legislation that we are

dealing with, I expressed the pain of having this Congress come together in a bipartisan manner. I know a couple of sessions ago, we worked on a bipartisan border security bill. Sometimes America says enough is enough. They want us to work together.

This morning I rise to mourn and stand with those families—58 of them—who are feeling now an unspeakable pain. They are questioning how their loved one could be at a joyous country music festival and be massacred.

My hometown newspaper says it right: that the massacre in Vegas was an act of pure evil.

Those of us who believe in this flag, whether we kneel, whether we stand as we pledge, we know that America is the greatest country in the world; but when she is hurting, it is important for this Congress to act.

The comment that this is no time to discuss how we solve this unfettered violence, this massacre, this evil perpetrator, then that sentiment is a sentiment I hope will only be a small percentage of this body.

We have tried over and over again in any manner that we could to discuss fairly the idea of gun safety legislation, not the diminishing of the Second Amendment, as some made the argument, that the kneeling, take a knee, or “I kneel” was a diminishment of the First Amendment. It absolutely was not, because the First Amendment allows one to petition one’s grievances.

In terms of the Second Amendment, the procedure of overturning a constitutional amendment would be a long journey, which would include the two Houses of Congress and the people of the United States.

Stop fueling fear that any manner of regulating the right to hold guns is in any way diminishing the Second Amendment, the right to bear arms.

It is “enough is enough.” There were hundreds of mothers and fathers outside of the Capitol this morning when Democrats stood up and called on this Congress and the Speaker to appoint a select committee, of which I join them in. Make it as large as it can be. Have people who will disagree. Take members of the jurisdictional committees and others who have experienced this violence. Let us solve this dirty problem.

It is dirty, for you cannot give any support to the idea of civilians having military-style weapons and taking them and preying on the innocent.

Beautiful young women, young men, mothers and fathers, grandparents now dead, and nothing but their faith will give to their family the hope that they may see them again, for we are God-fearing people in whatever faith we may have.

Our hope is vested in seeing our loved ones again, in particular in the Christian faith, and others have their ways of seeing their loved ones again.

There must be a ban on assault weapons. There must be a recognition that there exists domestic terrorism.

What was the Pulse nightclub?

Domestic terrorism comes in different ways. It doesn’t have to be ISIS. It can be Charleston, South Carolina. That was an act of intimidation.

There were those interviewed who said: I may rethink my life. Why should I be going to large venues? Maybe I can’t do that.

That is not America. That is not what we want for our children. Why can’t this Congress look at the polling numbers of the members of the National Rifle Association. They understand the importance of training, of putting locks on guns, of not having military weapons in the hands of individuals who would kill us dead.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that enough is enough. We cannot do nothing. This flag demands that we do something.

I close by saying that a veteran was killed. He was not killed in Iraq or Afghanistan, where he fought; but he was killed in the streets of America, where he had overcome post-traumatic stress disorder. We know that Texans were wounded.

So, Mr. Speaker, I leave this podium in respect simply to say: As America, we cannot do this any longer, and we must stand up as a Congress and do our jobs and find a way to end this gun violence now.

COMMEMORATING THE DEDICATION OF THE SOUTH TEXAS AVIATORS MEMORIAL

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, as home to almost half of all naval air training in our country, south Texas is a hub of military aviation. That is why I am here today to commemorate the dedication of the South Texas Aviators Memorial, which will be dedicated on October 12 at Corpus Christi’s Ropes Park.

After almost 3 years of planning, fundraising, and awareness by Associate Directors Caleb and Anne Booher, former Naval Air Station Corpus Christi flight instructor Chris Keech, and many other volunteers, the memorial will soon be permanently placed to grace the bay front of Corpus Christi.

This memorial, a tribute to fallen military aviators of all branches, features a 7-foot-tall bronze aviator surrounded by benches and a walkway made of bricks bearing the name of local individuals and businesses that supported the building of the memorial.

□ 1100

Thank you to each person who sponsored the building of this new memo-

rial. I am proud to represent so many south Texans that are proud of our military and are honoring military aviators who have paid the ultimate price in service to our country.

SERVICE ACADEMY NIGHTS IN THE 27TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, each year I have the honor of nominating young men and women from the 27th District of Texas to our United States service academies.

My office will soon be holding two service academy nights to help students interested in earning appointments to a service academy learn about the application process and eligibility requirements. Representatives from West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy will be on hand to answer questions. There will be a presentation about the Reserve Officer Training Corps, or ROTC.

These events are recommended for young men and women between the ages of 17 and 21 and their parents who are residents of the 27th Congressional District of Texas, but are open to any high school student considering applying to our service academies.

The first one will be in Victoria, on Tuesday, October 10, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the University of Houston–Victoria, University North Building Multipurpose Room, that is Room 114, at 3007 North Ben Wilson Street in Victoria.

The second will be in Corpus Christi, on Thursday, October 12, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. at Veterans Memorial High School’s cafeteria, 3750 Cimarron Boulevard.

For more information, you can contact my office or visit my website, farenthold.house.gov.

DOUBLE TEN DAY IS THE NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, or Double Ten Day, it is the National Day of Taiwan, and I would like to take the opportunity to wish the people of Taiwan a very happy Double Ten Day.

Over the years, Taiwan has proven its leadership on the global stage, despite its unique political status, through its commitment to democracy and its contribution to global health initiatives, international development, and humanitarian missions.

Taiwan was there following the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the 2013 typhoon in the Philippines, and was delivering critical aid and food in times of need. Taiwan was also there for the United States when Hurricane Harvey hit. They have donated a total of \$800,000 to the American Red Cross and Texas to assist with relief efforts.

I would like to thank the Taiwanese Government and its people for this generous support and their continued friendship. I would also like to recognize all the great Taiwanese companies

doing business in the 27th District of Texas. Thank you for creating American jobs and being a part of our communities.

Thank you again, Taiwan, and I offer my best Double Ten Day wishes to the people of Taiwan.

BIRTHDAY WISHES TO BOB HAUETER AND LUIS BUENTELLO

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, this week is the birthday of two of my staff: Luis Buentello in my district office, and Bob Haueter, my chief of staff here in Washington, D.C., and Corpus Christi. Both are dedicated public servants committed to helping the people of the 27th District and all of America.

Happy birthday, guys, and thanks for the help.

THE RELIEF EFFORT IN PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, as millions in Puerto Rico trudged through squalor and sewage in search of food, as hospitals ran low on power and medicine, as homes lay in ruins and businesses remained swamped under feet of water, our Commander in Chief went golfing. As our brothers and sisters on the island suffered, our President sank putts and hit drives.

As the gross inadequacy of his administration's response was revealed to a worldwide audience, the leader of the free world patted himself on the back. "We have done a great job with an almost impossible situation," Trump tweeted.

Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump has it backwards. He is not doing a great job despite an impossible situation; the Puerto Rican people are.

Yesterday, on a belated visit to the island, Trump could have apologized. He could have promised a vast expansion of the Federal relief effort to match the vast and growing needs of the Puerto Rican people. Instead, he offered only blame and condescension. "I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico," he says, "but you are throwing our budget out of whack," said Trump.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but our President is dead wrong. He is the one who is throwing our budget out of whack with his tax cuts for the rich. He is the one who is throwing our government out of whack with his early-morning tweets and his childish temper tantrums. He is the one who is throwing our country out of whack with attacks on immigrants and people of color and the disabled and veterans and Gold Star parents, and on and on, and now, most recently, on the courageous leaders of Puerto Rico and the people of Puerto Rico. Such poor leadership, he says, of the ability of the mayor of San Juan and others in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure Donald Trump understands the meaning of the word "leadership," especially in the wake of a natural disaster. Real leadership is about having the courage to do what is right and the compassion to do what is necessary to help others. It is about self-sacrifice, not self-promotion. It is about putting our country first and your own ego second.

Instead, yesterday we were treated to the bizarre spectacle of the President of the United States throwing rolls of paper towels into a crowd.

Despite the millions in Puerto Rico wanting for electricity or basic necessities, he called his administration's response "unbelievable" and "incredible."

Donald Trump even had the gall to congratulate Puerto Rico on not losing hundreds of lives like in a real catastrophe like Hurricane Katrina. Frankly, it is hard to recall a more callous statement from an American leader in my lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, the outrageously poor response to the devastation in Puerto Rico is the best illustration yet that President Trump only cares about people who look like him or vote for him or make the kind of money that he makes.

The American people, especially the 3.5 million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico, deserve a President who is capable of common human decency, a President more concerned about his conduct in office than his coverage in the media, a President who understands that his base is every single one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a few words in Spanish for the brave people of Puerto Rico.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The Puerto Rican people are stronger than Donald Trump thinks.

And they will come out of this crisis and prosper again.

We can't wait any longer.

We are with you.

Los puertorriqueños son más fuertes de lo que Donald Trump cree.

Y ellos saldrán de esta crisis y prosperarán de nuevo. No podemos esperar más.

Le debemos a la gente de la isla nuestro apoyo completo. Estamos con ustedes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

The gentleman from Arizona will provide a translation of his remarks to the Clerk.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Imam Abdullah Antepli, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

The holy One, as Your creation, we call You by different names, experience You through multiple paths. Our human diversity is from You. As the creator of all, You made us different. Enable us to understand, appreciate, and celebrate our differences. Teach and guide us to turn these differences into opportunities, richness, and strength. Prevent us from turning them into sources of division, polarization, hate, and bigotry.

The most merciful One, this incredibly diverse Nation of ours is one of the most successful attempts to understand Your wisdom in creating us different. We are far from being perfect, but came a long way in creating a multicultural, multireligious, and pluralistic society by making in America "you will be judged by what you do, not by who you are" as one of our foundational promises.

The most compassionate One, help us to preserve our achievements in this regard. Do not let the destructive forces of division and exclusion erode our ideals, our firm commitment to diversity and pluralism. Empower us and these legislators to further improve the culture of inclusion and welcome to all in our Nation and beyond.

The most forgiving One, if and when we forget You, do not forget us.

In Your most holy and beautiful name, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KATKO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING IMAM ABDULLAH ANTEPLI

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce today's guest chaplain, my friend, Imam Abdullah Antepli.

Imam Antepli has been a pioneer in Muslim Campus Ministry, serving since 2003, in chaplaincy roles at Wesleyan University, Hartford Seminary, and Duke University. He was also a founding member of the Muslim Chaplains' Association.

During his time in the chaplaincy, Imam Antepli counseled students and adults of all faiths and provided an Islamic perspective to discussions of faith, spirituality, social justice, peace, and cultural exchange. He effectively built bridges and promoted an understanding across religious and cultural divides. That was his mission, and it continues to be his mission to this day.

Imam Antepli's leadership roles at Duke University currently include chief representative of Muslim affairs at the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and senior fellow in the Office of Civic Engagement. He has also served as associate director of the Duke Islamic Studies Center. Imam Antepli also serves as senior fellow of the Jewish-Muslim Relations at the Shalom Hartman Institute in Jerusalem.

He joined Secretary John Kerry's Office of Faith-Based Community Initiatives and Secretary Hillary Clinton's religion and foreign policy team to bring a religious perspective to major foreign policy issues. He traveled around the world as an informal ambassador to engage on issues of religious diplomacy.

I am honored to welcome Imam Antepli back to the House of Representatives. He is a prophetic voice for peace and justice, an engaging teacher and counselor, a gifted interpreter of his faith, and an effective promoter not merely of interfaith tolerance, but of positive engagement.

I am happy to count him as a friend and, along with my colleagues, wish to express appreciation for his words of inspiration today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

AIR TRAFFIC REFORM

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I often hear at home from folks who are frustrated with their experiences with air travel and airport security.

We have an opportunity to address part of the problem to reduce flight

times, prevent involuntary bumping, save fuel, reduce emissions, reduce the number of government employees, and save money both in the public sector and out of our constituents' pockets.

The FAA is spending billions of dollars attempting to implement new technologies and next generation air traffic control management systems. They are failing.

Right now, we have the 21st Century AIRR Act, which is a step in the right direction. It is going to unleash American innovation and allow us not just to catch up with other countries but to surpass them.

It is about American jobs. It is about providing the American public with the service they deserve.

I urge Members to support and advance the 21st Century AIRR Act.

TAX CUTS DON'T PAY FOR THEMSELVES

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, Treasury Secretary Mnuchin and the President said that their plan would not benefit the rich and would grow the economy. They called it the Mnuchin rule.

If you make \$730,000 a year in America, your income would rise by 8.5 percent, which is \$129,000 a year, or \$10,750 a month. That is your tax cut under the Trump plan, a direct violation of what we were told.

We are also told that this plan was a middle class miracle. If you make \$67,000, your income will rise by 1.2 percent, which is \$670 a year, or a whopping \$56 a month.

This is not a miracle. This is an illusion. This plan will increase the deficit by \$2.4 trillion over the next 10 years. I am wondering where the deficit hawks are.

We were told that these tax cuts would pay for themselves. News flash: tax cuts don't pay for themselves. In fact, economists from Goldman say these tax cuts will have virtually no good impact on the economy. The Treasury Secretary and the National Economic Adviser are both immediately from Goldman.

This tax cut is a fraud being perpetrated against the American people and against the American middle class.

CRITICAL BILL FOR AMERICAN AVIATION

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, today, most actions in Congress are viewed through a partisan lens, but the 21st Century AIRR Act is a bill with significant support from both Republicans and Democrats, as well as a number of

groups representing a wide array of political ideologies.

Modernizing air traffic control has historically been a bipartisan issue. In fact, 20 years ago, then-President Clinton said: "The FAA's 20-year effort to modernize its air traffic control technology simply has not been able to keep pace with either the emergence of new technology or the growth and demand for air travel. . . . We can continue on the current course and continue to experience crowded airports, flight delays, and even higher passenger frustration. But if we act now to improve our infrastructure, we can ensure that air travel in the 21st century is the safest, most cost-effective, most efficient in the world."

These words are still true today.

Because we have failed to act decisively, the FAA is struggling to give Americans the 21st century air traffic control system they deserve. We have the opportunity to change that with the AIRR Act.

Many former top administration officials from both parties support reform as well as a broad coalition of stakeholders.

Air traffic control reform hasn't been a partisan issue, and it shouldn't become one now. I urge all my colleagues to pass this critical bill for American aviation.

HONORING EASTWOOD ACADEMY AND LYONS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AS 2017 NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Eastwood Academy and Lyons Elementary School in Houston, Texas, as National Blue Ribbon Schools for 2017.

The U.S. Department of Education selects blue ribbon schools each year from across the country based on their overall academic excellence and progress in closing the achievement gap. Lyons Elementary and Eastwood Academy are 2 of just 342 schools selected nationwide this year.

Lyons Elementary and Eastwood Academy were selected as exemplary high-performing schools based on State and national assessments while serving the historically disadvantaged communities of Northline and Eastwood.

I thank the parents, teachers, and administrators of Eastwood Academy and Lyons Elementary for their hard work and commitment to building a brighter future for our children and our community.

Finally, I wish to recognize the students at Lyons Elementary and Eastwood Academy for their diligence and academic excellence and wish them best in their future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NOLAN WATSON

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

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Nolan Watson, a Georgia resident and veteran of the United States Air Force, who joined our Heavenly Father earlier this year after battling kidney cancer for over a decade.

In 1966, Mr. Watson was one of the heroic men during the Cold War who was involved in the cleanup efforts after a B-52 bomber collided with a KC-135 tanker over Palomares, Spain, releasing four hydrogen bombs. After his service, Mr. Watson suffered from severe medical problems and was ultimately diagnosed with kidney cancer in 2002.

Nolan is survived by his lovely wife, Nona, who has been a fierce and devoted advocate for her husband, working tirelessly throughout the years to garner the recognition these young men deserved for the sacrifices they made responding to this unfortunate disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to stand with me and join me for a moment of silence to honor the life and legacy of Nolan Watson, a hero who deserves our respect and who will be sorely missed.

HOW TO BECOME A BETTER AND STRONGER NATION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to spotlight the statement of Lieutenant General Jay Silveria, the superintendent of the United States Air Force Academy, made after an incident involving racial slurs.

His speech made three clear points:

First, the appropriate response for horrible language and horrible ideas is a better idea.

Second, we currently have the opportunity to think about our defining values as Americans and to stand firm on our values.

Lastly, if you cannot treat someone with dignity and respect, then you need to get out.

Lieutenant General Silveria is a role model. I stand here to share these words because we in Washington need to hear and heed them. We must think about who we are as a nation and we must stand firm in our values. After all, we are Americans. Our values have always defined us.

So we simply cannot accept the words and actions of those who do not treat others with dignity and respect. We must respond to horrible language and hateful ideas with better ideas and

a strong resolve to rise above hate. This is how we become a better and a stronger nation.

DESIGNATING MANUFACTURING DAY

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support designating the first Friday in October as Manufacturing Day.

Across our country, manufacturing provides over 12 million jobs and contributes over \$2 trillion to our economy. In Kansas, manufacturing accounts for nearly one-fifth of the State's economy and directly employs over 160,000 people.

The industry has a long and successful history in Kansas, and this Friday, I plan to help a small manufacturing company, Superior Boiler Works in Hutchinson, Kansas, celebrate 100 years of being in business, as part of our Manufacturing Day tour.

These small businesses have a substantial impact on local communities by providing good-paying jobs in places like Atwood, Sharon Springs, and Hutchinson, Kansas.

I look forward to celebrating National Manufacturing Day in Kansas this Friday and ask my colleagues to support designating the first Friday in October as National Manufacturing Day.

□ 1215

COURAGE TO ACT ON GUN LEGISLATION

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, 26 small children and teachers were massacred at Sandy Hook Elementary, and Congress lacked the courage to act. Two years ago, the Emanuel 9 were murdered by a White supremacist, and Congress did nothing. Last year, in a hate crime against the LGBT community, 49 people were killed in the Pulse nightclub terrorist attack, and Congress did nothing.

This week, at least 59 people have been killed and over 500 injured in the worst mass shooting in modern American history. Will Congress yet again lack the courage to act?

Will we prioritize thoughts and prayers at the expense of substantive action that saves lives? Will we hide behind the "it's too early to talk about gun violence" excuse? If so, when is the right time? A week from now? a month? a year? or perhaps after the next mass shooting?

For the over 1,500 mass shooting victims since Sandy Hook, the right time

to talk about gun violence has tragically come and gone, but we can and must turn the page today. Let us not continue dishonoring their memories because of political pressure and fear to do what is right.

CELEBRATE NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this Friday we celebrate National Manufacturing Day. The economist, Peter Navarro, recently said that manufacturing is the seed for all other jobs in the United States. I couldn't agree more. Manufacturers are the pioneers, the innovators, and the people who bring ideas to life.

With over 20 percent of Florida's manufacturers located in the Tampa Bay area, I am proud of the fact that there are more than 2,500 manufacturers in and around my district. Their work couldn't be more essential to our community and our country.

It is our job to support manufacturing and to create a business environment in which they can thrive. This means passing meaningful tax reform, eliminating regulations that stifle the industry, and encouraging STEM education, which is needed for workforce development.

I look forward to continuing to work on these important issues as we embrace the full potential of what it means to make it in America: Made in America.

RYAN-McCONNELL REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, middle class families should be the focus of tax relief, not billionaires, not the wealthiest Americans. Unfortunately, the Ryan-McConnell tax plan fails that basic test.

Independent analysis shows that the Republican plan would actually raise taxes on many middle class families, giving billionaires, the top 1 percent, the biggest breaks. The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center says that middle class families could actually pay an increase of \$1,290 a year. Even worse, the families I represent would be asked to foot the bill for a big, massive giveaway to the rich.

Under the Republican plan, the wealthiest families, 5,400 families that are the superwealthy in this country, would get a \$270 billion break through the repeal of the estate tax—100 families in my home State of Michigan, the DeVos family, certainly the Trump family. This is not representative of the values of the American people.

Just saying that the people at the top won't benefit doesn't make it true. Read the bill. Look at these analyses. This is a giveaway to the wealthiest Americans, and it is wrong.

ENCOURAGE SENATE TO VOTE ON PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT SOON

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

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation passed the House yesterday, and I encourage the Senate to vote on it soon.

I am strongly pro-life. The Federal Government's most important responsibility is protecting human life, including the lives of the unborn. Additionally, we have a moral obligation to minimize pain and suffering, especially for the most innocent among us.

The United States is one of only seven countries that allow abortions after 20 weeks. At the 20-week mark, anesthesia is used in fetal surgeries for patients still in utero. For premature babies born at this stage, special care is given to reduce their pain.

H.R. 36 will prohibit abortions after the 20-week mark precisely because of the substantial evidence that unborn babies at this stage can and do feel pain.

I am proud to support H.R. 36, and I am glad it passed the House. I will continue to do all I can to advance a culture of life in Idaho and in America.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN PUERTO RICO

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, right now, 3.5 million Americans, our fellow citizens, are facing a humanitarian crisis. In Puerto Rico, the majority of people still lack basic electricity, clean drinking water, and medicine, the bare basic necessities just to stay alive—not to speak of the basic resources they need to begin the great task of rebuilding their lives and their communities.

It has been days since the hurricane passed over Puerto Rico leaving death and destruction in its wake. The people of Puerto Rico are literally crying out for help. There are far too many, especially those in rural communities, who still have not been reached by those bringing aid. As a Representative from an island State in Hawaii, I can only imagine their frustration and desperation.

I urge the administration to dedicate all available resources to helping the people of Puerto Rico. Work with Congress to pass an emergency aid package

to ensure that those delivering aid have what they need to help the people of Puerto Rico and save lives.

ALLOWING VA-CREDENTIALLED HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS TO PRACTICE TELEMEDICINE ACROSS STATE LINES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Department of Veterans Affairs for proposing a rule that will allow VA-credentialed healthcare providers to practice telemedicine across State lines. This is excellent news because our veterans should receive the best care possible no matter where they live or are located.

With advances in technology, we see new opportunities for veterans to obtain coverage through telemedicine, especially in some of our most rural areas.

The VA rule is similar to a bill that I introduced together with Representative JULIA BROWNLEY, called the VETS Act. The existing licensure requirements for VA service providers are not in line with the technology and care available today.

Outdated regulations prevent individuals who receive care within the VA system from accessing qualified providers who utilize telemedicine simply because of the geography and a State border. That is wrong, and we must change it.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the VETS Act and work to give our veterans access to the best care possible. Our servicemen and -women answered their country's call. Let's be there for them when they return home.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO BAN BUMP STOCKS TO CONVERT SEMIAUTOMATIC WEAPONS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, 58 innocent people were murdered in Las Vegas. Their killer used 12 bump stocks to convert his semiautomatic weapons into the equivalent of a machine gun.

No one should possess one of these devices, let alone 12 of them, and that is why I am introducing legislation to ban them.

But I am mindful, Mr. Speaker, that we have been here before after Newtown, Aurora, San Bernardino, Orlando, and other mass shootings. Each time, my Republican friends have refused to act.

Now, in the wake of the worst mass shooting in modern history, our Republican colleagues are not only refusing to act, but they are going to make the

problem even worse by pressing proposals that will make the problem worse, making it easy to carry a concealed weapon, making it easier to buy a silencer. I mean, this is insane.

I get it. Elections have consequences. You won last November so you get to do what you want, but this is wrong. Let's come together and do something. And I promise you, if Congress fails to respond to the demand for common-sense gun safety legislation, we will be held to account by those we serve, and rightly so. So let's work together and do something.

PASS TAX CUTS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, we have an incredible opportunity to pass tax cuts for the American people. I appreciate President Trump's leadership on this issue as well as the leadership of Chairman BRADY in working to pass the President's tax plan.

While we are working on tax cuts, I rise today to urge the chairman and the Ways and Means Committee to also eliminate tax credits for illegal immigrants. Most Hoosiers get it: we can't continue to reward people who come to our country illegally while those who work hard and play by the rules struggle to get ahead.

I have authored legislation to close the loophole that allows \$7 billion in refundable child tax credits to be paid out to illegal immigrants every year. This money should be used to increase the child tax credit for law-abiding American families. President Trump included this proposal in his budget request to Congress, and I believe it should be included in the President's broader tax plan.

RISING IN SUPPORT OF FULLY FUNDING THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to fully support the funding of CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program. CHIP plays a very important role in providing low-income children across the country with health insurance.

Without CHIP, over 9 million children nationwide, including 90,000 in my great home in Michigan, will lose access to doctor checkups, immunizations, and basic healthcare.

For the last 2 days, we heard numerous concerns for the unborn children. We must show that same compassion toward the low-income children who

are alive and living in our communities, whose access to critical healthcare, including CHIP, is a matter of life or death.

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

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to protect our Nation's children. We need to extend funding for CHIP and support the millions of families who rely on this program. Let's take care of our children in America.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 367

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 367.

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

There was no objection.

FOCUS ON BIPARTISAN EFFORTS TO INVESTIGATE THE CAUSES OF GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in light of the tragic and horrific events this Sunday, I believe our focus should be on bipartisan efforts to investigate the causes and lessen the potential for gun violence in America. That is why I am calling on Speaker RYAN to name a select committee to address these issues.

Additionally, I believe the Republican leadership should formally withdraw their so-called sportsman's package, which has many objectionable provisions.

Furthermore, we need to bring to the floor a vote on comprehensive background check legislation that includes closing the gun show loophole and individual internet sale loophole. There is overwhelming support in the public and this Congress for those actions.

I would like to see what the investigation reveals and whether a suppressor would have allowed this monster to create more carnage. However, we do know he used something called a bump stock, which I never heard of before.

Anything that converts a semiautomatic weapon into something that is virtually a fully automatic weapon, which is outlawed, should not be sold. The bump stocks and any other devices like that should be banned.

CRITICAL NEED TO FUND CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in disbelief that this Congress has shamefully allowed the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, to expire earlier this week. CHIP provides healthcare to 8.9 million low-income children in our country and to over 2 million children in my home State of California.

My Republican colleagues have spent all their time and energy this year fighting to repeal healthcare for millions of Americans covered by the Affordable Care Act, and now they have failed to protect healthcare for our country's children.

If we do not act quickly, it could soon lead to States not enrolling children and potentially even denying them coverage altogether due to the lack of funding.

It is critical that we fund the CHIP program without delay and provide certainty to these families that they will not lose their health coverage because of this irresponsible and derelict congressional inaction.

□ 1230

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH AND SUPPORT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CHOOSE

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 3 days after Congress allowed the Children's Health Insurance Program to expire, this House once again passed a bill that restricts women's health and reproductive rights.

This should not be the time to prioritize politics. Women should be able to make their own choices about their bodies and their healthcare.

Over the past 40 years, the Supreme Court has affirmed a woman's constitutional right to privacy, including the right to choose.

Not only is the 20-week ban imposed by this Congress not based on accepted science, but this ban disregards the role doctors play in making health decisions.

In States that have already passed this ban, young people, women of color, low-income women, and immigrant women are the ones who are most impacted by the ban.

If we care about women's health, we should work to reduce unintended pregnancies, expand access to contraception, and support maternal and children's health. Instead, the majority is slashing Medicaid, attacking Planned Parenthood, and passing bans.

Not me. I will remain committed to protecting women's health and supporting the constitutional right to choose.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 71, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 553 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 553

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Tiberi of Ohio and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time

as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all of my colleagues may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a great day. I don't know how your Wednesday has gotten started, but we are now in the throes of budget day.

Budget day only happens on the floor of this House once a year, and it is one of those times where I would tell you the House operates as every man, woman, and child across this country believes the House should operate every day.

I have the great honor as a member of the Rules Committee and as a member of the Budget Committee of bringing this structured rule to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 71, the rule that we will be debating for the next hour, makes in order every single budget substitute that was offered in the Rules Committee. Now, let me tell you what that means in practical terms.

Over the next 2 days, we are going to hear visions laid out for what the American government should spend, what American policies should look like, what the Federal budget should include.

Over the next 2 days, we are going to hear visions laid out from every single Member or group in this institution that cared enough about this process to craft a budget of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I serve in the Republican Study Committee. I was once chairman of the Budget and Spending Task Force on the Republican Study Committee. I had the honor of crafting a substitute budget to bring to the floor to offer for my colleagues' consideration.

Over the next 2 days, any Member who has a voice that needs to be heard has had the opportunity. We put out the call last week. My friend from Massachusetts and I, we sit on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. We send out the call to the membership in advance to say this is what we expect to happen in the Rules Committee, this is what we are going to be considering in the Rules Committee. We sent out the call for any Member of this House to craft their substitute amendment, and we received four.

We received one from the Congressional Black Caucus, we received one from the Progressive Caucus, we received one from the Republican Study Committee, and we received one from the Democrats on the Budget Committee. Every single one of those has

been made in order by the rule that I will ask my colleagues to support today.

We are going to debate those. We are going to vote on those each individually, allowing everybody to have their say. That budget that this House ultimately agrees on collectively, collaboratively after these days of debate, we will then send to the United States Senate for its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, they say that budgets are a reflection of values. I believe that to be true. We are going to have budgets on the floor of the House to consider that cut taxes, budgets that believe that the economy has not grown to its full potential, budgets that believe that the American workforce participation rate is still at historically low levels. We have to get men and women back into the workforce. We have to reward that dignity of work. We have budgets that are going to cut taxes in an effort to stimulate that job growth across this land.

We have other budgets that are concerned that we are not bringing enough revenue into the government coffers. It is true, Mr. Speaker. I know you are thinking it. We are bringing in more tax revenue today than we have ever brought in in the history of the United States of America. That is true, but we are still running budget deficits. So we will consider those budgets today that don't necessarily believe that spending is the problem; they think it is tax collection that is the problem.

We will consider budgets that raise taxes by about \$2 trillion. We will consider other budgets that raise taxes by about \$4 trillion. Mr. Speaker, I think we will even consider budgets that raise taxes by \$9 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, there are only two things that can happen in this institution. We either have to raise more revenue, or we have to cut spending, or we have to mortgage our children's future. Three things: raise taxes, cut spending, mortgage our children's future.

Over the next 2 days, we are going to have that debate and we are going to have that discussion.

I know where my constituency lands, Mr. Speaker. There are tough decisions that have to be made, and they believe they sent men and women to Congress to help make those tough decisions. We sit on the Budget Committee. That is what we do.

If you have not gotten a chance to work with her this season, Mr. Speaker, Chairwoman DIANE BLACK on the House Budget Committee, if there is a more patient and more persistent Member of this body, I don't know who that would be. She has worked tirelessly to move this process along, to get us to this point where we are today, trying to bring people together around a unified vision of what we can do and what we should do not just as an institution, but as a nation.

I expect we will have some disagreements over the next 2 days, Mr. Speaker. It won't surprise me at all. In fact, I think this institution is characterized by the things that we disagree about. Certainly that is what the media would like to focus on. But at the end of this process, what will have to be said is that we have considered every idea, that we have considered every point of view, that we have made room for every voice, and that we have now come together on a common pathway forward. That is what is ahead of us, Mr. Speaker, if we support this rule that we are debating now.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this rule. I hope you will find that budget that meets your constituency's needs, support that underlying budget, and then let's move a budget to the United States Senate and speak with one voice for the American people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I obviously rise in strong opposition to this rule. This can be a frustrating place. So frustrating, that sometimes I want to tear the remaining two strands of hair I have on my head out, because what we do here, in my opinion, is not to advance anything that is good for the American people. This is a frustrating place, because what happens on this House floor is either nothing or you guys make things worse.

On Sunday, we once again witnessed a massacre, the worst mass shooting in American history. People across this country are demanding action, but the response of the Republican leadership in this Congress is nothing. We had a moment of silence, but it means nothing because that is all we do. There are no hearings, no debate, no votes, just absolutely nothing.

It is obvious that too many Republicans have been intimidated and have been frightened or have been bought off by the National Rifle Association. It is shameful and, quite frankly, it is disgusting.

If the Republican leadership of this House is not willing to lead, then move aside. Allow us to bring measures to the floor so we can have a vote, so we can have a debate, so we can enact measures that might save some lives.

Mr. Speaker, what we are considering today, this Republican budget, is an example of the majority making things worse for the American people.

Budgets are moral documents. They show what we value and what we care about. And if this budget reflects Republican values, then shame on Republicans. When you look at the specific programs House Republicans target, it becomes clear just how cruel this budget really is.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, I complained loudly to the distinguished chairwoman of the Budget Committee about the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program known as SNAP, basically a program that provides poor people food. It helps prevent hunger in this country. In this budget, they call for \$164 billion in cuts to this program.

The chairwoman said: Well, I believe that people who get this benefit ought to work.

I pointed out to her last night, and I am going to point out to my colleagues here today, that the majority of people on this program—67 percent of the people who are on this program are not expected to work. Why? Because they are children, because they are senior citizens, because they are disabled.

Of those who can work, the majority work. But you have individuals who are working, who are on SNAP because they earn so little that they still qualify for this program.

So why aren't we demanding that work pay more in this country? Why aren't we coming together to demand an increase in the minimum wage so it is a livable wage, so that people who work don't have to be on public assistance?

Instead, we have yet another attack on poor people in the form of these cuts.

The gentlewoman said: Well, I want to narrow it down to just able-bodied adults without dependents. They all ought to work.

□ 1245

Well, many of these people do work, Mr. Speaker, but many of them don't work, for a number of reasons. Many have limited educational experience, with 80 percent having no more than a high school education or a GED. Some are aging out of foster care. Some have underlying mental health issues, difficult histories of substance abuse, or are ex-offenders with nowhere else to turn.

As many as 60,000 of these able-bodied adults without dependents who have qualified for SNAP initially are veterans. These are brave, courageous men and women who have served our country, who have returned home and are having difficulty reintegrating into the community, getting on their feet. Our gratitude for their service is, we are going to throw you off the food benefit? I don't know what people are thinking who drafted this in the budget.

The chairwoman of the Budget Committee said: Well, it is important that we constantly review programs to see if they are working, if they are living up to our expectations. I agree. I am a liberal Democrat. I want to make sure that whatever programs are in existence are working, are effective. Nobody is for ineffective government.

I happen to sit on the Agriculture Committee, Mr. Speaker. We have already held 23 oversight hearings on this program—23 on SNAP alone. We have had Republican witnesses, and we have had Democratic witnesses. As my friend from Georgia knows, his party is in control, so Republicans get to have more witnesses than Democrats do. We have had 23 hearings, and not one witness, not one, recommended a \$164 billion cut in this program.

In fact, what they recommended, Democrats and Republicans, was that we ought to strengthen wraparound services. That means like you ought to fund fully job training programs so that States can guarantee people a slot in a job training program.

Many argue, Democratic and Republican witnesses, that the benefit is too inadequate, that we need to expand the benefit, because contrary to what you hear oftentimes on this floor about SNAP and about how generous the benefit is and that it is like a gravy train, if you will, the average SNAP benefit is \$1.40 per person per meal. That is it. That is the benefit.

That is why when you talk to the heads of food banks all across the country, in every State in this country, they tell you the same thing, that they experience an uptick in people who need to utilize their services in the middle and toward the end of the month because, basically, the benefit is not enough to carry them through the month so they can put enough food on the table for them and their families.

We have 42 million people in the United States of America, the richest country in the history of the world, who are hungry. I am ashamed of that, and I am ashamed because hunger is a political condition.

What I mean by that is we can solve it, but we don't, because for some reason, this population, these people struggling in poverty, never quite rise to the level as the very wealthy in this country.

We have a budget here that not only cuts SNAP but basically cuts a whole bunch of other programs aimed at helping people get out of poverty and helping struggling middle class families.

Basically, this budget, just so everybody is clear, is kind of a blueprint to help pave the way for the Republican tax cut bill that they are going to produce on this floor in the not-too-distant future.

It was interesting last night in the Rules Committee, we heard people talk about, well, we have to make tough choices because we don't want to saddle our children and our grandchildren and great-grandchildren with debt. Well, if, in fact, my Republican friends get their wish and pass this tax cut, we are told that it will add about \$2.4 trillion to our debt.

The deal is this, Mr. Speaker. One of the faults in their budget is they have

these assumptions that we all know are not true. Like, for example, the Affordable Care Act is going to kind of mysteriously just disappear, and they are going to be able to cut Medicaid by close to \$1 trillion to help offset the cost of their tax cut. But the last time I checked, their repeal barely passed this House, and it can't seem to get anywhere in the United States Senate. Their assumptions are fantasy. They are not based on reality.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just food assistance that this budget dismantles. It cuts half a trillion dollars in Medicare and ends the Medicare guarantee. It rips apart the Affordable Care Act, drastically raising healthcare costs for older and low-income adults, and kicks another 20 million people off their health insurance if they get their wish here. It makes higher education more expensive. It cuts veterans' benefits. It reduces our commitment to ensuring that our neighbors have access to affordable housing. It even sticks the American taxpayer with a \$1.6 billion bill to begin constructing a costly and stupid and ineffective wall along the U.S. southern border with Mexico.

In case people are scratching their heads, during the campaign, Donald Trump said that Mexico was going to pay for the wall. I guess he didn't mean it because a downpayment was put into their budget.

I could go on and on and on, but you might ask yourself, Mr. Speaker: Who wins? The answer is simple. If this budget goes through, and they pave the way for their tax cut, it is clear who the winners are: Donald Trump, the Trump family, and all of his wealthy friends. While all these cuts in the budget come from our safety net programs, infrastructure investments, and programs that help middle and working class families, none of the savings in this budget—that is right, not one penny—come from closing tax loopholes that benefit big corporations or the wealthy.

As I said before, the drastic cuts are all being used to try to finance this massive tax cut that disproportionately benefits the wealthiest in this country. Give me a break.

Mr. Speaker, it is galling how indifferent that so many in this House seem to be to those who are struggling in poverty. America's most vulnerable, granted they don't have super PACs, they don't have big lobbyists, their voice in Washington is supposed to be us. The whole purpose of government, in my view, is to make sure that everybody gets a fair shake, and the people who need government the most are the people who are struggling in poverty.

But to listen to my colleagues and to look at this budget that they put together, it is clear that the poorest Americans in this country are being treated as if they don't exist, as if they are invisible, as if they don't matter. I just find that deeply offensive.

President Kennedy said it this way. He said: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich." It is frustrating. It is just frustrating that here we are with this budget which devastates so much of what I think is important.

If we implemented what this budget asks us to do, this country would become a tale of two cities, and it is already getting to that point. It would truly become a tale of two cities. It would create a government without a conscience, and I think we need to push back and we need to reject that.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't some Ayn Rand fantasy where we can just mess with the numbers and see what happens. We are talking about real people here—people who are counting on us; people who need help. This budget fails by any measure, in my opinion, to be a budget even for Republicans to support.

I think America's hardworking middle class families and all those working to struggle to get in the middle class deserve a heck of a lot better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and certainly vote against this cruel Republican budget, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, you heard the passion of my friend from Massachusetts, and I have had an opportunity to work with him on the Rules Committee for 7 years now. I can tell you that every bit of that passion is sincere.

So often I think folks turn on C-SPAN, they look at a group of politicians talking, and they think it is all for the cameras and it is all for show. I will tell you that while I sometimes have that same suspicion when I turn on a program of folks I don't know, with folks I do know, I can tell you that that passion is sincere.

What I can also tell you is that many of those concerns are misguided, and I think that is important. What happens here in this institution matters. Our ability to have that debate with one another matters. The truth is, as you know, Mr. Speaker, most of that debate doesn't happen here on the House floor.

My friend from Massachusetts and I are here today because it is time to vote. We are here to bring the rule, we are here to bring the substitutes, we are here over the next 2 days to vote. The conversation has gone on not for a day, not for a week, not for a month, but for the better part of this year on what the budget is going to look like.

I happen to have a copy of the budget report right here, Mr. Speaker. It captures all the votes we have taken. It captures all the debates we have had. It captures what the intent of the institution is.

Now again, we are going to have a choice of which budget we want to sup-

port. If you think taxes are too low, you can vote to raise taxes. If you think taxes are much too low, you can vote to raise taxes a whole lot. If you think the tax code as it exists today is a ridiculous compilation of confusing provisions stitched together by a patchwork of Congresses over the last 40 years, you can vote for fundamental reform.

If you are tired of the fact that America used to be number one in the world in terms of tax competitiveness and now we are at the bottom of the list and you want to take America back to being number one, you can vote for that, too. I happen to put myself in that category.

I want to read, if I may, Mr. Speaker, from the budget report. The fact is, I can't. I imagined myself a younger man when I grabbed that report.

If I can now read from the budget report. "The resolution's reconciliation instructions," that is what is in the budget, Mr. Speaker. That is what allows us to take a tax package from the House to the Senate. You have heard about how the Senate is having a tough time getting anything done because it requires a supermajority. It requires 60 votes. Through reconciliation, you can get things done with less than 60 votes. That is how the Affordable Care Act was passed, with less than 60 votes. You can get the tax bill passed with less than 60 votes.

It says this. "The resolution's reconciliation instructions that the Committee on Ways and Means will develop will be a deficit-neutral tax reform legislation and report such legislative language to the Committee on the Budget." Deficit neutral. Nobody wants to blow a hole in the budget, Mr. Speaker.

What the discussion is, is can we do better than today's tax code? Candidly, Mr. Speaker, if any Member of this body wants to take the position that we can't do any better, the IRS is as good as it can be in implementing the American Tax Code today, the Tax Code that is twice as long as the Bible is absolutely as concise and succinct as it can possibly be, those Americans who spend dozens of hours, even dozens of days, even dozens of weeks trying to put together their taxes, that is just the best we can do.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen it happen. Sometimes folks throw their hands up and think: We can't do any better. Not me. Not today.

We can all agree that we can do better than what we are doing today. Passage of this budget gives us that opportunity.

You heard my friend from Massachusetts speak from the heart, Mr. Speaker, about the ability we have as a government to care for one another. I would tell you that responsibility isn't uniquely a government responsibility. I would say it is a faith responsibility, it is a family responsibility, it is a com-

munity responsibility. It is a responsibility that begins at home. It doesn't begin here, it begins at home, but it is a sincere responsibility, and it is one that we want to do better at every day.

I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the labor force participation rate in America is the lowest it has been since the President from my great State of Georgia, Jimmy Carter, was in office. The labor force participation rate. There is not one of us in this body who can drive down the street without seeing a "help wanted" sign. There is not one of us in this body who can go out to a business without seeing someone asking folks to come in and help, yet fewer Americans are working today than ever before. Why? It is a hard question.

Fewer Americans are working today than since the 1970s. Why? It is important that we ask that question.

The budget is not designed to answer it. The budget can't answer it. I sit on the Budget Committee. I don't have the jurisdiction to answer it, but I know this: you will find in this budget a discussion of whether it is better to support people in poverty or lift folks out of poverty.

□ 1300

It doesn't have to be mutually exclusive. I would tell you that we can support people until we can lift them up, but that lifting them up must be our goal. Supporting them is not enough.

You will find it here, Mr. Speaker, in these pages. This is a vision document. This is what we are gathered together to do today, and we will have legitimate disagreements about when we are doing enough in a particular area and when we are doing too much.

There are those in this body, Mr. Speaker, who believe passionately in education. I am one of those people. I come from a district with amazing school systems.

You can go to any public school in my district, Mr. Speaker, if you work hard and apply yourself. I don't care what your background is, I don't care where your family is from, I don't care what you have stacked against you; if you work hard and apply yourself in our public schools, you can be anything you want to be.

I know everybody wants that for their constituency back home; and I have colleagues who believe that only Washington, D.C., is successful enough, has a track record of success strong enough to implement that vision back home.

I don't come from that camp. I see a lot of failure come out of Washington, D.C. I see a lot of bureaucracy come out of Washington, D.C. I see success come out of parents and teachers and principals back home raising taxes, supporting those institutions, making sure every child has a chance. We do that together as a community.

The discussion that we might have in this institution, Mr. Speaker, is not: Do you believe in education?

It is: Do you believe educators in Washington, D.C., have the best answers, or educators back home in your district have the answers?

The truth is that we don't have many educators in Washington, D.C. We have bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., who oversee educators. I side with my educators back home. It is a legitimate disagreement that we are welcome to have.

What can't be said, though, Mr. Speaker, is that there are any disagreements over these next few days that we are not going to be allowed to have. I have said it before, and I will say it again because it makes me so proud. We don't always have time or make room for all the voices in this institution, Mr. Speaker. You know, sometimes we pick and choose winners and losers, whose voice is going to be heard. Not today. Any Member of Congress could submit their budget to the United States House of Representatives Committee on Rules.

It is a hard thing to produce a budget. I told you I have done it before, Mr. Speaker. It takes a lot of time, a lot of effort, a lot of commitment. But if you believe that you have a better idea, you can do it. And if you did it, we made it in order in the Rules Committee last night and we are going to debate it on the floor and we are going to vote on it on the floor.

We can't always say that every single idea, every single substitute is going to make it to the floor for a vote. We can say that today. I am proud that we can.

It is not going to stop the disagreements, Mr. Speaker, but what it is going to do is air those disagreements; what it is going to do is allow us to talk about our differing visions; and what it is going to do is allow us to come together on a common vision at the end of the day.

I hope my colleagues will support this rule so we can begin that process, and I hope my colleagues will support the underlying budget of their choice.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in opposition to the Republican budget.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF
CATHOLIC BISHOPS,
Washington, DC, August 31, 2017.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As Congress proceeds with the 2018 budget process, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) reaffirms that the federal budget is a moral document with profound implications for the common good of our nation and world. The budget requires difficult decisions that ought to be guided by moral

criteria that protect human life and dignity, give central importance to "the least of these" (Matthew 25), and promote the welfare of workers and families who struggle to live in dignity.

The Catholic Church teaches that it is the role of the state to promote the three pillars of the common good. In May 2017, we outlined these three pillars: respect for the fundamental and inalienable rights of the human person, promotion of human development, and defense of peace. Our Conference has long supported the goal of reducing future unsustainable deficits that would harm all citizens, especially those who are poor. However, a just framework for sound fiscal policy cannot rely almost exclusively on disproportionate cuts in essential services to poor and vulnerable persons.

Sharp increases in defense and immigration enforcement spending, coupled with simultaneous and severe reductions to non-defense discretionary spending, particularly to many domestic and international programs that assist the most vulnerable, are profoundly troubling. The House Budget Committee's H. Con. Res. 71 proposes increasing defense spending by \$929 billion over the next decade, which is \$72 billion above sequester levels. This is coupled with a proposal to cut \$4.4 trillion over the same period from domestic and international programs that assist the most vulnerable, potentially impacting health care safety net programs like Medicaid, Medicare, and CHIP, as well as food security programs like SNAP. The proposal would also reduce current funding levels for environmental stewardship by \$824 million.

Such deep cuts would harm people facing dire circumstances, and would place the environment and natural resources at risk. When the impact of other potential legislative proposals, including the proposed reduction of spending on health care by hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade and implementation of tax policies that would offer trillions of dollars in tax cuts to the wealthy over the same period are considered, the prospects for vulnerable people become even bleaker.

Our nation should elevate diplomacy, along with humanitarian and international development assistance, as primary tools for promoting lasting peace, regional stability and human rights. The USCCB urges Congress to reject H. Con. Res. 71's proposed fiscal year 2018 budget authority level of \$41.521 billion for the International Affairs functions of government. This would represent a \$10 billion cut from this year's appropriations for those functions. Although the USCCB does not support every individual International Affairs account, it has repeatedly called for robust diplomatic efforts to end longstanding conflicts in a range of countries, including Syria and Iraq, as well as for robust funding for refugee and humanitarian assistance. It is hard to reconcile the need for diplomacy, political solutions, and life-saving humanitarian and development assistance with cuts to the State Department budget of the magnitude proposed by H. Con. Res. 71.

At the same time, H. Con. Res. 71 anticipates dramatic increases in immigration enforcement spending. We fear that such increases could pave the way for enactment of many of the destructive proposals contained in recently released budget plans, including increases in immigrant detention beds, the construction of a wall along the entire border between the United States and Mexico, and the expansion of agreements with state

and local governments that threaten local law enforcement's ability to foster trusting relationships with immigrants in their jurisdictions. Any changes to the tax code called for through reconciliation should include a provision to empower the educational choices of families. The reconciliation process should not be used to achieve savings through cutting health care, nutrition, income security, or other anti-poverty programs. This budget attempts to use the reconciliation process to fast-track over \$200 billion in cuts to anti-poverty programs over the next ten years, including Medicaid and Medicare. The bishops have devoted their efforts to addressing the morally problematic features of health care reform while insuring that all people have access to health care coverage.

The human consequences of budget choices are clear to us as pastors. Our Catholic community defends the unborn and the undocumented, feeds the hungry, shelters the homeless, educates the young, and cares for the sick, both at home and abroad. We help mothers facing challenging situations of pregnancy, poor families rising above crushing poverty, refugees fleeing conflict and persecution, and communities devastated by wars, natural disasters and famines. In much of this work, we are partners with government. Our combined resources allow us to reach further and help more. Our institutions are present in every state and throughout the world, serving some of the most marginalized communities and enjoying the trust of local populations.

The moral measure of the federal budget is how well it promotes the common good of all, especially the most vulnerable whose voices are too often missing in these debates. The Catholic Bishops of the United States stand ready to work with leaders of both parties for a federal budget that reduces future deficits, protects poor and vulnerable people, and advances peace and the common good.

Sincerely yours,

HIS EMINENCE TIMOTHY
CARDINAL DOLAN,
*Archbishop of New
York, Chairman,
Committee on Pro-
Life Activities.*

MOST REV. OSCAR CANTÚ,
*Bishop of Las Cruces,
Chairman, Com-
mittee on Inter-
national Justice and
Peace.*

MOST REV. CHRISTOPHER J.
COYNE,
*Bishop of Burlington,
Chairman, Com-
mittee on Commu-
nications.*

MOST REV. FRANK J.
DEWANE,
*Bishop of Venice,
Chairman, Com-
mittee on Domestic
Justice and Human
Development.*

MOST REV. GEORGE V.
MURRY, SJ,
*Bishop of Youngs-
town, Chairman,
Committee on Catho-
lic Education.*

MOST REV. JOE S.
VÁSQUEZ,
*Bishop of Austin,
Chairman, Com-
mittee on Migration.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the

Coalition on Human Needs against the Republican budget.

COALITION ON HUMAN NEEDS,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Coalition on Human Needs, I strongly urge you to vote no on H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed FY 2018 Budget Resolution, and to vote for the substitute budgets advanced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Democratic alternative budget resolution.

The Coalition on Human Needs is an alliance made up of human service providers, faith organizations, policy experts, labor, civil rights, and other advocates for meeting the needs of low-income and vulnerable people. Our members understand that the economic security of millions of American families depends on building on the progress we've made in health coverage, jobs, basic living standards, and ensuring that our children are well-prepared for productive lives. But the majority's proposed budget does not build—it breaks apart our engines of progress. It will make our nation weaker for decades to come.

The most recent survey data on poverty in the U.S. shows the biggest two-year decline since the late 1960's. Refundable tax credits for working families, SNAP/food stamps and housing subsidies have lifted multi-millions of people out of poverty. The decline in the proportion of our population without health insurance continued its decline in 2016, down to 8.8 percent. More people are working, and in general, low- and moderate-income households have finally started to make income gains.

The budget advanced by the House Budget Committee would be a dangerous backwards plunge, stripping trillions of dollars from programs that work to reduce poverty and create security and opportunity. Medicaid, Medicare, working family tax credits, nutrition assistance, education and housing assistance: these are just some of the services the budget would massively cut. The budget takes trillions in funding that supports economic security and progress and hands it to the wealthy and corporations in the form of enormous tax cuts.

The primary goal of H. Con. Res. 71 is to allow huge tax cuts to be enacted with only a simple majority in the Senate. These tax cuts are claimed to be a critical element in increasing economic growth enough to make the tax cuts deficit neutral. Reputable economists are skeptical that the proposed tax cuts would boost the economy to the 2.6 percent average growth projected in the budget and acknowledge that tax cuts to corporations and the rich deepen the deficit. History supports this: the economy grew and unemployment declined more during the Clinton tax increase years than during the Bush era tax cuts. And the Kansas experience with tax cuts is cautionary: revenues plummeted, with the tax take in 2016 \$570 million lower than in 2013, even after counting increases enacted in sales and cigarette taxes. The economic growth that did occur from cutting taxes was estimated to bring in about \$30 million, leaving the state very deeply in the hole. The state legislature has recently reversed course, unwilling to slash education budgets as much as the revenue hole would have forced. They saw that they were weakening their state. Congress should not inflict the same dangerous lesson on the entire nation.

We urge you to reject H. Con. Res. 71 because of its central choice: paying for tax cuts that overwhelmingly favor the rich and

corporations with cuts to essential services. Our nation faces major challenges: reducing disproportionate poverty among children and helping children and young adults to advance in education so they can meet the challenges in our economic future, protecting seniors in their retirement, and rebuilding communities. Both the emergency needs of communities devastated by natural disasters and the similarly urgent threats from opioids and other epidemics, decaying infrastructure and inadequate public health and consumer protections demand a vigorous federal response. Instead of making these investments, the House budget would cripple the federal capacity to respond by slashing domestic appropriations by 44 percent compared with FY 2010 levels over the next decade and making similarly extreme cuts in health care, nutrition, income assistance for seniors, people with disabilities, and working families. In addition to trillions of dollars in cuts and structural constraints to basic mandatory programs, the budget would fast-track \$203 billion in cuts to domestic programs over the next ten years through reconciliation rules. Cuts like these would recklessly weaken us; they are self-inflicted wounds.

The proposed tax cuts will worsen inequality and reward businesses that park their income offshore. Instead, Congress should insist that corporations and the rich pay their fair share. Please vote against weakening America, and instead protect and expand investments as called for in the budgets proposed by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the House Budget Committee Democrats' substitute. These three constructive alternatives deserve your yes vote.

Sincerely yours,

DEBORAH WEINSTEIN,
Executive Director.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to all Members of Congress from the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda against this Republican budget.

NATIONAL HISPANIC
LEADERSHIP AGENDA,
July 26, 2017.

Re NHLA opposition to House Budget Resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda (NHLA), the coalition of the nation's 45 pre-eminent Latino advocacy organizations, we are writing to express our deep concerns with the budget resolution that recently passed out of the House Budget Committee and urge you to vote against passage of the resolution if it comes to the House floor. The resolution threatens the basic living standards of tens of millions of Americans in order to subsidize tax cuts for the wealthy. From education and scientific research to basic assistance and health programs, the House budget would cut \$4.4 trillion from entitlement programs and \$1.3 trillion from non-defense discretionary programs over the next decade, crippling the most important drivers of our nation's economic engine—working families. For these reasons, and those detailed further below, NHLA will consider any votes on the budget resolution for inclusion in future NHLA scorecards evaluating the support of Members of Congress for the Latino community.

Budget resolutions serve as fiscal blueprints that signal the priorities of govern-

ment spending to support all Americans in their attainment of the American Dream. However, rather than seek to bolster opportunities for American working families, the House budget places the burden of reducing our deficit squarely on the backs of families struggling to make ends meet in order to give tax breaks to wealthy corporations and individuals. Rather than investing in America's future homebuyers, workers, and students, both the House budget and President Trump's budget undermine the progress our country has made and prioritize corporate interests over those of hardworking American families.

The trillions of dollars of cuts in the House budget would have a catastrophic impact on the millions of Latinos who struggle to put food on their tables and a roof over their heads. Recent research by UnidosUS (formerly NCLR) provides evidence of the strong impact of federal assistance programs on lifting millions of Latinos, especially children, out of poverty. In 2015, for example:

Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) lifted about 2.7 million Latinos out of poverty, including 1.4 million children.

Child Tax Credit (CTC) lifted an estimated 981,000 Latinos out of poverty, including 560,000 children.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) lifted an estimated 1.3 million Latinos out of poverty, including 640,000 children.

Rental assistance lifted about 720,000 Latinos out of poverty, including 270,000 children.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI) lifted an estimated 630,000 Latinos out of poverty, including 140,000 children.

The House budget resolution would threaten the effectiveness of many of these programs. The budget plan also calls for cuts to Medicaid and other health programs more severe than the House-passed bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Further, the House budget resolution dismantles consumer and worker protections, jeopardizing the ability of Latino and all working families to build and maintain wealth. The budget plan not only guts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—the only agency whose sole mission is to protect Americans from predatory practices in the financial marketplace—but also undermines our nation's workforce, cutting funding for the Wage and Hour Division in the Department of Labor more deeply than proposed in the Trump budget. Additionally, Latino workers cannot afford cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency, which protects our human health and environment from toxic chemicals. Working families need more and better enforcement of consumer financial and labor protection laws to protect Americans from abuse, and also ensure law-abiding financial service providers, as well as employers, are not harmed by unfair competition by unscrupulous actors.

Simply put, the House budget resolution would harm American families and workers, especially Latinos, making our nation more inequitable and less prepared for economic challenges. We strongly urge Members of Congress to oppose the House budget plan and instead support a budget that defends the interests of the American public and prudently spends taxpayer dollars.

Sincerely,

HECTOR SANCHEZ BARBA,
Chair, NHLA, Executive Director, Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA).

BRUCE GOLDSTEIN,
Co-Chair, NHLA Economic Empowerment and Labor Committee, President, Farmworker Justice.

ERIC RODRIGUEZ,
Co-Chair, NHLA Economic Empowerment and Labor Committee, Vice President, UnidosUS.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the AARP, the Main Street Alliance, and the League of Conservation Voters, all in strong opposition to the Republican budget.

AARP,

Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of over 38 million members and other Americans who are age 50 and older, AARP is writing to communicate our views as you consider H. Con. Res. 71, the House Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018. As the process moves forward, AARP urges you to support Social Security, Medicare, and other key programs that millions of Americans depend upon for their health and financial security and oppose proposals that would hurt older Americans.

MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Our members count on Social Security and Medicare and believe they should be protected and strengthened for today's seniors and future generations. Proposals creating a defined contribution premium-support program; restricting access by raising the age of eligibility; or allowing hospitals and providers to arbitrarily charge consumers higher prices than Medicare can make health care unaffordable for older Americans. These proposals do little to actually lower the cost of health care, but simply shift costs from Medicare onto individuals—many of whom cannot afford to pay more for their care. We urge you not to include attempts to cut Medicare benefits or increase beneficiary costs in the upcoming budget proposal.

The typical senior, with an annual income of around \$25,000 and already spending one out of every six dollars on health care, counts on Social Security for the majority of their income, and on Medicare for access to affordable health coverage. We will continue to oppose changes to current law that cut benefits, increase costs, or reduce the ability of these critical programs to deliver on their benefit promises. We urge you to continue to do so as well.

MEDICAID, LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS AND SNAP

Medicaid serves as a critical safety net for millions of people in every state, including over 17 million poor elderly and children and adults with disabilities, who rely on vital Medicaid health and long-term care services. Efforts to reduce or cap Medicaid funding could endanger the health, safety, and care of millions of individuals who depend on the essential services provided through this program. Furthermore, caps could result in significant cost-shifts to state governments unable to shoulder the costs of care without sufficient federal support. Instead of arbitrary caps, proposals should focus on efforts to improve Medicaid, such as encouraging more individuals to receive services in their homes and communities rather than costly institutional care.

SNAP plays a vital role in feeding millions of hungry Americans, including over four

million older Americans. Proposals to block grant the program, or impose work requirements will make SNAP less responsive and accessible in times of need; and without clear work requirement exemptions for the elderly and disabled, would bar these individuals from receiving SNAP benefits.

We ask you to reject the cuts proposed in H. Con. Res. 71. We stand ready to work with you to develop proposals that protect and improve Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and SNAP.

Sincerely,

JO ANN C. JENKINS,
Chief Executive Officer.

JOYCE A. ROGERS,
SVP Government Affairs, AARP.

MAIN STREET ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, October 2, 2017.

Re H. Con. Res. 71, Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Resolution.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: Main Street Alliance, a network of small business owners throughout the country, strongly urges you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Resolution. This budget, if enacted into law, would cut \$3.4 trillion from Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, education, employment and training, food and housing assistance, and infrastructure spending over the next 10 years. This will significantly harm small business owners and their employees, damage local economies, and decimate state budgets.

Millions of small business owners, their employees, and their families rely on Medicaid and Medicare for access to healthcare critical to their survival. The House Budget Resolution would strip them of their health coverage. The proposed budget would slash \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and other health programs, and gut Medicare by \$500 billion, transforming both from systems in which beneficiaries are guaranteed certain levels of coverage, to a capped amount per enrollee. Work requirements would also be imposed on Medicaid. This puts 69 million Medicaid recipients and 57 million Medicare beneficiaries at risk for a loss in services, including millions of small business owners and their employees.

Healthcare, education, food, and housing costs would skyrocket under the House Budget, devastating local economies and small businesses that depend on consumer demand from customers in their communities. In addition to the deep cuts to healthcare, the budget would cut \$150 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, which enables nearly 22 million families to put food on the table, and eliminate \$90 billion from education, training, employment, and social services programs, significantly scaling back Pell Grants, which help nearly 8 million students afford college. These draconian spending cuts would force vulnerable and working families to pay more for vital programs, resulting in a reduction in their disposal income and the amount of money they can spend on goods and services. Small business owners would see a decline in customers.

The House budget cuts would siphon trillions of dollars out of state economies from 2018 to 2027. Because the block grant funding scheme provides a fixed amount of Medicaid and Medicare funding for states each year, the proposal would also leave states on the

hook for any and all unexpected healthcare costs from recessions, natural disasters, public health emergencies, or prescription drug price spikes, and unaccounted costs like the aging of the population. The deep reductions in federal healthcare, education, employment and training, food and housing assistance, and infrastructure spending would force states to make up the difference, drastically cutting the quality of services offered. As state budgets contract, employment would decrease and small businesses would decline.

The impact of the House Budget Resolution on small businesses will be felt in the loss of vital services, reduced business, and contracted state budgets. We urge you to protect Main Street small businesses owners, working families, communities, and economies, and oppose the House Budget Resolution. Reject any budget that enables tax cuts for the very wealthy and large profitable corporations to lose revenue, since it will force deep cuts in vital programs that harm small business.

Signed,

AMANDA BALLANTYNE,
National Director, Main Street Alliance.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

Re Oppose FY18 House Budget Resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on H. Con. Res. 71. This budget resolution includes a huge giveaway to oil and gas companies by paving the way for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of America's most iconic landscapes. It threatens environmental and public health safeguards, provides tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, and slashes programs and protections that benefit communities across the country, among other harmful provisions.

The House budget resolution puts some of our most iconic landscapes at risk. It contains reconciliation instructions that aim to open up the pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and possibly other public lands and waters to drilling. The Arctic Refuge is one of the largest remaining intact ecosystems in the world. It has sustained the Gwich'in people for centuries and is home to an incredible array of wildlife, including caribou, wolves, polar bears, and nearly 200 species of migratory birds. We have a moral obligation to protect this natural treasure and to transition to a clean energy future.

Following in the footsteps of the Trump administration's unconscionable budget proposal, the House Republican leadership's budget resolution would make dangerous cuts to programs that benefit the most vulnerable in our society while benefitting polluters. Included in the resolution are provisions that will lead to trillions of dollars of cuts to health care and programs that provide basic living standards for struggling families, as well as other substantial cuts. Meanwhile, it would account for \$1.6 billion of federal funds to pay for a xenophobic and environmentally harmful border wall. Rather than investing in safeguards for clean air and water, protections for our national parks

and other public lands that drive our outdoor recreation economy, and growing clean energy industries, this budget sells out those priorities to pay for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires and for gifts to corporate special interests.

We urge you to REJECT H. Con. Res. 71 and will strongly consider including the vote on this bill in the 2017 Scorecard.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that it is clear that, certainly on the Democratic side, we are very much dedicated to trying to lift people out of poverty. That is one of the reasons why we oppose this Republican budget that cuts \$211 million from financial aid programs to help people be able to get additional higher education. That is one of the reasons why we have complained loudly about the inadequate funding for job training. You want people to train for employment, you need to make sure that those slots are available so that people can get the training and the assistance they need.

The gentleman says: Don't worry about the debt because the reconciliation instructions will instruct the Ways and Means Committee to do a deficit neutral tax plan.

Well, I mean, there is lots of stuff in here that are assumptions that aren't true, like, you repealed the Affordable Care Act. That didn't happen and it is not going to happen.

And what we are told from the Tax Policy Center and the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, according to their analysis, is that what the Republicans are proposing in terms of their tax plan will basically cost well over \$2 trillion, and that will be added to our debt.

So I don't—we can debate fantasyland if we want, but the reality is the reality, and this budget is a bad deal for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, this week, our Nation witnessed the deadliest mass shooting in history. We have endured horrific mass killings in Newtown, San Bernardino, Orlando, and now Las Vegas, among many others, all without any congressional action. The killings happen every single day on our streets, at public events, and even in our homes.

Mr. Speaker, my heart broke when the children of Sandy Hook were killed, and I remain absolutely stunned that this Congress has done nothing about it, nothing.

Now 59 people lost their lives in Las Vegas during what was supposed to be a celebratory event, a concert, and this is only 16 months after the last deadly mass shooting in Orlando. Gun violence in this country is out of control, and all we have done is cater to the gun lobby.

The United States Congress is a legislative body, Mr. Speaker. We are not

a think tank or a church or a synagogue. Thoughts and prayers are not what this country expects from us, and it is not what it needs from us. The people of this country need us to act, to pass laws that protect their lives and their children's lives.

As my colleague in the Senate, Senator CHRIS MURPHY, has said: "This must stop. It is positively infuriating that my colleagues in Congress are so afraid of the gun industry that they pretend that there aren't any public policy responses to this epidemic. There are. And the thoughts and prayers of politicians are cruelly hollow if they are paired with legislative indifference."

For this reason, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Mr. THOMPSON's bill, H. Res. 367, which I am a cosponsor of, which would establish the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain what I mean when I say "defeat the previous question." We are here debating which bills will come to the House floor this week, the agenda for the House of Representatives. The majority chose to consider their misguided budget. Fine. We can do that.

But what I am saying is that we should also take the first step in at least setting up a committee to look at gun violence in America. So if we say no to ending debate on this rule, by defeating the previous question, we can then debate whether or not to create this committee. This is the least we can do.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was almost 5 years ago that this Nation witnessed the terrible tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School, where 20 first graders were murdered in their classrooms, along with six of their teachers. Congress did nothing.

A church in Charleston, a White supremacist walked in and murdered nine worshippers. Congress did nothing. And worse than that, Congress didn't even address what is called the "Charleston loophole" that allowed this deranged White supremacist to be able to buy a gun or obtain a gun that he was buying without completing the background check.

Orlando, Florida, the nightclub: 49 people murdered. Congress did nothing.

The congressional baseball game, one of our own was shot by some deranged murderer. Congress did nothing.

Las Vegas, just these past days, a country music festival: 59 people murdered. The biggest mass shooting in the history of the United States of America. Even as sad, it is the 273rd mass shooting in the United States of America this year.

So what is Congress going to do? More of nothing? That is not appropriate.

In the almost 5 years since Sandy Hook, we have been working on our side of the aisle diligently to try and come up with some ideas, some solutions to help prevent gun violence, and we have come up with some. As a matter of fact, one of them is a bipartisan measure with a bipartisan coauthor on my bill, Mr. PETER KING from New York, and we have four or five Republican coauthors on that bill.

Have we had a hearing?

No.

Have we had a vote?

No.

All we are trying to do with that bill is expand background checks to make sure that criminals and the dangerously mentally ill can't buy firearms easily; make it more difficult for these people, who we know commit crimes with these guns, to get their hands on a gun. It is within the confines of the Second Amendment. It just expands the already existing background checks to include commercial sale of firearms across the country. No hearings, no votes.

Instead, our friends on the other side of the aisle have their own gun agenda. They want to legalize silencers. They want to remove the restrictions on silencers. Police entities, officers, chiefs, and sheriffs across the country have told us that this is dangerous. It puts the people that we represent at risk, but that is their gun agenda.

If you don't like the ideas that we have brought forward, please bring something forward, other than deregulating silencers, that will help with this epidemic that we are facing in our country.

Thirty people a day are killed by someone using a gun.

What are your ideas?

Nothing. Silence.

The only thing we have heard now is we hear from your leadership that we are not going to discuss policy in regard to gun violence prevention.

Well, that is why we came to Congress. That is why every one of us ran for Congress, to work on policy. That is why our constituents sent us to Congress, to vote on policy.

But on the heels of 59 people being murdered the day before yesterday, what are we told?

That we are not going to do policy on gun violence prevention.

That is not responsible.

The bill that my friend, Mr. McGovern, talked about, my bill that he is a coauthor on, would establish a Select

Committee, Democrats and Republicans, to sit down at the same table and try and find some solutions to help prevent gun violence, and then move that to the House for consideration. That is all we want.

We want these issues to be heard. We want to be able to do our job. Our constituents want a vote on these issues that are important to the safety of every single person in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we defeat the previous question.

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

If you have not tuned in to this debate until just these past few minutes, you might not know that this is the budget debate today. We have been prepping for the budget debate today for about 10 months now, and we are ready today not just with one budget, but with a variety of budget choices. And what is wonderful about this process is it has been such an open process.

You can come down to the House floor and air absolutely any idea that is on your mind. That has not just been true today, Mr. Speaker, but that has been true throughout this entire budget process. In fact, I have a letter signed by literally hundreds of groups that support not just voting on the rule to bring the budget to the floor, but groups that support passing the budget as we passed it out of the House Budget Committee.

Now, if my colleagues have any concerns about that, I hope they will come and knock on my door, Mr. Speaker, because I promise you that one of these groups is going to be from their part of the country.

Certainly, in Georgia, the Georgia Chamber of Commerce is on that list. So our folks back home are supportive. If you are from Alabama, I have got Alabamans on here. If you are from Baton Rouge, I have got Baton Rouge. If you are from Battle Creek, I have Battle Creek, because what we are working on here isn't a Republican budget, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1315

What we are working on isn't a regional budget. What we are working on here is the national budget for the United States of America that can be transformational for absolutely every citizen in absolutely every corner of this country.

We have that opportunity. I think we are going to seize that opportunity, but we can't do it until we move this rule to get to the underlying bills. I encourage my colleagues to do that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I include in the RECORD letters from the UAW, the SEIU, The National Treasury Employees Union, AFSCME,

the American Federation of Government Employees, and NARFE.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED
AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS
OF AMERICA—UAW,

Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), I am writing to strongly urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the House Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 budget resolution. The federal budget is a moral document as well as a fiscal blueprint, and H. Con. Res. 71 fails spectacularly on both fronts. This draconian budget would be a disaster for our economy, the middle class and our most vulnerable citizens.

The proposed budget forces working people and retirees to pay for enormous tax cuts to the wealthy. Despite claims to the contrary, by 2027, roughly 30 percent of households earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000 would see an increase in their taxes. H. Con. Res. 71 cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid and ends the programs as we know them. Medicaid and Medicare are literal lifelines for many of our most vulnerable citizens—especially children and the elderly. Medicaid is the largest provider of nursing home and long-term care.

This radical piece of legislation creates fast-track procedures to implement the tax cuts that will overwhelmingly benefit the wealthy and multinational corporations. The average tax cut for millionaires would be \$230,000 a year by 2027. It eliminates the estate tax, which currently only applies to the top two tenths of one percent of estates, giving the ultra-wealthy \$239 billion in tax cuts. By 2027, 80% of tax cuts will go to the top one percent.

It also uses these procedures to make at least \$203 billion in cuts to mandatory programs that are important for working families and our most vulnerable citizens. In total, this budget assumes \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts. Cuts of this magnitude would almost certainly lead to slashing funding for Legal Services Corporation, federal employee pensions, nutritional assistance infrastructure, and unemployment compensation, to name a few. It also repeals the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and the Affordable Care Act.

This budget resolution takes America in the wrong direction. We have tried “trickle down” economics several times in the past; it did not work then and it will not work now. These tax cuts will not pay for themselves. Instead, they will come at the expense of hardworking every day Americans—many of whom have trouble affording basic necessities today.

We strongly urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71 and instead work on a federal budget that invests in our country and works for ALL Americans.

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,
Legislative Director.

SEIU STRONGER TOGETHER,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union (“SEIU”), I write to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the FY18 House budget resolution. This budget would further rig the system against working Americans by slashing resources that help families afford basic needs like healthcare, food, and education—all to pave the way for tax cuts for corpora-

tions and the wealthy. SEIU believes The People's Budget is a better way forward for working families. While the House Republican budget would continue to leave working families behind, The People's Budget makes American workers its first priority through critical investments in health care, education, and infrastructure.

The first goal of any elected representative should be to improve the lives of their constituents. H. Con. Res. 71 fails to meet this standard. To pay for tax giveaways for the wealthy and corporations, the budget resolution includes reconciliation instructions that would significantly undermine basic living standards for families. For example, under the reconciliation instructions, committees are directed to make cuts of \$203 billion dollars over ten years to programs that could include Medicaid, Medicare, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and programs for people with disabilities, which provide critical support for millions of Americans.

By threatening Medicaid, this budget ignores the tens of thousands of people who mobilized month after month to soundly reject efforts to dismantle healthcare and cut Medicaid. Efforts to reduce or cap Medicaid funding put at risk healthcare for 74 million Americans—including children, people with disabilities, and seniors. Hospitals could be forced to close or cut services, further reducing access to care, especially in underserved areas. States—which must balance budgets and already face fiscal pressures—would not be able to make up the lost federal Medicaid dollars and would likely be forced to deny coverage. Furthermore, the cuts would lead to significant job loss in the healthcare industry, one of the fastest growing sectors in our economy.

In contrast, The People's Budget would focus on reforms to increase access, affordability, and quality of health care by building on the foundation of the Affordable Care Act (“ACA”). In its entirety, it would move the nation's health care system closer to achieving universal coverage, while ensuring that working families would have affordable care. At the same time, it would invest in developing innovative care delivery models that control costs and increase quality. The People's Budget would put America's health care system on the right path forward.

The House Republican budget, however, would compound the proposed Medicaid cuts with potential cuts to Medicare, Social Security Disability Insurance, and nutrition assistance. The budget doubles down on its harm to seniors and people with disabilities and further shift costs to states. The cumulative impact of the deep cuts proposed in this budget would force states to make drastic spending and job cuts, raise taxes, or both. This budget pressure would likely also trickle down to local governments in the form of decreased funding to cities and counties, creating a fiscal crisis in communities across the nation.

While H. Con. Res. 71 would force Americans to make a false choice between programs that are essential to their communities and tax giveaways for the wealthy, The People's Budget invests in American communities through a robust infrastructure program and makes debt free college a reality for all students—without sacrificing health care for millions of Americans. The House Republican budget makes no such commitment to education, and its steep cuts create the potential for state budget crises that put education programs and working families' futures in jeopardy. Trickle-down

economics have left America's middle class behind for decades. It is time we turn the page towards an economy that is designed for working families and aimed at improving their lives.

The proposed FY18 House Budget Resolution is a disaster for America's working families. By decimating programs that provide healthcare, food, housing, and education to set the stage for massive tax cuts for the wealthy and corporations, this budget is an attack on our communities' quality of life. We respectfully urge you to reject the proposed budget resolution, and instead support The People's Budget which would prioritize working families in building an economy that works for everyone. We will add votes on H. Con. Res. 71 to our legislative scorecard.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY
EMPLOYEES UNION,

Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As National President of the National Treasury Employees Union, I represent over 150,000 dedicated federal employees at 31 agencies. I am writing to ask you to VOTE NO on the House Budget Resolution, H. Con Res 71.

The House Budget Resolution instructs the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to produce at least \$32 billion in cuts to programs under its jurisdiction, which are federal employee benefit programs. While the Budget Committee recommended sizable cuts to federal employee retirement, it is important to highlight that this program has been utilized in recent years to help pay for both infrastructure and unemployment insurance. This was twice accomplished by increasing the amount federal employees contribute toward their retirement benefits, and occurred against a backdrop of a multi-year pay freeze, further squeezing employee paychecks. In recent years, federal employees have endured compensation losses of close to \$200 billion for deficit reduction, from the above retirement changes and from reduced pay increases in 2014, 2015, 2016, and in 2017. At a time when private sector raises are averaging 3%, federal wage increases continue to trail behind.

Federal employees play a vital role for taxpayers—ensuring air, water and food safety, border and national security, consumer protections, and preserving our national parks, to name just a few of their functions and missions. Like all Americans, federal employees face ever-increasing food, utility, health care, and college bills, and have rent and mortgage obligations. Families will fall further behind if their take-home pay is slashed or if cost-of-living adjustments, similar to those made to Social Security, military retirement and to veterans' benefits to keep these payments whole, are removed in retirement. These further cuts will also degrade morale, make it difficult for agencies to recruit and retain quality employees, and will erode income security for retirees.

Additionally, I ask you to strongly oppose Representatives McClintock and Walker's Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute that places a severe financial burden on federal employees by eviscerating federal employee compensation, and further unfairly attacks worker protections and labor organizations.

On behalf of our nation's federal employees—who live and work in every state and congressional district across the country—

serving as scientists, accountants, statisticians, park rangers, and law enforcement officers, I ask you to reject the cuts contemplated in the Budget Resolution, and VOTE NO.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,
National President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

Washington, DC, October 2, 2017.

MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year (FY) 2018 budget resolution approved by the House Budget Committee and scheduled to be considered by the full House. This budget plan would impose considerable hardship on many Americans in order to slash taxes for the wealthy and corporations and to boost defense spending.

The budget decisions made by Congress each year are vital to ensuring that the economy is strong and that our communities are safe and prosperous. Yet, this budget completely undercuts responsibility for shared prosperity by applying the same misguided priorities proposed by President Trump. It sets woefully inadequate spending levels for critical public services and cuts over a trillion dollars from non-defense discretionary spending (NDD), in order to significantly boost defense spending and provide massive tax giveaways to wealthy individuals and large corporations.

The budget slashes \$5.7 trillion over 10 years including \$1.3 trillion from NDD programs that have already been compromised by austere budget caps. FY 2018 statutory caps lower funding for NDD programs by 17 percent adjusted for inflation below FY 2010, and the House budget cuts this by an additional \$5 billion. The additional cuts proposed in the House budget would weaken public services that all Americans rely on, create massive budget problems for states, and lead to enormous job losses. It would force dramatic cuts in, education, job training, federal employee pensions, and nutritional assistance. Over 10 years, the budget cuts \$4.4 trillion from entitlement programs, such as, Medicare and Medicaid, including at least \$203 billion in entitlement cuts to be made through the "fast track" reconciliation process. As a result, safety-net programs that millions rely upon are once again a target, further shifting enormous and unsustainable costs to the elderly, disabled, students and states.

Rather than increasing revenues for investment that creates jobs and spurs economic growth, the proposed budget creates a fast-track process for tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit corporations and the wealthy. In fact, according to the non-partisan Tax Policy Center, the Trump/GOP tax cut would largely benefit the richest 1 percent. The budget also relies on the gimmicks of dynamic scoring and sham accounting, hiding the true cost of unnecessary and harmful tax cuts.

The budget approved by the House Budget Committee would hurt families, kill job growth and send the economy into a downward tailspin. I strongly urge you to oppose. H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed 2018 concurrent budget resolution.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2017.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, which represents over 700,000 federal employees across the country, I strongly urge you to oppose any FY 2018 budget resolution proposal that includes reconciliation instructions to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee (OGR) requiring cuts within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$32 billion for the FY 2018-2027 period, when the House considers various FY 2018 budget proposals during the week of October 2, 2017. These cuts would target federal employee retirement benefits, as that is the only substantial mandatory spending within OGR's jurisdiction.

Such an approach would be consistent with the Senate Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget resolution proposal that excludes reconciliation instructions that would result in cutting federal employee retirement benefits. Indeed, the Senate version only includes reconciliation instructions to two committees: the \$1.5 trillion allowance for net tax cuts under the Finance Committee's jurisdiction and a \$1 billion, 10-year deficit cut instruction to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee which could open up a portion of Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas exploration.

AFGE opposes the House Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget resolution's reconciliation instructions to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to cut federal employee retirement benefits by \$32 billion for the FY 2018-2027 period. We believe this budget reconciliation instruction would help rip away any sense of financial security that federal employees currently have.

As you know, the House Budget Committee budget report included recommendations that would:

Require federal employees, including Members of Congress and their staffs, to make greater contributions to their own defined benefit retirement plans.

Eliminate the Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS) supplemental annuity payments to federal employees who retire before age 62, such as law enforcement officers and federal firefighters.

Transition new federal employees to a defined contribution retirement system. (The existing Thrift Savings Plan under FERS is a defined contribution retirement plan.)

These proposed federal retirement cuts of \$32 billion over ten years would be on top of the \$182 billion in cuts to pay and benefits that federal employees have experienced since 2011. Those pay and benefit cuts included: a three-year pay freeze (2011, 2012, 2013), three years of reduced pay increases (2014, 2015, 2016), unpaid furlough days because of the 2013 sequestration, and two increases in retirement contributions for new hires (2012 and 2013).

It is important to view the House Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget proposal to cut federal employee retirement benefits in the proper context. The federal employee retirement systems (FERS and CSRS) have played no role whatsoever in the creation of the federal budget deficit. In addition, increasing federal employees' contributions to their defined benefit retirement plans would decrease consumer demand and thereby adversely impact the American economy.

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. KAHN,
Director, Legislative Affairs.

NATIONAL ACTIVE AND RETIRED
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, October 3, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association (NARFE), I write to ask you to oppose the inclusion of reconciliation instructions in any budget resolution that target federal retirement and/or health benefits considered by the full House of Representatives.

The House Budget Committee passed, and the House is expected to consider, a budget resolution containing reconciliation instructions calling for at least \$32 billion in cuts to mandatory spending under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (OGR). Such instructions directly target the hard-earned retirement and health benefits of federal and postal workers and retirees, as these benefits constitute the only substantial mandatory spending under OGR's jurisdiction.

Proposals to meet the \$32 billion in savings range from bad to worse—from imposing a "retirement tax" on current federal and postal employees by raising payroll contributions towards retirement without any benefit increase to various proposals that would dramatically reduce the value of federal pensions for those nearing—or even in—retirement. These are neither fair nor prudent policies, yet any budget resolution containing reconciliation instructions for OGR endorses them prior to any significant evaluation.

The upcoming budget resolution is being used to set the stage for advancing tax reform that proponents argue provides a break to hard-working, middle-class Americans. Reconciliation instructions that target hard-working, middle class federal and postal workers are diametrically opposed to that goal and undermine a key argument as the basis of comprehensive tax reform.

For these reasons, I ask you to oppose any budget resolution that contains substantial reconciliation instructions to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Sincerely,

RICHARD THISSEN,
National President

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague from Georgia, thanks for reminding us that the Republicans have been working on the budget for 10 months; but according to your own Republican Budget Committee website, the budget was supposed to be presented and finished by April 15, so you are a little late.

In any event, I also want to remind the gentleman, because I know he is on the Rules Committee, so I know he knows this, that the rule sets the agenda for the House. Yes, if one of the things that the Republicans want to bring up is their terrible budget, that is fine. You can do that. But the rule can also be an opportunity for us to bring up the bill that Mr. THOMPSON has offered, to set up this commission to deal with gun violence. We can do both.

You can walk and you can chew gum at the same time. This is not a radical idea. But this is our only way to be able to bring something to the floor, because the leadership of this House has said no to everything. They have said no to everything. We can't get hearings. We can't get votes. We can't get debates. We get nothing.

Don't be startled by us trying to defeat the previous question. It is a perfectly legitimate way to try to expand the agenda, and I hope that some of our Republican friends will vote with us to defeat the previous question. We can still do the budget, but we can also do the Thompson bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and fellow member of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 71, the Republicans' proposed budget. This plan would make extreme and irresponsible cuts to domestic spending programs and weaken our Nation's social safety net.

We should be proposing a budget that provides for real economic growth. We should be strengthening programs that help young Americans access higher education, increasing infrastructure funding, and investing in our Nation's roads and bridges. We should be focused on vision, aspiration, a budget reflective of our great Nation and the great things we can do.

This budget instructs my friend from Massachusetts and my committee to find \$10 billion in cuts to agriculture programs over the next 10 years. This decrease will affect our ability to fund essential USDA programs across our country in every congressional district. These are programs that farmers, schoolchildren, families, communities, and Americans rely on.

Where will we be forced to take the money from? Rural development? conservation programs? our already insufficient nutrition programs? resources for schools?

At a time when spending on fighting wildfires has surpassed previous records, will we cut that budget?

This budget and accompanying tax plan does not put us on strong fiscal ground either. Many people don't realize the significance of the agricultural industry in Delaware. Our State is filled with family farmers that produce specialty crops, commodities. Delaware has the highest number of chickens per capita—300—of any State in the Nation. Many of these farmers rely on the very programs that we will be forced to undermine if these cuts are realized, and that hurts all Americans.

Access to food is not just a farmer's issue; it will affect rural communities, urban communities, and all of us. This is not a responsible way to govern.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts that I have no further speakers remaining. I would be happy to close when the gentleman is prepared.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I just want to tell my colleague from Georgia, if he hasn't read what we are trying to propose here, we are suggesting that they bring up the Thompson bill to the floor under an open rule, and even get a motion to recommit, but under an open rule. Take us up on this offer because we have had no open rules in this Congress. Try it; you might like it. It might be contagious. We might see more open rules where Democrats, Republicans, liberals, and conservatives can offer their ideas. We suggest they bring it up under an open rule.

I would urge all of my colleagues to think about that before they cast their vote on defeating the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I began by saying the frustration I have with this place is that we either do nothing or we make things worse for people. Going back to this issue on creating a commission to deal with gun violence, there are a lot of things I would like to do, but maybe this is a way to get some bipartisan buy-in to actually try and figure out how to respond to this epidemic of gun violence.

There have been 26 bills on gun safety introduced in this Congress sponsored by Democrats and Republicans. I include that list in the RECORD.

GUN SAFETY BILLS IN THE 115TH CONGRESS

1. H. Res. 367 Establishing the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention.
2. H.R. 2841 Title: Disarm Hate Act
3. H. Res. 361 Supporting the goals and ideals of "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" and "National Gun Violence Awareness Month".
4. H.R. 57 Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act of 2017
5. H.R. 62 Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act of 2017 (200 additional ATF Agents)
6. H.R. 1982 To authorize funding to increase access to mental health care treatment to reduce gun violence
7. H.R. 370 Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that a standing committee (or subcommittee thereof) hearing be held whenever there is a moment of silence in the House for a tragedy involving gun violence
8. H.R. 630 National Statistics on Deadly Force Transparency Act of 2017
9. H.R. 445 Buyback Our Safety Act (gun buyback program)
10. H.R. 1079 Campus Gun Policy Transparency Act
11. H.R. 163 Gun Manufacturers Accountability Act
12. H.R. 2033 Undetectable Firearms Modernization Act
13. H.R. 3013 Help Communities Fight Violent Crime Act
14. H.R. 1111 Department of Peacebuilding Act of 2017

15. H. Res. 90 Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that gun violence is a public health issue and Congress should enact by the end of the 115th Congress comprehensive Federal legislation that protects the Second Amendment and keeps communities safe and healthy, including expanding enforceable background checks for all commercial gun sales, improving the mental health system in the United States, and making gun trafficking and straw purchasing a Federal crime.

16. H.R. 1475 Title: Gun Trafficking Prevention Act of 2017

17. H.R. 1612 Title: Gun Show Loophole Closing Act of 2017

18. H.R. 1708 Firearm Risk Protection Act of 2017 (insurance for gun owners)

19. H.R. 1832 To authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

20. H.R. 2380 Handgun Trigger Safety Act of 2017

21. H.R. 1832 To authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

22. H.R. 1478 Gun Violence Research Act

23. H.R. 3613 Safer Neighborhoods Gun Buyback Act of 2017

24. H.R. 3361 SECURE Firearm Storage Act

25. King-Thompson Background Check Bill (closes gun show and Charleston loopholes, not yet reintroduced)

26. No Fly No Buy (not yet reintroduced)

MR. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, people have their ideas. Some of them are maybe not so good ideas; some of them may be very good ideas. But let's begin to talk about what our response should be. That is at least doing something. That is better than a moment of silence or offering your thoughts and prayers to people who were victims in this terrible latest massacre.

We have got to do something, and nothing is no longer sufficient. We can't keep on doing that. People are horrified that Congress seems indifferent. We can't even have a hearing on this issue, never mind a debate on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up the Thompson bill, and maybe we can start coming together and coming up with some ideas that might save some lives. That is the least we can do.

Mr. Speaker, to my other point that we either do nothing or you guys do things that make life worse for people, it brings us to the budget. This budget basically, in my opinion, is a cruel budget that targets, disproportionately, those who are poor and those who are in the middle class.

It is astounding to me where some of the savings are sought. The idea that you would cut SNAP by \$164 billion, a program that provides food to people; a program where 67 percent of the people on the benefit are children, are senior citizens, or people who are disabled; a program where those who can work, the majority of them work, but they earn so little in the workforce that

they still qualify for that program. You want to take that benefit away, a benefit that is \$1.40 per person per meal.

Come on. What are people thinking when they make those kinds of suggestions?

By the way, we all know what this is. It is basically a pretext to move forward on your tax cut plan, which benefits Donald Trump, Donald Trump's family, and Donald Trump's friends.

This idea that somehow this would be deficit neutral is laughable. The OMB Director, Mick Mulvaney, stated: "If we simply look at this as being deficit neutral, you're never going to get the type of tax reform and tax reductions" that you guys are looking for. That is the former colleague and the OMB Director.

So we all know what is going on here. But people ought to think long and hard before they cast their vote for this Republican budget. Budgets basically indicate what we value, what we think is important.

I have got to tell you, I just don't believe that if people read this budget, that a majority of my friends, we have disagreements on lots of issues, but I just don't believe that deep in your heart you actually believe this stuff. I mean, this is offensive.

We ought to be talking about lifting people up and not putting them down. We ought to be talking about all of the citizens of this country with respect and treating them with dignity. We ought not treat people who are in poverty as if somehow they are invisible, and that is what this budget does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote down this Republican budget. I urge them to defeat the previous question so we can bring up, under an open rule—under and open rule, which nobody in this Congress has seen—a bill that would allow us to create a commission, a bipartisan commission to examine gun violence.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what I love most about budget day is the fact that we do get to talk about our competing ideas. I do reject some of the implications that we have heard that what we are talking about is whether we love people or not. That is actually not the debate today.

I want to stipulate that I know the men and women of this Chamber on a personal basis, and each and every one of them that I know personally loves and cares for their constituency back home. The debate that we have is not whether we love people; it is how to love people best.

Do you love people best by giving them a check or giving them a job? That is a legitimate debate.

Do you love people best by leaving their children with them or taking

their children away from them? That is a legitimate debate.

I believe in families. I believe in the dignity of work. I want to have those debates.

I think we do ourselves a disservice when we describe what is going on here today on the floor of the House as anything other than our absolute legal and governmental responsibility to pass a budget for the United States of America. Wherever you sit on the continuum, the political continuum, the economic continuum, the regional continuum, there is a budget for you today.

If what you believe, Mr. Speaker, is that the problems we have in this country are because taxes are not high enough, there is going to be a Democratic substitute coming out of the Budget Committee that will raise taxes about \$2.4 trillion. If you think taxes are too low, we can raise them \$2.4 trillion. That budget never balances. That budget never stops borrowing from our children and our grandchildren. That budget never stops mortgaging America's future. But it is a legitimate debate because folks are taking those funds and they are investing them in America. They are prioritizing that investment over balancing.

If you believe \$2.4 trillion is not enough, Mr. Speaker, we will have a budget from the Congressional Black Caucus today that will raise taxes by \$4.2 trillion. We can raise taxes by \$4.2 trillion. Again, that budget never balances. It spends all that money and more, but it is a legitimate debate about where those dollars come from and where those dollars are going. I am glad we are going to be able to have it.

If raising taxes by \$4.2 trillion isn't enough for you, Mr. Speaker, we have the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget on the floor. It raises taxes by just over \$10 trillion. Again, the budget never balances. It spends all of that money and more and continues to borrow from our children and grandchildren, but it is a legitimate debate and it is a conversation worth having. I am proud that the Rules Committee made that debate in order.

To describe what is happening on the floor of the House today, Mr. Speaker, as anything other than what is exactly expected of this institution is to do us all a disservice.

I talked about making taxes higher. Let me talk a second about making taxes lower.

I talked to some friends back home; I talk to constituents; I talk to folks for whom I work, and some of them might say: "Rob, I have enough to feed my family, and if it means paying down the debt and deficit, I am willing to pay a little bit more." Other members in the community, Mr. Speaker, say: "For Pete's sake, I am trying to grow a business here, Rob. I am trying to employ your friends and neighbors. I

am trying to keep the community working. I am plowing everything I have back into the business. If I don't have to pay as much in taxes, I am going to be able to hire more people."

The Republican budget, Mr. Speaker, takes a shot at once-in-a-generation tax reform—once in a generation. This isn't what we talked about last year or the year before that or the year before that. This is a conversation we have not had since Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill had it in 1986. This is a conversation that we have not had since America slipped from number one in the world to almost last in the industrialized world in terms of tax competitiveness. This is a conversation that America has longed for and that we can deliver today.

Mr. Speaker, let's have these debates about what our priorities are. Let's have these debates about whether or not we can do better. At the end of the day, let's agree that we, in fact, can do better, that our bosses back home expect us to do better, and that by supporting this rule and supporting one of the underlying budgets, we, in fact, will do better.

I encourage my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, support this rule, begin this debate. Let's pass this budget. Let's fulfill our promises. Let's make the difference that we all came here to make.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 553 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 367) to establish the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention. The first reading of the resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. After general debate the resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the resolution.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 367.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I would like to include in the RECORD letters from Social Security Works, AFSCME, SEIU, and the Coalition on Human Needs.

SOCIAL SECURITY WORKS,
October 4, 2017.

Hon. CEDRIC RICHMOND,
Chair, Congressional Black Caucus, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RICHMOND: We are writing to express our support for the FY18 Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) Alternative Budget. Your budget outlines responsible priorities, including strengthening Social Security benefits, and demonstrates the CBC's commitment to the best interests of the American people.

The CBC budget alternative is the complete opposite of the cruel legislative proposals contained in the Republican FY18 House Budget Resolution. While the Republican budget proposes cutting Social Security benefits and undermining Medicare and Medicaid, the CBC Alternative Budget works to improve Social Security and, more generally, our economic security, for all of us, including seniors, people with disabilities, children, and other vulnerable Americans.

The Congressional Black Caucus clearly understands that Social Security is a solution to a number of challenges facing the nation, including our looming retirement income crisis. Most workers—especially African-Americans—have seen their wages stagnate. They need insurance against the loss of wages in the event of death disability or old age, which Social Security provides, as opposed to more retirement income savings, which are a far less effective solution. Social Security is the primary retirement income for 72 percent of African-American seniors; we must work to protect Social Security benefits from any cuts, and work to expand its modest benefits.

The recommendation of the CBC Alternative Budget to adjust the cost of living calculations by using the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) would be a great start to strengthening our Social Security system. The current formula for the Social Security cost-of-living-adjustment (COLA) is slowly eroding the value of Social Security's already modest benefits. Seniors and people with disabilities deserve a yearly raise that keeps pace with their actual costs of living, which are ever increasing due to the cost of pharmaceutical drugs and medical expenses.

Thank you for introducing the CBC budget alternative. The American people deserve a budget that fully funds vital programs, and not one that makes cuts to pay for tax handouts for wealthy Americans. We look forward to working with you during the formation of next year's CBC budget alternative to strengthen the proposal even further.

Sincerely,
NANCY J. ALTMAN,
President.
ALEX LAWSON,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

Hon. CEDRIC RICHMOND,
Chairman, Congressional Black Caucus,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation

of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I strongly endorse the alternative budget resolution proposed by the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). The CBC budget represents the true needs of our nation and working families by supporting health care needs, basic living standards, nutritional assistance, job training, higher education and building better economic opportunities for everyone.

The budget decisions made by Congress each year are vital to ensuring that the economy is strong and that our communities are safe and prosperous. Unfortunately, H. Con. Res. 71, the budget approved by the House Budget Committee, promotes the same misguided, inequitable priorities as the budget proposed by President Trump. The GOP budget sets woefully inadequate spending levels for critical public services and slashes \$5.8 trillion over 10 years from non-defense discretionary programs and critical entitlement programs. It hurts vital human needs to significantly boost defense spending and provide massive tax giveaways to wealthy individuals and corporations.

The CBC budget sets a better course by investing in public services that all Americans rely on, preserving and improving the Affordable Care Act, cancelling budget sequestration cuts, investing in infrastructure to create jobs and strengthen communities, investing in education from the cradle through college, targeting investments to eradicate poverty, improving retirement security, strengthening the right to vote and creating a fair tax code to meet our nation's needs.

The CBC budget embraces American families and promotes job growth and economic prosperity. I strongly urge support for the CBC budget.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government Affairs.

SEIU,

Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union ("SEIU"), I write in support of the Congressional Black Caucus's Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2018 ("Alternative Budget"). The Alternative Budget would make America's tax system fairer, rebuild the nation's infrastructure, and invest in our communities and children through programs designed to lift millions out of poverty.

The House Republican budget (H. Con. Res. 71) would cut programs like Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security in order the finance tax giveaways to the wealthy and big corporations. The CBC's Alternative Budget would require the wealthy and corporations to pay their fair share, the Alternative Budget would also invest \$1 trillion into a robust infrastructure program that would accelerate the economic recovery and revitalize communities across the nation.

Furthermore, the Alternative Budget would invest in community-focused programs that are designed to lift millions out of poverty. These investments include restoring funding to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), expanding access to affordable housing, increasing access to affordable and quality education, and increasing funding for job training programs. Each of these provisions would focus on rebuilding the middle class and creating an economy that improves the lives of American workers.

The CBC's Alternative Budget, along with the Congressional Progressive Caucus's "The

People's Budget," are better paths forward for America's working families than H. Con. Res. 71. If you have any questions, please reach out to John Foti.

Sincerely,

JOHN GRAY,
Legislative Director.

COALITION ON HUMAN NEEDS,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Coalition on Human Needs, I strongly urge you to vote no on H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed FY 2018 Budget Resolution, and to vote for the substitute budgets advanced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Democratic alternative budget resolution.

The Coalition on Human Needs is an alliance made up of human service providers, faith organizations, policy experts, labor, civil rights, and other advocates for meeting the needs of low-income and vulnerable people. Our members understand that the economic security of millions of American families depends on building on the progress we've made in health coverage, jobs, basic living standards, and ensuring that our children are well-prepared for productive lives. But the majority's proposed budget does not build—it breaks apart our engines of progress. It will make our nation weaker for decades to come.

The most recent survey data on poverty in the U.S. shows the biggest two-year decline since the late 1960's. Refundable tax credits for working families, SNAP/food stamps and housing subsidies have lifted multi-millions of people out of poverty. The decline in the proportion of our population without health insurance continued its decline in 2016, down to 8.8 percent. More people are working, and in general, low-and moderate-income households have finally started to make income gains.

The budget advanced by the House Budget Committee would be a dangerous backwards plunge, stripping trillions of dollars from programs that work to reduce poverty and create security and opportunity. Medicaid, Medicare, working family tax credits, nutrition assistance, education and housing assistance: these are just some of the services the budget would massively cut. The budget takes trillions in funding that supports economic security and progress and hands it to the wealthy and corporations in the form of enormous tax cuts.

The primary goal of H. Con. Res. 71 is to allow huge tax cuts to be enacted with only a simple majority in the Senate. These tax cuts are claimed to be a critical element in increasing economic growth enough to make the tax cuts deficit neutral. Reputable economists are skeptical that the proposed tax cuts would boost the economy to the 2.6 percent average growth projected in the budget and acknowledge that tax cuts to corporations and the rich deepen the deficit. History supports this: the economy grew and unemployment declined more during the Clinton tax increase years than during the Bush era tax cuts. And the Kansas experience with tax cuts is cautionary: revenues plummeted, with the tax take in 2016 \$570 million lower than in 2013, even after counting increases enacted in sales and cigarette taxes. The economic growth that did occur from cutting taxes was estimated to bring in about \$30 million, leaving the state very deeply in the hole. The state legislature has recently reversed course, unwilling to slash education budgets as much as the revenue hole would have forced. They saw that they

were weakening their state. Congress should not inflict the same dangerous lesson on the entire nation.

We urge you to reject H. Con. Res. 71 because of its central choice: paying for tax cuts that overwhelmingly favor the rich and corporations with cuts to essential services. Our nation faces major challenges: reducing disproportionate poverty among children and helping children and young adults to advance in education so they can meet the challenges in our economic future, protecting seniors in their retirement, and rebuilding communities. Both the emergency needs of communities devastated by natural disasters and the similarly urgent threats from opioids and other epidemics, decaying infrastructure and inadequate public health and consumer protections demand a vigorous federal response. Instead of making these investments, the House budget would cripple the federal capacity to respond by slashing domestic appropriations by 44 percent compared with FY 2010 levels over the next decade and making similarly extreme cuts in health care, nutrition, income assistance for seniors, people with disabilities, and working families. In addition to trillions of dollars in cuts and structural constraints to basic mandatory programs, the budget would fast-track \$203 billion in cuts to domestic programs over the next ten years through reconciliation rules. Cuts like these would recklessly weaken us; they are self-inflicted wounds.

The proposed tax cuts will worsen inequality and reward businesses that park their income offshore. Instead, Congress should insist that corporations and the rich pay their fair share. Please vote against weakening America, and instead protect and expand investments as called for in the budgets proposed by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the House Budget Committee Democrats' substitute. These three constructive alternatives deserve your yes vote.

Sincerely yours,

DEBORAH WEINSTEIN,
Executive Director.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Democratic Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 27, the House Republicans' Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018.

Mr. Chair, House Republican budgeteers have a very poor track record when it comes to economic forecasts and projections.

For years, they have based their entire legislative agenda and strategy on their belief that the Affordable Care Act or Obamacare would be a failure.

The wish was father to the thought and they were wrong.

Because of Obamacare more than 20 million Americans now know the peace of mind that comes from affordable, quality health insurance that is there when you need it.

House Republicans oppose increasing the minimum wage, claiming that it costs jobs.

Wrong again.

Every increase in the minimum wage has been accompanied by an expanding economy, especially during the Clinton Administration.

House Republicans opposing comprehensive immigration reform claim that it will lead to lower incomes and lost jobs.

Wrong again.

Studies conducted by groups as far apart as the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO

consistently show that comprehensive immigration reform will grow the Gross Domestic Product by \$1.5 trillion over 10 years.

Given this sorry track record of economic forecasting, it is mind-boggling that anyone could support another Republican budget that favors the wealthy over middle class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class.

The Democratic Budget ANS represents a much better way forward to the economic prosperity and security that Americans want and demand because it:

1. Creates good-paying jobs by investing in cutting-edge research and innovation, education, and infrastructure—highways, broadband, school construction, and more.

2. Increases educational opportunities by enhancing the Pell Grant program and funds career, technical, and adult education, and supports initiatives to help borrowers manage their student debt.

3. Supports American workers and families through responsible tax reform that creates jobs, boosts economic growth, and ensures that the wealthy and big corporations pay their fair share.

4. Promotes economic growth, expanded opportunity, and better quality of life by supporting a raise in the minimum wage, equal pay for equal work, immigration reform, consumer safeguards, childcare, job training, and paid leave.

5. Protects a basic standard of living by funding for programs that ensure families can access nutrition assistance, find and afford quality housing in their neighborhood, heat and cool their homes when extreme temperatures hit, and supports strengthening and expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit and increased resources for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

6. Defends and strengthens the Affordable Care Act and protects Medicare by rejecting both Trumpcare and any plan to turn Medicare into a voucher-like system that would increase costs for seniors.

7. Rejects the Republican budget's 19 percent cut to diplomacy and foreign aid operations and invests instead in all aspects of national security, including our military and diplomatic corps, foreign aid, homeland security, veterans, and law enforcement.

The Democratic Budget ANS works FOR American families by giving them the tools to buy a home, send their kids to college and enjoy a secure retirement.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic Budget represents a better way.

We Democrats understand that we are all in this together and that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach between increased revenues and responsible reduction in expenditures.

Our plan will protect and strengthen our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but it is disastrous for the people from my home state of Texas who sent me here to advocate for their interests.

Let me highlight a few examples.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program.

2. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

3. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs.

4. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by \$5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

5. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to wither on the vine.

6. If the Republican budget resolution is adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year.

7. The Republican plan would re-open the donut hole, forcing seniors to pay the full cost of their prescription drugs if their yearly drug expenses are more than \$2,970 for the year.

8. Seniors reaching the prescription drug donut hole would pay an average of \$828 more in prescription drug costs in 2018 and approximately \$13,000 more from now through 2027.

9. Under the Republican budget, the 2,445,462 Texas seniors who utilized free preventive services currently covered by Medicare in 2017 will face increased costs in the form of higher deductibles, co-insurance, and copayments for certain services, including even cancer screenings and annual wellness visits.

10. The Republican budget would slash \$33 billion in nursing home care and other health care services for 754,500 Texas seniors and disabled persons who currently rely on Medicaid for their long-term care needs.

11. The draconian cuts included in the Republican budget would have a devastating impact on the 1,191 certified nursing homes in Texas that serve nearly 100,000 seniors, with more than half relying on Medicaid as their primary payer. As a result, nursing homes would be forced to slash services, turn away seniors, or close their doors.

Mr. Chair, the Republican budget may be characterized in many ways—cruel, irresponsible, short-sighted, reckless—but “fair and balanced” is not one of them.

In contrast, the alternative budget proposed by the Democratic Caucus is worthy of support because it fairly balances the need for increased revenues and responsible reductions in expenditures with the imperative of making the necessary investments in human capital required to move our country forward.

The Democratic Budget ANS will generate at least a million more jobs this year compared to the Republicans' austerity first plan by making the investments needed to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, create greater upward mobility, and ensure opportunity for our children and future generations.

Mr. Chair, Democratic alternative budget maintains our commitment to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security; expands the EITC for childless workers; and provides ample funding for early childhood education.

Especially important to my constituents, and those of my colleagues representing Louisiana, Texas, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, is that the Democratic Budget ANS includes the funds approved by Congress as a down payment for assistance in response to Hurricane Harvey and supports further emergency funding related to Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, along with other natural disasters.

It is said often, Mr. Chair, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

“The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.”

It is for this reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a moral test.

Unlike the Republican budget, the Democratic Budget ANS passes both of these tests with flying colors.

The Republican budget calls to mind what Talleyrand said of the restored Bourbon dynasty after the abdication of Napoleon:

“They had learned nothing and forgotten nothing.”

Like the discredited Ryan Budgets of years past, this repackaged and warmed over TrumpRepublican Budget seems to know the cost of everything but the value of nothing.

For these compelling reasons, I stand in strong opposition to the Republican budget and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a much better deal for the American people, the Democratic Budget ANS.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the following letter to the Honorable PAUL RYAN, Speaker of the House.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We write to request that, as the Congress considers the Fiscal Year 2018 budget resolution and any legislation written to comply with its reconciliation instructions, we continue to follow the long-standing practice of evaluating the fiscal effects of legislation relative to the baseline developed by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Using the CBO baseline will allow us to provide the American people the most accurate forecast of how proposed fiscal policies will affect our ballooning federal deficit.

CBO's baseline conforms to the principles that Congress has defined in law. For decades we have consistently used the CBO baseline to accurately calculate the fiscal

and distributional impacts of tax reform policy. The CBO baseline is the best mechanism to measure how we are affecting our nation's balance sheets because it reflects the clearest intent of Congress, accurately accounts for the costs of extending specific program provisions scheduled to expire, and keeps legislation in line with fiscal requirements set forth in reconciliation instructions within the budget resolution.

Our constituents are calling on us to enact sound fiscal policy, and many have answered that call with promises to get our financial house in order. Unfortunately, according to recent news reports, some members of the House of Representatives may break that promise by opting instead to change the baseline we traditionally use to determine how new tax policy proposals will affect the deficit. Instead, some lawmakers are pushing you to use a "current-policy" baseline that would, among other things, obscure the true cost of extending deficit-increasing tax cuts by ignoring their expiration dates written into the tax code.

Changing the baseline could cause Congress to inaccurately calculate the detrimental impact of tax cuts and therefore allow lawmakers to disregard important rules such as those that guide the use of reconciliation in order to limit long-term deficit increases. As you know, the Byrd Rule prevents reconciliation procedures from being used in the Senate to pass legislation that increases the deficit beyond the budget window. Adopting a current-policy baseline would effectively hide the \$400 billion cost of extending expiring tax cuts, and pretend that they are revenue neutral in order to meet the Senate's reconciliation requirements.

Such a change will have costly consequences. Every dollar of lost revenue hidden by a misleading or inaccurate current-policy baseline is a dollar added to our deficit that will in turn make it harder to adequately fund important priorities, such as national security, infrastructure, disaster relief, health care and the safety net for our most vulnerable citizens.

Resorting to gimmicks such as the "current-policy baseline" and creating unrealistic assumptions about economic growth rates obscures the full cost of tax cuts and severely undermines our ability to put the federal budget on a sustainable fiscal path. Whether these gimmicks serve a procedural or rhetorical role, the end result is the same: fiscally irresponsible policies, larger deficits, and erosion of the American people's confidence in our fiscal stewardship.

As you know, our annual deficits are projected to swell to over \$1 trillion by the end of the decade. Equally troublesome, the national debt is on an unsustainable trajectory. If we willfully choose to inaccurately account for taxing and spending legislation, then we will place our economic wellbeing in jeopardy and saddle future generations with the burden of shouldering today's fiscal wrongs. Instead, we must be open and honest with the American people. The traditional CBO baseline best accomplishes that by providing the most transparent and precise measure of the impacts of our fiscal policies.

Accordingly, we urge you to resist calls to abandon the CBO baseline in the budget resolution so that the American people are fully apprised of how we are affecting the nation's financial future.

Sincerely,

HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Co-Chair, House
Democratic Policy

and Communications
Committee.

JOSEPH CROWLEY,
Chairman, House
Democratic Caucus.

STENY H. HOYER,
House Democratic
Whip.

JOHN YARMUTH,
Ranking Member,
House Committee on
the Budget.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Education Association.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than three million members of the National Education Association (NEA), and the 50 million students they serve, we urge you to Vote No on the FY 2018 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) being brought to the House floor this week, and offer our views on the alternative budgets that have been proposed. The budget should reflect the priorities of our nation and should especially meet the needs of children and those most in need. Actions on this issue may be included in the NEA Legislative Report Card for the 115th Congress.

In addition to urging a NO vote on H. Con. Res. 71, we urge you to:

Vote YES on the Democratic substitute budget. This budget stresses the need to invest in our economic future. It lifts the budget caps, broadens access to education, defends and strengthens the Affordable Care Act, invests in infrastructure, raises the minimum wage, and supports tax reform that supports American families and workers.

Vote YES on the budget presented by the Congressional Progressive Caucus offered by Reps. Pocan (D-WI) and Grijalva (D-AZ). This budget provides a practical, progressive vision for our country by investing in 21st century infrastructure and jobs, tackling inequality, making corporations pay their fair share, and strengthening essential public programs.

Vote YES on the budget presented by the Congressional Black Caucus offered by Rep. Scott (D-VA). This budget would establish funding levels to allow for investments in key programs like education, infrastructure and job training, makes the tax code more progressive and fair, repeals the Budget Control Act and ends the threat of sequestration, and create jobs while also reducing the deficit.

Vote NO on the budget presented by the Republican Study Committee authored by Reps. Walker (R-NC) and McClintock (R-CA). This budget goes beyond the Budget Committee proposal in terms of balancing the budget on the backs of those least able to afford it by cutting spending \$5.7 trillion over the next 10 years. The budget also would repeal the Affordable Care Act, increase the Medicare eligibility age, and block grant Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program.

We strongly oppose H. Con. Res. 71 because it takes us in the wrong direction as a nation by making dramatic cuts to essential programs and services in order to finance tax cuts for the wealthy. Specifically, we oppose:

Doubling down on deep cuts to education and other domestic programs. This proposal would cut Non-Defense-Discretionary programs (i.e. education, health care, job training, etc.), which are already at historically low levels (as a percentage of GDP), by low-

ering the already inadequate spending caps by \$5 billion in 2018 and cutting spending for NDD programs by \$1.3 trillion over the next decade. This would force even deeper cuts to crucial investments like education depriving students of the opportunity they all deserve for a quality education.

Making dramatic cuts for essential programs to finance a massive tax cut for the wealthy and add \$2.4 trillion to our country's debt. According to the Tax Policy Center, the top one percent of households would get 80 percent of the framework's next tax cuts, or more than \$200,000 annually on average.

Slashing Medicaid and other health programs, which provides healthcare for more than one-third of our nation's children. Overall funding for Medicaid and other programs would be cut by \$1.5 trillion over the decade, while Medicare would be cut by \$487 billion over the decade.

Voucherizing Medicare and shifting costs to seniors. Under the proposed plan, seniors would receive "premium support"—fixed payments to help buy coverage, which would likely fail to keep pace with rising healthcare costs. The plan also could lead to the gradual demise of traditional Medicare by making the pool of beneficiaries smaller, older, and sicker—and increasingly costly to cover.

Student aid cuts, which appear to include deep cuts to the Pell Grant program and student loans. We should be working to make college more affordable for more students.

For too long Congress has tied its own hands with senseless and untenable budget caps, resulting in wholly inadequate funding levels for critical programs like education. This budget would make that problem much worse and sets the stage to enact massive tax cuts for the wealthy. We urge you to Vote NO on the FY18 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 71).

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,
Director, Government Relations,
National Education Association.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Black	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Blackburn	Chabot
Allen	Blum	Cheney
Amash	Bost	Coffman
Arrington	Brady (TX)	Cole
Babin	Brat	Collins (GA)
Bacon	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Banks (IN)	Brooks (IN)	Comer
Barletta	Buchanan	Comstock
Barr	Buck	Conaway
Barton	Bucshon	Cook
Bergman	Budd	Costello (PA)
Biggs	Burgess	Cramer
Bilirakis	Byrne	Crawford
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)	Curbelo (FL)

Davidson	Jones	Rogers (AL)	Kind	Nadler	Scott, David	Emmer	Knight	Rokita
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Rogers (KY)	Krishnamoorthi	Napolitano	Serrano	Estes (KS)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney, Francis
Denham	Joyce (OH)	Rohrabacher	Kuster (NH)	Neal	Sewell (AL)	Farenthold	Labrador	Rooney, Thomas J.
Dent	Katko	Rokita	Langevin	Nolan	Shea-Porter	Faso	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
DeSantis	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Francis	Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Sherman	Ferguson	LaMalfa	Roskam
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Rooney, Thomas J.	Larson (CT)	O'Halloran	Sinema	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn	Ross
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)		Lawrence	O'Rourke	Sires	Fleischmann	Lance	Rothfus
Donovan	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Lawson (FL)	Pallone	Slaughter	Flores	Latta	Rouzer
Duffy	Kinzing	Roskam	Lee	Panetta	Smith (WA)	Fortenberry	Lewis (MN)	Royce (CA)
Duncan (SC)	Knight	Ross	Levin	Pascarell	Soto	Fox	LoBiondo	Russell
Duncan (TN)	Kustoff (TN)	Rothfus	Lewis (GA)	Payne	Speier	Franks (AZ)	Love	Rutherford
Dunn	Labrador	Rouzer	Lieu, Ted	Perlmutter	Suozi	Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Sanford
Emmer	LaHood	Royce (CA)	Lipinski	Peters	Swalwell (CA)	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Estes (KS)	LaMalfa	Russell	Loebsack	Peterson	Takano	Gallagher	MacArthur	Scott, Austin
Farenthold	Lamborn	Rutherford	Lofgren	Pingree	Thompson (CA)	Garrett	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Faso	Lance	Sanford	Lowenthal	Pocan	Thompson (MS)	Gianforte	Marino	Sessions
Ferguson	Latta	Schweikert	Lowe	Polis	Tonko	Gibbs	Marshall	Shimkus
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)	Scott, Austin	Lujan Grisham, M.	Price (NC)	Torres	Gohmert	Massie	Shuster
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner	Luján, Ben Ray	Quigley	Tsongas	Goodlatte	Mast	Simpson
Flores	Love	Sessions	Lynch	Raskin	Vargas	Gosar	McCauley	Smith (MO)
Fortenberry	Lucas	Shimkus	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Rice (NY)	Veasey	Gowdy	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Shuster	Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Vela	Granger	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Franks (AZ)	MacArthur	Simpson	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez	Graves (GA)	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Smith (MO)	McCollum	Ruppersberger	Visclosky	Graves (LA)	McMorris	Smucker
Gaetz	Marino	Smith (NE)	McEachin	Rush	Walz	Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Stefanik
Gallagher	Marshall	Smith (NJ)	McGovern	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman	Griffith	Meadows	Stewart
Garrett	Massie	Smith (TX)	McNerney	Sánchez	Schultz	Grothman	Meehan	Stivers
Gianforte	Mast	Smucker	Meeks	Sarbanes	Waters, Maxine	Guthrie	Messer	Taylor
Gibbs	McCauley	Stefanik	Meng	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman	Harper	Mitchell	Tenney
Gohmert	McClintock	Stewart	Moore	Schiff	Welch	Harris	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Goodlatte	McHenry	Stivers	Moultou	Schneider	Wilson (FL)	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)	Thornberry
Gosar	McKinley	Taylor	Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Yarmuth	Hensarling	Mullin	Tiberi
Gowdy	McMorris	Tenney		Scott (VA)		Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)	Tipton
Granger	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)				Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse	Trott
Graves (GA)	McSally	Thornberry				Higgins (LA)	Noem	Turner
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Tiberi	Amodei	Long	Poe (TX)	Hill	Norman	Upton
Graves (MO)	Meehan	Tipton	Bridenstine	Loudermilk	Rosen	Holding	Nunes	Valadao
Griffith	Messer	Trott	Doyle, Michael F.	McCarthy	Scalise	Hollingsworth	Olson	Wagner
Grothman	Mitchell	Turner	Kihuen	Palmer	Titu	Hudson	Palazzo	Walberg
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Upton		Pelosi		Huizenga	Palmer	Walden
Handel	Mooney (WV)	Valadao				Hunter	Paulsen	Walker
Harper	Mullin	Wagner				Hurd	Pearce	Walorski
Harris	Murphy (PA)	Walberg				Issa	Perry	Walters, Mimi
Hartzler	Newhouse	Walden				Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger	Weber (TX)
Hensarling	Noem	Walker				Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)	Webster (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Norman	Walorski				Johnson (LA)	Poliquin	Wenstrup
Hice, Jody B.	Nunes	Walters, Mimi				Johnson (OH)	Posey	Westerman
Higgins (LA)	Olson	Weber (TX)				Johnson, Sam	Ratchliffe	Williams
Hill	Palazzo	Webster (FL)				Jones	Reed	Wilson (SC)
Holding	Paulsen	Wenstrup				Jordan	Reichert	Wittman
Hollingsworth	Pearce	Westerman				Joyce (OH)	Renacci	Womack
Hudson	Perry	Williams				Katko	Rice (SC)	Woodall
Huizenga	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)				Kelly (MS)	Roby	Yoder
Hultgren	Poliquin	Wittman				Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)	Yoho
Hunter	Posey	Womack				King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Hurd	Ratchliffe	Woodall				King (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Young (IA)
Issa	Reed	Yoder				Kinzing	Rohrabacher	Zeldin
Jenkins (KS)	Reichert	Yoho						
Jenkins (WV)	Renacci	Young (AK)						
Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)	Young (IA)						
Johnson (OH)	Roby	Zeldin						
Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)							

NAYS—189

Adams	Clyburn	Frankel (FL)
Aguilar	Cohen	Fudge
Barragán	Connolly	Gabbard
Bass	Conyers	Galleo
Beatty	Cooper	Garamendi
Bera	Correa	Gomez
Beyer	Costa	Gonzalez (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Gottheimer
Blumenauer	Crist	Green, Al
Blunt Rochester	Crowley	Green, Gene
Bonamici	Cuellar	Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cummings	Gutiérrez
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Brown (MD)	Davis, Danny	Hastings
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Heck
Bustos	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Butterfield	Delaney	Himes
Capuano	DeLauro	Hoyer
Carbajal	Demings	Huffman
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	Deutch	Jayapal
Cartwright	Dingell	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Chu, Judy	Engel	Kaptur
Cicilline	Eshoo	Keating
Clark (MA)	Españat	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Esty (CT)	Kennedy
Clay	Evans	Khanna
Cleaver	Foster	Kildee
		Kilmer

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1351

Messrs. GRIJALVA and HOYER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FITZPATRICK changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—232

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Comstock
Aderholt	Brat	Conaway
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Cook
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Costello (PA)
Arrington	Buchanan	Cramer
Babin	Buck	Crawford
Bacon	Budshon	Culberson
Banks (IN)	Budd	Curbelo (FL)
Barletta	Burgess	Davidson
Barr	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Calvert	Denham
Bergman	Carter (GA)	Dent
Biggs	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bilirakis	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bishop (MI)	Cheney	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Donovan
Black	Cole	Duffy
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Bost	Comer	Dunn

NOES—188

Adams	Cooper	Green, Al
Aguilar	Correa	Green, Gene
Barragán	Costa	Grijalva
Bass	Courtney	Gutiérrez
Beatty	Crist	Hanabusa
Bera	Crowley	Hastings
Beyer	Cuellar	Heck
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Higgins (NY)
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Himes
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Bonamici	DeFazio	Huffman
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Jayapal
Brown (MD)	DeLauro	Jeffries
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Bustos	Demings	Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Kaptur
Capuano	Deutch	Keating
Carbajal	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Cárdenas	Doggett	Kennedy
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Khanna
Cartwright	Engel	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kilmer
Castro (TX)	Españat	Kind
Chu, Judy	Esty (CT)	Krishnamoorthi
Cicilline	Evans	Kuster (NH)
Clark (MA)	Foster	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Gabbard	Lawrence
	Galleo	Lawson (FL)
	Garamendi	Lee
	Gomez	Levin
	Gonzalez (TX)	Lewis (GA)
	Gottheimer	Lieu, Ted

Lipinski	Pallone	Shea-Porter
Loeb sack	Panetta	Sherman
Lofgren	Pascrell	Sinema
Lowenthal	Payne	Sires
Lowey	Pelosi	Slaughter
Lujan Grisham,	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
M.	Peters	Soto
Luján, Ben Ray	Peterson	Speier
Lynch	Pingree	Suoizzi
Maloney,	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)
Carolyn B.	Polis	Takano
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Matsui	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Raskin	Tonko
McEachin	Rice (NY)	Torres
McGovern	Richmond	Tsongas
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
Meeks	Ruiz	Veasey
Meng	Ruppersberger	Vela
Moore	Rush	Velázquez
Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez	Walz
Nadler	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Napolitano	Schakowsky	Schultz
Neal	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Nolan	Schneider	Watson Coleman
Norcross	Scott (VA)	Welch
O'Halleran	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
O'Rourke	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Amodei	Kihuen	Scalise
Bridenstine	Long	Schrader
Doyle, Michael	Loudermilk	Scott, David
F.	McCarthy	Titus
Hultgren	Rosen	

□ 1359

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

OCTOBER 4, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S.
Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to section 3 of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act (Pub. L. 114-244), I am pleased to appoint Dr. Dolores Subia BigFoot of Norman, Oklahoma to the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 71, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 553 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 71.

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

□ 1402

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with Mr. LAMBORN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) or their designees.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 71, our budget, Building a Better America. Our budget takes real, tangible steps to balance the budget, build a stronger military, unlock tax reform, and support an economy that creates opportunity for all Americans.

In past years, our budget resolution was a vision document, but this year it is different. With the election of President Trump, our budget goes from being a vision document to being a governing document that outlines how we build a better America for our children and our grandchildren.

Today, we have the opportunity to fulfill our promises to the American people. Balancing the budget by 2027 is our top priority. Our national debt stands at \$20 trillion, with \$9 trillion added over just the last 8 years. For too long, both parties in Washington have failed to abide by a simple principle that all American families and

small businesses do, that we must live within our means.

Balancing the budget requires us to make some tough decisions, but the consequences of inaction far outweigh any political risk we may face.

Unless we take bold steps to bring our excessive spending and debt under control, a sovereign debt crisis is the natural conclusion. Failure to take swift and decisive action is not only inexcusable, it is immoral.

The budget resolution before us takes real steps to put our country on a sound fiscal path that balances in 10 years and will allow us to start paying down our national debt.

Building a Better America also assumes bold reforms to strengthening programs that our seniors and our most vulnerable citizens rely on and ensure that these programs can continue to serve them for generations to come.

While our budget includes reforms to discretionary spending, we also strongly believe that mandatory spending must be addressed in this budget resolution and in budget resolutions to come.

Mandatory spending is already more than two-thirds of all of our Federal spending, and that number will only continue to grow, and that is why our committee felt strongly about addressing mandatory spending programs in this budget through reconciliation.

Our budget requires 11 authorizing committees to find a minimum of \$203 billion in savings and reforms over the 10-year budget window with an expectation that the reforms will result in significantly higher savings.

This package of mandatory reforms is the largest since the 1990s, through reconciliation, and it is the first step to change the culture of Washington in our spending.

Our budget also promotes tax reform and regulatory reform to get the Federal Government out of the way and allow our free market economy to thrive. The larger the government, the less freedom individuals and businesses have to thrive, grow, hire, and innovate. The Obama economy left millions of Americans behind with over 14 million people leaving the labor workforce in just the last 8 years.

Through reconciliation, our budget specifically paves the way for progrowth tax reform that will reduce taxes for the middle class Americans and free up American businesses to grow and to hire. It will also simplify the Tax Code, allowing about 9 out of 10 Americans to file their taxes on a simple postcard.

Many of our friends across the aisle and in the media said that a 1.9 percent economic growth is the new normal and that we are doomed to continue the economic stagnation of the Obama years.

They have a pessimistic view of our Nation's ability to create jobs and to

build our foundation of greater opportunity for all.

America has the greatest workers, the greatest innovators, and the entrepreneurial ethos to far surpass the economic growth of the last 8 years, if only the Federal Government would get out of the way.

In this budget, we put our trust in the American people. But a stronger economy is not enough; we must also strengthen our military.

The number one job of the Federal Government is to protect its citizens. Over the last 8 years, the weak foreign policy of President Obama has led to an increase in threats from all corners of the globe while the funding for our men and women in uniform has failed to keep pace. Building a Better America invests \$621.5 billion in our military and \$75 billion specifically for the global war on terrorism for fiscal year 2018. These resources will help our men and women in uniform complete the mission with which they have been tasked.

Building a Better America presents us with an opportunity to change the trajectory of our country forever. The election of President Trump was a signal to all of us that the American people will no longer accept the status quo.

This budget is also a very personal one for me. As I and my committee have gone through the long and arduous process of getting this budget to the floor, I have had to stop and think about not just what we are doing but where we are going.

I have a picture of my six grandchildren taped to the back of my voting card. I was a nurse for more than 40 years and still hold my license today. Government and public service was never an ambition of mine, but when I saw what was happening in my State and in this country, I couldn't sit back and do nothing.

Every time I put my voting card into a slot, I am reminded of why I left the career that I loved to join the political fray. It is for them. It is for my children and grandchildren and for yours as well.

I grew up in an America where a poor girl, whose parents' only ambition was for her to finish high school, could graduate from college, become a nurse, and eventually become a Member of the House of Representatives.

I grew up in an America that was a land of—that is a land of opportunity and was a land of opportunity then of strength and of compassion. But that America is slipping away from us. For too many young people in this country, the opportunity to live the American Dream is out of reach. A government that was supposed to be of, by, and for the people has left them behind.

Building a Better America requires a government that spends within its means, a military with the resources to complete the mission, an economy that

creates the opportunity for all, and a Federal bureaucracy that respects the taxpayers.

It also requires an understanding that the greatness of America does not lie in the grand buildings and the stone pillars of Washington, D.C. The greatness of America lies in the spirit and the tenacity of the people.

We designed Building a Better America to put this vision into practice, to empower individuals to live their version of the American Dream. Future generations of Americans are counting on us, and failure is not an option.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of this committee for their hard work that they have done, for the months that we have worked tirelessly to come together and build a budget that reflects our principles.

It hasn't been easy, but producing a budget that puts our vision for fiscal sanity into practice will be worth it, and I thank each and every one of you for your hard work.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget we are debating here today is a shockingly extreme document that gives to the rich and takes from everyone else. It calls for more than \$5 trillion in spending cuts that threaten our economic progress and our national security, and it willfully ignores the needs and priorities of the American people.

This budget isn't about conservative policy or reducing the size of our debt and deficits. It is not even about American families. This budget is about one thing: using budget reconciliation to ram through giant tax giveaways to the wealthy and big corporations and to do it without bipartisan support.

□ 1415

This budget and the tax cuts it exists to support are built on a foundation of lies. They are part of a dangerous and deceptive three-step process Republicans have used before with serious consequences for our Nation and the American people.

This is what they do. First, my Republican colleagues call for massive tax cuts for the rich, claiming they will generate so much economic growth, that they will pay for themselves. Last week, congressional Republicans announced a \$2.4 trillion tax cut plan that benefits the wealthy at the expense of everyone else. Yes, I said trillions with a T.

For example, under this tax plan, millions of families making \$50,000 a year would be subject to a tax increase, while millionaires get a \$230,000 average tax cut. That is not tax reform. That is a shakedown.

In total, individuals will see their taxes go up by more than \$450 billion, while corporations, wealthy pass-through entities, and rich estates get a tax cut totaling \$2.9 trillion.

One might justifiably ask why anyone would want to do that. After all, the income disparity in the United States is greater than almost every other country on Earth, and it is getting larger. Just a few decades ago, the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans earned about one-fourth of all national income. Today, it is close to 40 percent. Yet, once this plan is fully phased in, 80 percent of the entire tax cut in this plan goes to just the top 1 percent, while 45 percent of all households with children see a tax increase.

You could be someone who gets a \$1 million salary, owns billions in corporate stock, be a partner in a hedge fund, or just the heir to a massive fortune, no matter the type of millionaire you are, Republicans make sure you will get a tax cut. No matter how many times President Trump, Secretary Mnuchin, or my colleagues across the aisle say it and how much they hope the American people will fall for it, these tax cuts won't pay for themselves.

That is not just my argument. That is the conclusion of the Federal Reserve, the Congressional Budget Office, and respected economists of all stripes.

Conservative economist and former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin said: "There is just no evidence that the tax cuts actually pay for themselves."

Even Goldman Sachs, Secretary Mnuchin's former employer, says any growth will be minimal, maybe up to two-tenths of a percent.

Bruce Bartlett, the man who wrote Reaganomics, which codified the trickle-down theory, told Congress last week that he now thinks it is: "bull." Well, that is half of the word he used, but you get the idea.

The historical record is clear. We went through this in the early 1980s, the early 2000s under George W. Bush, and we recently saw it play out to disastrous effect in Kansas. Now congressional Republicans want to try it again.

We all know the truth. The tax cuts in this plan will increase deficits and debt by approximately \$2.4 trillion in the first 10 years alone and trillions more in the years after. These aren't special, supernatural tax cuts. They aren't going to magically defy expert analysis, historical precedence, and empirical evidence. This budget will blow enormous holes in the Federal budget, which brings me to the second part of the Republican deception.

When the growth fails to happen as promised and these tax cuts keep digging our economy down deeper and deeper, Republicans will again bemoan the horrors of deficits and debt.

These cries will lead us to the third and final part of the plan. They will call for congressional action, not to roll back the tax cuts to the wealthy that caused all the damage, but for drastic cuts to important programs that the American people need and support. Education, healthcare, research, infrastructure, and veterans' benefits are already threatened in this budget. It includes an astonishing \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts; \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid alone. It even assumes \$49 billion in cuts to veterans' benefits.

The enormity of these cuts and the severity of the consequences for American families cannot be overstated, but more cuts will be coming if my Republicans get their way with this budget. We will see more attacks on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, nutrition assistance, on important benefits and services that help American families get ahead, and on key investments that keep our economy and our Nation strong.

To be clear, and with all due respect to my friend and colleague from Tennessee, by voting on this budget, for this budget, they are jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 515,000 hungry children in Tennessee so that the wealthiest person in that State, who has a net worth of \$8.8 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Democrats have a different budget and a far different vision for our country. Our priorities reflect the priorities of the American people.

We invest in programs that will grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and provide real support for working families; public investments that lead to a brighter future, such as rebuilding roads, bridges, and other vital infrastructure; retirement security for seniors now and for millions of Americans who fear they will never be able to afford to stop working; affordable education so that young people will be able to compete for the careers of the future; affordable, quality childcare for hardworking parents; and affordable quality healthcare for all Americans.

We believe in a government that helps individuals with nowhere left to turn and a Tax Code that helps families get ahead. Those are American priorities, and they should be the priorities of this Congress.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chair of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman and all the members of the Budget Committee who voted for this budget, and now it is on the floor.

I encourage all Members of the House to vote in favor of this budget, and

that is because our national debt continues to grow exponentially every day, every hour, every minute, and every second. We cannot afford to have any more time waiting to address the spending crisis that we are in.

This budget begins to put these irresponsible elitist policies behind us, and creates a culture around here that makes sure that our friends and neighbors who really need the help get the help without forcing our Nation's bills on our children and grandchildren, future generations, some of whom don't even exist yet.

Specifically, this budget reforms mandatory spending so it is focused on those, Mr. Chairman, in our communities who really need help. This will ensure that our country will focus limited resources on those who are most vulnerable, while encouraging a culture of self-reliance instead of government dependence.

We should be measuring, Mr. Chairman, success of these programs on how many people we get off of them, not how many people we trap in them.

Mr. Chairman, as the chart I am holding shows, because mandatory spending is over two-thirds of our total annual spending, reforming this part of our spending is the only way to really get our debt and deficits down. This budget, for the first time, starts addressing this part of the pie, \$203 billion worth, and that is because of the leadership here of Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Now, this budget also protects our friends and neighbors by making sure our families are safe, that the military has the tools that they need, and that the administration has the money it needs to secure our border.

This budget also jump-starts tax reform, which will put money back in the pockets of hardworking Hoosiers and all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, as President Ronald Reagan once said: "We don't have a trillion-dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion-dollar debt because we spend too much."

That is still true today, Mr. Chairman, except that that \$1 trillion is now \$20 trillion and growing.

Again, I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note for my colleague from Indiana that by voting for this budget, he will force 1,150,553 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Indiana to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$8 billion, can get a massive tax break.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today as a member of the Budget Committee to express my strong opposition to this budget resolution, which, if passed, would leave countless working families behind, and not to mention would, in fact, raise the Federal debt by at least \$3 trillion over the first decade and by at least \$6.6 trillion by the end of the second 10 years.

This proposed budget is an atrocious representation of our values. As more Americans find it harder and harder to get by, this budget guts what people need to be most successful. It takes away dollars from education; it takes away dollars from the programs we rely on for retirement, for switching between jobs, for healthcare.

We should be focused on funding the things that will enable the workforce to prepare for the 21st century, not gutting programs that will leave them falling further behind.

Rather than funding luxury travel for the Trump administration, let's invest in quality education, job skills training, and properly fund the State Department and foreign aid programs that Secretary of Defense Mattis and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Dunford have said are critical to our national security.

This budget puts working families, our economy, and our national security at risk.

Passage of this budget would also pave the way for Republican tax reform, if you want to call it that, which would favor big businesses that destroy our small towns.

It shouldn't be easier for a company to get a tax break on buying another robot than training their employees to gain skills for the modern economy. We need a tax plan to incentivize companies to invest in their workers instead of engaging in a race to the bottom where workers are viewed as a burden rather than an asset.

We need a budget that will foster economic growth for all of our people, and we need to make taxes more simple and fair for working families, not give handouts to the rich.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this proposed budget so that we can go back to the table—or, actually, to go to the table for the first time as Democrats and Republicans, and have a conversation about funding the resources that will actually move our economy and country forward into the 21st century and beyond.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who is also a member of our committee and also of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I must first start by thanking Chairwoman BLACK for her excellent work on this bill.

There are a lot of things that I can talk about that are very positive in

this budget, but today I want to emphasize how it prioritizes our national security.

With the growing threats around the globe, it is imperative that we fund defense of our Nation in an appropriate and a substantial way. We need to invest in our Armed Forces. We have to upgrade our defense systems and weapons systems, and we have to ensure the readiness of our military.

The United States must continue to lead on a global scale. This budget takes us in that direction by investing in our national defense. Obviously, coupled with targeted soft diplomacy funding, we accomplish that.

This budget takes us, as I said, in that direction, and it does so in a very positive way. I believe this budget makes those critical investments.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have to tell you that under the previous administration, cuts to our defense spending left the world a more dangerous place and it left our country in a more vulnerable place. Thankfully, the current administration recognizes the failure of the last 8 years and is, again, willing to lead again. Now it is up to us to do our part to provide the resources to allow the administration and our military to lead again. This budget gets us there. I am pleased to support it.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman for her invaluable leadership. I urge my colleagues to do the same and, again, make sure that we stand toe to toe with our adversaries and we stand, most importantly, with the national security interests of the United States.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for my friend and colleague from Florida that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 1,448,000 hungry children in Florida so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$13.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this dangerous budget proposal.

With many working families and businesses still struggling to adapt to a rapidly changing economy, our top priority in Congress should be to help expand opportunities and sustain long-term economic growth and security so no American is left behind as we forge new paths ahead.

□ 1430

To spur robust job growth, we must invest in our education system to provide the training and skills workers need to be prepared for the jobs of today and tomorrow.

We should invest in infrastructure that will put people to work and make our communities better places to do

business, and we should invest in growing a strong middle class, the backbone of our economy.

But instead, we are debating a budget that will go nowhere in the Senate simply so it can be used as a vehicle to give the wealthiest Americans a massive tax cut on the backs of middle class families.

This reckless budget cuts early childhood, K-12, and higher education programs, as well as job training and apprenticeships. It guts nutrition assistance, which provides benefits to more than 43 million Americans a year, almost half of whom are children. It continues the destructive cycle of neglecting our already crumbling infrastructure, even though we know the longer we wait, the more costly repairs will be in the future and the less economically competitive our communities will be.

Slashing programs that help working families in order to line the pockets of the wealthiest Americans has never led to jobs or economic growth, and it never will. Every dollar we spend is a reflection of our values, which is why I am deeply disappointed that this budget demonstrates an utter disregard for middle class Americans, a lack of vision for what our future could look like with smart, targeted investments, and a complete lack of empathy for the most vulnerable.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Budget Committee and also the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman for yielding time to me, and I particularly want to congratulate her on doing something that is going to be pretty remarkable today. She is bringing a budget that actually balances in 10 years.

My good friends on the other side will bring us three budgets, none of which come into balance in 10 years. In that, to be fair, they follow the tradition that President Obama set, who never ever brought us a budget that balanced and left us with a national debt roughly twice the size of the one he had when he came into office. If we don't do what Chairwoman BLACK suggests here, we are going to be in exactly that same position.

I particularly want to congratulate the chairwoman for having the courage to take on the tough issue of entitlement and mandatory spending reform. She has \$200 billion of it. It sounds like a lot of money, but it is out of \$30 trillion over 10 years. This is something we can do—frankly, we should do more of—and that is the way to actually move toward balance.

I also want to congratulate the chairwoman for actually working with other committee chairmen to help them identify the cuts so they are real. They

are not just fictional things in an imaginary document.

Finally, I particularly want to commend her for a wise investment in national security. That is a tough decision to make, but we have all seen the ravages left by sequester and by continuing resolutions that are the number one enemies of the United States military. We have actually, under the last administration, inflicted more damage on the military than any enemy could do on any battlefield anywhere in the world. Our chairwoman and our committee stops that, reverses that, and begins to invest.

Mr. Chair, I just want to end by pointing out the long-term solution here to our problems really is entitlement reform. We have to get serious about mandatory spending. It is two-thirds of the budget now. Without changing the direction we are going, it will be 81 percent a decade from now. It is simply not sustainable.

It is nice to talk about this discretionary program or that discretionary program. The fundamental problem that we face is mandatory spending. The chairwoman addresses it in her budget. We can come back and build on what she does next year and continue to go after the area that really unbalances the budget.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of the budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note, for my friend and colleague, that by voting for this budget, he will force 678,763 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Oklahoma to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$10.2 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the fiscal year 2018 Republican budget resolution, a budget that comes nearly 6 months late and days into the new fiscal year. This Republican budget betrays millions of hardworking middle class families, while showering billionaires with irresponsible tax cuts.

By cutting \$211 billion over the next 10 years for student loans and college aid, it makes it harder to send our kids to college. It abandons our Nation's crumbling infrastructure by cutting \$245 billion over 10 years for transportation. It turns its back on families putting food on the table with SNAP by cutting \$150 billion from the program over the next 10 years. It neglects our grandparents and our seniors with a \$487 billion cut to Medicare in the next decade, and it assumes the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, leaving over 20 million Americans uninsured.

I offered two amendments during the markup of this budget—one to fully

fund programs for our veterans, and another to reject paying for a border wall—both of which were blocked by my Republican colleagues.

This budget boosts defense spending to \$622 billion, \$72 billion above the budget cap for defense and well over even the President's request, and it underfunds nondefense spending at \$5 billion below the cap.

At the same time, Republicans have included instructions to fast-track a tax proposal that would add trillions to our Nation's deficit—trillions. It would end almost all itemized deductions, and according to the Tax Policy Center, increase taxes for roughly one in four taxpayers.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlemen from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, this budget completely ignores a balanced approach to achieving fiscal sustainability and stacks the deck even higher against middle class families, seniors, and students.

Mr. Chair, I reject today's Republican budget and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I want to remind my colleagues from the other side of the aisle that, during the time of the previous administration, there was \$9 trillion added to the debt, 1.9 percent economic growth, and that was the high of that period of time, and there were 14 million people who left the labor workforce. If their policies worked, we wouldn't see these kinds of statistics.

Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in many years, this budget uses reconciliation for the purpose it was intended: to bring mandatory spending under control.

The appropriations that dominate so much of the debate comprise less than one-third of our total spending, and that is called discretionary spending. The budget sets a level; the appropriations process spends to that level. That is everything from general government to defense.

We have actually been able to bring that under control, but the other two-thirds of spending is called mandatory spending. It is beyond the annual control of Congress. It continues automatically until and unless the statutes that call for it are actually changed.

It is the mandatory spending that is eating our country alive. Mandatory spending is supposed to be controlled by reconciliation. Instructions are sent

to the various authorizing committees to make whatever changes are necessary in current law to stay within our means. But this powerful fiscal tool has been ignored or squandered in past budgets, and this neglect is undermining the solvency of our country.

For the first time in many years, the House budget finally restrains mandatory spending by instructing our committees to find at least \$200 billion in savings over the next decade. That means this budget will get us back to balance within the decade, and this is why it is so important.

If the Democrats had their way and we maintain our current path, the Congressional Budget Office warns that in just 4 years, in 2022, our deficits will surpass \$1 trillion a year. That is where economists warn we run the risk of damage or even loss of our access to credit, a sovereign debt crisis.

If you want to know what that looks like, Venezuela is going through it right now, and within our own territory, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—pension systems implode, basic services falter, the economy collapses.

Two years after that, in 2024, 6 years from now, the CBO warns that the annual interest cost on our debt will reach \$654 billion. That is more than we currently spend on defense.

I would remind my friends on the left that you cannot provide for the common defense or promote the general welfare if you can't pay for it, and the ability of our country to do so is being undermined by our spending trajectory.

At the same time, we charge the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world, sending trillions of dollars of capital and hundreds of thousands of jobs to other countries. In the last 8 years, we have averaged only half of our postwar economic growth.

I remind my friends that corporations do not pay corporate taxes. Corporate taxes can only be paid in one of three ways: by consumers through higher prices, by employees through lower wages, by investors through lower earnings. Cutting corporate taxes means lower prices for consumers, higher wages for employees, and higher earnings for investors.

Tax relief is absolutely vital to reviving the economy, but experience does warn us that revenue growth only partially offsets revenue lost to tax reductions. Indeed, when we are told that the choice is between taxes and debt, those are two sides of the same coin.

Taxes and debt are the only two possible ways to pay for spending. Once we have spent a dollar, we have already decided to tax it. We either tax it now, or we borrow it now and tax it later. Either way, it is entirely driven by spending. By restraining spending, this budget makes possible the tax relief that our economy desperately needs to grow.

Frankly, we could do much more if we summon the political will, and I will be presenting such a budget tomorrow on behalf of the Republican Study Committee.

But this budget moves us a long way in the right direction. It sets in motion the policies that Presidents from Calvin Coolidge to John F. Kennedy to Ronald Reagan have all used to revive and expand our economy. It brings us closer to that day when families will awaken to a new and prosperous morning for America.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I want to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 2,319,000 hungry children in California so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$62.4 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chair, since the gentlewoman, my friend from Tennessee, remarked upon economic growth, let me, as one who was here at the time, perhaps correct the RECORD.

Bill Clinton's economic growth was higher than Ron Reagan's, and that is not in dispute. Barack Obama's economic growth was higher than George W. Bush's. We were losing 800,000 jobs a month at the end of the Bush administration, to bring up one point, which, by the way, is closer to 2.1 percent.

People here know I follow these issues like a hawk, but the truth is that this budget today that is being put forward is a threat to Medicare and Social Security down the road.

The previous speaker said he is concerned about mandatory spending. I gotcha. Put out a plan. Put out a plan on Social Security and Medicare. And don't do it in the backdoor way here as they complain about deficits and they prepare to embrace a tax cut of \$1.5 trillion or, over 10 years, \$2.2 trillion on top of the Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 which amounted to \$2.3 trillion. So we are at \$5 trillion worth of tax cuts, and the Clinton administration left us with four balanced budgets and \$5 trillion worth of surplus.

This is not a budget that supports meaningful tax reform. I am ready, and she knows because of our working together in the past, prepared to work with Republicans on fundamental tax reform. The system is begging for it.

Don't call tax reform tax reform when it is really a tax cut. And that is where this is headed, and I think they know that as well.

This is a partisan roadmap that has failed in the past. They are using reconciliation instruction so that the majority can ram through a tax plan here. That is all it is about.

Last night, by the way, the tradeoff is in some States you can keep the

mortgage interest deduction if you are willing to give up the State and local tax deduction.

I want to tell you something, I guarantee you right now, based on long history, we will end up keeping both, and they will have to add more to the debt as time goes on.

Is this a cut for the wealthy? Eighty percent of the tax cut goes to the top 1 percent in 2027.

□ 1445

This is from the Tax Policy Center in Washington. Incidentally, how great is it to have a nonpartisan scoring committee offer us a snapshot of the future?

The average tax cut for millionaires, \$230,000 a year in 2027. The average tax cut for the top one-tenth of 1 percent is \$1 million in the year 2027.

The people in this country who need tax relief are the middle class. We should be investing in human capital, community colleges; we should be investing in vocational education.

So 45 percent of all households with children will see a tax increase in 2027. Among households earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000, you are going to see a one-third tax increase in 2027.

I look at this and say: Why are we not offering some relief to middle class Americans? Why are we not investing in them? Do we not have enough faith in them to help them get through what have been difficult times with children in college and costs mounting all of the time?

Instead, it is back to tax relief for people at the very top. I guess concentrated wealth in America now is not a big issue. I guess the top 1 percent in America who, by the way, aren't even asking for tax relief—that is the irony of this. They are not asking for tax relief. They are arguing for more investment in America rather than concentrating more money in fewer hands.

The American people deserve a Tax Code that is based on fairness. Our code should reward hardworking, middle class families, small business, innovation, and ensure that no one, no matter how wealthy they are, can avoid paying their fair share.

Our focus is going to be on helping the middle class, creating jobs, boosting wages, and giving people the assistance they need in a complicated economy with their grocery bills and childcare as well. Invest in human capital today.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it kind of blows my mind. You look at the sign that was just displayed by our colleague; it says that the Republican budget is a bad deal for working Americans.

Well, I don't know what Americans you folks are talking to, but the mid-

dle class Americans that I talk to, they want an economic growing, job creating, tax cutting budget and tax relief effort. That is what they want out of the House. That is what the Republican plan is bringing.

We not only rebuild our military, but we do something that has not been done in years. We begin to get into that mandatory spending and the out-of-control spending that we have here in our Nation's Capitol.

Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the biggest threat to our national security is our national debt. How are we ever going to do that if we don't begin to address mandatory spending?

Mr. Chair, we have brought a good budget, a responsible budget, one that balances in 10 years to the floor. We need to get every colleague in this Chamber to get behind it because it is good for working Americans, it is good for working families, and it is the responsible thing to do.

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

I want to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 2,154,337 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Ohio to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$6.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

And just in case my colleagues on the other side are wondering where this information comes from as to the wealthiest person in each State, it is from that notoriously leftwing magazine, *Forbes*, this year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Chairman, any budget requires an examination of how and who pays for it and how that budget impacts the economy.

We were told by President Trump and Treasury Secretary Mnuchin that there would be no new tax cuts for the wealthy; and that this budget, and its blueprint, is a middle class miracle. That was last Wednesday.

One week later, this Wednesday, the facts are in. If you make \$730,000 in America, next year your income will rise by 8.5 percent, or \$129,000, or \$10,750 a month.

If you make \$67,000, your income will rise by 1.2 percent, or \$670 next year, or a whopping \$56 a month. This is no miracle. This is fraud being perpetrated against the middle class.

We are told that tax cuts pay for themselves through the magic of dynamic scoring. Their budget will increase the deficit by \$2.5 trillion over 10 years. Where are all the deficit hawks? Where are any of the deficit hawks?

Goldman alumnus Mnuchin and Gary Cohn, the National Economic Adviser, said that this bill will grow the economy. Goldman economists said that their budget will have no good impact in terms of growth in the Federal budget over the next several years.

Finally, infrastructure. The infrastructure budget for America, a nation of 300 million people, for the next 10 years is about the same as we spent rebuilding the roads and bridges of Iraq and Afghanistan over the last 10 years. This is unacceptable. We can do much better.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for her work on this incredible budget that we are talking about here today.

I rise today in support of the FY18 budget entitled "Building a Better America." Never has a budget had a more fitting title. The budget set forth by the House Budget Committee will balance the budget within 10 years, provide our military with the resources they need for national defense, and cut more than \$200 billion in mandatory spending.

Picture this: \$6.5 trillion in total deficit reduction over 10 years. On that fact alone, I would hope my colleagues would support this legislation.

This budget also paves the way for the recently released Unified Framework for Fixing Our Broken Tax Code.

On a telephone townhall with thousands of constituents on the phone from my district, 53 percent of participants reported that their most important priority for tax reform is a simpler, fairer Tax Code. The framework does just that and more.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the budget, to reduce the deficit, and take a huge step toward pro-growth tax reform that will increase paychecks, spur economic growth, and make our Tax Code simple, affordable, and competitive.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would like to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 809,000 hungry children in Georgia so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$12.6 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the Budget Act, adopted in 1974, requires that the House complete work on its budget for the next fiscal year by April 15. That is 172 days ago.

Yet we now have a budget resolution on the floor, already into the fiscal year for which the budget supposedly is planned. Some may ask why. The answer is a simple one.

This is, first of all, not a realistic budget which could or should stand as

a budget resolution. No, this budget is not about putting our country on a sustainable fiscal path, and—this is indisputable—it is not a budget to inform the appropriators of budget priorities and constraints.

No, the Appropriations Committee will not be informed. Why? Because we have already passed the appropriations bills. This budget doesn't have anything to do with the appropriation bills. They are passed, they are gone. They are in the Senate.

This is merely a vehicle for achieving partisan tax reform of the kind that President Trump and Republican leaders in Congress outlined last week. Despite what this sham of a budget pretends, their plan is to push through tax changes that massively increase deficits—I call it the granddaddy of all debt increases—while shifting even more wealth from middle class and working families to people like Donald Trump.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 80 percent of the tax cuts in this proposal would go only to those who make over \$900,000 a year. Hear me. The tax cuts mainly go to those making, in this Nation, over \$900,000 per year.

Despite promises from President Trump and Republicans here in the House, their plan actually raises taxes—hear me—while cutting taxes on those over \$900,000, it actually raises taxes on 1 in 3 middle class families who earn between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. HOYER. Even though Republicans continue to assert the discredited supply-side mantra that tax cuts pay for themselves, no responsible economist believes that, not one—responsible is the operative word. The Tax Policy Center's analysis found that their tax cuts would add \$2.4 trillion to deficits over the next 10 years.

The previous speaker said this balances the budget in 9 years. That is Alice in Wonderland balance. It will never happen. I have been here for 36 years; I have heard those comments all the time. It never happened.

But it is even worse, Mr. Chairman. The budget resolution also proposes to disinvest in job creation, pretends Republicans were able to repeal the Affordable Care Act—it hasn't been repealed, yet they pretend it has been repealed—to kick 23 million off their coverage and make those with preexisting conditions uninsurable.

It guts Medicaid and would end the Medicaid guarantee.

Furthermore, it would severely cut programs that reduce poverty and provide the kind of job training proven to get more people back into the workforce.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

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

Mr. HOYER. This resolution is a grab bag of all the worst Republican policies: partisan tax cuts for the wealthy that leave the middle class behind, the cruelty of TrumpCare, and draconian reductions in domestic investment. The product is just as bad as the sum of its parts; indeed, it is worse.

Instead, we ought to be working together to enact bipartisan tax reform that is fiscally responsible and focused on the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution, and I ask Republicans, who believe that tax reform must be permanent and, therefore, bipartisan, to join us in doing so.

Only one person can stop spending; that is the President of the United States. He can veto spending bills.

The debt under Ronald Reagan increased 189 percent. Under Bush I, 55 percent; he had 4 years. Under Clinton, 37 percent; under Bush II, 86 percent; and under Obama, who was dealing with the deepest recession of our lifetimes, 87 percent.

A budget is supposed to inform the Appropriations Committee of how it ought to proceed. This budget comes after the fact, and it is only for tax cuts for the wealthy.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues on the other side that we are talking about the budget. We are not talking about tax reform. We are going to have an opportunity to talk about that later.

Our budget does not assume that tax cuts pay for themselves, and our budget does not reflect that claim. Our budget includes a host of pro-growth economic policies, including comprehensive tax reform, as one of those, but regulatory reform; a reform in the improper payments; restoration of incentives for people to work and save and invest.

Most economists believe that this bundle of pro-growth tax policies will lead to a stronger economy than what we have under the current law. But we are talking about the budget here. So I would like for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to speak about the budget, and we will talk about tax reform at another time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution, and I commend Chairwoman BLACK on her leadership and tireless efforts.

Much has been said about our \$20 trillion debt, and I would like to add that we know that that debt can only be paid back with tax dollars that will be extracted from future taxpayers.

We debated and passed 12 appropriations bills in this Chamber. As heated as those debates were, they were on less than one-third of Federal spending. To attack our debt, we have to attack mandatory spending. This budget does that.

As I traveled around my district and talked to people in my district, I have been pleased to hear that business is good. Businesses want to grow, and they want to expand. But I have not been pleased when they told me that they cannot find employees. So I went back and looked at data. Arkansas has our lowest unemployment rate ever right now, but we have also got the lowest labor participation rate.

In the years from 2008 to 2016, we saw a 5.7 percent population growth. We saw a decrease in unemployment from 6 percent down to 4 percent, or 5½ down to 4 percent, but we had fewer people actually working in 2016 than we had in 2008. We had a decrease of 0.8 percent of people working and a decrease of 2.4 percent of people in the labor force during that time period.

We have to put plans and programs in place to get our economy growing. We have to get more people back to work. During that same time, we saw an increase in SNAP benefits. We saw 330,000 people, or over 14 percent of our State's population of able-bodied, working-age adults, getting their health insurance through Medicaid expansion.

We need to focus on addressing our budget woes. We need an economy that is growing and a labor force that is working. We need a military that is strong. We have to address the 70 percent component of spending that is driving our debt. This budget is the first step in achieving those results, and I urge everyone to vote for this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he will force 594,596 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Arkansas to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.5 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership as our ranking member on our Budget Committee.

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's so-called budget plan. I am a member, yes, of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and I know, because we work on this

each and every day, that our national budget is a statement of our national priorities and our values. I know very well that the Republicans have put forward, quite frankly, a sinister budget whose chief purpose is to hand tax breaks to billionaires.

Budgets are moral documents. They should not be rigged in favor of special interests and the wealthy few, but the Republican budget is. Our Nation's budget should prioritize working families and the middle class, too many of whom are making low wages and living below the poverty line.

It should assist those struggling to find a job and investment in workforce training, education, job creation, and job training. Instead, this Republican budget creates tax cuts for billionaire, millionaires, and corporations.

Our budget should expand to protect healthcare for all. Instead, this budget steals nearly \$2 trillion from lifesaving Medicaid and Medicare.

Our budget should also invest in our crumbling infrastructure, which, of course, creates jobs. But the Republican budget cuts funding for our roads, our bridges, and our railways.

Finally, with nearly 40 million Americans living in poverty, our Nation's budget should contain a serious and effective strategy to end poverty, especially for communities of color and rural communities who have higher poverty rates.

The House Republican budget does not do this. In fact, it slashes programs that help create good-paying jobs for struggling families by \$5.4 trillion. No family in America should be forced to go hungry. Yet, because wages are so low across this country, millions of families now rely on nutrition and food assistance. Yet this budget cuts \$150 billion from SNAP, food assistance, and nutrition assistance, which will create more poverty for people who are working. It doesn't make any sense. It is fundamentally immoral.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, once again, Republicans are determined to balance their budget on the backs of the most vulnerable; to hand tax breaks to millionaires, and billionaires, and corporations; and slush funds for Pentagon contractors.

This budget is cruel and unusual punishment for those who are not rich. I urge my colleagues to reject this un-American, heartless budget, and to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I would say to my colleague from Kentucky, I

think the rhetorical device that he is using at the end of each speaker is very effective and it is persuasive. But I would challenge him with this: I think one of the things that we have got to struggle with as a body, both Republicans and Democrats alike, is not being selective on the issue of the deficits. What we can't say is deficits are okay if it involves more spending for all of us as a body to distribute as we see fit, but deficits are not okay if they involve a tax cut and sending money back to individuals within each of our communities.

It is for that reason, again, I have voiced my concerns with regard to some of the components of this budget. But I think that the big issue for me is, simply, we cannot continue to spend as we are and have the ship of America sail forward.

It was Erskine Bowles who was the Democratic Chief of Staff to former President Clinton who observed: "We are walking our way toward the most predictable financial crisis in the history of man if we don't get our arms around spending."

So, for me, while not perfect—and I certainly cede that point—I think the building blocks of what this budget is trying to get toward is a sustainable economy.

How do you have a sustainable economy?

Many of the things that my Democratic colleagues have talked about in terms of education, workforce development, those things. But it is also about the foundation of: Is our spending sustainable?

You can't go on spending more than you take in forever without having bad things happen at the individual level, at the corporate level, and certainly at the governmental level.

I think it is about: Is our tax load sustainable?

Spending drives tax loads, which is interesting. I pulled a chart that shows for the first 100 years of our country's existence, we spent about 3 percent of GDP. It bumped up after World War II. We are now roughly around 20 percent, and we are on our way to 30 percent.

The question we have to ask in this budget or any other budget like it is: Can we continue to do this without going to the exact spot that Erskine Bowles was talking about?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Finally, I would simply make this point: Not only can you only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip—and there are certainly limits that have shown themselves, which is around 18 or 20 percent of GDP, regardless of tax rate, up, down; there is that—but there is also this: You can pay me now, or you can pay me later in life.

A deficit is simply a deferred tax. A debt is simply an accumulation of deferred taxes. One of the things, again, we have to get our arms around is that we are stacking up deferred taxes. We are stacking up an accumulation of taxes with debt and deficits. This budget, I think, begins to nudge us in the right direction in doing something about it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from South Carolina, and I certainly have a great deal of respect for his thoughtfulness. But I also must note that if he votes for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 366,000 hungry children in South Carolina so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and its intent to fast-track tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations. This resolution, first of all, is not serious. It assumes \$800 billion in savings from the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which we know will not happen. We have the Treasury Secretary being quoted as saying that "massive tax cuts will actually reduce the deficit. . . ."

Well, we know how that works. You cut taxes for the wealthy and say they are going to pay for themselves. When that doesn't work and the deficit explodes, you come back and demand massive tax and massive cuts in Medicare, Social Security, and education.

Anyway, the Republican budget resolution, even if it did add up, makes the wrong choices for America. By calling for trillions of dollars in spending reductions, the Republican budget undermines America's investments in infrastructure, the environment, scientific research, and much more.

I wanted to use my limited time to focus on its harmful impacts on the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee, where I serve as the Democratic ranking member. Under the Republican budget resolution, children in need of a healthy school meal, students in pursuit of an affordable college education, and workers in search of skills and training to get a better job all take the back seat to tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

In education, the budget harms students and families by undermining our Nation's education system, and instructs the House Education and the Workforce Committee to eliminate \$20 billion in investments in higher education by providing less funding for Pell grants and student loans.

In terms of other instructions, it instructs the Department of Labor to reduce funding designed to provide job training, protect workers from wage theft, and ensure that there is a sufficient number of inspectors to make sure that workers can come home safely from their jobs.

The budget also threatens child nutrition programs. In fact, during the Budget Committee's hearings, it was made clear that child nutrition programs are a target for savings to pay for tax cuts.

Today, almost 10 million children and 20,000 schools have access to universal, healthy school meals, where children are served nutritious meals without the stigma or need for paperwork. Cutting investments in programs to ensure that children have healthy school meals to partially fund tax cuts shouldn't be our Nation's goal.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal budget is a statement of our values. Unlike other Democratic substitutes that responsibly strengthen our economy and expand opportunity for all Americans, the Republican budget undermines priorities in which students, workers, and their families take a hit, and lays the groundwork for a return to a regressive framework benefiting a wealthy few.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the Republican budget resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), who is the chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman BLACK for yielding.

Imagine what our opinion would be of a movie review where the reviewer simply looked at a movie poster and then wrote the review and came to a conclusion that they didn't like the movie. They didn't listen to the music. They didn't see the direction. They didn't see the pacing. They didn't see the acting. They didn't see the script. They didn't see the cinematography. They saw nothing other than a movie poster and they came to a conclusion.

We would dismiss that and we would say: How ridiculous. How absurd.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what the Tax Policy Center did this past week. They wrote a review of a proposal as it relates to tax reform, and they didn't have the details.

Why didn't they have the details?

Because many of these details don't exist.

□ 1515

Specifically, they wrote a review which was very pejorative, which the Wall Street Journal completely trashed. They made this finding, and they had no notion of what the income brackets are like in our proposed tax reform plan. They had no notion about the anti-abuse rules that the Ways and Means Committee is working through

to make sure there is not an abusive situation as it relates to pass-through entities. They had no notion about some of the offshore protections that are being contemplated.

Let's avoid the hyperbole. Let's avoid the hackneyed, old, tired, and faded bumper sticker that says that any kind of pro-growth tax reform is a sop to the rich. It is complete nonsense.

I think the proof will be in a tax reform proposal that this House hopefully will be considering in the coming weeks and months that will bring buoyancy, optimism, and a real opportunity for us to take advantage of a once-in-a-generation opportunity for a Tax Code that nobody can defend and nobody likes. But let's get real and evaluate real numbers and not just look at posters and bumper stickers.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note for my colleague from Illinois that, by voting for this budget, he will force 2,066,376 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Illinois to pay more for lifesaving Medicare, all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$8 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member YARMUTH for the time to speak in opposition to the Republican budget.

As ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I am really perplexed as to why the majority continues their assault on American excellence, following President Trump's lead and divesting from investments in American global leadership, science, and infrastructure.

This budget would cut \$5 billion for domestic and international investments, while violating the Budget Control Act for defense spending and triggering a \$72 billion sequester of all defense accounts.

My Republican colleagues might argue that slashing nondefense investments is necessary to reduce the debt, but this is a false choice. Why would the Republican majority give tax cuts to the very wealthiest if it means this country has to take a backseat to China in research and development or let our own workforce go without the training to fill 21st century jobs?

We know there is a role for government where the private sector has left voids. Many in the private sector believe we should be investing more in basic research, STEM programs, and public transportation. This budget and the appropriations bills that enact this budget have fallen short in these areas.

Given the budget is 6 months late and the appropriations process has actually moved before the budget, we do not have to guess the implications of

the budget. We have seen what the Republicans would do under these draconian levels.

Just look, Mr. Chairman, at the Labor, Health, and Education bill that passed the House last month. That bill eliminated entire job training programs like apprenticeship grants, cut the Pell grant surplus, and eliminated Supporting Effective Instruction State grants, a \$2 billion investment that reduces class sizes and improves classroom instruction. This cut would cost 8,500 teachers their jobs.

The transportation spending bill eliminated the Department of Transportation's major infrastructure grant program, TIGER, a direct contradiction to the President's promise to improve our Nation's infrastructure and which Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao confirms "funds innovative projects that improve the safety of America's passengers and goods."

Mr. Chairman, we can and should—we must—do better than this. I urge a "no" vote on the Republican budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, for too long Congress has been allowed to play by a different set of rules than the American people in regard to how we budget. No one lives in a world where there is seemingly an endless supply of money, that is, until you enter the fantasy world of Washington, D.C.

However, hardworking American families, businessmen, and businesswomen live in the real world. They have to budget. They have to prioritize and make trade-off decisions: wants versus needs, what is good and what is essential. The bottom line, they have to live within their means.

But, apparently, our government has been exempt from such basic principles of fiscal responsibility under which we the people must live. The prevailing budget philosophy over the years among our representative leaders has been as follows: as long as we can borrow it, you can bet your bottom dollar we can spend it. And spend it they have.

This borrowing-and-spending delusion has left us on the brink of bankruptcy. We are \$20 trillion in debt, which puts our country in the worst debt position in the history of America, and this with the sacred constitutional charge to secure liberty for our posterity. That means give freedom to our children.

Mr. Chairman, there is no freedom with this level of debt. If we don't do something about this looming debt crisis and stay on our current spending trajectory, in less than 10 years, we will be at \$30 trillion in debt. We will have \$1 trillion in annual deficit. We will be spending more—get this—on our interest on the debt we owe than on national defense.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. I rise in support of this budget, a budget that begins to rein in this reckless spending, a budget that funds our national priorities and our core responsibilities and initiates a historic opportunity for tax relief for middle and working class families.

Let's stop spending our children's future and stop pretending that they won't inherit a disaster as a result. Let's live in the same reality as every other American. Let's focus on our main mission as a limited Federal Government by rebuilding our military, by maintaining our infrastructure, and by securing our food supply so we can maintain the ability to feed our own people.

Let's unleash our job creators from the highest tax burden in the free world. Let's allow our families and individuals to keep more of their hard-earned money, and let's hand this country safer, stronger, and freer than we found it.

Mr. Chairman, let's pass this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 2,060,000 hungry children in Texas so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, my fellow alum, for his leadership. I recognize and thank the chairwoman of the committee.

To my good friend that was on the floor, I think he wants limited government when disaster is not in his district.

So I think it is important as a member of this Budget Committee of which I am so very proud of its service, as the Democrats have worked so hard, and as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, a committee called upon for domestic tranquility and domestic security, might I just add that we are now marking up a bill just a few floors away from this House that is asking for \$15 billion to pay for a border wall in the midst of the horror of tragedy and in the midst of a lowering number of individuals even coming to the United States across the border, the very border wall that was told to us would be paid for by the people of Mexico.

But I think the important point is that my good friends who are supporting this dastardly budget that tears at the fabric of America are, as well, supporting a tax cut for the wealthy that will provide \$2.9 trillion of debt to the American people and increase the debt as well as the deficit. It will mean that working and middle

class families will have taxes raised on them by \$470 billion. We will see the heavy brunt of this budget on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

Just a few hours ago, I said the American people do not need to have the government step on them; and I can assure you, with this budget, which cuts more than \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare, we will step on the American people.

We will end the Medicare guarantee, and it will narrowly shortchange soft power by cutting and decimating the State Department, the very partner that we need to continue the security of the American people, raising defense, of whom I support all of our military. Texas is a military State. But it is \$72 billion above cap, and that is not giving our military personnel their due. It is going above the needs of the military.

We need to be prepared, but this skinny budget will undermine education and the workforce at \$326 billion, energy and commerce at \$1.56 billion, homeland security by \$25 billion, justice and the needs of civil justice by \$67 billion, and veterans by \$49 billion.

It will cut the Community Development Block Grant, and it will hurt Virgin Islands U.S. citizens, Puerto Rico U.S. citizens, and Texas, that is still struggling.

Before I came to this floor, I was engaging with my State about more disaster food stamp sites because I have people who are unhoused in the 18th Congressional District, who are needing the resources.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have individuals who our wonderful first responders had to drag out of the raging waters in Hurricane Harvey. I have homes that were underwater that need disaster relief. I have individuals who are walking along highways like oceans, and then I have children who are with families who do not have jobs because of Hurricane Harvey, who need the Children's Health Insurance Program or need the disaster food stamps.

This is a budget that steps on the American people. It steps on our disaster relief, and it does not recognize what the United States Government is. It is a refuge and a relief for the American people.

Vote "no" on the Republican budget.

Mr. Chair, as a member of the Budget Committee, a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and the proud representative of the 700,000 residents of 18th Congressional District of Texas who are still coping with the devastation

caused by Hurricane Harvey, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H. Con. Res. 71, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018.

Why do I urge every Member of this House to vote against this Republican budget resolution, laughingly called the "Building a Better America Budget," but which more accurately should be named the "Nightmare on Capitol Hill Budget"?

Let us count the ways; here are eight to start.

1. Republican budget mandates \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts to top priorities like disaster relief, education, infrastructure, research, veteran benefits, and programs that expand opportunities for American families.

2. Republican budget provides \$2.9 trillion in tax cuts to millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations, while raising taxes on working and middle class families by \$470 billion.

3. The budget includes fast-track reconciliation procedures to push through cuts to programs that tens of millions of Americans count on totaling \$203 billion across 11 House committees.

4. The steep reductions in program investments proposed in this Republican budget fall most heavily on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

5. Republican budget immediately guts investment critical to expanding economic opportunity by lowering the already inadequate austerity-level spending caps by an additional \$5 billion in 2018 and by even more in subsequent years.

6. Republican budget adopts Trumpcare but does even more damage because in addition to depriving more than 20 million Americans of healthcare, denying protection to persons with preexisting conditions, and raising costs for older and low-income adults, cuts more than \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare.

7. Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee and calls for replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with fixed payments for the purchase of health insurance, shifting costs and financial risks onto seniors and disabled workers; this represents a \$500 billion cut to Medicare over ten years.

8. The Republican budget focuses too narrowly on the military, shortchanging American soft-power and other essential elements of national security by increasing defense spending by \$72 billion above the cap and hollowing out the State Department and foreign aid agencies with cuts of \$11 billion and environmental and natural resource protection by more than \$6 billion.

Mr. Chair, the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of our values and priorities as a nation.

Sadly, this Republican budget, just like the President's "skinny budget" fails this moral test of government.

America will not be made great by stealing another \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, abandoning seniors and families in need, depriving students of realizing a dream to attend college without drowning in debt, or disinvesting in the working families just to give unwanted tax breaks to wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent.

America will not be positioned to compete and win in the global, interconnected, and digital economy by slashing funding for scientific research, the arts and humanities, job retraining, and clean energy.

Even a cursory review leaves the inescapable conclusion that this budget represents a betrayal—of our values as a nation, and of the promises made by the President during the election campaign.

This Republican budget is not a budget for the real world that real Americans live in but is as much a fantasy budget as the Trump “Skinny Budget” in that it pretends to achieve balance by assuming that painless spending cuts can and will be made by the following standing committees of Congress in the following amounts:

1. Agriculture Committee: cut \$207 billion
2. Armed Services Committee: cut \$33 billion
3. Education and Workforce Committee: \$326 billion
4. Energy and Commerce Committee: \$1.656 trillion
5. Financial Services Committee: cut \$124 billion
6. Homeland Security Committee: cut \$25 billion
7. Judiciary Committee: cut \$67 billion
8. Natural Resources Committee: cut \$59 billion
9. Oversight and Government Reform Committee: cut \$282 billion
10. Transportation and Infrastructure Committee: cut \$3 billion
11. Veterans Affairs Committee: cut \$49 billion
12. Ways and Means Committee: cut \$800 billion
13. Unassigned (i.e., Intelligence; Foreign Affairs; Small Business; Science, Space, and Technology Committees: cut \$747 billion
14. Total Cuts: \$4.38 trillion

To put these reckless, irresponsible, and draconian budget cuts in perspective, it is useful to examine what they mean when applied to the programs depended upon by Americans to rise up the economic ladder, plan for the future, provide for their families, and strive to achieve the American Dream.

The elimination of funding for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) drains resources from communities, even in times of disaster because CDBG provides flexible grants to local communities for a wide range of unique needs, including Meals on Wheels, housing programs, and community infrastructure improvements.

The Republican budget targets disaster grants made by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which help families and businesses when their disaster-related property losses are not covered by insurance.

The Republican budget makes higher education more expensive by cutting \$211 billion from student financial aid programs, like Pell Grants, over ten years.

The Republican budget also eliminates subsidized loans, making it difficult for students, particularly low-income students, to afford college and compounds the damage by making it more difficult to repay student loans by eliminating the Public Sector Loan Forgiveness and Teacher Loan Forgiveness programs.

The Republican budget's solution to the affordable housing crisis currently facing cities large and small all across the country is to convert all discretionary spending on affordable housing into a block grant, which means there will be even less assistance to help the 71 percent of extremely low income renter households who spend more than half their income on housing.

The Republican budget cuts \$154 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) over the next ten years by essentially converting it to a block grant, cutting off funding for eligible individuals and requiring cash-strapped states to either fill in the gap or take away food assistance from millions of working families, children, and seniors.

Mr. Chair, as economists and policy experts have documented time and again, immigration reform would expand the size of the U.S. workforce, and in turn would increase the size of the economy and reduce deficits.

The Republican budget, however, again rejects comprehensive immigration reform that would bring clear and just rules for those seeking citizenship and help secure the nation's borders.

In doing so, the Republican budget squanders an opportunity to reduce deficits by an estimated \$900 billion over the next two decades, boost the economy by 5.4 percent, and extend the solvency of Social Security.

Mr. Chair, none of us can forget the President's favorite boast and central campaign promise that he would build a wall on our southern border and guarantee that Mexico would be made to pay for it.

The Republican budget deprives the President of the opportunity to make good on his foolish boast by forcing American taxpayers to foot the bill for President Trump's \$1.6 billion border wall that will do nothing to stop unauthorized entry into the country and will not fix our broken immigration system.

The Republican budget continues to target federal employees by cutting their compensation and benefits by at least another \$163 billion over ten years, which comes on top of the \$182 billion in cuts federal employees have already absorbed in the form of higher retirement contributions, pay freezes, and furloughs.

The Republican budget puts U.S. transportation network on the road to ruin by slashing transportation spending, by \$254 billion over ten years, or 25 percent below current estimates.

The Republican budget cuts hurts veterans by cutting veterans benefits by nearly \$50 billion over the next ten years, with newly eligible veterans experiencing cuts in programs that pay for education benefits as well as loan guarantees.

Finally, Mr. Chair, it must be pointed out that the Republican budget's pretension to balance is based on reliance on trillions of dollars in budget games and gimmicks to rig the numbers.

The Republican budget counts a dubious \$1.8 trillion “economic dividend” from cutting taxes and taking away consumer protections that is not backed up by any credible analysis and assumes \$1.5 trillion of this “dividend” will go toward deficit reduction.

The Republican budget assumes, despite all precedent and evidence to the contrary, that

tax reform will be revenue neutral, even though Republican tax plans are projected to lose between \$3 trillion and \$7 trillion.

Given these budgetary shenanigans, never could it more truly be said that “figures don't lie, but liars figure.”

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

It is for this reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a “moral test.”

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards.

Because the American people deserve to know exactly what ills Republicans have in store for them, I strongly oppose H. Con. Res. 71 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this reckless, cruel, and heartless measure that will do nothing to improve the lives or well-being of middle and working class families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been an honor to work with the chairman of the Budget Committee as a new Member of Congress because it is such a learning curve to understand the challenges that we have in our country in so many ways, but especially on the fiscal side of things.

I would like to spend my time talking to my grandchildren right now. I am talking to your grandchildren as well.

In the last 48 hours, I have had an opportunity—it was more of a responsibility—to chat with my grandchildren about the horrific events that occurred in Las Vegas. When you are 8 or 16, you assimilate those things in different ways. I talk to them a lot about responsibility for behavior, responsibility for money, and responsibility for their own lifestyles.

I talked to them today to say that we are not going to put you into the debt hole caused by the spending that has occurred over the last decades in this country. We are not going to pass that along to you, because the hole is only getting deeper and more extensive, and we are passing it along to those next generations. Not only is it not right, it is morally wrong and absolutely irresponsible.

We have to ask ourselves the questions: If not now, then when do we begin to bend the spending curve? If we don't do it, then who will?

We know that mandatory spending within our grandchildren's lifetime

will eclipse almost, if not, 100 percent of the Federal budget. That means no money for research, for medical, for education, and for all of those discretionary dollars that are so wisely spent.

We have to begin to bend the spending curve now, and that means cuts in mandatory spending, while responsibly using the other dollars, the discretionary dollars, to advance good programs.

□ 1530

That takes discipline, that takes effort, that takes making tough decisions that are unpopular but necessary for the future of our country.

Our Budget Committee wrestled long and hard to present what you are going to vote on, and I am proud of the fact that with the discourse and debate that we had over tough issues, in the end, the American people are taking a next first step forward towards fiscal responsibility that reflects the reality that we owe to our grandchildren, just like our parents and grandparents felt that they needed to do for us during the Great Depression and a couple of World Wars to make sure that we have a physically viable country. This budget is a next first step.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 1,895,558 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Michigan to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$5.9 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and an alumnus of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, ugly is ugly.

This is an ugly budget, and it exists primarily to be a vehicle for tax cuts for the already fortunate, the top 1 or 2 percent in America, at the expense of everybody else. It will hemorrhage red ink for as far as the eye can see.

That is not a theory. That is what happened in the previous massive tax cuts, both under Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush.

Let me give you one example of the ruinous aspects of this budget, and it has to do with Federal employees.

This budget cuts Federal employee compensation and benefits by another \$163 billion over the next 10 years, \$32 billion of which is included in reconciliation and instructions which I sought to strike with an amendment submitted to the Rules Committee that was not allowed.

The Republican cuts include higher retirement contributions; elimination of the FERS supplement, which law enforcement retirees heavily benefit

from; lower annuities by changing the retirement calculation and reduced healthcare benefits; a 10 percent reduction in the Federal workforce at non-security agencies, even though nearly all of the workforce increases, since 2001, occurred in security-related agencies.

The Federal workforce provides vital services to our Nation. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, protect us from terrorists, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cybersecurity attacks, find cures for deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe. Veterans make up 31 percent of those Federal employees.

Federal employee pay and benefits are not the cause of this country's deficit and debt. The Federal workforce has already contributed nearly \$200 billion toward reducing the country's deficit in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, furloughs, and increased retirement contributions.

We should honor and revere the service of our Federal workforce, not denigrate it with the attacks included in this ugly budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), my dear friend.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chair of the Budget Committee for a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, I came to the floor today to weigh in on this budget debate.

I find it incredible that my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be in a state of denial on the fact that this country, the greatest on the planet, is \$20 trillion in debt.

These are the same people in opposition, Mr. Chairman, who will present a budget tomorrow that will add nearly \$3 trillion in more taxes and more than \$6 trillion in more spending. This debt is going to land squarely on the shoulders of our children, our grandchildren, and—let me just say it for the record—is so large that it is going to land on our grandchildren's grandchildren.

When does this insanity stop?

There is not an easy way out of the mess. This budget puts us on a path to fiscal sanity. It targets Federal spending that is outside the purview of the Appropriations Committee.

The budget ensures a strong national defense. It puts us on a path to fiscal sustainability, and it gives us the opportunity to do deficit reduction. The budget has progrowth policies that move us in a more sustainable direction.

I understand the opposition coming from the other side. Their answer, Mr. Chairman, as always, is: let's tax more and let's spend more. That is not a responsible course. It won't lead to a good outcome for this country.

Mr. Chairman, let me finally say that it is time we had a national conversa-

tion about the math problem facing this country. This budget starts that conversation. I encourage all my colleagues to support it, recognize where we are as a country, and resolve to do something about it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 200,000 hungry children in Arkansas all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.5 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution before us today.

You have got to get a charge out of what you are hearing and listening to today.

If one were to draw a chart from 2001 and 2003 to the present time, what contributes to the deficit and the debt?

I am glad to hear someone from the other side talk about that debt, because I thought you forgot all about it. This budget seems to think that you have amnesia.

If you look at the chart, what grows the debt? The tax cuts that you put into effect in 2001 and 2003, which helped the rich and brought us to an economic abyss 4 years later. You did it, and you are trying to do it again.

So we will see if Democrats are irrelevant, since you didn't include us, so far, up to this point. So much for our bipartisanship.

You asked for \$203 billion in mandatory spending cuts across 11 committees. It will have to be reconciled with a Senate budget that explodes our deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Good luck.

While this Republican budget claims to balance in 10 years, it does so with unnamed cuts, gimmicks, and magical thinking about the economic growth.

The budget is built on the same premise on which you tried to cut the ACA, the Affordable Care Act. Let's take \$750,000, cut down on Medicaid, and we will give that money in tax cuts to the very wealthy. That was your plan. You saw how the country received it.

This budget cuts Medicare by \$487 billion by eliminating the Medicare guarantee. How can you justify that and look into the eyes of seniors in this country?

It assumes repeal of the Affordable Care Act. You want to use the Affordable Care Act's money, but you want to dissolve it, choke it, and starve it. It assumes an appeal of that act, which would take 23 million Americans off their healthcare insurance.

It assumes a \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid—it is in your budget—and \$2.5 trillion in other mandatory cuts, with no specifics.

The gentleman from Michigan needs to study the facts. You have got to get him the facts.

The greatest contributor, as I said, were the two tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. We know the breakdown of where that went to.

This is not a serious budget. It is a desperate attempt to enact deficit-exploding tax cuts.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded to direct all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PASCRELL. I am making all my remarks through the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, 1 percent would be the recipients of 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts within 10 years.

This budget, like the phony tax plan, is a joke and is insulting to us as Members of Congress. I know you have some problems with your own Conference. I don't know how you are going to figure that out. Don't expect us to bail you out.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for her leadership during this budget process. She has done an amazing job of showing wisdom and patience and negotiating this all through this process. My sincere thanks are given to the gentleman.

This budget is a critical step in getting our economy growing and our national debt under control. Not only does it balance in 10 years and put our country on the path to fiscal stability, it also lays the groundwork for tax reform.

With this budget, we are demonstrating that it is possible to have fiscal discipline and keep our promises to the American people. We can no longer continue to kick the can down the road on our mandatory spending crisis. We are leaving behind more and more debt for our children and grandchildren, and it is morally wrong.

We must put politics aside and have tough conversations to ensure that we can keep the promises that we have made to Americans and to future generations.

This budget does not solve our mandatory spending crisis overnight, but it begins that process by achieving a \$203 billion savings in mandatory spending.

By passing this budget, we will also kick-start tax reform. I have said time and time again that America should be the best place in the world to do business, yet we have a Tax Code that tells

our businesses that they should take their jobs and their profits overseas.

Every American benefits from lower taxes and growing the economy. The tax reform framework we released last week will do just that. Americans will get to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks, companies will have the freedom to reinvest in their businesses and workers, and more people can move to the American Dream.

Before we can make these changes, we must pass the budget. The reconciliation instructions in the budget will set us on a path to comprehensive tax reform in both the House and the Senate.

This is not just a conversation about dollars and cents. It is about Americans who are counting on us to keep our commitments. We must do the tough work of reforming our mandatory spending programs and reforming our Tax Code.

I am excited to support this budget to build a better America and pledge to continue working toward comprehensive mandatory spending reform.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 1,519,461 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Georgia to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$12.6 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) the Democratic Caucus chairman.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my friend and colleague from Kentucky, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget proposal is just cruel. It isn't just cruel; it will set our country backwards. It is worse than cruel.

It puts more than \$5 trillion in cuts on the backs of working and middle class Americans. At the same time, it doles out billions of dollars in tax breaks to wealthy individuals, while leaving everyday Americans empty-handed.

Are you a senior who relies on Medicare or Medicaid for important healthcare needs?

Too bad, says the Republican budget. Your care will simply be cut.

Are you a student looking to get a good education and launch your career?

Tough luck, says the Republican budget. Pell grants are on the chopping block, if Republicans have their way.

Are you struggling to recover after a natural disaster?

Forget about it, says the Republican budget. Grants from FEMA and other programs that help rebuild our Nation will be eliminated.

The facts are clear: this Republican budget does nothing to invest in America, the American people, or our future.

It cuts funds for our crumbling infrastructure, rather than rebuilding our schools and roads and putting millions back to work. It slashes investment in green energy technology, rather than preparing a new generation of Americans to lead us into the economy of tomorrow.

Worst of all, it ramps up funding for endless wars overseas while gutting programs that help the brave veterans who served their country so well.

Eighty years ago, then-President Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke of a national nightmare when he saw a third of our Nation "ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished."

□ 1545

When you look at this budget, it is not hard to see why FDR's words haunt us to this day, because this budget would take us back to that terrible time when dreams were dashed, futures were uncertain, and hope was all but lost, put back to a time when people were hurting.

That is not the America I want. That is not the America our constituents deserve. They deserve a better deal for all Americans.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, Democrats believe that our constituents deserve a better deal, a better deal for all Americans, a plan to bring better jobs, better wages, and a better future to everyone, and a vision to give every American the opportunity to prosper and to succeed.

That is the kind of America we should be working towards. That is the better idea that America should be working towards. That is why I will vote "no" on this terrible plan.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I tell you what is cruel. That is doing the same thing over and over again and getting the same results. That is cruel. Especially when we look in our grandchildren's eyes and say: We are really sorry we didn't take 40-year-old programs and reform them so they could be better, so we could reduce the spending, we could give good services and reduce the spending. That is cruel when you don't do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Building a Better America budget. Last month, our country's national debt exceeded \$20 trillion. Interest payments under that alone are scheduled to go up to \$768 billion per year and will skyrocket to \$1 trillion should these artificially low interest rates return to their normal levels.

The debt not only threatens to bankrupt our country, it threatens our children's future and the American Dream.

Now, we can't change the culture of spending in Washington overnight, but this budget puts us on the right path to fiscal sustainability. Our budget balances in 10 years, works to begin paying down the debt, and promotes job growth policies like tax, regulatory, and entitlement reform.

For the first time in decades, this budget resolution finally directs Congress to address mandatory spending, the main driver of these deficits. As this graph shows, if nothing is done to address entitlement programs and our interest payments, mandatory spending will fully eclipse the Federal budget in the next few years.

Now, politicians in Washington have promised to address exploding debt and deficits for years, but now we have the opportunity to actually do it. We cannot solve our debt crisis, however, without economic growth. That is why our budget provides reconciliation instructions for tax reform.

Today we have a Tax Code that is overly complicated, punishes work, rewards special interests, and discourages job creation and investments here in America. The result has been an anemic recovery of only 1 or 2 percent. This stagnation has made it harder for families in Minnesota and all over the United States to realize the American Dream.

That is what this is about. Every time tax reform has been tried in the 1920s, in the 1960s, in the 1980s, it has worked to make America globally competitive by encouraging private sector investment that is more productive.

That is why today I urge my colleagues to support this budget, tax reform, economic growth, and fiscal sanity.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my friend and colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 216,000 hungry children in Minnesota so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$5.4 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's 2018 budget, which would dramatically increase our deficit and debt by trillions of dollars to give millionaires and billionaires a massive tax cut.

Don't be fooled. This plan directly benefits President Trump, his family, and his administration, including Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, Education Secretary DeVos, and Commerce Secretary Ross, but offers breadcrumbs for the middle class and nothing for low-income Americans.

The craziest thing about all of this is that Republicans have been crowing for 7 years that the deficit is too large and that it is hurting our job growth, yet here they go abandoning their principles to cash out their rich benefactors.

I also want to talk about some of the ways Republicans partially pay for this tax cut for the rich. During the same week that Equifax and Wells Fargo executives are testifying about the harm they have caused to millions of Americans, Republicans propose gutting the Consumer Bureau, which has successfully helped millions of our constituents receive compensation by effectively eliminating its funding and independence.

What is more, Republicans would eliminate the backup authority to safely unwind failing megabanks without harm to our economy. Rather than eliminate this tool, we should instead be talking about how to break up bad megabanks like Wells Fargo, who repeatedly break the law and harm millions of consumers. Yet, both the Consumer Bureau and the megabank wind-down authority are sacrificed to pay for the richest 1 percent tax cut.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to reject this measure.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Building a Better America budget. That is truly what it does. For too long, our government has spent money on a credit card with our children and grandchildren's name on it. It shocks some here in this Chamber, but the era of overspending is over.

Adopting this budget will allow us to deliver the key promises we have made to Americans: getting our spending under control, balancing the budget, and paving the way to deliver meaningful tax reform.

This resolution balances the budget within 10 years and produces a \$9 billion surplus in fiscal year 2027. It achieves deficit reduction of \$6.5 trillion over 10 years. It also reduces the size of our bloated government by giving instructions to 11 House committees to achieve at least \$203 billion in mandatory savings.

This resolution curbs our unsustainable spending while maintaining a strong defense and protecting critical programs like Medicare.

There is much work to be done to create jobs and get our economy moving beyond the pathetic 2 percent growth. This budget is an important step to doing just that.

This budget allows us to deliver on our promise to the American people to fix our broken Tax Code. Workers living paycheck to paycheck, like my parents did, need relief and they need it now. We cannot delay any longer.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seek to raise taxes by \$3 tril-

lion and simply spend more. I suggest they study how that approach worked in Greece.

I urge my colleagues to support the Building a Better America budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he will force 1,895,558 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Michigan to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has net worth of \$5.9 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell, here is the Republican and the President's case. They want you to believe that if you cut corporate taxes, if you cut taxes on the investor class, that this is going to raise wages. That is the President's argument.

Here is what I don't understand. If you want to raise wages, why not just raise wages? Why not just give the tax credits to working families?

The President's Wall Street bankers have a different theory that only gets credence in the beltway. This is not about economics. This is about common sense. Think about it. You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that the better way to raise wages is not to cut taxes for corporations, but to actually give the tax relief to people making under \$75,000.

You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that if you cut taxes for shareholders and corporate CEOs, they are probably going to invest it overseas. If you cut the taxes or give the tax relief to people making 50 grand in Michigan or Ohio, they are going to spend it and create jobs in the United States.

This is just common sense. You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that if you really want to create jobs, invest in technical training for the million skills gap we have, instead of putting hopes on corporate CEOs who already have record profits, that somehow they are going to create more jobs.

Mr. Chair, it used to be that there were serious thinkers on the Republican side, people like Jack Kemp. I disagreed with him, but at least he had innovative ideas of enterprise zones and how to really create jobs. But for the past 20 years, the Republican party has been devoid of ideas.

It is a mantra: tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts.

Oh, we are changing into a digital economy. How do we solve it? Tax cuts. That is not a constructive solution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to talk about common sense just for a moment. Common sense is if our other OECD countries have an average corporate rate of 18 to 20 percent and ours is between 35 and 39, and we have

companies that now decide to go overseas. It seems to me to be common sense to at least be equal to what other countries are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the national debt is a staggering \$20 trillion. We are handcuffing future generations with what—if we don't take action—will become an unsurmountable fiscal crisis. This budget resolution before us today is a step toward putting our Nation back on a sustainable fiscal path. But even more, it will lead to greater prosperity and opportunity for American families and generations to come.

My own experience as a 17-year-old, I had the good fortune to be able to buy a small construction company from my older brother for \$1,000 when I was fresh out of high school. Through a lot of hard work and a dedicated team of individuals, we were able to grow that company, employing over 150 people with family-sustaining jobs, family-sustaining wages.

That is what we call the American Dream. There are countless stories like that: the idea that we can begin with little or nothing, work hard, play by the rules, and achieve our dreams.

Unfortunately, in today's economic environment, for many, the American Dream seems out of reach.

Mr. Chair, that is why this budget is so important. Not only will it put us on a sustainable fiscal path, but it lays out the path forward for tax reform that will give American families the opportunity to improve their lives.

Consider a constituent that I spoke to this week. This particular constituent is a single father of 5 in Lancaster County. He asked me if our tax plan means more money in his paycheck. Now, he makes it work today, but it is difficult for him, and he could use some help. This is exactly the kind of hardworking American we are trying to help with our reforms.

Americans deserve this budget because it lets us pass tax reform to help families like the one I just described. They deserve it because too many Americans today do everything right but still struggle to make ends meet. Americans deserve it because they should have a more honest Federal Tax Code and a simplified filing process that allows them to spend more time with their family, to save for their children's college fund, or to plan for their retirement.

Passing this budget helps to make these things possible, and I strongly urge my colleagues in this Chamber to support it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for

734,000 hungry children in Pennsylvania all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3.8 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, debating this budget resolution is a partisan and pointless exercise, and I will point out to the chairman that it is October, after the fiscal year has expired and after we have already passed every single appropriations bill out of the House of Representatives, and, I might add, a continuing budget resolution.

□ 1600

Just as when we considered it in committee this summer, this resolution stands as a demonstration of the majority's willful and disgraceful neglect of the needs of the American people.

With so many critical legislative issues for us to discuss, the majority has decided it is a better use of our time to discuss tax breaks for millionaires and wealthy corporations; taking healthcare away from 20 million Americans; blowing up our deficit with an ineffective, immoral border wall; and gutting crucial investments in jobs, education, and medical research.

Instead, this House should be enacting legislation to expand background checks and ban assault weapons to combat senseless firearm violence after this Nation witnessed, once again, the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history.

This House should be passing the Dream Act to protect DREAMers who call this Nation home and protect them from this administration's heartless deportations.

Finally, instead of wasting taxpayer dollars and our constituents' time with this harmful budget resolution, this House should be reauthorizing CHIP, the bipartisan-backed Children's Health Insurance Program, which expired over the weekend and which potentially is going to leave children who badly need healthcare insurance twisting in the wind without it.

Congressional Republicans have chosen instead to bring this incredibly irresponsible and extreme bill to the floor.

In stunning ignorance of reality, it assumes TrumpCare will still pass. Just how many times must the majority be reminded that TrumpCare is not going to become law and the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land that Americans support?

How many times will the majority try to cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion, cut Medicare benefits, and raise insurance costs on elderly and low-income Americans?

Enough is enough. Instead of pandering to the well connected and our

worst impulses, this budget should embody America's best values, and it is far from it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Florida an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sadly, this budget does not reflect our responsibility to care for and invest in the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the proposed budget resolution, which will provide the spending cuts that Washington needs and give a pathway to reconciliation for tax reform.

Our national debt sits at an astronomical \$20 trillion and is projected to reach close to \$30 trillion within 10 years. Washington's out-of-control spending hinders our economy, Mr. Chair, and by kicking the can down the road, it puts the financial burden on the backs of our children and of our grandchildren.

Not only is our debt unsustainable, but high levels of government debt needs substantial resources, and taxpayers' dollars must go to servicing our debt. Over the next decade, the cost to service our debt will rise 219 percent, meaning we will spend close to \$800 billion by the year 2027 simply to pay the interest on our debt.

This budget reduces spending by \$5.4 trillion over a 10-year window. It does not expand the size of Federal Government. It does not encroach on State or local authority.

This is a conservative path forward and will help us accomplish what we came here to do: meaningful tax reform.

While I would like to see our government make even more wise choices with taxpayers' dollars, this budget resolution puts us on the road to achieving that goal. With this resolution as a vehicle for updating our outdated Tax Code, Mr. Chair, I truly believe we can accomplish something that has not been done in over 30 years.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 941,169 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in South Carolina to pay more for lifesaving Medicare, all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, the budget before us today sets up a tax plan that would harm hundreds of thousands of working families in Illinois and millions across the Nation.

It has been widely reported that this tax plan enables a budget that would eliminate the State and local tax deduction, also known as the SALT deduction, S-A-L-T, SALT deduction.

In my home State of Illinois, this SALT deduction represents a sizeable portion of taxpayers' income, accounting for approximately 6 percent of the average itemizers' average gross income.

Within my district, the SALT deduction allows families in Cook County to save an average of \$4,000 a year. In Kane and DuPage Counties, the numbers are even greater, \$5,000 and \$6,600, respectively.

Simply put, Mr. Chair, this SALT deduction prohibits double taxation on working families. That is why numerous bipartisan and nonpartisan organizations have spoken out in support of the SALT deduction, including the National Governors Association and the United States Conference of Mayors.

If this budget passes, the tax structure it creates will cause a dramatic increase in the tax burden on working families.

There is no doubt that our Tax Code needs to be updated, but we need to do so in a way that upholds the President's promise that working families would not see a tax increase.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this double taxation budget and this increase in taxes on working families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and I thank Chairman BLACK for her hard work developing this blueprint.

Our Nation's national debt now exceeds \$20 trillion. While there are many factors driving our Nation's fiscal health and long-term spending outlook, I am working to address one of those items this year: our Nation's need to dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

In 1982, Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and enacted a formal nuclear waste management program for the Federal Government and set a 1998 deadline for the Department of Energy to begin to dispose of used fuel. Nuclear utilities signed a contract with DOE requiring this deadline to be met. Unfortunately, the Federal Government did not meet that deadline and has yet to take title to this material.

Since then, the Federal Government has been held liable for not meeting this deadline, and the courts awarded

financial damages to utilities due to the breach of contract. The payments resulting from these lawsuits are paid from a specific Department of the Treasury account, known as the judgment fund, a permanent, unlimited fund not subject to budget caps or annual appropriations.

Since 2009, DOE's total liability has escalated from \$12 billion to nearly \$30 billion, or over \$2 billion in total liability for each year of delay. Last year alone, the nuclear waste costs were about one-third of all Federal Government payments due to litigation. Put another way, American taxpayers are paying over \$2 million every single day in which we neglect our moral and legal obligation to permanently dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

It is time to get our nuclear waste management program back on track. Bipartisan legislation I introduced, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, which passed out of the Committee of Energy and Commerce by an overwhelming vote of 49-4, would do just that. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address this budget challenge.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman BLACK again for her leadership and support of this important issue.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this budget.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, first, let me thank Chairman BLACK for her leadership on this remarkable budget.

When I ask my constituents from Texas about their biggest concerns for their family and the Nation's future, the overwhelming response is about the debt our country faces. Washington's spending just continues to grow too fast. Our national debt has topped \$20 trillion, and without action, our great country is poised for a difficult and painful fiscal reckoning.

Today, with this budget, we have the opportunity to do something about it, the opportunity to tackle our Nation's fiscal challenges head-on with a strong, two-part approach.

First, this budget provides real fiscal responsibility. It balances within 10 years. It preserves and improves Medicare for the long term. It returns power to our State and local governments so they can do what is best for their communities, not Washington.

Now, these measures get us moving in the right direction, but fiscal accountability is only one crucial piece of the puzzle. If we want a healthier American economy for the long term, we need a growing American economy for the long term. That is why this

budget by Chairwoman BLACK also lays the groundwork—the runway, if you will—for a once-in-a-generation pro-growth, pro-family, pro-middle class tax reform.

The House and the Senate are unified with President Trump in delivering a new Tax Code for a new era of American prosperity. We have released bold ideas to deliver more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for the American people, especially our middle class families.

We are united in getting tax reform legislation to the President's desk this year, but if we do not pass the budget, tax reform doesn't move forward. So I would like to ask all my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle: Where do you stand? Are you content with an unsustainable national debt, a slow-growth economy, and a broken pro-Washington, pro-special interest Tax Code, or do you stand in support of fiscal responsibility and pro-growth tax reform that allows all Americans to keep more of their paychecks?

This is our time to show the American people we don't accept that slow-growth future.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman BLACK of the Budget Committee for her remarkable leadership in bringing this budget forward.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time both sides have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution.

On behalf of Chairman HENSARLING, I would like to take a moment to speak about the instructions given by the chairwoman of the Budget Committee to the Financial Services Committee to find savings of \$14 billion.

Now, that is what we were sent here to do: to find those places where it makes sense to cut the budget and we don't harm anything. In fact, in this case, the Financial Services Committee is going to help things in rural communities by finding those savings that the chairwoman instructed us to find.

Several years ago, the Democratic majority passed the Dodd-Frank resolution, the Dodd-Frank Act. That enshrined too big to fail. It created unaccountable agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Earlier this year, this body passed H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act. That was trying to prune back the capabilities of CFPB to hurt the rural

areas, which it had been doing in my district.

Carlsbad National Bank recently shared with us how it takes them 185 pages to complete a mortgage loan, 185 pages for a small bank for just the simple resolution of buying a home.

Many times our community banks are simply stopping to offer that service. No one else is willing to come in to New Mexico and lend into these rural communities. So we are facing a very serious problem.

Sometimes community banks are having to consolidate. That hurts rural communities even worse, because the consolidation usually moves the bank's headquarters outside the State or outside the community. It weakens the fabric of the community.

So by finding the savings in this budget resolution which we were instructed to do, we not only save the money, but we also stop the encroaching regulations that CFPB is putting out, harming the rural communities, harming rural homeowners.

So for those reasons, I gladly support H. Con. Res. 71, the Budget Resolution Act, and urge its passage.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman BLACK and Chairman BISHOP for including ANWR, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, in the budget process.

I am looking forward to this. With this legislation, we contribute money to solving some of our national debt.

The small area of 1002 in the National Wildlife Refuge is an area of 2,000 acres, smaller than Dulles Airport.

□ 1615

Potentially, though, we have a little over 20 billion barrels of oil. Think how much money that would bring to the Treasury immediately through the bidding process.

This is an issue I have been working on for the last 45 years. It is time we passed it. Once it went to the Senate, and President Clinton vetoed it because it wouldn't help us with that embargo we had at that time.

Now is the time to make sure this Nation is independent totally. It won't happen overnight, but only Congress can do this. It is not a wilderness area. It is designated to be drilled at the behest of the Congress for the good of the Nation.

It will reduce the debt. Again, I said I expect bids of about \$10 billion to \$20 billion just to have the right to drill. With the new royalties that are coming down from the Secretary of the Interior, we will have not only a large amount going into the Treasury, we will have about 776,000 new jobs created by the discovery of this oil.

We have already seen what we have been able to do in other States by fracking and becoming more energy independent and how that controls the OPEC nations. But this is the area which oil has been developed by God. It is only going to be available to the United States, and it is time that this Congress steps forth and brings this to fruition for the people.

We will hear a lot from the other side of those interest groups that have no knowledge at all about the area I am talking about. We hear that the caribou herd will be affected. It is ironic that Prudhoe Bay has produced 17 billion barrels of oil, and when we started, there were 5,000 caribou. Now we have about 31,000 caribou. Oil didn't disturb them.

Oil is not evil. It is the necessity for this Nation socially to create jobs. It will make a healthier economy. I am asking my colleagues again to consider this legislation. It is necessary for this Nation. It is necessary, very frankly, for the good of this Congress. With \$20 trillion in debt, I have yet to hear anything that will create new wealth. You can cut all you want to cut, I will cut what I want to cut, but you have to create new wealth. You have to bring it into the fold of the general budget process and for the economy of this Nation.

Let's not keep putting our heads in the sand and saying: Oh, we don't need to do this; it is not the time to do it. Now is the time for the good of the Nation and because we are in debt.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider this in this budget. I compliment Mrs. BLACK and her work, her chairmanship, on the budget. It is a very difficult process.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time so we can hear from the Joint Economic Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentleman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we are making a choice today about the kind of future that we want. We can choose a future of more deficits and more debt piled onto our children, or we can continue having a weak economy where people in their prime working years can keep leaving the job market.

Or we can choose a future where America's job creators, people who go to work every day, decide that they will be better off starting or moving their business overseas.

Or we can choose the future of more of the same, and it is not the wealthy

who will suffer more of the same. It is the most vulnerable, low-income Americans trying to climb out of poverty. It is the middle class families who find it harder and harder to keep up, to get ahead—people like my dad, a machine operator who is now retired as a United Steelworker.

It is our children and our grandchildren who will have to pay tomorrow for the mistakes that we make today.

But we can instead choose a better future, Mr. Chair, where the government learns to live within its means and move forward toward balanced budgets; a future where job-creating small businesses aren't punished by our Tax Code when they succeed; a future where we stop losing jobs and businesses to foreign countries with lower tax rates, when workers can finally get the pay raises they deserve, more money in their pockets, and more prosperity is widespread, not just concentrated on our coasts and a few large urban cities.

We will be voting soon on a budget that restores fiscal responsibility and paves the way for a world class Tax Code built for growth and a better future for our kids and our grandkids.

Yesterday, at the Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Chair, we held a hearing on the decline in business startups, the engines of job growth and innovation in America, and the role tax reform could play in reversing this downward spiral.

Among other things, here is what we heard yesterday at the hearing. First, simplify the Tax Code. Entrepreneurs spend way too much time and way too much money complying with the Tax Code instead of focusing on growing their businesses.

Second, lower the tax rates that our companies and employers pay. That is something that foreign governments around the world, both friends and foes, have already done to attract more jobs, more businesses.

Third, let companies of all sizes write off the cost of their growth-producing investment immediately, this is called expensing, instead of deducting them slowly from the taxes over many years under very complicated depreciation rules.

Fourth, stop punishing our businesses for investing overseas profits by bringing them back home to America. Move away from the system that double taxes American companies that do business overseas.

These steps will boost economic growth. Growing markets will give entrepreneurs the confidence to risk starting a business, which many won't even do today, as we have seen more and more startups not making it to the starting line.

More startups create more jobs, an average of six new jobs per startup, and more economic growth means continuing to spread that prosperity.

I am happy to report that these recommendations are a large part of our tax reform framework that has just recently been unveiled: simplicity, lower tax rates, expensing, stop double taxing our American businesses that do business abroad, reward investment in America, and boost economic growth.

We need a Tax Code that makes America the best place in the world to do business and grow your business and keep your business.

Our job creators who are corporate taxpayers now face the highest tax rate in the developed world. While other countries aggressively lower their tax rate, Mr. Chair, to attract new businesses, we left our businesses standing still.

Mr. Chair, the tax reform framework would slash our corporate rate from the highest in the world, at 35 percent, to a competitive 20 percent. Instead of the worst, we get much better. In a global economy, that is just not a luxury, that is a necessity.

Our tax reform framework will not only help American companies compete with foreign ones, but also bring capital back to America to invest and grow jobs here at home.

Let's look at how the Tax Code is punishing our small businesses who pay individual taxes as pass-throughs, not just with complex taxes but also high tax rates.

When Main Street businessowners went to sleep on December 31 of 2012, their highest tax rate was 35 percent. When they woke up the following year in January of 2013, Mr. Chair, their top rate spiked to 44.6 percent due to Obama administration policies.

Many on the other side of the aisle will say that most small businesses don't pay the top rate, but taxpayers who do pay the top rate, those small businesses, in many cases, are responsible for much of our economic activity and our employment as pass-through businesses.

Every small business owner dreams of being successful, and the high top rate punishes the very success that we want them to achieve in America. Adding to the Federal rate, the tax rate, the local rate, many of these small businesses pay over 50 percent in taxes.

The tax reform framework not only slashes rates for American employers but our small businesses as well. The top rate for pass-throughs will be 25 percent.

Another feature of the tax reform framework, Mr. Chair, would allow businesses of all sizes to deduct their business expenses, their investments, immediately through expensing. This would encourage companies to make the kind of investment like buying state-of-the-art equipment that would lead businesses to grow, create more jobs, pay better wages, higher economic growth, and the best part of all, larger paychecks for workers.

Mr. Chair, we have a choice to make. We can turn our backs on the most vulnerable Americans and doom them to more of the same, subpar growth, stagnant wages, more debt, less opportunity, a complex and outdated Tax Code that punishes job creation and investment in America, or I hope we choose a better path forward, a better future for Americans, bigger paychecks, and it starts today with the passing of this budget.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this budget.

Ultimately, a national budget is like a deal between the American taxpayers and Congress about how this country will spend their money. Anyone who looks at the fine print in this budget plan can tell, with a glance, that the American people want, need, and deserve a better deal.

In the Republican tax plan that goes with this budget, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent. The top 1 percent gets an average of \$200,000 in tax cuts.

A better deal would drop plans to slash Medicare and Medicaid to pay for massive tax cuts for the wealthiest few—a deal that instead would be a bipartisan effort to bring middle class tax relief, badly needed investments, and greater opportunity.

But what we have instead is a budget that cuts \$5.4 trillion in spending over 10 years, including \$4.4 trillion in cuts to the mandatory programs that help average Americans get and stay ahead.

These aren't just paper cuts. These are huge cuts—cuts that would cause enormous damage in the lives of children, students, veterans, and other Americans. About half of these cuts in nondefense spending are in programs that help people who need the help the most—cuts in programs that provide food to those in need, programs that help students from low-income families afford a college education. They even have cuts in the badly needed disaster relief that is helping so many in our country.

In fact, by 2027, more than one-third of the resources for low- and middle-income people would be gone. Struggling Americans deserve a better deal than that. And who pays under the Republican tax plan? Seniors, single parents, and middle class families, it goes up.

Nondefense discretionary is already at its lowest level since the category has been tracked. Republicans want to cut even more, and so they target senior citizens and healthcare.

This budget cuts half a trillion dollars from Medicare, replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with a voucher-like system and increasing its eligibility age to 67.

□ 1630

The CBO estimates that these cuts would cause part B premiums to increase 25 percent by 2020. And this budget claims that it "saves" \$1.5 trillion by repealing the Affordable Care Act, even though they have already tried to repeal it about 60 times on this floor, without success, thank God, and the American people have made it clear that they don't want it repealed.

They still have no replacement plan for the Affordable Care Act. So that means that they would just be leaving millions without health insurance and threatening the coverage of all those with preexisting conditions and chronic illnesses, and would leave millions facing huge premium increases.

Their plan also cuts \$114 billion from Medicaid, ripping away coverage from low-income families and the disabled. This is just plain wrong. Our seniors deserve a much better deal than that.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY).

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak a little bit here about the tax reform opportunities that we are seeing now.

Some people don't like to admit it, but there is a proven, inescapable correlation among tax treatment, capital investment, and job creation. As this chart right here shows, unequivocally correlating an investment of capital with economic change, when you have more money put in, you get more jobs and more economic growth. And some people don't like to admit that connection, but it is inescapable. It has been that way ever since the first commerce took place in the Roman era.

We have a second chart that shows the post-World War II GDP change, an average of 3.1. The American middle class was built on opportunity, lower taxes, economic stimuli, and growth. It wasn't built on this 2.3 to 1.6 that we are going to get if we don't get back to some serious business-centric, investment-centric tax reform.

There is another equally inescapable fact, and that is that capital is fungible. If tax treatment nurtures it, like watering your yard, it will grow. If not, it will be invested somewhere else. Just look at Texas, just look at my home State of Florida, and look at Ireland, for example.

When the tax climate is nurturing and favorable for investment, you get money put in, you get jobs created, you get economic growth. Investment goes where it is most favorably treated. So going to 20 and 25 percent from 35 to 40 percent will unleash a torrent of capital investment and job formation.

Rapid capital recovery by expensing capital assets purchases will attract massive investments, stimulate our

economy, make our manufacturing companies do better, and build up the capital stock of our country again, like we used to do. This is going to create one thing: job-creating economic growth.

That is what we need and that is what the Republican reform program offers.

It also offers one more thing and it changes treatment of foreign income, which is something I have some experience in, and it will incentivize companies to keep their income here. That is a good thing for America.

So I might just mention for just a second about what they say and what we say. They say tax cut for the wealthy. No, it is not a tax cut for the wealthy. It lowers taxes on all businesses and middle class Americans.

They say rising brackets on low income. This is an absolute incorrigible falsehood. No. We are taking the 10 percent rate to zero. We are taking the 15 percent rate to 10. By the way, Ronald Reagan reduced the 11 percent rate to zero.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. They say it will explode the deficit, but we all know that economic growth shrinks deficits. Ronald Reagan proved that in spades, and we are going to see it again. When we eliminate many of these narrowly-crafted, special interest, lobbyist-driven credits and deductions, we are going to save enough money. Especially when we eliminate the State and local tax deduction, we are going to save a couple of trillion dollars that will help balance this.

Then they say loss of itemized deductions is a bad thing. When we double the standard exemption, no one is going to need to itemize. The people that do itemize, fine, they can have mortgage interest reduction, charitable reduction, whatever. But most Americans are going to be able to pay their taxes on a postcard.

In the polling in this country, the frustration of Americans with the IRS is directly related to the fact that nobody can fill out a tax form anymore. So we have great progress here.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent, and the top 1 percent gets an average of \$200,000 in tax cuts. And what we see in this budget is a slashing of investments in the future strength of our country.

Instead of slashing infrastructure spending, as this budget does, we should be increasing our spending to

fill the giant infrastructure pothole that Republican policies have left us with.

We have airports that feel Third World. We have bridges that are crumbling, tunnels that need replacing, roads that need fixing. Failing to do so costs all of us in time, money, and economic development.

This budget totally fails to recognize the value of infrastructure investment. It cuts \$254 billion from transportation over 10 years. Funding would drop from \$92 billion next year to just \$65 billion in 2022.

It eliminates the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery grant program used for infrastructure development and repair projects for interstate highways, bridge improvements, and ports. This is incredibly shortsighted.

According to a study by the American Society of Civil Engineers, failing to close the infrastructure investment gap brings serious economic consequences: \$3.9 trillion in losses to the U.S. GDP by 2025; \$7 trillion in lost business sales in 2025; and 2.5 million lost American jobs in 2025.

I have seen with my own eyes what infrastructure development can mean to business development and the quality of life in the city that I serve. The Second Avenue Subway, built with the help of Federal funds, opened in January and has already had a huge economic impact. Stores say their business is up 20 to 30 percent along that line and it has cut overcrowding and reduced traveling times.

New York's old Kosciuszko Bridge, which was first opened in 1939, was originally designed for 10,000 vehicles a day. It was carrying 18 times that and had become an accident choke point.

Thanks to Federal funding, it has been replaced, and the biggest city in the country will have a brand-new, 21st century bridge soon because these kinds of investments boost productivity and bolster our economy, with each \$1 in infrastructure investment generating up to \$1.80 in additional economic activity.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives our national infrastructure an overall grade of D-plus and our transit system a D-minus. It is just plain irresponsible to slash spending on our crumbling highways and bridges now, because if we don't make needed investments today, we will jeopardize our competitiveness tomorrow.

Let's be clear: we are already significantly underinvesting in infrastructure. As you can see from this chart, public investments in infrastructure and other public fixed assets have fallen over the last few years, dropping to a low of \$274 billion in 2014, from more than \$357 billion in 2009.

We have created a giant infrastructure spending pothole that you see right here. All told, it costs our Nation

more than half a trillion dollars in lost investment over 5 years.

The people of this country deserve modern infrastructure. They deserve a better deal.

This budget also cuts \$154 billion from nutrition, from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, ignoring the more than 40 million low-income families, including children, the working poor, the elderly, and the disabled, to say nothing of the 8 million people, including 4 million children it lifts out of poverty. The hungry children of America deserve a better deal than that.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a senior member of the Joint Economic Committee, as well as a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, the budget that is being considered here today sets in motion the process of the first major tax reform that we will have been able to see in 3 decades. We are on the cusp of a really exciting opportunity to give Americans what they deserve: a Tax Code that works for them, not against them.

Now, on the House Ways and Means Committee, we spent many months meeting, holding hearings, discussing, working on almost a daily basis ways to craft a tax plan that is simpler and fairer for all Americans. The framework that was just rolled out last week takes that into account and lays out a plan that will lead to more jobs and, most importantly, bigger paychecks.

You know, the economic "recovery" since the Great Recession hasn't worked for a lot of Americans. It certainly hasn't worked for a lot of Minnesotans that I represent. Economic growth has been anemic, and we remain uncompetitive in far too many areas. Many are living paycheck to paycheck, and either have or now are at risk of having a lower standard of living than their parents.

Young people, like my daughter's generation, will go backwards if this country is not fundamentally more competitive economically. They feel like they just can't get ahead.

Meanwhile, seniors, and baby boomers who will soon become seniors, are also at great risk. Their savings, as well as the government's ability to fulfill its commitment to Social Security and Medicare, could be undermined if we don't grow our economy at a higher rate.

So both Republicans and Democrats agree that it is time to fix our broken Tax Code. No one is defending the status quo, Mr. Chair. Our current Tax Code punishes American workers and manufacturers. It is a maze of special-interest loopholes that are unfair to hardworking Americans. It burdens

families and small businesses with excessive paperwork and compliance costs, creating unnecessary frustration each and every tax season throughout the year. That is why 9 out of 10 Americans either pay someone to do their taxes or have to buy the financial software to do their taxes.

Mr. Chair, our Tax Code is holding our country back. It is holding our economy back. So we have a stark choice. We can either truly grow the economy and put ourselves back on a path to real prosperity, or we can continue with weak economic growth, which only benefits “the few” and will do nothing for the rest of us when the next economic downturn happens.

Tax reform, for me, is about one thing and one thing only. It is about restoring the hope for a prosperous future for ourselves, for our parents, and, most importantly, for our children.

It is about Paula in my district, in Plymouth, Minnesota, who said that the Tax Code is hurting her small business and preventing her from hiring more employees and giving them a raise.

It is about an owner of an extrusion company in Chaska, Minnesota, that I just spoke to. He said he would invest in new equipment and machines if this tax plan passes.

And it is about lowering rates across the board for all Americans, as well as small businesses, so that they can keep more of their first dollars earned.

Tax reform means increasing the personal income for average Americans and reducing the cost of living so that day-to-day expenses are more affordable. This will lead to families being able to save for their future and their retirement. It will allow people to take more control of their lives and their finances so that they can save and spend and invest their hard-earned money as they see fit.

Mr. Chairman, this is a really important opportunity we cannot let slip away to help middle-income families and small businesses. Passing this budget puts us on a path for tax reform that has so much potential to unleash and grow our economy to the benefit of middle-income families in Minnesota and across the country.

□ 1645

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in 2001, some of our colleagues across the aisle said many of the same things we are hearing today about the miracle of tax cuts: that huge tax cuts for the most fortunate would pay for themselves, and that they would help grow our economy by trickling down through the miracle of so-called dynamic scoring.

But as we know from history, that was not the case. One year after the Bush tax cuts in 2002, here is what Brookings Institute said was happening in real life:

Our findings suggest that Bush tax cuts will reduce the size of the future economy, raise interest rates, make taxes more aggressive, increase tax complexity, and prove fiscally unsustainable.

A year after that, in 2003, the Brookings Institute said: “Over the past 2 years our country has experienced a dramatic deterioration in the Federal budget outlook.”

In January 2001, when President George Bush took office, the Congressional Budget Office projected surpluses of \$5.6 trillion—as in “T,” trillion—from 2000 to 2011.

But in 2011, nearly a decade after the GOP promised their budget would unleash the economy through tax cuts for the wealthy and budgets that cut services to the vulnerable, this is what we found, from National Public Radio: “Conservatives often promote tax cuts as a way to stimulate economic growth, but the years after 2001 were marked by the slowest growth since World War II.”

All of us remember when President Obama came to office that this country was shedding 800,000 jobs a month and it was a long time to dig ourselves out of that big Republican hole and get us moving in the right direction with job growth.

So let's not go down that road again. I call upon my colleagues to remember history.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I would again like to point out this little chart that shows facts. At the bottom of the chart, if the viewers can see, is the United States with our corporate tax rate. All of these other countries, most of whom are our friends, even France, is lower than the United States, Spain, Canada, Netherlands, Austria, Turkey, Italy, New Zealand, Japan—you can go on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we have the highest corporate rate in the industrialized developed world. Facts are a stubborn thing to deal with, Mr. Chairman. This budget, as Congressman PAULSEN said, is the first step into dealing with something that we haven't dealt with in 31 years.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this issue. I hear so much from my friends on the other side that I agree with, and I very much would like to work closely with them.

I point out to the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, my friend from Ohio, that while we have the highest corporate rate in the world, 35 percent, which is clearly not desirable, I served in Switzerland for 4 years,

where there were 700 American companies because the tax rate was so much lower. Yet that 35 percent rate, in actuality, turned out to be less than 14 percent across all American corporations, and a quarter of American corporations pay zero.

As we look at refining this, it is not just about dropping that rate. It is about making sure that every American corporation pays a fair share of their taxes to the U.S. citizens.

I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution. Budget resolutions, by their nature, are political documents. But this one also has an instrumental purpose, because the only reason this budget resolution is on the floor is to pave the way for the partisan process for the tax bill, which will significantly increase the deficit in order to give tax breaks to those who need them least.

I think everyone in this body agrees that the average American taxpayer, those who have had virtually no raise for 30 years, deserve and need tax breaks. If we can give them that tax relief, the economy will grow faster.

But the Senate reconciliation instructions that will ultimately pass are written to allow for a \$1.5 trillion increase in the deficit, and that is assuming that the fuzzy math and the rosy expectations actually work out. I appreciate the charts that my friend and colleague, Mr. ROONEY, showed that pointed out that we would like to get to 3.1 percent economic growth. I heartily agree.

But if we look at the period right now where we now have the worst disparity in wealth and the worst disparity in income that we have had in a long time, that tracks this decline from 3.1 percent to 1.6, 1.8, 2 percent.

When I started off in our family business, the corporate tax rate was 78 percent, and our economic growth was a lot higher. Not that we want to go back to 78 percent, but putting more money in the hands of the top 1 percent is not what is going to make this economy grow more quickly.

Actually, looking at the critical programs that are cut in this Republican budget gives us almost a handy guide of more effective ways to spend money. For example, this budget cuts transportation spending by 25 percent at a time when we have a D in our infrastructure by the American Society of Civil Engineers, when President Trump and candidate Hillary Clinton both campaigned hard on more infrastructure investment, not a cut.

This budget cuts student aid by \$211 billion when we know from our Joint Economic Committee hearings that the student debt our young people carry is one of the reasons they don't start new businesses, one of the things that suppresses the growth of new businesses in America.

We also know that human capital is the key to economic growth all

through history and today. It contains massive cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, making healthcare more expensive for those who can least afford it, and that is not a way to grow the economy.

We have an opportunity to enact fiscally responsible, sustainable, bipartisan tax reform that focuses on the Americans whose wages have been stagnant for 30 years. I believe the Democrats are prepared to engage in real reform. It should be simpler. It should be fairer. We should absolutely do away with the special deals and credits and gimmicks, but we need a lower rate for most Americans, and not make sure that 80 percent of the tax benefits go to the people who need them the least, who have the smallest propensity to spend and to invest.

There are many other things wrong with this budget. Let me just point out two particular problems. Number one, the budget attacks the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It essentially sacrifices wildlife and environmental protections to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest.

ANWR encompasses more than 19 million acres and is one of the last intact landscapes in America. It is essential that we protect this wild and spectacular land. The government briefly opened ANWR to seismic testing in the 1980s, and the damage from that activity is still visible today. Truck tracks still scar the expansive tundra where the permafrost never healed. Since then, the Federal Government has protected ANWR from harmful oil and gas drilling because of concerns about the impact on species like polar bears, muskoxen, and caribou.

Mr. Chairman, there are 37 land mammal species, 8 marine mammal species, 42 fish species, and more than 200 migratory birds that inhabit the ANWR. Seismic testing could do lasting damage to the fragile ecosystem way before drilling. Seismic activity sends shock waves underground, disturbing denning polar bears.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, the caribou are a food source for Alaskan indigenous groups who have lived off the land for thousands of years. All of this devastation will likely do very little in the short run to reduce the deficit. The oil prices are so low that no oil company is going to attempt to extract fossil fuels at this time.

We believe the ANWR must be protected from the budget for future generations, its wildlife, and the native people who inhabit it.

Part two, Mr. Chairman, is the budget also attacks Federal Government employee retirement benefits. It in-

structs the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to reduce the deficit by \$32 billion. This clearly targets Federal employee retirement benefits because that is the only substantial mandatory spending within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdiction.

By slashing these promised benefits, the budget will eliminate any sense of financial security that Federal employees currently have. We should be protecting their rights and benefits. This was the original bargain they made. Most gave up much more lucrative careers in the private sector for the opportunity to serve all Americans, and for a small but secure Federal pension.

It is also going to make it a lot more difficult for us to recruit and retain the quality employees who make America great.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this budget, and let's work together to create a Tax Code that really does simulate our economy and that works for all Americans.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who represents the central part of Illinois, and is a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. This bill makes necessary and responsible funding determinations by reducing the size and scope of government, cutting Federal spending by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years, and balancing the Federal budget in fiscal year 2027.

Given our Nation's more than \$20 trillion in debt, it is past time to get serious about our Federal spending so that important programs are able to be sustained long term. In addition, this bill sets the stage for much-needed tax reform. Small businesses and farmers are the bedrock of the American economy. For decades, we have allowed our Tax Code to balloon with loopholes and tax breaks for special interests, hurting our local economies and middle class workers.

That is why it is so crucial that we pass this commonsense budget as the first step in reforming our Nation's outdated Tax Code. Our current system continues to fail small business owners, farmers, and middle class families with its overwhelmingly complex system. That is why over 90 percent of Americans have to pay for help with filing their taxes every year.

Not only does this cost people their hard-earned money, but this also costs us our valuable time. Every year we spend a combined 8.9 billion hours filing our taxes. That is time we could be using to focus on our work and families. For businesses, that is time they could use for expanding and growing our economy.

The solution here is not to defend the status quo, as some on the other side of the aisle continue to do, but to simplify our Tax Code and lower the rates for businesses and the middle class.

Another crucial part of reforming our Tax Code must be the elimination of the death tax, which harms farmers like those in the 18th Congressional District of Illinois. Family-owned businesses and farms that use their hard-earned dollars to invest back in their businesses are often forced to sell off parts or all in order to pay the death tax.

There is nothing fair about penalizing our job creators and the drivers of our economy for investing in and growing their business. In fact, it is estimated that repealing the death tax would grow our economy by 0.9 percent over 10 years.

These small business investments are often necessary for small businesses and farmers who depend upon expensive machinery to earn their living. Our current Tax Code, however, encourages businessowners to put off their investments as they are only able to deduct the cost of equipment over many years. By allowing full expensing, businesses and farmers can fully invest in the tools they need to become more productive, all the while earning more savings.

According to the Tax Foundation, full expensing would save businesses money, leading to nearly a 5 percent increase in income for low- and middle-income workers.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chair, tax reform is about getting our economy back to working for the middle class, and for our small businesses, growing it from the inside out. This budget is the necessary first step in that process, and I am proud to support it. It will help bring relief to those who need it most.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, just to remind my colleagues, the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center points out that 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent.

But in this budget resolution that we are discussing, it slashes education funding, putting the drain of a college education for average Americans even further out of reach. It asks the American people who already experience crippling student loan debt to reach even deeper into their pockets for their education by cutting \$211 billion from student financial aid programs.

□ 1700

It freezes the maximum level awarded by a Pell grant at \$5,900, covering

just 23 percent of an education by 2026, compared to the 30 percent it covers today or the 77 percent it covered in 1980. In addition, it also cuts \$3.3 billion from the Pell grant surplus, which provides a much-needed reserve to cover the cost of future education.

If that is not enough, after students graduate, this budget makes it increasingly difficult to pay off student loans and steers graduates away from public service and teaching jobs by eliminating the Public Service Loan Forgiveness and Teacher Loan Forgiveness programs. Our students and our teachers deserve a better deal than that.

I must say that we are suffering from three hurricanes, devastating hurricanes, yet this budget eliminates three programs that play very key roles in disaster relief. The Community Development Block Grant program, AmeriCorps, and the Legal Services Corporation are all eliminated. This budget abolishes these programs that are literally supporting our relief efforts from Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Our Nation's veterans—our Nation's veterans—our bravest, are not spared the carnage of this heartless proposal. The GOP budget proposes \$50 billion in cuts to mandatory spending on veterans programs over 10 years, including education benefits and loan guarantees. So after we have already asked so much of our men and women in uniform, this budget refuses to give them the tools they need to transition to civilian life. Our veterans deserve a better deal than that from the country that they have served so honorably.

Cuts to research, where research is the future of our country, and this budget would also cut investments that are directly tied to our country's future prosperity by slashing basic research funding.

I want to point out how important research funding is to our country. In 1996, two Stanford graduate students took a \$4.5 million research grant from the National Science Foundation and developed a new algorithm called PageRank. Two years later, these same students took PageRank and launched a new internet search engine we now call Google. Today Google is worth over \$600 billion and employs over 72,000 Americans, and it all began with a Federal basic research grant of \$4.5 million.

Google is just one example on a long list of technological advancement companies and, most importantly, jobs that trace their roots to basic research investment. It is what has kept this country on top.

According to the Brookings Institution, two-thirds of the most influential technologies over the past 50 years were supported by Federal research grants. It has brought us lifesaving vaccines, the laser, touchscreen, GPS, and even the internet, technology that has served as a launching pad for cutting-edge medical treatment.

Sadly, the chart behind me reflects a sharp decline in the Federal share of funding of basic research dropping from 72 percent in 1967 to 44 percent in 2015. This GOP budget proposal follows that same trend with instructions to cut \$41 billion from science, space, and technology precisely at a time when we should be increasing investments in these sectors.

It is important to the future prosperity of America. Cuts now mean fewer jobs and economic growth in the future; they mean less innovation and less prosperity. So if my colleagues across the aisle want to grow the economy, turning this trend around is an important way to do it.

Now, I have heard all day from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle how very, very concerned they are about the deficit, but the GOP tax plan makes it worse. The tax framework released last week by the White House and Republican leaders would add \$2.4 trillion to the deficit in the first 10 years and another \$3.2 trillion in the next 10 years.

So the Republican budget is just totally unacceptable. This budget flat-out ignores the reality. So if Republicans are concerned about the deficit, then they should really rewrite their budget proposal.

In conclusion, look at the fine print of this proposed deal and imagine the harm it would cause to millions of American families, to our children, to our seniors, to our sick and suffering, to our disabled and our destitute, to our economy, to our research, and to our infrastructure. It is clear—clear—beyond any and all doubt that Americans deserve a better deal.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), who is the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget before the House.

As a legislator, but more importantly, as a father and grandfather, I am seriously concerned about the mountain of debt our Nation is passing on to our children and grandchildren. Our Nation's total Federal debt is now bigger than our gross domestic product.

Think about that. As the leader of the free world and the driver of global innovation and entrepreneurship, over the next 10 years, we expect to reach a point where annual interest payments to our creditors will exceed the amount we spend on defending our Nation.

It is imperative that we change this trajectory, and I commend Chairwoman BLACK and her colleagues on the Budget Committee for providing a blueprint for tackling the problem. While Congress has made many deci-

sions ahead of us to rein in mandatory spending, this budget is a critical starting point.

Not only is budgeting a fundamental principle of good governance, it is essential to our efforts to reform our outdated tax system to ensure it is simpler and reduces the tax burden for all Americans.

As a CPA with a current license, I look forward to the very real prospect of fundamental tax reform. This budget is the vehicle that can make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this budget.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I request the amount of time that is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ZELDIN). The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, in closing, I believe that this proposal that is before us is an absolute disaster. We should be charting a fundamentally different course.

When you listen to people around their dinner table in America tonight, they would be talking about their concerns in education, infrastructure, jobs, healthcare, security, environment, and disaster relief. But this plan delivers, instead, deep and sometimes disabling cuts to badly needed programs for millions in order to give away benefits to a fortunate few. This is just plain wrong. Budgets are about values and priorities, and the people of this country deserve better.

We should not be cutting our education spending. Failing to train the world's most highly educated workforce is irresponsible and puts our entire economy at a disadvantage. We should be investing more in education at every level—early education and high schools—motivating students to become engaged in science, technology, math, and engineering. We should be leading the way in developing new and improved technical and trade training programs for those who would prefer it. We should be doing more, not less, to make college and postgrad study affordable once again. To do anything less is to fail in our obligation to the rising generation.

We already trail much of the economically advanced world when it comes to healthcare. We get sicker, die sooner, and pay more for our care than most developed nations. Millions are just one serious illness away from financial ruin. But this budget plan would cut spending for healthcare, and this budget would weaken the pillars of financial security for our seniors. The proposed cuts to Medicare and Medicaid will come at the expense of seniors, the disabled, and the middle class.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford this budget. I urge my colleagues to reject

it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, America is at a crossroads, and this budget is about choices.

Mr. Chairman, there are moms and dads, single moms and elderly folks sitting at the kitchen table every night making choices on what to buy and what to pay for. They have to live within their means, Mr. Chairman.

The Federal Government, for too long, hasn't lived within its means, and this budget is about that. This budget is about tax reform. This budget is about growing our economy. We haven't seen the growth in this recovery that we have seen in others.

Mr. Chairman, I remember when I got my first job at McDonald's. My immigrant mother and my immigrant father sat me down and talked to me about the taxes that I would pay coming out of my first paycheck. I clearly remember my dad saying to me: Don't let the taxes that you pay stop you from saving most of this money, because in America, not only do you get taxed when you earn it, you get taxed when you save it, and if you save enough, you will get taxed when you die. That was my immigrant father with a fifth grade education. He was a steelworker.

Mr. Chairman, it is incredibly sad in America today when a successful entrepreneur will pay over 50 percent of what he or she makes in taxes at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 31 years since we reformed our outdated Tax Code, and now is the time—now is the time—at this crossroads to change the direction of America for our kids and our grandkids. I urge a “yes” vote on this responsible budget to live within our means, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 33 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 33¼ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do want to just begin this next section by making a brief comment about my good friend from Kentucky, who has been using some information off of Forbes as he responds to our speakers. I just want to say, I went out to look at Forbes to see what was on Forbes while we were on this brief intermission, and I found this article that was in Forbes just the day before yesterday that does say that the GOP tax framework is a pay raise for middle class families.

□ 1715

I encourage people to take a look at this. It actually does some scenarios for what we know at this point in time.

However, I do want to say that what has been put out is a framework. It doesn't really have enough details to give too much on these scenarios, because there are some very important pieces that are missing.

Guessing on these key points really doesn't allow us to do a proper analysis. Things like the brackets have not been definitively defined, and neither have the income thresholds or the enhanced child credit.

I think it is a little bit disingenuous to think that is really where we should be using those numbers right at this point in time to give a definitive scenario. I did want to say that that would be a good thing for people to look at if they would like to get a brief idea.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), our ranking member, for yielding and also for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this deeply flawed Republican budget resolution.

When we considered this resolution in July, Democrats offered 28 amendments. The amendments that we offered were meant to help set a course away from the disastrous path that the Republican majority and the Trump administration are steering us down.

We offered amendments on a broad range of issues important to our communities and our families. These included protecting our communities from the effects of climate change; preserving healthcare; investing in public health, research, and diplomacy; and investing in our Nation's workforce and infrastructure. Not surprisingly, not a single one of those made it through.

Instead, we have the resolution: a love letter to millionaires, billionaires, and corporations, and nothing but a manifesto of contempt for America's working families.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution we will be asked to vote on is based on the same faulty assumptions as the bill that came through committee. These include assuming that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act happened, which it did not, and an unrealistic economic growth of 3 percent.

The Republican budget resolution does little but hurt millions of American families in order to fast-track tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and corporations.

In addition, after all the Republican talk of deficit reduction, this cruel budget resolution massively increases the Federal debt by over \$2.4 trillion

over the next 10 years and \$3.2 trillion in the 10 years after.

Where does putting the interests of corporations and the wealthiest ahead of working families get us?

Well, we have seen where this ends.

Earlier this summer, the Republican-dominated Kansas Legislature was forced to roll back its 2012 tax cuts. In fact, a recent Brookings Institution analysis found that the tax cuts resulted in an “anemic level of revenues, which led to ballooning shortfalls, causing significant cutbacks in vital programs such as Medicaid, education, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, court funding, and infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Washington an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JAYAPAL. This Republican budget resolution will lead us into that same hole, yet we know that this will only give Republicans license to call for further cuts to critical programs like Medicare, Social Security, and education.

We know who wins under this budget resolution. It paves the way for a Republican tax proposal that gives a huge tax cut to the wealthiest in our country.

Consider this: 80 percent of the Republican tax cut goes to the top 1 percent by 2027; the average tax cut for the top 1 percent would be \$207,000; for millionaires, the tax cut would provide \$230,000 a year; and 42 million middle class households would face a tax increase, including those people earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is unfair to working families and to our country's future. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. Let's work together on a moral budget blueprint that supports all Americans.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chair, typically, a budget is a blueprint for how our government plans to meet our obligations to our people; but not this time.

By including reconciliation instructions for their tax plan, the Republicans are using this budget as a blueprint to give tax cuts to the wealthiest few, without requiring bipartisan support.

Under this bill, a family making \$50,000 a year could see their tax burden go up, while millionaires will save \$230,000. And who will pay to make the rich richer? Our working families, children, and seniors.

This budget slashes priorities like education, infrastructure, and veterans' benefits, and even guts Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion.

“You can’t make guarantees,” is how Treasury Secretary Mnuchin responded when asked if the Republican tax plan would help the middle class. But the thing is, you can make guarantees. If this Republican budget moves forward, it will guarantee that inequality gets worse, while the rest of us pay to help make millionaires into billionaires.

Mr. Chairman, I reject this budget and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution.

A budget is a moral document. It reflects our values. This budget is a stark reminder that the majority and the Trump administration are waging a war on the middle class and eviscerating the social safety net programs that help our most vulnerable citizens.

The social safety net was built on a bipartisan basis. Why is the majority hell-bent on destroying it?

Older Americans will suffer under this budget. It cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid. It betrays middle class job seekers by cutting job training, education programs, and other nondefense programs by 34 percent over the next 10 years.

It decimates the Food Stamp program, SNAP benefits and assumes the enactment of the House-passed repeal of the Affordable Care Act, targeting American families who are struggling to get by.

If we were serious about addressing the problems that face middle class families, we would be voting on a budget resolution that invests in their priorities: job training, apprenticeships, paid family and medical leave, fair trade, and equal pay for equal work.

Instead, we are considering a budget that is merely a means for the majority to jam through their tax cuts for the wealthy and for corporations.

The biggest economic challenge of our time is that too many people now are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. We should be growing the middle class and looking for solutions that work for America’s families.

We ought to be prioritizing the needs of working families, the ones who have entrusted us to come to Washington to fight for them and to fight for their families. Instead, this budget puts corporate profits first. It caters to those with the most lobbyists.

This budget is a disgrace to the promises that we have made to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget proposal.

As the ranking member on the Transportation Committee, I want to focus in a little bit on what they do to transportation.

We heard great promises from President Trump of a trillion dollars in new investment. Nothing has come from the White House. The first substantive action on transportation in this Congress is going to be the Republicans in the House of Representatives cutting transportation funding by \$254 billion.

That is right. No trillion dollars of new spending. We are going to spend \$254 billion less.

They are going to eliminate all long-route trains, isolating rural America. They are going to lose essential air service in rural America. And, by the way, the Republicans want to toll your interstate. So if you live in rural America, you can get in your car to go somewhere, but now you are going to have to pay to use the highway you already paid for.

Secondly, it eliminates critical funding for our urban areas, the economic engines of this country. It eliminates TIGER grants for freight and multimodal projects. It eliminates new investment in transit, new start projects. It eliminates all investments in high-speed rail and eliminates specific funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects. The Republicans just hate bicycles.

It also goes on—and this is totally amazing—seriously, you are going to cut funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency? Haven’t you been watching television? I think they are already out of money. You are going to cut funding?

We want to do away with those programs that might mitigate the disaster of future floods and hurricanes. You are going to cut grants for firefighters.

Then, that is not enough. We are going to roll back Davis-Bacon protections for people who work on federally funded projects. We are going to roll back Buy American? Really? So it is “Buy Chinese” in the Republican budget. Buy Chinese.

They want to devolve the obligation to fund Federal highways to the States. I have got news for you: we have tried that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is Kansas and Oklahoma. This is Kansas before we had the Eisenhower—by the way, a Republican—National Highway Program. They built their turnpike. Oklahoma

said they would build theirs. They didn’t. They were out of money. They didn’t build it until they got an 80 percent Federal match.

So let’s go back to the good, old days. We are going to devolve the obligations of putting together a 21st century transportation system in this country, knitting our country together, getting rid of congestion, moving people and goods more efficiently, but we are going to do it on a State-by-State basis. That is nuts. I just can’t believe this.

Then, there is another little trick. The chairman of my committee wants to privatize the airspace in the United States and reduce the ticket tax that pays for air traffic control. That would be a \$10 billion windfall to the airline industry, because they will raise prices. Then they are going to charge you a head fee to get on the plane.

Even better, it creates \$100 billion of new deficit. So this nifty little thing here contains a reserve fund of \$100 billion to try and make up for the fact and hide the fact that they are cutting \$100 billion of taxes that pay for the current system.

How are you going to pay for the next system?

The airlines will determine that, not Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter that has been signed by 242 agencies and think tanks supporting this budget.

Among those who have signed this letter are the American Bankers Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans for Tax Reform, Business Roundtable, Financial Services Forum, Manufactured Housing Institute, National Association of Manufacturers, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Grocers Association, National Retail Federation, Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, The Kentucky Chamber, and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, among many others.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS: We urge Congress to expeditiously pass a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions so that the promise of tax reform can be made a reality.

It has been 31 years since Congress last reformed the tax code. Since then, the code has become an anchor weighing down the economy, job creation, and wage growth for American families.

This Congress has a once-in-a-generation opportunity to fix the problem. Over the past several years, tremendous work has been done to prepare for this moment. In the 113th Congress the Ways and Means Committee conducted a comprehensive look at tax reform. Last year House Republicans released a Blueprint for reform. During the last Congress, the Senate Finance Committee convened bi-partisan working groups that tackled all the major aspects of reform.

President Trump has outlined his goals for reform, and the “Group of Six”—consisting

of members from the House, Senate, and Administration—has presented a framework to guide the drafting and markup of legislation in the Ways and Means and Finance Committees.

While much work remains to be done, we believe Congress is well-positioned to move forward with comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform.

The single-most important next step is for Congress to adopt a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions that will permit tax reform to move forward without the threat of a filibuster.

Just like Members of Congress, each of our organizations will continue to advocate for specific priorities within tax reform as the relevant committees and ultimately the full House and Senate consider tax reform legislation.

But failing to pass a budget resolution now may mean that tax reform never moves forward. That outcome is unacceptable to all of us and ought to be unacceptable to every Member of Congress who has advocated for reform.

Sincerely,

Aerospace Industries Association, African American Chamber of Commerce of New Jersey, Air Conditioning Contractors of America (ACCA), Alabama Retail Association, Alaska Chamber, Allen Fairview Chamber of Commerce (TX), Alliance for Competitive Taxation (ACT), American Bakers Association, American Bankers Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Exploration & Production Council, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Forest & Paper Association, American Foundry Society, American Gas Association, American Hotel & Lodging Association, American International Automobile Dealers Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Made Coalition, American Petroleum Institute (API).

American Supply Association, Americans for Tax Reform, Ames Chamber of Commerce (IA), Argentum, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Asian American Hotel Owners Association, Asphalt Roofing Manufacturers Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors of America, Associated Wire Rope Fabricators, Association for Hose and Accessories Distribution (NAHAD), Association of American Railroads, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Washington Business, Auto Care Association, Baton Rouge Area Chamber (LA), Battle Creek Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce (FL), Brainerd Lakes Chamber of Commerce (MN).

Bristol County Chamber of Commerce (MA), Buckeye Valley Chamber (AZ), Buffalo Niagara Partnership (NY), Business Council of Alabama, Business Council of New York State, Business Roundtable, Cedar Rapids Metro Economic Alliance (IA), Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association (CTIA), Central Louisiana Regional Chamber of Commerce, Chambers of Commerce Alliance of Ventura & Santa Barbara Counties (CA), Chester County Chamber of Business & Industry (PA), Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce (ID), Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry, Colorado Retail Association, Consumer Bankers Association, Convenience Distribution Association, Coral Gables Chamber of Commerce (FL), Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, Covington County Chamber of Commerce (MS), Crowley Chamber of Commerce (LA).

Davis Chamber of Commerce (UT), Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Eatonton-

Putnam Chamber of Commerce (GA), Edison Electric Institute (EEI), Edmond Area Chamber of Commerce (OK), Edwardsville/Glen Carbon Chamber of Commerce (IL), Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Entertainment Software Association, Financial Services Forum, Florida Chamber of Commerce, Florida Retail Federation, Food Marketing Institute, Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce (WI), Gas and Welding Distributors Association, Georgia Chamber of Commerce, Georgia Retail Federation, Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort Association & Film Commission (CO), Granbury Chamber of Commerce (TX).

Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Greater Bakersfield Chamber (CA), Greater Cedar Valley Alliance & Chamber (IA), Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), Greater El Paso Chamber of Commerce (TX), Greater Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce (AK), Greater Lehigh Valley Chamber of Commerce (PA), Greater Louisville Inc. (KY), Greater North Dakota Chamber, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber (OK), Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce (PA), Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (LA), Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce (VA), Greater Toms River Chamber of Commerce (NJ), Greater Yakima Chamber of Commerce (WA), Grocery Manufacturers Association, Hastings Area Chamber of Commerce (NE), Heating, Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Henderson Chamber of Commerce (NV).

Hilliard Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce (OR), Home Furnishings Association, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, Independent Office Products & Furniture Dealers Alliance, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, International Foodservice Distributors Association, International Warehouse Logistics Association, Iowa Chamber Alliance, Irrigation Association, ISSA, The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association, Jefferson Chamber of Commerce (LA), Jenkins County Chamber of Commerce (GA), Job Creators Network, Johnson City/Jonesborough/Washington County TN Chamber, Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce & Industry (MO), Kalispell Chamber of Commerce (MT), Kansas Chamber of Commerce, Kingsport Chamber (TN), Kyndle (Henderson County KY Chamber of Commerce).

Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Lancaster Chamber (PA), Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce (NV), Lemont Chamber of Commerce (IL), Lima Allen County Chamber of Commerce (OH), Little Rock Regional Chamber (AR), Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Louisiana Association of Business and Industry, Manufactured Housing Institute, McLean County Chamber of Commerce (IL), Metals Service Center Institute, Metro South Chamber of Commerce (MA), Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (WI), Michigan Retailers Association, Minnesota Retailers Association, Missouri Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Monroe Chamber of Commerce (LA), Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, Myrtle Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (SC), National Association of Chemical Distributors, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, National Association of Professional Employer Organizations.

National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, National Association of the Remodeling Industry, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Beer Wholesalers Association, National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Club Association, National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA), National Grocers Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Office Products Alliance, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Nebraska Retail Federation, NFIB—National Federation of Independent Business.

North Carolina Chamber, North Country Chamber of Commerce (NY), North Dakota Retail Association, North Kingstown Chamber of Commerce (RI), North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce (SC), North Orange County Chamber (CA), North San Antonio Chamber (TX), Office Furniture Dealers Alliance, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Ohio Council of Retail Merchants, Oklahoma Retail Merchants Association, Oshkosh Chamber of Commerce (WI), Oxnard Chamber of Commerce (CA), PA Chamber of Business and Industry, Pennsylvania Retailers Association, Plano Chamber of Commerce (TX), Portland Cement Association, Prattville Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Precious Metals Association of North America, Professional Beauty Association.

Reforming America's Taxes Equitability (RATE) Coalition, Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce (NV), Retail Association of Nevada, Retail Association of New Mexico, Retail Council of New York State, Retail Industry Leaders Association, Retailers Association of Massachusetts, Richardson Chamber of Commerce (TX), River Heights Chamber of Commerce (MN), S Corporation Association, Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce (CA), Salt Lake Chamber (UT), San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce (CA), San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership (CA), Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce (PA), Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, Service Station Dealers of America and Allied Trades (SSDA-AT), Silver City Grant County Chamber of Commerce (NM), South Summit Chamber of Commerce (OH), Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Southwest Indiana Chamber, St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce (MN), St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce, St. Tammany West Chamber of Commerce, State Chamber of Oklahoma, Steel Manufacturers Association, Tampa Bay Beaches Chamber of Commerce (FL), Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Texas Retailers Association, The Chamber of Commerce of the Santa Barbara Region (CA), The Chamber of Medford/Jackson County (OR), The Chamber Grand Forks/East Grand Forks (ND), The Fertilizer Institute, The Financial Services Roundtable, The Kentucky Chamber, The Longview Chamber of Commerce (TX), The Ohio Society of CPAs, The Real Estate Roundtable, Tile Roofing Institute, Tioga County Chamber of Commerce (NY).

Tire Industry Association (TIA), Truck Renting and Leasing Association, Tucson Metro Chamber (AZ), Tulsa Regional Chamber (OK), U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Union County Chamber of Commerce, United Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce (TX), USTelecom—The Broadband Association,

Utah Food Industry Association, Utah Retail Merchants Association, Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Virginia Small Business Partnership, West Baton Rouge Chamber of Commerce (LA), Wholesalers Association of the Northeast (WANE), Window and Door Manufacturers Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce, WMDA/CAR Service Station and Automotive Repair Association.

Mrs. BLACK. There are 242 different entities that signed this letter to say that passing a budget is what we should be doing and that would lead us to tax reforms.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee and a fellow rabid Cleveland Indians fan.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget.

As Vice President Biden stated: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget and I will tell you what you value."

The Republican's so-called Building a Better America budget shows us they do not value education, infrastructure, research and development, veterans' benefits, and other programs which expand opportunities for America's families.

□ 1730

This budget is immoral. It provides trillions of dollars in tax money to millionaires and wealthy corporations while shifting the burden onto the middle class. It cuts \$5.4 trillion from programs that American families rely on; programs like SNAP, Pell grants, Social Security, and healthcare.

The budget ends the Medicare guarantee. It cuts Medicare alone by almost \$500 billion over 10 years. A vote for this budget destroys American families in favor of a select few. This budget does not build a better America. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have had numerous letters submitted to us taking a position in opposition to this budget resolution, and I think they are pretty compelling, and I would like to read from some of them.

Here is a letter from the Main Street Alliance:

Main Street Alliance, a network of small business owners throughout the country, strongly urges you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. This budget, if enacted into law, would cut \$3.4 trillion from Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, education, employment and training, food and housing assistance, and infrastructure spending over the next 10 years. This

will significantly harm small business owners and their employees, damage local economies, and decimate State budgets.

We urge you to protect Main Street small business owners, working families, communities, and economies, and oppose the House budget resolution. Reject any budget that enables tax cuts for the very wealthy and large profitable corporations to lose revenue, since it will force deep cuts in vital programs that harm small business.

This letter from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare:

On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the House fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and the Republican Study Committee budget. Instead, I ask you to support the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Progressive Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus budgets.

The committee-passed budget resolution would slash funding to Medicare and Medicaid, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and make it easier for Congress to cut Social Security, all to pay for massive tax cuts for the very wealthy and profitable corporations.

This from the American Public Health Association:

On behalf of the American Public Health Association, a diverse community of public health professionals who champion the health of all people and communities, I write in strong opposition to the House FY 2018 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 71. This proposal does not eliminate sequestration and would drastically cut nondefense discretionary spending. Such cuts would devastate our Nation's public health and safety net system and would have a disproportionate impact on our Nation's most vulnerable citizens.

The proposal also includes the House passed repeal of the Affordable Care Act that would force millions to lose coverage, end the Medicaid expansion, drastically reduce Federal funding for the Medicaid program, and lead to increased cost and fewer benefits for millions of Americans.

This letter from the AFSCME, American Federation of State and County Municipal Employees:

On behalf of the 1.6 million members of AFSCME, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution approved by the House Budget Committee and scheduled to be considered in the full House.

This budget would impose considerable hardship on many Americans in order to slash taxes for the wealthy and corporations to boost defense spending. Rather than increasing revenues for investment that creates jobs and spurs economic growth, the proposed budget creates a fast-track process for tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit corporations and the wealthy.

In fact, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the Trump GOP tax cut would largely benefit the richest 1 percent. The budget also relies on the gimmicks of dynamic scoring and sham accounting, hiding the true cost of unnecessary and harmful tax cuts.

And this, from AARP:

Proposals creating a defined contribution premium support program, restricting access by raising the age of eligibility, or allowing hospitals and providers to arbitrarily charge customers higher prices than Medicare can

make healthcare unaffordable for older Americans. These proposals do little to actually lower the cost of healthcare but simply shifts cost from Medicare on to individuals, many of whom cannot afford to pay for their care.

Efforts to reduce or cap Medicaid funding could endanger the health, safety, and care of millions of individuals who depend on the essential services provided through this program.

Furthermore, caps could result in significant cost shifts to State governments unable to shoulder the cost of care without sufficient Federal support.

Proposals to block grant the program or impose work requirements will make SNAP less responsive and accessible in times of need, and without clear work requirement exemptions for the elderly and disabled, would bar these individuals from receiving SNAP benefits.

We ask you to reject the cuts proposed in H. Con. Res. 71. We stand ready to work with you to develop proposals that protect and improve Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and SNAP.

This from the Alliance for Retired Americans:

On behalf of the more than 4.3 million members of the Alliance for Retired Americans, I am writing to urge you to vote against H. Con. Res. 71, the budget resolution for FY 2018. This budget blueprint cuts spending by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years, disseminating numerous domestic programs, including those that benefit older Americans.

It is shocking that the same budget that cuts services for many low-income Americans and raises taxes on the middle class will also carry instructions to provide \$2.4 trillion in tax cuts to corporations and wealthy Americans.

These tax cuts, which will increase the deficit, sets up the perfect scenario for Congress to slash Medicare and Medicaid. We are not fooled by the House leadership's tax giveaway to the wealthy at the expense of ordinary Americans and urge you to oppose this draconian budget. We will be watching how you vote on this important issue.

This is a letter from the Coalition on Human Needs:

On behalf of the Coalition on Human Needs, I strongly urge you to vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed FY 2018 budget resolution, and to vote for the substitute budgets advanced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Democratic alternative budget resolution. Our members understand that the economic security of millions of American families depends on building on the progress we have made in health coverage, jobs, basic living standards, and ensuring that our children are well prepared for productive lives.

But the majority's proposed budget does not build. It breaks apart our engines of progress. It will make our Nation weaker for decades to come.

The budget advanced by the House Budget Committee would be a dangerous backwards plunge, stripping trillions of dollars from programs that work to reduce poverty and create security and opportunity.

Medicaid, Medicare, working family tax credits, nutrition assistance, education, and housing assistance, these are just some of the services the budget would massively cut.

The budget takes trillions in funding that supports economic security and progress and hands it to the wealthy and corporations in the form of enormous tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, Republicans have chosen to lavish huge tax breaks on large multinationals and the top wealthiest few in our country instead of growing our economy by investing in all Americans. Investing in our workforce, in our physical infrastructure, in entrepreneurship, that is the way to really grow the economy; not these retread Republican tax policies that offer all the benefits to the top and hope something will eventually trickle down to everyone else, that only grow the national debt, as has been shown time and time again.

Our Republicans today call their budget a vision for our country, and what a grim vision it is for anyone who does not count themselves among the top 1 percent. Republicans would only widen income inequality with massive tax breaks for the few, while slashing trillions from initiatives that give more Americans the chance to get ahead, while, at the same time, strengthening our overall economic future.

For seniors, this is a budget that breaks Trump's promise not to cut Medicare to the tune of about half a trillion dollars in cuts, and it would slash an additional \$1 trillion for Medicaid, upon which so many seniors rely.

For students and families that are struggling to get a college education, the ticket into the middle class, and into economic competitiveness, this budget will make it harder to climb the economic ladder with major cuts to Pell grants and other student assistance programs, and it will limit our investment in education and job training for American workers that are already out there trying to upgrade their skills.

What does the Republican budget do with all the money they save from cutting the middle class and working people, seniors, and those who are trying to get ahead? Well, it stuffs the pockets of those at the top and the large multinationals.

What President Trump and his Republican cohorts say their plan is, it isn't. You know, only last week, Trump said this about his tax plan: "I don't benefit. I don't benefit. In fact, very, very strongly, as you see, I think there is very little benefit for people of wealth."

Well, the analysis of the one tax return that leaked out suggests that President Trump will benefit to the tune of more than \$1 billion. Eighty percent of the tax breaks in this proposal go to the top 1 percent. That is people who are making more than \$730,000 a year while one in four Americans could actually see a tax increase.

That is why you can understand that they say they can't guarantee that

taxes won't go up for many people in the middle class. And overall, this is a budget that is dripping in red ink.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we begin to understand why Trump calls himself "the king of debt," because there is plenty of debt that will be added onto this plan.

For Trump and his cohorts, fiscal responsibility is just a political slogan that they use to undermine those education and social service programs they were never for in the first place.

The Republican budget is not just numbers. It has a real human cost. By slashing investments in our economic future, it is a recipe for weakness, not strength. I urge my colleagues to side with the middle class, with working folks all over America, and reject this budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Compact for a Balanced Budget Commission, and I will read a portion of this letter. They say: "Dear Chairman Black: We have reviewed the text of the budget resolution reported by your committee, H. Con. Res. 71, and write to offer our support. That rarest of political outcomes—sound policy that represents a win-win scenario for normally divergent factions—is possible as the budget process moves forward.

"Our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis. It is essential that the Federal budget returns to balance within the 10-year budget period because runaway Federal debt is not political or partisan—it is an economic, generational, and civil rights issue. We commend you and your committee for reporting a resolution that balances within the budget period; its adoption is very much in the national interest."

And again, this comes from The Compact Commission, Compact for a Balanced Budget.

THE COMPACT COMMISSION, C/O COMPACT FOR AMERICA EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, INC.,

Houston, TX, August 8, 2017.

Re 2018 House Budget Resolution and the Compact for a Balanced Budget.

Hon. DIANE BLACK,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BLACK: We have reviewed the text of the budget resolution reported by your Committee (House Concurrent Resolution 71) and write to offer our support. That rarest of political outcomes—sound policy that represents a win-win scenario for normally divergent factions—is possible as the budget process moves forward.

Our nation is facing a fiscal crisis. It is essential that the federal budget returns to balance within the ten-year budget period because runaway federal debt is not political or partisan—it is an economic, generational and civil-rights issue. We commend you and your Committee for reporting a resolution

that balances within the budget period; its adoption is very much in the national interest.

We also commend the Committee for including Section 501 in the resolution, which endorses adding a balanced budget requirement to the Constitution.

Section 501 identifies the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which we represent on behalf of current and future member states. We believe the most practical, prudent enforcement mechanism is the state-of-the-art balanced budget amendment (BBA) being proposed by the Compact. This state-of-the-art BBA has been specifically designed to overcome concerns expressed in 40 years of congressional hearings that have considered how a BBA should be drafted. Such concerns may have prevented prior BBAs from being proposed.

To advance the policy prescription in Section 501 of the budget resolution in the House, we recommend: updating this section to reflect that the concurrent resolution to effectuate the Compact (House Concurrent Resolution 73) was introduced on July 26, 2017; and incorporating the language of House Concurrent Resolution 73 into Section 501. This could be done as one of several amendments you are probably already planning to bring up during floor consideration as the manager's package, and requires only a majority vote as opposed to the two-thirds required for balanced budget amendment proposals made by members of Congress.

Taking these steps establishes a strong enforcement mechanism, sustaining the budget resolution following its adoption. It would also strengthen the appeal of the budget resolution to fiscal conservatives in the House and taking these steps prior to the consideration of legislation to raise the debt ceiling should expedite approval of that legislation.

Supermajorities of Americans have demanded a balanced budget for decades. Our nation's debt threatens future generations to default or austerity, but we believe there's a chance here for a third option: principled leadership on the matter of debt and spending.

We hope you and your Committee members will agree that there is a path here which acknowledges the need for long-term fiscal sanity while also meeting shorter-term political and policy needs.

Regards,

CHAIR MEAD TREADWELL,
Alaska Commissioner.
VICE CHAIR PAULATE
RAKESTRAW,
Georgia Commissioner.
GREG SNOWDEN,
Mississippi Commissioner.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to just bounce off of that and take a look at the chart that we have here. When we take a look at interest—and somehow we don't always talk that much about interest here. We talk about borrowing money and raising our debt ceiling continually. I have been here now for 6½ years, and the conversation is about raising that debt ceiling so that we can pay for our debt, but there comes interest on that.

Just as when we go to a bank and we borrow money, we have to pay interest on that. I remember years ago, when I bought my first house, we were at a period of time when President Carter was the President and the interest rates

were outrageous, and our interest rate on our house at that time, when we purchased it as a young married couple, was, I think, somewhere between 14 and 16 percent.

Interest rates now are very much more reasonable for young couples purchasing. And so I want to turn our attention to this chart here to take a look at the outlays in 2027 under the CBO baseline.

If we continue down this path that we are going in, without taking a look at our mandatory spending, the amount of money that we borrow, and the debt that we pile up with an interest to it, just what will that look like?

□ 1745

I think if we look at our own household and we would say that our interest that we are paying on the credit card or whatever, or the car interest or the House mortgage, if it were more than all of the other things like the food and maybe the education for our children and buying books and pencils and things that they need for school, we would be looking at the way in which we were managing our household income and saying, wow, that is not something we want to keep doing. We are going to have to get on some kind of a budget plan and reverse the trajectory of where we would be going.

So here we are. At the end of the period of 2027, if we look at 17 years down the road and we don't do anything about the kind of mandatory spending, which is two-thirds of our budget, currently, and continues to grow, here is what happens:

We see \$768 billion being spent on interest alone.

We see the next one down, the defense, at \$741 billion. We would actually be paying more in interest than we were in the security of our Nation and supporting our men and women who serve in the military, and all of the supplies and the necessary equipment that it takes to protect them as they protect us.

Look at what happens with Medicaid. We will be spending less on Medicaid that is for people who are the blind, the disabled, the elderly, the children, the pregnant mothers.

We talk about wanting to put our money and our values where we see the values really belong. Is this really where we want our values to be in the money that we spend, \$768 billion in interest compared to what we are spending on our military, what we are spending on our Medicaid?

Look at our veterans, our veterans that we talk about how much we honor them: \$248 billion as opposed to \$768 billion in interest.

Again, we must question where we are going and if this is the right direction. Is this the direction that we can all just raise our hand up and say, yes, we are making good decisions for the

future of our country? Because look at where the interest is compared to the other programs that we both, Republicans and Democrats, have said are so important to us.

Over and over again, we have had colleagues on both sides of the aisle go and speak about the importance of what our values are. Our budget is a vision of what our values are.

Transportation, and I have heard more and more times on both sides of the aisle talking about infrastructure, how important that is for our Nation. Look at what our transportation and our infrastructure will be. I don't know that we want to spend only \$110 billion on that and \$768 billion on interest. Think of how many roads we could build, how many bridges we could repair if we reverse this trajectory.

Then, finally, at the bottom here is science-based technology. We all want to be competitive with those around the world to make sure that we are spending the money where we need to spend the money to stay in front of these other nations with our science and our space and our technology.

I want to recommend here that there are only two other programs, Social Security and Medicare, that exceed that net interest. So we will say Social Security, Medicare, and then our net interest; and from there, everything else that we say, both the Republicans and the Democrats, are so important, that we say are our values, are going to be underneath the interest. I don't think that is really where we want to go.

I have to think, my oldest grandchild right now is 19 years old, soon to turn 20, when he is 30 years old, he might say to me: Mimi, what were you doing when you were in Congress? What were you doing to help us, because now we are paying more in interest than we are all of these other programs that we contend to be so important to us?

So these are difficult decisions to make, I will acknowledge that. But I will also say to you, as someone who—I consider myself to be a policy wonk. As I look at these various programs, I say there is nothing that we are doing in my life that I did 40 years ago that I am doing exactly the same. So if a program has been around for 40 years, should we not want to say maybe we can reform it? Not necessarily cut, but, in the reforming, you may find a way to decrease the spending that you are doing in that program.

Can't we all lock arms, Democrats and Republicans, and acknowledge that there are some decisions that have to be made with programs that have been there for a very long time?

Can we not acknowledge that there are some programs that perhaps have fraud, waste, and abuse that we can take care of, take that money and use it in these places where we really say our values lie?

So I would say that, as we talk about this budget, I am very proud of what we have done in this budget, in the cuts or, as I say, reforms in those programs that would result in \$203 billion worth of savings over a 10-year period, that these are programs that we gave the committees of jurisdiction an opportunity to look within their jurisdiction and to make those decisions and do the homework. It is your jurisdiction; it is not mine. We gave them recommendations and suggestions, but it is their jurisdiction.

Let them evaluate where it is that there are programs that can have new and creative ideas, things that can save us money, not necessarily using the word "cut," but in savings. Yes, you may have some cuts that are done, but these are good cuts. These are things that you have spent a lot of time thinking about.

That is really where we want to go. That is what this budget does is it says: Open up your minds. Think differently. Let's not do things the same old way and keep putting the same old programs out there that maybe aren't working.

And you know what? Maybe they are not even working for the people that we give them to. Maybe they are not working for them, because work is dignity.

When we say that someone who is able-bodied and without any dependents should be at work, that is not cruel. Do you know what that is? That is dignity. When people go to work, it is a dignified activity.

I always say, after I ask you what your name is, and we all do it, we say: What do you do? And when someone cannot tell you what they do, they don't feel dignified.

Look, I don't want to be cruel to people who are disabled, people who are having a really tough time and have other circumstances, but we should acknowledge that there is dignity in work; and when we can give people an opportunity to have that dignity, we should be willing to stand up and do that.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been a robust debate. We had a robust debate in the Rules Committee yesterday, and we have had robust debates in the committee markup and during hearings, as well, over the priorities of this country.

As we close this debate tonight, recognizing there will be a few minutes tomorrow for comments, I just want to say that, since this could very well be the last time that I get to appear in Budget Committee business with Chairman BLACK, I have truly cherished the 9 months that we have spent working together.

The chairman is a gracious, fair, thoughtful, and very, very collegial individual, and I wish her the best in her campaign, at least through the primary. I thank her and her very, very competent and professional staff for all of the courtesies they have shown us during this year and this process.

I also want to pay tribute to the Democratic staff, people who work very, very hard every day and are brilliant in their fields and make me sound smarter than I probably am, but I would like to read their names: Jon Antista; Erika Appel; Ellen Balis, the staff director; Hayden Flanery; Jon Goldman; Elliott Grantz; Jocelyn Harris; Najy Kamal; Sam Lau; Sheila McDowell; Diana Meredith; Farouk Ophaso; Kimberly Overbeek; Scott Russell; and Ted Zegers.

They do terrific work, and I want them to know how much I and all the members of the Budget Committee, the minority, appreciate their work.

I would also like to thank my personal staff, led by my chief of staff, Julie Carr, for the work they contribute to this process as well.

In closing, there are a few comments I want to make about this debate.

We heard several times during the day that it is really not fair to talk about the consequences of the tax proposal that will be the end result of this process because the details haven't been ironed out yet. That is, you know, fair enough as it goes, but there were enough details in the outline that we saw last week to make a pretty good guess as to what the impact of these tax cuts would be.

Now, we have read over and over, as Republican speakers spoke, the fact that they were willing to jeopardize the health and safety and nutrition of their citizens to give the wealthiest people in their State tax cuts. Most of these numbers that we read were in the billions of dollars: \$38 billion, \$16 billion. These are individuals with net worths of astounding amounts.

The outline that was publicly released last week said that the Republicans intend, under this tax proposal, to eliminate the estate tax. If they eliminate the estate tax, much of that money is not going to be taxed. They will get to keep it. I don't think that they are going to be out there creating new companies. Maybe their children will do it if they inherit it. Maybe they have given some of it away so those estates aren't quite as big. I suspect many of them have.

The point is, when you are talking about wealth, collectively, the wealthiest persons in the 50 States, collectively, have \$750 billion in net worth, which means that, if they paid the estate tax, there would be over \$300 billion in money that they would save if you eliminated the estate tax.

So while, yes, we may be off plus or minus 3 percent or 5 percent or 10 per-

cent, the fact is that this is an enormous break for the people who have been the most fortunate in this country. I think it is more than fair to say, if you say you are going to eliminate the estate tax, if you say you are going to eliminate the AMT, the alternative minimum tax, and we can go look at President Trump's 2005 tax return, which said he paid \$31 million in tax because of the alternative minimum tax, it doesn't take any details to know that he would have saved \$31 million in that year if you eliminate the alternative minimum tax.

So, yes, the rates may vary. Ultimately, the tax bill that we have presented to us may not lower the highest rate from 39.6 to 35 percent, but if it does, we know the impact that that will have. We know who will benefit most from that. It is the wealthiest 1 percent of this country.

As I will say tomorrow when we close this debate, I am in the top 1 percent. Half of this body are millionaires. They are all going to benefit. We are all going to benefit. Meanwhile, the people who rely on many of the programs that will be slashed under this Republican budget will suffer. That is not fair.

Now, Republicans will make the argument, as they always do because this is a matter of religious faith to them, that if you give people more money, they will magically create all this growth. Well, has that really happened?

Out of the Fortune 500 companies, I think, in a recent study, 92 of them paid 20 percent or less in corporate tax. Collectively, they eliminated 300,000 jobs over a 5-year period. So they had more money than corporations paying 35 percent. Did they use it to create more jobs, more wealth among middle class and working families? No. They used it to pay dividends, to buy back stock, and to increase the wages of their CEOs.

That is what has happened in modern history every time we lower corporate tax rates or we let them bring taxes in from overseas. They do not create more jobs with the money that they save.

So I think it is very, very fair for us to look at this entire process, the budget proposal, which does anticipate a tax cut—which they claim is revenue neutral, but it is a tax cut—and the outline that we saw last week and say: Who, really, is this going to help?

It is not going to help the people who need the help. It is going to give more money to the people who already occupy one of the strongest economic positions in a country with the greatest disparity of wealth in the world.

So as we conclude this debate, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the alternatives that will be proposed by the Democratic Caucus, by the Congressional Black Caucus, and by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and compare the values and the priorities

of those budgets to those that the Republican budget represents.

I think, on balance, anybody in good faith will say that those budgets, not the Republican budgets, are the budgets that will create a stronger, fairer society in this country, and those are the ones that we should proceed to adopt.

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

□ 1800

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

I likewise, would like to just say that the ranking member, Mr. YARMUTH, has just been wonderful to work with, and we may have differences of opinion, but we can do it in a very Southern hospitality way. I just so much appreciate his demeanor, his leadership on the committee, the way he honors the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, and it has just been a joy to work with him. I am going to miss working with him and being able to have lively debate, which is good for this body and it is good for America.

I want to also thank all the members who participated in the debate today, both the Democrats and the Republicans. This is what our democracy is about, being able to voice our opinions and at the end of the day being able to come to a conclusion after that debate. I look forward to continuing discussion and voting on the final passage tomorrow.

As we finish up, I also want to thank our staff for their hard work, and there are many of them, so I am not going to read all of them to you. I do want to mention some of those who are the leaders of the House Budget Committee staff and have just been great to work with.

Rick May, who is the staff director; Jenna Spealman; Andy Morton; Tim Flynn; Mary, who has been here with me at my side the entire time. What would I do without having somebody to pass papers to us? So Mary has been great. Jim Bates, and I am going to leave it at that because I am going to get in trouble if I don't announce all of them.

The staff has just been tremendous to work with, many hours, weekends, and, indeed, even holidays that they have been here helping to gather the information both for the Budget Committee hearings and then, also, for this today.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to a more lively debate tomorrow. I include in the RECORD the names of the staff of the Budget Committee.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MAJORITY STAFF

Rick May
Jenna Spealman
Andy Morton
Tim Flynn
Patrick Louis Knudsen
Benjamin Gardenhour
Gary Haglund

Chris Hartline
 Sarah Corley
 Sage Peterson
 Jim Bates
 Mary Popadiuk
 Jonathan Romito
 Elise Anderson
 Steve Gonzalez
 Robert Cogan
 Eric Davis
 Robert Yeakel
 Ellen Johnson
 Andy Morton
 Emily Goff
 Brad Watson
 Brittany Madni
 Steve Waskiewicz
 Alex Stoddard
 Jose Guillen

PERSONAL STAFF (REPRESENTATIVE DIANE BLACK, TENNESSEE, 6TH DISTRICT)

Teresa Koeberlein
 Dean Thompson
 Heather Douglass
 Jon Toomey
 Ace Burch
 Katie Mitchell
 Hillary Lassiter
 Zachary Royster
 Greg Dowel
 Nicholas Ayers
 Kenna Balch
 Emily Buck
 Michael Detwiler
 Josh Helton
 Bonny Warren

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I rise to share my concern regarding potential budget reconciliation instructions to the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. These instructions could potentially result in significant harm to federal employees and federal retirees, many of whom I represent.

The national debt is a serious challenge that Congress must address, but I urge members of this body to maintain the promises made to federal employees at the time of their hiring. At a minimum, any changes to federal employee retirement or benefits should only be made on prospective employees, not current or former employees.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD letters from: NAACP, National Committee to Preserve Social Security & Medicare, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, and the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO).

WASHINGTON BUREAU—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,

Washington, DC, October 2, 2017.

Re NAACP strong support for the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget proposal.

MEMBERS,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to support the alternative budget proposal as put forth by the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) later this week as you consider the budget resolutions for FY 2018. The CBC Alternative Budget responsibly reduces the deficit and at the same time alleviates harm

which has been inflicted by the recent austerity measures in a responsible and fiscally sound manner. Furthermore, it proposes significant investments to accelerate our economic recovery and ensures that our recovery is felt in every community, every state and every Congressional District in America.

A nation's budget is perhaps the best reflection of the priorities, moral values and the beliefs of its citizens. Our country, for all its assets and riches is facing some crucial problems. No community is free from challenges, including hunger, homelessness, unemployment, substandard education, crime, a crumbling infrastructure, and home foreclosures. Furthermore, there can be little debate that racial and ethnic minority Americans tend to be disparately affected by these challenges more than any other group.

The federal budget cannot cure every dilemma, but it can provide the American people with the tools to begin to address many of these ills. The CBC budget alternative preserves crucial social safety nets, including Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP and TANF and provides money for job creating programs, health care, and veterans programs to help our returning soldiers as they reintegrate themselves and their families into American life. At the same time, the CBC budget alternative closes tax loopholes and generates new income from those who can most afford to pay, thereby reducing the deficit by \$2.72 trillion over the next decade.

Clearly, the CBC Budget alternative merits your serious consideration and I hope that after a careful review you will agree that it sets our nation on the proper course and establishes our priorities as they should be. Thank you in advance for your attention to the NAACP position. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
 Director, NAACP
 Washington Bureau
 & Senior Vice President
 for Advocacy
 and Policy.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE
 SOCIAL SECURITY & MEDICARE,
 October 4, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the House Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Resolution and the Republican Study Committee budget. Instead, I ask you to support the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Progressive Caucus and Congressional Black Caucus budgets.

OPPOSE H. CON. RES. 71, THE HOUSE FISCAL
 YEAR 2018 BUDGET RESOLUTION

The committee-passed budget resolution would slash funding to Medicare and Medicaid, repeal the Affordable Care Act and make it easier for Congress to cut Social Security—all to pay for massive tax cuts for the very wealthy and profitable corporations.

The House budget calls for fast track procedures designed to ram Social Security benefit cuts through Congress without public scrutiny. This is an undemocratic end run to enact widely unpopular proposals.

Equally unpopular are proposals in the budget resolution to turn Medicare into a voucher or coupon program, raise the Medi-

care eligibility age to 67 and make other modifications to the program that would increase beneficiary out-of-pocket costs. These harmful changes would cut Medicare by nearly \$500 billion over ten years.

These vouchers/coupons might not be enough to keep up with health care inflation and could force seniors to pay more for less coverage. Less coverage will mean higher out-of-pocket costs that most seniors cannot afford to pay—particularly when half of them have incomes less than \$26,200 a year. Under coupon care, private insurers will design their health plans to attract younger and healthier beneficiaries. This will drive up the costs of traditional Medicare and force seniors into private plans that make it hard for them to choose their own doctors.

The budget resolution's plan to raise the Medicare eligibility age is a benefit cut. Although this proposal would save money for the federal government, it would increase system-wide health spending by boosting costs for everyone else, including 65 and 66 years olds who would have to buy private insurance, which—unlike Medicare—can be age rated.

H. Con. Res. 71 assumes savings from redesigning the Medicare benefit by combining the Part A and Part B deductibles and making changes to supplemental insurance (Medigap) policies, changes that would likely increase costs for people with Medigap policies. The measure would also expand income-related premiums under Medicare Parts B and D until 25 percent of beneficiaries are subject to these premiums. A Kaiser Family Foundation study found that this proposal would affect individuals with incomes equivalent to \$45,600 for an individual and \$91,300 for a couple in 2013.

The budget resolution ends the commitment Medicaid provides by turning it into block grants subject to per capita caps that will not grow with the needs of the population. You and your colleagues need only look at what is happening in Puerto Rico to see how their block granted Medicaid program has compromised the delivery of health care in an emergency.

Middle class Americans often rely on Medicaid for long-term services and supports when they exhaust their savings. Nearly two-thirds of all nursing home residents' care is financed in part by Medicaid. In addition, Medicaid provides home and community-based services that allow seniors to stay in their homes. There is no way to cut Medicaid by a trillion dollars without limiting seniors' access to long term care services.

SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS, CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS AND CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS BUDGETS

In sharp contrast to the committee-passed budget resolution are the alternative budgets to be offered as substitute amendments by the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Progressive Caucus (CPC) and Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). The National Committee supports these budgets because they address the country's economic concerns without asking vulnerable Americans who depend on Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid to contribute significantly more than the wealthiest one percent.

The Democratic Caucus budget includes provisions requiring drug manufacturers to provide rebates for drugs used by those dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid and builds on the improved Medicare efficiencies included in the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Similarly, the Progressive Caucus budget would allow Medicare to negotiate prescription drug prices and would eliminate a loophole some use to avoid paying their share of

Medicare payroll taxes. The Democratic, Progressive and Black Caucuses' budgets continue the investment made in the ACA to expand Medicaid in the states, helping people with modest incomes purchase health insurance.

The National Committee commends the Progressive Caucus for proposing to significantly strengthen Social Security's financial condition by raising the payroll tax cap on wages. We also support the CBC and CPC plan that helps protect seniors against the disproportionate amount they spend on health care by using a more accurate Consumer Price Index to set Social Security cost-of-living adjustments (COLA). In addition, we endorse the CPC proposal to offer Social Security credits to caregivers of children and elderly family members.

OPPOSE THE REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE
BUDGET

Conversely, we oppose the Republican Study Committee (RSC) budget's proposal to adopt the "chained" CPI to calculate COLAs. The chained CPI would cut projected benefits for the oldest and most vulnerable Americans who would be least able to afford it. We also oppose plans in the RSC substitute to increase the Medicare eligibility age and the Social Security full retirement age to 69. Contrary to popular belief, not everyone is living longer or is able to work into their 70s. For example, a 2015 study by the National Academy of Sciences found that for men born in 1960, those in the top income quintile could expect to live 12.7 years longer than men in the bottom income quintile. But even for Americans who can work longer, raising the Medicare eligibility age and Social Security retirement age are benefit cuts.

Like H. Con. Res. 71, the RSC budget would repeal the ACA and increase beneficiary out-of-pocket costs by privatizing Medicare, restructuring the program and expanding income-related premiums.

With so many major challenges facing our country, why do the authors of the House budget resolution and the RSC budget insist on fixing what is not broken? The answer is simple. They need to cut working and middle-class programs to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy and profitable corporations.

That's why we urge all Representatives to oppose these "Robin Hood-in-Reverse" budgets and instead protect the retirement and health security commitments made to generations of Americans by supporting the Democratic Caucus, CPC and CBC budget alternatives.

Sincerely,

MAX RICHTMAN,
President and CEO.

NETWORK LOBBY FOR
CATHOLIC SOCIAL JUSTICE,
Washington, DC.

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS FY2018 ALTERNATIVE
BUDGET

NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice strongly supports the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) FY 2018 Alternative Budget. This faithful budget prioritizes the needs of our country's most vulnerable, protects vital safety net programs and closes tax loopholes for the wealthy who intentionally avoid "paying unto Caesar what is Caesar's." (Matthew 22:21)

The CBC Budget Alternative reflects its commitment to investing in programs and policies that will support working Americans and help our nation prosper. The CBC budget

rightly begins with revenue, ensuring support for programs necessary for the long-term growth and development of our nation. NETWORK continuously states that ALL, especially the wealthiest and corporations must provide their fair share of support for our nation. "... from the one to whom much has been entrusted, even more will be demanded." (Luke 12:48)

Much of our national infrastructure is outdated and dilapidated. Roads are crumbling; hundreds of bridges have been designated as unsafe. This budget invests in these and other public structures. It also invests in housing for all levels of low-wage workers through investments in programs such as Public Housing Recaptalization and the national Housing Trust Fund. These would be decimated by the cuts proposed in the Republican Budget. NETWORK sees housing as a priority for mending the gaps in our society. Pope Francis, when addressing Congress in September, 2015 said: "We can find no social or moral justification, no justification, no justification whatsoever, for lack of housing."

Despite a lack of support from the public, Republicans in Congress continue their attacks on the Affordable Care Act. The Congressional Black Caucus's move to protect and strengthen the Affordable Care Act and ensure universal health care for all is in line with NETWORK's advocacy for quality, affordable, accessible healthcare. We know it is especially crucial to eliminate our nation's troubling racial and economic disparities in healthcare, which is a problem being addressed by the CBC Budget's healthcare proposals.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget protects social safety net programs, which NETWORK knows are essential to supporting families and communities. For both the CBC and NETWORK, ensuring the health of programs such as nutrition assistance, school meals, affordable child care, and more are critical. We strongly oppose putting the reduction or eliminations of safety net programs, SNAP in particular, on the chopping block as the Republican budget does.

One expense pushing both young adults and elders into poverty is the costs of college and repayment of college loans. Education is so necessary for young people, and for all who are retraining to meet the demands of our changing workforce. We strongly support the CBC budget's investment in education for the next generation, a stark contrast to the Republican budget which guts the Pell Grant program and eliminates many job-training programs. Changes to Pell Grants and job-training programs make it difficult for people to develop the skills to contribute to society to their full potential.

The tax credits most effective in helping low- and middle-wage households move out of poverty are the refundable Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the Child Tax Credits (CTC). Working families deserve to live in dignity! These tax credits are minimal compared to the tax benefits for the wealthiest households and corporations which would balloon in the Republican budget. It is unacceptable to provide further gains to those who are already receiving the greatest "welfare benefits" through existing tax breaks.

The CBC budget proposes beneficial improvements to retirement security. Unfortunately, Republican leaders do not agree and one of the mandatory programs at risk in the Republican budget is Social Security. Social Security is a program with obvious and just means of being strengthened. Lifting the ceiling on income subject to the em-

ployment tax by a few thousand dollars would keep Social Security viable indefinitely. Using the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) would also create a more just cost-of-living for seniors, as it takes into account the types of expenses the elderly face.

The Congressional Black Caucus Budget is a morally and fiscally responsible alternative to the Republican Budget. The CBC budget provides necessary expenditures and revenues, while reducing the deficit by approximately \$2.5 trillion over 10 years. NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Teaching is proud to support it.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR EQUAL
OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

Re Congressional Black Caucus Alternative
Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing as the CEO of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO), the only 501(c)(3), tax exempt membership association representing the nation's Historically Black Universities (HBCUs) and emerging Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs) and the 700,000 student enrollees, 72,000 faculty, and roughly 7 million alumni associated with these institutions. Today, NAFEO represents 106 public and private HBCUs and 50 PBIs in 35 states, the District of Columbia and U.S. Virgin Islands. I am writing in support of the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2018 ("CBC Budget"). The CBC Budget calls for fiscally sound and morally conscientious revenue and savings, new investments, and net deficit reduction. We urge you to support the CBC Budget which recommends a fair tax code that will allow Congress to reinvest in communities, such as infrastructure and school modernization, energy infrastructure and broadband access, adult and youth job programs, neighborhood revitalization, and a package that protects the safety net and helps to eradicate poverty. Also, the CBC Budget includes aid for those areas ravaged by the recent Hurricanes. NAFEO supports the entire budget, and we highlight certain sections below:

ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

NAFEO supports the CBC Budget recommendations to increase access to high quality education and make college more affordable. NAFEO, the only membership association of its kind, was founded by the presidents and chancellors of HBCUs and PBIs to represent the issues and interests of these richly diverse public, private and land-grant, two- and four-year, graduate and professional, historically and predominantly black colleges and universities. The organization provides an international voice for the nation's HBCUs and other equal educational opportunity institutions; advocates for policies, programs and practices to preserve and enhance HBCUs; and increases the active participation of underrepresented minorities in higher education and in the formulation and implementation of policies and programs in American higher education. The CBC Budget would fully fund the Every Student Succeeds Act, and the 2015 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and invest in increasing access to higher education and HBCUs. It would further provide affordable pathways for students, by providing grants, reducing interest rates, and increasing Pell Grant awards.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

NAFEO supports the CBC Budget recommendations to ensure targeted investments for our most vulnerable communities.

NAFEO endorses the CBC Budget recommendation to rebuild our nation's infrastructure and reinvest in our communities. NAFEO supports a \$1 trillion infrastructure rebuilding proposal, especially one that places HBCUs at its epicenter, because of their unique strategic locations, mostly in the areas in which the roads, bridges, waterways, airports and other infrastructure serve as the gateways to American commerce, and because HBCUs are graduating disproportionate percentages of the growing populations in America who are receiving degrees in the sciences, technology, engineering, mathematics, architecture, urban and rural planning, and other critical education and training required to improve our infrastructure. HBCUs also possess faculty, staff, students, goods, services, and promising practices, position them well to drive the new infrastructure initiative, the revitalizing of urban and rural America, the economic stimulus and STEAM agendas. Indeed, some HBCUs are serving as "Communiversities"—the epicenters for the revitalization of urban and rural America for shoring up infrastructures; energizing communities; seeding intellectual, scientific, technological, and economic capital; and ensuring healthy, sustainable, communities.

HURRICANE SUPPORT

NAFEO supports the CBC Budget recommendation to provide a \$200 billion down payment to aid victims of recent hurricanes. As noted above, NAFEO represents 106 HBCUs including the University of the Virgin Islands ("UVI"). The UVI President, Dr. David Hall, has shared that the University has endured tremendous challenges associated with the recent hurricanes, and is in dire need of operating funds. Dr. Hall writes "Due to the problems the Territory is facing as a result of the two [now three] hurricanes, and their financial impact, the monthly allotments to the University ha[ve] not been received. We receive approximately \$2.6 million each month from the local government and without those funds we will cease to operate. We are resuming classes on October 9th and the University will need to pay its employees and address other critical needs. Federal funding specifically earmarked to the University to operate would be extremely helpful and valuable."

Representative, we need your leadership to ensure that our nation's budget reflects our priorities and especially the needs of our students. The CBC Budget focuses on meeting the needs of our nation. We look forward to working with members of Congress to advance a budget that reflective of what we need and deserve.

Sincerely,

LEZLI BASKERVILLE,
President & CEO.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, as the Ranking Member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I strongly oppose House Concurrent Resolution 71.

This Budget Resolution would direct the Oversight Committee to identify a minimum of \$32 billion in savings over ten years.

Only two of the other 11 authorizing committees would be instructed to make more drastic cuts to federal programs—the Ways and Means Committee would have to identify at least \$52 billion and the Judiciary Committee would have to identify at least \$45 billion in cuts.

Once again, House Republicans are targeting middle class civil service workers and their pensions for massive reductions.

The Republican Budget would require federal workers to contribute significantly more to their pension plans than they do now.

It would also end the retirement supplement for employees like law enforcement officers who are required by law to retire before reaching eligibility age for Social Security benefits.

It would also eliminate pensions altogether for new hires.

This Budget Resolution would slash the federal workforce by 10 percent through attrition in certain agencies by limiting agencies to one new hire for every three employees who leave.

I am utterly dismayed at the relentless Republican attacks on middle class federal workers without any real consideration of what they do every single day for the American people.

Over the past several years, Republicans in Congress have cut federal employee compensation and retirement benefits for a total of nearly \$200 billion in order to pay for deficit reduction and other government programs.

The argument that federal workers must sacrifice for the good of the country might have made some sense when the country was struggling during the Great Recession, and they did sacrifice.

But it makes much less sense now that our economy is recovering and the wage gains made by private sector workers are far outstripping those of workers who commit their lives to public service.

The argument that federal workers must be continually forced to sacrifice for deficit reduction also loses its strength when House Republicans are trying to give tax cuts to the wealthy without paying for it.

The Republican tax package would add \$2.4 trillion to the deficit over 10 years, and 80 percent of tax cuts would benefit the top 1 percent of Americans, who earn at least \$900,000.

While the wealthiest in our country would receive the vast majority of tax cuts, one third of middle class families making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 would see their taxes increase.

Many of these middle class families are federal workers who dedicate their lives to serving the American people.

It is unfair and uncompassionate to treat our civil servants in this way.

These are the men and women who aided in the rescue and recovery efforts as Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria tore through Texas, Louisiana, the Southeast, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

More than 32,000 federal employees were involved in helping families trapped in the storms.

They include: disaster response teams from the Federal Emergency Management Agency; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers who provided temporary power and roofing, debris removal, and infrastructure assessment; National Guard soldiers and airmen who delivered food and water to survivors and cleared debris to open roads; Department of Energy personnel who ensured that fuel was available in impacted areas; Public Health Service officers who provided healthcare, including dialysis services to those in need; Members of the U.S. Coast Guard who helped ensure the delivery of relief supplies; and Agriculture Department employees who provided food to schools, shelters, and disaster organizations.

Rather than targeting and penalizing these brave and selfless public servants, Congress must do a better job at showing how much we appreciate their efforts.

I urge my colleagues to vote against House Concurrent Resolution 71.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 71

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that prior concurrent resolutions on the budget are replaced as of fiscal year 2018 and that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND RELATED MATTERS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 301. Point of order against increasing long-term direct spending.
Sec. 302. Allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.
Sec. 303. Limitation on changes in certain mandatory programs.
Sec. 304. Limitation on advance appropriations.
Sec. 305. Estimates of debt service costs.
Sec. 306. Fair-value credit estimates.
Sec. 307. Estimates of macroeconomic effects of major legislation.
Sec. 308. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.
Sec. 309. Scoring rule for Energy Savings Performance Contracts.
Sec. 310. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.
Sec. 311. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses as an offset.
Sec. 312. Prohibition on use of guarantee fees as an offset.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 321. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
Sec. 322. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 323. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 324. Adjustment for changes in the baseline.
Sec. 325. Application of rule regarding limits on discretionary spending.
Sec. 326. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

- Sec. 401. Reserve fund for commercialization of air traffic control.
- Sec. 402. Reserve fund for investments in national infrastructure.
- Sec. 403. Reserve fund for comprehensive tax reform.
- Sec. 404. Reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
- Sec. 405. Reserve fund for the repeal or replacement of President Obama's health care laws.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

- Sec. 501. Policy statement on a balanced budget amendment.
- Sec. 502. Policy statement on budget process reform.
- Sec. 503. Policy statement on Federal regulatory budgeting and reform.
- Sec. 504. Policy statement on unauthorized appropriations.
- Sec. 505. Policy statement on Federal accounting.
- Sec. 506. Policy statement on Commission on Budget Concepts.
- Sec. 507. Policy statement on budget enforcement.
- Sec. 508. Policy statement on improper payments.
- Sec. 509. Policy statement on expenditures from agency fees and spending.
- Sec. 510. Policy statement on promoting real health care reform.
- Sec. 511. Policy statement on Medicare.
- Sec. 512. Policy statement on combating the opioid epidemic.
- Sec. 513. Policy statement on the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
- Sec. 514. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery, and innovation.
- Sec. 515. Policy statement on public health preparedness.
- Sec. 516. Policy statement on Social Security.
- Sec. 517. Policy statement on Medicaid work requirements.
- Sec. 518. Policy statement on welfare reform and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program work requirements.
- Sec. 519. Policy Statement on State flexibility in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
- Sec. 520. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
- Sec. 521. Policy statement on supplemental wildfire suppression funding.
- Sec. 522. Policy statement on the Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 523. Policy statement on moving the United States Postal Service on budget.
- Sec. 524. Policy statement on the Judgment Fund.
- Sec. 525. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
- Sec. 526. Policy statement on tax reform.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,670,356,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,767,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,870,414,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,963,953,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,077,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,195,139,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,325,690,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,475,784,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,642,629,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,811,687,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$63,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$66,151,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$80,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$95,958,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$105,330,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$122,777,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$136,738,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$146,394,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$146,749,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$146,700,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,232,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,286,018,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,299,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,290,186,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,441,975,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,483,686,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,528,872,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,655,413,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,746,208,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,824,652,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,164,885,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,265,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,283,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,323,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,441,603,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,467,047,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,497,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,620,210,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,727,971,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,806,792,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$494,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$497,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$412,612,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$359,511,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$364,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$271,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$171,618,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$144,426,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$85,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$4,895,000,000.

(5) **DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.**—The appropriate levels of debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,059,756,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,720,619,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,263,387,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,717,657,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,120,068,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$23,414,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$23,577,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$23,665,687,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$23,701,446,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$23,484,672,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,399,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$15,971,804,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,477,150,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,920,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,371,706,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,720,326,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$17,949,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$18,156,356,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$18,299,466,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$18,345,826,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$629,595,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$607,810,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$660,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$636,795,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$693,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$666,519,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$728,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$698,761,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$731,818,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$717,568,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$735,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$720,401,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$739,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$720,755,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$742,886,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$729,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$747,414,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$734,037,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$751,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$737,798,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,428,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,965,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,654,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,585,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,795,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,285,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,102,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,025,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,175,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,524,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,072,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$29,702,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$29,360,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$30,346,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$29,718,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$31,018,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$30,259,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$31,694,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$30,797,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$32,378,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$31,325,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$33,112,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$31,928,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$33,854,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$32,550,000,000. Fiscal year 2027: (A) New budget authority, \$34,602,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$33,162,000,000. (4) Energy (270): Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, -\$3,088,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$2,559,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$1,704,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$1,714,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, -\$11,179,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$11,813,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$1,871,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$786,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$1,705,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$445,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$754,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$491,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$437,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$727,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, -\$4,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$1,052,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$2,233,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$1,207,000,000. Fiscal year 2027: (A) New budget authority, \$2,324,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$1,370,000,000. (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300): Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$31,720,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$35,641,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$31,856,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$33,751,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$33,255,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$33,581,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$32,704,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$32,652,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$34,295,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$33,909,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$34,684,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$34,186,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$34,598,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$34,081,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$35,520,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$34,921,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$36,186,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$35,526,000,000.	Fiscal year 2027: (A) New budget authority, \$36,742,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$36,078,000,000. (6) Agriculture (350): Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$24,223,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,913,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$21,091,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$20,200,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$19,786,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,293,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$18,217,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$17,660,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$17,835,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$17,339,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$18,153,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$17,713,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$18,880,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$18,331,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$19,863,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,225,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$20,214,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,593,000,000. Fiscal year 2027: (A) New budget authority, \$20,422,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,817,000,000. (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370): Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, -\$7,287,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$19,601,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, -\$7,517,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$15,753,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, -\$10,358,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$18,126,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, -\$13,446,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$22,106,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, -\$12,880,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$22,470,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, -\$12,330,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$22,598,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, -\$10,989,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$22,362,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, -\$10,255,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$22,849,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, -\$11,141,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$23,569,000,000. Fiscal year 2027: (A) New budget authority, -\$11,933,000,000. (B) Outlays, -\$24,521,000,000. (8) Transportation (400): Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$88,095,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$91,796,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$88,892,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$90,602,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$82,748,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$90,508,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$37,190,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$77,995,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$66,950,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$65,076,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$66,895,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$68,694,000,000.	Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$67,483,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$69,617,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$68,481,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$69,074,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$69,714,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$69,044,000,000. Fiscal year 2027: (A) New budget authority, \$70,948,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$69,741,000,000. (9) Community and Regional Development (450): Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$4,365,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$18,626,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$4,170,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$16,983,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$4,240,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$11,842,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$4,353,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$9,558,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$4,487,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$6,386,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$4,556,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$5,090,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$4,673,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$4,745,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$4,857,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$4,767,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$5,077,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$4,805,000,000. Fiscal year 2027: (A) New budget authority, \$4,953,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$4,809,000,000. (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500): Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$69,920,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$89,295,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$79,090,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$81,404,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$80,305,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$81,129,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$81,922,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$82,479,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$82,350,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$83,539,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$86,279,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$85,843,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$86,641,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$87,897,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$86,977,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$88,522,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$87,459,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$89,186,000,000. Fiscal year 2027: (A) New budget authority, \$88,216,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$90,080,000,000. (11) Health (550): Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$579,328,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$551,277,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$564,387,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$570,419,000,000. Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$552,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$541,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$512,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$518,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$528,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$533,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$547,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$549,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$571,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$569,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$594,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$591,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$618,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$613,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$623,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$626,774,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$593,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$593,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$652,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$652,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$692,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$691,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$739,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$739,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$826,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$826,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$845,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$845,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$850,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$850,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$916,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$916,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$988,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$987,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,053,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,053,435,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$491,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$477,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$464,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$454,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$475,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$464,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$484,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$475,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$492,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$489,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$475,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$468,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$484,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$471,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$493,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$480,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$502,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$496,505,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$511,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$505,382,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$176,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$178,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$191,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$190,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$194,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$193,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$199,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$197,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$215,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$213,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$212,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$210,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$209,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$207,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$227,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$225,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$234,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$232,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$243,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$241,501,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$51,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$58,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$58,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$63,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$70,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,722,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,722,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$376,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$376,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$409,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$409,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$450,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$450,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$493,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$493,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$531,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$531,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$565,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$565,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$589,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$589,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$607,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$607,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$620,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$620,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$623,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$623,911,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$44,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$23,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$42,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$34,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$45,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$40,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$48,056,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$44,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$50,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$47,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$52,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$49,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$53,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$51,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$53,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$51,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$52,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$53,919,000,000.
(20) Government-wide savings and adjustments (930):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$2,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$67,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$47,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$120,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$97,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$153,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$137,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$174,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$159,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$194,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$179,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$193,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$187,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$246,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$223,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$258,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$240,977,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$83,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$86,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$86,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$90,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$90,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$93,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$93,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$100,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$100,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$105,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$105,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$115,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$115,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$117,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$117,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$127,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$127,808,000,000.
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$13,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$4,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$1,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$165,000,000.
(23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,099,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND RELATED MATTERS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR RECONCILIATION.—Not later than October 6, 2017, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations on changes in laws within their jurisdictions to the Committee on the Budget that would achieve the specified reduction in the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000

for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$14,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$3,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$45,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(9) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$32,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(10) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(11) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$52,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (b).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, aggregates, or other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution.

(d) **DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) **SUNSET.**—This section shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 302. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) **SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) **SECTION 302 ALLOCATIONS.**—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) **APPLICATION.**—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) **DESIGNATIONS.**—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision were included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a

full fiscal year that proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) **AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) **AMOUNT.**—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$19,100,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$17,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading—

(1) **GENERAL.**—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(2) **VETERANS.**—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) **GENERAL.**—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) **VETERANS.**—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available for the first fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 305. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include, in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, an estimate of any change in debt service costs resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt service costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforcement of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of programs funded by discretionary spending or to appropriation bills or joint

resolutions, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

SEC. 306. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) **ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.**—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall also, to the extent practicable, provide a fair-value estimate of such loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(b) **STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide, to the extent practicable, a fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure that establishes or modifies a loan or loan guarantee program for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) **BASELINE ESTIMATES.**—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budget enforcement requirements.

SEC. 307. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 15th Congress, any estimate of major legislation considered in the House of Representatives or the Senate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means—

(A) in the Senate, a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty—

(i) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal

year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(I) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(II) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(ii) designated as such by—

(I) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending legislation; or

(II) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(B) in the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(i) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) designated as such by—

(I) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending legislation; or

(II) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 308. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to the applicable authorizing committee that reports such measure and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget

and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 309. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides the authority to enter into or modify any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis (NPV).

(b) **NPV CALCULATIONS.**—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Use of Energy Saving Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, dated September 28, 2015 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, if any net present value of any covered energy savings contract calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then the budgetary effects of such contract shall not be counted for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) **CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.**—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President's annual budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

SEC. 310. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted

as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 311. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 312. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 321. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation to the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the levels of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 322. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and

budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 301 of this concurrent resolution.

(e) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution depending on congressional action on pending reconciliation legislation.

SEC. 323. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 324. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 325. APPLICATION OF RULE REGARDING LIMITS ON DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution if—

- (1) the enactment of that bill or resolution;
- (2) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or
- (3) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would not cause the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 to be exceeded.

SEC. 326. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title and title II—

- (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

- (2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR COMMERCIALIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust, at a time the chair deems appropriate, the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and other applicable committees of the House of Representatives, aggregates, and other appropriate levels estab-

lished in this concurrent resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system if such measure reduces the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by the amount that would otherwise be appropriated to the Federal Aviation Administration for air traffic control. Adjustments to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the adjustments to the discretionary spending limits under such section 251(c), shall only be made upon enactment of such measure.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, a measure that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system shall be a measure that establishes a Federally-chartered, not-for-profit corporation that—

- (1) is authorized to provide air traffic control services within the United States airspace;
- (2) sets user fees to finance its operations;
- (3) may borrow from private capital markets to finance improvements;
- (4) is governed by a board of directors composed of a CEO and directors whose fiduciary duty is to the entity; and
- (5) becomes the employer of those employees directly connected to providing air traffic control services and who the Secretary transfers from the Federal Government.

SEC. 402. RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that invests in national infrastructure to the extent that such measure is deficit neutral for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 403. RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

In the House of Representatives, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that provides for comprehensive tax reform, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 404. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, budget aggregates and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program allotments, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 405. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OR REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals

or replaces any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 by the amount of budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom provided by such measure for such purpose.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) In fiscal year 2017, the Federal Government will collect approximately \$3.3 trillion in taxes, but spend more than \$4.0 trillion to maintain its operations, borrowing 15 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of fiscal year 2016, the national debt of the United States was more than \$19.5 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a constitutional convention to adopt a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

(4) As of the spring of 2016, 46 States have requirements to annually balance their respective budgets.

(5) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Currently in the 115th Congress, 8 joint resolutions proposing a balanced budget amendment have been introduced.

(6) In the 111th Congress, the House considered H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Representative Robert W. Goodlatte of Virginia. Although it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(7) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed to pass by one vote in the United States Senate.

(8) Five States, Georgia, Alaska, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Arizona, have agreed to the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which seeks to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget through an Article V convention by April 12, 2021.

(b) POLICY ON A BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should enact legislation that reforms the congressional budget process to—

- (1) reassert congressional control over the budget process by reorienting the Views and Estimates that committees submit to the Committee on the Budget, as required under 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to emphasize congressional rather than executive branch priorities;

- (2) strengthen enforcement of budgetary rules and requirements by—

(A) enabling Members of the House of Representatives to enforce budget requirements in a manner that does not jeopardize the ability of the majority to work its will on legislation; and

(B) permitting members of Congress to determine whether emergency-designated appropriations are for unanticipated situations that pose a threat to life, property, or national security;

- (3) increase control over the costs of Federal activities by—

(A) incorporating debt service costs into cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office;

(B) establishing a process for setting limits on the amount of debt incurred by the Federal Government from the private sector as a share of the economy that requires congressional action if such limits deviate from those previously determined by Congress and the President;

(C) transitioning to fair-value accounting;

(D) budgeting for Federal insurance programs on an accrual basis; and

(E) developing and implementing a regulatory budget as provided in section 503;

(4) achieve greater control over mandatory spending by reforming reconciliation procedures and requirements to ensure they are transparent, objectively applied, and maximize opportunities for deficit reduction;

(5) increase the efficiency of the congressional budget process by—

(A) realigning the budget cycle with the calendar year and the congressional calendar;

(B) simplifying the procedures by which the Committee on Appropriations adjusts its section 302(b) suballocations to ensure they are consistent with the Committee's overall section 302(a) allocation; and

(C) increasing congressional accountability for budget decisions;

(6) improve the transparency of the Federal Government's obligations by—

(A) modifying the content of the budget resolution to reflect the budgetary decisions that Congress actually makes and enforces;

(B) requiring the Comptroller General to periodically report to Congress on the consolidated financial report of the Federal Government; and

(C) restructuring the baseline, as set forth in section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to treat mandatory spending and revenue on a comparable basis; and

(7) achieve control over long-term budget obligations by—

(A) establishing declining limits on the amount of debt incurred by the Federal Government from the private sector as a share of the economy that requires congressional action if such limits deviate from those previously determined by Congress and the President; and

(B) codifying limits on the amount legislation can increase the deficit beyond the ten fiscal-year period of the concurrent resolution on the budget.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Federal regulations are estimated to cost \$1.9 trillion per year or approximately \$15,000 per household. Such costs exceed 10 percent of the Gross Domestic Product of the United States.

(2) Excessive Federal regulation—

(A) retards job creation, investment, wages, competition, and economic growth, slowing the Nation's recovery from economic recession and harming American households;

(B) operates as a regressive tax on poor and lower-income households;

(C) displaces workers into long-term unemployment or lower-paying jobs;

(D) adversely affects small businesses, the primary source of new jobs; and

(E) impedes the economic growth necessary to provide sufficient funds to meet vital commitments and reduce the Federal debt.

(3) Federal agencies do not systematically analyze both the costs and benefits of new regulations or identify and eliminate, minimize, or mitigate excess regulatory costs

through post-implementation assessments of their regulations.

(4) Agencies too often impose costly regulations without relying on sound science, through the use of agency guidance, judicial consent decrees, and settlement agreements, and through the abuse of high interim compliance costs imposed on regulated entities that bring legal challenges against newly promulgated regulations.

(5) Congress lacks an effective mechanism to manage the level of new Federal regulatory costs imposed each year. Other nations, meanwhile, have successfully implemented the use of regulatory budgeting to control excess regulation and regulatory costs.

(6) Significant steps have been taken already by President Trump and the 115th Congress, including the imposition of a regulatory pay-as-you-go regimen for new and revised regulations by the Trump Administration and the enactment of 14 measures under the Congressional Review Act that repealed regulations promulgated in the final 60 legislative days of the 114th Congress.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with the public, consider legislation that—

(1) requires the President's budget submission to include an analysis of the costs of complying with current and proposed regulations;

(2) builds the institutional capacity of the Congressional Budget Office to develop a regulatory baseline and estimate regulatory costs;

(3) codifies the Trump Administration's regulatory pay-as-you-go requirements, which require agencies to offset the costs of new or revised regulations with the repeal or modification of existing regulations; and

(4) requires Federal agencies to give notice and allow for comments on proposed guidance documents.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Article I of the Constitution vests all legislative power in Congress.

(2) Central to the legislative powers of Congress is the authorization of appropriations necessary to execute the laws that establish agencies and programs and impose obligations.

(3) Clause 2 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibits the consideration of appropriations measures that provide appropriations for unauthorized programs.

(4) In fiscal year 2016, more than \$310 billion was appropriated for unauthorized programs, spanning 256 separate laws.

(5) Agencies such as the Department of State have not been authorized for 15 years.

(6) The House adopted a requirement for the 115th Congress, as part of H. Res. 5, that requires each standing committee of the House to adopt an authorization and oversight plan that enumerates all unauthorized programs and agencies within its jurisdiction that received funding in the prior year, among other oversight requirements.

(b) **POLICY ON UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.**—In the House, it is the policy of this concurrent resolution that legislation should be enacted that—

(1) establishes a schedule for reauthorizing all Federal programs on a staggered five-year basis together with declining spending targets for each year a program is not reauthorized according to such schedule;

(2) prohibits the consideration of appropriations measures in the House that provide appropriations in excess of spending targets specified for such measures and ensures that such rule should be strictly enforced; and

(3) limits funding for non-defense or non-security-related Federal programs that are not reauthorized according to the schedule described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Current accounting methods fail to capture and present in a compelling manner the full scope of the Federal Government and its fiscal condition.

(2) Most fiscal analyses produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) are conducted over a 10-fiscal year period. The use of generational accounting or a longer time horizon would provide a more complete picture of the Federal Government's fiscal condition.

(3) The Federal budget currently accounts for most programs on a cash accounting basis, which records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received. However, it accounts for loan and loan guarantee programs on an accrual basis, which records revenue when earned and expenses when incurred.

(4) The Government Accountability Office has advised that accrual accounting may be more accurate than cash accounting in estimating the Federal Government's liabilities for insurance and other programs.

(5) Accrual accounting under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA) understates the risk and thus the true cost of some Federal programs, including loans and loan guarantees.

(6) Fair-value accounting better reflects the risk associated with Federal loan and loan guarantee programs by using a market based discount rate. CBO, for example, uses fair-value accounting to measure the cost of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac).

(7) In comparing fair-value accounting to FCRA, CBO has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of Federal assistance".

(8) The Department of the Treasury, when reporting the principal financial statements of the United States entitled *Balance Sheet and Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position*, may omit some of the largest projected Federal Government expenses, including social insurance programs. The projected expenses of these programs are reported by the Department in its *Statements of Social Insurance and Changes in Social Insurance Amounts*.

(9) This concurrent resolution directs CBO to estimate the costs of Federal credit programs on a fair-value basis to fully capture the risk associated with these programs.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with CBO and other appropriate stakeholders, reform government-wide budget and accounting practices so Members and the public can better understand the fiscal condition of the United States and the best options to improve it. Such reforms may include the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance analysis by considering the Nation's

fiscal condition comprehensively, over an extended time period, and how it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair-value accounting to better capture market risk.

SEC. 506. POLICY STATEMENT ON COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1965, the President's Commission on Budget Concepts made a series of recommendations that were adopted and continue to provide the foundation for the Federal budget process.

(2) Over the ensuing 52 years, the Federal budget process has undergone major transformations, including the following:

(A) Congress asserted its Article I “power of the purse” through the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the form of a congressional budget process predicated on the adoption of an annual budget resolution setting forth its priorities independent of the executive branch.

(B) Congress and the President have periodically augmented the President's budget submission and the budget resolution by establishing statutory budget rules and limits enforced through sequestration.

(C) The share of Federal spending that is not controlled through the annual appropriations process has ballooned from 32 percent of total Federal spending in 1967 to 69 percent in 2016.

(D) Activities previously considered the exclusive domain of the Federal Government have been fully commercialized, contracted out to the private sector, financed through third party arrangements, or devolved to State and local governments.

(E) Key functions of the Federal Government are now funded through user fees rather than general revenue, often shielding them from congressional control and oversight.

(F) The Credit Reform Act of 1990 placed Federal loans and loan guarantees on an accrual basis.

(G) Increasing shares of the economy are directed towards compliance with Federal regulations, which are not subject to the limitations applicable to Federal spending.

(b) POLICY ON COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that legislation should be enacted that establishes a Commission on Budget Concepts to review and revise budget concepts and make recommendations to create a more transparent Federal budget process.

SEC. 507. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should—

(1) adopt an annual budget resolution before spending and tax legislation is considered in either House of Congress;

(2) assess measures for timely compliance with budget rules in the House;

(3) pass legislation to strengthen enforcement of the budget resolution;

(4) comply with the discretionary spending limits set forth in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

(5) prevent the use of accounting gimmicks to offset higher spending;

(6) modify scoring conventions to encourage the commercialization of Federal Government activities that can best be provided by the private sector; and

(7) discourage the use of savings identified in the budget resolution as offsets for spending or tax legislation.

SEC. 508. POLICY STATEMENT ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office defines improper payments as any reported payment that should not have been made or was made in an incorrect amount.

(2) Improper payments totaled \$1.2 trillion between fiscal years 2003 and 2016 with a reported Federal Government-wide error rate of 5.1 percent in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Improper payments increased from \$107 billion in 2012 to \$144 billion in 2016.

(4) The Earned Income Tax Credit, Medicare, and Medicaid account for 78 percent of total improper payments, with error rates of 24 percent, 11 percent, and 10.5 percent, respectively.

(5) Eight agencies did not report payment estimates for 18 programs that the Comptroller General deems susceptible to significant improper payments.

(b) POLICY ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that an independent commission should be established with the goal of finding tangible solutions to reduce total improper payments by 50 percent within the next 5 years. The commission should also develop a more-stringent system of agency oversight to achieve this goal.

SEC. 509. POLICY STATEMENT ON EXPENDITURES FROM AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Many Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect and spend fees and other offsetting collections.

(2) The Office of Management and Budget estimates the total amount of offsetting fees and collections to be \$513 billion in fiscal year 2017.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable Government.

(b) POLICY ON EXPENDITURES FROM AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should reassert its constitutional prerogative to control Federal spending and exercise rigorous oversight over Federal agencies. Congress should subject all fees paid by the public to Federal agencies to annual appropriations or authorizing legislation and a share of these proceeds should be reserved for taxpayers in the form of deficit reduction.

SEC. 510. POLICY STATEMENT ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Patient-centered health care increases access to quality care for all Americans, regardless of age, income, or health status.

(2) States are best equipped to respond to the needs of their unique communities.

(3) The current legal framework encourages frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits that increase health care costs.

(b) POLICY ON HEALTH CARE REGULATION.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the American health care system should encourage research, development, and innovation in the medical sector, rather than stymie growth through over-regulation;

(2) States should determine the parameters of acceptable private insurance plans based

on the needs of their populations and retain control over other health care coverage standards;

(3) reforms should protect patients with pre-existing conditions, reward those who maintain continuous health coverage, and create greater parity between benefits offered through employers and those offered independently;

(4) States should have greater flexibility in designing their Medicaid program and State Children's Health Insurance Program;

(5) medical malpractice reform should emphasize compliance with best practice guidelines, while continuing to protect patients' interests; and

(6) States should have the flexibility to implement medical liability policies to best suit their needs.

SEC. 511. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 57 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Congress address Medicare's long-term financial challenges. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement more pronounced. The current challenges that Congress will need to address include—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2029 and unable to pay the scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase more than 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) due to extended life spans, enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program five decades ago;

(D) notwithstanding the program's trust fund arrangement, current workers' payroll tax contributions pay for current Medicare beneficiaries instead of being set aside for their own future use;

(E) the number of workers supporting each beneficiary continues to fall; in 1965, the ratio was 4.5 workers per beneficiary, and by 2030, the ratio will be only 2.4 workers per beneficiary;

(F) the average Medicare beneficiary receives about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every dollar paid into the program;

(G) Medicare is growing faster than the economy, with a projected growth rate of 7.2 percent per year on average through 2026, peaking in 2026 at 9.2 percent; and

(H) by 2027, Medicare spending will reach more than \$1.4 trillion, more than double the 2016 spending level of \$692 billion.

(3) Failing to address the impending insolvency of Medicare will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with having to pay for these unsustainable spending levels.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to save Medicare for those in or near retirement and to strengthen the program's solvency for future beneficiaries.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This concurrent resolution assumes transition to an improved Medicare program that ensures—

(1) Medicare is preserved for current and future beneficiaries;

(2) future Medicare beneficiaries may select from competing guaranteed health coverage options a plan that best suits their needs;

(3) traditional fee-for-service Medicare remains a plan option;

(4) Medicare provides additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and becomes solvent over the long term.

SEC. 512. POLICY STATEMENT ON COMBATING THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 91 Americans die each day from an opioid overdose.

(2) Nearly half of all opioid overdose deaths involve a prescription opioid.

(3) Since 1999, the number of prescription opioids sold in the U.S. has nearly quadrupled.

(4) Since 1999, the number of deaths from prescription opioids has more than quadrupled.

(5) The CDC asserts that improving opioid prescribing practices will reduce exposure to opioids, prevent abuse, and stop addiction.

(6) The CDC has found that individuals in rural counties are almost twice as likely to overdose on prescription painkillers as those in urban areas.

(7) According to the CDC, nearly 7,000 people are treated in emergency rooms every day for using opioids in a non-approved manner.

(8) The 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act were signed into law in the 114th Congress in an overwhelming display of congressional and executive branch support in the fight against the opioid epidemic.

(9) Bipartisan efforts to eliminate opioid abuse and provide relief from addiction for all Americans should continue.

(b) POLICY ON OPIOID ABUSE.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) combating opioid abuse using available budgetary resources remains a high priority;

(2) the House, in a bipartisan manner, should continue to examine the Federal response to the opioid abuse epidemic and support essential activities to reduce and prevent substance abuse;

(3) the House should continue to support initiatives included in the 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act;

(4) the House should continue its oversight efforts, particularly ongoing investigations conducted by the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, to ensure that taxpayer dollars intended to combat opioid abuse are spent appropriately and efficiently; and

(5) the House should collaborate with State, local, and tribal entities to develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing the opioid addiction crisis.

SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) is a means-tested program that provides health insurance coverage to low-income children and pregnant women who do not qualify for Medicaid based on income.

(2) SCHIP eligibility varies by State, as States decide the income upper limit for beneficiaries; the current upper limit varies from 175 percent of the Federal poverty level to 405 percent of the Federal poverty level.

(3) SCHIP covered on average 6.3 million people monthly in fiscal year 2017.

(4) The average cost of a child enrolled in SCHIP to the Federal Government was ap-

proximately \$2,300 in fiscal year 2017, compared to approximately \$1,910 for a child enrolled in Medicaid.

(5) The Federal spending allotment for SCHIP will expire at the end of fiscal year 2017.

(6) The Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission recommends an extension of Federal SCHIP funding, and warns that all States are projected to exhaust their Federal SCHIP funds during fiscal year 2018.

(7) SCHIP should be preserved to assist the Nation's vulnerable children.

(b) POLICY ON THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should work in a bipartisan manner to reauthorize SCHIP funding;

(2) the authorizing committees should consider establishing a Federal upper limit for SCHIP eligibility, rather than providing open-ended access to the program for those at higher income levels;

(3) the House should target resources designated for SCHIP toward those most in need of Federal assistance; and

(4) the House should require greater reporting by States of SCHIP data in order to better structure the program to meet beneficiaries' needs.

SEC. 514. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY, AND INNOVATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world for decades.

(2) The history of scientific discovery and medical breakthroughs in the United States is extensive, including the creation of the polio vaccine, the first genetic mapping, and the invention of the implantable cardiac pacemaker.

(3) Reuters ranks the United States Health and Human Services Laboratories as first in the world for innovation on its 2017 list of the Top 25 Global Innovators.

(4) The United States leads the world in the production of medical devices, and the United States medical device market accounts for approximately 45 percent of the global market.

(5) The United States remains a global leader in pharmaceutical research and development investment, has produced more than half of the world's new molecules in the past decade, and represents the world's largest pharmaceutical market, which is triple the size of the nearest rival, China.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the Federal Government should foster investment in health care innovation and maintain the Nation's world leadership status in medical science by encouraging competition;

(2) the House should continue to support the critical work of medical innovators throughout the country through continued funding for agencies, including the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to conduct life-saving research and development; and

(3) the Federal Government should unleash the power of private-sector medical innovation by removing regulatory obstacles that impede the adoption of new medical technology and pharmaceuticals.

SEC. 515. POLICY STATEMENT ON PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Constitution requires the Federal Government to provide for the common defense. As such, the Nation must prioritize its ability to respond rapidly and effectively to a public health crisis or bioterrorism threat.

(2) There is a persistent threat of bioterrorism against American lives.

(3) Naturally-occurring public health threats can spread through the transmission of communicable diseases during international trade and travel.

(4) As of April 3, 2016, the World Health Organization reported nearly 29,000 cases of the Ebola virus worldwide, including 4 instances in the U.S.

(5) As of July 12, 2017, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that the current Zika epidemic resulted in over 5,000 cases of the Zika virus within the United States, with nearly 37,000 more cases reported in U.S. territories.

(6) Preventing the spread of disease to Americans requires halting threats before they breach the U.S. border.

(7) The United States is a leader in global public health assistance and orchestrates international responses to health crises.

(b) POLICY ON PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should continue to fund activities of the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, and the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority to develop and stockpile medical countermeasures to infectious diseases and chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents;

(2) the House should, within available budgetary resources, provide continued support for research, prevention, and public health preparedness programs;

(3) the Federal Government should encourage private-sector development of critical vaccines and other medical countermeasures to emerging public health threats; and

(4) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State should collaborate on global health preparedness initiatives to prevent overlap and promote responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources.

SEC. 516. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 60 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg of the "three-legged stool" of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower income Americans' retirement security.

(3) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. The financial condition of Social Security and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced each year without reform. For example—

(A) in 2028, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) with the exhaustion of both the Disability Insurance Trust Fund and the Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Fund in 2035, benefits will be cut by as much as 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(4) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$1.3 trillion over the next 10 years.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to CBO, between 1970 and 2015 the number of disabled workers and their dependent family members receiving disability benefits has increased by more than 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. CBO also attributes program growth to changes in demographics and the composition of the labor force as well as Federal policies.

(6) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the "Greenspan Commission", which helped address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(7) Americans deserve action by the President and Congress to preserve and strengthen Social Security to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should work in a bipartisan manner to make Social Security solvent on a sustainable basis. This concurrent resolution assumes, under a reform trigger, that—

(1) if in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year, and any recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees;

(2) not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit its recommendations, the President should promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year, and the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House should introduce the President's legislation upon receipt;

(3) within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction should report a bill, which the House or Senate should consider under expedited procedures; and

(4) legislation submitted by the President should—

- (A) protect those in or near retirement;
- (B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;
- (C) improve fairness for participants;
- (D) reduce the burden on and provide certainty for future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2028 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This concurrent resolution assumes reform that—

(1) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work;

(2) ensures benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(3) prevents a 7 percent across-the-board benefit cut; and

(4) improves the Disability Insurance program.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that any legislation the House considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance Trust Fund must also improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

SEC. 517. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Medicaid is a Federal-State program that provides health care coverage for impoverished Americans.

(2) Medicaid serves four major population categories: the elderly, the blind and disabled, children, and adults.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office projects the average monthly enrollment in Medicaid for fiscal year 2018 to be 78 million people.

(4) Of this 78 million people, 27 million—more than one third of the enrollees—are non-elderly, non-disabled adults.

(5) Medicaid continues to grow at an unsustainable rate, and will cost approximately one trillion dollars per year within the decade, between Federal and State spending.

(6) Congress has a responsibility to preserve limited Medicaid resources for America's most vulnerable—those who cannot provide for themselves.

(7) Forbes reported last year on a first-of-its-kind study conducted by the Foundation for Government Accountability. It analyzed data from the State of Kansas, which demonstrates that work requirements have led to greater employment, higher incomes, and less poverty.

(8) The State of Maine implemented work requirements in 2014, and saw incomes rise for able-bodied welfare recipients by an average of 114 percent within a year.

(9) Work is a valuable source of human dignity, and work requirements help lift Americans out of poverty by incentivizing self-reliance.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that encourages able-bodied, non-elderly, non-pregnant adults without dependents to work, actively seek work, participate in a job-training program, or do community service, in order to receive Medicaid;

(2) Medicaid work requirements legislation could include 30 hours per week of work, of which 20 of those hours should be spent in the core activities of: public or private sector employment, work experience, on-the-job

training, job-search or job-readiness assistance program participation, community service, or vocational training and education;

(3) States should be given flexibility to determine the parameters of qualifying program participation and work-equivalent experience;

(4) States should perform regular case checks to ensure taxpayer dollars are appropriately spent; and

(5) the Government Accountability Office or the Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General should conduct annual audits of State Medicaid programs to ensure proper reporting and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

SEC. 518. POLICY STATEMENT ON WELFARE REFORM AND SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM WORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has grown from 17 million Americans in 2001 to 44 million in 2016.

(2) The work support role of SNAP has declined, and the program increasingly serves as a replacement to work.

(3) Work requirements were key to the success of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (Public Law 104-193), which led to a two-thirds reduction in welfare caseloads, a reduction in child poverty, and an increase in work participation. The successful 1996 welfare reform law provides a model for improving work requirements in other anti-poverty programs.

(b) **POLICY ON WELFARE REFORM AND SNAP WORK REQUIREMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should reward work, provide tools to escape poverty, and expect work-capable adults to work or prepare for work in exchange for welfare benefits; and

(2) SNAP should be reformed to improve work requirements to help more people escape poverty and move up the economic ladder.

SEC. 519. POLICY STATEMENT ON STATE FLEXIBILITY IN SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Spending on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has almost quadrupled since 2001.

(2) Various factors are driving this growth, but one major reason is that while States have the responsibility of administering the program, they have little incentive to ensure it is well run.

(3) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic President reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the 5 years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This bipartisan success offers a model for improving other anti-poverty programs.

(b) **POLICY ON STATE FLEXIBILITY IN SNAP.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that SNAP should be reformed to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility for struggling Americans on the road to personal and financial independence. Based on the successful welfare reforms of the 1990s, these proposals would improve work requirements and provide flexible funding for States to help those most in need find gainful employment, escape poverty, and move up the economic ladder.

SEC. 520. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.

(a) FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated, high-skilled workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) Average published tuition and fees have increased consistently above the rate of inflation across all types of colleges and universities.

(3) With an outstanding student loan portfolio of \$1.3 trillion, the Federal Government is the largest education lender to undergraduate and graduate students, parents, and other guarantors.

(4) Students who do not complete their college degree are at a greater risk of defaulting on their loans than those who complete their degree.

(5) Participation in Federal income-driven repayment plans is rising, in terms of the percent of both borrowers and loan dollars, according to the Government Accountability Office. Because these plans offer loan balance forgiveness after a repayment period, this increased use portends higher projected costs to taxpayers.

(b) POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to promote college affordability, access, and success by—

(1) reserving Federal financial aid for those most in need and streamlining grant and loan aid programs to help students and families more easily assess their options for financing postsecondary education; and

(2) removing regulatory barriers to reduce costs, increase access, and allow for innovative teaching models.

(c) FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—The House finds the following:

(1) 7.5 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with skilled personnel.

(3) The House Committee on Education and the Workforce successfully consolidated 15 workforce development programs when Congress enacted the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in 2014.

(d) POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to build on the success of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal workforce development programs; and

(2) empowering States with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce.

SEC. 521. POLICY STATEMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) In 1995, fire activities made up 16 percent of the United States Forest Service's (USFS) annual appropriated budget. Since 2015, more than 50 percent has now been dedicated to wildfire.

(2) Wildland fire suppression activities are currently funded entirely within the USFS budget, based on a 10-year rolling average. Using this model, the agency must average firefighting costs from the past 10 years to predict and request costs for the next year. When the average was stable, the agency was able to use this model to budget consistently for the annual costs associated with wildland fire suppression.

(3) Over the last few decades, wildland fire suppression costs have increased as fire seasons have grown longer and the frequency, size, and severity of wildland fires has increased.

(4) The six worst fire seasons since 1960 have all occurred since 2000. Since 2000, many western states have experienced the largest wildfires in their State's history. In 2016 alone, there were a recorded 67,595 fires and a total of over 5.5 million acres burned. The suppression costs to USFS and other Federal agencies for 2016 totaled over \$1.9 billion dollars.

(5) As wildfire costs continue to increase, funding levels for USFS wildfire suppression activities will also continue to constrict funding levels for other necessary USFS forest management activities focused on land management and wildfire prevention.

(b) POLICY ON SUPPLEMENTAL WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress, in coordination with the Administration, should develop both a long-term funding mechanism that would allow supplemental wildfire suppression funding and reforms on reducing hazardous fuel loads on Federal forests and lands that could decrease wildfires.

SEC. 522. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) For years there have been serious concerns regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care.

(2) Since 2003, VA disability compensation and health care have been added to the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) "high-risk" list, due to mismanagement and oversight failures, lack of a "unified vision, strategy, or set of goals to guide their outcomes," and the inability to ensure allocated resources are used in a cost-effective and efficient way to improve veterans' health care access.

(3) The VA's failure to provide timely and accessible health care to America's veterans is unacceptable. While Congress has done its part for more than a decade by providing sufficient funding for the VA, the agency has mismanaged these resources, resulting in proven adverse effects on veterans and their families.

(b) POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should require the VA to conduct an audit of its programs named on GAO's "high-risk" list and report its findings to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 523. POLICY STATEMENT ON MOVING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE ON BUDGET.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The President's Commission on Budget Concepts recommends that the budget should, as a general rule, be comprehensive of the full range of Federal activity.

(2) The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-239) moved the United States Postal Service (USPS) off budget and exempted it from sequestration.

(3) The USPS has a direct effect on the fiscal posture of the Federal Government, through—

(A) the receipt of direct appropriations of \$35 million in fiscal year 2017;

(B) congressional mandates such as requirements for mail delivery service schedules;

(C) incurring \$15 billion in debt from the Treasury, the maximum permitted by law;

(D) continued operating deficits since 2007;

(E) defaulting on its statutory obligation to prefund health care benefits for future retirees; and

(F) carrying \$119 billion in total unfunded liabilities with no foreseeable pathway of funding these liabilities under current law.

(b) POLICY ON MOVING THE USPS ON BUDGET.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that all receipts and disbursements of the USPS should be included in the congressional budget and the budget of the Federal Government.

SEC. 524. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE JUDGMENT FUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Judgment Fund (Fund), established in 1956, was created to pay judgments and settlements of lawsuits against the Federal Government.

(2) As a result of the Fund's design, it is ripe for executive branch exploitation. The Obama Administration used the Fund to make billions of dollars in payments to Federal agencies and foreign entities. For example—

(A) on January 17, 2016, the State Department announced the Federal Government agreed to pay the Iranian government \$1.7 billion to settle a case related to the sale of military equipment prior to the Iranian revolution, of which \$1.3 billion was sourced through the Fund, without prior congressional notification; the Obama Administration's use of the Fund to make this and other payments raises serious concerns by sidestepping Congress; and

(B) in 2016, the Department of Health and Human Services announced its intentions to use the Fund for settlements with health insurers who sued the Federal Government over the loss of funds for risk corridors under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(3) Failing to address the lack of oversight over the Fund annually costs taxpayers billions of dollars, as payments exceeded \$4.6 billion in 2016 and more than \$26 billion in the preceding 10 year period.

(b) POLICY ON JUDGMENT FUND.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider legislation that reclaims Congress's power of the purse over the Fund. Such legislation should—

(1) prohibit interest payments paid from the Fund for accounts or assets frozen by the Federal Government and listed on—

(A) the Sanctions Programs list of the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of Treasury; or

(B) Sponsors of Terrorism list of the Department of State;

(2) amend sections 2414 and 1304 of titles 28 and 31, United States Code, respectively, to—

(A) provide a clear definition and explanation of a "foreign court or tribunal"; and

(B) require congressional notification whenever the Fund makes a settlement or court ordered lump sum or aggregated payment exceeding \$500 million; and

(3) require legislative action to approve payments from the Fund in excess of a specified threshold, increase transparency, and require Federal agencies to reimburse the Fund over a fixed time period.

SEC. 525. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that significant savings were achieved by the House by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources, and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources, including printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent;

(2) the House should review policies and procedures for the acquisition of goods and services to eliminate unnecessary spending;

(3) the Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to services provided to Members and committees of the House, and identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room;

(4) no taxpayer funds should be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress; and

(5) retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 526. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all 3 counts: it is complex, unfair, and inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Standard economic theory holds that high marginal tax rates lessen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(3) Roughly half of United States active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a "pass-through" basis, meaning the income is taxed at individual rates rather than corporate rates. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the highest Federal rate on such small business income can reach nearly 45 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(4) The top United States corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) is slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages, discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(5) By deterring potential investment, the United States corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The United States tax rate differential fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate practices intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(6) The "world-wide" structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors that have more competitive international tax systems.

(7) Reforming the tax code would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and significantly reduce tax avoidance.

(8) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, consumers in higher prices, and investors in diminished returns.

(9) Increasing taxes to raise revenue and meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans' ability to save for their children's education and retirement.

(10) Closing special preference carve outs in our tax code to finance higher spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(11) Tax reform should curb or eliminate tax breaks and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board, not to fund more wasteful Federal Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(12) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform, including a broader tax base and lower tax rates, would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which would have a positive impact on total national output.

(b) **POLICY ON TAX REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider comprehensive tax reform legislation that promotes economic growth, creates American jobs, increases wages, and benefits American consumers, investors, and workers by—

(1) simplifying the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reducing the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowering tax rates for individuals and consolidating the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repealing the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reducing the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitioning the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-339.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) to offer the Con-

gressional Progressive Caucus budget amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) **DECLARATION.**—Congress declares that this concurrent resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 and 2019 through 2027.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 1. Direct spending.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance Appropriations.

Sec. 302. Point of order against funding for certain immigration enforcement efforts.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,566,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,231,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,754,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,852,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$4,011,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,197,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,295,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,405,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,617,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,840,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,069,484,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$0.
Fiscal year 2018: \$497,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$920,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$901,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$951,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$1,014,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$977,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$943,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$994,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,050,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$1,111,097,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,558,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,809,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,889,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$4,085,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$4,242,299,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,524,849,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,667,232,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,840,870,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$5,123,649,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$5,359,292,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$5,604,559,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,411,968,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,801,027,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,859,325,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,031,449,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,190,238,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,474,256,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,610,999,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,770,214,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$5,057,717,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$5,301,376,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$5,545,750,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: -\$845,569,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$569,974,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$569,974,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$179,434,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$178,367,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$276,918,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$315,134,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$364,396,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$440,607,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$461,344,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$476,266,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$20,611,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$21,412,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,584,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$21,734,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,490,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$22,950,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$23,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,111,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$24,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$25,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$26,305,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$15,093,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$15,752,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,322,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,693,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,794,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$18,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$20,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$21,166,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2017 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$620,810,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$597,390,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$573,048,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$581,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$575,522,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$594,087,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$582,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$609,309,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$594,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$623,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$611,949,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$637,690,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$620,850,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$655,897,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$632,247,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$670,145,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$651,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$680,394,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$663,759,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$690,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$674,679,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,533,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,508,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,831,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,425,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,384,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,369,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,870,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, 69,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,106,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$73,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,255,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,986,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,094,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$80,697,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$84,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$80,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$88,702,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$83,952,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,835,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,887,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,562,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,853,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,239,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,151,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,678,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,747,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,880,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,204,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,522,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,123,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,442,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,766,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,120,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,490,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,349,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,198,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,390,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,003,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,017,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,382,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$59,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$61,645,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,813,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,511,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,073,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,314,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,631,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,290,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,142,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,119,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,547,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,851,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$122,495,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$122,147,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$125,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$124,382,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$128,313,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$127,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,715,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,531,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,852,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$78,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$80,604,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,839,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$82,820,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,015,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,930,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,001,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,023,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,713,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,735,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,240,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,328,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -\$2,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$19,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,724,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$13,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,781,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,628,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$92,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$94,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$199,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$199,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$201,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$200,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$196,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$202,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$197,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$203,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$197,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$205,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$171,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$179,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$172,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$181,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$173,548,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$183,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$174,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$185,116,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$175,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$187,060,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$169,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$100,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$79,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$53,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$41,888,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$41,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,428,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$266,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$264,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$298,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$295,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$166,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$168,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$176,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$172,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$188,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$182,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$197,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$192,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$204,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$200,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$210,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$207,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$216,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$212,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$222,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$218,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$228,312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$224,320,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$548,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$548,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$578,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$585,289,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$613,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$612,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$659,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$646,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$687,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$683,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$726,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$721,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$765,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$761,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$807,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$802,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$852,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$846,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$897,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$891,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$943,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$938,235,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$598,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$598,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$599,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$599,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$650,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$650,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$676,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$676,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$723,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$723,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$817,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$817,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$840,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$840,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$861,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$861,049,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$963,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$962,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,016,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,016,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,091,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,091,006,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$522,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$512,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$574,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$554,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$641,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$624,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$691,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$675,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$737,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$721,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$785,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$775,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$819,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$807,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$855,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$837,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$904,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$887,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$947,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$937,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$995,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$984,004,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$50,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$54,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$54,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$59,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$75,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,931,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$175,596,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$178,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$185,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$183,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$204,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$199,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$213,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$209,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$223,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$219,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$243,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$238,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$242,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$238,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$241,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$237,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$261,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$257,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$271,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$266,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$281,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$277,377,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$57,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$77,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$80,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$78,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$91,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$90,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$95,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,445,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,207,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$358,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$358,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$379,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$379,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$408,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$408,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$444,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$444,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$482,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$482,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$518,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$518,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$554,698,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$554,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$588,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$588,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$621,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$621,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$654,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$654,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$682,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$682,937,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -\$886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,565,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$83,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$82,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$82,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$87,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$87,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$88,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$89,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$89,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$92,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$92,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$101,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 1. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2018 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017 is 4.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget adopts former President Obama's Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to expand eligibility, including for childless workers. Continues enhanced credits originally implemented under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to target those most in need. This includes extending the Child and Dependent Care Credit and the American Opportunity Tax Credit through 2027.

(B) The People's Budget includes former President Obama's proposal to boost the Child Tax Credit maximum deduction to \$3,000. It makes key expansions permanent to protect 50 million Americans who would otherwise be at jeopardy for losing part or all of their EITC and CTC.

(C) The People's Budget creates a debt free college that provides Federal matching program to support state efforts to expand investment in higher education, bring down costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt. The program would encourage innovation by states and colleges to improve efficiency and enable speedy and less-costly degree completion. By treating higher education as a public good worth investing in, we can once again make higher education accessible to all.

(D) The People's Budget allows students to refinance their student loans at low rates and allows private borrowers to shift to more affordable government loans. Allowing student borrowers to reduce the value of their debt will free up income for purchases and will create a job-creating ripple effect throughout the entire economy.

(E) The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The vast majority of SNAP recipients are households with children, seniors and individuals with disabilities, but recent cuts lowered average benefits by \$216 in 2014. Providing families with basic food security through SNAP is one of the most effective ways the Federal Government can stimulate the economy.

(F) The People's Budget provides an additional \$10.8 billion for child nutrition programs including program expansion and improvements for summer meals; essential improvements and expansion funding for preschool nutrition including increases in meal reimbursements to fulfill the new meal pattern, an additional meal or snack for children in long-term care, and expanded program eligibility; and investments in school meals and school kitchens.

(G) The People's Budget replaces the 40 percent excise tax with a public option to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to offer a public insurance option within the health insurance marketplaces. This ensures choice, competition, and sta-

bility in coverage. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the premium costs for Americans under the public option will be 7 to 8 percent lower than costs in private exchange plans. The repeal of the excise tax costs \$132 billion while savings from the public option are \$176 billion.

(H) The People's Budget continues funding for the entire CHIP program until 2020.

(I) The People's Budget protects States programs by fully retaining maintenance of effort requirements and eliminating any States ability to arbitrarily implement enrollment caps. Without action, Federal funding for CHIP will expire jeopardizing the health care coverage of more than 10 million children and pregnant women.

(J) The People's Budget permits the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers. Giving HHS the ability to negotiate prices, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, will save Medicare \$429 billion and will reduce costs for seniors.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2018 is 4.8 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017 is 5.6 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits in high-unemployment states for up to two years.

(B) The People's Budget also adopts former President Obama's reforms to improve solvencies and incentivize job training.

(C) The People's Budget improves the Affordable Care Act by repealing the excise tax on high-priced health plans. Proponents of the provision hoped that this tax would slow the rate of growth of health costs, while raising revenue. However, in an effort to avoid the tax, employers who traditionally offer excellent benefits have started offering less generous plans. This is an ineffective tool to bend the cost curve. Since the tax is attached to premiums instead of coverage it has the potential to hit plans it wasn't intended to impact.

(D) The People's Budget establishes a representative democracy that truly reflects the diversity and values of our nation by providing funding for the public financing of campaigns. This gives a voice to small donors that have been drowned out by dark money. Public financing keeps politicians accountable to the voters that elect them instead of to special interest money. In the era of the devastating Citizens United decision, big money has taken the reins of our election process. It is now more important than ever to provide candidates with effective alternatives to finance their campaigns.

(E) The People's Budget uses the Experimental Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to calculate Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) for Federal retirement programs other than Social Security. Affected programs include civil service retirement, military retirement, Supplemental Security Income, veteran's pensions and compensations. CPI-E is the most sensible and accurate measure of the real costs that seniors face in retirement, current underpricing of costs

amount to cutting benefits for those on fixed incomes.

(G) The People's Budget makes a down payment of \$1.9 trillion to help close the nation's infrastructure deficit while protecting against climate change and creating millions of living wage jobs. The budget also helps boost private financing for critical state and local projects by creating a public-private infrastructure bank. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) estimates that the United States will need to invest upwards of \$2 trillion above current levels over the next decade just to make required repairs to roads, bridges, water, and energy systems.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report making a general appropriations or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided for all programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018.

SEC. 302. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS.

It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that appropriates funds to implement Executive Order 13767, entitled "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements".

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2017 and fiscal years 2018–2027".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to replace the reckless Republican budget that is being considered before this House.

Instead of a doomsday budget that presents a future where everything is bleak and opportunity is nonexistent, the Progressive Caucus is offering a budget that can prove that the future can be bright and prosperous.

The Republican budget sacrifices everything from public education to Social Security to Medicare and Medicaid. It does this for one reason and one reason only: to give the wealthiest few and the corporations more tax breaks and increase their standing and concentration of power and wealth in this country more than it is already.

It has been said over and over that the budget that we are presenting we feel does deal with the values of this country. It deals very directly with something that is important to this Nation, and that is the American people, the greatest resource that we have as a nation, and we see it day in and day out.

This budget invests in the American people. It invests in jobs, it invests in solid education, and it invests in the greater good.

This budget is not narrow, tilted to a few: the wealthiest and the corporations in this country. It deals with the totality of who the American people are: those who are struggling and need opportunity, those who are elderly and need the continued support of this Nation through Medicare and Social Security, those who are poor who need Medicaid and a good education system so their opportunity will be better in the future.

Our budget speaks to the values of the American people. Our budget speaks to the needs of the American people. Our budget speaks to a future that returns the values, to the American people, of opportunity, of hope, and of chance.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, even though I disagree heartily with the budgets advanced by the Progressive Caucus, they do us an invaluable service in the budget debate by bringing into sharp relief the two very different visions of governance advanced by the two parties.

The Progressive budget is a sincere and bold document. Unfortunately, it is also wrong. It would hike taxes by \$10.1 trillion over the next 10 years relative to the Republican budget.

Now, think of every trillion dollars that we throw around here as \$8,000 from an average family, because that is what it comes to. So \$10.1 trillion in new taxes ultimately translates as \$81,000 from an average family over the next decade taken either as direct taxes or as tax-driven price increases or as lower wages or as lower earnings as businesses pass on their burdens to consumers or employers or investors. Remember, investors are largely your 401(k) or your pension plan.

It also runs up \$2.6 trillion more in debt than the Republican budget over the next 10 years. That means another \$21,000 of debt added to that family's obligations that they will have to pay as future taxes just as surely as if it appeared on their credit card statement this month. And they have got to pay that back before they pay back

their credit card statement. The IRS can get very insistent that they do.

And don't believe for a moment that only the rich will pay these taxes. It turns out that the so-called rich people aren't rich and they aren't even people. Many are struggling small businesses filing under subchapter S, small businesses that create two-thirds of the jobs in our economy.

We are told: "Don't worry. We are using that money to create wealth and jobs." Well, the problem is government does not create jobs because it cannot create wealth. Government cannot inject a dollar into the economy until it has first taken that dollar out of the same economy.

As Bastiat warned, we see the job that government creates when it puts the dollar back in the economy. What we don't see as clearly is the job that is lost when government first takes that dollar out of the economy. We see those lost jobs as stagnating wages and workers giving up and leaving the job market, or as it is also known, the Obama economy.

Here is what government can do and what the Progressive and Democratic budgets propose. It can transfer jobs from the private sector to the public sector by taxing one and expanding the other. It can transfer jobs from one sector of the private market to another by taxing one and subsidizing the other. That is precisely the difference between Apple Computer and Solyndra. It is the difference between FedEx and the post office. It is the difference between the Reagan recovery and the Obama recovery.

Reagan, like Coolidge and Kennedy before him, reduced the tax and regulatory burdens on the economy and produced one of the longest economic expansions in our country's history. It truly felt like morning again in America. That is the Republican approach, and it works.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), the co-chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I thank Mr. POCAN and his office staff for the fine work and time that they put into working on this budget that we are proposing today.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, also, for his leadership within the caucus.

I am proud to rise in support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget alternative. This is a practical, progressive vision for our country by providing solutions to counter the Republican cuts to vital programs and tax breaks for the wealthy.

Let me contrast the House GOP budget with the Progressive Caucus budget.

First, in healthcare, the Republican budget embraces TrumpCare by incor-

porating the House-passed American Health Care Act, which cuts at least 20 million people from their care. This includes up to \$1 trillion in cuts to Medicaid, threatening care for seniors in nursing homes, children, and struggling families. It makes \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare, ending the Medicare guarantee and shifting cost risk on to seniors.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget defends and strengthens the Affordable Care Act. It lowers prescription drug costs and expands access to mental healthcare and addiction treatment.

We invest in workers. The GOP plan slashes investments in workers and programs to help more Americans get back to work, programs like apprenticeships and job training. And yet the people's budget would create 2.4 million jobs over its first 3 years and raise wages for American workers.

The Republican budget, their \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts means less funding for roads and bridges and schools. Our budget puts a \$2 trillion investment into strengthening our Nation's infrastructure.

The Republican budget drastically cuts Federal funding, which could undermine our ability to respond to disasters. The people's budget provides \$200 billion in emergency disaster funds to rebuild communities devastated by hurricanes.

The Republican budget guts our public education system with cuts that could devastate schools and further disinvest in public universities. The Progressive Caucus budget makes debt-free college a reality and provides for the refinancing of student loans. It expands access to pre-K education and provides childcare for all families.

Let's get real. The reason we are debating the budget this week: Republicans can't wait to get started on their tax breaks for the wealthy. The Republican tax plan should be called the Trump Family Tax Plan because it enriches the wealthy on the backs of the middle class.

The Progressive Caucus gets it right. Not one more penny in tax breaks for corporations and the wealthiest Americans. The Progressive Caucus budget ensures that the top 1 percent pay their fair share in taxes, we close corporate loopholes, and we expand the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit for working families.

We must reject the Trump Family tax cut and invest in our roads and bridges, our schools, our healthcare, and our workers. Progressives are proposing bold policy solutions as clear alternatives to the cruel budget cuts Republicans are proposing.

The people's budget is an investment in the American people, and I urge you to support the Progressive Caucus people's budget.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my friend reminds me of a story when

Ronald Reagan was pushing his tax reductions a generation ago that produced the biggest expansion in our Nation's history. He was approached one day by a working class fellow on a stop that the President was making, and the man looks at him and says: Mr. President, the Democrats say that you Republicans want to cut taxes on the rich. Is that right?

Reagan says: Well, that is what they say.

And the man says: Well, you go ahead and do that, Mr. President, because a poor person never gave me a job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

□ 1815

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from California for yielding to me. As you know, Mr. Chairman, he is not just down here as the ranking member on the House Budget Committee. He is also the leader of the Republican Study Committee's Budget and Spending Task Force. The leadership he has provided in all those areas means a lot to the entire institution. I am grateful to him for it.

I also want to say I am grateful to my friends in the Progressive Caucus. I disagree with their budget, and I plan to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, how often do we come down here and folks want to complain about what is not going right, but they don't want to do anything about it?

To my friends' credit in the Progressive Caucus, they laid out a vision, and that is exactly what I came here to Congress to be a part of. Let's lay out our visions. Let's have some votes. Let's count those votes and see where we go from there.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, absolutely any group could offer a budget today, yet we only have four alternatives being considered. That tells you something about how hard it is to put your ideas forward. So I want to thank my friends on the Progressive Caucus for doing that.

I want to run through a couple of things that their budget includes, Mr. Chairman. It includes a 4 percent pay increase for Federal workers across the board. It includes \$500 billion in green energy incentives. It imposes a carbon tax to deal with greenhouse gases. It cuts \$70 billion from the Defense Department and, in fact, eliminates altogether the spending on the global war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, these are all legitimate policy disagreements.

Their budget also increases revenues, taxes, by \$10 trillion, but spends so much more on American priorities that we continue to end up with almost a \$1 trillion annual deficit in year 10.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of debate that we have to have. I want to

understand the priorities of my friends. I want to understand where they want to see more investments. And then I want to understand how it is we are going to balance this budget together. Because what is lacking in this plan, Mr. Chairman, what frustrates me the most about the Progressive Caucus plan is not the investment in green energy, it is not the investment in the Federal workforce, it is not the investment in healthcare; it is the fact that they don't believe we can do these things while raising taxes by \$10 trillion on the American people and balance the budget at all.

Mr. Chairman, if folks want to raise taxes in this institution—I think our problem is a spending problem. I don't think it is a taxing problem, but I am willing to have that discussion with them to understand their point of view.

But the reason I will ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget is not because it raises taxes \$10 trillion; it is because it raises taxes \$10 trillion, yet continues to borrow from our children and our grandchildren in the form of annual debt and deficits.

I think we can do better. But we cannot do better without an honest discussion of the issues, Mr. Chairman. Say what you want to about the budgets you are going to see on the floor here, these alternatives that we are going to discuss.

There are a lot of talking heads on TV who just want to talk about it and don't want to do anything about it. If you are looking for a ray of hope today, look at the Progressive Caucus, which I disagree with about almost everything as it comes to how to peg the numbers, but they put their vision forward tonight. They said: Let's take a stand tonight.

If we can work together across that aisle, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing that we cannot do on behalf of the American people.

Vote "no" on this budget, but applaud the effort that has gone into it such that we can try to find common ground going forward.

If we have but one thing to agree on in this institution, let it be to agree to pay for those things that we think are important. Whether it is wars or whether it is green energy, whether it is troops or whether it is Federal employees, let us agree that we should pay for those things today with our dollars, and the borrowing from our children and grandchildren should be ended forever.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, what the Progressive Caucus budget does, and does very clearly, is that we end the special treatment for Wall Street buddies of the majority of this Congress.

Meanwhile, their budget has no problem hitting low- and middle-income families with their tax plan. Under their plan, corporations get a \$2 tril-

lion cut, \$2.4 trillion, and the richest 1 percent will get a tax cut worth \$130,000 next year; and many middle class families will have to pay more.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a valued member of the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his tremendous leadership as co-chair of the Progressive Caucus; and our other co-chair, MARK POCAN, for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, the People's Budget. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that there are two different visions being presented here. Let's be very clear about what those two different visions are.

The Republican budget says we should invest millions of dollars into tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and the largest corporations.

Our budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, says we want to invest in people. We believe in working families across this country who are working hard, want to have a decent life, and want to build a better future. I choose investing in the people. That is what this budget does. It invests in education, in jobs, infrastructure, research, and science, and diplomacy.

Let me just focus for a minute on education as the gateway to opportunity. The People's Budget commits \$1 trillion to help families afford childcare, provides universal access to pre-K, and upholds our Nation's commitment to our public schools, which are the bedrocks of our communities nationwide, through adequate funding and supporting educators with resources that they need to reach every student.

It makes debt-free college a reality by investing in college as a public good. It creates apprenticeship opportunities for all of our districts across the country—red and blue, urban and rural.

Our country's success, Mr. Chairman, lies in that of our children and young people, not in the Republican plan to give tax cuts to the wealthiest. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this vision, this budget, and to invest in the people.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), a former director of the State Policy Network.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Progressive Caucus' budget.

In his farewell address, President Eisenhower said: "We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without asking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all

generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow."

Instead of trying to put America on a sustainable financial path, the progressive budget seeks to mortgage even more of our grandchildren's and great grandchildren's future, frankly, by spending over \$57 trillion over the next 10 years. With the national debt surpassing \$20 trillion just last month, now is the time to rein in reckless government spending, not explode it.

In addition to these spending increases, the Progressive Caucus is proposing nearly \$9 trillion in tax increases over the next decade. These enormous tax increases do not come close to covering the cost of the irresponsible policies proposed. I want to repeat that. Enormous tax increases that don't come close to covering the cost of what they have proposed.

As a result, the Progressive Caucus' budget raises the debt to over \$27 trillion by 2027. In fact, by fiscal year 2027, our deficits would be near \$1 trillion.

Higher taxes and higher spending would stifle the American economy and put our debt on an expedited upward trajectory. It is time for us to make tough decisions when it comes to this country's budget. The decision to oppose the Progressive Caucus budget is not one of those tough decisions.

This budget also makes no effort to curb waste, fraud, and abuse. Instead, it would expand bureaucratic programs by trillions of dollars without proposing any oversight measures. For example, it would spend \$41 billion on "free college" promises, and \$1 trillion on childcare and universal pre-K.

Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of the shovel-ready programs that were part of the Obama package just a few years ago. We all had this expectation that this money would go to rebuild our infrastructure, and it turns out just a little over 3 percent of that money actually made it to infrastructure projects; somewhere in the range of \$30 billion out of over \$800 billion.

That is what I see in the progressive budget. It continues the failed ObamaCare experiment, and even goes so far as to allow States to experiment with socialized medicine.

It continues to encourage able-bodied adults without children not to seek work by providing them a government paycheck.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. It increases the pressure on Americans' pocketbooks by increasing the price at the pump and, really, at every level.

It proposes Washington-centric solutions to problems that the States are better equipped to determine, such as the whole college issue. And it spends \$500 billion on green energy and imposes a carbon tax.

Mr. Chairman, we have a moral responsibility to spend taxpayer dollars wisely, and the Progressive Caucus fails to do this in its budget. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Caucus budget invests in the American people, invests in America, and still reduces the deficit by \$4 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), my friend and a member of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative GRIJALVA for his leadership.

Our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates we have a \$4.6 trillion infrastructure deficit. That is why the People's Budget wisely invests \$2 trillion to fix our infrastructure.

Not only will this budget help repair roads, highways, and bridges, but it will also put broadband all over America, including rural areas, and create millions of good-paying jobs, over 2.5 million in its first year.

We are presenting this plan. We are asking for support. Donald Trump talks a big game on infrastructure, but he has yet to put out a plan. So we urge the President to support our plan. If he doesn't want to, then put out his plan so we can have a discussion on how to move forward on fixing our infrastructure and creating high-paying jobs for Americans.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for giving me an opportunity to address the Progressive Caucus, their budget. I think the budget is unacceptable. It is something the American people ought to pay attention to because the day may come in which a budget similar to the Progressive Budget passes this floor.

The first thing to look at is we are increasing maybe by an average of about a little under—well, around \$1 trillion increase in taxes over the next 10 years. So you are taking a lot more money away from Americans. And despite this huge increase in taxes, you are looking at about a \$70 billion cut in defense.

I suggest that the public and the people who are supporting the Progressive Caucus take some time talking to their people in the current military, talk about the planes that can't fly, talk about the shortage of parts, and ask: How is it possible you could take this much more money from the American people and still feel we have to have significant cuts in our military budget?

But then you look at what we have to spend more on: a 4 percent raise for Federal workers. Look, we wish every-

body had a raise, but, really, at a time when we are approaching \$20 trillion in debt, is it a priority to give Federal workers a raise?

We put more and more people dependent on government; a large expansion of the program providing free college to people. At a time when, quite frankly, many people who already have college degrees can't get jobs, we are expanding that program. And, of course, by making it free, people will respect it less. And not only will they respect it less, but by making it free, many people will go to college who perhaps otherwise don't feel it is for them.

They won't make adjustments to the food stamp program, which is a problem.

We greatly extend the time that you are on unemployment, and this is kind of bizarre because it is a time when our employment is near historic lows. But despite the fact that until now we haven't had such unemployment for a long period of time, we want to extend unemployment, thereby encouraging more people to stay on unemployment.

□ 1830

I would like to thank my friends from the Congressional Progressive Caucus for allowing students to refinance their student loans, which shows something or another that there is a heart there, a little bit anyway. I wish I could get my own Conference to put that in. But in any event, I urge rejection of the Progressive budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, Americans in this Congress do have a choice. Our budget is a contrast to what the Republicans are proposing. We can either cut Medicare to pay for more tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires as our Republican budget does, or we can close tax loopholes to protect essential programs that invest in jobs. We chose investment.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chairman, a budget is a moral contract between elected officials—the government—and the people we were elected to represent. That is why I am proud to rise in support of the people's budget, presented by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. This budget serves as a Progressive alternative to the GPO's cruel budget plan, a plan that prioritizes tax breaks for billionaires over the need to fund care for seniors in nursing homes and children and struggling families in places like Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I was proud to help draft the people's budget, which invests \$200 billion to ensure that families in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Florida, and the U.S. territories have the immediate assistance they need right now.

The people's budget would also reduce the deficit by \$700 billion over the

next 20 years by investing in human capital. We would do this while enacting comprehensive immigration reform, protecting DREAMers, and ending funding for family detention centers.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support the people's budget and reject H. Con. Res. 71. Let's stand with the working class, the middle class, and the immigrants in our country. This is the right thing to do for our people and for our economy.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close when the gentleman from Arizona is finished, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time each side has.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 4¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader in our caucus and a leader here in Congress.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to thank the gentleman and Congressman POCAN for their really great leadership of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and for crafting a budget which creates economic growth, a decent standard of living for everyone, and a strong yet rational national security budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus' people's budget. Today, millions of Americans are struggling to make ends meet and millions more are working hard trying to find a job. Paychecks for everyday Americans are shrinking, while corporations are reaping record profits. Yet, instead of developing a budget to create jobs and to help American families, the House Republicans "balance" their budget once again on the backs of struggling families. And for what? To protect tax cuts for billionaires and millionaires and corporations. Again, this is totally disgraceful.

The CPC's people's budget stands in stark contrast to the House Republican budget. It creates 2 million good-paying jobs and invests \$2 trillion in infrastructure. It includes a plan to lift more Americans out of poverty, and it invests in communities of color, like expanding computer science education.

It ends the Pentagon's slush fund, known as the overseas contingency account, that for far too long has padded the pockets and the wallets of defense contractors at the taxpayers' expense. It also tackles waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon by demanding audit readiness. It is hard to believe that the Republican budget goes \$10 billion over what the Pentagon even requested.

Make no mistake, the people's budget does what the House Republican budget

does not. It works for the American people, not special interests, nor defense contractors, or the 1 percent.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to do what is best for all American families, and that is support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' people's budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for his leadership. It has been more than a pleasure to serve as the vice chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus for the number of years that we have had to put forward the people's budget.

I simply want to say what a budget is, Mr. Chairman. A budget is a roadmap for the American people. It is a question of whether America cares about the most vulnerable and whether or not, in our caring, we are prepared to do deeds to insist upon their success.

The Republican budget takes \$2 trillion and provides a big, wealthy tax cut for the rich, and it creates, in essence, a deep hole in affordable care for healthcare. It does not provide justice and fair elections. It takes away educational opportunity from students, and, of course, it does not bring the most vulnerable out of poverty and enhance the lives of the middle class.

The people's budget provides for supporting the Affordable Care Act. It provides for giving fair working tax cuts for others, and it provides fairness and justice.

I rise to support the people's budget. It invests in the American people. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the top ten reasons to support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget.

TOP TEN REASONS TO SUPPORT THE PEOPLE'S BUDGET

(Supported by over 60 organizations including: AFT, NEA, Planned Parenthood, Communications Workers of America, Sierra Club, AFSCME, AFGE, Vote Vets, Social Security Works, NARAL)

(1) The People's Budget invests \$2 trillion in America's crumbling infrastructure while promoting job growth and strengthening our commitment to sustainability. This is an investment in America which will transform our fossil-fuel energy system, overburdened mass transit, deteriorating schools, lead-contaminated water systems, and crumbling roads and bridges through local hiring and livable wages.

(2) The People's Budget enacts comprehensive immigration reform which permanently protects Dreamers and their families and opposes immigration bans on Muslims and refugees. Our country needs an immigration system that honors our values of inclusion, diversity, and equality. Our Budget prohibits funding to Customs and Border Protection to implement President Trump's discriminatory Muslim and refugee bans.

(3) Our budget takes bold action to fight climate change and rebuild our local communities recently devastated by hurricanes. The People's Budget requires polluters to pay for their reckless behavior while elimi-

nating tax breaks that incentivize fossil fuel energy over cleaner energy. It invests \$200 billion to ensure families in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Florida and U.S. territories have the immediate assistance they need to begin the stable road to recovery. It also provides funding for climate change research, mitigation and adaptation to protect those most at risk from future environmental disasters.

(4) The CPC budget delivers on the promise of child care for all and Pre-K for all. It ensures that families will not have to pay more than 10 percent of their income for child care, whether that care is at home or at a child care center. Our budget also expands pre-k for children across the country.

(5) We make debt free college a reality for all students by overhauling the student loan system which currently leaves college students saddled with unmanageable levels of debt. The People's Budget creates a federal matching program that supports state efforts to expand investments in higher education, bring down costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt.

(6) The People's Budget strengthens the Affordable Care Act, while pushing towards a single payer system. It prioritizes reforms to increase access, equity, and affordability. Maintaining the positive reforms from the ACA are critical as Republicans attempt to gut the health care system and leave millions of Americans stranded without access to critical insurance coverage. The People's Budget protects Medicare's integrity and improves its long-term solvency. It protects children and low-income Americans and gives states the freedom to transition to a single payer system. It also makes two significant policy changes to reduce the costs of prescription drugs: allows Medicare Part D to negotiate drug prices and ends "Pay for Delay" practice which keeps generics out of the market.

(7) The CPC Budget creates a fair tax system for working Americans. In order to make these bold, necessary investments in working families, we must rewrite the rules of a rigged economy that favors billionaires and big corporations. The People's Budget closes tax loopholes that corporations use to ship jobs overseas, and stops CEOs from receiving millions in tax-free bonuses. Our budget tackles inequality through fair tax rates for all Americans, leveling the playing field for working people.

(8) Our budget protects the right to vote and supports criminal justice reforms which strengthen public safety and avoid overcriminalization. Our budget calls for rebuilding trust in the justice system by funding community oriented policing reforms. It also strengthens Department of Justice voter protection programs, protects voting rights by increasing funding to voter protection agencies, and funds public financing of campaigns to curb the influence of special interests in politics. Additionally, the budget makes key investments in America's electoral integrity by upgrading our voting systems.

(9) The People's Budget creates pathways out of poverty by expanding proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives and restoring vital programs to our nation to provide prosperity for all. These include a national strategy to reduce poverty in half in ten years and \$12.8 billion investment to end family homelessness. The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and permanently

adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It also provides an additional \$10 billion for child nutrition programs and allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits for up to two years.

(10) We make veterans a priority by increasing funding for veterans supportive housing to eliminate veterans homelessness and expanding access to mental health care for all veteran and service members. Our budget also invests in job training opportunities for transitioning service members and veterans.

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

In the debate on the Republican budget and how it contrasts with the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, we heard a lot about needing to control mandatory spending, that that was the real issue here, runaway mandatory spending.

Make no mistake, when my Republican colleagues talk about cutting mandatory spending, they mean they want to cut Medicare and Social Security to pay for the trillion-dollar tax scam and creative numbers that are part of their budget for the wealthy and for the corporations in America.

The other issue that we heard a lot about is that, by making these major cuts for the wealthiest and the rich, that somehow their net gain and their profit and their break on taxes is going to trickle down to the rest of us. Well, we have seen that movie before in this country. That trickle-down theory doesn't work. The money doesn't trickle down, and the American people won't be fooled about that again.

Our budget invests \$2 trillion in infrastructure and jobs immediately. Our budget takes bold action to fight climate change, and our budget delivers on the promise for our children, their inheritance of this country, the inheritance of the children that everybody is worried about a deficit. We are worried about their future as well.

Our budget delivers on the promise of childcare for all, pre-K for all, and a robust public education system to provide all kids with an opportunity to succeed in this Nation.

Our budget is about the future, our budget is about emphasizing the values that make this country special and great, and our budget is a contrast. It offers a contrast about what this country can be if it invests in its people.

The road that we have been on for far too long in which we have disinvested in people, shifted wealth and burden onto the middle class and the working class in this country, that time has ended. Our budget represents that end.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on the people's budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, have my friends on the left learned absolutely nothing over

these past 8 years? If massive government spending, higher and higher taxes, and deeper and deeper debt produced economic growth, the Obama years should have been the golden age of our economy. Instead, we suffered prolonged stagnation. We averaged 1.5 percent annual growth, only half the average economic growth that our Nation has enjoyed in the postwar era. The Progressive and Democratic budgets promise more of the same.

We choose a different path, the Reagan path that produced an average of 3.5 percent growth year after year, higher wages, better jobs. Not just a Republican policy, John F. Kennedy did the same thing. He reminded us that a rising tide lifts all boats. These are the policies that create prosperity.

The government cannot create jobs because it cannot create wealth, but what it can do is create the conditions where jobs multiply and prosper or where they stagnate and disappear. That it can do very well. We have very consistent experience with the policies that create these conditions.

If you increase the burdens on the economy as the Democrats again propose, the economy contracts. If you lighten the burdens on the economy, it grows and prospers. No nation has ever taxed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

We know what works and we know what doesn't work because we have tried both paths many times before. The House Budget Committee's budget follows principles that have, time and again, consistently and rapidly produced economic expansion and prosperity.

The House Democrats' budget and the Progressive budget before us now double down on policies that have impoverished and bankrupted nations wherever they have been employed down through history.

That is the choice before us today. Let us choose wisely. Our future depends on it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,089,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,274,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,420,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,596,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,749,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,965,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,166,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,361,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,619,387,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$211,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$256,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$324,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$361,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$414,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$432,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$503,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$544,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$572,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$661,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,875,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,829,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,845,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,920,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,149,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,282,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,411,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,653,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,865,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,058,527,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,538,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,808,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,890,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,963,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,167,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,267,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,373,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,615,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,833,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,032,183,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$593,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -\$719,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -\$615,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -\$542,932,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: -\$570,144,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$517,194,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$408,194,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$449,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$472,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$412,796,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,175,683,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$22,085,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,866,575,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$23,578,811,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$24,291,408,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,985,937,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$25,599,925,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$26,248,973,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$26,981,444,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$27,552,527,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,515,893,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$16,336,714,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$17,080,338,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$17,782,001,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$18,543,046,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$19,291,339,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$19,972,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$20,739,642,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$21,579,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$22,413,681,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$611,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$583,502,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$624,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$605,816,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$638,087,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$620,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$651,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$634,689,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$664,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$652,811,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$678,690,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$661,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$692,897,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$670,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$707,145,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$689,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$722,394,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$703,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$737,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$718,554,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,815,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,630,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,563,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,812,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,563,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,970,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,705,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,744,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,271,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,817,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,175,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,897,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,039,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,539,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,725,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,596,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,234,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,128,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,653,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,557,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,013,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,281,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,539,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,036,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,337,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,793,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,033,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,498,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,138,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,717,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,555,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,703,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,614,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,876,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,684,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,507,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,334,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,504,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,997,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,926,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,746,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,216,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,054,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,341,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,248,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,791,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,939,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,710,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,911,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,980,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,986,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,068,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,647,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,257,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,620,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,280,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,582,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,469,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,731,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,866,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,965,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,691,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,664,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,998,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,211,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,231,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,614,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,737,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,490,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,549,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,933,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,232,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,586,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,505,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,867,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,373,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,755,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,075,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,792,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,377,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,949,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,120,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,167,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,317,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,731,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,204,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,315,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,672,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,499,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,195,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,468,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,346,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$412,246,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$260,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,199,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$246,432,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,422,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$162,071,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$98,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$129,557,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,348,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$115,488,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$110,947,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,441,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$112,855,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$114,823,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,517,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,726,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,338,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,834,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,297,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,806,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,354,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,296,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,298,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,080,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,839,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,384,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,071,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,080,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,935,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$142,001,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$165,585,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$165,987,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,570,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$159,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,088,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,233,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$163,705,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,826,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,277,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$157,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,679,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$156,729,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,996,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$157,914,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,273,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$151,875,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$573,434,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$602,568,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$604,320,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$646,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$637,447,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$669,270,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$666,179,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$702,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$696,993,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$735,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$728,890,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$772,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$763,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$810,799,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$801,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$849,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$839,223,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$890,688,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$879,028,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$601,682,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$601,303,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$672,626,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$672,318,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$720,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$720,416,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$775,853,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$775,637,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$871,247,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$871,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$896,829,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$896,611,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$920,920,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$920,693,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,028,532,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,028,285,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,093,424,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,093,171,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,176,028,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,175,780,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$528,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$508,933,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$541,318,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$538,787,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,195,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$554,966,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$567,182,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$569,833,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$583,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$594,084,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$592,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$598,840,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$601,577,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$602,988,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$621,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$625,226,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$636,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$648,216,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$653,208,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$664,923,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$183,573,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$181,049,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$198,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$195,432,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$203,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$201,863,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,846,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$225,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$223,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$222,849,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$220,873,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$217,808,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$216,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$235,899,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$234,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$241,380,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$252,030,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$249,835,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,596,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,328,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,092,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,865,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,272,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,336,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,965,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,534,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,559,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,220,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,916,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,963,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,438,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,798,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,991,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$81,299,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$80,655,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,065,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,734,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,477,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,458,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,418,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,777,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,882,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,156,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,575,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,693,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,129,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,492,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,848,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,644,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,111,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,437,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$377,635,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$377,635,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$413,674,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$413,674,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$461,176,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$461,176,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$512,434,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$512,434,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$560,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$605,893,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$605,893,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,696,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$644,696,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$679,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$679,742,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$714,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$714,720,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$743,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$743,185,000,000.
 (19) Non-Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$134,164,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,964,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,428,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,212,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,859,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,359,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,656,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,721,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,602,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,491,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,587,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,490,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,268,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,431,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,971,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,860,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$82,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$82,782,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$85,754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$85,754,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$85,454,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$85,454,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$87,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$87,183,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$88,846,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$88,846,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$89,285,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$89,285,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,809,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$101,023,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$101,023,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget.

The Nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the Republican budget continues to highlight the wrong priorities. It fast-tracks tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and claims that unrealistic economic growth will pay for these cuts when, in reality, those tax cuts will ultimately be paid for by children, seniors, and those in need.

It cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare and also cuts programs that support basic living standards, including nutritional assistance, and undermines national security by cutting diplomatic programs and foreign aid.

The Republican budget also cuts education, job training, research and development, and infrastructure. Their budget leaves hardworking American families out in the cold and would devastate our economic recovery after years of consistent job growth.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is in stark contrast to the Republican budget. It is compassionate. The numbers add up. It addresses the needs of the most vulnerable and improves our economy. Unlike the Republican budget, the CBC budget uses real numbers, not overly optimistic growth projections and assumptions of things that won't happen.

The CBC budget proposes \$3.9 trillion in revenue enhancements, and unlike the Republican budget, we show exactly how Congress can realistically reach this revenue target by outlining almost \$11 trillion in revenue options from which Congress could pick and choose \$3.9 trillion.

With the additional revenue, the CBC budget protects and strengthens the social safety net and commits the Federal Government to eradicating poverty in America.

Our budget includes a comprehensive infrastructure and jobs program, totaling over \$1 trillion over 5 years, and according to the Economic Policy Institute, it will create 2 million jobs next year.

In addition, the CBC budget eliminates any further threat of sequestration, eliminating the arbitrary budget caps and across-the-board budget cuts that are scheduled for next year.

It allocates \$200 billion for hurricane relief, \$100 billion to address the looming pension crisis, and additional funding for our veterans.

Even with the elimination of the sequestration and strong investment in programs that we know will create jobs and economic opportunity, the CBC budget is still estimated to reduce the deficit, when compared to the baseline, by approximately \$2.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

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

□ 1845

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion today because it is an important one. I know that the gentleman from Virginia and I both want to address the challenges facing our Nation and our fellow Americans.

We agree that the status quo is insufficient to meet the needs of the future, and we share a passion for protecting the vulnerable, breaking the cycles of poverty, and lifting Americans up.

But I must oppose this budget because it will not accomplish those things. This budget raises taxes by \$4 trillion, increases spending by \$1.4 trillion, and it never balances.

It proposes more Washington-man-dated answers to problems that States and communities are better equipped to solve. It makes no effort to control Federal deficits and debt, and it will leave our country bankrupt.

I want to be clear what this means. This budget will double down on generational theft—spending more and more money that we don't have today and leaving our children and grandchildren to foot the bill tomorrow.

In contrast, the Republican budget confronts our Nation's fiscal challenges head on by requiring mandatory spending reductions of at least \$203 billion and balancing within 10 years.

While this budget measures success on how much the Federal Government spends, the Republican House budget proposes to measure success by outcomes. If we have learned nothing from decades of spending on Federal welfare programs, it is that more money cannot resolve the complex issues underlying systemic poverty.

We must change our approach, and this starts with changing how we measure results.

This budget also fails to address a critical piece of the upward mobility agenda: reforming our broken Tax Code. Instead, it calls for tax increases that would stifle economic growth that the country so desperately needs.

America should be the most competitive place in the world to do business, but everything in our Tax Code today tells companies to take their jobs and their investments overseas and to leave them there.

Higher taxes on job creators and small businesses is the exact opposite of what we need to bring workers back into the labor force and get our economy growing again. Now is the time for comprehensive tax reform that unleashes the entrepreneurial spirit of America, increases business and personal investment, and promotes job creation. By failing to move the ball forward on tax reform, this budget leaves the American workers and families behind.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I want to note what this proposal does make cuts in, and that is in our national defense. In a time when we face increasingly complex and evolving international threats from places like North Korea, Russia, and Iran, this budget would cut overall defense spending and compromise the readiness and safety of our servicemembers and our national freedoms.

The first job of the Federal Government is to provide for our national security. We need to reinvest in our military to deter global threats and protect our homeland. That is why the Republican budget fulfills Congress' commitment to ensure robust funding for our country's national defense.

Mr. Chairman, we will have a lot of conversations today about priorities, because that is what budgets are: clear illustrations of our priorities.

We want to leave our Nation better for our children and grandchildren. We all want every person, regardless of their socioeconomic status or ZIP Code, to have the opportunity to realize the American Dream.

I oppose this budget proposal because it will not help us achieve these goals. It avoids the tough questions and substitutes more spending for better results.

It does nothing to promote vibrant economic growth, and it doubles down on bad ideas that stifle ingenuity and the spirit of entrepreneurship that we need. We have a responsibility to se-

cure our Nation's fiscal future and improve the lives of our citizens, but this budget is not the way forward.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), who is the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, BOBBY SCOTT, for his hard work, and the rest of the CBC in putting this budget together.

Mr. Chairman, I think that what I am having a hard time doing is wrapping my mind around the same failed arguments that we hear over and over again that we are going to cut trillions of dollars in taxes so that we can help the upper middle class and the top 1 percent really, and that is somehow going to benefit the poorest people in the country; we are going to exacerbate the deficit saying that we are going to create jobs.

We know it never happens, and then all of a sudden we find ourselves with an increasing debt and deficit, and then we go to the poorest people in this country and we ask them to pay for it. We cut the programs that are vital to lifting them out of poverty.

I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. My mother is a perfect example that a great education will lift you out of poverty and that having a Historically Black College and University that you can go to will prepare you for your future. But the problem is we don't talk about the fact that the Republican budget cuts education.

So how can we say with a straight face that we propose to lift people out of poverty, help people achieve the American Dream, help our children dream the impossible dream, and then give them the power so that they can go achieve it while we are cutting their education and we are cutting all the programs that help them to achieve it?

Look, we always hide behind protecting our country and the national defense. The biggest threat to our national defense resides on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is a shame when most people in this country and my colleagues wake up in the morning and say: Are we going to war with North Korea? That is not good for the economy, and that is not good for the mental health of the country. But I think that the Secretary of State has a great disposition and strategy when it comes to the national defense and diplomacy.

I think the key with what we have to do with budgets is understand that they are moral documents and they express our values, and cutting the disabled and others is not a true statement of American values.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget if for no other reason that there is a price on work, savings, and investment. When you raise that price too high, guess what you get? You get less work, savings, and investment, and you get less economic growth.

Look at the growth rates we have had over the last 10 years under astronomical debt and deficits. If spending could create an economic juggernaut, we would have one now. But instead, we have got 1.5 percent growth, 1.9 percent growth, and 2 percent growth—nowhere near what the prospending lobby would suggest.

Yet, if you look at the 1920s, if you look at the 1960s, and if you look at the 1980s—remember JFK in that famous Economic Club of New York speech said that the surest way to raise revenues is to cut tax rates now.

It worked then, it worked in the 1920s, and it will work right now as it did in the 1980s as well.

The reason is simple. The reason is very simple. Once you lower the price of work, savings, and investment, you not only get more of that, but you leave more capital in the private sector where it is put to use.

When you have capital put to use in the private sector, workers become more productive, and they earn more. I have always said the truck driver is much more productive with the truck, and the people who have the capital that can buy the truck is what makes the economy go.

We don't have a revenue problem in this country. Last year, we had record tax revenues: \$3.26 trillion, yet a deficit of \$587 billion. We have a spending problem, and the CBC budget increases spending above the CBO baseline over 10 years, while our budget is underneath the CBO baseline for 10 years. Our budget cuts taxes across the board including eliminating the bottom rate that we suggest in our tax reform plan.

This is a question of American vision and the American Dream. Our vision is for more capital in the private sector, more incentives to work, savings, and investment, and more people with rising incomes. Their vision is to protect the government budget.

Mr. Chairman, so I stand in opposition to this particular substitute budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. Also I want to thank him for his tremendous leadership in continuing to craft the Congressional Black Caucus' bud-

et which really does reflect our Nation's priorities and our values, so I rise in strong support of this budget.

As a member of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees and as chair of our Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, I am really proud that the Congressional Black Caucus budget includes \$300 billion in investments into initiatives that have proven to lift millions out of poverty.

For example, it restores the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, it extends emergency unemployment insurance, it expands access to affordable housing, and it also increases funding for job training and trade assistance programs.

The CBC budget creates a fair Tax Code that provides investments in communities. It boosts GDP by \$329 billion and helps create 2 million jobs. This budget addresses poverty head on by investing \$120 billion in creating jobs, \$25 billion to restore our Nation's public housing, and \$80 billion to modernize our schools.

Also, our budget employs the 10–20–30 formula championed by our assistant leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), by directing at least 10 percent of Federal spending into areas with poverty rates of more than 20 percent over the last 30 years. We will make progress toward ending entrenched and generational poverty that hurts families and communities.

With regard to the Pentagon, yes, we require that we audit the Pentagon and encourage DOD to implement remaining GAO recommendations that would likely lead to tens of billions in costs savings.

This is a budget that stands with the American people. It is a message to the American people that we stand with those who are working hard to find a job, and we stand with those working hard at a job with low wages. It is a message to the country that balancing the budget on the backs of struggling families to provide giveaways to billionaires and corporations is unacceptable. That is not the American way.

The CBC budget provides for the national security and the economic security of our Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, as one of the youngest Members of Congress, I feel an obligation not only to my district but to my generation. Right now in America, we are midway through the greatest wave of generational theft in all of human history.

The budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus takes the problems of Washington and makes all of them worse by doubling down on deficit spending and irresponsible financial decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I tell my constituents I am on two of the scariest committees

in Congress—Armed Services and Budget—because on the Armed Services Committee, I see every day that our adversaries are closing the capability gap. They are able to do more while, after 8 years of the Obama administration, our military has been left in shambles. This budget does nothing to rebuild the military. It leaves our troops on the battlefield without the tools they need to win, and it is absolutely shameful.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the budget today, we absolutely have to get back on a path of fiscal discipline. This budget, however, doesn't do that. It punishes American workers and American businesses with new taxes and more taxes.

It pours billions into the failed experiment of ObamaCare. To take things a step further, it would promote a healthcare system that is a single-payer system. Not only will this bankrupt our Nation, it will bankrupt hard-working Americans.

How much would premiums go up under a State-run single-payer system? \$1,000 a month? \$2,000? Of course, taxes would increase, too. The same families in this system would see enormous challenges meeting their needs because they would be funding irresponsible spending in Washington.

So beyond making our citizens sick and poor, this budget would gut our defense, weaken our military, and put more Americans in danger. Everyone here knows that the threats we face are serious: ISIS, Hezbollah, North Korea, and regional instability and volatility across the Middle East. Yet, bizarrely, this budget cuts funding for the global war on terror.

Under President Obama, readiness fell to the lowest levels in a century, GDP growth sputtered, the quality of healthcare for the middle class got worse, and our debt skyrocketed. These are not policies we should repeat, and certainly not policies we should expand.

Instead, let's vote for the Republican budget that has the greatest reduction in entitlement spending since Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House and can actually restore the great promise of the American Dream.

□ 1900

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the co-chair of the Congressional Black Caucus' Budget Task Force.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the CBC alternative budget, and I commend Representative SCOTT and his staff for the tremendous work that they have done.

The CBC budget provides for all of the essentials, including defense and infrastructure, but what I like most about it is that it is focused on job creation, rebuilding our veterans' hospitals, rebuilding infrastructure in our

communities, and putting people to work.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents need jobs and opportunities to work. The CBC budget focuses on jobs. I strongly support it, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this proposed amendment to the budget resolution.

I think it is very important, when discussing spending such as suggested before us, to remember that we do not live in a fantasy world. We live in a world where resources are limited. We have to make difficult choices. These are the same choices every family makes with their budget every day of the year.

Currently, our national debt rests at over \$20 trillion. The entire U.S. GDP in 2016 was only \$18.57 trillion.

Should we continue to spend money that we don't have without restraint?

This proposal never balances. It does raise taxes, though. With the tax increases in this proposal totaling \$3.9 trillion, one would expect this budget to balance.

What this does do is add over \$1 trillion in new spending. What is another trillion when you are only \$20 trillion in debt?

I challenge the supporters of this proposed budget to research the potentially catastrophic impacts of defaulting on our national debt. We are saddling future generations with an unsurmountable burden.

When our grandchildren and children look back on what we have done here, do we want this work to be that we left our country broke?

I don't think so.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to not kick the can down the road and to not pass this proposed amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, can you advise how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to point out that the healthcare plan in the budget is a public option, which CBO scores as a savings of over \$100 billion. We have \$1 trillion in spending for infrastructure, the same as the President has promised, but at least we pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Budget Committee, I find the CBC budget to be a principled and thoughtful budget.

It ends the threat of sequestration, it will accelerate our economic recovery,

it will help eradicate poverty in America, and it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

On the other hand, the tax cut that our Republican friends are proposing will cause a deficit by giving a whopping \$2.4-plus trillion in tax cuts, most to the top 1 percent of the American people.

It will not help the young child as he grows to seek opportunities and jobs. This will be a bill that is at a price that is not right. If you work hard, you get less.

Our budget, on the other hand, gives \$665 billion in immediate investments to rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. It is crumbling even more so after the devastating hurricanes. It gives \$120 billion to fund a national direct job creation program and full employment trust fund program.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It provides \$80 billion to fund the modernization of schools, \$45 billion to fund an energy infrastructure modernization program, \$20 billion to expand access to broadband services, \$25 billion for recapitalization, \$15 billion for improving and rebuilding VA hospitals, \$25 billion for HUD's Choice Neighborhoods program, and \$5 billion for summer jobs for young people.

I can attest to the fact that, in discussions with the Federal Communications Commission, the connectivity in vulnerable neighborhoods and communities is at an all-time low. Expanding broadband services is a vital need.

It is a vital need to expand the educational services for this young man in order for him to be capable of taking a job in the 21st century. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs that go unapplied for because the skill set of our young people have been deprived because of inadequate education.

This budget of the Congressional Black Caucus is a people investor. It invests in people. For that reason, I believe it is the right way to go. It balances our needs for the military and it provides for the American people.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It, in fact, provides that roadmap to ensure that the American people are taken care.

I want to make mention that it provides for \$300 billion for programs that are proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

Shouldn't this be what we are doing? Right now, in my district, thousands are online for the disaster Food Stamp program. That program needs to be extended.

This is what we do. We do not make people dependent. We give them a hand up, not a handout. That is what the budget is supposed to be: a roadmap for opportunity.

I support the Congressional Black Caucus budget, for that is what it is: a roadmap for opportunity.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) offered by the Congressional Black Caucus to H. Con. Res. 71, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018."

I support the CBC Budget for four principal reasons:

1. It ends the threat of sequestration;
2. It will accelerate our economic recovery;
3. It will help eradicate poverty in America; and
4. It will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, if we reject the House Republicans' "Price Is Not Right" and "Work Harder to Get Less" Budget with its discredited economic gimmicks and unrealistic projections and adopt the CBC Budget, we will get instead a comprehensive jobs program that would rebuild our nation's infrastructure and reinvest in our communities totaling \$1 trillion over the next decade.

The jobs created will accelerate our economic recovery and ensure that it reaches every community in America, while also making the necessary investments to ensure America's long-term economic competitiveness.

Specifically, the CBC Budget will create jobs by providing:

1. \$665 billion in immediate investment to rebuild our nation's crumbling infrastructure;
2. \$120 billion to fund a National Direct Job Creation Program and Full Employment Trust Fund Program;
3. \$80 billion to fund the modernization of schools;
4. \$45 billion to fund an energy infrastructure modernization program;
5. \$20 billion to expand access to broadband services;
6. \$25 billion for public housing recapitalization;
7. \$15 billion for improving and rebuilding V.A. hospitals and extended care facilities;
8. \$25 billion for HUD's Choice Neighborhoods Program and for communities that desperately need revitalization; and
9. \$5 billion for summer jobs so young persons can save money to attend college and plan for their futures.

Mr. Chair, when it comes to addressing the poverty that is still too prevalent in our country, the CBC Budget is clearly superior to the Republican's "Work Harder, Get Less" Budget.

The CBC Budget provides for \$300 billion for programs that have proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

The funding provided will be used to restore cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, extend emergency unemployment insurance, expand access to affordable housing, increase access to quality and affordable education, and increase funding for job training and trade adjustment assistance programs.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, to ensure that federal resources are targeted more efficiently towards eradicating poverty and are actually reaching communities most in need, the CBC budget proposes the codification of the “10–20–30” policy for federal spending.

Under the “10–20–30” policy at least 10 percent of the federal funds in certain accounts are to be directed to areas that have had a poverty rate of 20 percent for the last 30 years.

Finally, I support the CBC Budget because it puts an end to the draconian sequester burdening the economy and our people for the last several years.

In addition, according to an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, it is said often, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

“The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.”

The Republican budget resolution fails this moral test; the CBC Budget does not.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the House Republicans' budget and voting for a better alternative, the CBC Budget.

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

I certainly understand our colleagues' desire to fight poverty. I would like to share a little bit of my experience and what we have done to fight poverty at the local level.

For generations now, we have continued to throw more and more money towards eliminating poverty, with fewer and fewer results.

Yes, we have succeeded in alleviating the effects of poverty, but we have made very little progress in actually lifting people out of poverty. Instead of giving people a hand up, we are giving them a handout and essentially telling them life can't get any better than where they are. That is morally wrong, and I think that we can do better.

The key to solving poverty isn't just simply throwing more money at the problem. It is to try something different and find innovative ways to fix our welfare entitlement system, improve our education system, and return the dignity of work to our fellow citizens.

The proposed amendment does none of these things. It simply perpetuates the cycle of generational poverty that has been passed down from parent to child.

I saw the same situation in my hometown of West Point, Georgia. In fact, it is what motivated me to enter public service and run for mayor.

We had a community that was dying. Folks were trapped in generational poverty and had been stripped of the dignity of work.

Instead of continuing the current system, we made changes. We worked to get the government out of the way and allow the job creators to innovate and grow their businesses to hire more workers. We invested in our infrastructure and we were able to create over 15,000 advanced manufacturing jobs.

For the first time in a generation, we saw more people moving into the middle class than moving into poverty.

We made changes to our education system, working to break through the generational cycle of poverty and prepare today's students to work in a 21st century workforce.

With all of these changes, we saw our community come back to life. People had jobs and opportunity. They took advantage of it. They had the advanced manufacturing sector spring back to life, and we saw a revitalization of not only our community, but of our people.

These lessons are from the folks in the Third District. They sent me here to push those same type of ideas here in Congress.

The Republican budget puts us on a path to this type of reform, and I believe my colleagues and I share the desire to fight poverty in this country. However, I do not believe that the CBC budget proposal does us that justice.

I look forward to passing the House budget.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Virginia for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more responsible alternative than the GOP budget.

A nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the GOP budget continues to push the wrong ones, catering to the wealthy and the special interests.

The GOP likes to say that a rising tide lifts every boat, but that is only if every vessel is seaworthy. The GOP budget leaves too many Americans in dinghies, rubber rafts, and rowboats, subject to being capsized.

It includes trillions of dollars in irresponsible cuts, such as \$5.4 trillion slashed from job-creating programs; \$2 trillion cut from Medicaid and Medicare; \$5 billion eliminated from investments in education, research, and infrastructure that will prevent us from competing globally.

The GOP budget would devastate our economy by balancing the budget on the backs of students, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities in Maryland and across our country.

And for what?

To provide tax cuts to the top 1 percent—people who make at least \$900,000 every year.

In stark contrast, the CBC would create a fairer Tax Code and provide for much-needed investments in our communities. Our budget would boost our GDP by \$329 billion.

I, too, Mr. Chairman, served on the House Armed Services Committee, and I stand here to say that the CBC's budget would end sequestration for our military so that we can improve military readiness and, at the same time, restore critical domestic programs that support working families and revitalize our neighborhoods.

Rather than giving the top 1 percent a \$6 trillion tax cut, our budget would call for major investments here at home. We invest \$665 billion to modernize highways and infrastructure, \$120 billion in job-creating programs, \$80 billion so that every child learns in a modern classroom, and \$15 billion to rebuild our VA.

Perhaps, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, we invest \$300 billion over the next decade to eradicate poverty and provide basic standard of living to all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, our budget responsibly pays for all of our investments. Our budget is a credible alternative and a real plan for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I stand here to talk a little bit about the Republican budget first. It is a poor reflection of the values and priorities that we hold dear in America.

Once again, Americans insist on dooming the American people to the failed trickle-down economics of the Reagan era. The Republican budget shifts the tax burden away from the wealthiest Americans and larger corporations and places it squarely on the backs of hardworking middle- and low-income Americans. This has never helped, and it won't help now.

Not only would the Republican budget increase the national deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years, but it also foots the bill over to the most vulnerable segments of our community while cutting other important social safety network programs.

For example, the budget proposes to slash Medicaid by \$1.1 trillion and Medicare for seniors by \$487 billion. Nondefense discretionary spending across the government would also be cut by \$1.3 trillion at the expense of education, infrastructure, clean energy programs, medical research, and job training.

These are only some of the reasons why I stand tonight with my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget to propose an alternative to this budget we are facing.

The CBC's alternative budget asks those who have done well in our country to finally pay their fair share.

Our budget seeks to invest \$665 billion to modernize our crumbling infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our budget looks to invest \$80 billion in our children by modernizing our schools and better preparing our future generations to compete in a global economy.

Mr. Chair, the Republican budget is a poor reflection of the values and priorities that we hold dear as Americans.

Once again, Republicans insist on dooming the American people to the failed trickle-down economics of the Reagan era.

The Republican budget shifts the tax burden away from the wealthiest Americans and largest corporations and places it squarely on the backs of hardworking middle and lower income Americans.

Not only would the Republican budget increase the national deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years, but it also foots the bill over to the most vulnerable segments of our population while cutting other important social safety programs.

For example, the budget proposes to slash Medicaid by \$1.1 trillion and Medicare for seniors by \$487 billion.

Non-defense discretionary spending across the government would also be cut by \$1.3 trillion at the expense of education, infrastructure, clean energy programs, medical research, and job training.

These are only some of the reasons why I stand with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to propose an alternative budget amendment that serves the interests of the greater good, and not just a select few.

The CBC's alternative budget asks those who have done well in our country to finally pay their fair share.

Our budget seeks to invest \$665 billion to modernize our crumbling infrastructure.

Our budget looks to invest \$80 billion in our children by modernizing our schools and better preparing our future generations to compete in a global economy.

Our budget looks to bring \$20 billion in new investment to extend broadband internet to rural areas, so that everyone—not just the wealthy few—can have access to high-speed internet and access to information.

Our budget delivers \$300 billion over the next decade for social programs that help provide millions of Americans a basic standard of living.

This is a reflection of the values and priorities of the American people, not what is embodied in the Republican budget.

I, for one, do not believe that our nation does well by cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans while increasing taxes for the poor.

I do not believe that our nation does well by making massive cuts to social programs while allowing corporations to hide trillions of dollars overseas.

I do not believe that our nation does well by destroying Medicare and Medicaid for our elderly and poor while pushing tax cuts for the top one percent.

This is not the future that I envision for our country and neither do the American people—at least not 99 percent of them.

Mr. Chair, the Republican Budget is not a true reflection of the priorities of the American people.

This budget serves the interest of a select few at the heavy cost of exploiting millions of others.

We need to oppose the Republican budget in favor of a viable alternative such as the CBC Budget Alternative, which is more reflective of the values that we treasure in our society.

□ 1915

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus is a more compassionate, fiscally responsible alternative to the underlying Republican budget and does not rely on unrealistic growth projections or bizarre suggestions that massive tax cuts can pay for themselves. It makes our Tax Code fairer, protects and strengthens the Affordable Care Act, makes college more affordable, and ensures more Americans are lifted out of poverty. It also improves retirement security for our seniors.

With these targeted investments, our budget creates 2 million jobs next year and reduces our Nation's deficit by \$2.5 trillion over the next decade and puts us on a more sustainable path compared to the CBO projections of our budget. I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the budget presented by the gentleman from Virginia. This budget does nothing to address our mandatory spending challenges. It never balanced. It raises taxes, it increases spending, it cuts funding to our military. We can do better, we must do better, and the House budget is the way forward.

The American people sent us here to get our fiscal house in order. This budget does not accomplish that goal. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 553 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 71.

Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) kindly take the chair.

□ 2046

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal

years 2019 through 2027, with Mr. MITCHELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-339 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 314, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—108

Adams	Evans	McGovern
Barragán	Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Bass	Fudge	Meng
Beatty	Gabbard	Moore
Beyer	Gallego	Nadler
Blumenauer	Gomez	Nolan
Boyle, Brendan	Green, Al	Norcross
F.	Grijalva	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Panetta
Brown (MD)	Hastings	Pascarell
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Payne
Capuano	Huffman	Pingree
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Raskin
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Rush
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kennedy	Sánchez
Clyburn	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kildee	Schakowsky
Conyers	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lee	Scott, David
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sires
Demings	Lowenthal	Slaughter
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Lynch	Soto
Doggett	Maloney	Takano
Ellison	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
Engel	McCollum	Tonko
Espallat	McEachin	Vargas

Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—314

Abraham	Faso	Lowey
Aderholt	Ferguson	Lucas
Aguilar	Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer
Allen	Fleischmann	Lujan Grisham,
Amash	Flores	M.
Amodei	Fortenberry	MacArthur
Arrington	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Babin	Fox	Marchant
Bacon	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Banks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Marshall
Barletta	Gaetz	Massie
Barr	Gallagher	Mast
Barton	Garamendi	Matsui
Bera	Garrett	McCarthy
Bergman	Gianforte	McCaul
Biggs	Gibbs	McClintock
Bilirakis	Gohmert	McHenry
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	McKinley
Bishop (MI)	Goodlatte	McMorris
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	Rodgers
Black	Gottheimer	McNerney
Blackburn	Govdy	McSally
Blum	Granger	Meadows
Bonamici	Graves (GA)	Meehan
Bost	Graves (LA)	Messer
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	Mitchell
Brat	Green, Gene	Moolenaar
Brooks (AL)	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Grothman	Moulton
Brownley (CA)	Guthrie	Mullin
Buchanan	Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)
Buck	Handel	Neal
Bucshon	Harper	Newhouse
Budd	Harris	Noem
Burgess	Hartzler	Norman
Bustos	Heck	Nunes
Byrne	Hensarling	O'Halleran
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	O'Rourke
Carbajal	Hice, Jody B.	Olson
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Palazzo
Carter (TX)	Hill	Palmer
Cartwright	Himes	Paulsen
Castro (TX)	Holding	Pearce
Chabot	Hollingsworth	Perlmutter
Cheney	Hoyer	Perry
Cicilline	Hudson	Peters
Coffman	Huizenga	Peterson
Cole	Hultgren	Pittenger
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Collins (NY)	Hurd	Poliquin
Comer	Issa	Polis
Comstock	Jenkins (KS)	Posey
Conaway	Jenkins (WV)	Quigley
Connolly	Johnson (LA)	Ratcliffe
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Correa	Jones	Renacci
Costa	Jordan	Rice (NY)
Costello (PA)	Joyce (OH)	Rice (SC)
Courtney	Katko	Roby
Cramer	Keating	Roe (TN)
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)
Crist	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Cuellar	Kilmer	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kind	Rokita
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rooney, Francis
Davidson	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (CA)	Kinzinger	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Ross
DeGette	Krishnamoorthi	Rothfus
Delaney	Kuster (NH)	Rouzer
DeLauro	Kustoff (TN)	Royce (CA)
DelBene	Labrador	Ruiz
Denham	LaHood	Ruppersberger
Dent	LaMalfa	Russell
DeSantis	Lamborn	Rutherford
DesJarlais	Lance	Sanford
Deutch	Langevin	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Donovan	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Duffy	Latta	Schrader
Duncan (SC)	Lawson (FL)	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Levin	Scott, Austin
Dunn	Lewis (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Emmer	Lipinski	Sessions
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Sewell (AL)
Estes (KS)	Loeb	Shea-Porter
Esty (CT)	Loudermillk	Shimkus
Farenthold	Love	Shuster

Yarmuth
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi

Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Blunt Rochester	Long	Rooney, Thomas
Bridenstine	Murphy (PA)	J.
Doyle, Michael	Napolitano	Rosen
F.	Pelosi	Titus
Kihuen		

□ 2110

Mr. McNERNEY and Mrs. COM-STOCK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. ADAMS and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 292, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

AYES—130

Adams	Clyburn	Green, Gene
Barragán	Cohen	Grijalva
Bass	Connolly	Gutiérrez
Beatty	Conyers	Hastings
Beyer	Crowley	Heck
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Higgins (NY)
Blumenauer	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Boyle, Brendan	DeFazio	Huffman
F.	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Brady (PA)	Demings	Jayapal
Brown (MD)	DeSaulnier	Jeffries
Butterfield	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas	Ellison	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Espallat	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Evans	Khanna
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Kildee
Chu, Judy	Fudge	Krishnamoorthi
Cicilline	Gabbard	Larsen (WA)
Clark (MA)	Gallego	Larson (CT)
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Lawrence
Clay	Gonzalez (TX)	Lawson (FL)
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lee

Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Nolan

NOES—292

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch

Norcross
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Raskin
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman

Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schradner
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres

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

NOT VOTING—11

Blunt Rochester
Bridenstine
Doyle, Michael
F.
Kihuen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2117

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, had come to no resolution thereon.

MONTANANS DEALING WITH
FEDERAL OVERREACH

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I met last week with a couple of small business owners in Butte, Montana, who have been the target of an out-of-control Federal bureaucrat in the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

One of the bureaucrat's targets is Riley's Meats. Over a period of 12 years, Dr. Jeffrey Legg with the FSIS ordered Bart Riley to comply with what he told Riley were Federal regulations.

Mr. Riley spent over \$10,000 in compliance costs and suffered years of har-

assment, but these weren't real Federal regulations. They were costly measures dreamed up by this bureaucrat.

I saw the toll that dealing with this government harassment has taken on the Riley family over the last decade.

No one should have to endure such a nightmare. Stories like these are why the American people demand that Washington is cleaned up.

For the Riley family and other Montanans dealing with Federal overreach, I will continue to focus on this issue until it is resolved.

MASS SHOOTING IN LAS VEGAS

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, America has again been rocked by a mass shooting, and our hearts ache and our hands pray for the victims and those who are recovering. You can't help but watch the countless scores of video accounts and not feel an urge to act.

My constituents ask: Are we helpless to stop the next mass shooting?

We are only helpless once the trigger is squeezed and you are in the pathway of a bullet, but we are not helpless in this House. In fact, if we come together, we are more powerful than any weapon.

Aren't the dead owed a dialogue, a conversation about whether we should have background checks, a talk about whether people who have weapons of war should only be warriors, and what about talking about restrictions on ammunition purchases?

I refuse to accept the tradeoff that we must allow and accept that a mass shooting is going to happen in this country for an unfettered access to firearms.

If the police officers who went into that building so blindly and were so brave could do that and show that courage, we can come into this building and have the courage to have a dialogue for those victims.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK AND
ACHIEVEMENT OF STEVE
HILDRETH

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and the achievement of Steve Hildreth, an exemplary employee and member of our community. Steve celebrated his retirement last month after working for 30 years at the Georgia Pacific Paper Mill in Camas, Washington.

Steve started at the mill in 1987, as sleeter helper in the print department. By the time he retired, he held the position of the shift team leader for the

shift instrumentation technicians. He was well respected by the operators and crews of the machines, and he knew the job was to make their job easier.

He was also a member of the Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers union throughout his career and held office in Local 5 for several years.

Fortunately, Steve has options in retirement. According to his wife, Shari, he is a true Renaissance man, in that he can build, troubleshoot, and fix just about anything. He is spending his time remodeling their Washougal home, setting up his new shop, and making his way through Shari's extensive honey-do list.

Mr. Speaker, southwest Washington has been fortunate to have someone like Steve Hildreth as an employee, father, husband, grandfather, and resident for the past 30 years. I would like to congratulate Steve on his retirement and wish him all the best in the years to come.

TRADE AND JOBS HEARING IN BROOK PARK, OHIO

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the NAFTA negotiations continue, it is important for us to listen to our constituents on how we can make NAFTA better for them.

To that end, I convened important stakeholders for a hearing in Ohio on how NAFTA has hurt American workers and what we can do to help them.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the testimony of Ms. Lee Geisse of the BlueGreen Alliance, Cheryl Johncox of the Sierra Club, and Mark Milko of Workers United.

BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE TESTIMONY, LEE GEISSE, REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER

We know that it is possible to have trade agreements that don't engage the U.S. in a race to the bottom, but instead lift up our own workers and workers throughout the world. We applaud Congresswoman Kaptur's work on this issue and so many others that are vital to the future of Ohio's workers, economy and the environment! Thank you for bringing these folks together and inviting the BlueGreen Alliance to participate!

In 2006, the United Steelworkers and the Sierra Club formed this unique Alliance—founded with the belief that we no longer have to choose between good jobs and a clean environment; we can and must have both. In these 11 years, we've convened workers, environmentalists, and industry leaders to forge partnerships that help us find solutions to address historic problems like climate change in ways that create and secure quality jobs. Together, we are a powerful voice for good jobs, a clean environment, and a fair and thriving economy.

The North American Free Trade Agreement, also known as NAFTA, has been in effect since 1994. The current Administration has announced plans for its renegotiation,

but without much detail. That renegotiation begins this month. For far too many, NAFTA has meant the loss of good, quality paying jobs and increased pollution, as the deal exacerbated offshoring and profiteering off the backs of workers and the environment. It's time for a trade agreement that levels the playing field and makes deep reforms to strengthen workers' rights and environmental standards. American workers should expect agreements that ensure that other countries have to play by the same worker safety and environmental rules that we do. Anything short of [this] would be a failure.

NAFTA's replacement must support good union jobs, livable wages, healthy communities, clean air and water, and a more stable climate. Through an open, public process, the U.S. can partner with other nations in mutually beneficial trade and climate agreements that are fair, protect workers' rights and jobs, safeguard the environment; ensure the democratic processes of sovereign nations are not overturned by unelected bodies; and raise the bar for consumer and public protections in all nations that are signatories. The BlueGreen Alliance recommends a new approach to trade that lifts up workers and communities. This requires fundamental changes to NAFTA, including:

1. Creating a transparent and inclusive renegotiation process. NAFTA renegotiations should not be done in secret but should be transparent and allow for public participation. This means inviting and incorporating public input on U.S. proposals for the agreement, and making negotiating texts available for public comment after each negotiating round. Workers, environmentalists, and other key stakeholders should be part of the process to make sure negotiators understand the impact of the deal on jobs and the environment. It is critical that all stakeholders and the general public be involved in a transparent, fair, and participatory negotiating process.

2. Eliminating corporate courts that incentivize offshoring and undermine environmental protections. NAFTA's Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) provision has created private courts in which foreign corporations can demand compensation for environmental protections and other democratically enacted laws before unelected, unaccountable, panels of corporate lawyers. By creating unique privileges for foreign investors, ISDS can incentivize offshoring and threaten the very safeguards we have democratically enacted. NAFTA's broad rights for foreign corporations, including ISDS, must be eliminated—mere tweaks will not be sufficient. NAFTA's replacement must eliminate ISDS so as to safeguard workers and environmental and health protections.

3. Including strong and binding labor and environmental protections—including wage and climate standards—in the core text of the agreement. NAFTA has enabled corporations to offshore production to take advantage of lower environmental and labor standards abroad. This has significantly impacted workers in both the manufacturing and service sectors. It has spurred the loss of good paying jobs, carbon leakage, and the export of pollution, while undermining domestic labor and environmental protections. To fix this, NAFTA's replacement should establish a binding floor of labor and environmental protections across North America. It should require signatory countries to adopt living wages for workers and to implement policies to fulfill important international labor and environmental agreements, including the Paris Climate Agreement and the Inter-

national Labor Organization's conventions. These commitments should be included in the core text of the agreement and trade sanctions should be used to penalize violations. NAFTA must make a commitment to prioritize workers and the environment.

4. Creating a stronger, independent enforcement mechanism. Rules mean nothing if they aren't enforced. In the history of the U.S. trade agreements, labor and environmental provisions have consistently been ignored. Even post-2007 trade agreements with labor and environmental provisions in the core text have failed to produce disputes over widely documented labor and environmental violations. To fix this, the agreement that replaces NAFTA must create a new, independent dispute settlement mechanism for enforcing labor and environmental provisions rather than replicating the failed system of the past. Stronger enforcement is critical to ensure that the agreement is upheld and that it creates a fair playing field among all parties.

5. Protecting and promoting Buy American and green procurement policies. Currently NAFTA requires that the federal government treat foreign bidders as if they were American bidders when deciding how to spend U.S. taxpayer money. It also includes rules that limit governments' ability to use "green purchasing" requirements that ensure government contracts support environmental protection. To protect and grow America's manufacturing and service sector employment, create taxpayer funded jobs in the U.S., and safeguard our air and water, NAFTA's replacement should support domestic job creation and responsible bidding standards.

6. Strengthening rules of origin. Rules of origin should benefit producers and workers across North America. For example, NAFTA's replacement needs to adopt more robust rules of origin that require automotive manufacturers to make a higher percentage of new vehicles and their parts in the originating country in order to qualify for tariff free trade. The agreement should ensure the signatory countries receive manufacturing, investment, and production benefits of the agreement. Under the current agreement, many countries that are not part of the agreement take advantage of loopholes to gain market access. The rules of origin and regional value content need to be updated so that they can incentivize manufacturing and production domestically.

We know exactly what causes outsourcing: low wages, exploited workers in unsafe working conditions, and weak, or non-existent, environmental, protections in other countries.

Americans, Ohioans, and working people everywhere need fair trade deals that put workers and the environment first and don't put corporate interests above our health, our rights, and our safety.

The promise of NAFTA being a job creator was hollow, and thousands of Ohio workers watched helplessly as this flawed trade agreement led to the outsourcing of middle-class jobs. While Donald Trump has promised to renegotiate NAFTA, the skepticism is that his billionaire, climate-denying cabinet, could actually make it worse!

All of our partners and allies must commit to helping champions like Congresswoman Kaptur watch closely and ensure that the voices of working people are heard throughout this process to support—not undermine—good jobs, efforts to address climate change, and safe worksites and healthy communities!

CHERYL JOHNCOX, ORGANIZING
REPRESENTATIVE, SIERRA CLUB

Thank you, Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur, for this very important hearing associated with the North American Free Trade Agreement Renegotiation. My name is Cheryl Johncox and I am a member of the national field team of Sierra Club.

For more than two decades, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has harmed communities across Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.—particularly people of color and lower income families—by undermining environmental protections, eliminating jobs, increasing air and water pollution, eroding wages, and fueling climate change.

To transform NAFTA from a polluter-friendly deal into one that supports environmental protection, any renegotiation must include, at a minimum,

1. Eliminate rules that empower corporations to attack environmental and public health protections in unaccountable tribunals. NAFTA's investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) system has empowered multinational corporations to bypass our courts, go to private tribunals, and demand money from taxpayers for policies that affect corporate bottom lines. Corporations have used NAFTA to challenge bans on toxic chemicals, the decisions of environmental review panels, and protections for our climate. They have extracted more than \$370 million from governments in these cases, while pending NAFTA claims total more than \$35 billion. The cases are heard not by judges, but by corporate lawyers outside the normal court system. Broad corporate rights, including ISDS, must be eliminated from NAFTA to safeguard our right to democratically determine our own public interest protections.

2. Add strong, enforceable environmental and labor standards to the core text of agreement. NAFTA's weak and unenforceable environmental and labor side agreements facilitated a race to the bottom in which corporations could offshore jobs to exploit lower environmental and labor standards in another country. Any deal that replaces NAFTA must create a fair playing field by requiring each participating country to adopt, maintain, and implement policies to ensure compliance with domestic environmental laws and important international environmental and labor agreements, including the Paris climate agreement, and treaties protecting Indigenous rights. In addition, each country must make commitments to tackle critical conservation challenges related to illegal timber trade, illegal wildlife trade, and fisheries management. These commitments must be included in the core text of the agreement and made enforceable via an independent dispute settlement process in which trade sanctions are used to correct labor and environmental abuses.

3. Safeguard energy sector regulation by overhauling overreaching rules. NAFTA's energy chapter, written before awareness of climate change was widespread, must be eliminated. Other NAFTA rules allow renewable portfolio standards, low-carbon fuel standards, and other climate-friendly energy regulations to be challenged for impeding business and hurting corporate bottom lines. Such rules must be narrowed to protect climate policies in each country.

4. Restrict pollution from cross-border motor carriers. NAFTA encouraged a rise in cross-border motor traffic without doing anything to mitigate the resulting increase in harmful vehicle emissions. Any deal that replaces NAFTA must require cross-border

motor carriers to reduce emissions in order for their goods to benefit from reduced tariffs. In addition, all cross-border commercial vehicles must be required to comply with all state and federal standards to limit pollution.

5. Require green government purchasing instead of restricting it. NAFTA's procurement rules limit governments' ability to use "green purchasing" requirements that ensure government contracts support renewable energy, energy efficiency, and sustainable goods. NAFTA's replacement must require signatory governments to include a preference for goods and services with low environmental impacts and fair labor practices in procurement decisions.

6. Bolster climate protections by penalizing imported goods made with high climate emissions and lax labor standards. NAFTA allows firms to shift production to a country with lower climate standards, which can spur "carbon leakage" and job offshoring. To prevent this, and encourage greater climate action from high-emissions trading partners, each country must be required to impose a border tax on imported goods made with significant climate pollution, and unfair labor practices.

7. Add a broad protection for environmental, labor and other public interest policies. NAFTA's many overreaching rules restrict the policy tools that governments can use to protect the environment and other broadly-shared priorities. NAFTA includes no provision that effectively shields public interest policies from such rules—only a weak "exception" that has consistently failed to protect challenged policies. Instead, any deal that replaces NAFTA must include a broad "carve-out" that exempts public interest policies from all of the deal's rules.

Any NAFTA renegotiation must be conducted through an open process that invites the public to help formulate U.S. positions and to comment on negotiated texts after each negotiating round. Bolstered by resurgent support for a new trade model, we commit to push for this environmental overhaul of NAFTA, and against any polluter-friendly deal that masquerades as change.

WORKERS UNITED,
August 11, 2017.

Re NAFTA field hearing.

Congresswoman KAPTUR,
Cleveland Office, Cleveland, OH.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KAPTUR: I just wanted to respond in writing on a couple of facts on how NAFTA can affect workers indirectly impacted by NAFTA in manufacturing.

1. Workers that supply the food service in factories that are moved to Mexico.

2. Workers that work in the hospitality industry are impacted because of the loss of good paying jobs, those manufacturing workers no longer have the disposable income to go to a racetrack, ball game or other sporting events at all or as often.

3. The workers that still produce goods like our garment workers are put in a bad bargaining position at contract time because of trade agreements like NAFTA.

Please keep me in the loop on anything we can do to help in this process to get this trade agreement amended.

Sincerely,

MARK A. MILKO,
Area Director Workers United.

Ms. KAPTUR. Lee and Cheryl underlined the adverse environmental effects of NAFTA and the need to strengthen environmental standards in any renegotiated agreement.

I was proud to note their statements that Ohio has become number one in solar manufacturing. Just as Mark said, it is important that we ensure that these valuable manufacturing skills are passed along to our youth, and not outsourced.

I am grateful for their contributions and welcome their continued engagement as the negotiations proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to include their remarks in the RECORD. They are important for all Americans to read, especially those negotiating the new NAFTA.

RECOGNIZING CARE NET PREGNANCY CENTER OF CENTRAL NEW YORK

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Care Net Pregnancy Center of Central New York.

Founded in 1989, Care Net provides free, confidential services for women facing an unplanned pregnancy across our region. Nationwide, Care Net has a network of over 1,100 pregnancy centers.

Through its work, Care Net of Central New York has provided guidance and compassionate care to over 24,000 individuals, equipping women with the resources they need to make an informed decision about their pregnancy.

From pregnancy counseling to post-abortion recovery services, Care Net offers a wide range of support and assistance to women considering this life-changing, difficult decision.

During an emotional and challenging time, Care Net staff provides an unparalleled level of compassion, support, and dedication to the women and men they serve.

Care Net continues to lead the way in the mission to protect the sanctity of life, helping to save the lives of thousands of unborn children each year.

It is an honor to stand here today to recognize Care Net's service to our community and its unwavering commitment to future generations.

COMMENDING THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET FOR THEIR ATTENTION TO WILDFIRES IN THE WEST

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend this evening the Office of Management and Budget and Mr. Mulvaney for the special attention they are taking to the wildfire situation we have in this country, especially in the West.

They have put forward a request for \$576 million additional funding for fire

suppression, but even more importantly is to get at the root of the problem with better forest management that will make sense and make a difference over the coming years of getting rid of the fuel, getting the fuel out of the forest that is so much of the problem, with millions and millions of dead trees, brush, and all the other hazards that cause wildfires, that are going to happen anyway, to become catastrophic fires.

So OMB calling for these reforms that we have been talking about, me and my colleagues, for a long time is really a good sign that this administration wants to get serious about cutting way back on the wildfires and the severe damage to air quality, habitat, wildlife, and the asset the American people own, that they are serious about it.

□ 2130

YOU HAVE EARNED YOUR REST CORPORAL MICHAEL PAUL MIDDLEBROOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for half the remaining time until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), my friend.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

On October 1 of this year, less than one week ago, my brother of the thin blue line, Corporal Michael Paul Middlebrook, a nine-year veteran of the Lafayette Police Department, was killed in the line of duty while responding to a "shots fired" call at a local convenience store.

Corporal Middlebrook is survived by his wife, three daughters, and his parents. During his tenure at the Lafayette Police Department, Corporal Middlebrook accumulated seven letters of commendation for acts of bravery and outstanding police work.

Michael understood that his job as a cop began with an oath. And that oath was not to a chief or a sheriff or a marshal. It was an oath of allegiance to the constitutional principles that his badge represents. Corporal Michael Middlebrook recognized unwaveringly the civil constitutional rights of the citizens he had sworn to protect and defend and serve.

In March of this year, Michael was awarded the highly prestigious Heart of Law Enforcement Award by the national nonprofit group Beyond the Badge. During the ceremony, Corporal Middlebrook was recognized by Louisiana's Governor and was presented a commemorative State flag. This award was given to recognize Corporal Middlebrook's ongoing contributions to

the low-income community that he patrolled.

Michael regularly took donated food items from local convenience stores and distributed the food to the homeless and less fortunate. Michael also collected clothing on his off time and delivered the clothing to poor souls he encountered during his shift deep in the night while the world slept.

In the last 6 months alone, Corporal Michael Middlebrook was recognized for having saved a person's life by placing himself between the victim and the knife-wielding suspect, and for single-handedly apprehending an armed robbery suspect seconds after the 911 call was placed.

Corporal Middlebrook's chief, my friend and brother, Chief Toby Aguillard, provided this quote: "For many in our community, Corporal Middlebrook was a spearhead that brought them to justice. For many others, Corporal Middlebrook was a cradle of compassion. He was an officer's officer, loved and respected by his peers. The void he leaves in our department, in our community, in our hearts will be felt for generations. He will never be forgotten."

That quote was from Michael's chief. Brother Michael, you have earned your rest. Your watch has ended. We have got it from here. The thin blue line will never forget your service. We shall always honor your memory, and we shall watch over your family.

May our Saviour bless your ascension, and may He hold your loved ones close to His own heart.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, when someone with the service of my friend from Louisiana, Mr. HIGGINS, pays tribute, you know it is somebody worthy, because my friend from Louisiana served with distinction in the United States Army, wearing the uniform of this country. He served as a law enforcement officer. He knows about serving, protecting others, and a willingness to lay down his life for others.

It has been deeply touching to have seen accounts of what is going on in Las Vegas. To understand what I have seen in my years as a prosecutor, judge, and chief justice, when everyone is running away from the sound of a gun, first responders and law officers are running into harm's way to help and protect others.

It was Jesus who said, "Greater love has no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Those who wear the uniform, as my friend has, of law officer and in the military, they know what that means. My 4 years in Active Duty in the Army, we were not in combat, but Jesus was right.

There were so many there in Las Vegas that put their own lives on the line for the sake of the lives of others.

There are others that couldn't wait to rush to a microphone to demand: Gun control, gun control.

I am waiting for them to rush to the mic and scream: Knife control, knife control.

Or after a van is used as the weapon: Van control, van control.

What is clear is we need to look at the real causation, whether it is machetes being used to torture and kill 800,000 precious humans in Africa, whether it is knives, whether it is ammonium nitrate. People with evil in their hearts are going to find a way to wreak havoc.

We know that without a gun being used, the biggest—worst tragedy and loss of life attack was on 9/11 in 2001. I don't believe there was a gun used in the whole process, yet it was a worse loss of American life than at Pearl Harbor.

You have got to look at what is in the heart, what's causing it. If they are going to use knives, if they are going to use planes, if they are going to use vehicles, yeah, we need to protect ourselves, but we need to look at what is in the heart.

I know the sheriff said the shooter may have been radicalized. We don't know yet. We know there was a trip to the Philippines.

I am very proud to have met out in the jungles of the southern Philippines with some of our special forces. Amazing. Some of the best America has to offer, and they were out in the jungles teaching the Filipino soldiers, the best that the Philippines had, how to go after the radicalized Islamists in the southern Philippines.

But we don't know if this man with evil in his heart had been radicalized. Others say there were no indications. But one thing was certain, he looked down on that crowd of people enjoying life, enjoying their families, enjoying their loved ones, and all he could see was worthless people that needed to be eliminated.

Why did he have that in his heart? Where do people get those ideas?

I mean, we argue and disagree here on the House floor. When I was a judge, I watched argument. At times it seemed like they wanted to come to blows, but it was part of a civil process in a bastion where we come and we disagree and we don't use physical violence, but we are still supposed to have respect for each other and each other's position.

To hear some comedian say, "Just do something," would have been viewed by those who gave us the documents that have allowed us to be the greatest Nation—I think greater than Solomon's Israel, more assets per person, the only country in the history that I'm aware of where the number one health problem for the Nation's poor is obesity, and it is a serious issue.

But how did we get here?

Obviously, for the Japanese at Pearl Harbor, it was easier for them because they weren't looking in the eyes of people.

It was easier for this guy 32 floors up because he was not looking at the eyes of these people, his people he wanted to kill that he didn't think were worth allowing to live, despite the love they were sharing with each other and the joy.

Where do people get those ideas that somebody is that worthless? Is it from hearing people with whom someone disagrees is deplorable, that they simply cannot be made worthy of living?

Here is a statement from this October 2 article. Some CBS executive said she was not even sympathetic for the victims of the shooting at a country music festival. She said: "I am actually not even sympathetic because country music fans often are Republican gun toters."

□ 2145

Scott Pelley has questioned whether the shooting was "foreseeable, predictable and, to some degree, self-inflicted."

But for someone who appears to know right from wrong, not suffering from mental disease or defect, to inflict that kind of death on people who are just innocent, just having a good time, there has to be so much evil and hate in his heart.

So we have a Supreme Court that has been saying for years: You have got to get prayer out of schools. Never mind the fact that prayer got this country started, that prayer and worship and honoring God have been behind the greatest developments in this country's history that got us to this place, to this plateau, as a nation.

Although some would argue we have hit the height of freedom, some surveys don't have us anywhere near the top of being one of the freest countries in the world anymore.

It is continuing to be, after tragedies, after people with evil in their heart do evil things, that more cry out: We need to lose more freedom. We need to lose more freedom.

That is not the answer. Let's look at what is in people's hearts and what would be good to have in their hearts.

I know where we came from, but even I was surprised when my pastor, David Dykes, and I and his wife, Cindy, my wife, Kathy, we were going through the State Department. I had not done a tour of the State Department before because it is mostly boring, but we came to a glass case that had a document in it, and it said it was a duplicate.

We know that many of our most important documents, including the Declaration of Independence, were made in duplicate, so I don't know if this was one that was actually signed or it was a duplicate. It appeared to be of the era.

I said to Dr. Dykes: Did you know the Treaty of Paris began like that?

I didn't know. I study history most every day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I did know that rule.

But this was the Treaty of Paris, 1783, and John Adams was there. But this is where we were negotiating with England, the most powerful country in the world, imploring them to recognize this little upstart country of 13 States as an independent country, independent and free of the shackles that were there as Colonies by England.

Here they have got the biggest navy. They have an impressive military, most powerful nation, and we are asking them to swear on a document that we in the United States have the right to be free and independent.

So as I contemplated that, well, these first words that are in much bigger letters than the rest of the document, began to make sense.

What would you have asked somebody swear under, at the beginning of our Nation, asking the most powerful nation in the world to swear that they recognize, something important enough they would not want to break that oath, even with the anger and the despising attitude that many in England had at that time?

Well, the words they chose for those big, tall letters, were these, and this is a copy of the copy. "In the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity."

Well, some say we were started with the Declaration of Independence, recognizing that we are free and, of right, ought to be free because we are endowed by our Creator with these unalienable rights.

And then we have this document where England swears in the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity that they recognize our independence. That came after the Great Awakening, in the 1700s, where pulpits were on fire with the glory of God and the recognition of what God had given us and of the importance of the Bible.

No, everybody wasn't a Christian back then, but of the signers of the Declaration, you had over a third of them were—may have been over half were actually ordained Christian ministers.

There were secularists that supported the end of slavery, but the churches drove that. The churches provided the Underground Railroad, most often, to try to help Africans to be free Americans.

It was an ordained Christian minister who went on to help bring about the full meaning of the Constitution, that this should mean what it said, an or-

dained Christian minister named Martin Luther King, Jr.

So, Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln, he started life early as, bragging to his law partner, he was an infidel. Going from that, as Steve Mansfield discusses, I believe the book is entitled "Lincoln's Struggle With God." By the time he became President, he knew there was a God. And just like Benjamin Franklin said: "I have lived, sir, a long time. The longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that, 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.'"

He said: "I firmly believe this. I also firmly believe that without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel."

So this man, kind of homely looking—I thought Daniel Day-Lewis captured his essence so well. When I met Doris Kearns Goodwin over at the Library of Congress, I said: You've got to tell me, you do such fabulous research—and, yes, she is a more liberal Democrat, I know, but she does fabulous research. And in her book, "Team of Rivals," she has well documented he didn't have a pleasant voice, kind of high, raspy. Daniel Day-Lewis nailed it.

But Lincoln came to know what Ben Franklin testified to in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention. He lost a son. He and his wife lost a son in 1861. There are indications he totally blamed himself because he thought he hadn't done quickly enough what God meant for him to do: end slavery. I don't know if that is true or not.

But in March of 1863, this was Abraham Lincoln's declaration, and I will finish with this, Mr. Speaker. Abraham Lincoln's words were: "But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all the blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own."

Lincoln goes on and says: "Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us then, to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness"—Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this was not the act of God punishing Americans for being country music fans or being conservatives. This was not the act of God punishing Americans for turning away.

This was from a man with evil in his heart in a country where God has been driven out of the schoolhouse, driven out of government buildings by a majority of Supreme Court Justices who have no clue how far from the original intent of the Constitution they have wandered.

It is the result of years of teaching people that there are those among our what we deem innocent in society who just should not be allowed to live. That is not the teaching of Jesus. It is not the teaching in the Bible, and it is not what this country grew so great believing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. KIHUEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 5 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of husband's health.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 29, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3823. To amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2519. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9 a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. KAP-

TUR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3937. A bill to require the Federal prudential banking agencies to determine whether certain institutions they regulate engage in a pattern or practice of violations of Federal banking and consumer protection laws and regulations, to provide for the revocation of banking charters and Federal deposit insurance for such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3938. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3939. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to make the native sod provisions applicable to the United States and to modify those provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VELA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3940. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for housing stipends and supply fee payments under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals affected by extended school closures due to natural disasters; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3941. A bill to improve food safety, to encourage greater production of agricultural commodities for use in the locality in which produced, to reauthorize and expand Department of Agriculture support of these efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 3942. A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 to include sex trafficking victims in the transitional housing assistance grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GON-

ZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VELA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 3943. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General from using eminent domain to acquire land for the purpose of constructing a wall, or other physical barrier, along the international border between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3944. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize a grant program to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras and securely storing and maintaining recorded data for law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3945. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. HANDEL, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3946. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Statesboro, Georgia, the "Ray Hendrix Veterans Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr.

GOMEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. SPIERER):

H.R. 3947. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 3948. A bill to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from compelling a person to produce or furnish algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 3949. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the designation of State approving agencies for multi-State apprenticeship programs for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. HILL, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 3950. A bill to specify the scope of judicial review of certain agency actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 3951. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to declare that an aviation humanitarian crisis exists for airports impacted by a major disaster or emergency,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to replace the Federal Election Commission with the Federal Election Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3955. A bill to reform public financing for Presidential elections and provide for public financing for Congressional elections; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 3956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the treatment of seasonal positions for purposes of the employer shared responsibility requirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. HANDEL, and Mr. SMUCKER):

H.R. 3957. A bill to repeal title VIII of the Higher Education Opportunity Act and title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 3958. A bill to establish a pilot program on securing energy infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 3959. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to give States the option of monitoring covered criteria air pollutants in designated areas by greatly increasing the number of air quality sensors in exchange for greater regulatory flexibility in the methods of monitoring, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 3960. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Liu Xiaobo, and collectively to all advocates of democracy and human rights in China, in recognition of their extraordinary advocacy for liberty and human rights despite repression and their impact on world peace and global understanding of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Kissimmee River and its tributaries in the State of Florida for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIREs, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. SPIERER):

H.R. 3962. A bill to require face-to-face purchases of ammunition, to require licensing of ammunition dealers, and to require reporting regarding bulk purchases of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BOST, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUM, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. EMMER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of the first Friday of October as "Manufacturing Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GALLEGOS, and Mr. BEYER):

H. Res. 555. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit, respectively, certain documents and other information to the House of Representatives relating to the executive order on the review of designations under the Antiquities Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 556. A resolution urging the President of the United States to allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration and to reject any claims for the continued postponement of the full public release of those records; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 557. A resolution commending the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 3938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Line 18 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 3942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper . . .

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 3946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the general welfare clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 3949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 3950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, and Article III, Sections 1 and 2, of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 3951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 3956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 3962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 37: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 147: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 246: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 299: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 436: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 445: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 535: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 598: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 613: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 619: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 620: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 632: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 638: Ms. BASS and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 669: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 686: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 750: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 807: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 820: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 821: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 846: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 850: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 866: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 927: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1017: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 1046: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 1057: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 1078: Mr. KIND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1094: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1111: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 1133: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 1136: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1148: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1150: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1164: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 1167: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 1241: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 1273: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 1274: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 1276: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 1279: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1298: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 1374: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 1406: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 1444: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 1459: Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 1552: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 1566: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1568: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. POLIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1639: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1661: Ms. STEFANIK and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1676: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 1729: Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 1762: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. GOWDY.
 H.R. 1825: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 1896: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 1953: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 2133: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. COLE, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 2193: Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 2267: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 2285: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2318: Mr. KIHUEN.
 H.R. 2321: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 2401: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. ADAMS.
 H.R. 2436: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2465: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 2481: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2625: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 2633: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2644: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2651: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 2705: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 2740: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2782: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 2821: Mr. REICHERT.
 H.R. 2862: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2890: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 2901: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 2908: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
 H.R. 2936: Mr. NEUHOUSE.
 H.R. 2999: Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 3034: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. LEE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MENG, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 3117: Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 3222: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 3303: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 3320: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 3324: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 3329: Mr. BUDD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 3345: Mrs. DEMINGS.
 H.R. 3352: Mr. CORREA and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 3363: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3380: Mr. RUSH, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 3394: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3402: Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 3464: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER.
 H.R. 3479: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 3497: Mr. HIMES and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 3512: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 3528: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 3548: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 3549: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 3576: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 3632: Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 3639: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 3711: Mrs. HANDEL.
 H.R. 3727: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 3730: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 3733: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 3738: Ms. LEE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 3755: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 3761: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 3767: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 3775: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 3808: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 3826: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 3832: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
 H.R. 3847: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 3849: Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 3862: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 3866: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 3875: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 3877: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3896: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 3923: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3925: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.J. Res. 48: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Miss RICE of New York.
 H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL.
 H. Res. 142: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H. Res. 213: Mr. ELLISON.
 H. Res. 283: Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. MOULTON.
 H. Res. 367: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, and Mr. GOMEZ.
 H. Res. 370: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
 H. Res. 401: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. TIPTON.
 H. Res. 458: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H. Res. 495: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER, and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H. Res. 517: Mr. KIND.
 H. Res. 535: Ms. MENG.
 H. Res. 544: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mrs. LOVE.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 367: Mr. DEFazio.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, in addition to congratulating the people of Taiwan on the occasion of their National Day this coming October 10, I would like to reiterate my strong support for both the Taiwan Relations Act (also known as the TRA) and the bilateral trade agreement between Taiwan and the United States.

Economic bonds between Taiwan and the United States have continued to grow due to various bilateral mechanisms and exchanges including: the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, the Digital Economy Forum, the SelectUSA Investment Summit, the United States Business Day, and the Agricultural Trade Goodwill Mission. In 2016, two-way trade of goods between Taiwan and the United States exceeded \$65 billion, making Taiwan the United States' 10th largest trading partner.

Since 1993, Taiwan has maintained its spot on the list of the top seven countries importing U.S. agricultural products. Altogether, Taiwanese importers have purchased nearly \$30 billion in U.S. grain products. In 2016, Taiwan imported \$3.4 billion worth of U.S. agricultural products, roughly one-quarter of Taiwan's annual agricultural imports.

Taiwan is not only a valuable trade partner, but our nations have a strong relationship based on shared values of freedom, democracy, and human rights, as well as interests in enhancing peace, security and prosperity in the Asia Pacific region. I look forward to continue working with my colleagues to address the global challenges that face Taiwan and continue our prosperous relationship.

RECOGNIZING THE 106TH
NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 106th National Day of the Republic of China, which falls on October 10th, and to extend my best wishes to the people of Taiwan.

The U.S. and Taiwan have maintained a close and mutually-beneficial relationship based on our shared values of freedom, democracy and free enterprise. The passage of the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979 has contributed to the peace and stability of the Asia Pacific region, and enabled the people of Taiwan to build a prosperous and democratic society. Since then, Congress has continued to play a

strong role in bolstering our bilateral security, economic and cultural ties.

This close relationship was exemplified recently in the wake of Hurricane Harvey, when the government of Taiwan not only offered their support but also donated \$800,000 to the disaster relief efforts. I would like to join my colleagues in recognizing this generous donation and offer my sincere thanks.

I extend my best wishes to the people of Taiwan as they celebrate their National Day and I look forward to continuing our strong relationship for many decades to come.

JILL BORSTELMAN KLAUSING

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an outstanding teacher in my district.

I stand today to celebrate Dunbar High School teacher Jill Borstelman Klausling of Cape Coral. She returned to the classroom after a 16-month hiatus due to stage 3 breast cancer. After months of extensive treatment, she is blessed to continue her passion of teaching.

Jill has devoted almost two decades to teaching intensive reading at Dunbar High School and has had a lasting impression to countless students. Her high energy and determination is unmatched and enhances the learning environment every day.

I wish her and her family the best as she continues her recovery. The students and faculty of Dunbar are in a better place with Jill in the classroom. This has been a challenging start to the school year, and I wish all our local educators the best.

HONORING MR. CLINTON PARKER

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Clinton Parker, who was recently named a 2017 Hero of the Year by the National Association of Letter Carriers. Mr. Parker has proudly served as a mail carrier in Waterbury, Connecticut, but he has gone above and beyond the call of duty to help others in his community.

Mr. Parker has a long history of service to our country, and is a 30-year Army veteran. He takes his commitment to protecting others seriously, and on December 6, 2014, Mr. Parker helped first responders during a dangerous situation. A fellow veteran experiencing

post-traumatic stress was in a standoff with police; and, at the request of the man's father, the police contacted Mr. Parker to ask for his assistance in diffusing the situation. While on his mail route, Mr. Parker accepted the call and bravely assisted police in a seven-hour standoff, which ended peacefully.

His friends and coworkers know Mr. Parker as a humble man who quietly serves his community, but his brave actions in Watertown, along with his decades of military service, speak volumes about his character and deep care for others. He stays in contact with the veteran he helped in 2014 as much as possible to ensure that he is getting the treatment and attention that he deserves.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clinton Parker has served our country throughout his career, and he willingly steps up to help others at moments of crisis. His leadership, bravery, and selflessness are inspiring, and it is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 2 and 3, I was absent for recorded votes No. 544 through 547. Had I been present, on Roll Call No. 544 I would have voted YES; on Roll Call No. 545 I would have voted YES; on Roll Call No. 546 I would have voted NO; and on Roll Call No. 547 I would have voted NO.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call vote 546 on Tuesday, October 3, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER
TORRANCE MAYOR DELORES
"DEE" HARDISON

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of former mayor of the City of Torrance Delores "Dee" Hardison—a beloved wife, mother, and grandmother—who

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

passed away on September 30, 2017, at the age of 79.

Born Delores Grinton on January 22, 1938, in Bellingham, Washington, Dee was one of nine children born to Walter and June Grinton. She graduated from Western Washington University in 1960, where she met her future husband, Lowell Hardison, who worked for Boeing. Dee later received a master's degree from California State University, Long Beach. She taught at Lincoln High School in Seattle and moved to Reno, Nevada with Lowell. Dee and Lowell moved to Torrance, near what is now Sur La Brea Park, in 1967.

Dee began mobilizing the local community to persuade the city to build Sur La Brea Park. This successful campaign led to her service for almost a decade on the Parks and Recreation and Planning Commissions, while she also worked as a physical education teacher and later a special-education instructor for the Torrance Unified School District.

She was then elected to the Torrance City Council in 1986 and became mayor in 1994. During her time as mayor, she was visible and accessible to her constituents. In the days immediately after 9/11, Dee was at Del Amo Fashion Center talking to community members and offering her support during that difficult time. She oversaw the expansion of the Civic Center library, establishment of the Madrona Marsh Nature Preserve and redevelopment of Old Torrance.

Her outstanding public service extended to other community organizations. For more than 25 years, Dee was an active member of the Torrance Education Foundation and board chair for LINC Housing, a nonprofit group that builds housing for seniors and families throughout the state. She was the 2011 recipient of the Jared Sidney Torrance Award, which recognizes an individual's sustained service to the community and is considered Torrance's highest honor. She was also recognized as Torrance YMCA Woman of the Year, Switzer Center South Bay Woman of the Year, and a Cal State Dominguez Hills Distinguished Alumni.

Dee is survived by her husband, Lowell, her two sons, Mark and Brad, and two grandchildren whom I hope take comfort in the way Dee lived her life serving Torrance, the city that she loved. Torrance loved her back. May her memory be a blessing to us all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for Roll Call votes No. 544 and 545 on the evening of October 2, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1547, sponsored by Rep. MARTHA MCSALLY; I would have voted in favor of H.R. 965, sponsored by Rep. ANN KUSTER.

RECOGNIZING LINDA OXBYS

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize Linda Oxby, a longtime educator, coach, and mentor.

Ms. Oxby first found her love for coaching volleyball at Coal City High School where she spent her first five years in education. Eventually she moved to Edwards County High School in Albion, IL, where she taught and was an administrator for 28 years as well as coached their volleyball team for 19 years. During her coaching career at ECHS, she amassed 633 victories and 5 trips to the IHSA State Volleyball Tournament. And in 2012, Edwards County High School renamed their gym to the "Linda Oxby Gymnasium" in her honor.

In 2011, Ms. Oxby was diagnosed with cancer, but remained dedicated to her community, school, and team as she continued to coach volleyball through her treatments. On September 28th, Linda Oxby passed away after a 6-year battle with cancer, leaving behind a legacy of compassion, respect, and service. While Linda Oxby experienced phenomenal success on the court, her number of victories is unparalleled to the number of lives she impacted as a coach, teacher, colleague, and friend.

I send my most heartfelt condolences to Linda Oxby's family, friends, and to the entire Edwards County School District. She will be missed dearly by all of those she has touched.

IN RECOGNITION OF KENNETH BIANCHI, 2017 LACKAWANNA COLUMBUS DAY ASSOCIATION ITALIAN MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kenneth Bianchi, who will be recognized as the Italian Man of the Year by the Lackawanna Columbus Day Association as they celebrate the 525th anniversary of Columbus' discovery of America.

Born and raised in West Scranton to Deno and Frances Ranakoski Bianchi, Ken received his Bachelor's Degree in Education from Mansfield University and continued postgraduate studies at Penn State University. While at Mansfield, Ken played varsity basketball and spent one year as team captain.

In 1967, Ken began his teaching career in the Line Mountain School District in Northumberland County, Pennsylvania. He returned to Scranton a year later to teach history and physical education at Cathedral High School, where he served as Athletic Director. Ken went on to teach for the Scranton School District, where he remained until his retirement in 2004.

Ken was head boys basketball coach at Scranton Technical High School from 1976 to

1991. In 1997, he became the head coach for boys basketball at Abington Heights High School. During his coaching career, Ken has lead his teams to victory 747 times, and they made the ELITE 8 in the state three times, with last year's squad ending up one of the Final Four teams in Pennsylvania. Ken's teams have won 22 straight District II playoff games and have won the District II Championship the past six years.

In 1985, Ken received a citation from the Pennsylvania House of Representatives when his Scranton Tech team won the Lackawanna League Southern Division Championship for the first time in twenty years. In 2005, the Scranton Times-Tribune recognized Ken as one of Northeastern Pennsylvania's top twenty-five coaches of all time. In 2006, he was inducted into the Northeast Chapter of the Pennsylvania Hall of Fame. The Times-Tribune also honored Ken by naming him Coach of the Year in 2011 and 2016. He also received The Joseph M. Butler Memorial Award in 2016 in recognition of his contribution to Scholastic athletics.

It is an honor to recognize Ken for his outstanding career as an educator and coach. I am grateful for all the work he's done to shape young minds throughout his lifetime.

TRIBUTE TO JOANN EACCARINO

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Ms. JoAnn Eaccarino upon her retirement from the Child and Family Agency of Southeastern Connecticut.

For 23 years, JoAnn served the Child and Family Agency of Southeastern Connecticut's school-based health centers through skilled and compassionate care for children, steady support for the centers' medical and behavioral health professionals, and integration of these services with the agency's child care, after-school, and outpatient behavioral health services. Prior to her service in the health centers, JoAnn served her country with distinction as a nurse in the United States Air Force from 1974 to 1977, before being discharged with a Commendation Medal at the rank of Captain.

Through her distinguished career, JoAnn has dedicated herself to improving the health and well-being of individuals in a variety of hospital, outpatient primary care, military, and private, non-profit settings. JoAnn has been a passionate, statewide advocate for improved access to quality medical and behavioral health care through her years of leadership within the Connecticut Association of School-Based Health Centers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Eaccarino's career-long dedication to improving the health status of Connecticut's children and families through compassionate, direct care and tireless advocacy.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF KEANSBURG, NEW JERSEY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Borough of Keansburg, New Jersey as it celebrates its centennial this year. It is my honor to join with its officials and residents in commemorating this significant milestone.

With its beautiful shoreline and proximity to New York City, the area attracted visitors from the north that helped transform Keansburg from a fishing community to a resort town dating back to 1917. Over the years, its location and affordability, as well as the Keansburg Amusement Park, helped the borough develop into a year-round residential town.

Today, Keansburg continues to grow, revitalizing its business district, improving its recreational resources and expanding its community activities. Although the town was devastated by Superstorm Sandy in 2012, the community remains resilient and continues to rebuild. In 2016, the borough celebrated the opening of the new Joseph Caruso Elementary School, a 122,000 square-foot state of the art facility for kindergarten through fourth grade students.

In its 100th year, the borough is governed by Mayor George Hoff, Deputy Mayor Thomas Foley and Council members Arthur Boden, James Cocuzza, Sr. and Sean Tonne, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in marking the 100th anniversary of the Borough of Keansburg and celebrating its rich history.

HONORING THE CAPITOL HILL JAZZ FOUNDATION

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Capitol Hill Jazz Foundation as it celebrates its inaugural annual event, Hill Fest, during Capitol Hill Jazz Week in the District of Columbia.

The Capitol Hill Jazz Foundation was conceived after recognizing a need for jazz in the Washington, D.C.-area and the unique historical and educational opportunities it provides to musicians.

The mission of the Foundation is to serve the Washington, D.C. jazz community by providing a weekly jam session, an annual jazz festival and arts advocacy on behalf of D.C. jazz musicians. The Foundation seeks to assist Washington, D.C.-based jazz musicians, venues and jazz education programs.

This week, the Capitol Hill Jazz Foundation celebrates its Hill Fest, which brings together musicians, community leaders and policy professionals to address policy concerns that directly affect musicians at the local and na-

tional level. Hill Fest will also serve as an outlet for local music vendors to be introduced to a broader audience.

Therefore, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Capitol Hill Jazz Foundation during Capitol Hill Jazz Week in the District of Columbia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, I mistakenly voted NAY on Roll Call Vote 550 for S. 782—To reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Taskforce Program, and for other purposes. I intended to vote YEA on the measure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to personal reasons, I unfortunately missed votes on September 27th and September 28th.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 538, YEA on Roll Call No. 539, YEA on Roll Call No. 540, NAY on Roll Call No. 541, YEA on Roll Call No. 542, and YEA on Roll Call No. 543.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROSS MACCIOCCO, 2017 LACKAWANNA COLUMBUS DAY ASSOCIATION ITALIAN MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ross Macciocco, who will be recognized as the Italian Man of the Year by the Lackawanna Columbus Day Association as they celebrate the 525th anniversary of Columbus' discovery of America.

Ross is the son of the late Joseph and Julia Paris Macciocco and grew up on Cabrini Avenue in West Scranton. Ross is a graduate of West Scranton High School, Keystone Junior College, and East Stroudsburg University. Ross received his Bachelor's Degree in Health and Physical Education in 1972. After graduating from East Stroudsburg, Ross was hired to coach basketball by the Dunmore School District.

Ross began his coaching career at Dunmore High School in the 1980–1981 season and spent 28 seasons as Head Girls Basketball Coach. Over his tenure, Ross compiled 528 wins, 12 league championships, 7 District II Titles, and was runner-up in the 1994 State Championship. He coached three All-State players, and 24 of his players went on to compete at the collegiate level.

Ross then went on to be head coach for Scranton Preparatory School girls basketball team, where he spent 6 seasons. While at Scranton Prep he amassed 132 wins, three League Championship, one District Title, two Lynett Tournament Titles, and two AAA Elite 8 appearances. His Scranton Prep teams have had two All-State players and 10 former players went on to play college basketball.

Ross coached the Keystone State Games, Pocono Region Team in 1985–1986 and is a member of the Russell/WBCA 400–500 Victory Club. He was inducted in the Chic Feldman Hall of Fame in 2000 and the Local Chapter of the Pennsylvania Hall of Fame in 2005. He spent the 2016–2017 season as an Assistant Men's Basketball Coach at Marywood University and is currently the Boys' Varsity Assistant to Joe Ferguson at Stroudsburg High School.

Ross has been married to his wife Terry for 42 years. They reside in Dunmore, Pennsylvania. They have two daughters Tara and Jenna and three grandchildren Lucas, Mollie, and Jaxon.

It is an honor to recognize Ross as he accepts the Italian Man of the Year award by the Lackawanna Columbus Day Association. I am grateful for all the work he has done to help our young athletes strive for excellence.

HONORING PULASKI COUNTY DEPUTY BRANSON EBER

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Deputy Branson Eber of Pulaski County on his recent outstanding actions. Earlier this year, the Pulaski County Sheriff's Department awarded Deputy Eber with the Medal of Valor for the integrity and commitment he showed during a cross-county pursuit.

Deputy Eber went above and beyond to ensure the safe rescue of a fellow Hoosier. His remarkable actions led to successful communication between multiple agencies and saved a life. Deputy Eber's bravery, instinct, and commitment to service are exemplary characteristics of the men and women in our nation's law enforcement who work to keep our communities safe every day.

I am grateful for the hard work and dedication Deputy Eber has shown in his career in local law enforcement as well as in the National Guard. His spirit and courage are positive reflections on northern Indiana, and our community is a safer place to live because of his service.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Indiana's 2nd District, I want to thank Deputy Eber for his leadership, determination, and conviction. I commend the hard work of all our nation's police officers, first responders, and emergency dispatchers, and I applaud Deputy Eber's embodiment of law enforcement at its finest.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. CEDELL
BROOKS' RETIREMENT FROM
THE KING GEORGE COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Cedell Brooks, a citizen of King George County and Virginia's First District, on his retirement from the King George County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Brooks has served his community well for decades. Mr. Brooks began his career in public service as the youngest African American to be elected to a County Board of Supervisors in the Commonwealth. Mr. Brooks leadership and service continued throughout his career on the Board with many important community projects including: the establishment of Shiloh Park recreational facility, relocation of a landfill to Sealston, construction of Fire and Rescue Company #1 in Courthouse and Company #3 in Fairview Beach, in addition to overseeing the establishment of Sealston Elementary School, King George Elementary School, and King George High School. Mr. Brooks also helped the County Fire and Rescue Department transition to a full-time force to better serve the community.

During his tenure, Mr. Brooks served as the Chairman of the King George County Board of Supervisors five times, and as a member of the King George County's Social Services' Board for 20 years.

I would like to thank Mr. Brooks for his many contributions throughout his 26 year career. I wish him, his wife Carolyn, and daughter Cayla, the best of luck in their future endeavors.

HONORING THE PROJECT SELF-
SUFFICIENCY 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Project Self-Sufficiency, based in Newton, New Jersey, serving Sussex and Warren counties, on the occasion of its 30th Anniversary.

Project Self-Sufficiency was founded in 1987 with the core mission of improving families' lives by providing childcare, educating and helping single parents find jobs. Since 1987, the organization continues to stay true to its mission by emphasizing the importance of community. Project Self-Sufficiency's staff members live in the community and many, were once themselves, beneficiaries of its services.

The first Founding Board President, Michael J. Holub, played a huge role in creating the essence of Project Self-Sufficiency. Michael was a supporter in the early stages and helped nurture the project into an organization that works to enhance the lives of local community members every day.

One amazing story that comes to mind is Matthew. Matthew was 17 years old when he found out he had a daughter on the way. He knew this would bring many changes and he needed to, in his words, "man-up". He went from being a teenager sitting on his couch to working a wide variety of jobs. Even though he was making money, at 22, he still did not have his high school diploma. When Matthew joined New Jersey Youth Corps of Sussex, which at the time was a new program, he found the missing puzzle piece in his life. Through this program he was able to gain experience at his community internships and earn his GED. He graduated from the Youth Corps and his daughter was able to witness her father get his diploma and understand the power of education.

Project Self-Sufficiency has grown tremendously in the past 30 years in both the hearts and homes of residents in Sussex and Warren counties. The organization began with two staff members, who within the first year, were able to help 343 single parents and their children. Project Self-Sufficiency began as a small and passionate organization, which surpassed public expectations.

More than 25,000 families have been helped by Project Self-Sufficiency, not including the 30,000 children whose quality of life has improved immensely from this organization. Project Self-Sufficiency has helped 12,000 adults in the surrounding area in career training, and out of that number, 9,000 adults have been granted employment. This organization has conducted over 38,000 home visits and has helped families in need receive services from Project Self-Sufficiency.

Project Self-Sufficiency has always put their clients first, which is what makes them continue to be the successful organization it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Project Self-Sufficiency on the occasion of its 30th Anniversary.

INTRODUCTION OF POLICE
CAMERA ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Police Creating Accountability by Making Effective Recording Act, also known as the Police CAMERA Act, a bill I introduced earlier today with more than a dozen of my colleagues here in the House and in coordination with Senators BRIAN SCHATZ and RAND PAUL who introduced the bill today in the Senate. If enacted, this bill would establish a grant program to assist state and local law enforcement with the deployment of body-worn camera programs.

Safe communities require good police.

Good policing requires public trust.

Unfortunately, in far too many communities, that trust has become strained.

In the wake of recent police shootings, our nation is facing sobering questions about the basic fairness of our criminal justice system. We face sobering questions about race.

Over the past several years, the wider availability of video has shined a much-needed light on police use of deadly force. Without video of places like North Charleston, Staten Island, Chicago, Cleveland, Baton Rouge, Tulsa and Falcon Heights, Minnesota the world might never know what occurred.

The more we see of these types of videos, the more we are left to wonder about all the incidents that were not recorded.

Had there been better video of the shooting of Darius Stewart in my home town of Memphis, it might have helped to better inform the grand jury that, sadly, refused to indict the police officer who was responsible.

Justice is supposed to be blind, but it is not supposed to be blind to the facts.

Police body cameras can help provide evidence and restore some much-needed trust.

They can protect both police and citizens alike.

The vast majority of police are well meaning, dedicated public servants, and we depend upon them to keep us safe from criminals. They have dangerous jobs, as we have seen all too frequently.

But the fact remains some officers go beyond the law in a callous disregard for due process. Their actions damage the public trust that is essential for good police to be able to serve and protect our communities.

Police body cameras, alone, won't solve this problem. But they are an important step in the right direction.

I would like to thank Senators SCHATZ and PAUL for their leadership on this issue and for partnering with me on this legislation.

I also thank my colleagues who have signed on as cosponsors of this legislation and I urge all Members to help pass the Police CAMERA Act quickly.

HONORING TENNESSEE STATE
UNIVERSITY IN NASHVILLE,
TENNESSEE

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tennessee State University for its 45 years of participation in the Federal Depository Library Program. Tennessee State University and its renowned library are not only invaluable to the Middle Tennessee community, but to America.

Tennessee State University has been a staple of the community for more than a century. Its library is unique and filled with knowledge. In 1945, Ms. Lois H. Daniel was appointed the director. She led the library for 31 years, reaching new heights and creating the Library Service Program to train school librarians. She also ushered in a new partnership in 1972 when Tennessee State University joined the Federal Depository Library Program.

Through the Federal Depository Library Program, Tennessee State University helps maintain access to government documents for the entire nation. It preserves history by storing and providing public access to our laws, rules, research, and other documents. The Library

Service Program has thrived at Tennessee State University, and now it is leading the way in transitioning to the digital age. It is fitting that a historic university with a bright future should be a caretaker for our government's documents.

I would also like to honor the countless people that have helped grow the Library Service Program, including Dr. Evelyn Fancher, Dr. Yildiz Binkley, Dr. Murle Kenerson, Ms. Laverne Walker, Ms. Jessie Hughes, Mr. Crayton Dudley, Ms. Sharon Johnson, Ms. Sandra Peterson, Ms. Anita Etheridge, and Ms. Angel Sloss.

I am proud to celebrate Tennessee State University's Martha M. Brown/Lois H. Daniel Library. It has served our nation well during its first 45 years of public service as a Federal Depository Library.

HONORING BRIDGETTE BEATTY JONES

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Bridgette Beatty Jones, former District Office Manager of Mississippi's "Fighting 4th" Congressional District.

I am blessed with a team of professionals who hit the ground running when I first came to Congress in 2011. The transition to a new office could have been overwhelming but for the energy and leadership of Bridgette Jones leading the way for my team in the district.

One important aspect of Bridgette's work was planning and executing public events, such as the Congressional Art Competition, our Salute to the Military, our Youth Leadership Summit, and our Military Service Academy Day. Today, on the occasion of our annual Academy Day, I salute Bridgette in appreciation for her passionate leadership of this event.

Like the nominees and academy cadets Bridgette worked with over the years, she too represents the qualities of an excellent academy candidate. In addition to her sharp, professional, albeit pint-sized, appearance, Bridgette possesses amazing intelligence, a devotion to serving her community, a powerful work ethic, seemingly endless athleticism—especially on the tennis court—and a noble character.

On my staff, she best understood the process of Academy Day, from coordinating with academy representatives and service members, schools, and families involved in the event, right down to the smallest detail. Bridgette's contagious enthusiasm was greatly appreciated, as she facilitated the work of the selection board and the cadet nominees who would come to represent our district at the academies.

For these reasons, and so many more, I am proud and grateful for the opportunity to honor Bridgette Jones, my friend and former District Office Manager on the House floor today. I wish her and her husband, Bud Jones, as well as their children, Paige and A.J., all the best for the future, and thank her for her service to

South Mississippi. Bridgette will always be a member of Team Palazzo.

2017 MERIT SCHOLARS

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize seven students from my district who have received 2017 National Merit Scholarships.

The criteria that must be met to receive one of these scholarships is quite difficult. In fact, of the 15,000 finalists selected, only half will actually receive scholarships.

The recipients of this prestigious scholarship are Connor Schmidt of Ham Lake, Benjamin Caswell of Shoreview, Raffi Toghrumadijan of Blaine, Rachel Cho of Blaine, Piper Christenson of Spring Lake Park, Catherine Lewis of Blaine, and Kenneth Truong of Coon Rapids.

Each one of these students has big plans for their future, which include careers in medicine, science, and engineering—all fields that are critically important to the success of our nation.

I congratulate each of these students on receiving this scholarship, and I look forward to watching them achieve great success in their respective careers.

Good work and good luck.

HONORING JACOBY CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jacoby Creek Elementary School, which was selected as a 2017 National Blue Ribbon School, in the Exemplary High Performing Schools category, by the U.S. Department of Education. This highly competitive award reflects outstanding academic achievement and the highest caliber of professional service and family and community engagement.

With over 400 students from a variety of socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds throughout rural Humboldt County, Jacoby Creek Elementary School offers a well-rounded educational program that challenges its students academically in a safe and inclusive climate while fostering a lifelong love of learning. In addition to a staff dedicated to helping students meet their fullest potential, Jacoby Creek Elementary School's educational success is uniquely supported by extremely high parent and community participation in all aspects of the school program. The school has earned a strong reputation for academic excellence and prides itself on developing students who are kind, productive, and considerate citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this hard-earned distinction reflects a true community success. From the

amazing students and their families to the staff, administrators, and extended community, Jacoby Creek Elementary School has developed an effective education model for the state and nation, empowering students of today to be the problem-solvers, inventors, and pioneers of tomorrow. Please join me in congratulating Jacoby Creek Elementary School on this impressive achievement.

HONORING THE CALDWELL PUBLIC LIBRARY'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Caldwell Public Library, located in the Borough of Caldwell, New Jersey, on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

The forerunner of the present Caldwell Public Library dates back to the post-Revolutionary War era. Pioneers purchased books and founded a library in 1804. The number of books increased relatively few to over five hundred volumes in the ensuing years. As a result of personal or home ownership of books, the interest in the library waned, resulting in its dissolution in 1835.

In early 1894, Caldwell High School held a faculty meeting to discuss reading material for students. At that time, nothing was available except books owned by the residents in the community. After several meetings concerning this matter, the committee concluded that a library was needed for the students as well as for the greater public.

On December 4, 1894, the library opened its doors and the circulation for that first day was thirty-five books. Patrons paid a very small fee to borrow books. For several years, this was the sole source of library revenue.

By 1907, Professor Hedden, Superintendent of Schools, requested the Caldwell Borough Council to submit to the voters a referendum to establish a free library under the State Library Act. The measure was ultimately accepted and approved.

On June 8, 1908 a letter from the Carnegie Library Foundation offered a sum of seven thousand five hundred dollars to construct a library. For the next nine years, the library board was confronted with problems, which hindered the construction of a new edifice. Acquiring a suitable location was the principal issue, until Mr. George W. Canfield of West Caldwell, generously donated \$2,000.00 toward the purchase of a site for the library. With the contribution, and donations from other interested persons, a total of \$3,000.00 was accumulated to purchase a new location.

On October 12, 1917 the Caldwell Library was formally dedicated. Mayor Peck, who, at the time, was President of the Library Trustees, was delivered the key of the building.

During the First World War, the Council of National Defense made an appeal for magazines and books for soldiers on transport ships. Miss Hasler designated the library as a collection center for books from this area. The public responded enthusiastically by donating more than five hundred volumes.

On Armistice Day, November 12, 1919, two bronze tablets, installed on each side of the front entrance of the Caldwell Library, were dedicated and unveiled during auspicious ceremonies. On Memorial Day and Veterans Day, the James Caldwell Post 185 of the American Legion, and various local veterans organizations conduct joint exercises at this memorial.

This event served as a turning point for Caldwell, in that the library became a focal point for the community; generating civic volunteerism. The "Friends of the Library," continue to this day to promote its goals.

The purpose and aim of Caldwell library is to meet the cultural and intellectual needs of the people of the area. It is with this goal in mind that the library hopes to continue and expand its services to the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating the Caldwell Public Library on the occasion of its Centennial Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING DOUG McCUMBER

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize Doug McCumber for his leadership and service to his community of Tuscola, IL.

Doug graduated from Tuscola High School in 1967 and then the University of Illinois in 1971. After graduating from the University of Illinois, Doug began his 40 year career in banking and a life dedicated to his community. Over time, Doug served in many capacities such as the President of Tuscola's Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce, and Community Development Corporation. Doug was also active in Tuscola's United Methodist Church as a member of its Board of Trustees.

An avid sports fan, Doug enjoyed cheering on the Illini and St. Louis Cardinals, but that was nothing compared to his love for all things Tuscola Warriors. In fact, most knew Doug as the "Voice of the Warriors" as he was the play-by-play announcer for Tuscola High School's football team for 43 seasons.

Doug McCumber passed away September 26th, remembered as a beloved family man to his wife and children, a devoted Christian to his congregation, and a public servant to the entire Tuscola community.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to send my deepest sympathies to Doug McCumber's family, friends, and all of those he impacted in service to his town.

HONORING THE NEW SHARON AND OSKALOOSA FIRE DEPARTMENTS

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group of firefighters from my dis-

trict. Millions across the country watched Hurricane Harvey hit parts of Texas in late August, causing tragic loss of life and devastating damage to areas such as Houston. A group of Iowa first responders with a history of helping out during national disasters knew they had to help.

On Thursday, September 14th, members of the New Sharon Fire and Oskaloosa Fire Departments loaded up materials and drove twenty-two hours to Rockport, Texas to help a community in need. Over the course of their time in Texas, these volunteers worked tirelessly to help their fellow first responders clean up and recover from this storm. In a time of disaster, Iowans step up to help out those in need. To the volunteers from the New Sharon and Oskaloosa Fire Departments, I am in awe of your selflessness, and you have undoubtedly made a significant impact on a community devastated by Hurricane Harvey.

A CHIEF HISTORIAN

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the renowned historian Dennis E. Frye for his dedication to preserving our nation's history and for his passion on sharing our history with anyone lucky enough to meet him.

Dennis Frye serves as the Chief Historian at Harper's Ferry National Historical Park. Dennis has authored several books on the Civil War and has lectured on the topic throughout the nation.

Recently, my staff had the good fortune of taking a tour of Harper's Ferry, led by Dennis. He not only gave them great insight into the battle that took place at Harper's Ferry, but he also gave them a wider understanding of one of the most tumultuous times in our nation's history.

As Dennis so aptly pointed out on their tour, while our nation's history has not always been pleasant, it is critical that we never try to forget or erase it. If we do, then we have not learned from our history and we are more likely to repeat mistakes of the past.

I thank Dennis for sharing his knowledge and wisdom with my staff. They will never forget him.

IN RECOGNITION OF MID-CITIES TEXAS CHAPTER OF THE LINKS, INC.

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Mid-Cities Texas Chapter of The Links, Incorporated as they are awarded the 2017 Community Service Award from the Pro-Duffers Foundation for their work to promote programs that provide services to protect, enhance and enrich the educational, eco-

nomc, cultural and social aspects of the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex.

The Links was chartered on April 20, 1985 and has since expanded its association to 280 chapters worldwide with more than 14,000 predominantly African-American members globally. Led by President Billie Hawkins, the Mid-Cities Texas Chapter of The Links boasts a coalition of 50 professional women focused on a commitment to community, comradery, and communication. To commemorate their 30th anniversary, the Mid-Cities Chapter donated \$30,000 to six local charities whose mission, vision and work in the community aligned with the service focus areas of the chapter: services to youth, the arts, health and human services, and removing barriers for national and international African American leadership development.

In years past, the Mid-Cities Texas Chapter collaborated with The University of Texas at Arlington and The University of Dallas to develop programs encouraging K-12 students to consider careers in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM). The organization is also responsible for organizing Project ALERT (Alzheimer's Link to Education, Research and Treatment) with The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center's Alzheimer's Disease Research Center helping educating African-Americans about the disease and the importance of participating in clinical trials. Additionally, the Mid-Cities chapter established the Sallye Moore Scholarship Funding, awarding more than 30 four-year college scholarships to graduating seniors, and funded school construction in South Africa among other service projects aimed at empowering the African diasporic community.

I honor the Mid-Cities Chapter of The Links, a dedicated community service organization.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HAZELWOOD CEMETERY

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Hazelwood Cemetery, which is located in Springfield, Missouri.

The Hazelwood Cemetery was officially dedicated on October 26, 1867, and was originally located several miles outside of city limits. However, despite the original location outside of the city, over the years Springfield has grown around the Hazelwood Cemetery.

On the 14th of October this year, the Hazelwood Cemetery will celebrate its sesquicentennial anniversary. 150 years of both history and service to the Springfield community will be celebrated on this day. The Hazelwood Cemetery honors John Polk Campbell, the founder of Springfield, John T. Woodruff, the visionary of Route 66 and many other notable members of the local Springfield community.

On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the significant role the Hazelwood Cemetery has played in honoring the lives of the Springfield community.

OPERA AT FLORHAM 35TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Opera at Florham, located in Fairleigh Dickinson University, in the Borough of Madison, New Jersey, on the occasion of their 35th Anniversary. From humble beginnings, this organization's mission is to educate and provide affordable operatic and related musical performances.

In 1982 Violetta DuPont co-founded the organization as an extension of Fairleigh Dickinson University's Music Department. Since then Opera at Florham has been providing outstanding operatic and other vocal selections from the American Song Book. Each performance features three outstanding vocalists who have performed across the country. To this day, Opera at Florham is New Jersey's only long running opera recital series.

Part of Opera at Florham's mission is to provide stage and role opportunities to young and upcoming artists. The inaugural Violetta DuPont Vocal Competition was held in 1987. This annual competition provides young operatic talent an opportunity to compete for cash prizes in front of judges and a live audience. In 1995, Opera at Florham became a 501(c)(3) non-profit charitable organization and continues to be affiliated with Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Opera at Florham is most known for its staged opera. Each season four musicales are performed in Lenfell Hall at Fairleigh Dickinson University, in the former residence of the Vanderbilt's and Twombly's. These musicales are priced affordably, yet feature high artistic excellence. These events showcase the drama, passion, music, and story that good opera is known for.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Opera at Florham on the occasion of their 35th Anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF UNITED
COURT OF THE LONE STAR EM-
PIRE'S DALLAS CHAPTER

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the United Court of the Lone Star Empire (UCLSE) in celebration of over 40 years of service to the Dallas LGBTQ community.

The UCLSE is a chapter of the International Court System, one of the largest LGBTQ organizations in the United States. In 1986, the UCLSE hosted its first coronation and has since worked tirelessly to serve those in the Dallas Community affected by HIV/AIDS.

Members of the UCLSE have fiercely served the LGBTQ community by addressing the needs of those suffering from HIV/AIDS.

Due to the work of fearless LGBTQ advocacy groups, like the UCLSE, they have made a long lasting impact on the local community. UCLSE serves to ensure that Americans of any sexual orientation are treated fairly, are granted equal access to healthcare, and retain equal protection of their rights under the law.

The generosity of the UCLSE extends not only to those fighting HIV/AIDS in North Texas, but also includes a host of other organizations across the country. UCLSE beneficiaries include the Aids Interfaith Network, Aids Services of Dallas, the Greg Dollgener Memorial Aids Fund, the Sharon St. Cyr Fund, the Legacy Founders Cottage and Counseling Center, and the Resource Nutrition Program.

Over the past 40 years, the UCLSE has raised over \$500,000 for its charity partners in the Dallas area. In addition to its efforts, the UCLSE also supports other local organizations with similar missions and endeavors through collaborative community efforts.

The UCLSE will honor the work of its inspirational members in October 2017 at its XLIII annual coronation in Dallas, Texas.

I honor the United Court of the Lone Star Empire, an institution of the Dallas and Texas LGBTQ community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBU-
TIONS OF MICHAEL LIEBERMAN

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the contributions of an extraordinary individual, Michael Lieberman, who in September celebrated 35 years at the Anti-Defamation League. Over his 35 year tenure with ADL, Michael has made invaluable contributions to the civil rights community on issues such as religious freedom, fighting anti-Semitism and all forms of discrimination, and striking the right balance between security and civil liberties.

As ADL's Washington Counsel, his advocacy for hate crime legislation is particularly noteworthy. Michael worked to secure passage of a comprehensive federal hate crimes law for more than 15 years. His leadership on this issue was instrumental in the passage of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which was signed into law by President Obama in 2009. Michael also chairs the Hate Crime Coalition for the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the most important civil rights coalition organization in Washington, and is widely recognized as one of our nation's foremost experts on hate crime laws.

As ADL's point person on Federal and state response to bullying and bias-motivated violence, Michael has participated in a number of academic and law enforcement training seminars on the subject—including training at the FBI Academy at Quantico. He has written numerous pieces on the issue, including training manuals and articles for criminal justice and civil rights publications. In 2015 he received the Justice Department's 2015 Meritorious Public Service Award for his leadership work in building coalitions to combat hate violence.

Michael embodies ADL's mission. He works tirelessly to stop the defamation of the Jewish people and to secure justice and fair treatment to all. His entire career has focused on making the world a better place for all individuals, regardless of who they are or where they came from. He is a remarkable professional, mentor, and friend. Everyone that has an opportunity to work with Michael is constantly impressed by his drive and passion to make a difference. His work at the League has made an impact on countless lives, and we thank him for his substantial contributions to the community and our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at an event off the Capitol Hill campus, I was unable to make Roll Call vote No. 545. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN NATIONAL
DAY

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 106th national day of Taiwan. The United States and Taiwan have enjoyed a fruitful partnership for decades, and I would like to wish the people of Taiwan a very Happy National Day.

Our two countries' partnership has flourished thanks to a mutual commitment to democratic values and constitutional government. Through its many successful elections and commitment to an open election process, Taiwan serves as a strong example of democracy for not only the Asia-Pacific region, but also the world. Yet it is not just our commitment to democratic and constitutional values that ties our two countries together.

In 2016, Taiwan ranked as the United States' 10th largest trading partner and 8th largest export market for U.S. agricultural products. In fact, Taiwan is Minnesota's 5th largest export market, with over \$450 million in exports sent to our friends in 2016. This is a relationship I am proud to support and urge my colleagues to find areas where our two countries can partner to our mutual benefit.

The framework for the United States' relationship with Taiwan, the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances, were crafted almost four decades ago, but our belief in their principles remains resolute. With continued commitment to this important relationship, I would like to again wish the people of Taiwan a Happy National Day.

HONORING THE NEW JERSEY
STATE CONFERENCE OF THE
NAACP

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the New Jersey State Conference of the NAACP as it holds its annual convention in the Township of Parsippany, part of New Jersey's 111th Congressional District. I am honored to have Morris County host the nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization. The New Jersey State Conference of the NAACP is commended for bringing together advocates in one place under the theme: "Relating to the Past, Understanding the Present, Preparing for the future."

The NAACP has more than 500,000 members throughout the world serving as key leaders in civil rights, campaigning for equal opportunity and conducting voter mobilization. New Jersey, the nation's most densely populated state, has 41 branches, 9 college chapters, a prison unit, 15 youth councils, and 2 high school chapters devoting its time, through volunteerism, to close the gaps of inequality in the many social issues challenging us today—health, employment, education, justice, media and the environment. New Jerseyans are working hard to ensure the legacies of the great Civil Rights Leaders before us, live on. Richard T. Smith, New Jersey's NAACP Chapter President, was just named one of New Jersey's "Most Influential African-Americans" in South Jersey Journal. In Richard's words, "we will fight for freedom until all people have realized the equal hand of justice." With esteemed commendation, I thank Mr. Smith for his leadership and wish the New Jersey State NAACP conference a successful convention and year ahead.

By bringing together the state's leaders in education, religion, business, health care, public policy, and social advocacy, the convention fosters the very conversations we need to be having in order to break down racial barriers, move the nation forward and reach equality for Americans once and for all.

DEFERRED ACTION FOR
CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS PROGRAM

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last month, the President made the irresponsible decision to rescind the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. DACA gives hundreds of thousands of young individuals the opportunity to come out from the shadows and contribute to our great country without fear of being sent back to a country that they barely know.

Juan Carlos Cerda, a community organizer with the Texas Organizing project and recent graduate of Yale has already seen firsthand how much of an impact this policy change can

have. Due to an error in USCIS's system, Juan Carlos's DACA status was temporarily suspended in the fall of 2016. He was forced to take a leave of absence from teaching at an elementary school in the Dallas Independent School District. He was even denied access to volunteer on campus. If this is the havoc that rescinding DACA can have on one individual, imagine how it would impact the 113,000 recipients in North Texas and the 800,000 recipients across the country.

DACA has allowed Erik Burgos, a Store Systems Engineer and graduate of Southern Methodist University, the opportunity to assist local students in achieving their academic ambitions as he currently does in his spare time. Without DACA he would be forced into the shadows and would no longer have a meaningful impact on students' lives.

Because of the President's decision Maria Roman, Cynthia De La Torre Castro, and countless others would be prevented from pursuing the careers that they studied on university campuses across this great country. Bouzidi Najoa would be forced to return to a country where her family faced persecution by their government without her parents or siblings. Simply put, this policy change would not just drastically impact DREAMers, it would impact their friends, families, and communities.

Mr. Speaker, these people are no different than you or I. They go to the same schools with our children, they're involved with their local church groups, and work hard every day to ensure that they too can one day live the American dream. This is why we need to bring the DREAM Act to the floor and pass this important bipartisan piece of legislation. These DREAMers have only known one home. It's time for this Congress to step up to the plate and let these young people know that we want them to always consider America their true home.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
KATHLEEN PEILING CHANG, MD

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Kathleen Peiling Chang, MD, a physician, wife, mother, sister, daughter, Ironman triathlete, and tireless school volunteer. Kathleen left this world peacefully on Friday, July 28, 2017 after a six-year battle with breast cancer. She was the center of the universe to her loving husband, Teddy Chen, and their two sons, Matthew, aged 8, and Alex, aged 6. I have had the honor of knowing Kathleen and Teddy and their beautiful family for many years.

Kathleen was born in December 1976 and grew up in Southern California where she and her sister enjoyed many trips to the beach and Disneyland. She attended the University of California, Berkeley, and after graduating with degrees in neurobiology and psychology, she earned her MD at the University of California, San Diego. Kathleen completed her pediatric residency and infectious diseases fellowship at Children's Hospital & Research Center Oak-

land. She married Teddy during her residency and after completing her fellowship, she practiced at Kaiser Permanente in San Jose.

During their time together Kathleen and Teddy embarked on many adventures, including triathlons, scuba diving in underwater caverns, hiking the lava fields of Kilauea, climbing Half Dome, and ice climbing on glaciers in Switzerland.

While pregnant with Alex, at 34 years old, Kathleen was diagnosed with stage I breast cancer. Alex was induced and born a few days early so that Kathleen could begin treatment. After recovering from chemotherapy and surgery, Kathleen went back to work, ran half marathons with Teddy, and focused on being a mother. But the cancer was relentless, and exactly two months after running the Orange County Half Marathon in 2013, she was diagnosed with stage IV cancer, with extensive bone metastases causing pathologic fractures in her spine, and unresectable liver metastases. Kathleen's oncologist didn't expect her to live through the end of the year, and discussed transitioning to hospice care. But Kathleen was strong and full of will to live for her children, and searched for a better alternative. She found hope with the help of Dr. Michelle Melisko, an oncologist at the University of California, San Francisco.

During the next four years, she went back to work despite the advice of her doctors, because that was what she trained to do and she wanted to help her patients. Each time she was forced to go on disability leave, many of her patients waited for her to return. She worked part-time, ostensibly to rest and take it easy on her days off. Instead, she filled those days off with volunteering at her children's school, and continued to be a supermom, somehow juggling motherhood, her medical career, and cancer treatment. Kathleen insisted on living life to the fullest. She did many things likely inadvisable for a stage IV cancer patient with extensive bone metastases and several pathologic fractures including vertebrae, ribs, and hip. She ran or walked several 5Ks, biked, skied, bungee trampolined, rode roller coasters, and other things that made her doctors cringe. She also had the chance to see her children finish second grade and kindergarten, and renew her wedding vows with Teddy as the children looked on.

The cancer, however, was implacable, notwithstanding Kathleen's efforts to live life to the fullest. She faced each heartbreaking setback with incredible strength and courage, all the way to the end. Kathleen is survived by her husband, Teddy Chen, their two sons Matthew and Alex, her sister, Jennifer, and her parents, Kuo-Cheng and Christine. She is also survived by her extended family from Kaiser Permanente and from her residency at Children's Hospital Oakland, who provided love and support during her travails. She is and forever will be greatly missed. Her extraordinary life was cut too short at 40 years old, but the things she did in life will ripple through the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. ALICIA
WOLFE WISECARVER

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mrs. Alicia Wolfe Wisecarver for her service to my office and the people of California's Twenty First Congressional District.

Alicia Wolfe was born on June 28, 1987 to Don and Mary Kay Wolfe in Anaheim, California. The Wolfe Family eventually settled in Clovis, California where she attended and graduated from Clark Middle School and Clovis High School. She has three siblings, her brother Christopher, sister, Laura, and her identical twin, Emily.

After graduating from Clovis High School in 2005, Alicia went on to attend the University of California at Los Angeles where she received two Bachelor of Arts Degrees in both History and Political Science in 2009. Alicia then returned to Fresno to obtain her Masters in History at California State University, Fresno in 2011.

In July 2013, Alicia joined my team as Constituent Services Representative. She quickly proved to be a valuable asset to my Congressional Office and earned the title of Constituent Services Director. During her time in my office, Alicia maintained an impeccable work record and set high standards of organization and customer service. She has an excellent eye for detail and was instrumental in the daily operations of my District Office. In addition to casework, Alicia was responsible for my U.S. Military Service Academy Pro-

gram, where she helped students throughout California's Central Valley realize their dreams of attending a military service academy.

Alicia's willingness to reach out to the community created great relationships with local veteran organizations and federal agencies. She was respected by her peers and was able to create and foster connections with constituents, business leaders, and public officials, all of which are integral skills of Congressional Staffers.

On May 27, 2017, Alicia married her husband Mr. Lee Wisecarver in Kingsburg, California. Outside of work, the newlyweds enjoy spending time with family, especially their two dogs, Duke and Peter. Peter too, was part of our office family, serving as the unofficial mascot.

Mrs. Wisecarver's time with my office came to a close on September 1, 2017 so she may pursue her new career as a teacher at Buchanan High School in her hometown of Clovis, California. Knowing Mrs. Wisecarver, her character, and her work ethic, I have no doubt that she will achieve many great things in her future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Mrs. Wolfe Wisecarver for her public service to the people of California's Twenty First Congressional District and wishing her well as she embarks on the next chapter of her life.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all

meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 5, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 18

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice.

SH-216

OCTOBER 25

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing naval forces and the Navy's current and planned capabilities to meet those threats.

SVC-217

SENATE—Thursday, October 5, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Father of love, who made Heaven and Earth, sustain us through this day. May our lawmakers focus on Your glory and not their own. Inspire them with Your presence so that their lives will reflect Your mercy and truth. Lord, give them the wisdom to trust Your plans and to desire for You to do as You please for our Nation and world.

Forgive us when we depend primarily on our strength and ability to meet life's challenges, forgetting that You are able and eager to help us. God, our deliverer, we bless Your Name from this time forth and forever more. Thank You for Your merciful kindness that is new each day.

We pray in Your precious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, during the Obama years, many of the hard-working men and women of America's middle class felt completely forgotten. Paychecks often did not keep pace with rising costs. Opportunities for work could often seem bleak. For those men and women, the promise of a hard-earned retirement seemed to drift further and further away. For so many middle-class Americans, the last decade meant a weak economy and a decline of opportunities. People of this Nation deserve better. They deserve larger paychecks, more jobs, and better opportunities to get ahead.

This Congress is committed to helping the economy live up to its full potential once again, which is exactly why we are committed to passing tax reform. This is our once-in-a-generation opportunity to overhaul a broken

tax code that holds us back and replace it with something that actually works for the hard-working people of our country. It represents the single most important thing we can do today to get our economy back on the right track.

Working together, President Trump, his team, and the tax-writing committees in Congress have developed the framework that will help us get there. Here is what it envisions:

For American workers, we want to make your taxes lower, simpler, and fairer. We want to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more in yours.

Helping individuals and families succeed is the first aim of tax reform. Helping businesses succeed is the second aim, so we can help create more jobs and keep them right here in America.

American businesses, both large and small, face an increasingly competitive global economy. We want to put American businesses and workers on a level playing field because when they are, they can win.

We want to help bring jobs and profits back home, and once they are here, we want to give businesses the right incentives to keep them right here in America.

We want to unleash the potential of the American economy—helping you keep more of the money in your paycheck, helping businesses grow and workers succeed, helping move the economy into high gear so we can sustain real prosperity into the future for America's middle class.

These are the kinds of ideas that should be shared by everyone, Republicans and Democrats alike. Our friends across the aisle supported the need for tax reform for many years. They used to advocate it loudly. But the tone seems to be different now. What changed? The President, or so it would seem.

We know that our Democratic friends are under immense pressure from the hard left to oppose everything this President touches, but I hope they can resist that pressure and do what they know is right. After all, shouldn't we all support cutting middle-class taxes, helping small businesses, and bringing jobs and investments back to our country?

I was always under the impression that Democrats wanted to end corporate offshoring, eliminate loopholes for the wealthy, and cut middle-class taxes. Well, these are all aspects of the current tax reform framework. So there is no need for our friends to invent reasons to justify opposing tax re-

form. There is no reason to launch attacks on the tax reform framework based on made-up details that aren't actually in it. Tax reform has been a bipartisan effort in the past. It can be, and it should be, again now.

It is up to our Democratic friends to decide if they would like to engage in a serious way. I personally hope they will join us in advancing this important initiative for our country. I think we owe at least that much to the millions of Americans who felt forgotten over the last decade.

Tax reform can help move our economy into high gear. It can help deliver more jobs, higher wages, and increased opportunities for the American people. The men and women of this country deserve it, which is why I am committed to keeping up the work to get tax reform accomplished.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Quarles nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to applaud the nomination of Randal Quarles to help oversee the Federal Reserve System. Mr. Quarles is certainly eminently qualified to serve in this capacity in this important position. Through his long experience in public service and the private sector, Mr. Quarles has gained experience in financial regulation, economics, and the firsthand operations of financial institutions. He also has a proven track

record of leadership and policy management.

The Fed's responsibilities are extensive, and they are varied, and the roles Mr. Quarles has been nominated for come during a unique period in the Fed's history. The years ahead will be decisive for the development of the Federal Reserve, the American economy, as well as domestic and international financial reform. It is paramount that the Fed be equipped with a well-rounded leadership team so it can meet the many challenges and opportunities of maintaining monetary and financial stability. I firmly believe that Mr. Quarles is an ideal fit to take on such responsibilities—for the success of the Federal Reserve and the good of our Nation.

In closing, I applaud and strongly support the President's nominee to help oversee the Federal Reserve System. I know him personally. I know what a fine man he is. I know what an excellent leader he is. He will do a good job.

Importantly, I would note that it is the intention to confirm Mr. Quarles to the position of Vice Chair for Supervision—another essential role.

It is critical that Mr. Quarles begin his work at the Fed as soon as possible. There really is no time to waste. He will do a great job.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote today on the confirmation of Mr. Randal Quarles to be a member of the Federal Reserve. Instead, I am in Las Vegas, meeting with victims of and first responders to the deadliest mass shooting in modern U.S. history.

On the question of Mr. Quarles's nomination, I want to make clear that I would have voted "no" had I been present. While an official in the Bush administration Treasury Department in the lead-up to the economic crisis of 2007 to 2009, Mr. Quarles failed to take action to prevent the build-up of risk that ultimately led to hundreds of thousands of foreclosures and evictions in Nevada. In fact, Mr. Quarles during that period repeatedly maintained that the financial system was safe, that large banks were well-capitalized, and that the housing market was strong, notwithstanding clear signs of escalating risk. After serving in the Treasury Department, Mr. Quarles was the beneficiary of the second-largest "loss share" agreement in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's history. This agreement provided a taxpayer-backed guarantee and allowed Mr. Quarles to profit substantially off of the failure of a large bank.

If confirmed, I hope that Mr. Quarles will exceed my expectations and become a strong advocate for a safe and resilient American financial system.

However, I cannot in good conscience vote to confirm him given my concerns about his past record.

Thank you.

NOMINATION OF LEE FRANCIS CISSNA

Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote today on the confirmation of Mr. Lee Francis Cissna, to be Director of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS. Instead, I am in Las Vegas helping my constituents in the aftermath of the worst mass shooting in modern American history.

On the question of Mr. Cissna's nomination, I want to make my opposition to his confirmation clear. I do not believe Mr. Cissna to be qualified to lead the USCIS. This decision is based on his prior experience, as well as his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. Cissna stated during his confirmation hearing that he had a role on President Trump's transition team and he offered his "technical assistance" in crafting some of the President's draconian immigration policies. Additionally, it is my belief that Mr. Cissna does not have the management experience necessary to oversee a large organization like the USCIS.

If confirmed, I hope that Mr. Cissna will surpass my expectations and serve this country well as USCIS Director. The role of the USCIS in implementing and administering our immigration benefits is too important for any other result. I believe strongly in the importance of immigrants to the culture and economy of the United States, and I hope Mr. Cissna's actions as Director show that he agrees. However, I cannot in good conscience vote to confirm someone about whom I have so many concerns.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we continue to grieve with the people of Las Vegas and families of the injured and the deceased, when I think of the pictures I see of those beautiful young people who had the best of life ahead of them, we ache for them. But our thoughts must turn to action so this doesn't happen again.

What can we do as a nation to change? Because surely when there are more mass shootings this year than there are the number of days this year, when we average more than one mass shooting per day, something has to change.

I am sure that if you asked the grieving families whether they want the laws to change so this might not happen again, the overwhelming majority would say yes, they would want us to do something. If we could talk to those brave souls who were killed and are now in Heaven, they would say: Do something. They wouldn't say: Let's wait. They wouldn't say: Leave things alone. The fact that they were killed, the fact that there were so many injured—they wouldn't think it is political to try to save their lives or prevent somebody else from dying the way they did. So when folks say: Don't bring politics into this, that it is inappropriate, I am sure the families of the loved ones who were lost would agree with me that it is appropriate and important and necessary.

Politics is where we are supposed to come together and debate the great problems of our time in order to find solutions to them. Politics is how we are supposed to make our country a better, safer, more prosperous place to live. And there is no more appropriate time than now to talk about the issue of gun violence.

Yesterday, President Trump visited Las Vegas. I am glad he went to show our solidarity and remind everyone there that they have the full support of the Nation. But he didn't talk about guns. There is a huge opportunity he missed to lead this Nation in a reasonable, moderate debate on gun safety, but that opportunity is not over. The President still has the opportunity. All eyes are on the President to see if he will grasp the opportunity and lead the Nation to do something reasonable and moderate about guns and gun safety.

President Trump, are you going to wait to hear what the NRA says first? Are you going to wait for the NRA to give you the green light? You ran your campaign saying you were beholden to no one. You fashion yourself as a strong man. Well, are you going to show that you are not beholden to anyone now? Are you going to show your strength now? Are you going to be the first Republican President in a generation to buck the NRA? You know what the right thing to do is.

I say to President Trump: Come out and say that you support and would sign a law to ban bump stocks—the modification used by the Las Vegas gunman to make his weapons automatic. That is small, and it is the right thing to do. Don't wait for the NRA to make up their mind. Do it.

Of course, banning bump stocks can't be our only response. It is hardly enough. Even though we should do whatever we can in this body in obedience to the NRA, we must do more. Abandoning efforts to deregulate silencers would be the next step. The police were able to figure out where the gunman was because of the noise from his gun in the Mandalay Bay Hotel.

Let's forget about implementing a national concealed carry reciprocity. My police officers in Times Square don't want to let someone who has had no check, who might have a mental derangement like Paddock, come to Times Square—and they can't do anything about it; that is what that law would do—or any other heavily populated place, the downtowns of many of our big cities and even medium-sized cities, Disney World, baseball games, football stadiums. If this concealed carry reciprocity passed, crazy people could carry weapons concealed into any football stadium in America, and the police couldn't check on them and see if they had a gun.

We have to do these things. If you looked at what would be the most effective way in stopping the daily gun violence that is doable, the most important and attainable thing to do would be adopting universal background checks. It is common sense, it is measured, it is prudent, and it would be really effective.

The bill Senator MURPHY introduced yesterday is one I have been involved with for a long time, and we should see if we can get enough support to pass it. We can and should talk about these issues more. It requires only a modicum of moral and political coverage. President Trump and Republicans in Congress ought to show that moral and political courage now by bucking the NRA and engaging in a reasonable debate about commonsense gun laws.

Fully automatic weapons are already illegal, made so by a law signed by President Reagan in 1986. Banning bump stocks is entirely consistent with the books. Senator FEINSTEIN introduced a reasonable proposal. What are we waiting for, the NRA to give us a green light? That is so wrong.

If the President and Congress are so beholden to the NRA that they can't do the very bare minimum—banning a device that allowed a shooter to kill 59 Americans with ease, a device whose ban would in no way infringe on the legitimate rights of gun owners—then our politics, our means of making this country a better and safer place, will have once again failed us.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, turning to the humanitarian crisis in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, yesterday, once again, Congress received a request from the administration for a supplemental aid package that will go to help Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and other States hit by storms. It also includes some money for the Western States beset by wildfires.

It is a good first step, but it is just the start of a long recovery and relief effort that will require additional aid from this Congress. While aid and resources are necessary now, these islands are just starting to assess the

damage. Once they determine how devastating these storms actually were, we need to respond immediately to provide additional support and funds to assist their recovery and rebuilding, just as we have done for past storms and disasters. On this package, I have three points.

First, I am urging my colleagues to add additional and vital flexible funding for recovery like the community development block grant. We gave CDBG to help Texas after Harvey. We can't deprive Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands of this money.

Second, I am warning my colleagues on the other side—particularly those in the House—not to attach any extraneous, ideological policy riders to this urgent aid package. Ideological policy changes to the Flood Insurance Program and forest management policies should come nowhere near this bill. They tried to do it last week in the FAA bill, and we had to send it back because of joint opposition, both sides of the aisle. Let's not go through that again. I thank our chairman of the Banking Committee for helping in that regard.

Third, it has become clear that Puerto Rico's recovery will be further hindered by its ongoing debt crisis. That crisis, coupled with the devastation from Hurricane Maria, has led to growing concerns that the island will soon face a liquidity crisis. Simply put, the island is running out of money to pay for essential services like first responders, not to mention funds for rebuilding and recovery. The funds we hope to include in the disaster package are critical, but we have to make sure the island has enough cash to start the process. In FEMA, local governments often have to lay out the money first and then they get repaid, but Puerto Rico doesn't have the money to lay out so we have to deal with that issue to make it effective.

With these issues in mind, we should act quickly on this supplemental aid, but it is just the beginning of Congress's aid to rebuild.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, finally, on the Republican tax plan, I have so much to say about this plan. It is so awful in so many ways: huge tax cuts for the wealthy and the powerful, raising taxes on middle-class people—which I am going to talk about in a minute—blowing a huge hole in our deficit, and to fund the tax cuts for the rich, cutting Medicare and Medicaid by close to \$1.5 trillion.

We are all in favor of a serious tax reform debate. We have mentioned our guidelines: no tax cuts for the 1 percent, no increase in the deficit, and do it in a bipartisan way. The Republican plan does just the opposite. That is why Democrats are so opposed. It lavishes tax breaks on the rich, pays for it by cutting Medicare and Medicaid, and

leaves everyone in the cold, except the very wealthy.

Today I want to focus on one provision of the GOP tax plan: the repeal of the State and local tax deduction. The Republican plan raises taxes on millions of middle-class families across the country by repealing the State and local deduction. Forty-four million Americans take that deduction. That is about one in eight. It is about one in four or five families who take that deduction. One-third of all taxpayers take the deduction. It is almost one in three. They don't just get a few pennies back. They get several thousand dollars off their taxes each year. It is not just a rarified group in States like Massachusetts, New York, and California. The reason it brings in \$1.3 trillion is because it affects so many people throughout the entire country.

If you do not believe me, look at the numbers. Look at these charts. I am posting the percentages for each State. Forty-six percent of the people in Maryland get an average deduction of \$12,900. Connecticut gets 41 percent. I showed one of my colleagues that Virginia is higher than New York. Thirty-seven percent get an \$11,000 deduction.

Massachusetts, Oregon. To my colleagues from Utah, 35 percent of Utah taxpayers get an average deduction of \$12,954. In Utah, they say: Well, the standard deduction makes up for it. With most families, the standard deduction will not because we are taking away the standard exemption so it is a wash if you are a family of three.

Let's keep going. Minnesota and New York. I want to show my Republican colleagues how it would affect some of their States. Let's take Georgia. One-third of all taxpayers get an average break of \$9,000. Look at these numbers, my colleagues. I am going to send them to every one of you. Look how it affects your State.

Here we go. Iowa, 29 percent of all people get a \$10,000 break, on average; Pennsylvania, 29 percent, an \$11,000 break; Arizona, 28 percent, a \$7,000 break.

My friend from Idaho, I didn't know he would be here, but his number on the chart—28 percent of Idahoans get an average of an \$8,800 break. Do you want to take that away from them? The standard deduction doesn't make up for it if you have one child or more. Nebraska, 28 percent get an \$11,000 deduction.

By the way, these numbers come from a group that put it together, but it is from the IRS. These are IRS numbers.

South Carolina, 27 percent, \$8,000; Missouri, 26 percent, \$9,800; Ohio, 26 percent, \$10,000. Kentucky, my dear friend the Republican leader, in his State, 26 percent of the people—one out of four—get that State and local property deduction, averaging \$9,995. Do you want to take that away?

Alabama, where our dear friend the Presiding Officer is from, gets 26 percent. One out of four of his constituents get an average break of \$5,900. Kansas, 25 percent, gets an average break of \$9,400.

I am saying these numbers because our friends on the hard right, who just want to lower their own taxes, are telling everybody, oh, this is just in four States—Massachusetts, New York, California, New Jersey.

No, it is across America.

Let's keep going. I am having a good time. I hope you all are.

Oklahoma, 24 percent of the people get an \$8,000 break. I think this is Mississippi, 23 percent, gets a \$6,300 break; Louisiana, 23 percent, close to one out of four, \$6,700. Texas, the great State of Texas, where our majority whip comes from, 23 percent, close to one out of four Texans, get a \$7,800 break. Indiana, 23 percent get an \$8,700 break; Florida, 22 percent get a \$7,300 break. Wyoming—it wouldn't affect Wyoming because it is a rural State—22 percent get a \$6,300 break.

The State that is least affected is still very affected. South Dakota and West Virginia, only 17 percent of the people get a \$9,000 break in West Virginia and a \$6,000 break in South Dakota. North Dakota, Tennessee, and Arkansas—21 percent, 19 percent, 18 percent breaks, between \$4,900 and \$6,800.

The Achilles' heel of this bill—there are many—is State and local deductibility. It kills the middle class and the upper middle income people. It doesn't really affect the rich. They do not pay a lot of property taxes, the bulk of these deductions. They make their money in high-income places. They have a lot of stocks and a lot of bonds. It is the middle class and the upper middle class who get clobbered by this tax break. The standard deduction does not undo it because you lose the standard exemption. Even if you are just a husband and wife without kids—

Mr. President, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the debate be delayed for a few minutes. I know my colleagues are—well, I just need to finish my remarks. I am almost done.

The benefit of State and local deductibility affects every State, every city, every town, every municipality, and goes deep into the middle class and the working class.

One other point I have to make, now realizing this, some of our Republican colleagues are saying we will modify it. Folks, there is no real way to modify the provision to eliminate State and local deductibility. If you want to give a choice that will not work—because for middle-class taxpayers, it is only the combination of their itemized deductions, such as State, local, mortgage, and others, that make it worth it for them to itemize.

If you have to choose between the mortgage deduction and your property

tax deduction, it is a loser. So they say: Well, we will just do this for the very rich. Yet, as I mentioned, that is not where the money is. Where are you going to cap it? It is mostly a middle-class deduction. If you cap it, say, for people whose incomes are above \$500,000 or \$1 million, you don't bring in much money. So it is a loser. You cannot fix it. Get rid of it. You cannot fix it. The plans that are being done still continue to hurt the middle class dramatically.

The Republican plan to repeal State and local cannot be fixed, modified, or tweaked around the edges. Each of the proposals does not work. It must be scrapped. The State and local deduction affects everyone, even the almost one in five taxpayers in the lowest States where it affects the fewest people. It is just one of the many flaws in this broken, broken framework.

Let's start over. Don't just do a Republican plan that appeals to the handful of very wealthy corporations and very wealthy individuals. Work with us on a fair plan that helps the middle class, not the very wealthy. We are ready, but if you do the same thing that you did on healthcare in trying to do it by yourselves, I think that you will meet with the same fate that the healthcare bill did.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRAPO and I both be allowed to speak for 5 minutes on the nomination of Randal Quarles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, every time President Trump has the choice between standing up for American families or standing up for wealthy banks and giant corporations, he chooses the rich guys.

Time and again, he has promised that he would "never be beholden to the lobbyists or the special interests," but he has appointed dozens of Big Business executives and lobbyists to senior positions in his administration. During his campaign, he promised that he would not let the Wall Street guys get away with murder, but after he was sworn in, he loaded up his economic team with Goldman Sachs executives. Over and over again, he has promised to drain the swamp, but then he appointed an army of lobbyists and industry insiders to positions that oversee the industries that paid them for years.

Randal Quarles is just the latest in this long line of corporate appointments. He is President Trump's nominee to the Federal Reserve's Vice Chair for Supervision. He has gone through the revolving door so many times that it is hard to keep up—from a big Wall Street law firm, to the Treasury De-

partment, back to the Wall Street law firm, back, eventually, to the Treasury Department, then to a private equity fund, followed most recently by a trip to another private equity fund. Now Mr. Quarles is ready for another spin through the revolving door.

The Vice Chair for Supervision of the Fed is one of the most important jobs in the government. After the 2008 crisis, Congress put the Fed in charge of supervising the biggest banks. That included banks and other financial institutions that would bring down the whole financial system with them if they went under—the so-called "too big to fail" institutions. The Fed is what stands between millions of American families and another economic catastrophe that could rob them of their jobs, their savings, or their homes. After the 2008 crisis, Congress created the Vice Chair for Supervision position to lead efforts to supervise these giant institutions. There is no other position in government that has a more important role in stopping the next financial crisis.

So what kind of supervision and oversight does Mr. Quarles believe in? His motto seems to be, "Whatever the big banks want, give it to 'em.'"

Mr. Quarles has spent more than a decade in private equity and investment management, where he has argued repeatedly for weaker rules for giant banks, including relaxing the rules for stress tests that evaluate banks' soundness, lowering capital and leverage standards, and repealing the Volcker rule.

At his hearing before the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, I showed Mr. Quarles a 124-page list of financial rule rollbacks from a lobbying group for the biggest banks in the country. I asked him to tell me which of those dozens of changes he disagreed with. He couldn't name one—not one.

The No. 1 thing that we need from a Vice Chair for Supervision is independence from Wall Street—a demonstrated willingness to stand up to the wishes of the big banks and protect the interests of working families. There is not a speck of independence in Mr. Quarles' track record.

Mr. Quarles' time in government also raises red flags. As Under Secretary of the Treasury for Domestic Finance, he was responsible for overseeing financial institutions, markets, and regulations in the years leading up to the financial crisis. Let me say that again. Mr. Quarles was the Treasury official in charge of helping to oversee Wall Street in the years leading up to the crisis. Does anyone want to point out how that worked out?

If Mr. Quarles had wanted to stand up to the banks, he could have found and fixed systemwide problems in the markets before catastrophe struck. Instead, in 2006, when the banks were

making gobs of money off of risky bets that eventually crashed the economy, Quarles gave a speech in front of a roomful of bankers and said: "Fundamentally, the economy is strong, the financial sector is healthy, and our future"—the banks—"looks bright." Less than 2 years later, the entire system exploded and cost Americans, collectively, about \$14 trillion.

Make no mistake about it, confirming Mr. Quarles endangers the health of the economy. The last time that Mr. Quarles was in charge, he failed to act to protect the American people from the biggest recession since the Great Depression either because he missed the signs or because he deliberately ignored them. Either way, that makes him the wrong person for the job.

American families deserve a strong leader as the Vice Chair for Supervision of the Fed who will fight hard to keep them safe. Everything we know about Mr. Quarles says that he will be fighting hard for the big banks. I will be voting no on Mr. Quarles' nomination, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of the Honorable Randal Quarles to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Quarles has extensive government and private-sector experience dealing with both domestic and international financial markets. He is no stranger to public service in his having previously served in multiple top posts in the Treasury Department.

Mr. Quarles has also been nominated to serve as the Vice Chairman for Supervision, a role that has never been officially filled. Instead, former Federal Governor Dan Tarullo has acted as the de facto Vice Chairman for Supervision in various ways, including by chairing the Federal Reserve Board's Committee on Supervision and Regulation, overseeing the Large Institution Supervision Coordinating Committee, and representing the Fed at the Financial Stability Board and in Basel, among other functions.

In February, Chair Yellen committed in a hearing that she expected President Trump's nominee for Vice Chairman for Supervision to have the same responsibilities that Governor Tarullo had, including heading the Federal Reserve's Committee on Supervision and Regulation and representing the Fed at the Financial Stability Board and in Basel.

I expect Mr. Quarles to perform those same duties in the interim, and I look forward to confirming him to that position soon. Mr. Quarles has strong bipartisan support and was voted out of the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee with the affirmative

vote of 17 to 6. If confirmed, he will play a key role in developing regulatory and supervisory policy for the Federal Reserve System.

I urge all of my colleagues to support Mr. Quarles' nomination today and vote for his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Quarles nomination?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Cardin	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Isakson	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	King	Strange
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Cruz	McCaskey	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Nelson	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—32

Baldwin	Harris	Murray
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Duckworth	Leahy	Udall
Durbin	Markey	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Cortez Masto	Heller

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to make a unanimous consent request. We

have been able to work out an agreement on further aspects of Mr. Quarles' nomination.

I want to thank my ranking member, SHERROD BROWN, for working with us on this and helping us to be able to move forward.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 303.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the Senate then resume consideration of the Gingrich nomination.

One modification, Mr. President. I am striking the portion of this unanimous consent request relating to the Gingrich nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further debate on the nomination?

Hearing none, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Quarles nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John McCain, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Lee, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, James M. Inhofe, Cory Gardner, Jeff Flake, John Thune, John Barrasso, Orrin G. Hatch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Strange
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Manchin	Thune
Donnelly	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McCaskill	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Cortez Masto	Heller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Cissna nomination?

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Strange
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Manchin	Thune
Donnelly	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McCaskill	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Cortez Masto	Heller

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, not too long ago—I believe this was 2011—a

President came to a joint session of Congress and before the American people, he said what needed to be said about our Tax Code. He was pretty blunt. He said that our Tax Code is "rigged." He said: "It makes no sense, and it has to change." Of course, you can imagine, that was met with bipartisan applause in the House Chamber and across the country.

The same President called on Democrats and Republicans to "simplify the system, get rid of the loopholes, and . . . lower the corporate tax rate"—one that, I might add, ranks among the highest in the industrialized world.

That President, like the rest of us, knows that our business tax rate is a self-inflicted economic wound because businesses figure out, How can I move money offshore and my headquarters offshore, and if I earn money overseas, how can I avoid bringing that back to the United States for better wages and more jobs and to build the business? That is all because of our self-destructive Tax Code.

But the President's name—and I gave it away by saying the year the speech was given. The President's name might surprise you, given the nature of the current debate in Washington. It was Barack Obama who said that, and the straight talk came from his 2011 State of the Union address.

Let's fast forward a few years. We have a new President from a different party beating the same drum. President Trump has called our Tax Code a relic and a colossal barrier standing in the way of America's economic comeback. He is right, of course, but so was President Obama.

Tax reform doesn't have to be partisan. In fact, it shouldn't be because the ramifications are much more important than just the politics and the scorekeeping of the day. The job creators in my State of Texas are the ones who really understand what is at stake because they are living it. They are the ones who are getting slammed by our current system.

Take Lisa Fullerton, for example, who owns a small retail business in San Antonio, my hometown. Ms. Fullerton is an accountant with 33 years of experience, who used to handle her own business's tax compliance in-house. Eventually, though, the code became too complex, and enforcement became too punitive, and she couldn't take that risk anymore. She said that her outsourcing of tax and employment functions now costs her small business roughly \$280,000 more per year than it did in 2000.

Lisa is far from the only one who is frustrated. Kurt Summers is the President of Austin Generator Service, a small residential power company in the Texas capital. For him, a lower tax rate would mean the difference between his company turning a profit or a loss. It would literally make the difference between being able to keep the

doors open or have to lock them up permanently. He explained that any extra profits realized through tax savings might enable his company to grow more aggressively. To him, the need for change is very simple. It means more hiring and more jobs.

So Texans, like Alaskans and like all Americans, get the picture. But the picture is pretty messed up, and it doesn't make any sense.

Greg Brown, President of W.W. Cannon, an industrialized storage company in Dallas, says that compliance has gotten to be a truly herculean tax. It has gotten so difficult that he has had to outsource that to a CPA—again, because it is so complex and people don't want to risk the burden of not doing it right because of the punitive nature of the penalties.

Darryl Lyons, CEO of PAX Financial Group, has done the same thing. He is harmed each year by the passthrough taxes on his small business income, which impair his ability to save for business emergencies, as well as to pay off his company debt.

Lastly, in terms of my stories here, Andy Ellard, the owner and general manager of a machine company in Dallas, regularly purchases expensive computer numerical controlled equipment to stay competitive in his industry. I have no idea what that is—computer numerical controlled equipment. He said that the tax ramifications of every purchase have to be considered. Almost every day, he asks: Can we expense it? Do we have to depreciate it? And if we do, over how long?

Mr. Ellard isn't shy with his words. He calls the complicated deduction scheme for business expenses "chaos."

Clearly, something needs to change. As I said at the outset, that has been acknowledged on a bipartisan basis by the current President and the past President. I even brought out some quotes yesterday or the day before from the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, making exactly the same argument. The ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Oregon, said that lowering the corporate tax rate will make America more competitive globally and will bring money back home for jobs and investment in our country. So it is important for us to be consistent and, unfortunately, they haven't been.

Things are starting to change. Last week, the so-called Big 6—led by Speaker RYAN; Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin; KEVIN BRADY, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; and the Finance Committee chairman, ORRIN HATCH—released a unified framework that contains core principles for reform. Among them are a simplified rate structure, the elimination of the alternative minimum tax, and many itemized deductions and incentives for companies to keep jobs on American soil. Perhaps

most importantly, the framework recommends what is widely agreed upon as overdue, which is lowering our uncompetitive corporate rate, which puts American employers and workers at a disadvantage.

Today, it is sad but true that we are divided on many issues in America. But as President Trump and President Obama have suggested, tax reform does not have to be one of them.

I listened to our friend the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, this morning, calling for bipartisan tax reform. They are going to have a chance to do that because, after we pass a budget resolution, I anticipate that in the Senate Finance Committee, Senator HATCH will call up a base bill known as the chairman's mark, which will be open for amendment in the Senate Finance Committee. That is what people have been asking for, a chance to participate in the writing of the legislation in the committee and then to have it come to the floor for open debate and amendment. It is what we call regular order around here. But what I am hearing from our Democratic colleagues is, yes, they want bipartisan legislation, but they don't want to participate in the process of writing. It strikes me as pretty hypocritical. This shouldn't be partisan, as President Obama and President Trump have demonstrated and as Democrats and Republicans alike have said time and again.

We in Washington have no magic wand that will make our Tax Code suddenly disappear, but that doesn't excuse us from working to make taxes and tax compliance a little less painful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, last weekend a man camped out on the 32nd floor of the Mandalay Bay Hotel in Las Vegas. He stockpiled 23 weapons and hundreds of rounds of ammunition. He set up bipods and scopes. He brought a hammer to knock out the window. Then, on Sunday, he opened fire. He kept firing for 15 minutes, stopping only to reload and switch weapons. Over 15 minutes, he murdered 58 Americans and injured more than 500.

The day after the shooting, I was in Washington. I had seven or eight meetings, and not a single person in those meetings brought up the worst shooting in modern American history—not one.

I am not sure if it was two mass shootings ago or three when we started to accept this as a normal condition of American life, when we lost our belief that it was within our power to protect our fellow Americans at a country music concert or at a nightclub or at a movie theater or at a school.

I know there are strong beliefs about guns in America—principled beliefs—

but there are also steps that the overwhelming majority of Americans want us to take. There are 90 percent of Americans who think we need background checks for every gun sale, including 74 percent of NRA members. There are 89 percent of Americans who think we should prevent the mentally ill from purchasing guns. There are 82 percent of Republicans who want us to bar gun purchases for people on the no-fly or terrorist watch list. Yet Congress has done nothing to respond to the American people. We did nothing after Aurora, after Newtown, after Orlando—nothing.

Unlike Washington, in Colorado, after the two mass shootings in Aurora and at Columbine, our legislators rose to the occasion and made tough choices after we suffered two of the worst mass shootings in our Nation's history. After the massacre at Columbine, we closed the gun show loophole. After the tragedy in Aurora, we strengthened our background checks in a Western State. Last year, those background checks blocked 8,704 people from buying guns. That may sound like a lot, but 380,000 people applied for guns in Colorado last year. That means just 2 percent of those folks who applied were blocked and that 98 percent were able to buy guns without a problem.

Who were the 2 percent whom Colorado is blocking but whom this Congress fails to block? Among them were murderers and rapists and kidnappers and domestic abusers.

No one could come to this floor and tell me Colorado is worse off because we have kept guns out of the hands of those people. The average wait time for those background checks is 12 minutes. That strikes me as a fair tradeoff to keep guns out of the hands of murderers and kidnappers and rapists. Yet here in Washington, despite now an annual tragedy—tragedy after tragedy—Congress has done nothing. We haven't even done the simple things like close the gun show loophole or stop people on the terrorist watch list from buying weapons.

This is not about taking guns away from people who have them. It is about keeping guns out of the hands of people who nearly everybody agrees should not have them. It is about stopping more people like the Las Vegas killer from modifying his rifles to become almost fully automatic and far more deadly. I cosponsored a bill this week to ban those modifications, and I am encouraged that some of my Republican colleagues seem to be open to that idea.

I know we cannot stop every madman or every random act of violence in this country—we cannot—just as we cannot stop every murder from happening, but that does not mean we should not make them less likely or that we cannot take steps to limit their harm, steps that are backed by the overwhelming majority of Americans and

that are fully consistent with the Constitution.

I remember, after the shooting at the Pulse Nightclub, I was supposed to take my daughter to camp that day. She was going to be away from us for a month. I can remember I did everything I could to keep her from hearing the news that day, as the numbers of fatalities increased during the course of the day, because I didn't want her to leave us—she was about 12 at the time—with a sense of fear, the fear I felt and the country felt. I am so sorry my children and America's children have to grow up in a country where mass shootings are common, where we are beginning to see them just as part of our lives.

I heard somebody the other day on television say that is the price of freedom. What a shame that somebody would say that in the United States of America. What a surrender that represents to our children and to the victims of these crimes. I didn't grow up in that America, but conditions have changed. We have let it happen. The result is, we now have an entire generation of Americans—of our countrymen, our sons, and our daughters—who are growing up with a reasonable fear that they could be victims of a mass shooting or that their moms or their dads might not come home one day.

I think our kids have enough to worry about. They have every right to see a movie with their parents, to go dancing with their friends, or to see a concert on their one night off without having the fear of being shot down by people who have no business carrying such powerful weapons. They have a right to expect that this Congress will finally do something about gun violence in our country—violence which is far greater than anywhere else in the industrialized world.

In the wake of these horrific acts, as always, Americans spring into action. First responders secure the area and care for the wounded. Neighbors hold vigils to honor the victims and support grieving families. Journalists shed light on what happened and why. Citizens speak out to demand action from their elected officials. They are doing their jobs, and it is time for Congress to do ours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from West Virginia.

TAX REFORM

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, last week, I rose to talk about the importance of tax reform. I believe this is a policy issue we cannot talk about enough and that we cannot emphasize enough. So, today, I rise to talk about how important the reform is to our small businesses, and in the coming weeks, I will be up here to talk about other important aspects of tax reform.

We are all from different States and other parts of the country, but we all

know small businesses are a major economic driver in our country, as 95 percent of businesses in the United States are small businesses, and that number is even higher in my State of West Virginia. Small businesses employ more than half of West Virginia's workforce. Yet our small businesses face a marginal tax rate as high as 39.6 percent. At the same time, their effective tax rate can vary widely. In fact, a CNBC survey showed that 22 percent of small businesses cannot really say what their effective tax rate really is.

Think about that.

If you are a small business that is a partnership or an LLC, then your profits are going to pass through to you and be taxed at the individual rate. There are currently seven individual tax brackets. Then you have credits and deductions. There is also a self-employment tax, and the list goes on. On top of that, small businesses can have Social Security and Medicare taxes, a Federal unemployment tax, and employment taxes. That is not even taking into account taxes like a State-level income tax or property tax and more. That is why businesses and individuals spend billions of dollars a year to comply with the Tax Code. That is more than 18 hours for every man and woman and child in the United States of America. If I could give a visual here, that is basically 3 million people working full time on taxes for small businesses at a cost of \$195 billion.

The point is, it is complicated. Our Tax Code is too complicated, and that is part of what tax reform is about—simplifying the Tax Code. If Congress can simplify the Tax Code just to cut compliance costs in half, think of how many significant resources that would free up that would be better used to grow the economy, create jobs, raise wages, and expand businesses.

The National Federation of Independent Business, which represents 325,000 small businesses across this country, called this tax reform framework a good start, and it has urged us to take swift action. According to a survey by Paychex, 41 percent of small business owners want tax reform to be the very top priority.

Whom will these reforms really help? We are going to have a long discussion on this. This is just part of whom they will help. They will help the small businesses that employ so many people in my home State of West Virginia. They will help people like Eric Hott, of EH Chocolates & More, from Hampshire County. Eric has a great story. Eric grew up on a farm in Kirby, WV. His mother was from Hornberg, Germany. While growing up, his grandmother was always cooking something. After graduating from high school, Eric moved to Germany to begin a culinary apprenticeship. By 2006, he had a chef apprenticeship at a five-star hotel in Germany. He went on to serve at

events like the G8 Summit and for guests that included the German Chancellor and his First Lady. After running a patisserie in Germany, he moved to Switzerland, where he refined and perfected the art of chocolate-making. That sounds good to me. Then what did he do? He wanted to come home. He returned home to West Virginia. He went back to Kirby, WV, and started his own small businesses—first EH Chocolates & More and, later, Farm Fresh Produce. Both are growing and delicious businesses.

Small businesses employ middle-class Americans who power this and other small businesses across the country. We need more folks like Eric—lots more—who are willing to take the risk, who have a good idea, and who want to stay and work in their own homes in rural America and certainly in our State of West Virginia, which has had a major economic downturn. We need more Eric Hotts. We need to simplify the Tax Code for small businesses and let them focus on what they do best, which is refining their products, providing their services, and providing jobs for people in their various areas.

As much as any other policy that Congress can advance, tax reform will promote growth and provide job opportunities across this great country. Across the entire country, only two in five distressed communities have seen any job growth during the past 5 years. Fully 50 percent of U.S. job growth has occurred in just 2 percent of our country's counties.

We need to change that. We need to help small businesses that are major economic drivers in every part of our country. It is no wonder that small businesses have found it difficult to open, let alone succeed in many parts of our country. Because of our outdated Tax Code, real wages for most workers have barely increased for decades. By modernizing our Tax Code, we can create more opportunity and higher wages for Americans. We can achieve a simpler system with lower rates that is good for business and workers and, from the description I just put forward, would be a good time saver and resource saver.

The best thing about this in terms of small business is that it would lead to more jobs. Let's create an environment that leads to more investment in our States and continues to grow and build jobs. These are the changes hard-working West Virginians and Americans are hungering for. In order to make West Virginia the best place to live and work, now is the time for tax reform.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to make this a reality. Doing it will benefit so many—everyone in this country.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1937 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING ELDER ROBERT D. HALES

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I rise today to honor the life of Elder Robert D. Hales, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Elder Hales passed away peacefully on Sunday, October 1, at the age of 85. He leaves behind his faithful wife Mary and their two sons, Stephen and David.

Robert Hales was born and raised in a faithful household in Long Island, NY. He was an all-American boy who played baseball through college at the University of Utah but eventually traded in his baseball uniform for a flight suit, serving in the U.S. Air Force as a jet fighter pilot. Elder Hales's service as a military aviator would inform the rest of his life and certainly his entire ministry. He took with him the unit motto displayed on the side of his aircraft: "Return With Honor."

After his discharge from the military, Elder Hales entered the world of international business. In jobs around the world, he established a reputation as an enthusiastic leader who relished a challenge and dealt fairly with others. Because of these qualities, Elder Hales rose to become president of Paper Mate, a division of Gillette. Later, he assumed senior executive positions at Max Factor Company, the Hughes Television Network, and Chesebrough-Pond's Manufacturing Company. But Elder Hales never let work dominate his life, as so many executives do. Despite the enormous demands on his time, he stayed faithful to the more important commitments he made to his family and to his Lord.

So it was that Robert Hales, a business executive of international renown, made an unusual decision in the prime of his life: He left the corporate world to give his all to the church. When Jesus said "Come, follow me," Robert Hales left his nets straightaway and became a fisher of men.

Elder Hales was called to become the presiding bishop of the church in 1985, overseeing the church's vast charitable network. As bishop, he used the skills of a business executive not for profit but to help the least of those among us.

In 1994, Elder Hales was sustained to the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, a

church position he held for 23 years until his passing just days ago. From this position as a watchman on the tower, he boldly proclaimed the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and he also spoke out on such pressing societal issues as religious freedom. He saw that the erosion of religious belief in the United States was quickly devolving into social and political intolerance for religious people and institutions. But this prediction did not lead Elder Hales to despair, no; instead, he redoubled his efforts to edify the next generation—the young men and women who were in the preparatory period of life, as he termed it.

His addresses and sermons were full of moral exhortation and practical advice on living well. Don't walk, run to holiness, he urged his brothers and sisters in faith. Elder Hales knew that holiness is an activity, a pursuit to which we must consecrate our whole lives running the race and enduring to the end.

Through his example and through his words, Elder Hales taught that virtue is not just a good intention but a good deed reinforced and compounded by past deeds.

Elder Hales urged young men and women to embrace the joys of adulthood through marriage, child-rearing, and responsible citizenship. He knew that the way to true happiness lies in those sacrificial activities, not the selfish lifestyles that tempt so many today.

During one memorable address to the General Conference of the church, Elder Hales recounted the advice he received as a boy when he had been tempted to make a poor decision: "Robert," his father had said to him, "straighten up and fly right!" From the testimony of his life, it is clear that Elder Hales honored his father's advice in the Air Force, in the workforce, in the household, and in the church. Elder Robert D. Hales flew right. Now he has returned with honor to be embraced by his Heavenly Father.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I want to be able to give a quick update to this body on a conversation that started yesterday and has been ongoing for months about Russia and their interference in our elections and how they are trying to engage with us in a way that much of Europe has seen for

decades but that we just haven't seen in the United States.

Yesterday, Senator BURR and Senator WARNER stood up and gave an update of where we are in the status of the investigation of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. They walked through some of the statistics. We have done over 100 interviews. We have 4,000 pages of transcript from those interviews. We have 100,000 documents that we have gone through so far, and there is more to go. We have completed some areas where we have interviewed everyone who we could possibly interview in that area. In other areas, as we do one interview, they quote a couple of other people, and we chase down those individuals, and it continues. So parts of the investigation are not done at this point, but some of it is.

Several aspects are clear from the investigation, though, again, it is not complete, and we will have a final document at the end. Some of the areas that are clear are that Russia was trying to use active measures to engage us in our last election. That part is very, very clear.

The question comes for many people: Why would they do that? Quite frankly, this is the way Russia has worked for a very long time—this asymmetric warfare they do where they try to constantly interfere in other people's thoughts and conflicts. They have done it across Europe for a long time. They are now doing it here.

Some of this is a product of Russia's having a very weak economy and trying to find some way to bolster themselves up. In the last 2 years, the Russian ruble has dropped 40 percent in value. As they struggle with low oil prices and struggle in the way they function with their government with the oligarchs and have a select group of people who can succeed and other folks who continue to struggle around the country and as they struggle under that system where they have fake elections and such, they try to reach out to other countries and try to interfere in our elections to make us look like them.

We have a free press that they try to engage in. We have free speech that they don't have in Russia. We have freedom of religion, which they don't have in Russia. We have the ability to be able to have disputes on political issues. They clearly don't have that in Russia. If you disagree with leadership in Russia, you will end up in prison. If you disagree with leadership in the United States, you will end up on TV. It is very different to be in an open society like ours. But they reach into what we consider a strength and try to make it our weakness.

We are going to try to get the facts out on this over the next several months as we work through this process. We are going to expose what Russia is really trying to do. Do they use

some overt propaganda networks like Sputnik Radio and RT? Is their Russian propaganda on multiple cable and satellite channels throughout the United States? Their version of the facts are designed to create discord in our Nation. That is what they do.

They also have ways that are not quite as overt. They reach in on social media platforms. They have their trolls in Russia who have thousands of fake accounts on Facebook and Twitter and other social media apps. They use those thousands of apps to search around any news in America and find a place where there is conflict in America and then try to amp up the volume.

To be clear, the Russians are not creating conflict in America. We have plenty of it. We disagree on issues. Again, it is our free society. When we disagree on something, we disagree on it publicly and sometimes loud. That is who we are as Americans. We try to work things out, sometimes at a high volume. But just like two kids who are fighting on the playground in the fifth grade—remember those two kids that started a fight and their friends were watching them? Then, eventually, someone on the other side of the playground started yelling “fight,” and the crowd started forming. The Russians aren’t starting the fight. They aren’t even in the fight. They are the kids on the far side of the playground, trying to get more people to run to the fight. They are not starting the Twitter wars and the battles, but they look at where America is divided, issues like race. Their troll farms will try to find areas where we disagree, such as areas of race, and reach in and try to amplify the volume on that by repeating accusations and by trying to be even more hostile online. They are trying to stoke disunity in our Nation.

It is important that we know that every time you see something with a high number of hashtag counts that goes up, it is not always Americans who are pushing that up. Occasionally, it is an outside body trying to raise the volume and make a conflict look even bigger than it already is in America because they are into sowing discord. That is what they love to do. That is what the rest of the nations have seen them do. We should be very clear that the Russians are trying to continue to sow chaos into us.

They have reached into our election systems. In the previous couple of weeks, the FBI notified 21 different States that during the last election season, the Russians tried to interfere in their election process as a State. Now, that doesn’t mean they did interfere. That means they reached in and tested systems. That means they tried to go into voter databases to see if they could access a voter database to see who was registered to vote. They tried to get into a secretary of State’s office in a local State to see if they

could figure out how they do their elections. That means they reached into systems in States to see what voting machines they used and if they tried to connect them in. They were trying to find out how they do elections, learn as much as they could about their process, and see how far they could get.

Through all of our work, we have yet to find a single vote that was changed. The Russians didn’t get into voting machines. They didn’t alter the election in any way, but they were constantly probing through multiple States to see what they could get access to.

Now, it is my belief that they are preparing for something else. They are trying to see what they could get access to in the last election to see if they could get back into it and do even more in the next election. We should be aware of that. We should be aware not only of their propaganda, but we should be aware that they are going after our elections to see if they can find a way, at the end of the election, to make us doubt the outcomes.

What can we do about that? I will give you several ideas. One of them, I would say, is that we need to protect the primacy of States running the elections. There is absolutely no need for the Federal Government to go to States and take over their election process. It is a constitutional protection that those States have to be able to run their elections, but every State is also responsible to do it. Of the 21 States that I noted here that the Russians tried to engage in, they couldn’t get to a single voting machine. The States are already doing a good job, but they need help.

There is no reason the State of Oklahoma should have to work alone to be able to protect itself from the Russians trying to invade it in the cyber attack. They are going to need some allies to come along with them, but the States should still be able to run the system. There should be more sharing between the State and the Federal Government. There should be an opportunity for the Federal Government to be able to say to a State, earlier than 10 months after the election: Hey, you are being hacked. For the FBI to notify States a couple of weeks ago that they were hacked in the 2016 elections is a little late. When it is occurring, we need to have that engagement between State IT folks and Federal IT folks. We need to be able to have that conversation as it is ongoing so the State can take protective measures as it is occurring. We need to have that cooperation between States and the Federal Government. We need to be able to help States come up with ways they can audit their system after the election is over.

When every election occurs, you should be able to audit it and make sure the machines that were running the election actually were not hacked.

You can verify that. In Oklahoma, we have optical scanners. You fill out a paper ballot. You run it through an optical scanner at the end of the election time, and they can count everything from the optical scanner. If there is any question, they can go back to the paper and actually do a hand count. We can literally audit our elections and their process. It is a safe system that we have set up in our State. Every State does it differently, but I would encourage every State to set up a system where they can audit their system.

We know this year that the Russians were trying to engage in our election. It could be someone else who could do it. Any number of groups could try to interfere in our process. It is basic common sense to say we should have a system of elections we can actually audit. Perhaps Russia, in the days ahead, hopes that our Nation will be more like theirs. We will not be.

We are the longest constitutional Republic in the world. We still need the world. We still put out our values about free speech, free press, freedom of religion, and opportunities for individuals to actually engage and to have conflict with their own government and to be able to disagree publicly on things. We still can disagree with each other. We need to be aware that they want to turn us into them. I would hope for the sake of the Russian people, in the days ahead, that they could be more like us.

Ronald Reagan told a story about a friend of his who had a conversation with a Cuban refugee fleeing from communism and oppression in Cuba in 1964. He said that his friend, this Cuban refugee, said:

If we lose freedom here, there is no place to escape to. This is the last stand on Earth.

We are still a role model for the rest of the world. As much conflict as we have with each other, we are still a role model. I have no issue disagreeing at times with people on this floor. We can have our disagreements, but I don’t want the Russians to interfere in our disagreements. They can keep their business over there. In the days ahead, we will continue to expose the things they are doing. So they can back off and go bug someone else because we are akin to what they are doing.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

EQUIFAX BREACH

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I say to the Presiding Officer—and the Senator who is about to become the Presiding Officer—I appreciated the work

of you two together, in tandem, today for two nominees in front of the Agriculture Committee. I thank you.

(Mr. SASSE assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, I rise to talk for a moment about a hearing yesterday, which the Presiding Officer sat through, too, with the outgoing CEO of Equifax. We know what happened with Equifax, yet we really don't know entirely what happened. We know there was a breach of Equifax's information, and 145 million Americans—more than half of the adult population in our country—had their data breached. Criminals will now have access to the data of far too many Americans.

I am hopeful because I and Senator CRAPO, the chairman of the committee, and others on the committee were pretty unhappy—not to speak for others, certainly, but we were pretty unhappy with Equifax's performance yesterday because we didn't get a lot of answers to a number of our questions.

When you think about what we do with medical language, with our personal medical information, we have laws to say that our personal medical information belongs to us. We, of course, can share it with a hospital or a doctor or whomever we want, but our doctor can't share it with other doctors without our permission. Our hospital can't share it with other hospitals without our permission. But our personal financial data doesn't fall into those categories.

We know how this happens. Equifax is a company that many have rarely thought about. A lot of people have never thought much about it, and many have never really explored who they are. Equifax is a company in Atlanta. There are three data agencies like this. They get your data without your permission. They get it from a utility company or from a bank or from somebody else. They have two jobs: to collect your data and then to protect your data, your personal financial data.

This company—this CEO has been paid \$69 million over the last 3 years. The CEO we met with, who has retired, has been compensated very generously. Who knows if he will end up getting bonuses and golden parachutes and all? The American public has come to unfortunately expect that these CEOs will abuse the public trust.

Look at what happened at Wells Fargo, creating all kinds of accounts for people who didn't even want those accounts, who didn't even know they were having those accounts opened. And look at Equifax.

In far too many cases, these companies don't protect our information the way they have promised they would. It makes all of us, the 145 million, subject to some kind of criminal activity in all kinds of ways—to violate our privacy and to take advantage of us financially and all the identity theft and all the things that come with that.

If you were a student at Bowling Green State University who graduated and you miss a student loan payment after you have graduated, you get your credit dinged by Equifax. If you are a homeowner in Mansfield, OH, or in Ravenna, OH, and you miss a monthly payment or a couple of monthly payments, you get your credit dinged. You are held accountable by Equifax, but Equifax hasn't really been held accountable much by anyone.

The cynicism people in this country have toward our financial system, toward Wall Street—then we see Wells Fargo do what they have done; then we see Equifax do what they have done. It is time for Congress to push away these special interest groups that have far too much influence in this body.

The White House has not been helpful. The White House looks like a retreat for Goldman Sachs executives, with all the people around the President who do the bidding of Wall Street and protect far too many of these Wall Street firms and Wells Fargo and the Equifaxes of the world.

I am hopeful that we will sit down in a bipartisan way and begin to figure out what to do here. Maybe we do consider the protections we have for people's medical records—we ought to have the same protection for their financial records. It simply makes sense, and I am hopeful we can come to a solution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUERTO RICO RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today, as I have on so many occasions, to give voice to the 3.5 million Americans who call Puerto Rico home. Their lives have been turned upside down by Hurricane Maria, and now more than ever, they desperately need to be heard. I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in amplifying the voices of millions of Puerto Ricans calling out for help and the millions here on the mainland who have yet to hear from their families.

Here on the floor with me today are aerial photos of the destruction caused by Hurricane Maria, the astounding damage I saw firsthand when I toured Puerto Rico by helicopter on Friday, pictures largely taken by me.

Take this collapsed bridge in the municipality of Utuado, situated in the central mountains of Puerto Rico. Every day, the 30,000 Americans who live in Utuado depend on these bridges to cross the beautiful rivers that run through it, but today those 30,000

Americans are secluded, waiting in the dark, and wondering when help will arrive.

Images like these have stayed with me from the moment I left Puerto Rico, and I share them today because the people of Puerto Rico need our collective voices and support to stop this humanitarian crisis from devolving into a full-blown American tragedy.

This is another example of some of the devastation of a large number of homes in a community.

If we hope to overcome the monumental challenges before us, we need a full grasp of the reality on the ground. I thought that is why President Trump went to Puerto Rico this week—to get a dose of reality. Instead, the President continued to feed on his own warped version of reality. The President told the people of Puerto Rico that they should be “very proud” that the death count was only “16 versus literally thousands of people” who died in “a real catastrophe like Katrina”—a real catastrophe like Katrina. And certainly that was a catastrophe, but this is no less real for the people of Puerto Rico. Yet, moments later, the AP reported that fatalities in Puerto Rico have tragically risen to 44. And while I pray it is not the case, I fear that it may be even worse, because we have secluded communities that still have not gotten access, so we don't know what is happening there.

In short, the situation is perilous, and we don't have a moment to waste.

Like many, I had hoped that during his visit to Puerto Rico, the President would take the high road and set a new tone after his administration's woefully delayed and inadequate response to Hurricane Maria. Instead, the President took victim-blaming to a whole new level. He told emergency responders and local elected officials: “I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico, but you have thrown our budget a little out of whack.”

Well, Mr. President, perhaps we have to dial back the budget-bursting, trillion-dollar tax cuts you want to give to billionaire families like yours, because it is going to take more than paper towels to help the people of Puerto Rico.

In this country, we don't turn our backs on Americans in need. We don't complain about how much it costs to restore power to hospitals or rebuild roads in ruin that connect people to their government and essential services or get clean drinking water and food and medicine to the hungry and the frail. We are the United States of America, and we are there for each other, whether it is Texas after Harvey or Florida after Irma or New Jersey after Sandy or Puerto Rico after Maria.

If you heard the President speak earlier this week, you would have heard that everything is going great and that he

in particular is doing the greatest job any President has ever done in the history of the world. The administration will tell us that the majority of hospitals are open but leave out the fact that many are running on emergency generators at significantly reduced capacity. They will leave out how the shortages of ambulances and fuel and functional roads have made getting to the hospitals nearly impossible. Even if you do find a way there, the hospitals might not have the medicine, supplies, or doctors you need.

The administration will boast that it has set up 11 distribution points for food, water, and other necessities, but what good is a distribution center that takes hours to reach and is out of supplies before you get there?

They will brag about how half of the people have access to running water but neglect to say that in some rural areas in the north, barely over 13 percent of people have access to running water.

They will boast about all of the buildings being inspected—something that even the Governor of Puerto Rico questioned—but look at this image I took 5 days before the President landed. This is just 25 minutes outside of San Juan. Hurricane Maria destroyed many of the wooden homes that populate the island and weakened many of its immense structures, as the picture showed that we had up before. Here is an example of it. So you see that all of these homes are destroyed. Some of them are not made in the same way. Here is a cement structure that is also totally destroyed. I saw the same sights across Puerto Rico in communities near the capital, in the mountains, and along the coast.

What does all this tell us? It tells us an unfortunate truth: that the administration's response to this crisis has been woefully inadequate from the start.

For 2 weeks, Puerto Ricans cried out for help—help accessing clean water, help powering hospitals, help feeding families. Yet the President accused them—the victims of this historic natural disaster—of being ingrates clamoring for handouts. He dismissed the urgency of their situation, and he effectively called the mayor of San Juan another nasty woman who should pipe down.

Well, this is the mayor of San Juan, wading hip deep in water. Does this look like a woman who isn't taking responsibility? No. To me, it looks like a leader doing everything she can to save lives.

I knew from the start that we weren't getting the full picture, and because the administration went out of its way not to provide support for a bipartisan congressional delegation to visit the island, I decided to go myself. After all, it will be the responsibility of Congress to fund disaster relief and

long-term recovery on these islands, and we need the facts in order to produce the right legislation. So last Friday, I boarded an Americans Airlines flight to Puerto Rico.

Now, let me be clear. I have visited the island of Puerto Rico I don't know how many times over the past 25 years, both in my official capacity as a Member of Congress and personally to vacation. It is no exaggeration to say that the island I saw on Friday is not the island I have known and loved. The lush, green, tropical landscape that comes to mind when we think of Puerto Rico was mostly devoid of life.

I met with the Governor of Puerto Rico. I spoke to local law enforcement officials, first responders, and Federal FEMA officials. With the help of the Governor's office and the Puerto Rico Joint Forces of Rapid Action—or FURA, as they are known on the island—I saw the damage by helicopter. I saw debris and mudslides and fallen trees on the inland streets, destroyed homes sprinkled with the occasional yet all-too-familiar blue of FEMA tarps. A dead green hue covered the landscape that was such a foreign sight to me that I caught myself thinking I was somewhere else.

This was an all-too-familiar scene—the scene of a strong cement structure of a building, on the surface impervious to the strong winds of a hurricane, yet now on the verge of sinking into the Earth. The hurricane eroded so much land that in some inner parts of the island, landslides have become the new norm. The people who live here may never be able to return. Entire generations of close-knit communities may never be the same.

Despite these dire conditions, during my visit to Puerto Rico, I felt the spirit of community and commitments shared by so many Americans across the island. After Hurricane Maria, they woke to devastation, no communication, and the isolating affects of roads being cut off by fallen trees, electrical posts, and debris. As they wait and wonder when their government will come to their aid, they are doing everything they can to survive. They have taken matters into their own hands. They are clearing roads, sheltering relatives who lost their homes, and working together to care for the most vulnerable. So through it all, I saw the hard-working spirit alive in Puerto Rico that I see whenever I speak with Puerto Rican families there and across New Jersey, where so many of my constituents are mobilizing to send help as they anxiously wait to hear from their families.

Like so many Americans, I too worried about my family on the island. My brother faces health challenges, and I worried about his care. Fortunately, we had a brief moment to meet, and I was able to give him some supplies—help one person. But as tough as this

situation was, he is one of the lucky ones. He lives in a suburb of San Juan which is relatively better off than the more remote, rural areas.

Let's look at a chart of our recovery status. Fifteen days after the storm ravaged the island, where does it stand? Well, 93 percent of our fellow Americans are still without power. I can tell my colleagues firsthand that the heat and the humidity from all of the water that came from Maria is stifling. It is oppressive. It is hard to breathe.

Sixty percent of Puerto Rico has no cell phone service, meaning people have no way of connecting to their families on the island and outside of the island or calling for help if they needed it. If they did, we could have pinpoint accuracy of search and rescue missions.

Day by day, fewer and fewer Puerto Ricans have access to clean, running water. From October 2 to October 3, the population with running water dropped from 29 percent to 13 percent.

The truth is, this situation would be unacceptable in any major city on the U.S. mainland, but, as the people of Puerto Rico know all too well, they don't get the same treatment as their fellow citizens on the mainland. The ugly truth is that for generations, Congress has treated the people of Puerto Rico not as our fellow Americans, not as people who have fought and bled for their country, like the famous Borinqueneers, an all-Puerto Rican infantry division, who received, recently, the highest decoration Congress gives collectively—the Congressional Gold Medal. They haven't treated them as first-class citizens but as second-class citizens.

Hurricane Maria didn't create this disparity, but it exposed the long-standing inequities that have hindered the island's success for generations. The people of Puerto Rico don't receive equal Medicaid funding, Medicare coverage, or access to tax credits. They aren't just numbers on a ledger; they are long-term care for a grandparent, treatment for a critically ill child, and a fair shot to make a living wage and raise a family.

This didn't happen overnight. These wrongs add up over time. As Governor Rossello said so eloquently:

I invite you to reflect on why Puerto Rico is in the current state of disadvantage and inequality. It's not something that happened just a few months or few weeks before this storm. It is a condition that has happened for more than a century in Puerto Rico.

I invite you to reflect on the reality that even after the storm hit Puerto Rico, even when it was evident it was a disaster in the United States, only half of our U.S. citizens knew Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens. So when Hurricanes Irma and Maria slammed into Puerto Rico, these disparities, these inequalities, were laid bare.

None of this should have taken the Trump administration by surprise. We knew the storm was coming. We knew for days that a category 5 hurricane was on a collision course with Puerto Rico, just as communities across the island were picking up the pieces after Irma. We have known for years about the island's aging infrastructure, like the downed power line pictured here.

In short, all of us knew Hurricane Maria was a recipe for disaster that would leave 3.5 million Americans imperiled, disconnected, and in the dark. It should not have taken the administration 12 days to issue a disaster declaration—something I called for—for 100 percent of the island because, as I saw on Friday, there is no community in Puerto Rico untouched by this tragedy. Focused leadership would have had a three-star general on the ground the moment the clouds parted, not 8 days after the storms struck.

We needed medical evacuation vehicles and vessels, aid and relief delivery systems on standby, the USNS *Comfort* ready for immediate deployment—something I called for. Instead, the administration told us helping Puerto Rico is hard because it is an island in a big ocean—but it happens to be an island of 3.5 million U.S. citizens.

We have no more time to waste. That is why it is so urgent that we take action now. If we could send 20,000 troops to Haiti, surely, we can get more boots on the ground saving American lives in Puerto Rico. We need more helicopters airdropping food and water to secluded communities. We need generators delivered and the repair of communication towers expedited.

It is up to the President to mobilize every resource possible—to save lives, to get the lights turned on, to rebuild bridges, to reach secluded communities, to reconnect families. We can't afford to waste any more time, not when lives are on the line, not when elderly residents in nursing homes grow frailer by the moment, not when hungry American children have nothing to eat, not when communities are without clean drinking water for days on end. We need to keep the pressure on the administration.

That is why I wrote the President, urging that he activate the Defense Production Act of 1950 so the military could more quickly deliver vast private sector resources to those in need. That is why my colleagues and I wrote to the White House and urged FEMA to waive disaster relief cost sharing because, as the Governor told me: I have no revenue coming in. I have no revenue coming in, and the likelihood of revenue coming in, certainly in the short term, is not there. How do you acquire the 70 or 75 percent Federal assistance if you don't have the 25 percent to put up? That is why we have written the USDA asking that they use all available resources to get food to the people of Puerto Rico.

This is an all-hands-on-deck situation for the Federal Government, but Congress also has a responsibility to act. That is why I sent a letter to Leader McConnell and Speaker Ryan urging that they bring forward an emergency supplemental aid package and fund community development block grants for disaster recovery. It is up to us in Congress to immediately authorize, not just the emergency funding needed to save lives in Puerto Rico but also the assistance needed for a full-powered recovery.

We must give Puerto Ricans the tools to rebuild. That means making sure Puerto Rico's financial control board gives the Governor the flexibility to spearhead this recovery. Board members of that control board should be on the island, assessing the damage, speaking to the survivors, allowing Governor Rossello to create a new budget that reflects Puerto Rico's post-Maria reality. The damage, by some estimates, could be as high as \$90 billion, so adjusting expectations and enabling flexibility is absolutely critical going forward.

I have said it before and I will say it again. The people of Puerto Rico must come before Wall Street creditors. As it turns out, this is one area where the President and I can find common ground. Just last night, he called for Puerto Rico's debt to be wiped out. I hope all of us—the administration, my colleagues in Congress, and the fiscal control board—can work together to jump-start Puerto Rico's recovery. That must include enabling flexibility, addressing the island's crippling debt, and ensuring that pensions are protected and paid. Imagine not getting your pension—no longer working, having no income, and then your pension is not protected. How do you make it? All of us in the Senate have a responsibility to stand with Puerto Rico. How we respond to this crisis will have profound consequences, not just for the Americans who live in Puerto Rico today but for generations to come.

We need to pass a disaster package that matches the astounding damage suffered by the island. The photos I have brought to the floor today give a glimpse—not anywhere near the whole picture—of the devastation on the ground. It is not enough to reconnect a faulty, ailing power grid. It is time to be proactive and rebuild Puerto Rico so it is prepared for the next storm and for the 21st century. It is time to fix the underlying disparities which have hindered Puerto Rico's success. Otherwise, we will simply be rebuilding a broken foundation.

Let me close by saying, I remind my colleagues that Puerto Ricans are not just citizens of the United States—which, in and of itself, should speak to the compelling arguments we should be engaged in helping Puerto Rico as our fellow Americans. They have fought to

defend our Nation from World War I to the War on Terror. Take a walk down to the Vietnam Memorial, and you will see Puerto Rican names engraved in that stone far in excess of the number of people proportionately to the American population. Throughout our history, Puerto Ricans have given their lives so they may remain part of the "land of the free." To this day, more than 10,000 Puerto Ricans serve in every branch of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Let's also remember that beyond the 3.5 million citizens living on the island, there are 5 million Puerto Ricans living in our States, in our congressional districts, and in our communities. In the aftermath of this unprecedented disaster, these Americans deserve the same rights, the same respect, and the same response from their Federal Government. That is what I told leaders from New Jersey's Puerto Rican community earlier this week—assembliesmen and women, mayors, community leaders, and concerned citizens.

We all remember how hard it was to secure the funding we needed to rebuild New Jersey in the aftermath of Superstorm Sandy. We had to fight tooth and nail every step of the way, and, guess what, we had two U.S. Senators from New Jersey and 13 Members of Congress, joined by our colleagues from New York—two U.S. Senators from New York and a whole host of congressional Members as well as from Connecticut, which was also affected. It was an incredible time here to try to get relief.

Americans in Puerto Rico have no vote in the Senate, they have no votes in Congress, and the fight to rebuild Puerto Rico will be that much harder, but, as I have in the past, I intend to be their voice and their vote in the U.S. Senate.

Now is not the time to pretend like recovery will be a piece of cake. No one—not the Governor, not the President, not any one of us—should sugarcoat the human catastrophe playing out in Puerto Rico. It is time for honesty about the conditions on the ground, the challenges we face, and the actions we must take.

Yes, Puerto Rico is an island in the middle of a very big ocean, but we are the most powerful nation on the face of the Earth. We have the most advanced military capabilities ever known and the most skilled Armed Forces in the world. We have to be there for 3.5 million Americans who are in need. We are the United States of America. We do the impossible. Give our men and women in uniform any mission, and they rise to the occasion.

If we conducted the Berlin Airlift, set up tactical operations in the mountains of Afghanistan, built green zones in Baghdad in the height of the Iraq war, then surely we can save the lives of Americans in danger, and surely we can save those lives and help rebuild

Puerto Rico. We must not rest until every American is safe and the work of rebuilding is done.

I yield the floor.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote today on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich to be Ambassador to the Holy See. Instead, I am in Las Vegas meeting with victims of and first responders to the deadliest mass shooting in modern U.S. history.

I support the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich to be Ambassador to the Holy See. The U.S. relationship with the Holy See is an important one and is best supported with a confirmed ambassador leading it. Ms. Gingrich's faith and engagement with the Catholic community will support U.S. ties to the Vatican. •

Mr. MENENDEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Johnny Isakson, Patrick J. Toomey, Richard Burr, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, Richard C. Shelby, Cory Gardner, John Thune, James E. Risch, Deb Fischer, David Perdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 75, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Ex.]

YEAS—75

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Baldwin	Flake	Murphy
Barrasso	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Reed
Cantwell	Heinrich	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cardin	Hoeven	Rounds
Carper	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Schumer
Collins	Kaine	Scott
Cooms	Kennedy	Shaheen
Corker	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Ernst	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Young

NAYS—20

Blumenthal	Hassan	Stabenow
Booker	Hirono	Tester
Brown	Markey	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Peters	Warren
Gillibrand	Sanders	Wyden
Harris	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Heller	Nelson
Cortez Masto	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). On this vote, the yeas are 75, the nays are 20.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from North Dakota.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise today to talk about what is really a “once in a generation” opportunity, and that is the opportunity we have right now to reform our outmoded and complex Tax Code and also, most importantly, to provide tax relief for our Nation's families, farmers, and small businesses.

Our Tax Code has not been updated since 1986. When you think about all that has changed over the last 30 years, you know that modern advances in technology have drastically revolutionized the way business is conducted. Today, the creation of the internet, substantially increased automation, and instant communications have created dramatic changes and in many ways have brought us closer in terms

of communication and have interconnected our global economy in ways we never could have foreseen back in the 1980s, when we last reformed our Tax Code.

So it is past time—not time but past time—to modernize our outdated Tax Code to the 21st century. We must do so in order to ensure that American businesses can compete on the global stage, while providing tax relief to hard-working middle-class families who have been struggling to get and stay ahead over the last decade.

The recently released tax blueprint proposes sweeping tax reforms that will benefit working families and small businesses throughout the country while promoting job creation, economic growth, and global competitiveness. This country was built on hard work by individuals and families who strive each and every day to make ends meet to provide for their loved ones and to plan for retirement. The current Tax Code is complex and has many loopholes that do nothing to help our hard-working families keep more of their own hard-earned money. Our tax framework will help individuals and families in my home State and across this country to get ahead by generating new jobs through sustained economic growth while lowering the overall tax burden and putting more money back in the taxpayers' pockets.

We do this in a number of ways: by doubling the standard deduction, by eliminating taxes on the first \$12,000 earned by an individual and \$24,000 earned by a married couple, effectively establishing a zero-percent tax rate as the bottom bracket—the bottom tax rate. That means that nearly 81 percent of North Dakotans who claim the standard deduction could see a significant increase in their take-home pay. That is true of other States across the country as well. Further, we are consolidating and lowering the tax rates across the board while simplifying the Tax Code to make it fairer for every-body.

At nearly 70,000 pages long, it is no wonder that Americans currently spend 6 billion hours a year complying with the Tax Code. In fact, 94 percent of taxpayers choose either to pay someone else or to use software to prepare their taxes because of the complexity of our Tax Code. Our goal for tax reform is to allow the vast majority of Americans to file their tax returns on a single page—a simple calculation, something they can do themselves. We want to reduce the cost and stress that many Americans feel during tax season.

Further, our tax framework aims to create greater opportunities for small business owners, farmers, and others to help grow our economy and be more competitive than ever before. While we focus on a business friendly State in North Dakota—we have a very business

friendly climate—the Federal tax continues to place an undue burden on the nearly 71,000 small businesses that operate in our State, which is more than 95 percent of all of the employers in the State. Again, this is something that applies across the Nation. The driver of our economy, the backbone of our economy is small business. They are the job generators. They are the job creators. We have to do more to help them do what they do, which is to create jobs and to grow our economy.

The same applies to our family farmers. My State alone has more than 30,000 family farms and ranches. Their marginal tax rate can reach as high as almost 45 percent, nearly twice the average rate of the rest of the industrialized world. That creates real challenges. This tax framework follows the example we have set in our State by restoring economic opportunity, by lowering the tax burden, and by enacting a pro-growth tax code.

Economists in general agree that high corporate taxes reduce wages to workers, raise costs to consumers, and reduce returns on retirement savings. That affects all of us. Maintaining high tax rates does nothing to improve the fairness of our system. It only punishes everyday citizens and reduces economic opportunities for all Americans.

For far too long, our Tax Code has incentivized American companies to send jobs and investment overseas, instead of keeping them here at home—keeping that investment, keeping those jobs here at home. Consequently, large multinational corporations now hold approximately \$2.6 trillion overseas. That is money that could be repatriated back to the United States for investment in American jobs here at home. Our framework would end the loopholes and the incentives that keep foreign profits offshore by moving to a territorial tax system and encouraging repatriation of these offshore funds, bringing that investment back to America. This is about getting the American economy going again and creating jobs and opportunity here at home rather than overseas.

It is vital that we advance a comprehensive tax reform that simplifies the IRS code and simplifies rates. Putting more money in the pockets of working individuals and families and empowering private investment will drive domestic job creation and increase wages through higher demand for labor and lower business costs. All the while we can ensure stable government revenues through a broader tax base, a growing economy, and a more efficient tax system. That means that we will continue to be able to fund our priorities as we work to get our debt and deficit under control.

Ensuring U.S. competitiveness in the global marketplace and providing tax relief to middle-class families will benefit both current and future genera-

tions. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together to get tax reform done for the people of my State of North Dakota, for their respective States, and for Americans across this entire country.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, in many ways, the Children's Health Insurance Program has been an outstanding example of what a bipartisan, democratic process can accomplish. Twenty years ago, President Bill Clinton worked with a Republican majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives to successfully pass the Children's Health Insurance Program into law. That legislation passed with 85 votes in the Senate—an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote—to recognize the simple fact that all children born in this great country of ours should have healthcare coverage.

The Children's Health Insurance Program, along with our Nation's community health centers, has more often than not seen great bipartisan support. As Members of Congress, we have always come together and understood the importance of these programs, and we have done everything we can to ensure that quality, cost-effective care is available to millions of Americans. Unfortunately, as I stand here today, funding for both the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers has expired.

The Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, provides healthcare coverage to over 100,000 children in my home State of Michigan and more than 9 million children nationally. In addition, community health centers serve as the primary medical home to over 600,000 Michiganders and more than 20 million individuals across our country. For people living in rural and underserved areas, their community health center is their doctor's office and often their only choice when it comes to care close to home.

We have already passed the deadline to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program and the Community Health Center Fund. We have passed the time to act. We should not wait any longer to provide certainty to the millions of children and their families who depend on CHIP and to the Americans who will lose access to care if their community health center is closed.

We are already seeing the impact of our inaction in the CHIP program. Several States have begun to warn that they may be forced to end enrollment of new children, cut back services, or end their programs altogether if we do not act soon. Independent experts estimate that at least 10 States could completely run out of funding for their

Children's Health Insurance Program before the end of the year, while funding for the remaining States' programs would not be very far behind.

This is not a responsible way to govern. I have heard from physicians in my State, especially in rural communities, who fear that this lack of action will mean great harm to the patients they serve. I have heard from pediatricians who know firsthand what the end of CHIP would mean for Michigan's children. As our country grapples with what we can do to expand mental health treatment and address the expanding opioid epidemic, letting these programs lapse would be a huge step in the wrong direction. This unnecessary uncertainty has already forced some community health centers to contemplate staff hiring freezes and layoffs. It is certainly harming their day-to-day operations. It has made it difficult for them to recruit new doctors, and it has made it harder for their offices to obtain loans to grow their practices and to serve more patients.

Luckily, this is a problem we know how to solve. I am proud to have cosponsored bipartisan legislation with Senators HATCH and WYDEN that would ensure funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program. I also support similarly bipartisan legislation by Senators BLUNT and STABENOW to extend funding for our Nation's community health centers.

I welcome the fact that the Senate Finance Committee held a markup yesterday and was able to advance the bipartisan bill to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program. Now the rest of us in Congress need to do our job. Let's bring both of these bills up for a vote because, quite frankly, we cannot afford to wait any longer. Our Nation's children and millions of Americans who use community health centers as their primary medical home cannot afford to wait any longer. Historically, these programs have not been controversial to reauthorize, and they should not be now.

I am urging my colleagues to prioritize the children of our rural and underserved communities who will be hurt if we do not act soon. Let's do what is right for our country's children and families and pass this vital legislation as soon as possible.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. HEITKAMP and Ms. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1942 are printed in today's

RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. ALONZO B. PATTERSON, JR., AND MRS. SHIRLEY PATTERSON

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to recognize an extraordinary individual in my State, along with his wife. I would like to take a few minutes today to recognize Reverend Dr. Alonzo B. Patterson, Jr., and Mrs. Shirley Patterson.

During the first week of November, Anchorage is going to host 4 days of events to commemorate the service of two of our most beloved community leaders, the Reverend Dr. Alonzo B. Patterson and his wife, Shirley Patterson. Next month, Reverend Patterson leaves the pulpit of Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church. This is a pulpit he has held for some 47 years. Mrs. Patterson, his wife of six decades, is to be recognized for her service as well.

Anchorage is one of America's great communities, and it is not uncommon to celebrate the retirement of a figure of Patterson's stature, but 4 separate days of events—that is huge, and it is a testament to the respect our community has for the Patterson family.

Think about this: Alaska has been a State for just 58 years. Reverend Patterson has had his pulpit for 47 years. And Shiloh is not Reverend Patterson's first pulpit in Alaska; it is his second. He came to Anchorage after founding the Corinthian Baptist Church in Fairbanks. Reverend Patterson grew up with Alaska, and Alaska grew up with Reverend Patterson.

Corinthian and Shiloh could appropriately be characterized as African-American churches. But for the African-American community in Alaska, they are far more than churches; they are centers of Black history in Alaska.

Zakiya McCummings interviewed Reverend Patterson earlier this year for an article published in the Anchorage Press, and in that interview, Reverend Patterson explained:

The church was, and always has been, the sanctuary in the Black community. It is the meeting place, the community center, the focus for support and help, the place you come to be important, the psychologist for your particular problem, the time to shout out your frustrations and the only place to be significant. You could be a Deacon or something in the church where in the rest of the community, you were just another Black person. The church was for us a panacea for many of the social ills that existed then and still have relevance.

Given the central role Reverend Patterson has played in Alaska's African-American community for most of our State's existence, it is no surprise that he is regarded as a historian of Black culture in Alaska. Ms. McCummings observed that it is a responsibility that he doesn't take lightly. Reverend Patterson told her:

I feel like I have to be the keeper of our historical plight and to speak to each generation in my time. It is a powerful responsibility

because if I go to sleep on my watch, then the next watch will have nothing to build on. . . . We're responsible that the gate remains open for the next generation.

Under Reverend Patterson's watch, there was much progress. In the 1960s and 1970s, Reverend Patterson recalled, "much of Alaska was small family businesses, including the banks. If you were not part of that family or their friends, you had a hard time getting a job.

Many of the jobs for African Americans were either construction or government jobs."

Reverend Patterson proudly recalls the first Black principal of a State elementary school, an African-American banker who was elected to the school board and subsequently to the Alaska Legislature, an African-American activist in the Fairview section of Anchorage who is regarded as the grandfather of the city's public transportation system. Today's African-American community is built on the foundation of these pioneers who endured.

Make no mistake about this, Alonzo Patterson was no mere spectator to all of this progress. He was an agent of change, rooted in his observation, and he stated: "In ministry there are no limits except the ones we set for ourselves." Under his leadership, Shiloh grew spiritually, physically, and fiscally, and would include a church school, a television ministry, and a jail outreach ministry.

On Shiloh's 29th anniversary, the mortgage note for the original structure was burned under the theme, "Burning to Build," and groundbreaking for a new educational wing commenced. There was more building to come. The Martin Luther King Jr. Family Life Center was dedicated on May 23, 1993. In 2001, Reverend Patterson spun off a new nonprofit organization, Shiloh Community Development, Inc., to serve youth, minorities, and the disadvantaged. Today Shiloh Community Development is well known for its youth mentoring program called Young Lions of Alaska.

He is a founder of Bridge Builders of Alaska, which celebrates the diversity of our communities and a powerful voice in Alaska's annual celebration of Dr. Martin Luther King Day. In 2015, Reverend Patterson was the keynote speaker at the King Day ceremonies on JBER. At that ceremony, he warned his audience that Dr. King's dream is at risk of dying. He said:

This dream is at risk if nothing is done, and nothing is holding us back but ourselves. Stop waiting for miracles; believe in yourself to make society better. Each of us can do our part, by loving and respecting others.

This is just one example of his powerful voice. Reverend Patterson's sermons were always inspiring, many legendary, and it explains why he is regarded as a pastor's pastor, growing not only his congregants but the gen-

erations of ministers who will follow in his footsteps. As one who has joined in the congregation there at Shiloh on numerous occasions, I can attest that there was never a Sunday that I did not leave feeling inspired by the words of Dr. Patterson.

They aren't calling the appreciation festivities for Reverend Patterson a retirement ceremony. They are calling it a transition, probably because nobody believes Rev. Alonzo Patterson has any intentions of pursuing a future of leisure. Leadership and inspiration runs in Alonzo Patterson's DNA.

We wish him and Shirley well in their next calling, and we take comfort in the fact that their contributions to our community are far from over. November marks a transition, not a retirement—and certainly not a eulogy—for this extraordinary Alaska family.

On behalf of my Senate colleagues, I thank Dr. Patterson and his lovely wife Shirley for their good works, and thank them in advance for their continued leadership.

ALASKA AIRLINES "COMBI" PLANES

Mr. President, I know I have occupied a little bit of time on the floor this afternoon with a wide range of topics—from the tragedies that face many of our indigenous women to recognizing a prominent leader of the Alaska community. Now I wish to share a little bit of Alaska's history as we see a transition in aviation and transportation.

It is really the end of an era in my home State. On October 18, just a few days from now, Alaska Airlines will fly the final run of the uniquely Alaskan combi plane before retiring them and updating the fleet.

OK. She is going to make a floor speech about an airplane. Yes, I am going to make a floor speech about an airplane because this combi plane is a special Boeing 737-400, designed to carry up to 14,000 pounds of cargo and 72 passengers. It is called a combi because it is a dual-use plane, a combination of passengers and cargo. Alaska Airlines is the only major airline in the country to have these combi planes, and they were specifically designed for the special challenges of a very large State. Over their lifespan, they have delivered every imaginable thing via airplane in Alaska.

You have all heard me talk about the size of our State. The sheer size of this State presents logistical hurdles unlike anyplace else. I keep saying we are one-fifth the size of the country, and 80 percent of our communities are not connected by road. When we think about how we move around in our State, a postage stamp placed in the middle of an average sheet of paper represents the area a person can reach in Alaska by coastline, river, road, or railroad. The rest is only reachable by plane. You just have to fly everywhere. This being the case, it only makes

sense to try to efficiently deliver people and goods to hub communities in Alaska. Alaska Airlines is looking to serve. This is not a promotion for them; it is a recognition that they needed to figure out how to move people and freight, and they reconfigured the aircraft to do this.

What makes these planes so special is, they can carry up to four large cargo containers. We call them igloos. These igloos load into the front portion of the aircraft, right behind the pilots. There is a simple divider between the cargo and the passengers. So they load the cargo up front, and the passengers come up the back on a set of steps, just like we used to do in the prejetway times. You load from the back, but your first 17 rows of a traditional aircraft would be occupied by cargo. If you have more cargo—if you are flying fish out from Cordova south or if you are flying your Iditarod dogs that have been dropped in Nome and need to get back to Anchorage and you need a lot of space for the animals, you have flexibility to move back and forth.

These have flown all over the State, up to Nome, on the Bering Sea coast, along the Arctic Ocean, to the oilfields in Prudhoe, and, most famously, in the “milk run” area. The milk run got its name because Alaska Airlines literally delivered the milk to the communities along the way, as well as other food stuff—all manner of goods and passenger. It is something that if you are from the southeast, we all know about the milk run. We all complain about the fact that it takes about 5 hours to get from Anchorage down to Juneau, if you have to go through Yakutat and Cordova and stop at each one. That is just the way it is. You bounce down from Cordova, Yakutat, Juneau, Ketchikan. Finally, you hit Seattle. You run into your sports teams, families are coming and going. These are the workhorses that are not only moving the passengers, they are moving the groceries, they are moving the mail, they are moving the medicine. They are moving it all.

When I say it moves everything, we have built up a little bit of history about how things move around. We have moved cows. We have moved cars. The picture I like best is moving the herd of Santa’s reindeer. I think Santa was actually posed in this, but the reindeer were not. They needed to be able to move the reindeer so they hauled them in the front, situated them, and closed it off, and you have the passengers in the back. Whether you are moving reindeer, whether you are transporting an injured eagle to the Raptor Center in Sitka or letting the sled dogs hitch a ride back to Anchorage after they have made the thousand-mile trip to Nome, this is what we do.

The invention of the combi plane really highlights the unique needs and

the parameters of daily life in the State. We are a long way from the lower 48. You can barely drive to any of the communities. If you are going to move goods, if you are going to move passengers, you are on an airplane. Whether it is Essential Air Services, bypass mail, air freight, these are the backbones of commerce in Alaska. This is our interstate. It is the interstate in the air.

Whether we are shipping our wild caught, sustainably managed salmon that people around the world love to eat, we ship that out. We ship in the toothpaste, the loaves of bread, and the basics that we need. Thanks to the combi, we have been able to do this with regular, reliable scheduled service in areas where the weather would usually chase off more. These are smaller aircraft. They can handle it all. The size of the combi allows them to land and take off in much more turbulent conditions than smaller propeller planes.

So it is a kind of bittersweet time for some of us who have grown up around these aircraft. As we think about the “only in Alaska” type of things, it is encouraging to know that this development of retiring the combi planes—the proposal is to replace them with separate, full-sized passenger and cargo planes. As a result of the increased demand for goods and passengers, we need more space on planes to deliver both. If updating the fleet means that we need and get more business in Alaska, I suppose that is a good thing for all.

There are many of us who are going to be bidding a fond farewell come October 18, which is the last scheduled flight for the combi. It is also Alaska Day in our State. I thank Alaska Airlines and those who fly these great planes and do so safely. They provide a level of service and have for so long. I thank them for what they have done over the course of so many years.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, here is what is happening with so-called “tax reform.” Tonight, the Budget Committee is voting on a budget resolution that does two things.

First, it sets the spending limits for everything in the government—environment, energy, defense, healthcare, education, transportation, and so on.

Second, it includes something called reconciliation instructions that basically direct all of the committees to report back with legislation that either

increases or decreases the Federal deficit by a certain amount. This time around, here is what they are doing—asking the Senate Finance Committee to draft legislation to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Again, this is going to pass on a party-line vote, with Republicans prevailing, to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. This is what will start the tax reform process.

That is not all. Republicans still haven’t given up on decimating our healthcare system. They are still trying to cut Medicaid and, this time, Medicare, and they are going to use this tax bill. They are going to cut \$473 billion from Medicare at a time when our population is getting older and many seniors are already struggling. They are also going to cut \$1 trillion from Medicaid. This is the program that pays for one out of every two births in this country. It helps millions of families who have loved ones in nursing home care.

Last week, they tried to pass a healthcare bill that cut taxes. Now they are trying to pass a tax bill that will cut healthcare. Their proposal will, actually, increase the deficit by \$4 trillion. That is 12 zeros.

Here is what we could do with \$4 trillion. We could completely rebuild half of the airports in the United States. We could put 20 million people through 4 years of college. We could pay off the debt for every student loan.

Instead, the United States is going to be in the red by \$4 trillion, but after they cut \$1 trillion from Medicaid and one-half trillion dollars from Medicare, the party that has railed against the Federal debt and deficit will still add \$2.5 trillion to the deficit.

This is all so that they can give tax cuts to the richest people in the United States. I promise you, I understand that both parties are sometimes guilty of exaggerating and that sometimes both parties are guilty of relying on talking points and relying on caricatures of the other side, but you couldn’t caricature this bill if you tried. This bill is already a caricature of what people say Republicans are all about, which is to shred the social safety net and provide tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans.

They are going to cut the corporate tax rate from 35 to 20 percent, and they are going to cut tax rates across the board, but the people who will actually benefit will be the people at the top. The Tax Policy Center, which is a non-partisan, highly respected group, has crunched the numbers, and they found that within 10 years, 80 percent of the benefits of this \$4 trillion tax bill will go to 1 percent of Americans.

Remember what is happening. We are borrowing a huge chunk of this, and whatever is not borrowed comes out of Medicare and Medicaid. So the programs that pay for women to give birth in a hospital or for elderly people to

get healthcare will be decimated, and the wealthiest Americans will pay less in taxes. This is bad policy, not just for the people who work hard but for the whole economy.

I want to give you a specific example. Again, both parties rely on talking points, and both parties accuse each other of having the wrong set of ideas, but we have an example of what happens when you do this. This bill is actually modeled after what they did in the State of Kansas. The State government eliminated one of its business taxes, telling people that it would help the State's economy. Instead, the economy slowed down, which left them with even lower tax revenues. They had to cut government programs, like education, and now people do not want to send their kids to Kansas public schools anymore because they do not have the resources to educate their children.

This is not a path that America should follow. Everyone needs to pay their fair share, and that includes big corporations and the people who are benefiting from the system and making millions of dollars every year, but in this proposal, they are the ones getting all of the tax breaks.

Companies already have huge tax breaks. Some corporations end up paying zero in Federal income tax every April 15 even though they are making healthy profits. They have teams of lawyers and accountants who help them dodge paying even a penny to the Federal Government. That is why corporate income taxes make up less than 10 percent of all of the revenue to the Federal Treasury. Meanwhile, at least 30 percent of the middle class will actually pay more if the Republicans succeed with their tax reform package.

Think about this.

Thirty percent of the middle class is going to see tax increases in their tax bills. Why? It is because they have to find some money to subsidize the tax cuts for the richest people. Some of the money will be found by borrowing; some of the money will be found by making cuts to Medicare and Medicaid; and some of the money will be found by increasing taxes on the middle class. One out of every two households with children will see its taxes go up under this plan. Increasing taxes for these people while decreasing them for big corporations is not a plan for economic growth. We have heard over and over that Republicans do not want to add to the deficit—I don't either—but this is, literally, what they are voting to do tonight.

Again, this is not a talking point. This is not a sort of rhetorical flourish. The bill, itself, provides for \$1.5 trillion worth of deficit spending. Yet it is not deficit spending on the military; it is not deficit spending on disaster response; and it is not deficit spending on Medicare or Medicaid or Social Secu-

rity or any of the social safety net programs that they claim is the problem with the Federal budget. It is deficit spending for the purpose of a tax cut, 80 percent of which is going to 1 percent of the country. This is not conservative—certainly not fiscally conservative—and it will not help us to grow the economy.

It is no surprise that this policy is bad, because, again, the process has been so bad. With healthcare, they ignored regular order. They obliterated the committee process. They ignored Democrats. They ignored the way the U.S. Senate is supposed to work, and they failed. One Republican Senator says that he will not vote for anything that adds one penny to the deficit. Another Republican Senator said that he will not do anything that does not cut taxes for everybody. It already does not meet that test. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle—Republicans too—have promised not to cut Medicaid or Medicare. It violates all of those promises.

If you did not like the ACA repeal because it cut Medicaid, guess what. This cuts Medicaid more. If you made a promise to your voters not to cut Medicare, you should be aware that this bill provides for one-half trillion dollars in cuts to Medicare. If you are railing against debt and deficits, this is the biggest budget buster that I have ever seen in my short, 5-year career in the U.S. Senate.

During the campaign, the President of the United States promised not to cut Medicare, and the senior Senator from Arizona has called for regular order. This violates every procedural and policy principle that has been articulated on this Senate floor since I have been here. I do not see a way forward on this legislation when it has been conceived in a purely partisan way. It will only take us deeper into dysfunction. For the sake of the Senate, let's stop going down this path. Let's restore regular order and work together on a bipartisan tax reform process.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR ALONZO PATTERSON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, nearly every week I have been coming down to the Senate floor to recognize someone in my State who has made a difference for Alaska and really has made a difference for all Americans. It is my favorite part of the week to actually come down and talk about Alaska to my colleagues in the Senate, to the

folks in the Gallery, to the press, and to the American people watching. It is what I refer to as our time to talk about the Alaskan of the Week.

Many watching and on the floor and those who have visited our great State know that Alaskans think it is the most beautiful place in the world. There are natural wonders everywhere. We had a beautiful summer. We have resilient, warm-hearted, fiercely independent but accepting people. We have challenges in Alaska just like the rest of the country, but at the heart of our State are kind, generous people full of different cultures and backgrounds that we celebrate.

Most people don't know this about Anchorage, AK: My hometown is probably the most culturally and ethnically diverse city in the country. We have places of worship all over the city and the State that reflect that great diversity of Alaska and America.

One of the stalwarts of our faith community for the past 47 years has been Pastor Alonzo Patterson of the Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church, and he is our Alaskan of the week. Every Sunday he fills his church with spirit, joy, and gospel music punctuated by "amens" that float through the church, down the street, and work their way into our community and into our hearts. That is what he has been doing for 47 years. For decades, those sermons have inspired countless Alaskans to help feed the hungry, provide homes for those without, and strive to create a more just country, State, and society, and a more just community.

Let me tell you a little bit about Pastor Patterson. He was born in Wilson, LA, and raised in New Orleans. Like a lot of Alaskans, thousands of Alaskans, he joined the military and made his way up to Fairbanks, AK, in the 1960s, where he founded the Corinthian Baptist Church, and he ministered to the congregation there. Then, in 1970, he was called to Shiloh, one of the few African-American churches in Anchorage. He designed and rebuilt Shiloh at its current location, and under his leadership, Shiloh's membership, its facilities, and its energy took off.

He has conducted thousands of marriages and baptisms. He has given thousands of eulogies, celebrated graduations and anniversaries, counseled countless couples, people who are grieving, people who are rejoicing, people who are suffering, and he has helped turn that into action—not just for the African-American community but for all people and all races in our community and in our State.

Pastor Patterson told a reporter:

The church was and always has been a sanctuary in the Black community. It is the meeting place, the community center, the focus for support and help, the place you come to be important, the psychologist for your particular problem, the time to shout out your frustrations and the only place to be significant.

He continued:

You could be a Deacon or something in the church where in the rest of the community you were just another Black person. The church was for us a panacea for many of the social ills that existed then and still have relevance.

That is what he talked about. That is his heart and soul, how he saw his church and congregation. Thanks to Pastor Patterson and Shiloh, the city is a more inclusive place for all. He has helped heal those social ills for thousands of our fellow Alaskans.

One of his friends, Celeste Hodge Growden, a member of the church, said:

He and the church have led the way for a lot of things that have been accomplished here [in Anchorage]. Pastor Patterson always says, "leaders lead." That is the way he has lived his life. He is not in the background.

During election time, Pastor Patterson organizes a huge "get out the vote" campaign. He was instrumental in getting a Martin Luther King memorial in Anchorage—a 10-year-long endeavor.

She also talked about the groups he chaired, founded, and led beyond his congregation, including Bridge Builders of Anchorage, the March of Dimes Foundation, the Martin Luther King Jr. Foundation of Alaska, and the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance of Anchorage.

You know, with leaders like this, the list goes on and on. In addition to Corinthian Baptist Church in Fairbanks and Shiloh in Anchorage, Pastor Patterson also planted Eagle River Missionary Baptist Church and Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church of Palmer.

I have been uplifted to the core when my wife Julie and I have gone to Shiloh and listened to Pastor Patterson preach and listened to the beautiful—and I mean beautiful—Shiloh choir sing. It is a spiritual and energizing experience like no other. I love attending services at Shiloh.

On November 5, 2017, Pastor Patterson's 80th birthday, he will be giving his last sermon as pastor of Shiloh, and I certainly plan on being there. He is stepping down for Pastor Undra Parker, who will be the new and dynamic leader of Shiloh—another great Alaskan, another veteran—and I know he is going to do a great job. But of course it is a bittersweet time for Shiloh's parishioners because of the foundation Pastor Patterson built.

The church, the singing, and the amens will continue on Earth and the church in Anchorage, AK, as it is in Heaven. God bless Pastor Patterson, his wife of 61 years, First Lady Shirley Patterson, and the congregation of Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church for all they have done and continue to do for our community.

Congratulations to Pastor Patterson for being our Alaskan of the Week.

Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about my Members on the other side of the aisle who are doing

something that is just not helping the United States of America right now; that is, obstructing progress with regard to the new administration.

I understand that right now my party is in the majority, and to be honest, I have been someone who thinks we should spend a lot more time here in the Senate, working in the Senate and getting things done. We have a lot of work to do. But I see that people back home can get frustrated with some of the lack of progress, and some of that we can address by spending more time in this body.

Some of the questions that are coming out are about why things aren't getting done. It is a good question. Answers can be complicated, but what it mostly boils down to is that a lot of issues in this body—a lot—rely on consensus. The rules were carefully constructed so that the minority has a say in the legislative process. For the most part, I believe that is a good thing. As a former President once pointed out, we are not a red or blue America; we are the United States of America.

With that said, the people did elect us to come here and start getting things done. Implicit in their votes for a new President and a new administration was to be able to put people in the Federal Government to work, to focus on growing the economy, and to focus on rebuilding the military after a 25-percent cut over the last 8 years, to focus on better jobs and higher wages.

Throughout history, whether it has been Republicans or Democrats, the minority party has understood this. When a new administration gets elected, they start to put nominees in place, and the Senate takes action. We hold hearings and we have votes to put Senate-confirmed officials in the Federal Government to work. If you don't like the person, you can ask them tough questions in hearings and you can vote against them on the floor of the Senate or in committees. But what we are seeing right now is pure obstruction. On every single nominee, the maximum amount of time is required before there is even a vote. This is something new. This is something different. In fact, the current minority leader said the following words in 2013:

Who in America doesn't think a President, Democrat or Republican, deserves his or her picks for who should run the Federal Government agencies? Nobody.

That was the minority leader in 2013. They were wise words then, but apparently he and his Members have forgotten those words.

I have some facts here on the board. At this point in time, 10 months into President Obama's Presidency in 2009, the Senate had allowed more than 318 nominees to be cast by a simple vote. The Senate only asked for a procedure known as cloture five times. Essentially, President Obama got elected, and the Senate Democrats and Repub-

licans worked to get his team put in place. Yes, the Republicans did that. Certainly, I wasn't here then. They voted against some of these nominees, and that is fine. But what they did was they let them come to the floor for a vote.

In contrast to what I mentioned about President Obama's first year in office, only 100 of President Trump's nominees have been confirmed through voice vote. That is less than one-third of the courtesy given to President Obama 8 years ago. Cloture votes for Trump's nominees have been required for 100 nominees. Remember, I just said there were five for Obama's nominees 8 years ago. There have been 100 for Trump's nominees, and only 63 have been allowed by simple voice vote. What does that mean? It means that each vote requires a 2-day waiting period and then another 30 hours of debate. That is what it means.

The press won't write about it. My friends in the press sitting up here in the Gallery won't write about this. The contrast between the Trump treatment by the Senate and the Obama treatment by the Senate is incredible, and we don't hear a word out of the press on this. And this isn't partisan; this is just hurting the American people. There was an election, and now we need to fill the government with people who can run agencies. With all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, they are not doing it. They are not allowing it.

We had a vote on an Eighth Circuit judge last week. It had to go through cloture. We essentially spent the whole week on this—2 days and 30 hours. The judge passed the Senate by a 95-to-1 vote. It was a 95-to-1 vote. He wasn't controversial at all so what was the point? The point was simply to delay.

Again, here is the difference. Nominations sent to the Senate are about the same. President Obama had more 8 years ago but not too many more. There were 520 versus 443 for President Trump confirmed. At this time during the Obama administration, there were 342. Trump has 163. So that is 66 percent for the Obama nominees 8 years ago and 37 percent for the Trump nominees.

The press will not write about it, but this is a disservice to Americans, whether you are a Democrat or Republican. I will just mention a few. We have had nominees, such as the Assistant Secretary for Health in Health and Human Services. It came out of committee several weeks ago. It is sitting on the floor. The Assistant Secretary of Health, it is not a controversial position for the company, but it is an important position. I bet that person is going to finally get passage from the Senate at some point by a big supermajority, but we are delaying it. We are delaying it.

I really would love it if the minority leader would come down, look at the

American people, and just say: Here is why we are delaying. Here is why we are delaying. Explain it. They love to do this kind of stuff, procedural “dark arts,” thinking people aren’t watching. People understand this.

The head of a leading Democratic think tank told the press they intend to hold up and tie up floor time on every single Trump administration nominee. Now, if that happens, if they take the time for every nominee—there are over 1,000 who need Senate confirmation—and they take the entire amount of time they are allowed with cloture and other votes, if they don’t extend the courtesy that was extended to President Obama when he was trying to put his team in place, the Trump administration will never have a team in place. It will literally be 4 years.

I hope today the press starts writing about this because the difference here in 8 years is quite remarkable and yet nobody is talking about it; that being that the minority leader and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle stop obstructing what every other administration has had in terms of a courtesy, which is, if you win the election, whether you liked it or not, you work with the other side in the U.S. Senate to get your people in place—Department of Defense officials, Department of Transportation officials, Department of Health officials, Environmental Protection Agency officials. We have to get the country moving again, and the obstruction, which is unprecedented, by the minority leader and unfortunately many of my colleagues on the other side is only harming the American people. It is only harming the progress that the vast majority of Americans want, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. I am hopeful they are finally going to change and start moving forward nominations and letting us vote on them so we have an opportunity to actually get this country moving again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I would like to begin by talking about the recent tragedy in Las Vegas, the largest mass shooting in U.S. history, with at least 59 dead and more than 500 injured, including one Minnesotan who was injured and another who lost his life. So I join my colleagues in mourning for the victims and their families. They are and should be our focus at this time, as well as making sure those who were hurt get the best medical care this country can give.

As we look ahead, these events underscore the urgency to continue fighting for funding to better treat mental illness but also for sensible gun safety legislation, and I joined with some of my colleagues the day after the tragedy in Las Vegas to call for those

changes. No one policy will prevent every tragedy, but we need to come together on commonsense legislation to save lives.

One place we discussed this week where we could come together—because we have in the past—is on background checks. My colleagues Senator MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY, who are two A-rated NRA Senators, have already demonstrated that we can find bipartisan agreement on something as straightforward as background checks. I was very pleased they came together on this legislation, but the fact remains, the Senate’s failure to pass that bipartisan compromise was disheartening—one of my more disheartening days in the Senate because I began my day that day with the families of the Sandy Hook tragedy, with the parents who had come to this building to advocate for a bill, the background check bill, that they knew wouldn’t have saved their child’s life, but they knew it would have saved others. What we have seen with expanded background checks is they reduce suicides and they reduce domestic homicides by a fairly large number.

Our constituents agree that we should be able to find some agreement here, as the numbers have consistently shown that Americans across the political spectrum, including gun owners, support proposals to require background checks by wide margins. I have a State, like the Presiding Officer’s, where there are a lot of hunters. It is a proud tradition in Minnesota so I look at all these proposals and I say to myself: Does this hurt my Uncle Dick and his deer stand? For many of the ones I have looked at, the answer is clearly no, including the background check bill.

When I talk to law enforcement in my State, they stress the need to have effective background checks to stop felons, people with severe mental illnesses, and others prohibited under current law from accessing guns. These efforts do not have to infringe in any way on Americans’ lawful right to own guns.

Another sensible measure is Senator FEINSTEIN’s legislation to close a loophole that allows bump stop devices to convert semiautomatic firearms into weapons that work like fully automatic guns. Law enforcement officers have now recovered 12 of these devices from the Las Vegas shooter’s room. I am a cosponsor of that bill, and I am encouraged that some of my Republican colleagues have agreed to look at this.

I hope we can find a path forward in the weeks ahead, not only with regard to this particular focus, the bump stock device legislation, but also on some of the other bills like the background check bill.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, I am here for another purpose today; that is, that we must get to work on other important business in the Senate. We need to reauthorize the Children’s Health Insurance Program and come together on bipartisan fixes to the Affordable Care Act. No parent should ever have to worry whether their child will have healthcare, but funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, expired over this weekend. CHIP is one of the great bipartisan success stories. Both parties have come together to support a program that provides healthcare to millions of children.

In Minnesota, these funds support coverage for 125,000 children. I heard from the children’s hospitals and clinics of Minnesota just last week about many of the families who count on this program. While States like mine are finding ways to make Federal funding last a bit longer, since ours has already expired, every single day Congress doesn’t act puts coverage of millions of children at risk.

There is already bipartisan work underway to keep this program going. Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN have introduced a bipartisan bill to extend CHIP for 5 years. In 2015, the last time we renewed this program, it passed the Senate with 92 votes—92 out of 100 votes. We should demonstrate that same bipartisan spirit again. The children in America are counting on us. We must act before it is too late or States like mine may be forced to make difficult choices about insurance coverage for some of our more vulnerable constituents.

CHIP is one part of our healthcare system that is working. We should be doing everything in our power to protect it. So let’s come together and pass this long-term reauthorization of CHIP.

Mr. President, CHIP is not the only area where we should be able to come together on healthcare. The American people want us to work together on bipartisan fixes to the Affordable Care Act. As I said the day it passed, it was a beginning and not an end. Any major piece of legislation like that needs improvements and changes. Let’s work together on the bipartisan bills and ideas that have been put forward. Just like my friend Senator MCCAIN said, we could do better working together—Republicans and Democrats.

Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY have been holding hearings and discussions on commonsense solutions to bring down insurance costs over the past month. We had Governors here, and there were actually more Republican Governors in the room than Democratic Governors, as they embraced these suggested changes which include reinsurance. I note Senator

COLLINS and Senator NELSON, a Republican and a Democrat, have a bill together that would do something on that front.

I look at what has been done in Alaska—I see my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI here—and what has been done in Minnesota when it comes to reinsurance, and we have seen some of the rates go down, not to where we need them to go, but there has been a decrease in the amount of rates. We would like to see that on a national basis, and that is why I am such a strong supporter of Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY's work.

Mr. President, finally, we need to be doing something on the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs. People such as Kim from Plymouth, MN, is struggling to afford her insulin because it has gone up three times. She keeps the injector with a few drops of insulin from day-to-day so she can get by. That is why I think we should have Medicare Part D negotiations. I have a bill that now has 33 cosponsors that lifts the ban that makes it illegal for 41 million seniors to negotiate the prices of drugs. Seniors can be a pretty stubborn and very vocal group. Why don't we let them unleash their power and allow Medicaid to negotiate prices?

Senator GRASSLEY and I have a bill to stop pay for delay, where major pharmaceutical companies are paying off generics to keep their products off the market. I have a bill with Senator GRASSLEY, Senator LEAHY, and Senator LEE—the four of us lead the bill—the CREATES Act, which makes it easier to get more generic competition in the market. We also—MCCAIN and I, and Senator LEE and I—have bills that allow for safe drugs to come in from other countries to again create more competition to bring the price down. When the prices of four of the top best selling drugs in America have gone up over 100 percent, I don't think we can just sit here and do nothing anymore.

I bring up these efforts because, for the most part, they are bipartisan—the work of Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY, the bills that have been introduced to do something on prescription drugs. Let's get moving on that and let's reauthorize CHIP. The last time it passed the Senate with 92 votes.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 323, 324, 325; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc, with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid

upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my hope that we will be able to come to agreement with regard to the nominees whom I have just asked for consideration. These are individuals who have been moved out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to be named to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. This is a Commission that has been without a functioning quorum for months on end. They have just recently been able to achieve that quorum, but they are not yet to a full complement.

We worked hard to reach an agreement with colleagues so these names could advance so the FERC could get to work in an expeditious manner. There is much to be considered. The work that has piled up, that has cost our economy, that has cost our country over these many months, as we have seen these delays when you don't have a functioning FERC, has been considerable. We want to try to reach agreement, but I am disappointed that we are not going to be able to advance them this afternoon.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

WILDFIRE FUNDING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, 4 weeks ago, I stood here on the floor of the Senate and called for increased funding to fight the wildfires. This is just one of the dramatic pictures of Oregon ablaze. It is thousands and thousands of acres.

I had the experience of driving roughly 350 miles in my State and never escaping the smoke from the fires that were in every single corner and in every quadrant of the State of Oregon. We have seen the challenge of Mother Nature at work this year with Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria hitting in Texas, Florida, and Puerto Rico. But let's not forget the incredible damage being done in Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington by these extraordinary fires.

Over the last decade, we have seen an average of 50,000 fires in America each year. They destroy and burn up more than 5 million acres, but this year the count is well over 8 million acres and counting. In Oregon, we normally have fires that burn, on average, about 500,000 acres, but this year we are well over 600,000 acres and counting.

As a result of these raging fires, we have many communities that have been so powerfully impacted and so

many forests destructively impacted. We should stop and ask: What can we do better in terms of our forests and our communities? That is why I am taking to the floor right now.

The first thing we need to do is to end fire borrowing. This is where the U.S. Forest Service, in order to pay for fighting these fires, proceeds to borrow from every other account. This has become all too common. What are those other accounts? They are the hazardous fuels funds, forest management funds, forest restoration funds, forest conservation funds, road maintenance funds, and funds that are designed to prepare for future timber sales.

All of that does a lot of damage to the preparation. So the fires are more resilient and aren't susceptible to this type of firefighting. We have seen, on average in the last decade, a cost of fighting fires across the country of about \$1.6 billion. But this year, we are over \$3 billion—almost double. So even though the Appropriations Committee had wisely put in a buffer of several hundred million dollars to prevent fire borrowing, those funds were long ago wiped out.

So there we were 4 weeks ago. I was working to say that now that we are over the allotted funds for the year, let's immediately get more funds that can be used to backfill this shortage in September. I thank all of my colleagues for the fact that those funds were included in the continuing resolution. We successfully provided a bridge so that firefighting could continue and so that the fire borrowing was quickly repaid.

But that is not a permanent solution—to try to legislate or to backfill on a rapid basis. Indeed, when we have these kinds of fire seasons, it is like other natural disasters. It is like tornadoes and hurricanes and floods. So we need to have a FEMA-style backup for those worst ever fire seasons. That is what my colleagues Senator WYDEN and Senator CRAPO—bipartisan teamwork—have been putting forth. It is called the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2017. It says that when we reach a certain level of funding for fighting fires, the balance will go to a FEMA-style fund. That is exactly the way it should be done.

It has been estimated in the past that if just the top 1 percent or 2 percent of the worst fires were funded in FEMA-style fund, we would never have had fire borrowing in the past. But the most relevant kind of crisp and clean way to do that would be to adopt this bill Senator WYDEN and Senator CRAPO have put so much work into and which I am certainly pleased to cosponsor. That would be very useful, and we should do that now.

We should respond while the memory is fresh and, actually, while fires are still burning in State after State—certainly burning in my home State of Oregon. Then we should recognize, too,

that this terrible fire year has done so much damage to so many communities. We have communities where the roads have been cut off. We have communities where the tourists disappeared because of the smoke, or other economic enterprises had to shut down for an extended period.

So as we assist those communities hit by Harvey and hit by Irma and hit by Maria, let's also help those communities that were hit by this year's extraordinary fires. That would mean strengthening the Small Business Disaster Loan Program. That would mean taking the additional funding for the USDA Emergency Community Water Assistance Program, and, certainly, it would mean making additional community development block grants available to the communities impacted by these fires. Let's not forget those communities as we provide assistance in funding to the communities affected by the hurricanes.

Then we also need to address the fact that many assets in our forests were scorched by these fires. There are trails that have to be repaired, roads that have to be repaired, watershed repairs to avoid landslides, facilities that were scorched and burned, and wildlife and fish management restoration, including critical sage grouse areas.

I was up visiting the incredible waterfall, the Multnomah Falls. They were explaining that several of the trails have bridges—there are so many bridges on the trails in Oregon—and that the fire had burned some of the understructure. So from above it looked like the bridges were safe, but they weren't safe. They can't reopen those trails until they get support to do all these repairs. The Forest Service has estimated that it will take \$150 million to restore the damage done to the Forest Service's infrastructure.

So we should make that happen as part of this bill. Then, we should turn to forest fire resilience. We have 2 million acres in need of fire prevention efforts in Oregon. Actually, we have far more of that in need of fire prevention, but we have nearly 2 million that have already passed through environmental approval for work to reduce the hazardous fuels that are on the floor of the forest, and we need to thin these forests.

You can imagine that when you have clearcuts and those clearcuts are replanted, the trees grow back very close together. In a short amount of time, those forests are very good for fires and very good for disease, but they are neither good for ecosystems nor for timber stands. So they have to be thinned, and that thinning can be done, in Oregon alone, on nearly 2 million acres already approved through the environmental process. The challenge is to get more funds into that effort.

That, too, should be part of this because, whether you talk to an environ-

mentalist or talk to somebody who wants sawlogs for the mills, they both know that if you thin these forests, you make them more resistant to fire. With better timber stands, you have better ecosystems, and you supply a steady supply of sawlogs to the mill.

Let's not reopen the timber wars of the past. Let's work together with a win-win.

I want to show this chart because it indicates the dramatic change of what has happened to the Forest Service budget. We can go back to 1995 and compare it to the year 2015. I want to focus particularly on the orange. The orange is the amount of money that was spent fighting forest fires, and 20 years ago, it was 16 percent of the Forest Service budget. But in 2015—2 years ago—it broke 50 percent. It was 52 percent of their budget. This year, it has certainly gone up much higher than that. So as the amount of funds spent on fighting fires has increased, it has dramatically reduced the amount of funds that support our maintenance and improvement of the forest. That is what is getting squeezed out.

Let me put it differently. The more you spend fighting fires out of a single pot of money, the less money you have to prevent the fires. Everywhere I go they say: Can't we do more on the front end so these forests are more resilient? If you think about how fire works, it really gets going if the trees are close together because one tree lights the next tree on fire. If you thin them, you slow that down. The fire goes from the ground, where there is brush, to the canopy, where there are branches, very easily if the branches are close to the ground. So you trim off those branches, separate the trees, thin them out, shave off the branches, cut off the branches, and suddenly you have a forest that is much more resilient.

There are those folks who have said: Let's just get rid of the environmental rules. Let's just clearcut everything. Let's do 10,000 acres at a time. That is, by the way, 15 square miles. Let's set those 15 square miles next to each other. Let's just shave the Earth and wipe out the forests. That way, there will not be forest fires. Those are the timber wars of the past.

What we have seen is that we can bridge the divide between a good ecosystem and a good timber stand by thinning the forest, by making them more like a natural forest, which is much more fire resilient. In the process of thinning, which has to be done periodically over time, we are also providing a steady foundation for sawlogs for our mills.

There is a mill in John Day, OR. I met with the folks there who were very worried. The workers there were very worried about that mill getting shut down. I was determined to do everything I could to save that mill. What ended up happening is that we found we

couldn't save that mill with a timber sale because a timber sale can't commit to a load of logs over a 10-year period. The owner of the mill couldn't commit to the cost of new machinery if he didn't know he would get logs for an extended period of time. So we discovered that we could, though, through a forest health contract—through a stewardship contract—enable a steady supply of thinned logs to make it to that mill and make sure that mill stayed open. Not only did it keep it open, but it added workers to that mill. That is the type of win-win solution that we need.

There is another way of looking at the cost of fighting fires. Here we see, in 1995, 16 percent of the budget going to fight fires; in 2017, 56 percent. Let's look into the future. An original estimate was that we would reach 67 percent by 2025; now the new estimate, based on the changing dynamics in the forest, is that we will get to over two-thirds of the budget fighting fires by the year 2021—four fire seasons from today. That is how big the issue is. That is why we need funds from the front end to be able to thin these forests. This is simply common sense.

If you are the private owner of a private forest, you wouldn't dare let this forest retain this high propensity for fires and disease. You would thin the forest. You would make it a better timber stand; you would make it a better ecosystem. And that is what we need to do.

We have also seen that another way of looking at the changes is how the staffing levels have changed over the last two decades. If we look at just two decades ago, we can see that in 1998 there were about 18,000 individuals dedicated to managing the forest lands and just 5,700 dedicated to going out and fighting blazes. Now we have come into the future, and we see now that the number of people fighting fires is larger than the number working on all of the other forest programs. We have to commit to doing far more on the prevention end. If we let this summer's crisis go without securing funding to thin those forests that have already gone through the environmental process, we are making a huge mistake, and it is going to cost us more because there are going to be even more fires in the future. So not only do we spend more out of the National Treasury to fight them, but we will have less healthy timber stands to fuel our economy.

Let's end the fire burn. Let's provide the funding to restore the fire service assets that were burned, the scorched assets. Let's provide assistance through community development block grants and small business loans to assist the communities that were scorched by these fires. Let's pass Senator WYDEN and Senator CRAPO's bill, which proceeds to create a FEMA-like

structure to back up the worst fire seasons, and certainly, certainly, absolutely, let's invest in prevention on the front end by thinning these forests and getting the flammable buildup of forest branches off the floor of the forests. Those are positive things we can do.

At this moment in Houston, in Miami, in Puerto Rico, people are thinking, what can we do to better prepare for the next storm surge? What can we do to be better prepared for the next hurricane? Well, we know for sure that we are going to have fires across the Northwest in Montana, in Idaho, in Oregon, in Washington every summer, and they are simply getting worse. We must ask ourselves the same question: How do we change this rhythm? How do we operate this differently and better? That is our responsibility in this Chamber, and that is the set of things we can do to have a far better outcome in the future.

I urge all of my colleagues to support these five efforts as we support funding for Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Tuesday, October 17, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 191, the nomination of David Trachtenberg to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. I further ask that there be 10 minutes of debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 327, 332, 333, and 337.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Stephen B. King, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czech Republic; BARBARA LEE, of California, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Seventy-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; CHRISTOPHER

SMITH, of New Jersey, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Seventy-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and J. Steven Dowd, of Florida, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there any further debate on the nominations en bloc?

If not, the question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the King, Lee, Smith, and Dowd nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 365, 366, and 367.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Timothy Gallaudet, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere; Howard R. Elliott, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Department of Transportation and Walter G. Copan, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gallaudet, Elliott, and Copan nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bruce J. Walker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability).

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Walker nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over 2 weeks ago, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands were devastated by Hurricane Maria. This was less than a month after the islands felt the impacts of another powerful storm, Hurricane Irma. Hurricane Maria has left a wake of destruction across the islands. In Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, too many Americans remain without power, clean drinking water, or a method of communicating with their relatives and first responders.

Last week, I met with leaders in the Puerto Rican community in Chicago to discuss local efforts to provide aid. This week, I met with a delegation from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to discuss relief efforts and what we can do at the Federal level to help them rebuild. The stories they shared about friends and family in Puerto

Rico were heartbreaking. These people, our fellow American citizens, are facing a life and death situation. Sadly, the lives of at least 16 people have been claimed.

The situation in Puerto Rico is dire, and aid cannot wait. The 3.5 million people who live on the island of Puerto Rico are our fellow U.S. citizens, and it is our duty to provide aid to them in their time of need.

Yesterday, Congress received a supplemental aid request from the administration to provide much needed disaster relief to our fellow Americans. Now, Congress must come together to help these Americans rebuild homes and businesses, restore critical infrastructure, and access life-sustaining supplies.

Providing emergency disaster assistance to people in need is not a local issue. It is an American issue.

Just as I expect my colleagues to come to the aid of the State of Illinois when we are faced with a natural disaster and just as Congress came to the aid of Hurricane Harvey victims a few short weeks ago, the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands expect us to rally behind them as they work to respond to Hurricane Maria.

I urge my colleagues to quickly pass a clean aid package that will help all Americans whose lives have been impacted by these natural disasters. Any supplemental appropriations bill that includes aid for States impacted by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma must also include aid for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and western States that have been devastated by wildfires.

I was heartened to hear that the Illinois National Guard has deployed teams to provide telecommunication assistance, food, water, tents, and cots to Puerto Rico. I was also glad to see that individual assistance is now available for all 78 of the municipalities on the island, ensuring all individuals in Puerto Rico can receive assistance from the Federal Government.

The Federal response to this disaster has taken far too long, and we must do more to help our fellow American citizens during this humanitarian crisis.

In Congress, our top priority should be making sure the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have the funding they need to rebuild and recover. We cannot delay providing this much needed funding any longer.

It has been tragic to see thousands of shipping containers held at ports, which have been full of critical, life-sustaining supplies that are not reaching those most in need. There continue to be reports of families in Puerto Rico who are stranded and isolated. We must prioritize quickly distributing supplies to reach every individual in the days, weeks, and months to come. The U.S. citizens who live in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are at risk of running out of food, water, and fuel.

It would be unconscionable for us to abandon them in their time of need.

Our thoughts are with the many people who have lost their loved ones, their homes, and other property. I want to recognize the hard work of the volunteers, local officials, and Federal employees that have come forward in this time of need and pitched in at every level.

We can and should do more to help the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands rebuild and recover. I have no doubt that the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands will be able to clean up and rebuild, and they will be stronger for it. The entire Nation must come together as an American family to give them the aid and support they need at every step along the way.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are a lot of issues roiling our Nation these days. I want to talk about an issue that may not get all the headlines, but that has seen dramatic and troubling changes this year: our Nation's higher education policy.

Over the last several weeks, Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos has continued her assault on students and their families.

Previously we had seen her rescind reforms that would improve customer service for students and hold student loan servicers accountable for their treatment of borrowers; rescind a policy prohibiting debt collectors from charging borrowers 16 percent fees to bring their loans out of default; halt the processing of borrower defense loan discharge applications from students defrauded by for-profit colleges and throwing out rules intended to help students get the discharges to which they are entitled to under law; rewrite the gainful employment rule, which is meant to protect students from programs for-profit colleges that saddle students with too much debt compared to their income; propose eliminating public service loan forgiveness, which helps students afford to serve their communities, States, and country while repaying their student loans; propose dumping \$38 billion in additional student loan interest on needy students by eliminating subsidized undergraduate loans; and propose freezing the maximum Pell grant award so that their award covers even less of what it costs a student to attend college.

That is just the beginning.

Several weeks ago, I joined Senators BROWN, MURRAY, and WARREN in calling on Secretary DeVos to appoint a credible, well-qualified, independent chief enforcement officer to lead the Department of Education's enforcement unit.

The unit was created after the collapse of Corinthian to improve over-

sight of higher education institutions and enforcement of Federal laws.

Robert Kaye, a respected investigator and consumer expert from the Federal Trade Commission, was selected to be the first chief. Kaye left the post in March.

Secretary DeVos allowed this critical position to remain vacant for more than 4 months until earlier last month, when she finally announced the appointment of Dr. Julian Schmoke, Jr.

At first glance, Dr. Schmoke meets none of the requirements for the job that my colleagues and I set out in our letter.

As chief enforcement officer, Dr. Schmoke will be charged with ensuring that institutions of higher education are following Federal laws and regulations.

This will mean paying special attention to an area that poses the most risk to students and has demonstrated systemic abuse: for-profit colleges.

These are the colleges that enroll 9 percent of all postsecondary students in America, but take in 17 percent of all Federal student aid and account for 33 percent of all Federal student loan defaults.

Beyond the infamous Corinthian and ITT Tech examples, there are countless examples of for-profit colleges defrauding students, whether it be Ashford, Westwood, or DeVry.

Last year, DeVry agreed to pay the Federal Trade Commission \$100 million for defrauding students and agreed to a separate settlement with the Department of Education.

Guess who Dr. Schmoke previously worked for? You guessed it, DeVry University.

In fact, there are reports that DeVry is still under investigation by the very unit Dr. Schmoke has been appointed to lead. How is that for the fox guarding the henhouse?

If that wasn't enough, there is no discernable evidence on Dr. Schmoke's resume of any experience conducting or overseeing investigations.

Shortly after his appointment, I joined Senators BROWN, WARREN, BLUMENTHAL, and WHITEHOUSE in writing to Dr. Schmoke raising these concerns and asking him to meet with us. We are still waiting.

As Betsy DeVos orchestrates a corporate takeover of the Department of Education by for-profit interests, State attorneys general and other Federal agencies are even more important in providing aggressive oversight to protect students and taxpayers.

Betsy DeVos is doing what she can to disrupt that, too.

On September 1, the Department of Education provided notice to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that it was terminating its existing data-sharing agreement with the CFPB.

The Department took exception "to the CFPB unilaterally expanding its

oversight role . . .” into areas that the Department viewed as within its jurisdiction.

The CFPB has been a leader in protecting student borrowers harmed by Federal loan servicers like Navient and predatory lending practices by institutions like Corinthian and ITT Tech.

This political stunt makes clear that Secretary DeVos would rather initiate a turf war than work with other Federal agencies to fulfill the Federal Government's collective oversight responsibilities.

In announcing Dr. Schmoke as the new chief enforcement officer, Secretary DeVos said, “Protecting students has always been my top priority.”

Well, Madam Secretary, your actions just don't back up that statement.

Nearly every time you have had the opportunity to stand up for students, their families, and taxpayers, you have turned your back on them.

Commonsense protections for students and taxpayers shouldn't be a partisan issue.

Secretary DeVos, I urge you to abandon this assault on students and instead work with us to strengthen America's system of higher education, to deal honestly with wrongdoing by for-profit colleges, and to increase opportunities for all Americans.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for today's vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 226, Callista L. Gingrich to be U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See. I would have voted yea. •

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CONFIRMATION OF ERIC HARGAN

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote on the confirmation of Mr. Eric Hargan, to be Deputy Secretary for Health and Human Service, HHS. Instead, I am in Las Vegas to grieve with and assist my fellow Nevadans in the aftermath of the worst mass shooting in modern American history.

On the question of Mr. Hargan's nomination, I want to make my opposition to his confirmation clear. I do not believe Mr. Hargan to be qualified to be a leading member of HHS. This decision is based on his prior experience, his work and statements opposing the Affordable Care Act, as well as his statements regarding the extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program. Deputy Secretary Eric Hargan would be the highest ranking appointee at HHS, making him responsible for implementing and enforcing the Affordable Care Act, ACA, going forward. Considering the fact that the adminis-

tration has repeatedly and consistently sought to undermine the ACA, I fear that someone with Mr. Hargan's views will only aid and abet this reckless game the administration is playing with Americans' healthcare.

I hope that Mr. Hargan will surpass my expectations and serve this country well as Deputy Secretary at HHS. The role of HHS Deputy Secretary in implementing and administering the efforts of strengthening our healthcare system is too important for any other result. I believe strongly that Americans deserve affordable and accessible healthcare coverage, and I hope Mr. Hargan's actions as Deputy Director show that he agrees. However, I could not in good conscience vote to confirm someone about whom I have so many concerns. Thank you. •

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-42, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$113 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
*Lieutenant General, USA,
Director.*

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-42

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Japan.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$108 million.

Other \$5 million.

Total \$113 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Fifty-six (56) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs).

Non-MDE includes: Containers, weapon support and support equipment, spare and repair parts, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-YAK).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: JA-D-YAI, JA-D-YAH.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 4, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Japan—AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs)

The Government of Japan has requested a possible sale of fifty-six (56) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs). Also included are containers, weapon support and support equipment, spare and repair parts, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$113 million.

This sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by meeting the security and defense needs of a major ally and partner nation. Japan continues to be an important force for peace, political stability, and economic progress in the Asia-Pacific region.

The proposed sale will provide Japan a critical air defense capability to assist in defending the Japanese homeland and U.S. personnel stationed there. Japan will have no difficulty absorbing these additional munitions into the Japan Air Self-Defense Force.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, Arizona. There are no offset arrangements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Japan.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-42

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The proposed sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to the Government of Japan related to the AIM-120C Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air (AMRAAM). The AIM-120C AMRAAM is a radar guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-

down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high flying, low flying, and maneuvering targets. The AMRAAM All Up Round is classified CONFIDENTIAL, major components and subsystems range from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL, and technology data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or an equivalent system which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that Japan can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Japan.

AUTOMATIC GUNFIRE PREVENTION ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the Automatic Gunfire Prevention Act of 2017.

First, I would like to thank Senators BLUMENTHAL, MURPHY, SCHUMER, DURBIN, LEAHY, CORTEZ MASTO, VAN HOLLEN, GILLIBRAND, KLOBUCHAR, MARKEY, CASEY, REED, HASSAN, MERKLEY, CARPER, CARDIN, COONS, FRANKEN, HARRIS, BOOKER, WHITEHOUSE, HIRONO, SANDERS, WARREN, CANTWELL, MCCASKILL, NELSON, MURRAY, UDALL, KAINE, WARNER, BENNET, SCHATZ, WYDEN, BROWN, DUCKWORTH, MENENDEZ, and BALDWIN for cosponsoring this legislation. Their support for this bill is deeply appreciated.

Just days ago, in Las Vegas, NV, we experienced the worst mass shooting—in terms of the number of victims—in our Nation's history.

There are now at least 58 dead and nearly 500 wounded as a result of that attack. The grief and pain of so many victims and their loved ones is overwhelming and all too familiar to gun violence victims and survivors all across America.

What makes this mass shooting particularly devastating is that the shooting was done by a single gunman. Within minutes, the gunman exacted devastating firepower on hundreds of people, terrorizing concertgoers and an entire community.

How was this possible?

While facts are still being uncovered, we know that this particular gunman had amassed a vast arsenal. He had at least 23 firearms and hundreds of rounds of ammunition in his hotel room among which were 12 semiautomatic rifles enhanced with "bump-stock" devices.

These bump-stock devices are typically used to turn semiautomatic rifles

into functional machine guns, capable of shooting hundreds of bullets per minute.

A semiautomatic rifle's rate of fire is usually 45 to 60 rounds per minute. With a bump-stock device attached, these semiautomatic weapons can fire up to 700 rounds per minute. Bump-stock devices are readily accessible. They can be purchased online or at a store by anyone for merely \$100.

Anyone who has seen YouTube video clips of semiautomatic rifles outfitted with these devices knows just how devastating they are.

The number of bullets that can be sprayed into a crowd within minutes is staggering.

Because they are so dangerous, automatic machine-gun-like weapons have been categorically banned in America since 1986 under the National Firearms Act.

This law was a direct response to the Prohibition Era's mobster crimes during which machine guns were used to kill their victims at a deadly rate.

One seminal event during this period was the St. Valentine's Day Massacre of 1929.

That tragic day was marked by the murder of seven men in a garage on the North Side of Chicago. The massacre was the culmination of a feud between an Irish American gang and another gang led by Al Capone. Organized crime was rampant during that era, and fully automatic weapons were the weapons of choice for gangsters. Indeed, the men who committed the St. Valentine's Day Massacre used Thompson submachine guns, known as "Tommy guns," to mow down their victims.

The St. Valentine's Day Massacre, which remains in infamy, clearly demonstrated that elected leaders must do something about this violence and get these fully automatic guns out of the hands of killers.

As a result, the National Firearms Act was enacted in 1934. When originally passed, it heavily regulated machine guns, imposing a tax on the making and transferring of machine guns and other lethal weapons. It also imposed a special occupational tax on those engaged in the business of importing, manufacturing, and dealing in firearms regulated under the National Firearms Act.

It also required the registration of all machine guns and other guns regulated under the National Firearms Act with the Treasury Secretary.

Later, in 1986, the National Firearms Act was amended to ban all future automatic weapons from private possession, except for those legally owned and registered as of May 19, 1986.

Therefore, today, automatic weapons are generally banned for civilian use—and rightfully so. They are absolutely lethal weapons of war and have no business being in our homes, our schools, our businesses, and our streets.

Notwithstanding this outright ban, there is a loophole in the law that allows bump-stock devices to configure legal semiautomatic weapons so that they can function like a fully automatic weapon. This loophole must be closed.

If automatic weapons are banned, these devices should be banned. There is no functional difference between automatic weapons and a bump-stock enhanced semiautomatic weapon. Such devices are simply not needed to hunt or to use in a private home for self-defense.

Like we saw in Las Vegas, these bump-stock devices allow those with a motive to kill to use fully legal firearms to wreak havoc and kill large numbers of people within minutes.

The bill I have introduced is straightforward. It closes the loophole that allows civilians to purchase and use devices that convert semiautomatic weapons into machine guns. Specifically, it bans the sale, transfer, importation, manufacturing, or possession of bump fire devices, trigger cranks, or anything that accelerates a semiautomatic rifle's rate of fire.

The bill further provides an exception to this ban, by allowing for the lawful possession of these devices by law enforcement and the government.

Those who violate the ban would be subject to the same penalty available to those who illegally possess a machine gun under current law.

Closing this loophole should not be a partisan issue. Anyone who has seen footage from the shooting in Las Vegas should recognize that weapons that are altered to emulate automatic gunfire should not be permitted in our communities.

In my view, this bill is a modest proposal. It was one that was included in the Assault Weapons Ban legislation that I proposed 4 years ago, which we failed to pass in 2013.

Tragically, had that legislation been enacted in 2013, it could have perhaps saved lives in Las Vegas.

Indeed, when the police dispatcher was first contacted in Las Vegas at 10:09 PM local time, it took 11 minutes until the last shots were fired and the suspect was neutralized.

Think of that for a moment. If automatic gunfire had been impossible for the gunman, less shots would have sprayed through Las Vegas that night, and less people may have died. That is extraordinarily sobering.

I recall standing here on this floor nearly 4 years ago, urging my colleagues to adopt the assault weapons ban, pleading that it could possibly save lives.

That was on the heels of one of the darkest days in American history, when 20 beautiful children and 6 educators had their lives taken at Sandy Hook Elementary School. It is an absolute travesty that Congress refused to act back then.

It is my strongest belief that when our Nation is faced with dire situations—like sickness, or job stagnation, or human trafficking—it is our job, our solemn oath as lawmakers, to try to solve these problems.

We utterly forsake that solemn oath when we simply do nothing; when we yield to cynicism or to a single lobbying faction.

If we do not act today, we are failing the American people. We are failing our communities. We are failing responsible gun owners.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. We must act. Now is the time.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the United States is facing an urgent nuclear crisis with North Korea. President Trump should not trigger another nuclear crisis with Iran.

North Korea's nuclear program presents a clear and direct threat to the United States. Our top military official, General Dunford, testified last month that North Korea has the capability to strike the U.S. mainland with an intercontinental ballistic missile. North Korea has ramped up the pace of its ballistic missile tests, firing two ICBMs over Japan in recent months. Just last month, North Korea conducted its sixth test of a nuclear weapon, the largest yet.

Meanwhile, President Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong Un are engaged in nuclear brinkmanship. Trump has threatened to "totally destroy" North Korea, has tweeted that North Korea "might not be around much longer," and has rebuked his own Secretary of State for attempting to find a diplomatic solution. With each reckless pronouncement, Trump's threats could bring the United States closer to a war that would put at risk millions of lives, including tens of thousands of American soldiers.

Confronted with the North Korean nuclear threat, President Trump is seeking to provoke another nuclear crisis, this time in the turbulent Middle East. He has repeatedly threatened to withdraw from the agreement that the United States and the international community forged to prohibit Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. He has called the Iran deal an "embarrassment," "the worst deal ever," and has vowed to "rip up" the agreement. In making those threats, Trump is putting our security and credibility at risk.

The Iran deal is working. It has verifiably shut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear bomb, imposed tough constraints on Iran's nuclear program, and subjected Iran to the most comprehensive inspection and monitoring regime ever negotiated. How do we know? We know from Donald Trump himself.

Just 2 weeks ago, President Trump found Iran in compliance and waived

nuclear-related sanctions on Iran. In fact, the Trump administration has twice certified Iran's compliance with the deal, acknowledging that adherence to the agreement is in the vital national security interests of the United States. Our State Department, our Defense Department, and our intelligence community have all assessed that Iran is in compliance with the nuclear agreement. Most importantly, President Trump has presented no evidence to Congress, as he is required to do by law, of any potential Iranian breach of the deal. In fact, the administration has yet to brief the Senate on its strategy for Iran, despite weekly requests from my colleagues.

Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, Trump has suggested that he will refuse to certify Iran's compliance with the deal by October 15, the next deadline. This will effectively kick the deal's fate to Congress, which will then have 60 days to decide whether to reimpose the nuclear-related sanctions on Iran waived under the deal.

Make no mistake: Trump's reasons for not certifying Iran's compliance are based on politics, not national security. He wants to tear up an agreement that has prevented Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, simply because it was negotiated by a democratic administration. Trump has threatened to do this without offering any alternative plan to block Iran from getting a nuclear bomb.

In the absence of any evidence of an Iranian violation, Trump and his team are manufacturing reasons not to certify the deal, citing issues not addressed in the nuclear agreement, such as Iran's sponsorship of regional terrorism, its ballistic missile tests, and its human rights violations.

Iran is subject to sanctions for those malign activities. Since the Iran deal has been implemented, the United States had designated over 100 individuals and entities for sanctions. Congress passed a new law this July, that I cosponsored, sanctioning Iran for these aggressions. It is worth underscoring this point: Donald Trump has yet to issue instructions to his administration on how to implement that sanctions law.

In short, the Iran deal has not prevented the United States from taking measures to hold Iran accountable for its destabilizing actions elsewhere. It has, however, prevented Iran from conducting those same actions with a nuclear weapon. That is where our focus should continue to be. A nuclear-armed Iran would be a far greater menace in the region than a nonnuclear Iran.

The truth is, if the United States had tried to expand the nuclear agreement to also address Iran's ballistic missile tests and its regional terrorism, there would simply be no deal. Russia and China would not have agreed to its

terms. Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon was the only point on which all parties were united. Critics of the deal who argue otherwise are not being straight with the American people.

In a world of alternative facts, that point is worth reiterating. No deal, including this one, contains everything we want. That is the nature of a negotiation. Unilaterally withdrawing from the agreement will not produce a better deal today. In fact, we have much less negotiating leverage today. The United States does not have the backing of our allies and partners around the world for withdrawal. Our partners have been crystal clear. They will not renegotiate the deal while it is working. Without that international backing, we have no leverage with Iran.

This brings to bear another, equally important, point. This administration is already putting American credibility at risk; if we manufacture a specious excuse for abandoning the Iran agreement, our word will mean little. That will make it nearly impossible to negotiate a diplomatic solution to the nuclear crisis in North Korea, already an extremely challenging prospect. Put simply, our allies, partners, and adversaries would have no reason to trust the United States.

That is why Secretary of Defense Mattis, when asked whether it was in the national security interest of the United States to stay in the Iran deal, said, "Yes, Senator, I do."

I want to end by outlining the choice we face right now. The choice we face right now is between a deal or no deal. It is between cutting off Iran's pathways to a bomb or allowing Iran to push forward with its nuclear weapons program. It is between maintaining U.S. leadership in the world or empowering our adversaries. It is a choice between diplomacy or heading down a path toward war.

For these reasons, I urge President Trump to certify Iran's compliance with the nuclear agreement by October 15. If he fails to do so, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to preserve the deal.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues and all Americans in celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month and the innumerable contributions of the Hispanic American community. There is much to celebrate. Although Hispanic Americans comprise 18 percent of the U.S. population, Latino-owned businesses, by some estimates, are responsible for approximately 86 percent of this country's small business growth. What is more, their economic influence is unrivaled by any other demographic since the baby boomers, representing a \$1.5 trillion segment of the consumer market,

according to a recent Stanford University state of Latino entrepreneurship, and perhaps, most notably, Hispanic Americans play an increasingly important role in our democracy, with a record 27 million Latinos eligible to vote in last year's election.

It has never been clearer that Hispanic Americans represent an impressive cultural and economic force. Ultimately, however, their value to this country is not in their statistics. It is in their character. A love for family, a commitment to community, and an unparalleled penchant for hard work are the tenets of Hispanic heritage. They are also the building blocks of America. This is no coincidence: Hispanic Americans helped build and sustain our Nation. They are an irreplaceable thread in the fabric of American society. With their knack for innovation, with their fearless pursuit of better lives, and sometimes with their bare hands, they have shaped this country from the ground up, and we are all the better for it.

While we use this month to reflect on their dignity and importance to this country, this year, in particular, the Hispanic American community is best served through actions not just words. Congress must pass the Dream Act. President Trump's order to rescind the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, Program has shaken the Hispanic American community and most American to their core. Dreamers were brought to this country as children, with no decision in the matter. More importantly, they are quintessentially American in every way, except for their immigration status. They have lived, played, worshipped, and gone to school alongside our children most of their lives. They are our children's classmates and neighborhood friends and teammates. They are the college students studying at the library. They are the young serviceworkers at our favorite restaurants, studiously saving up for next semester's tuition. They are young men and women in uniform, serving in harm's way, defending our freedoms.

Dreamers were raised here, and most know no other home except the United States of America. If Congress does not act to protect them, the President's actions will force many of them out of work, into hiding and into poverty. This will not make America stronger. What makes America stronger are the Dreamers themselves. Their spirit, character, and will to overcome represent what is best about our country. We should be proud to call them our own. We shouldn't be sending them underground or into exile.

There is another urgent matter demanding our full attention: hurricane relief for Puerto Rico. The pictures coming from Puerto Rico are heart-breaking. The devastation that has hit the island as a result of Hurricane

Maria deserves the same commitment and support that would go to any other location in the United States. Puerto Rico's 3.4 million residents are American citizens, and they should be treated just the same as residents of Florida, Texas, and Louisiana. The Senate should quickly take up the emergency supplemental appropriations request as soon as possible after the Columbus Day recess.

Voting rights, access to quality, affordable healthcare, higher education, tax reform, these are also issues critically important to Hispanic Americans because they are the issues important to the country. There is no breathing room between the two. Our national interests are their personal interests, so their interests must also be ours.

Americans are a diverse group; we do not all look the same or worship in the same way. We are, each and every one of us, united by far more profound things: a love for the freedoms this country affords us; respect for the power and peace we derive from our diverse communities; and an unshakable belief in every person's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. What makes us Americans is our moral fiber and our shared love for the United States. Any other litmus test is a discriminatory one; yet every day, and sometimes at the hands of our own government, Hispanic Americans are tested and questioned, profiled, and met with suspicion, out of sheer ignorance and baseless prejudice. Still, they march on. They meet the challenges of systemic discrimination with grace, grit, and courage. Indeed, the Hispanic American community often reflects the best of America, even when America offers less than its best in return.

Now more than ever, Hispanic Heritage Month must be about standing up and declaring support for Hispanic Americans. Now more than ever, Congress must use its collective voice to magnify their voices, to affirm Hispanic Americans' rightful place in this Nation and to proclaim a commitment to representing their interests right here in this Chamber.

We must begin fulfilling that commitment by immediately passing the Dream Act. But our commitment must extend further. We must support more equal representation of Hispanic Americans in our society, including in Congress. We must address the healthcare disparities that disproportionately affect the Hispanic community, an issue that begs Congress to work together toward more universal, affordable coverage. We must acknowledge the difficulties Hispanic American students face in affording college. Finally, we must stand firm against the tidal wave of bigoted rhetoric that has flooded the national dialogue in recent months. Whenever and wherever Hispanic Americans are degraded, belittled, or

oppressed, basic morality demands that we speak up and speak out. Tolerance and respect, like a muscle, require effort and exercise. We must not allow these values to atrophy on our watch. Diversity and inclusion are American virtues and proud features of Hispanic heritage alike; we must now, and always, be their steward.

TRIBUTE TO MARY GAUTREAUX

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I wish to indulge in a bit of bragging. I know every one of us in this Chamber has that one or two staffers who are the Jacks or Janes of all trades of their operations.

My longtime loyal friend and staffer, who has served the great State of Oregon for over 20 years in my office as a fellow, a field representative, and now deputy State director, Mary Gautreaux celebrates her 70th birthday on October 17. I want to recognize her enormous and long-lasting contributions over the past two decades in my office to making Oregon a better place to live and enjoy.

Mary brings a lifetime of expertise to the natural resources issues that play such an essential part in Oregon's economy and quality of life. Not only does she know these issues but she has lived these issues and passed on her love of them to her children, Ryder, Myria, Callie, and Lucas, as well as her five grandchildren.

Before joining my office in the 1990s, Mary served in the U.S. Forest Service. In those days, Mary planted trees and fought fires to support her young family. While the work was seasonal, to start, she quickly made an impression on the U.S. Forest Service and became a full-time employee.

Then I was lucky enough to get her as a fellow in 1994 in my DC office when I was still a member of the House of Representatives for the proud 3rd District of Oregon and still had rugged good looks and a full head of hair.

She worked in my DC office for a year and had just moved back to Oregon when I realized my office was better for her presence, so I hired Mary to work as field rep in Oregon. I may not know much about a lot of things, but I can recognize an excellent teammate, and Mary was a natural fit on "Team Wyden."

When I was elected to the U.S. Senate for the first time in 1996, I made a promise to do a townhall meeting in every county in Oregon every year I was privileged enough to represent the good people of Oregon in Washington, DC. In the last 21 years, she has been with me at almost every one of the 800-plus townhalls I have held each year in each of Oregon's 36 counties.

At almost every one of those townhalls, I have at some junction pointed to Mary and said, "Folks, give Mary a call about this issue. She works nights

and weekends—never hesitate to call.” It does not matter the issue; Mary always answers the phone. She has been going the extra mile with and for Oregonians in every nook and cranny of our State, both literally and figuratively.

Literally, Mary has traveled with me and solo to countless meetings in grange halls, diners, and farmhouses all across Oregon, and there has never been an issue too big or too small for her to take on.

One way to explain the praise Mary has earned is to say that Oregonians know Mary as a public servant always willing to listen and find solutions that benefit all of Oregon and Oregonians, not just the ones that vote for me. She lives by my promise to be the “Senator for all of Oregon,” and Oregonians know it and appreciate her for it.

My appreciation and Oregon’s appreciation for Mary goes deeper than that accurate and well-deserved summation.

The deeper truth is that anybody who knows Mary knows she is an original and unforgettable force of nature—fierce on behalf of Oregonians, bold in her problem-solving, always willing to help, and just as ready with a smile to lighten any situation.

She has a gigantic heart matched only by her passion for public service and protecting the natural treasures we Oregonians all hold dear.

The bottom line is I have been very fortunate to work with her, to call her friend, to have her as an integral member of Team Wyden, and I look forward to many more years of her public service to the people of Oregon and her friendship to me and my family.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DONALD AND RITA GALLES

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the St. Anthony Tri-Parish Catholic School Foundation’s 2017 honorees, Donald Galles and Rita (Murphy) Galles.

The foundation supports the wonderful work of the St. Anthony Tri-Parish Catholic School. The school is dedicated to achieving academic excellence in a faith-filled community and living a life committed to Christian service. Since 1927, the school and staff have provided a high standard of academic achievement and Christian values. The school provides strong religious and educational leadership to the Casper community.

On October 12, 2017, the foundation will be hosting the sixth annual Joy Breakfast and celebrating the school’s 90th anniversary, nearly a century of educating students. Every year at this event, the foundation honors individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the school and exemplify

the values of the Catholic community. Don Galles and Rita (Murphy) Galles are perfect for this honor. Both the Galles family and the Murphy family have a long history of supporting Catholic education and serving as role models to our community. John and Mari Ann Martin, Susie and the late Mick McMurphy, and Joe Scott will also be recognized at the breakfast for their invaluable contribution and dedication to the St. Anthony’s Tri-Parish Catholic School Foundation.

Rita is a caring nurse and dedicated mother. As a native to Casper, WY, she attended St. Anthony’s Parochial School and graduated from Natrona County High School in 1947. Rita then attended the St. Joseph’s School of Nursing in Denver, CO, and started her nursing career. As a nurse, she touched so many lives by caring for the sick and injured. While in Denver, she married Dr. Joseph Murphy at the Blessed Sacrament Church on November 24, 1953. They were married for 51 years and had 12 children: Patrick, Mary Ann, Donald, Kevin, Mark, Sheila, Michelle, Rita, Kathleen, Maureen, Robert, and Anne. Rita enrolled all 12 of her children in St. Anthony’s in order to ensure they received an excellent academic and religious foundation. With this strong background, her children have collectively spent more than 75 years in post-high school education.

Donald is a decorated veteran, accomplished businessman, and loving family man. Like Rita, he is a native of Casper, WY, and attended both St. Anthony’s Parochial School and Natrona County High School. After high school, Don joined the U.S. Army’s 100th Infantry Division in France. He proudly fought for our country on the front lines during World War II. Don was seriously wounded while fighting in France. For his brave service to our Nation, Don was awarded the Silver Star, the Nation’s third-highest award for valor. He also received a Bronze Star, Purple Heart, and Combat Infantry Badge. After the war, Don attended and graduated from Creighton University in Nebraska. It is there that he met Ann Christensen, who later became his wife for 55 years. They returned to Casper and raised six children: Tom, David, Dona, Laura, Karla, and Jeff. Many of their children attended St. Anthony’s. In Casper, Don had a successful career as a partner with a local oil and gas firm. He is also active in the community as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Knights of Columbus, and a lifelong member of St. Anthony’s Catholic Church.

The Galles and Murphy families were joined together in 2005. In the presence of their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, Don and Rita were married at St. Anthony’s Catholic

Church on December 29, 2005. As the place where they first met as children, the church holds great memories and a deep personal connection for them both.

Over the years, Don and Rita have generously contributed their time and resources to both the church and school. They have also given back to our community in numerous other ways. For example, Don and Rita made an essential donation to purchase land and a building to expand the Casper Seton House, which assists homeless mothers and children. Their kindness, devotion, and generosity are true reflections of their character and the values they have passed along to their family.

It is with great honor that I recognize these outstanding members of our Wyoming community. My wife, Bobbi, joins me in extending our congratulations to Donald and Rita Galles for receiving this special award.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN GABRIEL “GABE” SMITH

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a Marylander, John Gabriel Smith, whose courage not only broke barriers for himself but also advanced the cause of the betterment of humanity. We celebrate and honor Mr. Smith, known as Gabe, because he was the very first African American to graduate from Gonzaga College Preparatory High School, located just a few blocks from the Capitol Building, with the class of 1954.

Gabe was born in the turbulent times of the early 1940s in St. Mary’s County, MD, where he and his two sisters were introduced to the ugly world of racism. His hard-working parents committed their children to a Catholic education and religious fellowship at St. Peter Claver, a predominantly African-American church in rural Ridge, MD. As an eighth grader, Gabe decided to serve as an altar boy; little did he know that it would change his life and place him in the annals of American history.

The head pastor of St. Peter Claver was a humble man by the name of Father Horace B. McKenna, S.J., a White Jesuit priest who had been serving the segregated and neglected African-American community in Southern Maryland for two decades. Father McKenna would later found So Others Might Eat, SOME, a ministry which continues to feed the hungry here in Washington, DC. One day, Gabe listened intently as Father McKenna described the spiritual journey many men had taken on the way to priesthood. Gabe, who was interested in pursuing this vocation, asked Father McKenna how he could become a priest too. Father McKenna told Gabe that he would, at a minimum, need to learn Latin. Unfortunately, there were no schools in St. Mary’s County or the surrounding

areas that Gabe could attend which taught Latin, let alone provide the other instruction necessary to launch his vocation, so Father McKenna told him about a school in Washington, DC, where he could learn Latin and all the other requisites. That school was Gonzaga College High School.

Racial segregation was the barrier that would have prevented Gabe from attending Gonzaga, but that was about to change. Gabe often speaks about the angels who have been in his life, including Father McKenna, football coach Joe Kozik, and Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, a man who quietly but diligently worked to break the racial divide here in the Nation's Capital. Several years before the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954 to end segregation, Archbishop O'Boyle ordered the integration of all Catholic schools and churches in the Archdiocese of Washington. Thus, in 1951, John Gabriel Smith was one of the first African Americans to enter Gonzaga, one of the Nation's elite prep schools.

Gabe moved in with his sister, who lived around the corner from the school. He had observed and experienced abusive conditions under segregation in St. Mary's County; thus, he was on guard among his peers at school. Fortunately, during his time at Gonzaga, his classmates welcomed him in the classroom and stood with him in the face of adversity and strife when they walked outside the school's walls.

As a member of the Gonzaga Purple Eagle football team, he encountered yet another angel in his life, a football coach named Joe Kozik, who stood by Gabe, along with his teammates. Whenever the Eagles played an opponent opposed to integrated teams, Coach Kozik and his teammates always stuck together like a family to overcome hate and ignorance.

In June of 1954, the year of the Brown decision to end segregation in public schools across the Nation, Gabe completed his education at Gonzaga College High School as the first African-American graduate. Poised with a thorough education, including a command of Latin, he entered Howard University, where he choose to pursue a different vocation and graduated with a degree in pharmacy. He became a pharmacist and worked for over 40 years, retiring just this past spring with Shopper's Food Warehouse in Fort Washington, MD, where he spent most of his career.

Gabe has been married to Mrs. Jeanette Graves Smith for 50 years and has five children; his eldest, Pamela, passed away several years ago. Gabe is a proud Marylander and a proud resident of Prince George's County. He has long led his neighborhood association as president and served as an active member in good standing of the Mt. Ennon Baptist Church Men's Ministry.

Even though more than 60 years have passed since Gabe attended Gonzaga,

he still comments, "I had angels who helped me through and they continue to be with me today." To this day, Gabe sees his life as an example of the power of love in the pursuit of the greater good. Gabe's life shows us that, despite dark times and dark moments, where there is light through our good deeds and good intentions, there is hope.

John Gabriel Smith was the first of over 1,100 African-American students to graduate from Gonzaga College High School so far. He will leave an outstanding legacy for the State of Maryland, the halls of Gonzaga, and for the United States as an example of what happens when we seek inclusion and love for humanity. He shows us that living by faith and love, everyone can succeed. I commend Gabe Smith for his leadership and life of service.●

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a Marylander, John Gabriel "Gabe" Smith, whose courage not only broke barriers for himself but whose courage advanced the cause of the betterment of humanity.

On October 14, he will be recognized at the Gonzaga High School homecoming by the Gonzaga Onyx, a group of African-American alumni of Gonzaga, due to his achievement of being the very first African-American to graduate from Washington, DC's Gonzaga College Preparatory High School with the class of 1954.

He was born in the turbulent times of the early 40s in St. Mary's County, MD, where he and his two sisters grew up. His parents relied on hard work and diligence to pursue excellence and committed their children to a Catholic education and religious fellowship at St. Peter Claver, a church with a predominantly African-American parish in rural Ridge, MD. As an eighth grader, Gabe decided to serve as an altar boy; little did he know, it would change his life and place him in the annals of American history.

He listened to Father McKenna describe the ways that people had traveled to find God and become a priest. Interested in pursuing this vocation, he asked Father McKenna how he, too, could achieve it and was surprised when Father McKenna told him that he would, at a minimum, need to know Latin.

Unfortunately, there were no schools in St. Mary's or the surrounding areas that taught Latin, let alone the tools necessary to launch his vocation, so Father McKenna told him about a school in Washington, DC, where he could learn Latin and all the other requisites. That school was Gonzaga College High.

Several years before the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954 to end segregation, Archbishop O'Boyle ordered the integration of all Catholic schools and churches in the Arch-

diocese of Washington. Thus, in 1951, he entered the halls of Gonzaga.

Fortunately, during his time at Gonzaga, his classmates stood with him in the face of adversity and strife when they walked outside the school walls. As a member of the Gonzaga Purple Eagle football team, he encountered additional support from Coach Joe Kozik who stood by him, along with his teammates. Whenever the Eagles would play an opponent that vehemently rejected the idea of teams with African-American players, Coach Kozik and his teammates always stuck together like a family to overcome hate and ignorance.

In 1954, he completed his education at Gonzaga College High School as the first African-American graduate. Poised with his education and command of Latin, he entered Howard University and graduated with a degree in pharmacy, where he commanded his field for over 40 years, just retiring this past spring of 2017. He is now spending time with his wife and children.

Gabe says that "he had angels who helped him through and they continue to be with him today." He will forever leave an outstanding legacy for the State of Maryland and the halls of Gonzaga College High School. He was the first African American at Gonzaga, paving the way for over 1,100 esteemed African-American alumni to follow in his footsteps.●

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL FREDERICK HOLLISTER CAMPBELL AND AMY S. CAMPBELL

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to honor the lives of Lt. Col. Frederick Hollister Campbell and Amy S. Campbell.

Lt. Col. Frederick Hollister Campbell served in the U.S. Marine Corps for more than 25 years, serving in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. He earned a Navy Commendation Medal for saving the lives of 250 fellow marines at the Battle of Iwo Jima. After his military career, Fred opened his own private law practice and taught college-level classes at Colorado College and the University of Colorado.

During a time when women rarely attended college, Amy received her B.A. in elementary education from National University and went on to receive her M.A. in reading education from Northwestern University. Prior to her marriage to Fred, Amy taught first and second grade. A two-time military widow, Amy lost her first husband, Bob Noran, as a result of injuries sustained during the Battle of the Bulge in WWII.

Amy and Fred were married on April 14, 1951. A proud supporter of her husband's career, Amy put aside her teaching career to be a full-time officer's wife and mother to their daughter.

Amy and Fred went on to live an incredible life together, traveling, raising their daughter, Susan, and volunteering with many organizations. Fred passed away on December 27, 2011, and Amy went on to live near Susan in Missoula, MT, before passing away on November 29, 2016. I send my condolences to the friends and family of Fred and Amy, as they are both greatly missed. They will be laid to rest together in Arlington National Cemetery.●

TRIBUTE TO BRADEN MATZINGER

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing a young Montanan named Braden Matzinger for his compassionate heart and entrepreneurial spirit in helping our State recover from a devastating wildfire season.

The 2017 wildfire season has impacted many communities in Montana. The fires consumed nearly 1.3 million acres of land. Over the summer, two firefighters lost their lives while protecting the people of the Treasure State. The bravery and commitment demonstrated by all the folks involved with the firefighting effort has generated a sense of unity and support from Troy to Alzada. That sense of unity can be found in the actions of 9-year-old Braden Matzinger of Bozeman. Braden has raised donations for the Montana Wildfire Relief Fund at the last two Montana State University home football games. He sweetened his approach to charitable fundraising with a cup of free lemonade for all those making a donation. At the two football games, he raised over \$600 in donations.

Sometimes life throws us lemons. How we respond is a reflection of our character. The Montana values of charity, compassion, and entrepreneurship are alive and well in the character of our next generation of youngsters, and Braden is a prime example. Thank you, Braden, for seeing an opportunity to help, making a plan, and following through with your plan. To Braden's parents, Jeff and Katie, thank you as well for raising such a high-quality young man.●

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 164TH REGIMENT LANDING ON GUADALCANAL

● Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, 75 years ago, on October 13, 1942, the men of the 164th Infantry Regiment, North Dakota Army National Guard, landed on Guadalcanal to make history as the first U.S. Army unit to offensively engage the enemy in either theatre during World War II.

The soldiers, supplies, and the rifles they carried were welcomed by the beleaguered First Marine Division that had been fighting on the island since August. The prize was the strategic

airfield captured by the marines and coveted by both Allies and the enemy as a key location to champion air and naval superiority in that area of the South Pacific.

On Guadalcanal for only 12 days, the trained but untested soldiers were thrust into the second battle for Henderson Field on the night of October 24. The 3rd Battalion trudged up muddy slopes to fight shoulder to shoulder with Lt. Col. Chesty Puller's marines as waves of Japanese threatened the thin line protecting the airfield. The next day, having proved its mettle, the 164th Infantry remained in charge of that line as the marines moved to an adjacent location. The Japanese attacked the 164th sector on the night of October 26, incorrectly believing the new Army troops could not hold the line. The 164th held firm at the location that became known as the Battle of Coffin Corner, earning the respect of the marines in the form of a Navy Presidential Unit Citation.

The lineage of the 164th Infantry Regiment carries significant history as North Dakota National Guard infantrymen were called to serve in the Spanish American War, the Philippine Insurrection, Mexican Border Incident, World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. The regiment ceased to exist in 1955, its companies reorganized to engineer units, but the esprit de corps of the combat soldiers has remained intact.

On the 75th anniversary, to the day, of the regiment's landing at Guadalcanal, the 164th Infantry Association will hold its last annual reunion, ending a tradition that began in 1945. On Saturday, October 14, the 164th Association will host a public event to recognize the service and heritage of the unit that was so important to the history of the North Dakota Army National Guard, the State of North Dakota, and the United States of America. Eight veterans of Guadalcanal will attend this event, ages 94 to 98, and they will represent all members of the regiment, living or remembered, as this important chapter of North Dakota military history ends.●

RECOGNIZING FIGARETTI'S RESTAURANT

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Figaretti's Restaurant in the scenic northern panhandle of my home State of West Virginia.

Figaretti's was recently named the best Italian restaurant in West Virginia. In my home State, this honor means so much more than just good food. It is a testament to our State's value of family, heritage, and traditions.

Some people may think our love of history means we cling to the past. It is the exact opposite. In an age where the future seems so uncertain, where

we have access to more information and more choices than we know how to process, West Virginians know their priorities. What has stayed constant throughout history is our commitment to our loved ones, keeping our traditions alive, and passing our knowledge of our diverse heritage on to the next generation. The future of West Virginia and the entire country is at the forefront of our minds. These are the values that have made West Virginia stand out in our Nation, and these values are also present in the legacy of excellence at Figaretti's.

In 1944, Sicilian immigrant, Anna Figaretti, started making spaghetti sauce for her neighbors while her husband, Giuseppe, worked in the local mine in Clarksburg. Soon, with support and encouragement from her community and help from her five sons, Anna's spaghetti sauce became available in local grocery stores and eventually in her own restaurant.

Today the restaurant is owned by the third generation of the family. It is my honor to congratulate Dino Figaretti, his wife, Michelle, and his son, Enzo, for this special recognition. Gayle and I have enjoyed the company of the Figaretti family at the beloved Wheeling location and have shared many great meals and conversations with Tony, Sr., and Tony, Jr. I value their friendship so very much.

Owning a business is one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences, and doing it as a family makes it all the more special.

It is my honor to recognize and celebrate the Figaretti family and the Wheeling community for this well-deserved honor.●

REMEMBERING ERMALEE HICKEL

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Ermalee Hickel, the wife of our late Governor, Wally Hickel, who passed away on September 14 at the age of 92. Ermalee was married to Wally Hickel for 65 years until his death in 2010. She is buried next to her husband in Anchorage Memorial Park, standing up, facing Washington, just as Governor Hickel was.

This is the way the power couple of post-Statehood Alaska desired to be remembered. Standing up for Alaskans to Washington, DC. A powerful symbol not only to Alaskans, but Washington, that the battle for Alaska's sovereignty is far from over and that the Hickels, in spirit, stand with Alaskans as we wage this battle to conclusion, however long that may take.

Wally and Ermalee's son, Jack Hickel, remembers these words explaining why his father wanted to be buried standing up. "He said, if they don't do it right he's going to crawl out of his grave and straighten them out. He thought they were going to screw everything up. He wanted to keep his

eye on them." Now there will be two pair of eyes gazing east.

Ermalee, I should warn you, has two pretty tough eyes. She was widely known as "more beautiful than a butterfly, but tougher than a boot."

The history books will mention that Ermalee was twice the first lady of Alaska, as well as the wife of a Secretary of the Interior. They might mention that she was a strong woman, but that really doesn't tell you much about the person, and there is really much more to the story.

Ermalee was born to Lewis and Aline Strutz. The Strutzes moved from Montana to Anchorage in 1924. They bought a house downtown and raised six kids in that house: four girls and two boys. Anchorage was a pretty small town in the day, but it had plenty of life. As a high school student, Ermalee did it all. She was a softball player, editor of the school paper, and quite popular. She never missed a dance. She ushered at the movie theatre and, unique to Anchorage, worked at a cannery. Upon graduation, she went to work on the local base as the secretary to a military officer, a very important job for an outstanding individual. The Strutz girls were like that—popular, successful, from a really good family.

Wally Hickel, on the other hand, arrived in Anchorage from Kansas in 1940 with all of 37 cents in his pocket. His family was in insurance, but he left Kansas to pursue his passion in boxing. That led him to California, and when it didn't work out, Wally booked a ticket in steerage on a vessel headed to Alaska. He replenished his bank account by winning a \$125 purse at a boxing tournament conducted during Fur Rondy, the Anchorage winter carnival. Wally married a local girl, Jannice Cannon, who went to school with Ermalee. Wally and Jannice had a son, Ted. Jannice tragically died in 1943 at the Mayo Clinic. Wally returned to Anchorage, a single dad, and took a job inspecting aircraft on the ramp of Alaska airbases.

In 1945, Ermalee and Wally were married in a small Catholic Church and went on to build a family. It was a tough time for the both of them. Wally still had to pay off Jannice's medical bills and worked a second job as a bartender and a bouncer to make ends meet.

Wally subsequently quit his job on base and told Ermalee that he figured it out. Anchorage was growing and construction was its future. Turns out, he was right. The family found stability and a modicum of wealth. That gave Wally the freedom to pursue his interest in politics. Over time, Wally's investments in Anchorage's growth provided a strong financial foundation for the family.

Throughout it all, Ermalee was a steadfast partner—managing the house, putting chains on the tires of

the car to take the kids skiing, even ironing the pants of her hero, Charles Lindbergh, when he came to Juneau to address the Alaska Legislature. Lindbergh asked Ermalee if she would get "the help" to press his pants. Turns out Ermalee was "the help."

"Ermalee was calm, empathetic and insightful. Wally turned to her and followed her counsel. She guided and protected him, out of sight," wrote Anchorage author and historian Charles Wohlforth. She read to schoolchildren and visited with elders in the Pioneer's Homes. She visited the soup kitchens and the juvenile detention facilities. She fought for benefits for the disabled, raised awareness of fetal alcohol syndrome, and sought to protect seniors from scammers. She did it all without ever seeking credit. Ermalee was always gracious and lovely to me.

Wohlforth headlined his column remembering Ermalee Hickel's legacy with the words "Ermalee Hickel led Alaska, too." She did with dignity and grace from the beginning to the very end. It is an honor and a pleasure to share this story of an Alaskan life well lived with the Senate today.●

RECOGNIZING THE CAROLINA YOUTH DEVELOPMENT CENTER'S NEW PARTNERSHIP

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to recognize and congratulate the Carolina Youth Development Center, Cummins, Inc., and the Hootie and the Blowfish Foundation on its new partnership to provide youth aging out of foster care an independent living transitional house. The Carolina Youth Development Center has been a blessing to our State for over 200 years with their bold mission. They work tirelessly to empower and equip South Carolina's most vulnerable children by providing a safe environment, educational support, and career readiness.

Carolina Youth Development Center has an impressive 227-year history of serving the community's most vulnerable children and families, dating back to its founding as the Charleston Orphan House in 1790. The agency remains steadfast in its commitment to youth in foster care and continues to lead the way, changing lives and transforming communities.●

TRIBUTE TO BILL JOHNSTONE

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a man who has done so much for Montana. Bill Johnstone, a native Montanan, graduate of Montana State University, and retiring chairman of D.A. Davidson, has dedicated his life to improving Montana.

His work at D.A. Davidson has helped countless Montanans financially prepare for the future. Whether it is helping Montana families plan for retirement, small business owners strategize

about the future, or municipalities meet their financial needs, Bill has been there for them, but Bill's good work expanded beyond the private sector. While running a thriving company that employs more than 1,300 employees, hundreds of them Montanans, Bill has always invested his time and resources in Montana. He serves as a member of the board of regents to the Montana University system and has spent years improving schools across Montana.

Bill has also served on the International Heart Institute in Missoula and as the chairman of the Great Falls Public Schools Foundation, helping to raise funds for our public schools. His dedication to his company, his family, and his community makes Bill a model Montanan.

Helping move Montana forward is a common theme in Bill's family, his father, William A. Johnstone, served the education community for nearly 30 years and retired as acting president of Montana State University. It is clear Bill has instilled hard work and public service in his children as well. His son Anthony is an associate professor of law at the University of Montana and former solicitor general of the State of Montana and his son Jesse is the founder and president of a digital marketing agency in New York.

As Bill retires, his legacy at D.A. Davidson will live on and his lasting impact on Montana as a whole will continue to grow. Thanks for the 17 years at D.A. Davidson, Bill, and for your service to Montana. I wish you, your wife, Andrea, and your kids Anthony and Jesse nothing but the best in retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO ANNE MAXWELL LIVINGSTON

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the service of my friend Anne Maxwell Livingston. Mrs. Livingston has served since 2011 as chairwoman of the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, CRMC, which protects Rhode Island's coastal resources through research, regulation, and restoration.

During her 6-year tenure, CRMC has been a nationally recognized leader in ocean and coastal management. One of the shining jewels of CRMC's work has been its innovative Special Area Management Plans, or SAMPs. These plans are ecosystem-based management strategies developed in collaboration with government agencies, municipalities, and other stakeholders to best manage coastal systems. During Mrs. Livingston's tenure, the council saw its groundbreaking ocean SAMP, the first formally adopted ocean spatial plan in the country, pay real-life dividends. In developing this plan, CRMC engaged a diverse group of stakeholders and laid the groundwork for cooperation among

a multitude of regulatory agencies. This effort and CRMC's continued engagement in the process paved the way for the successful development of the Nation's first offshore wind farm off the coast of Rhode Island.

The CRMC has also helped Rhode Island towns and residents understand the increasing effects of sea level rise and storm surge. Using the latest climate change predictions and state-of-the-art modeling, CRMC, in cooperation with the University of Rhode Island and others, developed an online tool, STORMTOOLS, that gives anyone with an internet connection free access to information that can be used to help decide everything from what neighborhood to buy a home in to where to site a new stormwater treatment plant. CRMC is now developing a coastal environmental risk index that can show Rhode Island homeowners individualized flood risks in 3-D.

In addition to her service on the CRMC, Mrs. Livingston has served Rhode Islanders as a board member of the Jamestown Tax Assessment Board of Review and on the board of the Girl Scouts of Rhode Island and the Jamestown Education Foundation. She also continues to serve as treasurer for the Opera House Theater & Performing Arts Center in Newport and on the advisory boards of the Dorcas International Institute of Rhode Island and the Providence Children's Museum. Mrs. Livingston is a passionate and committed leader, and I am grateful for her many years of service to our State's CRMC.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 3 of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act (Public Law 114-244), the Minority Leader appoints Dr. Dolores Subia BigFoot of Norman, Oklahoma, to the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 178. An act to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 652. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1117. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 34. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-164).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 906. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for congressional notification regarding major acquisition program breaches, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-165).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 938. A bill to require notice of cost-free Federal procurement technical assistance in connection with registration of small business concerns in procurement systems (Rept. No. 115-166).

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees (Rept. No. 115-167).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1514. A bill to amend certain Acts to reauthorize those Acts and to increase protections for wildlife, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-168).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Joan Louise Larsen, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

William L. Campbell, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Robert M. Duncan, Jr., of Kentucky, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Charles E. Peeler, of Georgia, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Georgia for the term of four years.

Bryan D. Schroder, of Alaska, to be United States Attorney for the District of Alaska for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1921. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to increase limitations and authorizations for Farm Service Agency guaranteed loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr.

LANKFORD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BURR, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1922. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself,

Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1923. A bill to prohibit firearms dealers from selling a firearm prior to the completion of a background check; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1924. A bill to authorize 2 additional district judgeships for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently modify the limitations on the deduction of interest by financial institutions which hold tax-exempt bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1926. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1927. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1928. A bill to establish a review of United States multilateral aid; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1930. A bill to establish a cost of greenhouse gases for carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide to be used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1931. A bill to reform public financing for Presidential elections and provide for public financing for Congressional elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1932. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide for certain wildfire mitigation assistance; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. KING, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1933. A bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1934. A bill to prevent catastrophic failure or shutdown of remote diesel power engines due to emission control devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 1935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian tribal governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1936. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the designation of State approving agencies for multi-State apprenticeship programs for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1937. A bill to authorize appropriations for border infrastructure construction, to provide conditional resident status to certain aliens, and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include grounds of inadmissibility and deportability for alien members of criminal gangs and cartels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1938. A bill to establish a policy framework that offers and rewards work, strengthens the incentive to work, greatly reduces poverty, and creates new jobs in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1939. A bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1940. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1941. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to clarify the treatment of authentic Alaska Native articles of handicraft containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1942. A bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1943. A bill to amend the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act to extend the transition period for preferential treatment of certain textile and apparel articles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1944. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to allow the Commissioner of Social Security to waive the 30-day residency requirement for receipt of supple-

mental security income benefits for individuals who evacuate from certain territories of the United States as a result of an emergency or natural disaster; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1945. A bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1946. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow unpopulated census tracts that are contiguous to low-income communities to be treated as low-income communities under the new markets tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1947. A bill to improve food safety, to encourage greater production of agricultural commodities for use in the locality of production, to reauthorize and expand Department of Agriculture support of those efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 1948. A bill to abrogate the sovereign immunity of Indian tribes as a defense in inter partes review of patents; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1949. A bill to authorize demonstration projects to improve educational and housing outcomes for children; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1950. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to submit to Congress a report on promoting broadband Internet access service for veterans; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS:

S. 1951. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to award grants to nonprofit veterans service organizations to upgrade the community facilities of such organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1952. A bill to improve oversight and accountability of the financial processes of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1953. A bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1954. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a central parking facility on National Zoological Park property in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1955. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Liu Xiaobo, and collectively

to all advocates of democracy and human rights in China, in recognition of their extraordinary advocacy for liberty and human rights despite repression and their impact on world peace and global understanding of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1956. A bill to authorize the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the Director of the National Park Service to enter into cooperative management agreements for the operation, maintenance, and management of units of the National Park System in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1957. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a gasoline supply reserve in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. Res. 285. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 286. A resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the poorest countries have access to a quality education through the Global Partnership for Education; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 287. A resolution designating October 8, 2017, as "National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 288. A resolution designating the week of October 1 through 7, 2017, as "National Community Policing Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 289. A resolution designating the week beginning October 8, 2017, as "National Wildlife Refuge Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 290. A resolution designating October 5, 2017, as "Energy Efficiency Day" in celebration of the economic and environmental benefits that have been driven by private sector innovation and Federal energy efficiency policies put in place over the past 4 decades; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 91

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 91, a bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deferral of inclusion in gross income for capital gains reinvested in opportunity zones.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. PETERS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 503

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 503, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make publicly available certain regulatory records relating to the administration of the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the use of an alternative depreciation system for taxpayers violating

rules under the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 818

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with disabilities to save additional amounts in their ABLE accounts above the current annual maximum contribution if they work and earn income.

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, supra.

S. 825

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 825, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for meals.

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1084, a bill to amend title 18,

United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 1085

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1085, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America's public safety officers.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1510

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1510, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for online voter registration and other changes and to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve voting, to require the Election Assistance Commission to study and report on best practices for election cybersecurity and election audits, and to make grants to States to implement those best practices recommended by the Commission.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1595

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1595, a bill to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, supra.

S. 1690

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater support to students with dependents, and for other purposes.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1706

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1706, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1719

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to eliminate duties on imports of recreational performance outerwear, to establish the Sustainable Textile and Apparel Research Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1756

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1756, a bill to improve the processes by which environmental documents are prepared and permits and applications are processed and regulated by Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1823, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to clarify that non-commercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not in interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1883, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to publish a final rule to provide for the screening, testing, and treatment for sleep disorders of individuals operating commercial vehicles.

S. 1916

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1916, a bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 245

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 245, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 245, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1927. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service

loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I reintroduced the Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act, a bill that would enable faculty working less than full-time to participate in the Public Service Student Loan Forgiveness Program.

Contingent faculty members are like full-time instructors. They have advanced degrees. They teach classes and spend many hours outside the classroom preparing for class. They hold office hours, grade papers, and give feedback to students. They provide advice and write letters of recommendation. Students rely on them. Since most adjuncts have advanced degrees and, as the 63 percent of graduate degree recipients who borrow have an average of almost \$59,000 in student loans, they are among the 44 million Americans with student debt.

The Public Service Loan Forgiveness program is meant to encourage graduates to go into public service by offering student loan forgiveness for eligible Federal loans after ten years of full-time work in government or the non-profit sector. Public service fields like nursing, military service, and public health qualify. And many education jobs qualify, including full-time work at public universities and part-time work at community colleges in high-needs subject areas or areas of shortage. But other faculty members, those who work part-time, are not eligible for loan forgiveness because the law requires an annual average of 30 hours per week to qualify for the program. For adjunct faculty working on a contingent basis—many of whom may only teach one or two classes while holding down other part-time jobs to make ends meet—this requirement can be difficult or impossible to meet, even when they are putting in more than 30 hours of work each week.

The number of faculty hours given for each class is calculated differently at different schools. Some schools give one hour per hour in the classroom while others actually take into consideration the time required outside the classroom. So, even as these faculty members are working hard to provide quality instruction for their students, often without the option of moving into a tenured, full-time position, their public service is not recognized by the current Public Service Loan Forgiveness program.

The Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2017 would solve this by amending the Higher Education Act to expand the definition of a “public service job” to include a part-time faculty member who teaches at least one course at an eligible institution of higher education. They would still have to meet all the other requirements to qualify for the public service loan forgiveness program, including

making 120 on-time payments while employed at a qualifying institution, and they could not be employed full-time elsewhere at the same time. I believe it corrects a major flaw in the current system and rewards individuals for their contribution to public service rather than penalize them for the number of hours they work.

This bill would benefit someone like Brittany, an adjunct professor in southern Illinois. Brittany finished her graduate degree in 2013 and still has over \$70,000 in student loan debt today. This debt has prevented her from attending law school, her longtime dream, and makes it challenging to put money aside for her retirement. This debt is also putting her children’s future at risk—Brittany will still be paying off her own loans when it is time for her now four-month old child to attend college. This bill would ensure that Brittany, and thousands like her, could secure their family’s financial future by earning credit towards the Public Service Loan Forgiveness for loan payments made while teaching, regardless of the fact that she isn’t full-time faculty.

Unfortunately, for all their contributions to their colleges and the students they work with, adjunct faculty like Brittany often don’t have the same employment benefits or job security as their colleagues. The number of classes they teach every semester varies. To make ends meet, these professors often end up teaching classes at more than one school in the same semester, getting paid about \$3,000 per class and making an average annual income that hovers around minimum wage. This also means that, in some parts of the country, they spend as much time commuting as they do teaching.

Nationally, over half of all higher education faculty work on a contingent basis. In the past, these were a minority of professors who were hired to teach an occasional class because they could bring experience to the classroom in a specific field or industry. Over time, as university budgets have tightened and it has gotten more expensive to hire full-time, tenure track professors, higher education institutions have increasingly relied on adjuncts.

From 1991 to 2015, the number of part-time faculty in the U.S. increased two and a half times from 291,000 to over 743,000. At the same time, the percentage of professors holding tenure and tenure-track positions has been steadily decreasing from 45 percent of all instructors in 1975 to only 29 percent in 2015. The number of full-time instructors, tenured and non-tenured, now makes up less than half of all professors on U.S. campuses. Today, a majority of the 1.5 million faculty employees at public and non-profit colleges and universities in the United States work on a part-time, contingent basis.

Illinois colleges rely heavily on adjuncts. In 2015, 52 percent of all faculty at all Title IV degree-granting institutions in the state—more than 31,700 faculty employees—worked on a part-time basis. This is a 32.4 percent increase in part-time faculty in Illinois compared to a 7 percent increase in full-time faculty since 2002.

This bill does not fix the growing reliance by our higher education system on part-time professors who are underpaid and undervalued. But it would ensure that members of the contingent faculty workforce are no longer unfairly excluded from the loan forgiveness program for public servants. I would like to thank my colleague, Senator AL FRANKEN from Minnesota, for joining me in this effort. I hope my other colleagues will join us to ensure this program benefits faculty members who provide our students with a quality education.

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

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

S. 1927

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY.

Section 455(m)(3)(B)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(m)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “teaching as” and inserting the following: “teaching—

“(I) as”;

(2) by striking “, foreign language faculty, and part-time faculty at community colleges), as determined by the Secretary.” and inserting “and foreign language faculty), as determined by the Secretary; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) as a part-time faculty member or instructor who—

“(aa) teaches not less than 1 course at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a)), a postsecondary vocational institution (as defined in section 102(c)), or a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b)); and

“(bb) is not employed on a full-time basis by any other employer.”.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1937. A bill to authorize appropriations for border infrastructure construction, to provide conditional resident status to certain aliens, and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include grounds of inadmissibility and deportability for alien members of criminal gangs and cartels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Border Security and Deferred Action Recipient Relief Act, which I am introducing.

This bill offers solutions to the serious problems facing us with regard to

border security, while at the same time addressing the needs for a legislative solution for those issues faced by the children who were brought here through no fault of their own.

With respect to the border, this bill provides \$1.6 billion in funding for border security measures that the President requested and the House has already approved in a bipartisan vote. As an Arizonan, I am more than familiar with the steps we need to take to increase border security. We have a better situation on the border than we have had in a while, but there are still measures that need to be taken.

In addition to the appropriate barriers that will aid in preventing illegal crossings, we need access roads that actually get to the border. If there is one issue I hear from property owners, ranchers, Border Patrol agents, and others near the border, it is that they need better access. We have had an issue with regard to roads that are used by the Border Control that are paid for by the county. It is a situation that needs to be resolved, and it will benefit all of us who travel near the border. This bill addresses that. The road issue was also raised by the GAO. I requested a study on behalf of my constituents, along with my colleagues, to see what we could do with the roads and access situation. GAO came back with recommendations, and this would implement some of the recommendations.

The bill also aids law enforcement by ensuring the swift deportation of individuals determined to be members of violent gangs and drug cartels.

I would also like to thank Congresswoman BARBARA COMSTOCK for her leadership on this issue by sponsoring the Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act, which passed the House.

With respect to the children brought here through no fault of their own, this bill takes a measure that has already earned bipartisan support in the House of Representatives, the Recognizing America's Children Act, which provides a solution for the DACA kids. These young immigrants were brought here as children and simply know no other country. For all intents and purposes, these young people consider themselves Americans. If we can protect these DACA recipients and provide solutions to better secure our borders at the same time, that is a win-win.

The President and Congress both want to improve border security. We both want to respond to the threat of dangerous gangs and drug cartels. We both want to arrive at a legislative solution for the rescission of the DACA Program that benefits those who want to contribute to their communities and to the American dream. This bill is the best way to thread the needle and deliver what the President has asked for, what the Congress wants, and what my constituents in Arizona deserve. These issues are far too important for us to delay.

To be clear, I will work with anyone to support any number of proposals that accomplish these goals, but I believe that the straightforward approach of the Border Security and Deferred Action Recipient Relief Act, which I am introducing today, is the best chance we have to put this bill on the President's desk.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1942. A bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss and bring awareness to the obligation that we have to never forget what is happening to way too many Native American women in this country.

For too long, the disproportionate incidents of violence against Native American women have gone unnoticed, unreported, or underreported, and it is time to address this issue head-on. That is what I intend to do today and in the remaining days of my time in the Senate, until we actually get a bill passed.

There is no official database or requirement for information collection regarding the number of missing and murdered Native women. In most cases, the only records of them are records that have been provided to us by the families and friends of the victims. It is critical that Congress push the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI to work with Tribal communities to come up with culturally appropriate protocols for responding to cases of missing and murdered Native women.

I would like to take this time to honor Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind, whose story has been told on the news in North Dakota and nationally and who has been on the forefront of my mind since introducing this bill.

On August 19, Savanna, a 22-year-old member of the Spirit Lake Tribe, who was 8 months pregnant, went upstairs to her neighbor's apartment in Fargo, ND, after being invited to try on a dress for alterations. While she was there, what awaited her in that apartment were truly horrific acts of violence. Although Savanna's baby daughter survived and is now safe with her father and grandparents, that was the last time anyone who loved Savanna saw her alive.

After 8 days of searching for Savanna by the family and the community, her body was finally found by chance by kayakers in a nearby river. Her body was wrapped in plastic and duct taped. Her death was an incredible tragedy and, unfortunately, one that happens way too often to Native women.

While the news of Savanna's death was heard around the world, thousands of indigenous women are murdered and disappear each year, with many of those cases being ignored or forgotten.

Over my decades in public service, I have worked with Tribal communities on issues that involve violence against Native women. In response to those talks and to this latest tragedy, today I am introducing legislation that would help tackle the barriers to bringing justice for missing and murdered Native women across the country.

My bill, which is named after Savanna, would work to improve Tribal access to Federal databases for missing persons. It would promote interjurisdictional collaboration by establishing protocols for responding to cases of missing and murdered Native Americans, and it would require the collection of data related to missing and murdered Native women.

Native women are an inherently vulnerable population whose voices are still not heard by most people in power. Across rural North Dakota, women living on reservations face unique challenges when dealing with violence. Lack of access to emergency services, lack of access to law enforcement officers, lack of access to an AMBER Alert system, and confidential victim services that are not provided—these all act as barriers to women getting the help that they desperately need.

Unfortunately, there is no official database or mandated database collection on the total number of missing and murdered Native women in our country. This has added to not knowing what the actual magnitude of this epidemic really is and has resulted in several Tribal members sending me stories and handwritten lists of the names of missing and murdered women that people have gathered just from their collective memory.

I would like to share some of the stories that I have been so honored to receive from family members. Telling these stories—and giving me the ability to tell these stories—is not easy because every time you tell the story, you relive the story. These tragedies still hurt deeply. Even years after the murder, they still absolutely relive that experience. I know they have given me these stories to tell for one simple reason: because they pray and they hope and they dream that giving me these stories may change the outcome for some other family.

I am going to start by talking about these wonderful women—these beautiful women. Up at the far right-hand corner with her beautiful baby is Stella Marie Trottier-Graves. Stella Marie was born and grew up in Belcourt, ND, and was a member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa. She spent many years traveling the world with her husband, who served in the U.S. Air Force,

and their three children. The family lived in Florida, Germany, Japan, and Arizona. Everywhere they went, Stella quickly made friends and proudly shared her Chippewa culture. She was loved and adored by all who met her for living an adventurous and fearless life.

In July 2009, Stella and her family moved back to Belcourt, ND, and she started to attend Turtle Mountain Community College. On September 16, 2010, Stella and her cousin were at the local bar when she decided to stay behind with other people they knew. According to witnesses, Stella left with another couple to continue the evening out.

Stella's body was later found in a male Tribal member's pickup in an open field on the reservation. It wasn't until 13 days later that the family was officially notified by law enforcement of Stella's death.

Throughout the investigation, there were a lot of rumors and misinformation, which made it difficult to find the murderer or the murderers. People who were with Stella the night of her death said that they were never questioned, and information provided was never followed up on. No one has ever been charged or convicted for this murder, and the last hours of Stella's life remain unknown.

Stella was an incredible woman who was loved by all who knew her. Her family, her children, and her Tribe deserve justice.

Monica Wickre is pictured here with those beautiful earrings and the red shirt. Monica was a 42-year-old mother of three who was born and raised in Belcourt on the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa reservation and lived near Aberdeen, SD.

After a night out with friends on April 7, 1993, Monica never returned home. Her relatives grew concerned when they had not heard from or seen Monica for several days. Eventually, the family filed a missing persons report and started to talk to friends and neighbors. The detective assigned to the case worked closely with the community and the family and assured them he was working diligently on this case.

In June of that year, a canoeist found Monica's badly decomposed body in the James River outside Aberdeen. Throughout the next several years, new detectives were assigned to the case, each having to basically start over and work with limited notes, interviews, and evidence from the previous investigators. A couple of times, the police told the family that they had a suspect or were close to arresting someone for Monica's murder, but there was never enough information to charge the suspect. This has resulted in nearly 25 years of heartache for Monica's family and her friends.

Monica's family wants justice for their daughter, sister, and mother, and

they all want closure. Although the case is no longer active, the family continues to bring awareness about Monica's case in the hope that someone will come forward with information that will, in fact, help solve it.

Monica Lisa Two Eagle is the woman with the dark hair in the floral print shirt. She was a member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe and one of 14 children. She was kind, caring, and athletic. In the winter of 1979, Phil Two Eagle saw his sister Mona Lisa, who was in her early twenties, leave the siblings' house and get into a red-and-white pickup with a couple of men. Mona Lisa never returned.

In the following days, the family and local law enforcement searched for her on horseback. Taking it upon themselves, they searched for her on horseback. About 2 weeks after she went missing, Mona Lisa's father and brother found her frozen in a pasture near their home. She had been beaten, possibly raped, and left alone in a blizzard. Rumors ran wild that family and law enforcement tried to solve the crime, but, even to this day, no one was ever convicted or even charged. The two men who were last seen with Mona Lisa all those years ago are still running free, while the family lives every day with the lack of justice.

Lakota Rae Renville, the woman in the black-and-white photo, is the last victim I want to talk about. I want to thank her family, who are here today and who have honored me and trusted me with her memory. I want to help them understand how grateful I am, but I also want them to know that sharing her story will help raise awareness about the crimes of missing and murdered indigenous people.

Lakota was a member of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Dakota Bands of North and South Dakota, who, despite being shy and reserved, had a solid group of friends who supported her and even helped her excel in school. After graduation, Lakota spent time taking care of her family, especially her nieces and nephews.

In 2005 Lakota met a man online and unexpectedly relocated to Missouri, unbeknownst to her family. With most details still unknown 12 years later, the family is left with more questions than answers. What they do know is that she was forced into sex trafficking and manipulated against her will.

In October of 2005, Lakota's family was called and told that her body was found badly beaten, wrapped in carpet padding and a blanket in an open gravel pit in Missouri. Local investigators brought in and subsequently let go dozens of suspects and, to this day, have not brought her murderer to justice.

Lakota was never given a chance to become a mother or pursue that bright future that surely lay ahead of her. She was robbed of a life she had yet to experience, a life that was certain to be

filled with love from her family and deep appreciation from her family.

These are not isolated cases. This goes on every day in America.

I want to make a point of how discouraging it, so many times, when you see events unfolding where it may be that a young girl goes missing in a Caribbean island and the world is turned upside down looking for her or when we hear a story of someone who comes from maybe a more affluent and wealthy family who goes missing and we turn over every stone to find them. Yet that is not the story for very many indigenous women.

When you look at the importance of what we do today, probably the most important thing we can do is to tell these stories, and from telling these stories we have an opportunity to really change. We can't ignore that frequently for Native people, they are not wrong to believe that they are the forgotten people of this country. Way too often, the first Americans become the last Americans.

Under the Savanna's Act, the Attorney General, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, must consult with the Tribes on how to improve Tribal access to Federal criminal information databases, such as the National Crime Information Center and the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System. We need to ensure that Tribal law enforcement has up-to-date information on missing Native women and better communication—in fact, essential—with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and Tribal law enforcement agencies so cases like the ones you have heard of today don't go unnoticed or uninvestigated.

Jurisdictional issues are a huge barrier in Indian Country to responding to and prosecuting crimes committed on Tribal lands. Standardized protocols must be established in order to give a quicker response to Native women going missing. The complexity of jurisdiction on Tribal lands can slow down an investigation, but it is not an excuse. It can waste crucial time at the beginning of an investigation or a case, but it is not an excuse. If we do not act rapidly, we know we lose precious time to prevent homicides and to bring a woman safely home and help apprehend the perpetrators.

In one case study alone done by the National Institute of Justice, 97 percent of Native women experience violence by a non-Native perpetrator. This number emphasizes what I have long said, that historical trauma is a major factor of violence against Native women, and perpetrators feel that Tribal lands give them a free pass from the law. This can no longer be tolerated, and jurisdictional issues must be addressed. It cannot be the excuse for inaction.

Although we don't know the total number of missing and murdered Native women, it is clear, from all of the

stories and from the statistics that we do have, that the rates at which Native American women experience violence is intrinsically related to the likelihood of their going missing, being murdered, and forced into sex trafficking.

Here are just some of the statistics collected by the National Institute of Justice, the Government Accountability Office, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention regarding violence against Native women. In 2016, 5,712 cases of missing Native women were reported to the National Crime Information Center, and 125 of those cases were in my State of Dakota alone. On some reservations, Native women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average. I want to repeat that. On some reservations, Native women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average.

American Indians and Alaskan Natives are two times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault compared to all other races.

In 2010, we found that the U.S. attorneys declined to prosecute nearly 52 percent of violent crime that occurred in Indian Country. Homicide is the third leading cause of death among American Indians and Alaskan Native women between 10 and 24 years old.

These high rates of violence, including domestic violence, sex assault, and human trafficking, must stop. We must work together to combat domestic violence and human trafficking in Indian Country.

Just last week, the Indian Affairs Committee held a hearing to discuss the lack of services provided for Indian Country regarding the horrific acts of violence and human trafficking of Native women. Just yesterday, while questioning one of the officials at the Department of the Interior about the need to do training in human trafficking at our casinos, he simply said: I thought you were going to ask me about Indian gaming. I quickly said: I am asking you about Indian gaming because all of this works together.

If we do not work together in every institution of the Federal Government, in every institution of the State government, and in every institution of Tribal government, we will never make progress in providing the security that we have in this building, and the security that we enjoy as White women will never be realized for women living on the reservation in Indian Country. We cannot let this continue.

There are countless more stories like Savanna's, Stella's, Mona Lisa's, Monica's, and Lakota's that we will never know. It is time for Congress to recognize this epidemic and take action to prevent these stories and find out just how many stories there really are. It is time to give voice to these voiceless women. It is time to bring their perpetrators to justice and give a voice to the families who are strug-

gling even today—sometimes decades later—to understand how this can happen in America. They seem to be second-class citizens.

I think that is what we know. I am working with very many of my colleagues on the other side. This isn't a partisan issue.

I have been joined by my wonderful colleague from the great State of Alaska. I think the first time we ever met, this was the topic of conversation: What is the security for Indian children, security for Indian women, and Alaskan Native women? We knew because both of us have traveled extensively in our States and spent a lot of time in the indigenous populations.

When family members ask us why this is happening, we frequently don't have an answer.

I know that in my State jurisdictional issues provide some barriers to actually getting this done, but that is an excuse. We need to do better.

With that, I want to yield the floor to my wonderful colleague from the great State of Alaska, who once again is joining me and leading her side of the aisle to bring attention to these issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge and thank the Senator from North Dakota. She has been a champion for the Native people, the indigenous people around the country, including in my State of Alaska. Whether it is working to address the issues related to childhood trauma, which so many of our young Native children face, or the issues relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking—these are scourges that we see directed, unfortunately, at so many of our Native women in the State of Alaska, in the State of North Dakota, and around the country.

She has cited the statistics. I think sometimes we just get numb by the statistics. When you are told that you are four times the national average, that sounds bad. But what does that mean? When you put a face to it, when you hear the tragedy repeated through the stories, these are not just statistics that we are speaking of. These are real women. These are our sisters. These are our neighbors. These are our friends, and these are human beings who deserve to be respected in their lives but also respected in other tragic deaths. How we work to address these difficult issues needs to be a focus and a priority for us.

So I appreciate what the Senator from North Dakota is doing in bringing attention to our Nation's lackluster—and that is kind of a polite term here—response to the tragedy of missing and murdered Native women and girls.

I am proud to lend my voice to the proposition that Congress, in the exercise of our trust responsibility to our

Native peoples, has a responsibility to do more. You would think that that trust responsibility demands us to be paying even closer attention, and yet it seems that we just withdraw from that, that that responsibility is not acknowledged.

Now, it is not often here in the United States that we benchmark our treatment of indigenous peoples against Canada, but in this case, there is actually a compelling difference between Canada's national response to the tragedy of missing and murdered Native women and our seeming indifference here in the United States.

Down in southeastern Alaska, right across on the Canadian side, lies a town called Prince Rupert. It is in British Columbia. The Alaskan ferry comes in from Washington State and stops in Prince Rupert and then moves into Alaska. Prince Rupert is also the terminus of Highway 16, and the locals refer to Highway 16 as the "Highway of Tears." They refer to it as the "Highway of Tears" because it is a road on which Native women and girls have vanished for decades now. The question is, How many? Who is disappearing? Some would say as few as 12 and perhaps as many as 43. CBS News devoted a segment of its news magazine show "48 Hours" to the Highway of Tears.

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau committed 54 million Canadian dollars to a national inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women and girls. I will admit that there is some controversy over whether the national inquiry is actually fulfilling its mission, but my point here is that Canada stepped up. They have acknowledged that this is an issue, that this is a problem, and they have responded to the disproportionate victimization of Native women and girls, and they have done so in a tangible way. Here in the United States, as my friend and colleague has noted, we are more than a bit late in acknowledging that the problem even exists.

Earlier this year, the Senators from Montana—both Senator DAINES and Senator TESTER—were successful in designating May 5, 2017, through a resolution, as the National Day of Awareness on Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls. The resolution recites that some Tribal communities face murder rates that are 10 times the national average, as Senator HEITKAMP has noted. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, homicide was the third leading cause of death among Native women between the ages of 10 and 24 years and the fifth leading cause of death for Alaska Native women between 25 and 34 years of age. So we are trying to raise attention and awareness. We are trying to shine a spotlight on this issue.

I certainly think it is high time that Federal law enforcement answer the question, Why? Why is the murder rate

for Native women so high, and why are we not addressing it in a comprehensive fashion? The Senator from North Dakota has pointed out that in many areas, jurisdictional issues are at play, and I agree. That is not an excuse. We acknowledge that we have challenges with jurisdictions. Let's figure this out. Women are disappearing and dying.

In Alaska, it is not so much jurisdictional issues; it is the fact that in far too many of our communities, we lack any law enforcement presence. We might have a VPSO—a village safety police officer—but they are not armed. They are very limited in terms of their ability to provide for levels of enforcement. More frustrating than so much of that is that women who have been victimized feel as though reporting doesn't get them anywhere because there is no follow-through. There is no prosecution. There has been no effort that will allow them to have any level of recourse, much less justice, visited upon them.

As we talk about these issues of jurisdiction and law enforcement and the rates that we see, I think we need to be clear that the discussion today—the call for justice—is not driven by statistics and rates. It is driven by their faces. It is driven by the loss of people's daughters, people's siblings, people's friends, including Savannah and Stella and Nicole and Mona Lisa. These are all real people, real women with names, with faces, with families.

In Alaska, the face we so often associate with the lack of progress when it comes to addressing the issue of missing and murdered Native women is the face of Sophie Sergie. This year marks the 24th anniversary of the death of Sophie Sergie from Pitkas Point. This is a Yup'ik village in southwest Alaska.

On August 26 of 1993, Sophie was found dead in the women's bathroom dorm on the University of Alaska Fairbanks campus. She was raped. She was shot dead. It is believed that her body remained in that bathroom for some 13 hours before it was found. The murder weapon was never recovered. That case is still a cold case 24 years later. But we don't forget Sophie Sergie, just as we don't forget the women the Senator from North Dakota has shared stories about. We cannot forget these women.

Unlike the tragedies along the Highway of Tears, we really don't know how many Native women and girls have gone missing and murdered. That is a big part of the problem. But I will tell my colleagues that if you ask advocates for Native women, the answer comes back: It is no secret. We all know somebody. We all know somebody who has gone missing, somebody who has been murdered.

That was the testimony of Tammy Jerue. She is the executive director for the Alaska Native Women's Resource

Center, and she testified before a congressional briefing last February. Tammy told the briefing that her organization has documented as many as 50 names of women. When we think about it, numbers on that order were significant enough for Prime Minister Trudeau to commission a national inquiry. So it causes us to ask the question, What about us? What number do we have to get to before there is a call to action, before we wake up and say: This is not acceptable. This is not acceptable that our Native women are disappearing, are being murdered.

Native women are asking why Federal law enforcement has no protocol for addressing the crisis in our Indian Country, why there is a lack of coordination among criminal justice agencies in this country to set aside the jurisdictional challenges and investigate these tragedies in an effective manner, and why there is a lack of victim services.

In the Indian Affairs Committee, we had a hearing on human trafficking, sex trafficking. It was pretty revealing about the lack of victim services—specific—that could be there to help our Native victims. Right now, the families of missing and murdered Native women in Alaska have to cover the cost of a traditional burial. They have to cover the cost of immediate long-term counseling, and so many other expenses they can't afford. We maintain a victims of crime fund here in this country to address these sorts of costs, but there is no dedicated Tribal funding stream. We have had some pretty bipartisan efforts here in the Senate to establish one, but we haven't even been able to do that bare minimum to provide for the victims.

The issue we are discussing today is tragic and frustrating. It is depressing. But to remain silent is to truly further marginalize Native women and girls, and that is unacceptable. Perhaps we are not going to devote tens of millions of dollars to a national inquiry; However, it is high time that we acknowledge a problem that has failed to make headlines in this country, because you first have to acknowledge that a problem exists to make headway in addressing that problem.

So, again, I thank the Senator from North Dakota for her strong and steadfast advocacy on behalf of not only our Native women but our Native children, our indigenous peoples across this country. I appreciate all that is being done, and I look forward to working with her again as we try to shine a brighter light on a very tragic situation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself,
Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr.
KAINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr.
FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr.
VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr.
CARPER, Ms. WARREN, Ms.

HIRONO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1945. A bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 1945

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keep Americans Safe Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (29) the following:

"(30) The term 'large capacity ammunition feeding device'—

"(A) means a magazine, belt, drum, feed strip, helical feeding device, or similar device, including any such device joined or coupled with another in any manner, that has an overall capacity of, or that can be readily restored, changed, or converted to accept, more than 10 rounds of ammunition; and

"(B) does not include an attached tubular device designed to accept, and capable of operating only with, .22 caliber rimfire ammunition.

"(31) The term 'qualified law enforcement officer' has the meaning given the term in section 926B."

SEC. 3. RESTRICTIONS ON LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (u) the following:

"(v)(1) It shall be unlawful for a person to import, sell, manufacture, transfer, or possess, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, a large capacity ammunition feeding device.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device otherwise lawfully possessed on or before the date of enactment of the Keep Americans Safe Act.

"(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

"(A) the importation for, manufacture for, sale to, transfer to, or possession by the United States or a department or agency of the United States or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State, or a sale or transfer to or possession by a qualified law enforcement officer employed by the United States or a department or agency of the United States or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off-duty), or a sale or transfer to or possession by a campus law enforcement officer for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off-duty);

"(B) the importation for, or sale or transfer to a licensee under title I of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for purposes of establishing and maintaining an on-site physical protection system and security organization required by Federal law, or possession by an employee or contractor of such licensee on-site for such purposes or off-site for purposes of licensee-authorized training or transportation of nuclear materials;

“(C) the possession, by an individual who is retired in good standing from service with a law enforcement agency and is not otherwise prohibited from receiving ammunition, of a large capacity ammunition feeding device—

“(i) sold or transferred to the individual by the agency upon such retirement; or

“(ii) that the individual purchased, or otherwise obtained, for official use before such retirement; or

“(D) the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device by a licensed manufacturer or licensed importer for the purposes of testing or experimentation authorized by the Attorney General.

“(4) For purposes of paragraph (3)(A), the term ‘campus law enforcement officer’ means an individual who is—

“(A) employed by a private institution of higher education that is eligible for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

“(B) responsible for the prevention or investigation of crime involving injury to persons or property, including apprehension or detention of persons for such crimes;

“(C) authorized by Federal, State, or local law to carry a firearm, execute search warrants, and make arrests; and

“(D) recognized, commissioned, or certified by a government entity as a law enforcement officer.”.

(b) IDENTIFICATION MARKINGS FOR LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.—Section 923(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “A large capacity ammunition feeding device manufactured after the date of enactment of the Keep Americans Safe Act shall be identified by a serial number and the date on which the device was manufactured or made, legibly and conspicuously engraved or cast on the device, and such other identification as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe.”.

(c) SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE OF LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.—Section 924(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding device” after “firearm or ammunition” each place the term appears;

(B) by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding device” after “firearms or ammunition” each place the term appears; and

(C) by striking “or (k)” and inserting “(k), or (v)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(C), by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding devices” after “firearms or quantities of ammunition”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(E), by inserting “922(v),” after “922(n),”.

SEC. 4. PENALTIES.

Section 924(a)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “or (q)” and inserting “(q), or (v)”.

SEC. 5. USE OF BYRNE GRANTS FOR BUY-BACK PROGRAMS FOR LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(I) Compensation for surrendered large capacity ammunition feeding devices, as that term is defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code, under buy-back programs for large capacity ammunition feeding devices.”.

SEC. 6. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such

provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 285—HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF DR. SAMUEL DUBOIS COOK

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 285

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook was born on November 21, 1928, in Griffin, Georgia;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in history from Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia;

Whereas, as a student, Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook was a friend and classmate of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and a leader at Morehouse College, where he served as student body president and founded the campus chapter of the National Association for the advancement of Colored People;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook earned a Master of Arts in Political Science and a Doctor of Philosophy from Ohio State University;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook is a veteran who served in the United States Army during the Korean War;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook taught at Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Atlanta University, the University of Illinois, and the University of California, Los Angeles, before becoming a faculty member at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook spent his life working for social justice and equality;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook distinguished himself as an educator, scholar, thinker, activist, and public servant;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook broke racial barriers as the first African American to hold either a regular or tenured faculty appointment at a predominantly white southern college or university, when he received an appointment at Duke University;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook also broke racial barriers in his field by serving as the first African American president of the Southern Political Science Association;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook endeavored to advance interracial harmony;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook left an indelible imprint on Dillard University, a historically black university in New Orleans, Louisiana, as its president for more than 2 decades;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook was appointed to the National Council on the Humanities by President Jimmy Carter and appointed to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council by President Bill Clinton;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook served as vice president of the American Political Science Association, president of the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, and chair of the Presidents of the United Negro College Fund;

Whereas Duke University established the Samuel DuBois Cook Society, the Samuel

DuBois Cook Center on Social Equity, the Samuel DuBois Cook professorship, and the Samuel DuBois Cook Postdoctoral Fellowship;

Whereas Ohio State University established the Samuel DuBois Cook Summer Academy and the Samuel DuBois Cook graduate fellowship, to honor the work and achievements of Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook died on May 29, 2017; and

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook is considered to be a trailblazer who lived a life of integrity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life and achievements of Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook.

SENATE RESOLUTION 286—SUPPORTING THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN ENSURING CHILDREN IN THE POOREST COUNTRIES HAVE ACCESS TO A QUALITY EDUCATION THROUGH THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 286

Whereas access to quality education reduces poverty, advances economic prosperity, improves peace and security, and strengthens public health;

Whereas the 2016 Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Report, the globally recognized annual accountability tool on the status of education internationally, found that an estimated 263,000,000 children and youth are out of school worldwide, with girls still more likely to be out of school than their male peers in most of the developing world;

Whereas a 2015 GEM Report found that two-thirds of the world's out-of-school children live in countries affected by fragility and conflict;

Whereas a 2016 GEM Report found that sub-Saharan Africa remains the region with the highest out-of-school rates for all age groups and of the 61,000,000 out-of-school children of primary school age, 33,000,000, or more than half, live in sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas the 2011 World Health Organization's World Report on Disability has found an estimated 90 percent of children with disabilities under age 18 in the developing world do not attend school;

Whereas a 2012 GEM Report found that 250,000,000 primary schoolchildren are failing to learn basic literacy and numeracy skills, 130,000,000 of whom have attended at least four years of school;

Whereas a 2011 GEM Report found that educating all students in low-income countries with basic reading skills could lead to 171,000,000 people lifted out of poverty, a 12 percent drop in global poverty;

Whereas a 1999 World Bank study on conflict found every year of school decreases the chance of male youth engaging in violent conflict by 20 percent;

Whereas a 2011 GEM Report reported that an educated mother is more likely to have her children vaccinated, and girls in school are three times less likely to be infected with HIV than their peers who are not in school;

Whereas the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) is the only public-private global partnership exclusively dedicated to education in the world's poorest countries;

Whereas GPE eligible countries are home to approximately 870,000,000 children and youth, which represent 78 percent of out-of-school children;

Whereas GPE support resulted in 72,000,000 more children in primary school in 2015 than in 2002 and a 10 percent increase in primary school completion over that same period in GPE partner countries;

Whereas GPE support to partner countries has achieved a 71 percent primary completion rate for girls in 2014 compared with 56 percent in 2002;

Whereas 60 percent of GPE's spending is in countries affected by conflict or fragility and helped these countries to increase their primary school completion rates from 56 percent in 2000 to 69 percent in 2015;

Whereas GPE incentivizes developing country governments to increase their own domestic financing for education, which has resulted in partner countries pledging \$26,000,000,000 for their own domestic financing during GPE's 2014 replenishment conference;

Whereas support for GPE complements the United States Government's bilateral basic education programs by fostering coordination among all key partners, ensuring the development of national education sector plans, and building on the commitment of developing country governments;

Whereas, on April 20, 2017, GPE called on donors and developing country partners to fund a \$3,100,000,000, three-year plan to support 89 developing countries in improving the quality of and access to education for 870,000,000 children and youth and provide education plan implementation grants to 67 developing countries, covering 64 percent of out-of-school children;

Whereas GPE is urging developing country governments to allocate 20 percent of government expenditure to education and philanthropic and private sector donors to increase their contributions; and

Whereas, with support from donors, GPE will be able to ensure 19,000,000 more children complete primary school, 6,600,000 more children complete lower secondary school, 1,700,000 more teachers are trained, 23,800 classrooms are built, and 204,000,000 textbooks are distributed, bringing new hope to a generation of children and youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms the leadership and commitment of the United States Government to improving access to quality education for the poorest and most marginalized children and youth worldwide, which is critical to global stability, economic prosperity, and poverty elimination;

(2) supports the mission and goals of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) to mobilize global and national efforts to contribute to the achievement of equitable, quality education and learning, with a focus on effective and efficient education systems and strong education financing;

(3) recognizes that United States Government investments in bilateral basic education are complemented by GPE's education systems approach and convening authority; and

(4) encourages increased commitment and investment by the United States Government, international donors, private foundations, and private sector donors through the GPE to the global effort to ensure children and youth are in school and learning throughout the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 287—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 8, 2017, AS “NATIONAL HYDROGEN AND FUEL CELL DAY”

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 287

Whereas hydrogen, which has an atomic mass of 1.008, is the most abundant chemical substance in the universe;

Whereas the United States is a world leader in the development and deployment of fuel cell and hydrogen technologies;

Whereas hydrogen fuel cells played an instrumental role in the United States space program, helping the United States achieve the mission of landing a man on the moon;

Whereas private industry, Federal and State governments, national laboratories, and institutions of higher education continue to improve fuel cell and hydrogen technologies to address the most pressing energy, environmental, and economic issues of the United States;

Whereas fuel cells utilizing hydrogen and hydrogen-rich fuels to generate electricity are clean, efficient, and resilient technologies being sold for stationary and backup power, zero-emission light duty motor vehicles and buses, industrial vehicles, and portable power;

Whereas stationary fuel cells are being placed in service for continuous and backup power to provide business and energy consumers with reliable power in the event of grid outages;

Whereas stationary fuel cells can help reduce water use, as compared to traditional power generation technologies;

Whereas fuel cell electric light duty motor vehicles and buses that utilize hydrogen can completely replicate the experience of internal combustion vehicles, including comparable range and refueling times;

Whereas hydrogen fuel cell industrial vehicles are being deployed at logistical hubs and warehouses across the United States and exported to facilities in Europe and Asia;

Whereas hydrogen is a nontoxic gas that can be derived from a variety of domestically available traditional and renewable resources, including solar, wind, biogas, and the abundant supply of natural gas in the United States;

Whereas hydrogen and fuel cells can store energy to help enhance the grid and maximize opportunities to deploy renewable energy;

Whereas the United States produces and uses more than 11,000,000 metric tons of hydrogen per year; and

Whereas engineers and safety code and standard professionals have developed consensus-based protocols for safe delivery, handling, and use of hydrogen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates October 8, 2017, as “National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 288—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 1 THROUGH 7, 2017, AS “NATIONAL COMMUNITY POLICING WEEK”

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 288

Whereas police officers are indispensable members of the community who put their lives on the line to protect others;

Whereas promoting strong relationships founded in trust and mutual respect between law enforcement officers and the communities they serve helps ensure the safe and effective execution of the law;

Whereas law enforcement officers and communities that work together to address public safety concerns can create lasting solutions to difficult challenges;

Whereas a long-term commitment to community policing is necessary to eliminate the underlying causes of crime;

Whereas the advancement of community policing should be supported to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies have necessary resources; and

Whereas community policing has been recognized as an important tool for improving the relationship between law enforcement officers and the communities they serve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 1 through 7, 2017, as “National Community Policing Week”; and

(2) supports community policing and encourages the people of the United States, law enforcement agencies, and elected officials to identify ways in which communities may improve public safety, strengthen relationships, and build trust.

SENATE RESOLUTION 289—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING OCTOBER 8, 2017, AS “NATIONAL WILDFIRE REFUGE WEEK”

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 289

Whereas, in 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt established the first national wildlife refuge on Pelican Island in Florida;

Whereas, in 2017, the National Wildlife Refuge System, administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is the premier system of land and water to conserve wildlife in the world and has grown to approximately 836,000,000 acres, 566 national wildlife refuges, and 38 wetland management districts located in every State and territory of the United States;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important recreational and tourism destinations in communities across the United States and this protected land offers a variety of recreational opportunities, including 6 wildlife-dependent uses that the National Wildlife Refuge System manages, specifically hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

Whereas, in 2017, 373 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have hunting programs and 310 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have fishing programs, averaging more than 2,400,000 hunting visits and nearly 6,900,000 fishing visits each year;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System experienced more than 31,400,000 wildlife observation visits during fiscal year 2016;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important to local businesses and gateway communities;

Whereas visitation to the National Wildlife Refuge System increased by nearly 30 percent from 2006 to 2016;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System experiences more than 50,000,000 visits each year, which generate more than \$2,400,000,000 in sales and 35,000 jobs in local economies;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System encompasses every kind of ecosystem in the United States, including temperate, tropical and boreal forests, wetlands, deserts, grasslands, arctic tundras, and remote islands, and spans 12 time zones from the Virgin Islands to Guam;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are home to more than 700 species of birds, 220 species of mammals, 250 species of reptiles and amphibians, and more than 1,000 species of fish;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are the primary Federal lands on which the production, migration, and wintering habitat for waterfowl are fostered;

Whereas, since 1934, the sale of the Federal Duck Stamp to outdoor enthusiasts has generated more than \$850,000,000 in funds, which has enabled the purchase or lease of more than 5,700,000 acres of habitat for waterfowl and numerous other species in the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas refuges provide protection to more than 380 threatened and endangered species;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are cores of conservation for larger landscapes and resources for other agencies of the Federal Government, State governments, private landowners, and organizations in efforts to secure the wildlife heritage of the United States;

Whereas more than 40,000 volunteers and approximately 200 national wildlife refuge "Friends" organizations contribute more than 1,350,000 volunteer hours annually, the equivalent of nearly 650 full-time employees, and provide an important link to local communities;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide an important opportunity for children to discover and gain a greater appreciation for the natural world;

Whereas there are national wildlife refuges located in several urban and suburban areas and there is a refuge located within a 1 hour drive of every metropolitan area in the United States, which has enabled national wildlife refuges to employ, educate, and engage young people from all backgrounds in exploring, connecting with, and preserving the natural heritage of the United States;

Whereas, since 1995, refuges across the United States have held festivals, educational programs, guided tours, and other events to celebrate National Wildlife Refuge Week during the second full week of October;

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has designated the week beginning on October 8, 2017, as "National Wildlife Refuge Week"; and

Whereas the designation of National Wildlife Refuge Week by the Senate would recognize more than a century of conservation in the United States, raise awareness about the importance of wildlife and the National Wildlife Refuge System, and celebrate the myriad recreational opportunities available to enjoy this network of protected lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 8, 2017, as "National Wildlife Refuge Week";

(2) encourages the observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities;

(3) acknowledges the importance of national wildlife refuges for their recreational

opportunities and contribution to local economies across the United States;

(4) finds that national wildlife refuges play a vital role in securing the hunting and fishing heritage of the United States for future generations;

(5) identifies the significance of national wildlife refuges in advancing the traditions of wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

(6) recognizes the importance of national wildlife refuges to wildlife conservation, the protection of imperiled species and ecosystems, and compatible uses;

(7) acknowledges the role of national wildlife refuges in conserving waterfowl and waterfowl habitat under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(8) reaffirms the support of the Senate for wildlife conservation and the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(9) expresses the intent of the Senate—

(A) to continue working to conserve wildlife; and

(B) to manage the National Wildlife Refuge System for current and future generations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 290—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 5, 2017, AS "ENERGY EFFICIENCY DAY" IN CELEBRATION OF THE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS THAT HAVE BEEN DRIVEN BY PRIVATE SECTOR INNOVATION AND FEDERAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY POLICIES PUT IN PLACE OVER THE PAST 4 DECADES

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 290

Whereas October has been designated as "National Energy Awareness Month";

Whereas improvements in energy efficiency technologies and practices along with policies of the United States enacted since the 1970s have resulted in energy savings of more than 60,000,000,000,000 British thermal units and energy cost avoidance of more than \$800,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas energy efficiency has enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress and in administrations of both parties for more than 40 years;

Whereas bipartisan legislation enacted since the 1970s to advance Federal energy efficiency policies includes—

(1) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(2) the National Appliance Energy Conservation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-12; 101 Stat. 103);

(3) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(4) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.);

(5) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.); and

(6) the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-11; 129 Stat. 182);

Whereas energy efficiency has long been supported by a diverse coalition of busi-

nesses (including manufacturers, utilities, energy service companies, and technology firms), public-interest organizations, environmental and conservation groups, and State and local governments;

Whereas, since 1980, the United States has more than doubled its energy productivity, realizing twice the economic output per unit of energy consumed;

Whereas more than 2,200,000 individuals in the United States are currently employed across the energy efficiency sector, as the United States has doubled its energy productivity and business and industry have become more innovative and competitive in global markets;

Whereas the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department of Energy is the principal Federal agency responsible for renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency efforts;

Whereas cutting energy waste saves the consumers of the United States billions of dollars on utility bills annually; and

Whereas energy efficiency policies, financing innovations, and public-private partnerships have contributed to a reduction in energy intensity in Federal facilities and vehicle fleets by over 47 percent since the mid-1970s, which results in direct savings to United States taxpayers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 5, 2017, as "Energy Efficiency Day"; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe Energy Efficiency Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1110. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. Kaine, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PERDUE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1595, to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1110. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. Kaine, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PERDUE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1595, to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect

to Hizballah, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PREVENTION OF ACCESS BY HIZBALLAH TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Sec. 101. Mandatory sanctions with respect to fundraising and recruitment activities for Hizballah.

Sec. 102. Modification of report with respect to financial institutions that engage in certain transactions.

Sec. 103. Sanctions against agencies and instrumentalities of foreign states that support Hizballah.

TITLE II—NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH

Sec. 201. Blocking of property of Hizballah.

Sec. 202. Report on racketeering activities engaged in by Hizballah.

Sec. 203. Modification of report on activities of foreign governments to disrupt global logistics networks and fundraising, financing, and money laundering activities of Hizballah.

Sec. 204. Report on combating the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Regulatory authority.

Sec. 302. Exceptions.

TITLE I—PREVENTION OF ACCESS BY HIZBALLAH TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 101. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FUNDRAISING AND RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES FOR HIZBALLAH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 101 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 101. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FUNDRAISING AND RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES FOR HIZBALLAH.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person that the President determines knowingly provides significant financial, material, or technological support for—

“(1) Bayt al-Mal, Jihad al-Bina, the Islamic Resistance Support Association, or any successor or affiliate thereof as designated by the President;

“(2) al-Manar TV, al Nour Radio, or the Lebanese Media Group, or any successor or affiliate thereof as designated by the President;

“(3) a foreign person determined by the President to be engaged in fundraising or recruitment activities for Hizballah; or

“(4) a foreign person owned or controlled by a foreign person described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

“(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

“(A) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers

Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a foreign person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(B) **ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

“(i) **VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—An alien who the President determines is subject to subsection (a) is—

“(I) inadmissible to the United States;

“(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

“(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

“(ii) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien who the President determines is subject to subsection (a), regardless of when issued.

“(II) **EFFECT OF REVOCATION.**—A revocation under subclause (I) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the alien.

“(2) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under paragraph (1)(A) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

“(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

“(d) **PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If a finding under this section, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court ex parte and in camera.

“(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under this section or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding.

“(e) **WAIVER.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the imposition of sanctions under this section if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 30 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to a foreign person, and every 180 days thereafter while the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appro-

priate congressional committees on the status of the involvement of the foreign person in activities described in subsection (a).

“(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and every 180 days thereafter for the following 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that lists the foreign persons that the President determines are described in subsection (a).

“(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ADMITTED; ALIEN.**—The terms ‘admitted’ and ‘alien’ have meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

“(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(3) **ENTITY.**—The term ‘entity’ means a partnership, association, corporation, or other organization, group, or subgroup.

“(4) **HIZBALLAH.**—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given such term in section 102(f).

“(5) **PERSON.**—The term ‘person’ means an individual or entity.

“(6) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term ‘United States person’ means a United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or a person in the United States.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by striking the item relating to section 101 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 101. Mandatory sanctions with respect to fundraising and recruitment activities for Hizballah.”.

SEC. 102. MODIFICATION OF REPORT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

Subsection (d) of section 102 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **REPORT ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ORGANIZED UNDER THE LAWS OF STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and every 180 days thereafter for the following 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

“(A) identifies each foreign financial institution described in paragraph (2) that the President determines engages in one or more activities described in subsection (a)(2);

“(B) provides a detailed description of each such activity; and

“(C) contains a determination with respect to each such foreign financial institution that is identified under subparagraph (A) as engaging in one or more activities described in subsection (a)(2) as to whether such foreign financial institution is in violation of Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting

transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism) by reason of engaging in one or more such activities.

“(2) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION DESCRIBED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign financial institution described in this paragraph is a foreign financial institution—

“(i) that, wherever located, is—

“(I) organized under the laws of a state sponsor of terrorism or any jurisdiction within a state sponsor of terrorism;

“(II) owned or controlled by the government of a state sponsor of terrorism;

“(III) located in the territory of a state sponsor of terrorism; or

“(IV) owned or controlled by a foreign financial institution described in subclause (I), (II), or (III); and

“(ii) the capitalization of which exceeds \$10,000,000.

“(B) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—In this paragraph, the term ‘state sponsor of terrorism’ means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

“(i) section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

“(ii) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

“(iii) section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780); or

“(iv) any other provision of law.”.

SEC. 103. SANCTIONS AGAINST AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF FOREIGN STATES THAT SUPPORT HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 103. SANCTIONS AGAINST AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF FOREIGN STATES THAT SUPPORT HIZBALLAH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and as appropriate thereafter, the President shall block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(b) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY OF A FOREIGN STATE DESCRIBED.—An agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in this subsection is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state that the President determines knowingly provides significant financial, material, or technological support for, goods or services to or in support of, or arms or related material to—

“(1) Hizballah;

“(2) an entity owned or controlled by Hizballah; or

“(3) an entity that the President determines has acted for or on behalf of Hizballah.

“(c) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under subsection (a) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

“(e) PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a finding under this section, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court ex parte and in camera.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under this section or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding.

“(f) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the imposition of sanctions under this section with respect to an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, and every 180 days thereafter while the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the involvement of the agency or instrumentality in activities described in subsection (b).

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY OF A FOREIGN STATE; FOREIGN STATE.—The terms ‘agency or instrumentality of a foreign state’ and ‘foreign state’ have the meanings given those terms in section 1603 of title 28, United States Code.

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(3) ARMS OR RELATED MATERIAL.—The term ‘arms or related material’ means—

“(A) nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological weapons or materials or components of such weapons;

“(B) ballistic or cruise missile weapons or materials or components of such weapons;

“(C) destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

“(D) defense articles or defense services, as those terms are defined in paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, of section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794);

“(E) defense information, as that term is defined in section 644 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2403); or

“(F) items designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

“(4) HIZBALLAH.—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given that term in section 102(f).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 102 the following new item:

“Sec. 103. Sanctions against agencies and instrumentalities of foreign states that support Hizballah.”.

TITLE II—NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH

SEC. 201. BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 201. BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF HIZBALLAH.

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that Hizballah conducts narcotics trafficking and significant transnational criminal activities.

“(b) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and as appropriate thereafter, the President shall block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of Hizballah if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(c) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under subsection (b) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

“(e) PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a finding under this section, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court ex parte and in camera.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under this section or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding.

“(f) WAIVER.—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the imposition of sanctions under this section if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(g) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given that term in section 102(f).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to title II and inserting the following:

“TITLE II—IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HIZBALLAH AND REPORTS RELATING TO NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH.”; AND

(2) by striking the item relating to section 201 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 201. Blocking of property of Hizballah.”.

SEC. 202. REPORT ON RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 202. REPORT ON RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY HIZBALLAH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the following:

“(1) Activities that Hizballah, and agents and affiliates of Hizballah, have engaged in that are racketeering activities.

“(2) The extent to which Hizballah, and agents and affiliates of Hizballah, engage in a pattern of such racketeering activities.

“(b) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

“(2) HIZBALLAH.—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given that term in section 102(f).

“(3) RACKETEERING ACTIVITY.—The term ‘racketeering activity’ has the meaning given that term in section 1961(1) of title 18, United States Code.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by striking the item relating to section 202 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 202. Report on racketeering activities engaged in by Hizballah.”.

SEC. 203. MODIFICATION OF REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO DISRUPT GLOBAL LOGISTICS NETWORKS AND FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years”;

(B) in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and free-trade zones.” and inserting “free-trade zones, business partnerships and joint ventures, and other investments in small and medium-sized enterprises;”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a list of jurisdictions outside of Lebanon that expressly consent to, or with knowledge allow, the use of their territory by Hizballah to carry out terrorist activities, including training, financing, and recruitment;

“(G) a description of the total aggregate revenues and remittances that Hizballah receives from the global logistics networks of Hizballah.”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) ENHANCED DUE DILIGENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall prescribe, as necessary, enhanced due diligence policies, procedures, and controls for United States financial institutions, and foreign financial institutions maintaining correspondent accounts or payable-through accounts with United States financial institutions, that the President determines provide significant financial services for persons and entities operating in a jurisdiction included in the list required under subsection (a)(1)(F) if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ‘correspondent account’ and ‘payable-through account’ have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.”;

(4) in subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (2) by adding before the period at the end the following: “and on any requirements for enhanced due diligence prescribed under subsection (b)”.

(b) REPORT ON ESTIMATED NET WORTH OF SENIOR HIZBALLAH MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter for the following 2 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains—

(A) the estimated total net worth of each individual described in paragraph (2); and

(B) a description of how funds of each individual described in paragraph (2) were acquired, and how such funds have been used or employed.

(2) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—The individuals described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Secretary General of Hizballah.

(B) Any other individual that the President determines is a senior foreign political figure of Hizballah.

(3) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

(A) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of the report required under paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public in precompressed, easily downloadable versions that are made available in all appropriate formats.

(4) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the President may use any credible publication, database, or web-based resource, and any credible information compiled by any government agency, nongovernmental organization, or other entity provided to or made available to the President.

(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(B) FUNDS.—The term “funds” means—

(i) cash;

(ii) equity;

(iii) any other intangible asset the value of which is derived from a contractual claim, including bank deposits, bonds, stocks, a security (as defined in section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a))), or a security or an equity security (as those terms are defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))); and

(iv) anything else of value that the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be appropriate.

(C) SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.—The term “senior foreign political figure” has the meaning given that term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

SEC. 204. REPORT ON COMBATING THE ILLICIT TOBACCO TRAFFICKING NETWORKS USED BY HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on combating the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah to finance their operations, as described in the report submitted to Congress in December 2015 by the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Health and Human Services entitled, “The Global Illicit Trade in Tobacco: A Threat to National Security.”.

(b) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the steps to be taken by Federal agencies to combat the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah.

(2) A description of the steps to be taken to engage State and local law enforcement authorities in efforts to combat illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah operating within the United States.

(3) A description of the steps to be taken to engage foreign government law enforcement and intelligence authorities in efforts to combat illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah operating outside the United States.

(4) Recommendations for legislative or administrative action, as appropriate, to address the threat of illicit tobacco trafficking networks.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, prescribe regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 10 days before the prescription of regulations under subsection (a), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees regarding the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 302. EXCEPTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply to the following:

(1) Any authorized intelligence, law enforcement, or national security activities of the United States.

(2) Any transaction necessary to comply with United States obligations under—

(A) the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947;

(B) the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967; or

(C) any other international treaty.

(b) **EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions under this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not include the authority or requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR-328A to hold a hearing on the following nominations: Gregory Ibach, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Regulator Programs; William Northey, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agriculture Services.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 to hold a hearing on the nomination of Paul Trombino III, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 to hold a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 to hold a hearing entitled “The Federal Response to the Opioid Crisis.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 to hold an executive business meeting.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 2 p.m., in room SH-219 to hold a closed hearing.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 109, S. 692.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 692) to provide for integrated plan permits, to establish an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman, to promote green infrastructure, and to require the revision of financial capability guidance.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Water Infrastructure Flexibility Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF ADMINISTRATOR.

In this Act, the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SEC. 3. INTEGRATED PLANS.

(a) **INTEGRATED PLANS.**—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) **INTEGRATED PLAN PERMITS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(A) **GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The term ‘green infrastructure’ means the range of measures that use plant or soil systems, permeable pavement or other permeable surfaces or substrates, stormwater harvest and reuse, or landscaping to store, infiltrate, or evapotranspire stormwater and reduce flows to sewer systems or to surface waters.

“(B) **INTEGRATED PLAN.**—The term ‘integrated plan’ has the meaning given in Part III of the Integrated Municipal Stormwater and Wastewater Planning Approach Framework, issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and dated June 5, 2012.

“(C) **MUNICIPAL DISCHARGE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘municipal discharge’ means a discharge from a treatment works (as defined in section 212) or a discharge from a municipal storm sewer under subsection (p).

“(ii) **INCLUSION.**—The term ‘municipal discharge’ includes a discharge of wastewater or storm water collected from multiple municipalities if the discharge is covered by the same permit issued under this section.

“(2) **INTEGRATED PLAN.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator (or a State, in the case of a permit program approved under subsection (b)) shall inform a municipal permittee or multiple municipal permittees of the opportunity to develop an integrated plan.

“(B) **SCOPE OF PERMIT INCORPORATING INTEGRATED PLAN.**—A permit issued under this subsection that incorporates an integrated plan may integrate all requirements under this Act addressed in the integrated plan, including requirements relating to—

“(i) a combined sewer overflow;

“(ii) a capacity, management, operation, and maintenance program for sanitary sewer collection systems;

“(iii) a municipal stormwater discharge;

“(iv) a municipal wastewater discharge; and

“(v) a water quality-based effluent limitation to implement an applicable wastewater allocation in a total maximum daily load.

“(3) **COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A permit for a municipal discharge by a municipality that incorporates an integrated plan may include a schedule of compliance, under which actions taken to meet any applicable water quality-based effluent limitation may be implemented over more than 1 permit term if the compliance schedules are authorized by State water quality standards.

“(B) **INCLUSION.**—Actions subject to a compliance schedule under subparagraph (A) may include green infrastructure if implemented as part of a water quality-based effluent limitation.

“(C) **REVIEW.**—A schedule of compliance may be reviewed each time the permit is renewed.

“(4) **EXISTING AUTHORITIES RETAINED.**—

“(A) **APPLICABLE STANDARDS.**—Nothing in this subsection modifies any obligation to comply with applicable technology and water quality-based effluent limitations under this Act.

“(B) **FLEXIBILITY.**—Nothing in this subsection reduces or eliminates any flexibility available under this Act, including the authority of—

“(i) a State to revise a water quality standard after a use attainability analysis under section 131.10(g) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), subject to the approval of the Administrator under section 303(c); and

“(ii) the Administrator or a State to authorize a schedule of compliance that extends beyond

the date of expiration of a permit term if the schedule of compliance meets the requirements of section 122.47 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection).

“(5) CLARIFICATION OF STATE AUTHORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in section 301(b)(1)(C) precludes a State from authorizing in the water quality standards of the State the issuance of a schedule of compliance to meet water quality-based effluent limitations in permits that incorporate provisions of an integrated plan.

“(B) TRANSITION RULE.—In any case in which a discharge is subject to a judicial order or consent decree as of the date of enactment of the Water Infrastructure Flexibility Act resolving an enforcement action under this Act, any schedule of compliance issued pursuant to an authorization in a State water quality standard shall not revise a schedule of compliance in that order or decree unless the order or decree is modified by agreement of the parties and the court.”

(b) MUNICIPAL OMBUDSMAN.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Office of the Administrator an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman.

(2) GENERAL DUTIES.—The duties of the municipal ombudsman shall include the provision of—

(A) technical assistance to municipalities seeking to comply with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(B) information to the Administrator to help the Administrator ensure that agency policies are implemented by all offices of the Environmental Protection Agency, including regional offices.

(3) ACTIONS REQUIRED.—The municipal ombudsman shall work with appropriate offices at the headquarters and regional offices of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that the municipality seeking assistance is provided information—

(A) about available Federal financial assistance for which the municipality is eligible;

(B) about flexibility available under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and, if applicable, the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(C) regarding the opportunity to develop an integrated plan, as defined in section 402(s)(1)(B) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as added by subsection (a)).

(4) INFORMATION SHARING.—The municipal ombudsman shall publish on the website of the Environmental Protection Agency—

(A) general information relating to—

(i) the technical assistance referred to in paragraph (2)(A);

(ii) the financial assistance referred to in paragraph (3)(A);

(iii) the flexibility referred to in paragraph 3(B); and

(iv) any resources related to integrated plans developed by the Administrator; and

(B) a copy of each permit, order, or judicial consent decree that implements or incorporates an integrated plan.

(c) MUNICIPAL ENFORCEMENT.—Section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED PLANS THROUGH ENFORCEMENT TOOLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with an enforcement action under subsection (a) or (b) relating to municipal discharges, the Administrator shall inform a municipality of the opportunity to develop an integrated plan, as defined in section 402(s).

“(2) MODIFICATION.—Any municipality under an administrative order under subsection (a) or settlement agreement (including a judicial consent decree) under subsection (b) that has developed an integrated plan consistent with section 402(s) may request a modification of the administrative order or settlement agreement based on that integrated plan.”

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and make publicly available a report on each integrated plan developed and implemented through a permit, order, or judicial consent decree since the date of publication of the “Integrated Municipal Stormwater and Wastewater Planning Approach Framework” issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and dated June 5, 2012, including a description of the control measures, levels of control, estimated costs, and compliance schedules for the requirements implemented through an integrated plan.

SEC. 4. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.

Title V of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 519 (33 U.S.C. 1251 note) as section 520; and

(2) by inserting after section 518 (33 U.S.C. 1377) the following:

“SEC. 519. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Office of Water, the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, the Office of Research and Development, and the Office of Policy of the Environmental Protection Agency promote the use of green infrastructure in and coordinate the integration of green infrastructure into, permitting programs, planning efforts, research, technical assistance, and funding guidance.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Office of Water—

“(1) promotes the use of green infrastructure in the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

“(2) coordinates efforts to increase the use of green infrastructure with—

“(A) other Federal departments and agencies;

“(B) State, tribal, and local governments; and

“(C) the private sector.

“(c) REGIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.—The Administrator shall direct each regional office of the Environmental Protection Agency, as appropriate based on local factors, and consistent with the requirements of this Act, to promote and integrate the use of green infrastructure within the region that includes—

“(1) outreach and training regarding green infrastructure implementation for State, tribal, and local governments, tribal communities, and the private sector; and

“(2) the incorporation of green infrastructure into permitting and other regulatory programs, codes, and ordinance development, including the requirements under consent decrees and settlement agreements in enforcement actions.

“(d) GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION SHARING.—The Administrator shall promote green infrastructure information sharing, including through an Internet website, to share information with, and provide technical assistance to, State, tribal, and local governments, tribal communities, the private sector, and the public regarding green infrastructure approaches for—

“(1) reducing water pollution;

“(2) protecting water resources;

“(3) complying with regulatory requirements; and

“(4) achieving other environmental, public health, and community goals.”

SEC. 5. FINANCIAL CAPABILITY GUIDANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFORDABILITY.—The term “affordability” means, with respect to payment of a utility bill, a measure of whether an individual customer or household can pay the bill without undue hardship or unreasonable sacrifice in the essential lifestyle or spending patterns of the individual or household, as determined by the Administrator.

(2) FINANCIAL CAPABILITY.—The term “financial capability” means the financial capability of a community to make investments necessary to make water quality or drinking water improvements.

(3) GUIDANCE.—The term “guidance” means the guidance published by the Administrator entitled “Combined Sewer Overflows—Guidance for Financial Capability Assessment and Schedule Development” and dated February 1997, as applicable to the combined sewer overflows and sanitary sewer overflows guidance published by the Administrator entitled “Financial Capability Assessment Framework” and dated November 24, 2014.

(b) USE OF MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—The Administrator shall not use median household income as the sole indicator of affordability for a residential household.

(c) REVISED GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of completion of the National Academy of Public Administration study to establish a definition and framework for community affordability required by Senate Report 114-70, accompanying S. 1645 (114th Congress), the Administrator shall revise the guidance described in subsection (a)(3).

(2) USE OF GUIDANCE.—Beginning on the date on which the revised guidance referred to in paragraph (1) is finalized, the Administrator shall use the revised guidance in lieu of the guidance described in subsection (a)(3).

(d) CONSIDERATION AND CONSULTATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—In revising the guidance, the Administrator shall consider—

(A) the recommendations of the study referred to in subsection (c) and any other relevant study, as determined by the Administrator;

(B) local economic conditions, including site-specific local conditions that should be taken into consideration in analyzing financial capability;

(C) other essential community investments;

(D) potential adverse impacts on distressed populations, including the percentage of low-income ratepayers within the service area of a utility and impacts in communities with disparate economic conditions throughout the entire service area of a utility;

(E) the degree to which rates of low-income consumers would be affected by water infrastructure investments, the use of rate structures, and customer assistance programs to address the rates of low-income consumers;

(F) an evaluation of an array of factors, the relative importance of which may vary across regions and localities; and

(G) the appropriate weight for economic, public health, and environmental benefits.

(2) CONSULTATION.—Any revised guidance issued to replace the guidance shall be developed in consultation with stakeholders.

(e) PUBLICATION AND SUBMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On completion of the revision of the guidance, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives the revised guidance.

(2) *EXPLANATION.*—If the Administrator makes a determination not to follow one or more recommendations of the study referred to in subsection (c)(1), the Administrator shall include in the publication and submission under paragraph (1) an explanation of that decision.

(f) *EFFECT.*—Nothing in this section preempts or interferes with any obligation to comply with any Federal law, including the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 692), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 221, S. 1103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1103) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department-wide guidance and to develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1103) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1103

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ENHANCED DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY COORDINATION THROUGH THE BLUE CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 434. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘human trafficking’ means an act or practice

described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department a program, which shall be known as the ‘Blue Campaign’. The Blue Campaign shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

“(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Blue Campaign shall be to unify and coordinate Department efforts to address human trafficking.

“(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary, working through the Director, shall, in accordance with subsection (e)—

“(1) issue Department-wide guidance to appropriate Department personnel;

“(2) develop training programs for such personnel; and

“(3) coordinate departmental efforts, including training for such personnel.

“(e) GUIDANCE AND TRAINING.—The Blue Campaign shall provide guidance and training to appropriate Department personnel and other Federal, State, tribal, and law enforcement personnel, as appropriate regarding—

“(1) programs to help identify instances of human trafficking;

“(2) the types of information that should be collected and recorded in information technology systems utilized by the Department to help identify individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking;

“(3) systematic and routine information sharing within the Department and among Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies regarding—

“(A) individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking; and

“(B) patterns and practices of human trafficking;

“(4) techniques to identify suspected victims of trafficking along the United States border and at airport security checkpoints;

“(5) methods to be used by the Transportation Security Administration and personnel from other appropriate agencies—

“(A) to train employees of the Transportation Security Administration to identify suspected victims of trafficking; and

“(B) to serve as a liaison and resource regarding human trafficking prevention to appropriate State, local, and private sector aviation workers and the traveling public;

“(6) utilizing resources, such as indicator cards, fact sheets, pamphlets, posters, brochures, and radio and television campaigns—

“(A) to educate partners and stakeholders; and

“(B) to increase public awareness of human trafficking;

“(7) leveraging partnerships with State and local governmental, nongovernmental, and private sector organizations to raise public awareness of human trafficking; and

“(8) any other activities the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the Blue Campaign.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 433 the following:

“Sec. 434. Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign.”.

SEC. 3. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure, in accordance with the Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance required under section 434(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, the integration of information technology systems utilized with-

in the Department to record and track information regarding individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that—

(1) describes the status and effectiveness of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign; and

(2) provides a recommendation regarding the appropriate office within the Department of Homeland Security for the Blue Campaign.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$819,000 to carry out section 434 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2.

HIZBALLAH INTERNATIONAL FINANCING PREVENTION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1595 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1595) to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rubio substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1110) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill (S. 1595), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 287, S. Res. 288, S. Res. 289, and S. Res. 290.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

REPORTING AUTHORITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's adjournment, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters on Friday, October 13, from 9 a.m. until 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2017, THROUGH MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, October 6, at 10:30 a.m.; Tuesday, October 10, at 9:15 a.m.; and Friday, October 13, at 8:30 a.m.

I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 13, it next convene at 4 p.m. on Monday, October 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Gingrich nomination, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:51 p.m., adjourned until Friday, October 6, 2017, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

R. D. JAMES, OF MISSOURI, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE JO-ELLEN DARCY.

BRUCE D. JETTE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE HEIDI SHYU, RESIGNED.
SHON J. MANASCO, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE GABRIEL CAMARILLO.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DAVID J. RYDER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE EDMUND C. MOY, RESIGNED.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEON A. WESTMORELAND, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ANDREW WHEELER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE ROBERT PERCIASEPE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LISA A. JOHNSON, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

KATE S. O'SCANNLAIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, VICE M. PATRICIA SMITH, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MITCHELL ZAIS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, VICE JAMES H. SHELTON III, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FRANK M. COFFMAN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PATRICK J. WILKERSON, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

KURT D. ENGELHARDT, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE EDITH BROWN CLEMENT, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

THOMAS M. GRIFFIN, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH

CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KELVIN CORNELIUS WASHINGTON, TERM EXPIRED.

MARK S. JAMES, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ALFRED COOPER LOMAX, TERM EXPIRED.

JOHNNY LEE KUHLMAN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CHARLES THOMAS WEEKS II, TERM EXPIRED.

DANIEL C. MOSTELLER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PAUL CHARLES THIELEN, TERM EXPIRED.

GARY G. SCHOFIELD, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CHRISTOPHER TOBIAS HOYE, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 5, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

LEE FRANCIS CISSNA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2004.

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN FOR SUPERVISION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STEPHEN B. KING, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CZECH REPUBLIC.

BARBARA LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

CHRISTOPHER SMITH, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

J. STEVEN DOWD, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DIRECTOR OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

BRUCE J. WALKER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TIMOTHY GALLAUDET, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

HOWARD R. ELLIOTT, OF INDIANA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

WALTER G. COPAN, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 5, 2017

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

PRAYER

Reverend Timothy Kesicki, Jesuit Conference, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

God of all consolation, from whom human sadness is never hidden, we turn to You to be our strength this day.

The psalmist proclaims that You are close to the brokenhearted and that You save those crushed in spirit.

We pray that You lift the spirit of our Nation this day, and guide those who represent and lead Your people.

Help our leaders to find good counsel and give ear to Your holy words. The Book of Proverbs teaches us that: "For lack of counsel a nation fails, security lies with many advisers."

May all who advise, guide, and help to direct our government do so with selfless care. May they put the needs of others before their own cares and lift the burden of those who suffer most.

Grant our leaders discerning minds and hearts, so that "Your will be done" today and every day with which You bless us.

We pray this with great faith and hope.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) come for-

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PETERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

RECOGNIZING PERRY TECHNICAL INSTITUTE AND TYLER ANDRINGA

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Perry Technical Institute for receiving the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges' 2017 School of Excellence Award.

Perry Tech has continually provided high-quality education and technical training for students in the Yakima Valley of central Washington, and this award is well deserved.

On top of that, I would like to recognize Tyler Andringa, who received the commission's 2017 Outstanding Graduate Award. Tyler graduated from Perry Tech in December 2016 with a certificate in information technology and communication systems.

Tyler has cerebral palsy and has overcome many challenges to obtain his certificate. He has served as a role model and a leader among his classmates.

Applying the resources and guidance he received at Perry Tech, Tyler is currently employed with Continuant, a telecommunications service provider, where he is succeeding in advancing his career goals. His achievements are commendable, and I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

Please join me in congratulating Perry Technical Institute on their achievements as they continue to provide excellent education and job training to equip students just like Tyler Andringa.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, our tax system is broken and in desperate need

of reform. We need a simpler Tax Code that is fiscally responsible, makes American businesses more competitive, and allows working families to prosper in a 21st century economy.

But the Ryan-McConnell tax proposal would do the opposite and fails on the promises made by President Trump to boost the middle class. Middle class families would see an average tax increase of \$1,290 per year. That is a 380 percent increase for an average family of four.

A new analysis from the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center said that the Ryan-McConnell proposal would add \$5.6 trillion to the national debt, a 27 percent increase from the current debt which is already too high.

Under this proposal, the increased deficits will far outweigh the benefits of reductions, and economic growth and hardworking Americans will both suffer.

Instead, we need forward-looking policies that are fiscally responsible and create opportunities for families and businesses in today's economy. That will only come from bipartisan negotiations where we can work together to create the best possible tax conditions for Americans.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FARM TO SCHOOL MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, October is National Farm to School Month. It is time when we celebrate food education, school gardens, and lunch trays filled with healthy, local ingredients.

Farm to School brings healthy foods from local farms to schoolchildren nationwide. The program teaches students about the path from farm to fork and instills healthy eating habits that can last a lifetime by introducing children to real food.

At the same time, use of local produce in school meals and educational activities provides a new direct market opportunity for family farmers in the area and lessens environmental impacts of transporting food long distances.

More than 31 million children eat a school lunch 5 days a week, 180 days a year. If school lunch can taste great and support the local community, everybody wins. In the early 1990s, there were merely a few Farm to School programs, and today there are thousands.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, it is encouraging to see this program grow and our schoolchildren's diets improving. A lifelong love of healthy, locally grown food from your local farmer is something we can all support.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, 585, the number of people murdered and injured in Las Vegas on Sunday during the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history.

477, the number of days since the previous deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history in Orlando.

521, the number of mass shootings since Orlando.

91, the average number of Americans killed by gun violence every day.

69, the number of homicides in Charlotte in 2017.

Zero, the number of actions taken by Congress to address the gun violence epidemic in our country.

When is enough enough? What is it going to take for Congress to end gun violence?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stop wasting time and demand that a joint select committee be established to combat gun violence and the bipartisan King-Thompson bill be brought to the floor for a vote.

It is time that we had the moral courage to act. Our Nation can't wait, and they shouldn't.

RECOGNIZING BRETT RUBIN OF BUCKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a brave young man in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Brett Rubin.

A resident of Northampton, Brett's positive attitude and boundless energy make him a promising young leader in our community. This is even more notable due to the challenges Brett faces from type 1 diabetes. Despite these obstacles, Brett has never allowed this illness to define him or hold him back.

More amazing, Mr. Speaker, is that Brett has channeled his desire to cure this illness and to help others. Partnering with the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Brett and his mother, Sandy, have raised thousands of dollars to combat type 1 diabetes. Participating in foundation walks, the Rubins join a close-knit group of family and friends, and they call themselves Brett's Band, which is a fitting name honoring a teenager who marches to his own beat and steals the show wherever he goes.

It is my honor to recognize this exemplary young man. I know Brett's future will be bright and that type 1 diabetes will never interfere with his ambitions or his aspirations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Pursuant to House Resolution 553 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 71.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 0911

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the house of representatives.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement in the House of Representatives

- Sec. 301. Point of order against increasing long-term direct spending.
- Sec. 302. Allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.
- Sec. 303. Limitation on changes in certain mandatory programs.
- Sec. 304. GAO report.
- Sec. 305. Estimates of debt service costs.
- Sec. 306. Fair-value credit estimates.
- Sec. 307. Estimates of major direct spending legislation.
- Sec. 308. Estimates of macroeconomic effects of major legislation.
- Sec. 309. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.
- Sec. 310. Limitation on advance appropriations.
- Sec. 311. Scoring rule for Energy Savings Performance Contracts.
- Sec. 312. Estimates of land conveyances.
- Sec. 313. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.
- Sec. 314. Prohibition on the use of guarantee fees as an offset.
- Sec. 315. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses as an offset.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

- Sec. 321. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
- Sec. 322. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
- Sec. 323. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
- Sec. 324. Adjustments to reflect updated budgetary estimates.
- Sec. 325. Adjustment for certain emergency designations.
- Sec. 326. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

- Sec. 401. Reserve fund for the repeal of the 2010 health care laws.
- Sec. 402. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for additional measures relating to the replacement of Obamacare.
- Sec. 403. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the 2010 health care laws.
- Sec. 404. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.
- Sec. 405. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.
- Sec. 406. Reserve fund for revenue measures.
- Sec. 407. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for infrastructure reform.
- Sec. 408. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.
- Sec. 409. Implementation of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement.
- Sec. 410. Deficit-neutral reserve account for reforming SNAP.
- Sec. 411. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Social Security Disability Insurance Reform.
- Sec. 412. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.
- Sec. 413. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.
- Sec. 414. Reserve fund for commercialization of air traffic control.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS

- Sec. 501. Policy statement on Obamacare repeal.
- Sec. 502. Policy statement on replacing Obamacare.
- Sec. 503. Policy statement on Medicare.

- Sec. 504. Policy statement on Medicaid State flexibility block grants.
- Sec. 505. Policy statement on Social Security.
- Sec. 506. Policy statement on means-tested welfare programs.
- Sec. 507. Policy statement on reform of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
- Sec. 508. Policy statement on work requirements.
- Sec. 509. Policy statement on a carbon tax.
- Sec. 510. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
- Sec. 511. Policy statement on tax reform.
- Sec. 512. Policy statement on trade.
- Sec. 513. Policy statement on energy production.
- Sec. 514. Policy statement on Federal regulatory budgeting and reform.
- Sec. 515. Policy statement on Federal funding of abortion.
- Sec. 516. Policy statement on transportation reform.
- Sec. 517. Policy statement on the Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 518. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.
- Sec. 519. Policy statement on a balanced budget amendment.
- Sec. 520. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
- Sec. 521. Policy statement on reforming the congressional budget process.
- Sec. 522. Policy statement on Federal accounting.
- Sec. 523. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,668,877,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,756,890,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,850,457,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,947,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,079,775,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,210,906,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,349,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,502,499,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,672,058,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,842,299,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$64,692,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$76,618,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$100,119,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$112,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$103,141,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$107,010,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$113,215,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$119,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$117,320,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$116,088,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,869,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,894,948,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,895,989,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,925,467,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,056,667,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,054,334,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,152,483,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,296,588,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$3,397,043,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$3,451,336,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,809,440,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$2,876,701,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$2,881,466,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$2,955,056,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,056,336,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,039,746,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,124,286,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,264,841,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$3,380,506,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$3,435,219,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$140,563,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$119,811,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$31,009,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$7,440,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: -\$23,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: -\$171,160,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: -\$224,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: -\$237,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: -\$291,552,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: -\$407,080,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$20,705,790,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$21,342,481,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$21,881,784,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$22,365,586,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$22,732,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$22,971,856,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$23,180,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$23,283,603,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$23,324,552,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$23,082,487,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,046,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$15,593,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$16,095,547,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$16,568,776,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$16,984,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$17,277,258,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$17,552,761,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$17,774,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$17,922,572,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$17,943,641,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$676,050,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$652,657,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$676,241,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$651,644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$676,460,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$650,005,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$674,719,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$647,508,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$673,902,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$660,780,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$688,039,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$673,944,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$702,217,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$684,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$716,434,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$703,603,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$732,456,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$719,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$747,635,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$734,397,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,236,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,568,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,517,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,810,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,508,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,469,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,270,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,485,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,068,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,881,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,222,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,712,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,636,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,669,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,168,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,148,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,308,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,519,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,775,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,977,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,253,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,986,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,767,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,304,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,709,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,844,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,141,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,393,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,567,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,979,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,573,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,549,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,172,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,041,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, -\$8,602,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$2,530,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, -\$4,244,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$5,977,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, -\$16,964,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$17,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$3,169,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,702,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,190,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,421,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,716,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$5,297,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,261,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,080,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,096,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,023,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,767,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,952,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,056,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,593,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,854,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,691,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,651,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,868,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,566,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,593,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,211,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,062,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,672,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,353,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,671,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,184,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,423,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,344,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,013,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,632,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,313,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,276,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,084,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,061,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,864,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,157,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,647,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,424,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,817,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,139,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,702,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,020,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$9,217,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,316,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,865,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,514,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$15,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$25,946,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$14,917,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,024,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$14,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,184,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,818,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,083,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,941,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,606,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$27,462,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$13,895,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,552,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$83,577,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,088,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,185,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,804,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,577,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,883,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,156,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,185,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,040,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,708,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,337,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,885,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,366,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,747,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,337,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,198,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,646,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,014,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,275,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,434,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,058,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,715,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,562,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,197,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,751,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,232,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,282,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,337,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,275,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,463,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,278,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,336,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,239,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,903,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,454,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,945,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,158,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,683,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,598,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,530,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,228,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,941,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,665,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,210,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,170,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,141,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,302,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,344,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$454,509,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$432,501,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$435,341,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$439,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$457,516,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$448,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$450,448,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$455,861,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$456,758,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$461,189,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$465,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$466,743,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$473,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$471,674,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$479,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$476,960,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$484,487,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$481,009,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$483,275,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$485,571,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$591,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$590,967,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$650,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$650,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$674,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$674,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$707,798,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$707,601,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$778,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$778,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$774,353,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$774,163,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$774,204,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$774,007,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$842,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$841,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$924,327,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$924,102,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$989,487,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$989,265,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$472,681,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$458,878,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$427,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$418,415,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$433,650,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$424,439,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$438,723,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$430,323,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$442,003,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$439,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$421,768,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$415,075,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$428,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$417,101,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$434,146,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$423,466,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$441,856,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$436,970,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$448,955,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$443,434,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,704,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$178,038,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,507,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,930,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$193,931,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$197,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$215,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$213,337,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$212,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$210,444,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,943,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$227,991,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$225,820,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$234,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$232,660,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$241,501,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,438,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,597,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,054,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,361,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,354,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,365,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,203,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,488,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,252,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,105,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,669,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,048,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,818,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,757,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,972,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,497,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,346,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,159,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,959,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,817,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,488,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,594,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,325,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,274,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,140,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,930,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,796,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,518,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,942,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$373,956,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$373,956,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$399,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$399,575,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$432,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$432,397,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$464,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$464,410,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$492,279,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$492,279,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$516,440,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$516,440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$532,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$532,410,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$544,916,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$544,916,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$555,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$555,256,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,858,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$554,969,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$103,895,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$139,536,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$122,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$113,004,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$192,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$164,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$192,585,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$160,271,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$213,001,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$185,944,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$239,872,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$219,297,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$186,688,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$167,764,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$165,184,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$150,710,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$201,905,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$176,558,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$237,951,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$216,002,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$83,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$83,212,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$86,409,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$86,409,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$86,316,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$86,316,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,347,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,347,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$93,573,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$93,573,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, -\$100,001,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$100,001,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, -\$105,371,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$105,371,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$115,139,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$115,139,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, -\$117,033,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$117,033,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, -\$127,808,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$127,808,000,000.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than 90 days after the adoption of this resolution, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations on changes in laws within their jurisdictions to the Committee on the Budget that would achieve the specified reduction in the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$327,704,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$32,601,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$441,015,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$2,665,188,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall sub-

mit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$154,083,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$24,689,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$67,178,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$59,302,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(9) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$447,960,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(10) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$5,561,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(11) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$49,022,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(12) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,417,836,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may file appropriately revised allocations, aggregates, and functional levels upon the consideration of a reconciliation measure under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report to the House of Representatives pursuant to this section, if it is in compliance with the reconciliation directives by virtue of section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) REVISION.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be the allocations and aggregates established by this concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(d) PURPOSE OF RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the reconciliation instructions provided pursuant to this section are to be used for—

- (1) enacting the mandatory spending reforms recommended by this resolution; and
- (2) enacting comprehensive tax reform.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement in the House of Representatives

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of

whether a measure would cause a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning with the first fiscal year that is 10 fiscal years after the budget year provided for in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget in the House of Representatives, for each bill or joint resolution other than an appropriation measure and any amendment thereto or conference report thereon.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION.—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, levels, or limits contained in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 401.

(d) DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 302. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) 302 ALLOCATIONS.—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the "first fiscal year" and the "total of fiscal years" shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(f) ADJUSTMENTS TO FUND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget

may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels related to Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or the allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report or joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution to account for new information.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year that proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such change in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such change in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$13,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 304. GAO REPORT.

(a) GAO SUBMISSION.—At a date specified by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, the Comptroller General, in consultation with the chair, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to the chair a comprehensive list of all current direct spending programs of the Government.

(b) PUBLICATION.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget shall cause to be printed in the Congressional Record the list submitted under subsection (a). The chair shall publish such list on the Committee’s public Web site. Such publication shall be searchable, sortable, and downloadable.

SEC. 305. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include in

any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, or an estimate of an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, an estimate of any change in debt service costs (if any) resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt servicing costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforcement of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of discretionary programs or to appropriation measures, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

SEC. 306. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall, to the extent practicable, provide a supplemental fair-value estimate of any loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(b) STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide a supplemental fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure establishing or modifying a program providing loans or loan guarantees for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) BASELINE ESTIMATES.—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

SEC. 307. ESTIMATES OF MAJOR DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.

The Congressional Budget Office shall prepare, to the extent practicable, an estimate of the outlay changes during the second and third decade of enactment for any direct spending legislative provision—

(1) that proposes a change or changes to law that the Congressional Budget Office determines has an outlay impact in excess of 0.25 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States during the first decade or in the tenth year; or

(2) for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives requests such an estimate.

SEC. 308. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.—During the 114th and 115th Congresses, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act for major legislation considered in the House of Representatives shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on

the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAJOR LEGISLATION.—The term “major legislation” means a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) TIMING SHIFTS.—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 309. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto is offered or any conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 310. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or

continuing appropriation may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading—

(1) **GENERAL.**—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(2) **VETERANS.**—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) **GENERAL.**—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) **VETERANS.**—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 311. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon that affects the use of any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis.

(b) **NPV CALCULATIONS.**—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal use of energy savings performance contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal use of energy saving performance contracts and utility energy service contracts, dated September 28, 2012 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, if any present value calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then such savings may not be used as an offset for purposes of budget enforcement.

(e) **CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.**—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the

Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President's annual budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

SEC. 312. ESTIMATES OF LAND CONVEYANCES.

In the House of Representatives, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall include in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any measure that conveys Federal land to any non-Federal entity—

(1) the methodology used to calculate such estimate;

(2) a detailed justification of its estimate of any change in revenue, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections resulting from such conveyance;

(3) if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget, any information provided by the Bureau of Land Management or other applicable Federal agency, including the source and date of such information, that supports the estimate of any change in revenue, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections;

(4) a description of any efforts to independently verify such agency estimate; and

(5) a statement of the assumptions underlying the estimate of the budgetary effects that would be generated by such parcel in CBO's baseline projections as of the most recent publication or update.

SEC. 313. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 314. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 315. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 321. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section

302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 322. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 301 of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 323. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions in accordance with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 324. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT UPDATED BUDGETARY ESTIMATES.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect any adjustments to the baseline made by the Congressional Budget Office.

SEC. 325. ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and

other budgetary levels for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that designates an emergency under section 4(g)(2) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

SEC. 326. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title, title II, and title VII—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that only consists of a full repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 402. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL MEASURES RELATING TO THE REPLACEMENT OF OBAMACARE.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals or replaces provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 403. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 404. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 when the macroeconomic effects of such reforms are taken into account.

SEC. 405. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that such chair determines are necessary to implement a trade agreement, and the budgetary levels for any companion measure that offsets such trade measure, if the combined cost of each measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 406. RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue.

SEC. 407. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms the Federal infrastructure funding system, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 408. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 409. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution to accommodate the enactment of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement if it includes permanent spending reductions and reforms to direct spending program, and does not increase outlays in any fiscal year.

SEC. 410. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE ACCOUNT FOR REFORMING SNAP.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP), but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 411. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations,

aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms the Social Security Disability Insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 412. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 413. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit reforms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 414. RESERVE FUND FOR COMMERCIALIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust, at a time the chair deems appropriate, the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and other applicable committees of the House of Representatives, aggregates, and other appropriate levels established in this concurrent resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system if such measure reduces the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by the amount that would otherwise be appropriated to the Federal Aviation Administration for air traffic control. Adjustments to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the adjustments to the discretionary spending limits under such section 251(c), shall only be made upon enactment of such measure.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, a measure that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system shall be a measure that establishes a federally chartered, not-for-profit corporation that—

(1) is authorized to provide air traffic control services within the United States airspace;

(2) sets user fees to finance its operations;

(3) may borrow from private capital markets to finance improvements;

(4) is governed by a board of directors composed of a CEO and directors whose fiduciary duty is to the entity; and

(5) becomes the employer of those employees directly connected to providing air traffic control services and who the Secretary transfers from the Federal Government.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS**SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON OBAMACARE REPEAL.**

It is the policy of this resolution that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) should be repealed.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPLACING OBAMACARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Obamacare put Washington's priorities before those of patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised. Instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500; instead, average premiums have increased 105 percent. A study conducted by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated premiums to continue rising over the next decade, projecting an average increase of 8 percent per year between 2016 and 2018, and increasing by nearly 60 percent by 2026.

(2) President Obama pledged, "If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan." Instead, CBO now estimated 7 million Americans will lose employment-based health coverage due to the health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House Pelosi stated that the President's health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, CBO estimated that by 2025 Obamacare will reduce the number of hours worked by approximately 2 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. Additionally, a study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimated that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) Since the ACA was signed into law, the Obama administration repeatedly failed to implement it as written. President Obama's unilateral actions resulted in numerous changes, delays, and exemptions. President Obama signed into law another 24 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual "mandate" could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees even if it violates the companies' religious beliefs. More than 7 years after enactment, the courts continue to evaluate the legality of how President Obama's administration implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly of the underlying law; health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(5) Obamacare is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. Its complex structure of subsidies, mandates, and penalties perversely impact individuals, married couples, and families. Those who previously had insurance along with those who did not have been funneled into a new system that is providing less access to doctors and treatments. Millions of Americans have been added to a broken Medicaid system that is incapable of providing the care promised. Cuts made to Medicare to fund a new entitlement are undermining the health

security of seniors. Taxes and mandates are distorting the insurance market and harming the broader economy, resulting in fewer jobs and less opportunity. By design, Obamacare put Washington at the center of our health care system, at the expense of patients, families, physicians, and businesses. The ACA should be fully repealed, allowing for real patient-centered health care reform that puts patients first, not Washington.

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING OBAMACARE.—It is the policy of this resolution that Obamacare must not only be repealed, but also replaced by enacting the American Health Care Reform Act.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2028 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries; and

(D) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in or near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits due to the program's impending bankruptcy, and instead offer beneficiaries more options, better care, with reduced costs for both beneficiaries and the Federal Government, by modernizing Medicare.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Medicare is preserved for current and future beneficiaries.

(2) Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as an option.

(4) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

(6) The Medicare eligibility age is gradually increased to keep pace with increases in longevity.

(7) Medicare is simplified by combining parts A and B and reforms to Medigap plans are implemented.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID STATE FLEXIBILITY BLOCK GRANTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) should be block granted to the States in a manner prescribed by the State Health Flexibility Act.

SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the "three-legged stool" of retirement security, which includes employer provided benefits as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2022, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2034, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2034, benefits will be cut nearly 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The Disability Insurance program provides an income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. However, the program is in serious financial trouble. The number of beneficiaries has skyrocketed from 2.7 million in 1970 to 10.6 million in 2016. At the same time, the labor force participation rate has now fallen to the lowest levels since the 1970s. As a result, the Social Security Actuary now projects that the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be depleted in 2023.

(4) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 11 percent in 2023, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(5) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security.

(b) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes these reforms will include the following policies, based upon the Social Security Reform Act:

(1) Adoption of a more accurate measure for calculating cost of living adjustments.

(2) Adoption of adjustments to the full retirement age to reflect longevity.

(3) Makes Social Security benefits more progressive over the long term, providing those most in need with a safety net in retirement.

(c) POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes that reforms to the Disability Insurance program will include—

(1) encouraging work;

(2) updates of the eligibility rules;

(3) reducing fraud and abuse;

(4) enactment of H.R. 2031, the Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment

Benefits Double Dip Elimination Act, to prohibit individuals from drawing benefits from both programs at the same time; and

(5) enactment of H.R. 1540, the Social Security Disability Insurance Return to Work Act, to allow the award of time-limited benefits for applicants whose medical recovery is anticipated in order to create new opportunities for beneficiaries.

SEC. 506. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

(1) Too many people are trapped at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder, and every citizen should have the opportunity to rise, escape from poverty, and achieve their own potential.

(2) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and congressional Republicans enacted reforms that have moved families off of Federal programs and enabled them to provide for themselves.

(3) Today, there are approximately 92 Federal programs on which Government at the Federal and State level spend more than \$1 trillion annually that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(4) It should be the goal of welfare programs to encourage work and put people on a path to self-reliance.

(b) POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should be reformed to give states flexibility to implement and improve safety net programs and that to be eligible for benefits, able bodied adults without dependents should be required to work or be preparing for work, including enrolling in educational or job training programs, contributing community service, or participating in a supervised job search; and

(2) the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 507. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORM OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) SNAP.—It is the policy of the resolution that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program be reformed so that:

(1) Nutrition assistance funds should be distributed to the states as a block grant with funding subject to the annual discretionary appropriations process.

(2) Funds from the grant must be used by the states to establish and maintain a work activation program for able-bodied adults without dependents.

(3) It is the goal of this proposal to move those in need off of the assistance rolls and back into the workforce and towards self-sufficiency.

(b) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes that, pending the enactment of reforms described in (a), the conversion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs.

SEC. 508. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that all means-tested welfare programs should include work activation requirements for able-bodied adults.

SEC. 509. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.

It is the policy of this resolution that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 510. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Across the Nation, too many Americans are struggling to make ends meet. The slowly falling unemployment rate has masked an underlying crisis as millions of Americans have abandoned the work force and wages have stagnated. The labor force participation rate has plummeted to levels not seen since the Carter presidency.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 1.9 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country's fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher.

(4) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country's economic outlook. Investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. They know that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation and they act accordingly. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(5) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels) is a net positive for economic growth over time.

(6) If the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a "crowding out" of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(7) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(8) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$273 billion.

(9) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(b) POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code will put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 511. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A reformed tax code should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) eco-

nomics growth. The United States tax code fails on all 3 counts: it is complex, unfair, and inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) High marginal tax rates lessen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation.

(3) The United States corporate income tax rate is the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages, discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(4) The "world-wide" structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors that have more competitive international tax systems.

(5) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, consumers in higher prices, and investors in diminished returns.

(6) Closing tax loopholes to finance higher spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(7) Tax reform should curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board, not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(8) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform, including a broader tax base and lower tax rates, would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which would have a positive impact on total national output.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform that is revenue-neutral on a dynamic basis that provides for the following:

(1) Targets revenue neutrality based on a dynamic score that takes into account the macroeconomic effects of reform.

(2) Collapses the current seven brackets for individuals into just three, with a top rate of no more than 33 percent.

(3) Simplifies the tax code to ensure that fewer Americans will be required to itemize deductions.

(4) Gives equal tax treatment to individual and employer healthcare expenditures modeled on the American Health Care Reform Act.

(5) Encourages charitable giving.

(6) Repeals the Death Tax.

(7) Eliminates marriage penalties.

(8) Provides tax-free universal savings accounts to reward saving.

(9) Repeals the alternative minimum tax.

(10) Reduces double taxation by lowering the top corporate rate to no more than 20 percent.

(11) Reduces the rate for capital gains and dividends.

(12) Encourages net investment, savings, and entrepreneurial activity, including full expensing.

(13) Moves to a competitive territorial system of international taxation.

(14) Ends distortionary special interest giveaways, such as the Wind Production Tax Credit.

SEC. 512. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass international competition.

(b) POLICY ON TRADE.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution—

(1) to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive tax system to promote domestic job creation;

(2) that the United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through high-standard trade agreements that satisfy negotiating objectives, including—

(A) the expansion of trade opportunities;

(B) adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and

(C) the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and enforcing United States rights; and

(3) that any trade agreement entered into on behalf of the United States should reflect the negotiating objectives and adhere to the provisions requiring improved consultation with Congress.

SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY PRODUCTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and currently unavailable areas of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be open for energy exploration and production.

SEC. 514. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive Federal regulation—

(A) has hurt job creation, investment, wages, competition, and economic growth, slowing the Nation's recovery from the economic recession and harming American households;

(B) operates as a regressive tax on poor and lower-income households;

(C) displaces workers into long-term unemployment or lower-paying jobs;

(D) adversely affects small businesses, the primary source of new jobs; and

(E) impedes economic growth.

(2) Federal agencies routinely fail to identify and eliminate, minimize, or mitigate excess regulatory costs through post-implementation assessments of their regulations.

(3) The United States Code of Federal Regulations now contains over 185,000 pages of regulations in 242 volumes.

(4) Notwithstanding the size and growth of Federal regulations, Congress lacks an effective mechanism to manage the level of new Federal regulatory costs imposed each year. Other nations, meanwhile, have successfully implemented the use of regulatory budgeting to control excess regulation and regulatory costs.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act has resulted in more than 177.9 million annual hours of regulatory compliance paperwork, \$37.1 billion of regulatory compliance costs on the private sector, and \$13 billion in regulatory compliance costs on the States.

(6) Agencies impose costly regulations without relying on sound science through the use of judicial consent decrees and settlement agreements and the abuse of interim compliance costs imposed on regulated entities that bring legal challenges against newly promulgated regulations.

(b) POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with the public, consider legislation that—

(1) promotes—

(A) economic growth, job creation, higher wages, and increased investment by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining, simplifying and lowering the costs of Federal regulations; and

(B) the adoption of least-cost regulatory alternatives to meet the objectives of Federal regulatory statutes;

(2) protects—

(A) the poor and lower-income households from the regressive effects of excessive regulation; and

(B) workers against the unnecessary elimination of jobs and loss or reduction of wages;

(3) requires—

(A) an annual, congressional regulatory budget that establishes annual costs of regulations and allocates these costs amongst Federal regulatory agencies;

(B) cost-benefit and regulatory impact analysis for new regulations proposed and promulgated by all Federal regulatory agencies;

(C) advance notice of proposed rulemaking and makes evidentiary hearings available for critical disputed issues in the development of new major regulations; and

(D) congressional approval of all new major regulations before the regulations can become effective, ensuring that Congress can better prevent the imposition of unsound costly new regulations;

(4) reduces—

(A) regulatory barriers to entry into markets and other regulatory impediments to competition and innovation; and

(B) the imposition of new Federal regulation that duplicates, overlaps or conflicts with State, local, and Tribal regulation or that impose unfunded mandates on State, local, and Tribal governments; and

(5) eliminates the abuse of guidance to evade legal requirements applicable to the development and promulgation of new regulations.

SEC. 515. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer dollars shall go to any entity that provides abortion services.

SEC. 516. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRANSPORTATION REFORM.

It is the policy of this resolution that State and local officials are in a much better position to understand the needs of local commuters, not bureaucrats in Washington. Federal funding for transportation should be phased down and limited to core Federal duties, including the interstate highway system, transportation infrastructure on Federal land, responding to emergencies, and research. As the level of Federal responsibility for transportation is reduced, Congress should also concurrently reduce the Federal gas tax.

SEC. 517. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans

Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care.

(2) In 2015, for the first time, VA health care was added to Government Accountability Office's (GAO) "high-risk" list, due to mismanagement and oversight failures, which have resulted in untimely and inefficient health care. According to GAO, "the absence of care and delays in providing care have harmed veterans."

(3) The VA's failure to provide timely and accessible health care to our veterans is unacceptable. While Congress has done its part for more than a decade by providing sufficient funding for the VA, the administration has mismanaged these resources, resulting in proven adverse effects on veterans and their families.

(b) POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs continue its oversight efforts to ensure the VA reassesses its core mission, including—

(A) reducing the number of bureaucratic layers;

(B) reducing the number of senior and middle managers;

(C) improving performance measure metrics;

(D) strengthening the administration and oversight of contractors; and

(E) supporting opportunities for veterans to pursue other viable options for their health care needs; and

(2) the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on the Budget should continue to closely monitor the VA's progress to ensure VA resources are sufficient and efficiently provided to veterans.

SEC. 518. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could "lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings."

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017, the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs.

(4) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$137 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2015.

(5) Under clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(6) Clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the House of Representatives prohibits an appropriation for an expenditure not previously authorized by law. Despite this longstanding prohibition, more than \$310 billion has been appropriated for unauthorized programs in fiscal year 2016, spanning 256 separate laws.

(7) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules.

SEC. 519. POLICY STATEMENT ON A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government will collect approximately \$3.4 trillion in taxes, but spend nearly \$4 trillion to maintain its operations, borrowing 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) As of March 16, 2017, the national debt of the United States was nearly \$20 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Government to hold a constitutional convention to adopt a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

(4) Forty nine States have fiscal limitations in their State constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) Five States, including Arizona, Georgia, Alaska, Mississippi, and North Dakota, have agreed to the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which is seeking to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget through an Article V convention by April 12, 2021.

(b) POLICY ON A BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress should propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

SEC. 520. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies held \$921 billion in unobligated balances at the end of fiscal year 2017.

(2) These funds comprise both discretionary appropriations and authorizations of mandatory spending that remain available for expenditure.

(3) In many cases, agencies are provided appropriations that remain indefinitely available for obligation.

(4) The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an Act of Congress.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed;

(2) the appropriate committees in the House should identify and review accounts

with unobligated balances and rescind such balances that would not impede or disrupt the fulfillment of important Federal commitments;

(3) the House, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and appropriate agencies, should continue to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction; and

(4) unobligated balances in dormant accounts should not be used to finance increases in spending.

SEC. 521. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Enactment of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 was the first step toward restoring constitutionally endowed legislative responsibility over fundamental budget decision making.

(2) However, the congressional budget process has neither constrained spending nor inhibited the expansion of Government. The growth of the Government, primarily through a multiplicity of mandatory programs and other forms of direct spending, has largely been financed through borrowing and high tax rates.

(3) The enforcement of the current budget process, including congressional points of order and statutory spending limits, have been too often waived or circumvented. This contributes to a lack of accountability, which has led to broad agreement that reforming the system is a high necessity.

(b) POLICY ON REFORMING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress should—

(1) restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) reassert congressional power over spending and revenue, restore the balance of power between Congress and the President as the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 intended, and attain the maximum level of accountability for budget decisions through efficient and rigorous enforcement of budget rules;

(3) improve incentives for lawmakers to budget as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially by adopting an annual budget resolution;

(4) encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending;

(5) revise the methodology used in developing the baseline, which is intended to reflect an objective projection of the budgetary effects of current laws and policies for future fiscal years, by removing any tendency toward assuming higher spending levels;

(6) promote efficient and timely budget actions to ensure lawmakers complete their budget actions before the start of the new fiscal year;

(7) provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts economic growth and job creation; and

(8) eliminate the complexity of the budget process and the biases that favor higher spending.

(c) LEGISLATION.—The Committee on the Budget of the House should draft legislation during the 115th Congress that rewrites the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers' dollars

are spent wisely and efficiently. Such legislation shall—

(1) attain greater simplicity without sacrificing the rigor required to address—

(A) the complex issues of the domestic and world economy;

(B) national security responsibilities; and

(C) the appropriate roles of rulemaking and statutory enforcement mechanisms;

(2) establish a new structure that assures the congressional role in the budget process is applied consistently without reliance on reactive legislating;

(3) improve the elements of the current budget process that have fulfilled the original purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(4) rebuild the foundation of the budget process to provide a solid basis from which additional reforms may be developed.

SEC. 522. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Current accounting methods fail to capture and present in a compelling manner the full scope of the Government and its fiscal situation.

(2) Most fiscal analyses produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) are conducted over a 10-year time horizon. The use of generational accounting or a longer time horizon would provide a more complete picture of the Government's fiscal situation.

(3) The Federal budget currently accounts for most programs on a cash accounting basis, which records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received. However, it accounts for loan and loan guarantee programs on an accrual basis, which records revenue when earned and expenses when incurred.

(4) The Government Accountability Office has advised that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimate of the Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs, specifically insurance programs.

(5) Accrual accounting under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA) understates the risk and thus the true cost of some Federal programs, including loans and loan guarantees.

(6) Fair value accounting better reflects the risk associated with Federal loan and loan guarantee programs by using a market based discount rate. CBO, for example, uses fair value accounting to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

(7) In comparing fair value accounting to FCRA, CBO has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of Federal assistance".

(8) This concurrent resolution directs CBO to estimate the costs of credit programs on a fair value basis to fully capture the risk associated with Federal credit programs.

(b) POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with CBO and other appropriate stakeholders, reform government-wide budget and accounting practices so Members and the public can better understand the fiscal situation of the United States and the options best suited to improving it.

SEC. 523. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$513 billion in fiscal year 2017.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present the Republican Study Committee's 2018 budget, *Securing America's Future Economy*.

This proposal combines savings that have been proposed by the Congressional Budget Office, many RSC members, and public policy think tanks, including The Heritage Foundation, Citizens Against Government Waste, and the National Taxpayers Union. It is based on a simple principle that government should spend its money as carefully as families spend what they have left after they have paid their taxes.

By restraining the growth of spending and refocusing resources on core government responsibilities, adopting commonsense reforms, and placing Medicare and Social Security back on sound financial footing, we believe there is still time to save this country from financial and economic ruin. But time is running out.

On our current course, the Congressional Budget Office warns that, within 4 years, our deficits will balloon to \$1 trillion annually, adding about \$8,000 a year to an average family's debt that they will have to pay off in future taxes. Two years after that, interest on the national debt will reach \$654 billion. That is more than we currently spend for the entire defense establishment.

Let me repeat that so it sinks in. Six years from now, we will spend more than our current defense budget accomplishing nothing but renting the

money that we have already borrowed and spent. Three years later, Medicare will collapse. Six years after that—if we get that far—Social Security runs out of money.

This approaching crisis can be described with just three numbers: 26, 35, and 49. Once you understand those three numbers—26, 35, and 49—you can plainly see the root of our problems.

Twenty-six percent is the combined population and inflation growth over the past 10 years. Thirty-five percent is the growth in Federal revenues. Clearly, this is not a revenue problem. The problem is that third number. Forty-nine percent is the growth in spending—nearly twice the rate of inflation and population combined.

We are about to hear about the draconian cuts from the opposition. Let me emphasize, the RSC budget continues to grow the Federal Government every year. I repeat, the RSC budget spends more every year.

Over the decade, we have provided for more than \$1 trillion of government growth. Only in Washington can that be described as a cut. The RSC budget merely restrains the growth of spending over the next decade to give families the time and room to catch up.

□ 0915

By doing so, we can arrest the ruinous spiral of debt and interest costs that now threaten the very solvency of our Nation.

This budget gores a lot of sacred cows, because we want to point out the wide range of savings available to achieve. But I would ask the opponents of this budget to consider one thing as we race toward the looming fiscal crisis just 4 years down the road: you cannot provide for the common defense or general welfare or do all of the other things our government is called upon to do if you cannot pay for them. Our mountainous debt, driven by out-of-control spending, now threatens our ability to do so.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to cut to the chase: the Republican Study Committee budget is so extreme, it cannot be taken seriously. It cuts spending by \$10 trillion over 10 years, which is \$4 trillion more than the already irresponsible spending cuts in Chairman BLACK's budget.

To its credit, the RSC tells us where those cuts will come from, rather than leaving large amounts unspecified or using matching asterisks or phony economic assumptions to reduce spending.

The RSC budget cuts Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. It cuts programs that ensure basic living standards, protect the environment, and help families afford college.

For 2018, the RSC budget matches the President's level for defense, including war funding. But for nondefense discretionary spending, the RSC budget provides \$394 billion, which is \$122 billion, or 24 percent, below the austerity cap.

There is no way this House or any House would approve an appropriations bill that inflicted a 24 percent cut on all government operations. If just two programs—veterans' programs and NIH funding—were excluded from those cuts, everything else would be cut by more than 55 percent.

So yes, this budget claims to reach balance, but it would achieve it by making cuts that would be catastrophic. Not even Congress is that self-destructive.

I contend that the two Republican budgets actually show how dismissing the notion that revenues must be a part of any solution to restrain deficits and debt, compounded with the flawed notion that balance must be achieved in the short term, will inflict intolerable hardship on the American people.

While totally unintentional, they make a pretty compelling case that for Congress to responsibly address our debts and deficits, while funding the Federal programs and investments that the American people want and expect, raising revenues has to be part of the equation.

One of the things that amuses me, in a very kind of dark way, is that I remember so well, in 2010, when Republicans actually rode to victory in the House by claiming that we Democrats were going to cut \$750 billion out of Medicare. That wasn't true, but they claimed it.

Now, in this Republican Study Committee budget, they have doubled down on that. It is not exactly double, but they are going to cut it by \$898 billion. I don't think America's seniors and the disabled population would feel very good about that.

I would like to thank my colleagues for bringing that important issue to the debate.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, \$20.2 trillion. Our national debt is more than \$20.2 trillion.

Let's put it this way: each American's share of the national debt is \$62,000. From the retiree in North Carolina who has already done so much to serve the country, to the newborn child in New York with so much potential, that is \$62,000. In fact, it is more than

the median American family brings home in an entire year.

Our debt continues to mount, even as Federal reserves reach record highs. This leads to an undeniable conclusion, even from Captain Obvious: the Federal Government has a spending problem.

The growing Federal Government has significant negative consequences for the country and its people. The large Federal debt reduces investment, productivity, and wages, while Federal interventions in the economy reduce the incentive to work, resulting in a shrinking labor market.

The debt can have dangerous implications for our national security, recently causing a bipartisan group of leading national security officials to write that “our long-term debt is the single greatest threat to our national security.”

Most fundamentally, when the Federal Government is too big and too intrusive, it interferes with our unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Eleven months ago, the American people voted to give Republicans unified control of government. Now it is time to follow through and implement the policy agenda that Congress and the President were elected on.

As the calendar moves into fall, the grade of the 115th Congress will be delivered on whether we can reform our inefficient Tax Code. This process starts with the budget. Along with repealing ObamaCare and securing our border, the Republican Study Committee budget allows us to fulfill these promises, and more.

This fiscal year 2018 RSC budget ensures a strong national security, robust economic growth, equal opportunity for all, a sustainable social safety net, and a return to constitutionally limited government, all with a goal of securing America's future economy.

Instead of a future of high debt and low growth, the RSC budget proposes a positive blueprint for success and opportunity. Our budget focuses on progrowth, profamily policies that will boost America's economy and provide a strong fiscal foundation for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to thank my friend, Mr. McCLINTOCK, for his leadership of the RSC budget task force, as well as all the members of the Republican Study Committee who participated in this effort.

With this budget, we have accomplished our goals of detailing the variety of bold policy solutions, as well as helping to influence the balanced budget offered by my friend, Chairman BLACK, to include meaningful, enforceable, reconciliation targets, as the RSC budget does, so that we can begin the essential task of implementing these policies into law.

My fellow Members, when will our debt matter? Next year? The year after?

In 6 years, we are projected to spend more than \$650 billion on interest alone on our debt.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. What will it take for our friends on the left to stop hijacking the American Dream for our children and grandchildren? Is it not a moral injustice to leave this level of debt to the next generation?

Mr. Chairman, we have been making this argument in the House for years. Today, it is time to make a difference.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating to have this debate and speaking in such high-principled ways about the need to reduce deficits and debt. I don't think any Democrat would argue that we need to do something to reduce deficits and debt. We face a very dire, long-term fiscal future.

But we also lose sight of the fact that the American people expect something from their government. They expect our government to keep them safe, but they also expect their government to protect their drinking water, protect their air, to make sure that the food they eat is not dangerous, to provide law enforcement and help local law enforcement to do many things.

The budget, as well as Chairman BLACK's committee budget, would decimate all of those services that the American people expect from the Federal Government.

I think only about what is going on right now with Houston, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and the enormous cost that the Federal Government is going to have to bear to help restore those communities and those territories to some degree of normalcy. That is what they expect the American Government to do. These budgets would make that all but impossible.

So we look at it both ways. Later, we will propose a Democratic alternative that actually makes those kind of investments and makes sure that the notion of American security is not just a huge military, but is a foundation of investment in human capital and research and infrastructure that will allow this economy to grow. We do it with keeping debt at the same percentage of the economy, as it is now, because we are willing to raise revenues.

On the other hand, Republican budgets, both the Republican Study Committee budget and the chairman's budget, anticipate enormous tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and corporations—tax cuts that have been proven to do exactly the opposite of what many on the other side claim they do, which is to stimulate economic growth.

We will hear claims that, yes, we can cut taxes by \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion over 10 years, and they are going to be paid for by this renewal of economic activity. But history tells us that is not what happens. Not only history tells us that, but virtually all the economists in the country tell us that, too.

Goldman Sachs, Steve Mnuchin's previous employer, says that the tax cuts outlined last week would maybe create an additional 0.2 percent of growth in the economy.

CBO and the Federal Reserve say tax cuts don't pay for themselves. Even Bruce Bartlett, the author of “Reaganomics,” says this whole notion that tax cuts pay for themselves is nonsense. He actually said bull, which is half of what he said, but you get the idea.

This is not easy. We can speak in the darkest terms of how we are imposing this debt on our grandchildren and try to use emotional arguments. But the fact is, we are dealing with a very realistic, pragmatic dilemma, and that is: how to do what the American people expect us to do without making the future impossible.

It is not done by the Republican budgets. We think it is helped along by the Democratic alternative, and we look forward to having that debate just a little bit later this morning.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would remind my friend from Kentucky that Ronald Reagan reduced the Federal income tax rate from 70 percent down to 28 percent, and income tax revenues doubled.

He is correct that we expect things from our government. We have seen a 49 percent increase in spending in the last decade. Have we seen a 49 percent increase in the quality of education or a 49 percent increase in our infrastructure or our defense capability?

What we have seen is a 49 percent increase in bureaucracy and government.

I would remind the gentleman that when we squander the people's money, we rob them of the means to meet the disasters and unforeseen circumstances that confront our country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), my friend and former chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go off script for a little bit and echo the comments the gentleman was making.

He talked about the Reagan tax cuts and what they did to stimulate the economy and to grow tax revenues and to allow hardworking American families to keep more of their paychecks.

I would also go on to remind the gentleman from Kentucky, to disabuse

him about his views of tax reform, and remind him that President John F. Kennedy, a Democrat, reduced the top marginal rates from 93 percent to 73 percent. The economy grew, more jobs were created, and more revenue was created for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government doesn't have a revenue problem. It has a spending problem. That is what we tackle with the Republican Study Committee budget.

I thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for his incredible and insightful leadership in generating the FY 2018 RSC budget that we are now considering.

The House Budget Committee's budget proposals continue to benefit from the framework of the RSC budget by including meaningful, enforceable reconciliation targets, as our budget does. The House budget will begin the essential task of implementing these policies into law.

Other instances where the RSC-led budget proposals have historically wound up being adopted in the larger House budget include the following:

First, balancing the budget within a 10-year budget window.

Two, including policies to ensure the solvency of entitlement programs, such as Social Security, Medicare, and also Medicaid.

Number three, providing the necessary funding and resources for a robust national security.

Number four, fully repealing ObamaCare.

Number five, establishing a pathway to progrowth tax reform that will jump-start our economy and help hard-working American families take home more of their paychecks.

I was humbled to serve as the chairman of the RSC during the 114th Congress. At that time, we generated a new budget for fiscal year 2017, called the Blueprint for a Balanced Budget 2.0. It was written and released in the spring of 2016.

Like the current RSC budget, it provided a robust agenda of conservative policies to show the American people our vision for this Nation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. In the tradition of The Heritage Foundation's 1980 mandate for leadership that provided a policy agenda for the incoming Reagan administration, our Blueprint for a Balanced Budget 2.0 for the new President and his administration set forth an agenda for governing in 2017.

□ 0930

By all accounts, the RSC budget has proven successful in achieving this goal, with President Trump basing many of the policies for his fiscal 2018 budget request on the RSC's fiscal 2017 budget.

I am pleased to see that many RSC-led proposals are included in both the President's budget and the House budget that we will consider later today.

In the coming years, I look forward to continuing to see the RSC putting forth and leading on many conservative, sound policy ideas for our budgetary process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all our colleagues to vote "yes" on the RSC budget and to vote "yes" on the House GOP budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I feel like I have to be Paul Harvey for a second and talk about the rest of the story.

Because while what Mr. MCCLINTOCK said was true about the initial phases of the Reagan administration, at the end of the Reagan administration, the national debt had almost tripled, and he had been forced to raise taxes a couple of times in the interim.

So, again, we can argue about how positive cutting taxes were in the Reagan administration, but the end result wasn't particularly good for the American economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, who wins in the Republican budget?

Same old same old; millionaires, billionaires, large corporations. The Republican budget paves the way for their plan, which gives 80 percent of its tax cuts to the top 1 percent of Americans, while 30 percent of middle class households making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year would actually see a tax increase. This is according to the non-partisan Tax Policy Center.

It slashes \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, even worse than TrumpCare, and it ends the guarantee of Medicare benefits for American seniors.

It attacks women's health by defunding, of course, Planned Parenthood, once again. It slashes SNAP—SNAP, the Food Stamp program—by \$154 billion, taking nutrition assistance away from up to 7 million households.

Did you really come to Congress to take food out of the mouths of hungry children?

Now we are considering the Republican Study Committee budget, which includes even deeper cuts for children and families and seniors while giving tax cuts to the wealthy.

My Democratic colleagues and I offer A Better Deal for America. The United States is the richest country in the world at the richest time in history. We can have quality healthcare, affordable childcare, debt-free college, secure retirement, and world-class infrastructure, but not if we give massive tax cuts to the wealthiest individuals and corporations.

So I urge my colleagues to reject the RSC budget, reject the Republican

budget, and to support the Democratic alternative. Americans deserve a budget that grows our middle class and invests in our future.

I want to read just one paragraph of a letter from Planned Parenthood that says: "The House Budget Resolution proposes cuts that would be disastrous for women, men, and young people. Planned Parenthood sees every day. It sacrifices access to healthcare, repealing the Affordable Care Act, gutting Medicaid, and proposing even deeper cuts to low-income nondefense discretionary spending. It undermines access to critical reproductive healthcare, including no copay birth control, for millions of women."

The women of America are watching. This budget is a particular disaster for them, for us.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, Article I, section 9 of the Constitution grants Congress the power of the purse. This assigns to Congress the role of final arbiter of the use of public funds.

Despite this clear declaration of power, the Office of Management and Budget estimates that agencies collected over \$513 billion in fines, fees, penalties, and other offsetting collections and receipts in fiscal year 2017. Allowing agencies to have slush funds outside of the normal appropriations process is a recipe for bad acting.

The RSC budget calls for implementing the Agency Accountability Act, which directs that all fines, fees, and settlements go to the Treasury, making them subject to the normal appropriations process. This would end the agencies' ability to operate independently and outside of the oversight of Congress. More importantly, it would allow Congress to fully account for how much money the government actually collects and where that money is coming from.

I am also pleased that the RSC budget does what is increasingly becoming an impossible task: it balances the budget, all while prioritizing defense spending to keep this country secure. This budget sets forth the bold ideas necessary to put the country back on a path of fiscal responsibility.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that if we stay on the current irresponsible fiscal path we are on, by 2047, in 30 years, our debt to GDP will be 150 percent. Stated more simply, our debt will be 50 percent greater than our entire gross domestic product.

We must put our Nation back on a path of fiscal responsibility, and the RSC budget does exactly that. As former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Michael Mullen warned, our national debt is the greatest threat to our national security. By putting our Nation on a sensible fiscal path of balancing the budget, we reduce the extremely heavy burden that a bloated

Federal Government places on America's working families, allowing them to prosper and making the government less intrusive in their lives.

I would also like to add extemporaneously in regard to what we are doing on SNAP benefits. What we are doing is imposing work requirements on able-bodied adults with no children. I want to repeat: able-bodied adults with no children. I think most Americans would agree that if they are getting payments from the Federal Government, they ought to at least do some work.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to my colleagues on this budget that there are two fundamental assumptions that are being made that need to be challenged.

One, you are saying that we have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. This country is spending on domestic priorities and defense at a level that existed when the President of the United States was Dwight D. Eisenhower, and that was before Medicaid and Medicare.

We have a significant issue about how we are going to meet the needs of the people of this country, both on defense, where we need some help, but definitely on the domestic side as well.

The second assumption that you are making—and it is an assertion that is made over and over again—is that tax cuts will pay for themselves. That is the theology of your budget: tax cuts pay for themselves.

You know, why not go to zero, and we will all be rich?

That is essentially what is being said here. But the tax cuts are always at the high end of the income spectrum, which is exacerbating inequality and creating a problem for us to meet essential needs in this country.

So this question of tax cuts paying for themselves and fiscal responsibility, let's have a little bit of history here. This was the theology of George Bush when he passed the tax cuts when he became President. They did not pay for themselves. We went from the Clinton-era surpluses to the Bush-era deficits, and in another fiscally, grossly irresponsible move, he put the war on the credit card.

The war was on the credit card. We had unpaid-for tax cuts and we had an unpaid-for war. And this is not just fiscal responsibility; this is governmental, personal, congressional irresponsibility. You have got to pay for things. Whether it is the war or it is food stamps or it is any program that you want to pick, you have got to pay for it.

You don't pay for it by the magic asterisk of saying, "the tax cuts that we

propose," when we are going to spend by cutting taxes or going into a war that we don't pay for, \$1 trillion, it doesn't work. And that is why we are in this path that is very dangerous with respect to the long-term debt.

I believe in that. We have got to pay our bills. When we had the majority, we had a doctrine that said: Pay as you go.

If any Democrat, the budget chair, or me wanted to propose some spending, we either had to come up with the revenue or we had to cut somewhere else. I believe in that.

But I don't believe in unpaid-for tax cuts paying for themselves. I don't believe that more spending pays for itself and we can just put it on the credit card.

Now, we have got some problems and challenges in this country. We have got an opportunity problem.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, kids going to school get out with a debt the size of a mortgage. We have got an inequality problem. It has never been worse. It goes back to the Great Depression, when we had this divide between what hardworking people made and what the top 1 percent made.

We have got a healthcare affordability problem, but you don't solve that by slashing access to healthcare and throwing 24 million people off of healthcare. We have got an infrastructure problem that we are totally neglecting. It is not addressed in this budget.

We have got a DREAMer problem.

How is it that, in this Congress, we are literally not allowing 800,000 young people who came here, through no fault of their own, not voluntarily, and we are going to give them the hook and deport them?

It is outrageous?

We have got a rural America problem. Rural America has been left behind. The inequality in this country is really hitting hard on rural America, in parts of Vermont, and in all parts of this country. And there is nothing in this budget that says: We are going to give hope to rural America by investing in them.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the whole House to support this Republican budget, H. Con. Res. 71.

Let me just say a few things.

First, this is a budget that reflects our first principles: freedom, freedom enterprise, a government accountable to the people it serves.

It is a budget that will help grow our economy, and it is a budget that will

help rein in our debt. It strengthens our national defense. It supports our men and women in uniform. It eliminates mindless, endless spending, and it maximizes American's tax dollars. It reforms Medicaid. It strengthens Medicare.

This is a budget that keeps our responsibilities to our children and our grandchildren. Remember, we have a responsibility here, each and every generation, each and every Member: leave the country better off so your kids and your grandkids can prosper.

That American legacy is seriously at risk because of our growing deteriorating budget situation, because of the coming debt crisis. This budget tackles that.

There is one more thing that this budget does that is so important. It paves the way for historic tax reform. It unlocks the reconciliation process. We need to pass this budget so that we can deliver real relief for middle-income families across this country. We need to pass this budget for the people who are living paycheck to paycheck in America, who are trying to juggle it all. They are looking to get under a hopelessly broken Tax Code.

We haven't reformed this tax system since 1986. We need to pass this budget so that we can help bring more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for people across this country. The time for this is now, and the opportunity is right in front of us.

I want to especially commend Chairman BLACK for her commitment to this vision. I want to especially commend the members of the Budget Committee for their steadfast commitment to this vision. We would not be in a position today to pass this budget without her tireless leadership and the leadership of her members of the committee.

It is so encouraging that the Senate has passed their budget out of committee. They are on the track, too. That means we look forward to working with the Senate to take the next step.

We have an opportunity to make right by our fellow countrymen. We have an opportunity to make right by the people we represent. We have an opportunity to actually restore prosperity in this country.

□ 0945

We haven't seen that kind of economic potential in this country in at least a decade. We can fix that this year.

We know a debt crisis is coming. We know if we do nothing, the next generation will be worse off. We can stop that, fix this, and make them better off.

That is what this budget paves the way for, and that is why I urge all of my colleagues to support this budget.

I thank the chair for her steadfast support. I thank the Members for getting us to where we are today, and I

really look forward to the day where we can look at this moment as when we got the country on the right track.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just say that we need to cut right to the chase.

It is unlikely that either the Republican Study Committee budget or the Republican Budget Committee budget could pass this House. It certainly couldn't pass the Congress.

This is all about moving the ball forward so we can push through a massive tax cut to the wealthiest Americans, with 51 votes in the Senate. That is what this day is about, and that is what this process is about.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject both the Republican Study Committee budget and the Republican Budget Committee budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters of support of the Republican Study Committee budget from the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, FreedomWorks, and Heritage Action for America.

COMMITTEE FOR A RESPONSIBLE
FEDERAL BUDGET,
September 8, 2017.

Hon. MARK WALKER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALKER: I am writing you to express our appreciation for the fiscally responsible budget released by the Republican Study Committee.

Your budget would make important progress by putting debt on a downward path as a share of GDP, reducing it from 77 percent today to 56 percent by 2027—instead of letting it rise to 89 percent as under current law.

By calling for spending cuts and entitlement reforms, your budget helps to keep the national debt on a sustainable path.

We applaud the Republican Study Committee for your serious contribution to the ongoing budget debate.

Sincerely,

MAYA MACGUINEAS,
President, Committee for a Responsible
Federal Budget.

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST
GOVERNMENT WASTE,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: You will soon vote on several different budget proposals for fiscal year (FY) 2018. On behalf of the more than one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I urge you to support the budget resolution as reported by the House Budget Committee and the Republican Study Committee's (RSC) budget resolution, both of which would put the nation back on the path to fiscal sanity and pave the way for comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform.

Under the leadership of Chairman Diane Black (R-Tenn.), H. Con. Res. 71, as reported by the House Budget Committee, would reduce spending by \$6.5 trillion over 10 years and balance the budget by 2027. H. Con. Res. 71 provides reconciliation instructions for fundamental tax reform that, if enacted, will

allow Americans to keep more of their money, simplify the filing of taxes, and allow small businesses to boost wages and create jobs. While H. Con. Res. 71 would increase defense spending above Budget Control Act mandated cap levels, this legislation also calls for \$203 billion in spending cuts across various programs and a \$700 billion reduction in improper payments.

The RSC budget enacts many of the same reforms as the House Budget Committee's plan, but it proposes to reduce government spending by \$10 trillion over 10 years and achieves balance in six years. The RSC plan creates a pathway for tax reform; repeals and replaces Obamacare; makes Social Security solvent; rescues Medicare and disability insurance; and decreases FY 2018 non-discretionary spending to \$394 billion.

Tax reform presents an historic opportunity to unleash the economic potential of the American people. While Congress is well-positioned to enact tax reform, that cannot occur until a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions is adopted. I urge you to support both the House Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget resolution as reported and the RSC's FY 2018 budget resolution. All votes on the FY 2018 budget resolutions will be among those considered in CCAGW's 2017 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHATZ,
President, CCAGW.

[From FreedomWorks, Oct. 4, 2017]
KEY VOTE YES ON THE MCCLINTOCK
AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 71

On behalf of FreedomWorks' activist community, I urge you to contact your representative and ask him or her to vote YES on the amendment offered by Rep. Tom McClintock (R-Calif.) to H. Con. Res. 71, the budget resolution for FY 2018. The amendment, which includes reconciliation instructions for fundamental tax reform, is the Republican Study Committee's FY 2018 budget alternative.

The Republican Study Committee's (RSC) FY 2018 budget would reduce federal spending by more than \$10 trillion over the ten-year budget window, bringing the budget into balance in FY 2023. The RSC's budget would repeal ObamaCare and enact other patient-centered health insurance reforms, make Social Security and Medicare solvent, and reform federal welfare programs. It also promotes free trade, regulatory reform, and other free market, limited government principles.

The current text of H. Con. Res. 71 and the McClintock amendment include language that allows the House Ways and Means Committee to produce legislation to reform the tax code. Riddled with loopholes and special interest deductions, America's tax code has become far too complex. According to the Tax Foundation, Americans spent 8.9 billion hours and \$409 billion complying with the more than 74,000-page tax code.

It has been more than 30 years since Congress passed fundamental tax reform. Congress has a generational opportunity to reform the tax code by consolidating and lowering tax rates, broadening the tax base, and promoting job creation and international competitiveness for American businesses. This will make the tax code fairer and simplify the filing process, allowing the vast majority of Americans to file their taxes on a postcard.

FreedomWorks will count the vote on the McClintock amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 on our 2017 Congressional Scorecard. The score-

card is used to determine eligibility for the FreedomFighter Award, which recognizes Members of the House and Senate who consistently vote to support economic freedom and individual liberty.

Sincerely,

ADAM BRANDON,
President, FreedomWorks.

[From Heritage Action for America, Oct. 3, 2017]

"YES" ON THE RSC'S BUDGET: SECURING
AMERICA'S FUTURE ECONOMY
(By Andrea Palermo)

On Thursday, the House will vote on the Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) Budget offered by the Republican Study Committee (RSC) as an amendment to the committee-approved FY18 budget resolution. The RSC's Budget: Securing America's Future Economy, introduced by RSC Budget and Spending Task Force Chairman Tom McClintock (R-Calif.), would balance in 2023, reduce non-defense discretionary spending, reestablish national defense spending to support the military, break the "firewall" between defense and non-defense discretionary spending, fully repeal and replace Obamacare, repeal Dodd-Frank by implementing the Financial CHOICE Act, reform entitlement programs, and finally, enact pro-growth tax reform. If passed, the RSC's budget would give lawmakers a serious conservative blueprint for reform.

Pro-Growth Tax Reform. Republicans campaigned and promised to fix America's broken tax code. The current code has become a significant obstacle to economic growth, job creation and higher wages for American workers. The RSC budget would fulfill the Republican campaign promise by enacting tax reform that cuts taxes for families, makes American businesses competitive around the globe, ends double taxation, and simplifies the code.

Repealing Obamacare. Republicans owe their majorities to their unwavering opposition to Obamacare, a reality that is reflected in the RSC's budget. The budget remains committed to fully repealing the law despite recent Republican failures, and sends a signal to the American people that conservatives will continue to push for free-market, patient-centered health care reforms.

Funding Defense. Although the Budget Control Act of 2011 has put significant pressure on our military, a conservative budget would align military spending with strategic priorities by breaking the firewall. The RSC's budget does not rely on the much-discussed OCO gimmick, but increases defense spending to a total of \$668 billion in FY18, which is \$119 billion above the current defense cap. Importantly, that cost is offset by lowering non-defense discretionary spending to \$394 billion in FY18, which is \$122 billion below the cap.

Reforming Entitlements. The RSC's budget maintains the Medicare premium support reforms, which are widely established and broadly supported. In addition, the budget lays down bold markers on Social Security, Social Security Disability Insurance and Medicaid. It takes a similarly aggressive approach on mandatory program spending like food stamps (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) by building on the success of the 1996 welfare reforms and enacting work requirements as outlined in the Welfare Reform and Upward Mobility Act (H.R. 2832/S. 1290) and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Reform Act (H.R. 2996).

Other important items in the budget include: Enacting the Financial CHOICE Act,

eliminating the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), holding federal agencies accountable, reducing funding for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), separating food stamps and farm programs, ending commodity subsidy programs, reforming crop insurance, ending unconstitutional amnesty for illegal immigrants, enforcing existing immigration laws, securing our borders, delegating elementary and secondary education to states and localities modeled after the Academic Partnership Leads us to Success (A-PLUS) Act, reforming Higher Education by passing the Higher Education Reform and Opportunity (HERO) Act, eliminating Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, returning transportation and infrastructure policy to the states, reorganizing the executive branch, and protecting the life of the unborn.

Taken as a whole, the RSC's "Securing America's Future Economy" demonstrates a seriousness of purpose when it comes to governing. If passed, this budget would provide a fiscally responsible path forward for our nation, limit the size and scope of our bloated federal government, and unleash economic prosperity for all Americans.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, Just a few steps from this Hall, Thomas Jefferson addressed his first inaugural address. After listing all of the blessings that our country enjoys, he asked what more do we need to maintain a happy and prosperous society. He said: "Still one thing more, fellow citizens. A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government. . . ."

We have it within our power to restore that wise and frugal government and the prosperity and happiness that free societies always produce the moment we summon the political will to do so. The Republican Study Committee seeks that shining city on a hill and today offers this map to get us there.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 281, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

AYES—139

Abraham	Barton	Brat
Allen	Bergman	Brooks (AL)
Amash	Biggs	Buck
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Bucshon
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Budd
Babin	Black	Burgess
Banks (IN)	Blackburn	Byrne
Barr	Brady (TX)	Calvert

Carter (GA)	Hudson
Chabot	Huizenga
Coffman	Hultgren
Cole	Jenkins (KS)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (LA)
Comer	Johnson, Sam
Conaway	Jordan
Culberson	Joyce (OH)
Davidson	Kelly (MS)
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)
Emmer	Labrador
Estes (KS)	LaHood
Farenthold	LaMalfa
Ferguson	Lamborn
Fleischmann	Latta
Flores	Lewis (MN)
Franks (AZ)	Long
Gaetz	Loudermilk
Garrett	Love
Gibbs	Marchant
Gohmert	Massie
Goodlatte	McCaul
Gosar	McClintock
Gowdy	McHenry
Graves (GA)	McMorris
Graves (LA)	Rodgers
Graves (MO)	Meadows
Grothman	Messer
Guthrie	Mitchell
Handel	Moolenaar
Harper	Mullin
Harris	Newhouse
Hensarling	Norman
Hice, Jody B.	Olson
Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Hill	Perry
Holding	Pittenger
Hollingsworth	Poe (TX)

NOES—281

Adams	Crawford
Aderholt	Crist
Aguiar	Crowley
Bacon	Cuellar
Barletta	Cummings
Barragán	Curbelo (FL)
Bass	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Davis, Danny
Bera	Davis, Rodney
Beyer	DeFazio
Bilirakis	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Delaney
Blum	DeLauro
Blumenauer	DelBene
Blunt Rochester	Demings
Bonamici	Denham
Bost	Dent
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Deutch
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart
Brown (MD)	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Doggett
Buchanan	Donovan
Bustos	Duffy
Butterfield	Duncan (SC)
Capuano	Duncan (TN)
Carbajal	Ellison
Cárdenas	Engel
Carson (IN)	Eshoo
Carter (TX)	Espallat
Cartwright	Esty (CT)
Castor (FL)	Evans
Castro (TX)	Faso
Cheney	Fitzpatrick
Chu, Judy	Fortenberry
Cicilline	Foster
Clark (MA)	Fox
Clarke (NY)	Frankel (FL)
Clay	Fudge
Cleaver	Gabbard
Clyburn	Gallagher
Cohen	Gallego
Collins (NY)	Garamendi
Comstock	Gianforte
Connolly	Gomez
Conyers	Gonzalez (TX)
Cook	Gottheimer
Cooper	Granger
Correa	Green, Al
Costa	Green, Gene
Costello (PA)	Griffith
Courtney	Grijalva
Cramer	Gutiérrez
	Hanabusa

Posey	Luján, Ben Ray
Ratcliffe	Lynch
Renacci	MacArthur
Rice (SC)	Maloney
Rohrabacher	Carolyn B.
Rokita	Maloney, Sean
Rooney, Francis	Marino
Rooney, Thomas J.	Marshall
Ross	Mast
Rouzer	Matsui
Sanford	McCarthy
Scalise	McCollum
Schweikert	McEachin
Scott, Austin	McGovern
Sensenbrenner	McKinley
Sessions	McNerney
Shimkus	McSally
Smith (MO)	Meehan
Smith (NE)	Meeks
Smith (TX)	Meng
Smucker	Mooney (WV)
Stewart	Moore
Taylor	Moulton
Tipton	Murphy (FL)
Walberg	Nadler
Walker	Neal
Walorski	Noem
Walters, Mimi	Nolan
Weber (TX)	Norcross
Webster (FL)	Nunes
Wenstrup	O'Halleran
Westerman	O'Rourke
Williams	Palazzo
Wilson (SC)	Pallone
Woodall	Panetta
Yoder	Pascarella
Yoho	Paulsen
Zeldin	Payne
	Pearce
	Pelosi
	Perlmutter

Peters	Sires
Peterson	Slaughter
Pingree	Smith (NJ)
Pocan	Smith (WA)
Poliquin	Soto
Polis	Speier
Price (NC)	Stefanik
Quigley	Stivers
Raskin	Suozi
Reed	Swalwell (CA)
Reichert	Takano
Rice (NY)	Tenney
Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Roby	Thompson (MS)
Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)
Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Ros-Lehtinen	Tonko
Roskam	Torres
Rothfus	Trott
Royce (CA)	Tsongas
Ruiz	Turner
Ruppersberger	Upton
Rush	Valadao
Russell	Vargas
Rutherford	Veasey
Ryan (OH)	Vela
Sánchez	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Visclosky
Schiff	Wagner
Schneider	Walden
Schrader	Wasserman
Scott (VA)	Schultz
Scott, David	Waters, Maxine
Serrano	Watson Coleman
Sewell (AL)	Welch
Shea-Porter	Wilson (FL)
Sherman	Wittman
Shuster	Womack
Simpson	Yarmuth
Sinema	Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—13

Bridenstine	Kihuen	Sarbanes
DeSantis	Murphy (PA)	Titus
Doyle, Michael F.	Napolitano	Walz
Frelinghuysen	Rosen	Young (AK)
	Roybal-Allard	

□ 1011

Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina, CLEAVER, DENHAM, NORCROSS, CONYERS, CUMMINGS, RUTHERFORD, BACON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WEBSTER of Florida, SESSIONS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 555.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I was absent during roll call votes No. 553 through 555 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the Grijalva of Arizona Substitute Amendment No. 1, aye on the Scott of Virginia Substitute Amendment No. 2, and no on the McClintock of California Substitute Amendment No. 3.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for struggling families.
Sec. 202. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care improvements.
Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for job creation through infrastructure and other investments and incentives.
Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for education.
Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and service members.
Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for retirement security.
Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence and security.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 302. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 303. Costs of emergency needs, overseas contingency operations, and disaster relief.
Sec. 304. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 305. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 306. Adjustments for changes in the baseline.
Sec. 307. Reinstatement of Pay-As-You-Go.
Sec. 308. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—POLICY STATEMENTS

Sec. 401. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.
Sec. 402. Policy of the House on tax reform that provides support and relief to hardworking American families.
Sec. 403. Policy of the House on defense and nondefense funding increases.
Sec. 404. Policy of the House on immigration reform.
Sec. 405. Policy of the House on Social Security.
Sec. 406. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities.
Sec. 407. Policy of the House on financial stability and consumer protection.
Sec. 408. Policy of the House on women's economic empowerment.

Sec. 409. Policy of the House on national security.

Sec. 410. Policy of the House on Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 411. Policy of the House on disaster response funding.

Sec. 412. Policy of the House on the Federal workforce.

Sec. 413. Policy of the House on climate change science.

Sec. 414. Policy of the House on increased efficiency and eliminating waste.

Sec. 415. Policy of the House on the investigation of Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. presidential election.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,844,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,964,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,113,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,423,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,597,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,764,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,953,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,207,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,452,763,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$111,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$130,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$162,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$181,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$240,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$279,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$301,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$331,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$417,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$494,376,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,367,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,461,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,629,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,799,113,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,033,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,174,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,306,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,541,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,777,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,981,428,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,298,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,458,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,600,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,772,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,013,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,138,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,256,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,494,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,734,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,939,221,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$453,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$493,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$487,431,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$531,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$589,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$540,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$491,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$540,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$526,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$486,458,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$21,723,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,376,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,077,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$23,809,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$24,527,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$25,225,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$25,964,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$26,751,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$27,396,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,379,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$15,974,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$16,590,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,280,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,061,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$18,832,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$19,597,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$20,455,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$21,349,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$22,257,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$611,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$605,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$624,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$615,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$637,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$624,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$650,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$635,887,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$663,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$652,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$678,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$661,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$692,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$669,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$706,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$688,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$722,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$703,659,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$737,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$718,554,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$52,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$52,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$51,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$51,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,398,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,156,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,530,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,335,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,045,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,582,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,606,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,953,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,130,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,388,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,607,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,808,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,260,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,550,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,211,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,622,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,863,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,350,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,622,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,074,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,346,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,586,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,792,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,565,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,173,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,341,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,873,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,963,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,341,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,411,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,074,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,858,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,334,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,346,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,807,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,471,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,270,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,003,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,166,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,423,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,297,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,515,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,459,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,095,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,593,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,350,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,746,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,675,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,696,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,169,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,784,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,694,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,065,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,041,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,010,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,904,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,122,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,863,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,248,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,675,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,067,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,766,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,833,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,220,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,803,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,931,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,518,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,144,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,523,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,360,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,763,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,596,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,417,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,791,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,159,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,503,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,785,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,376,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,551,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,843,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,316,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,728,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,297,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,056,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,127,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,208,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,317,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,834,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,984,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,346,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,632,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$99,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$101,474,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,477,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$103,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$105,171,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$107,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$108,930,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,342,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,344,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,877,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,725,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,707,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,465,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,132,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,303,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,391,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,028,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,391,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,248,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,957,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,443,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,803,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,579,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,187,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$106,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$105,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$109,914,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$115,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$112,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,590,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$116,131,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$114,730,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$118,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$117,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$120,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$119,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$122,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$121,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$124,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$123,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$126,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$125,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$128,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$127,646,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$571,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$579,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$602,781,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$603,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$646,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$636,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$669,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$668,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$703,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$701,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$736,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$734,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$772,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$770,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$810,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$807,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$849,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$846,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$890,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$887,123,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$598,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$597,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$655,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$655,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$694,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$693,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$746,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$746,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$840,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$840,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$865,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$865,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$888,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$888,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$986,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$986,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,070,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,069,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,152,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,151,843,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$522,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$504,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$538,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$525,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$554,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$542,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$569,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$558,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$587,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$583,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$596,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$587,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$605,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$591,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$626,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$612,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$641,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$635,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$658,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$650,880,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$50,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$53,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$53,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$57,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$57,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$62,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$75,625,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,642,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$177,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$178,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$194,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$191,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$201,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$198,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$207,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$205,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$223,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$221,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$221,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$219,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$218,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$216,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$236,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$234,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$243,968,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$241,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$252,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$250,117,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$68,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$80,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$80,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,878,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,624,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$376,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$376,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$408,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$408,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$451,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$451,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$500,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$500,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$547,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$547,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$592,994,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$592,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$633,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$633,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$670,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$670,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$707,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$707,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$737,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$737,707,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$22,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$12,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$17,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$12,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$15,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$12,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$13,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$10,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$11,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$8,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$6,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$4,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$2,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$13,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,367,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$82,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$82,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$84,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$84,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$86,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$88,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$88,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$92,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$92,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$100,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$100,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$41,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$19,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$7,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$3,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$1,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$64,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$30,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STRUGGLING FAMILIES.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of struggling families by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027. Improvements may include any of the following:

(1) Ensuring that all Americans have access to good-paying jobs, including funding proven, effective job training and employment programs, such as summer and year-round youth employment programs and registered apprenticeship programs, and national service opportunities.

(2) Tax reform that provides support and relief to hard-working American families, including enhancements to the Earned Income Tax Credit, the Child Tax Credit, and the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit.

(3) Expanded investments to ensure all working families have access to high-quality childcare programs.

(4) Creation of a permanent summer child nutrition Electronic Funds Transfer program to ensure children receive supplemental food benefits.

(5) Additional investment in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund beyond the base levels provided by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac).

(6) Reauthorization of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program that ensures the continuation of successful home visiting programs and additional Federal support to serve a greater share of at-risk families.

(7) Changes to improve the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, including legislation that increases funding for the base block grant, increases access to education and training, or requires States to spend more TANF funds on the program's core purposes such as work, childcare, and assistance to struggling families.

(8) Funding for research designed to improve program effectiveness in creating positive outcomes for low-income children and families.

(9) Additional investments that end homelessness among America's families.

(10) Changes to improve support for at-risk families, reduce child abuse and neglect, or

improve reunification, permanency, and post-permanency services in order to reduce the need for foster care.

(11) Changes to encourage and efficiently collect increased parental support for children, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child and policies to ensure that non-custodial parents are able to pay the child support they owe and maintain positive relationships with their children.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENTS.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) improves the affordability and quality of health care and expands coverage;

(2) improves access to and affordability of prescription drugs;

(3) improves the stability of the marketplaces for nongroup health insurance;

(4) advances biomedical research and development of more effective treatments and cures;

(5) extends expiring provisions of Medicare, Medicaid, Children's Health Insurance Program and other health programs;

(6) improves access to opioid addiction treatment and prevention programs;

(7) improves availability of long-term care services and supports for senior citizens and individuals with disabilities,

(8) improves the contemporary health care workforce's ability to meet emerging demands;

(9) improves Medicare quality, efficiency, and benefit design to make care more affordable and accessible for people with Medicare; or

(10) improves Medicaid quality, efficiency, and benefit design to make care more affordable and accessible for people with Medicaid; by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR JOB CREATION THROUGH INFRASTRUCTURE AND OTHER INVESTMENTS AND INCENTIVES.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities or other measures that create jobs for Americans and boost the economy. Revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) provide for additional investments in highways, transit systems, bridges, rail, aviation, harbors (including harbor maintenance dredging), seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure;

(2) provide for additional investments in other areas that would help businesses and other employers create new jobs; and

(3) provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to help small businesses, nonprofits, States, and communities expand investment, train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees; by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EDUCATION.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that supports students by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027. Support may include any of the following:

(1) Efforts to make higher education more affordable and increase college and degree completion by encouraging States and institutions of higher education to improve educational outcomes and access for low- and moderate-income students through support for campus-based aid programs; increased funding for the Pell grant program; and assistance to empower borrowers in lowering and managing their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded repayment options.

(2) Increases in funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to put the Federal Government on a 10-year path to fulfill its commitment to America's children and schools by providing 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for special education.

(3) Increases in funding to ensure access to high-quality child care and early learning programs for every child including investments in the Federal Preschool Development Grant program, Head Start program, and the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

(4) Increases in funding for formula programs authorized by Congress in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, including Title I-A, Title II-A, Title III, The 21st Century Community Learning Center Program, and Title IV-A, to support public school teachers and prepare all public school students, including students who are low-income, students learning to speak English, minority students, and students with disabilities, for success in college and their careers.

(5) Increases in funding for STEM, including computer science, and Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs to close the nation's skills gap by ensuring all students have access to high-quality educational programming that prepares them for high-paying careers in a global economy through the integration of academic content and technical skills.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) reforms or otherwise improves the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide greater and more timely access to quality health care and to enhance the delivery of benefits to the Nation's veterans, or improves the delivery of health care to servicemembers;

(2) improves the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental illnesses, and increases the capacity to address health care needs unique to women veterans;

(3) makes improvements to the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 to ensure that veterans receive the educational benefits they need to maximize their employment opportunities;

(4) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military per-

sonnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(5) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt);

(6) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation; or

(7) improves information technology at the Department of Veterans Affairs, including for the purchase and implementation of the same electronic health record system used by the Department of Defense; by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that strengthens or protects retirement security by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022. The revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) improve the security of existing pension plans, including public- and private-sector plans, single- and multi-employer plans, and the Central States Pension Fund;

(2) address the impending insolvency of the coal miners' pension plan (1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension plan) that, if left unfunded, will jeopardize the solvency of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation insurance fund;

(3) improve access to and quality of existing pension plans, including both defined-benefit and defined-contribution plans; and

(4) create new options or incentives for employers to offer pension or retirement savings plans, and/or for employees to participate in them.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency;

(2) encourages investment in emerging clean energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration;

(3) provides additional resources for oversight and expanded enforcement activities to crack down on speculation in and manipulation of oil and gas markets, including derivatives markets;

(4) limits and provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;

(5) assists businesses, industries, States, communities, the environment, workers, or households as the United States moves toward reducing and offsetting the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; or

(6) facilitates the training of workers for these industries ("clean energy jobs")

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2019 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading "Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations" in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2020, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for all discretionary programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018.

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES UNDER THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates \$4,860,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service under the Enforcement appropriation title to carry out tax enforcement activities and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$514,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service that is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap (taxes owed but not paid), the Chair of the Budget Committee shall increase the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution,

amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates \$151,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$35,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(c) **PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.**—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 303. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS, AND DISASTER RELIEF.

(a) **EMERGENCY NEEDS.**—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or this resolution.

(b) **OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for Overseas Contingency Operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to, but not to exceed, the total amount of budget authority specified in section 102(21).

(c) **DISASTER RELIEF.**—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated for disaster relief pursuant to this subsection, then the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and as necessary, the aggregates in this resolution, shall be adjusted by the amount of new budget authority and outlays up to the amounts provided under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as adjusted by subsection (d).

(d) **WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION OPERATIONS.**—

(1) **CAP ADJUSTMENT.**—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for wildfire suppression operations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates a base amount equal to 70 percent of the average cost of wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years and provides an additional appropriation of up to but not to exceed \$1,154,000,000 for wildfire suppression operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the additional amount of budget authority above the base

amount and the outlays resulting from that additional budget authority.

(2) **DEFICIT-NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENT.**—The total allowable discretionary adjustment for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the sum of allocation increases made pursuant to paragraph (1) in the previous year.

(e) **PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.**—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 304. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—For purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 305. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—In the House, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 306. ADJUSTMENTS FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 307. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 115th Congress,

the following shall apply in lieu of “CUTGO” rules and principles:

(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the terms “budget year”, “current year”, and “direct spending” have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term “direct spending” shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4)(C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House directing the Clerk to add as a new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate measure as passed by the House shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

(i) bill or joint resolution;

(ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business;

(iii) a conference report; or

(iv) an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a bill or joint resolution, the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

SEC. 308. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 401. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all American families will

improve their health and financial security, which will make the economy stronger.

(2) Medicaid is the Nation's largest health insurance program, providing quality, comprehensive, and affordable coverage to more than 70 million vulnerable Americans, including more than one in three children.

(3) Millions of low-income seniors and people with disabilities rely on Medicaid to pay for nursing home care and home- and community-based services that provide help with activities of daily living.

(4) Medicaid coverage provides financial stability to families struggling to escape poverty and to parents of children with disabilities and special health care needs.

(5) The existing financing structure of Medicaid ensures that Federal contributions keep pace with costs and enables States to respond to changing needs, such as increased enrollment in coverage during economic downturns or an aging population that requires extensive long-term care services.

(6) Under the Affordable Care Act, 31 States and the District of Columbia have expanded Medicaid eligibility to low-income adults, including working parents who do not receive coverage through their employers.

(7) Roughly 20 million previously uninsured people have gained health care coverage under the Affordable Care Act, reducing the Nation's uninsured rate for working-age adults to one of the lowest levels on record.

(8) The law provides premium tax credits that vary by income and the local cost of coverage and cost-sharing assistance to help low- and middle-income families afford quality insurance and pay their out-of-pocket costs.

(9) The law prohibits insurers from denying coverage or charging higher premiums based on pre-existing conditions, requires coverage of essential health benefits like maternity care and prescription drugs, limits out-of-pocket costs, and prohibits lifetime and annual limits on coverage.

(10) The law put in place significant cost-saving reforms to Federal health programs that have played a part in slowing the rate of healthcare spending growth in recent years, with 2011, 2012, and 2013 experiencing the slowest growth rates in real per capita national health expenditures on record.

(11) On May 4, 2017, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017, legislation that would repeal provisions of the Affordable Care Act, make deep cuts in Medicaid, and—

(A) result in 23 million Americans losing health insurance in 2026, including 14 million people losing Medicaid;

(B) dramatically increase costs for older adults, low-income families, and people with pre-existing conditions;

(C) reduce Medicaid spending by \$834 billion over ten years;

(D) jeopardize care for seniors in nursing homes, children with disabilities, and families receiving Medicaid benefits as States look to reduce coverage and services;

(E) severely undermine access to substance abuse treatment during the nationwide opioid epidemic;

(F) shorten the life of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; and

(G) provide nearly \$1 trillion in tax cuts that mostly benefit millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) Congress should build upon the progress of the Affordable Care Act to make health

care coverage more affordable and accessible to all American families, and reject any measures to repeal or undermine the law;

(2) the Administration and Congress should fully implement, enforce, and fund the Affordable Care Act, and stop any efforts to sabotage the health insurance marketplaces; and

(3) Congress should preserve Medicaid and not dismantle it by converting Medicaid into a block grant, per capita cap, or other financing arrangement that would limit Federal contributions and render the program incapable of responding to increased need that may result from trends in demographics or health care costs or from economic conditions.

SEC. 402. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM THAT PROVIDES SUPPORT AND RELIEF TO HARDWORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Tax plans from House Republicans and President Trump prioritize tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations, while shifting more of the burden onto everyone else. Their plans fail to close special interest loopholes in the tax code, and even add trillions of dollars of new loopholes for the wealthy. These plans reflect the failed theory of “trickle-down” economics, which creates few jobs and instead leads to massive deficits. A return to these policies would—

(A) fail to create good paying middle-class jobs;

(B) do nothing to help low-income or middle-class households with the rising costs of health care, education, housing, child care, or retirement; and

(C) widen the income gap between millionaires and billionaires and the middle class.

(2) Americans today are working harder than ever, but continue to struggle to find good jobs, get ahead, and stay ahead. This is part of a four-decade trend of stagnant wages for middle-class and low-income households, even as millionaires and billionaires become richer and corporations reap massive profits.

(3) The Obama Administration ended with 83 consecutive months of private-sector job growth, but challenges still remain to create more good-paying jobs and broadly shared prosperity. The number of long-term unemployed remains elevated, and unemployment for people of color continues to be higher than the rest of the population. Many areas remain in need of well-paying jobs.

(4) By almost any metric, the middle class has seen little to no improvements in their incomes. Real median household income in 2013 was only \$7,000 higher than it was in 1979. Median weekly real earnings for workers increased less than 1 percent from 1979 to 2014. Poorer workers have done even worse. For workers in the lower half of the income scale, real annual wages from 1979 to 2014 grew only \$76. And the entire lower 50 percent of the United States population holds a mere 1 percent of total national wealth.

(5) All the while, millionaires and billionaires have seen their incomes and wealth skyrocket. Incomes for the top one percent of households grew five times as fast as for middle-income workers, and now average over \$1 million a year. CEOs make nearly 300 times what the typical worker does. Ten percent of the population owns 76 percent of the Nation's total wealth, and the average net assets of the top one percent now exceed \$10 million per person.

(6) The top one percent of households receives a disproportionate share—17 percent—of the benefit of major tax expenditures.

This uneven distribution of major tax expenditures has exacerbated income and wealth inequality. The tax code treats income from wealth more favorably than income from work by giving preferential tax rates on unearned income, and it contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House to responsibly reform the tax code to provide support and relief to low- and middle-income families, create good-paying jobs, and drive broadly-shared prosperity, while closing special-interest loopholes and making sure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share.

SEC. 403. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE FUNDING INCREASES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The current spending limits set by the Budget Control Act of 2011 are too low, for both defense and nondefense funding. Defense and nondefense investments must be at appropriate levels to protect both national security and economic security. The non-defense discretionary spending limit for 2018 is \$2 billion less than it was in 2016, in nominal terms, representing a significant cut to purchasing power. If the inflation rate is what the Congressional Budget Office projects, the 2018 cap represents a reduction of nearly \$30 billion compared with 2016. Defense spending faces similar reductions.

(2) The Budget Control Act of 2011 is based on parity for defense and nondefense spending, setting up separate caps for both and instituting a “firewall” to prevent reductions in one category because of increases in the other.

(3) Bipartisan agreement has provided a solution to the austerity-level caps before, and can be used again to change these arbitrary spending caps to prevent the harsh impact of massive, irresponsible cuts to important Federal programs.

(4) Congress must begin discussions and negotiations immediately, to raise the caps to appropriate levels, and maintain parity between defense and nondefense.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE FUNDING INCREASES.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should enact increases to the current defense and nondefense spending limits, in equal amounts, without using reductions in one category to pay for increases in the other.

SEC. 404. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Fixing the country's broken immigration system will mean safer communities, a stronger economy and lower budget deficits.

(2) The Congressional Budget Office estimated that enacting the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, as introduced by House Democrats in the 113th Congress, would have reduced the deficit by \$900 billion over the next 2 decades, boosting the economy by 5.4 percent, and increasing productivity by 1.0 percent.

(3) The Social Security Actuary estimated that immigration reform will reduce the Social Security shortfall by 8 percent and will extend the life of the Social Security Trust Fund by 2 years.

(4) The United States is a Nation founded, built and sustained by immigrants, and the Congress has a responsibility to harness the power of that tradition by implementing an effective and fair immigration policy.

(5) The current immigration system is broken because it keeps families of legal immigrants and United States citizens separated for decades, it allows for the exploitation of undocumented workers to the detriment of all workers, it does not meet the needs of our economy and discourages legal immigration, and it keeps millions of hard-working, law-abiding families who have lived in our communities for decades hiding in the shadows, including many thousands who came to the United States as infants or young children.

(6) Overly aggressive immigration enforcement that focuses on individuals with deep ties to the United States hurts State and local law enforcement efforts to establish and maintain trust with immigrant communities. The number of Latinos reporting crimes in big cities across the country is lower than past years, particularly among domestic violence and sexual assault victims.

(7) The vast majority of individuals in U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody have not been convicted of a serious crime. ICE's own statistics demonstrate that arrests of people with no criminal record increased 157 percent in the first 100 days of the Trump Administration, and only 6.5 percent of those arrested were convicted of violent crimes.

(8) The number of detained asylum seekers continues to rise dramatically and detaining asylum seekers, other vulnerable populations, and those who do not pose risks to public safety is unnecessary and wasteful.

(9) Increasing the use of alternatives to detention rather than expanding immigration detention would be more humane and cost-effective.

(10) It has been nearly four years since the Senate passed, on a bipartisan basis, its comprehensive immigration reform bill.

(11) Immigration reform is needed to secure the sovereignty of the United States of America and to establish a coherent and just system for integrating those who seek to join American society.

(12) A successful immigration system cannot rely on border security alone. The country needs a system that promotes the reunification of families, protects workers and is responsive to the needs of employers, and implements an inclusive legalization program for those who are currently here.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress enact comprehensive immigration reform—such as the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, introduced by House Democrats in the 113th Congress—to boost our economy, lower deficits, establish clear and just rules for citizenship, and make our communities safer.

SEC. 405. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Most of the 61 million Americans who currently receive earned Social Security benefits rely on these benefits for the majority of their income, with nearly a quarter of them relying on Social Security for at least 90 percent of their income.

(2) In the past, Social Security benefits were part of a 3-legged stool where retirees relied on a combination of Social Security, a private pension, and personal savings to finance retirement.

(3) Social Security benefits will be more important to future retirees as few workers will receive traditional pensions, and many workers cannot afford to adequately fund their retirement through employer-sponsored savings plans or IRAs.

(4) Social Security's Disability Insurance (DI) and Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) systems are intertwined both in their benefit structure and in their revenues—DI recipients who reach retirement age receive OASI benefits and beneficiaries in each category have helped finance the other category even if they will never receive those benefits.

(5) Social Security benefits are already being cut as Social Security's normal retirement age is increasing from 66 years for workers retiring now to 67 years for those born in 1960 and later. This cut disproportionately impacts low-earners because life expectancy continues to increase among higher-earners but not low-earners. Thus, high-earners will generally receive benefits for a longer time than low-earners.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the House of Representatives will not adopt changes to Social Security that involve reductions in earned Social Security benefits.

SEC. 406. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security.

(2) In 2018, 60,000,000 people will rely on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services.

(3) The Medicare program has lower administrative costs than private insurance, and Medicare costs per enrollee have grown at a slower rate than private insurance for a given level of benefits.

(4) People with Medicare already have the ability to choose a private insurance plan within Medicare through the Medicare Advantage option, yet two-thirds of Medicare beneficiaries chose the traditional fee-for-service program instead of a private plan in 2016.

(5) Rising health care costs are not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, they are endemic to the entire health care system.

(6) Converting Medicare into a voucher for the purchase of health insurance will merely force seniors and individuals with disabilities to pay much higher premiums if they want to use their voucher to purchase traditional Medicare coverage.

(7) A voucher system in which the voucher payment fails to keep pace with growth in health costs would expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks.

(8) Shifting more health care costs onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both.

(9) Versions of voucher policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely set it up for a death spiral as private plans siphon off healthier and less expensive beneficiaries, leaving the sickest beneficiaries in a program that will wither away.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities should be preserved and strengthened, and that any legislation to end the Medicare guarantee, financially penalize people for choosing traditional Medicare, or shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with

vouchers or premium support for the purchase of health insurance, should be rejected.

SEC. 407. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON FINANCIAL STABILITY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 is an important component of the country's response to the financial crisis and recession. It took a number of steps to protect consumers of financial products and services as well as protect taxpayers from the costs of another financial crisis.

(2) These steps included the creation of an orderly liquidation process to allow regulators to close failing institutions that some argue are "too big to fail," as well as a new Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC), an Office of Financial Research to monitor the stability of our financial system, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (the Consumer Bureau).

(3) The Consumer Bureau plays a critical role in protecting older Americans, military service members, student loan borrowers, and other consumers, especially in minority and low-income communities. It has implemented new rules for mortgage markets and prepaid cards, and also successfully recovered nearly \$12 billion on behalf of more than 29 million consumers and service members.

(4) The Consumer Bureau's funding from the Federal Reserve's operations help give it important independence from efforts to interfere with its vital mission and activities, independence on par with every other banking regulator.

(5) The Consumer Bureau has already faced and overcome efforts to obstruct its operations.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should continue to support the vital work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau as well as its governing and financing structures and other key components of the Dodd-Frank legislation such as orderly liquidation authority, FSOC, and the Office of Financial Research.

SEC. 408. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Women's contributions are critical to the economic success of hard-working families.

(2) Not only do women play a key role in maintaining healthy families, they also have unique health care needs and face issues that require special focus.

(3) Every hard-working American deserves to feel safe and supported during retirement. Yet women are more likely to face financial risk during retirement because of their lower lifetime earnings and disproportionate role as family caregivers.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should economically empower women and protect their health and safety. Congress must enact policies that would accomplish the following:

(1) Help families attain better jobs, fight pay inequity, raise the minimum wage, and enable women entrepreneurs and small businesses to achieve their goals.

(2) Give American families control of their own lives, and help them balance the demands of work and family. These policies include paid and expanded family and medical leave, paid sick days, and quality, affordable child care.

(3) Strengthen the retirement security of women and their families by protecting Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

(4) Support caregivers, many of whom sacrifice their own careers to provide for family members.

(5) Maintain health insurance protections for women, increase funding for the prevention and treatment of women's health issues such as breast cancer and heart disease, and support access to full reproductive care.

(6) Prevent and protect women from domestic violence and sexual abuse.

SEC. 409. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The country faces many national security challenges and we must continue to support a strong military that is second to none.

(2) Those who serve in uniform are our most important security resource and the Administration and Congress shall continue to provide the support they need to successfully carry out the missions the country gives them.

(3) A growing economy is the foundation of our security and enables the country to provide the resources for a strong military, sound homeland security agencies, and effective diplomacy and international development.

(4) Austerity-level spending caps threaten adequate investment in activities critical to our economy and national security, which include activities funded by both the defense and nondefense portions of the discretionary budget.

(5) Diplomacy and foreign aid are essential components of our security and the President's proposal to cut these activities by 32 percent below current levels prompted more than 120 retired admirals and generals who have first-hand knowledge of their effectiveness in securing our Nation to forcefully object.

(6) The Nation's projected long-term debt could have serious consequences for our economy and security, and that more efficient military spending has to be part of an overall plan that effectively deals with this problem.

(7) Reining in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense—the last department still unable to pass an audit—such as the elimination of duplicative programs and better controlling delays and cost overruns on weapon systems that have been identified by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) needs to continue as a priority.

(8) The Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans and requirements to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant, are affordable, and are applicable to 21st century threats; and such review should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for, and cost of, the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization.

(9) Nonwar operation and maintenance costs per active-duty service member have grown at a rate well above inflation for decades—from \$59,000 per service member in 1980 to \$157,000 per service member in 2015 (measured in constant 2017 dollars), and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this area.

(10) Cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing “loose nukes” and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the austerity-level spending caps required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 for fiscal years 2018 through 2021 should be rescinded and replaced by a fiscal plan that is balanced and takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs; and

(2) efficiencies can be achieved in the national defense budget without compromising our security through greater emphasis on eliminating duplicative and wasteful programs, reforming the acquisition process, identifying and constraining unsustainable operating costs, and through careful analysis of our national security needs.

SEC. 410. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) continues to face challenges meeting the needs of the next generation of returning veterans, including sufficient funding to provide critical services and benefits.

(2) Access to quality health care and veterans' benefits has been an ongoing challenge for the VA, highlighted most recently in the ongoing claims backlog and veterans waiting months for health care appointments.

(3) Providing health care where veterans live and ensuring a sufficient number of health care professionals, especially in the area of mental health treatment, have also been challenges.

(4) The VA has made progress in reducing the number of initial benefit claims, dropping the claims backlog to less than 94,000 from a peak of 611,000 claims just a few years ago, but that statistic leaves out the many veterans who are still waiting many months or even years to have their appeals decided.

(5) The President's budget includes a 6 percent increase over current-year funding but shifts funding away from critical programs that veterans rely on in favor of expanded funding that pays for certain veterans to get private health care at the expense of care provided at VA hospitals and clinics.

(6) The President's budget also cuts funding from other Federal agencies that provide lifesaving programs and services for veterans, including deep cuts to Medicaid benefits veterans rely on, the elimination of the Interagency Council on Homelessness, steep cuts at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, elimination of the Legal Services Corporation, and severe cuts to entrepreneurship outreach programs targeted to veterans through the Small Business Administration.

(7) The VA currently has advance appropriations for approximately 85 percent of its discretionary budget. The residual 15 percent, which includes funding for the day-to-day operations at the Veterans Benefits Administration, remains vulnerable to a Government shutdown.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) Congress should support a funding level no less than the President's request for veterans' discretionary programs so that the VA has the resources it needs to ensure veterans get the health care and benefits they earned in a timely fashion;

(2) Congress should lift the austerity-level funding cap on nondefense programs for 2018 and beyond to ensure adequate funding for veterans' programs;

(3) advance appropriations be expanded to cover all of VA's discretionary budget to prevent delays in veterans' benefits and services during a Government shutdown;

(4) the VA submit along with its annual budget a “Future-Years Veterans Program” that projects its needs over five years to help facilitate the appropriations and oversight processes;

(5) Congress should provide sufficient resources for the VA's Office of the Inspector General to guarantee veterans are properly served and that resources are spent efficiently;

(6) no changes be made to the Individual Unemployability benefit to ensure that disabled veterans, many of them severely disabled, who are deemed unable to engage in substantial work as a result of their service to our country, continue to receive the full disability and social security benefits they earned and were promised; and

(7) Congress shall provide sufficient funding and staff resources for VA hospitals and clinics, and that any increased funding for private and community care not provided directly by the VA should not come at the expense of necessary resources for VA hospitals and clinics.

SEC. 411. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON DISASTER RESPONSE FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House find the following:

(1) Natural disasters such as hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria require swift congressional action to help storm survivors get their lives back on track, rebuild disaster-stricken communities, and prevent further damage to the economy.

(2) The Budget Control Act of 2001 provides procedural tools specifically to respond to natural disasters, by allowing adjustments to the spending caps for disaster and emergency spending.

(3) Mitigation and prevention is an important part of disaster recovery and response, providing investments that make future disasters less costly in terms of both dollars and lives.

(b) POLICY ON FUNDING FOR DISASTER RESPONSE AND RECOVERY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should act swiftly to assist with recovery from hurricanes and other natural disasters. Such funding should be provided using the budgetary provisions in place for this purpose: providing adjustments to the spending caps for disaster and emergency response, recovery, and mitigation. Congress must also support efforts to address future disaster damage and loss, by appropriately funding mitigation and prevention efforts.

SEC. 412. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal workforce provides vital services to our Nation on a daily basis. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, protect us from terrorists, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cyber-attacks, find cures for deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe.

(2) Veterans make up 31 percent of the Federal workforce.

(3) Many Federal workers are paid at a rate that is far below their private sector counterparts.

(4) The Federal workforce is older than in past decades and older than the private sector workforce. Nearly one third of the Federal workforce is eligible to retire.

(5) Federal employee pay and benefits are not the cause of the country's deficits and

debt. The Federal workforce has already contributed more than \$180 billion toward reducing the country's deficits in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, furloughs, and increased retirement contributions. The President's budget for 2018 continues to unfairly target the Federal workforce by proposing an additional \$149 billion in compensation and retirement benefit cuts.

(6) Since 1975, the Federal workforce has declined 35 percent relative to the size of the population of the United States.

(7) Nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 to 2016 is due to increases at security-related agencies, including the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of Veterans Affairs.

(8) Proposals to reduce the size of the workforce at nonsecurity agencies by 10 percent have excluded an assessment of their impact on government services.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should not target Federal employees to achieve further reductions in the deficit as they have already contributed more than their fair share, that Federal workers should be compensated with pay and benefits at a level that enables the government to attract high quality people—which is especially important during this period when more workers will be retiring—and that no proposal to reduce the size of the workforce should be considered without an assessment of its impact on government services.

SEC. 413. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Global climate change is a threat to national security, public health, and economic growth.

(2) The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that the effects of climate change are occurring worldwide, stating: "The impacts of climate change have already been felt in recent decades on all continents and across the oceans".

(3) The United States Government Accountability Office described climate change as, "a complex, crosscutting issue that poses risks to many environmental and economic systems—including agriculture, infrastructure, ecosystems, and human health—and presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government".

(4) In March 2017, Secretary of Defense James Mattis, in written testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated that "climate change can be a driver of instability and the Department of Defense must pay attention to potential adverse impacts generated by this phenomenon".

(5) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reported that 2016 was the warmest year on record, setting a new record for global average surface temperatures for the third year in a row. Furthermore, 16 of the 17 warmest years on record have occurred since 2001.

(6) The United States National Research Council's National Climate Assessment and Development Advisory Committee found climate change affects "human health, water supply, agriculture, transportation, energy, coastal areas, and many other sectors of society, with increasingly adverse impacts on the American economy and quality of life".

(7) The most vulnerable among us, including children, the elderly, low-income individ-

uals, and those with underlying health conditions, face even greater health risks as a result of climate change.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that climate change presents a significant public health, environmental, and financial risk to the United States. The United States must continue to play a leadership role on climate change policy and should not retreat from global commitments on climate change. Congress must provide robust funding for climate change science, which provides critical information for protecting human health, defending the United States, and preserving economic and environmental systems throughout the world.

SEC. 414. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INCREASED EFFICIENCY AND ELIMINATING WASTE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office ("GAO") identifies examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and makes regular recommendations regarding ways to reduce costs and increase revenue.

(2) The Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs "could lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings, with significant opportunities for improved efficiencies, cost savings, or revenue enhancements in the areas of defense, information technology, education and training, health care, energy, and tax enforcement."

(3) The tax gap, the difference between taxes owed and taxes paid, now averages \$458 billion annually. Even modest improvements in enforcing existing law could yield a boost in revenue without any changes to the tax code.

(4) Tax expenditures, or spending through the tax code, total \$1.5 trillion per year and represent the largest category of spending in the budget—exceeding Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. However, unlike other types of spending, tax expenditures are not reviewed in any systematic way in the annual budget process.

(5) Improper payments, payments that should not have been made or that were made in an incorrect amount, totaled \$144 billion for 2016. While some improper payments are the result of fraud, the vast majority are due to unintentional errors, such as payments to eligible beneficiaries that were not properly verified, or overpayments or underpayments because of a data entry mistake.

(6) Shutting down the government, arbitrarily cutting agency budgets, and funding large portions of the government through stop-gap appropriations do not lead to efficient and effective government.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress must continue to root out wasteful spending, make government operations more efficient, pass appropriations bills on time, and avoid costly government shutdowns. Congress must task agencies with shrinking the error rate in government programs and provide adequate budgetary resources for agencies to develop new processes, review expenditures, and improve information technology systems.

SEC. 415. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Free and fair elections are the cornerstone of our democracy, and foreign interference in them undermines the public trust

and casts doubt on the legitimacy of our government.

(2) The country's intelligence agencies all agree that Russia launched a campaign to undermine the 2016 U.S. presidential election, which included cyber-attacks, dissemination of false information, and other intelligence operations to malign Secretary Hillary Clinton and increase the odds of a Donald Trump presidency.

(3) Members of the Trump campaign had repeated contact with Russian government officials and oligarchs and then failed to report this contact in testimony to Congress and in security clearance applications. One such meeting reportedly included a request for a back-channel line of communications with the Russian government using Russian facilities, which would preclude U.S. Government oversight. Another involved a Kremlin-linked Russian lawyer and a former Soviet counterintelligence officer under the assumption that they would provide politically damaging information about Secretary Hillary Clinton as part of the Russian government's effort to support the Trump campaign.

(4) Under the direction of Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, the FBI was investigating whether members of President Trump's campaign colluded with Russia to influence the election.

(5) On May 9, 2017, President Trump fired FBI Director Comey and then made statements suggesting his dismissal was to stop the investigation of collusion.

(6) On May 17, 2017, the Department of Justice announced the appointment of former FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III to serve as Special Counsel to investigate Russian interference into the 2016 presidential election and any coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the Trump campaign.

(b) **POLICY ON THE INVESTIGATION OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that to restore confidence in our government and to preserve the sanctity of our electoral process, Congress must ensure adequate funding for the Special Counsel appointed by the Department of Justice so that he can perform a thorough and nonpartisan investigation of Russia's campaign to affect the 2016 U.S. presidential election and any individuals in the United States that may have colluded in those efforts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Chairman, Democrats and Republicans are looking at the same challenges facing our country and American families. Education, healthcare, and housing costs have all increased while wages stay stagnant.

It used to be that the two parties would debate different strategies to address the problems facing the American people. Sadly, those times are behind us.

In giving millionaires, including the majority of this Congress, the President, and wealthy donors a giant tax

cut, the Republican budget does not even pretend to address the problems facing the American people. Not only does it ignore working families, it increases their challenges.

The Democratic budget alternative, in stark contrast to the Republican budget, begins to address the real challenges our country faces now and in the long term.

□ 1015

We are less than a decade removed from the worst economic crisis in most of our lifetimes, and we have a chance to rebound in a way that builds a foundation for our country to thrive for generations, but we have to seize that opportunity.

Rather than giving resources to people and businesses that already have them, we are calling for targeted investments in programs that grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and provide real support for working families and real security in retirement.

Rather than sending thank-you notes to the corporations that bankroll campaigns, we have an opportunity to make vital public investments that lead to a brighter future rebuilding roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure, all of which lead to good jobs now and in the long run.

Rather than giving the President a multimillion-dollar refund on taxes he refuses to disclose, we can invest in retirement security for seniors who didn't inherit millions. We can invest in affordable education so young people do not have to grow up wealthy to have a shot at earning it in their future careers.

Instead of taking healthcare away from people, straining emergency rooms, and making Americans sicker, we have an opportunity to continue investing in affordable quality healthcare for all of us, finally eliminating a great burden on American families, a burden that no other developed nation shares.

This budget is an opportunity for our country to invest in our future, and if we adopt the Republican budget plan, we will have squandered it.

Democrats believe in a government that prioritizes American families, and they should be the priorities of this Congress. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this budget substitute, which is, put simply, an abdication of our fiscal responsibility as a governing body.

Our country is \$20 trillion in debt, with \$9 trillion added to the national debt during the Obama years. We have the responsibility to our children and our grandchildren to stop this Congress' addiction to spending. It is a responsibility that I take seriously; it is a responsibility that the members of my committee take seriously; and it is a responsibility that Republicans in the House take seriously.

Clearly, it is not a responsibility that our friends across the aisle take seriously. Our budget works to end the addiction to spending that has dominated Washington for far too long.

The House budget, passed out of committee with unanimous Republican support in July, begins to address our spending addiction by balancing the budget over 10 years so that we can start paying down our national debt, and it addresses mandatory spending in a significant way for the first time since 1997.

This budget substitute does quite the opposite. The Democrats' budget raises taxes by \$2.7 trillion, which would be the largest tax increase in U.S. history. It increases spending by \$6.2 trillion, compared to the budget passed by my committee. It never balances, with a deficit in 2027 of \$852 billion.

What we hear from the other side of the aisle and what we see in this budget is simply more of same: more spending, more tax increases, and more debt. I don't think that is acceptable, and neither do the American people.

Since we began this budget debate yesterday, my counterparts on the other side of the aisle have been throwing out misleading numbers about our budget and our tax reform effort in order to hide the fact that they offer no new solutions to the most pressing problems our country faces.

Here is a number that they should keep in mind while they discuss this fiscally irresponsible substitute. The national debt for every person is over \$63,000. Every man, woman, and even child in our country has a \$63,000 weight hanging over their heads. Our budget takes real steps to fix this crisis. This budget substitute does not. Honestly, it is as simple as that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this Democrat substitute, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, once again, House Republicans are determined to visit cruel and unusual punishment on the American people by presenting a budget that is reckless, regressive, and reprehensible. It is a budget that will hurt working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, and rural America.

It is a budget that will eradicate the social safety net, end Medicare as we

know it, rip away health insurance from 23 million Americans, and impose billions and billions of dollars in life-altering debt on younger Americans.

It is outrageous that this is all being done to enact tax cuts for the wealthy and the well-off, tax cuts for the privileged few, tax cuts for special interests here in Washington, D.C.

This parade of horrors is being jammed down the throats of this country so that everyday Americans can subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless.

We deserve better. The Democratic budget will invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in education and job training, invest in the social safety net, invest in research and development, invest in affordable housing, and invest in the wellbeing of everyday Americans.

The Republican budget is a raw deal. The Democratic budget is a better deal, focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future. It is worthy of our support.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HANDEL) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1117. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY).

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chair, with all respect, the cruel and unusual punishment is the Democratic-proposed substitute amendment. The raw deal is the Democratic-proposed substitute amendment that increases spending \$6.2 trillion over our budget.

This thing raises taxes—\$2.7 trillion, the largest tax increase in American history, at a time when we are drowning in debt and stagnant wage growth.

It requires a one-to-one match of defense and nondefense discretionary spending at a time when we can't keep our F-18s flying and we have airplanes crashing around the country for lack of maintenance.

This is unconscionable. This budget never balances. It will leave us with an \$852 billion deficit by fiscal year 2027. It expands ObamaCare, the most disastrous and heinous trick played on the American people that I can remember. It prioritizes amnesty over security.

We are never going to get our country straight and preserve our sovereignty if we don't protect our security. On the other hand, we have got the Republican budget that offers to do a lot of things. One thing it offers to do is put a work requirement for able-bodied adults with no dependent children into welfare.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD an article by Nicholas Eberstadt of AEI talking about the horrible condition of our labor force now and how drastically important this is and how much it will improve the opportunities for people to rise out of poverty. We have got three 25- to 54-year-old males sitting out of the labor force collecting benefits for every one that is unemployed. The unemployed rate is 4.7 percent. That makes the total 20 percent. It is almost over 5 million people that we owe them a moral obligation to offer them an opportunity to rise out of poverty through work, and that is what the Republican budget does.

[Commentary, Feb. 15, 2017]

ECONOMY: OUR MISERABLE 21ST CENTURY

(By Nicholas N. Eberstadt)

On the morning of November 9, 2016, American's elite—its talking and deciding classes—woke up to a country they did not know. To most privileged and well-educated Americans, especially those living in its bicoastal bastions, the election of Donald Trump had been a thing almost impossible even to imagine. What sort of country would go and elect someone like Trump as president? Certainly not one they were familiar with, or understood anything about.

Whatever else it may or may not have accomplished, the 2016 election was a sort of shock therapy for Americans living within what Charles Murray famously termed "the bubble" (the protective barrier of prosperity and self-selected associations that increasingly shield our best and brightest from contact with the rest of their society). The very fact of Trump's election served as a truth broadcast about a reality that could no longer be denied: Things out there in America are a whole lot different from what you thought.

Yes, things are very different indeed these days in the "real America" outside the bubble. In fact, things have been going badly wrong in America since the beginning of the 21st century.

It turns out that the year 2000 marks a grim historical milestone of sorts for our nation. For whatever reasons, the Great American Escalator, which had lifted successive generations of Americans to ever higher standards of living and levels of social well-being, broke down around then—and broke down very badly.

The warning lights have been flashing, and the klaxons sounding, for more than a decade and a half. But our pundits and prognosticators and professors and policymakers, ensconced as they generally are deep within the bubble, were for the most part too dis-

tant from the distress of the general population to see or hear it. (So much for the vaunted "information era" and "big-data revolution.") Now that those signals are no longer possible to ignore, it is high time for experts and intellectuals to reacquire themselves with the country in which they live and to begin the task of describing what has befallen the country in which we have lived since the dawn of the new century.

Consider the condition of the American economy. In some circles people still widely believe, as one recent New York Times business-section article cluelessly insisted before the inauguration, that "Mr. Trump will inherit an economy that is fundamentally solid." But this is patent nonsense. By now it should be painfully obvious that the U.S. economy has been in the grip of deep dysfunction since the dawn of the new century. And in retrospect, it should also be apparent that America's strange new economic maladies were almost perfectly designed to set the stage for a populist storm.

Ever since 2000, basic indicators have offered oddly inconsistent readings on America's economic performance and prospects. It is curious and highly uncharacteristic to find such measures so very far out of alignment with one another. We are witnessing an ominous and growing divergence between three trends that should ordinarily move in tandem: wealth, output, and employment.

Depending upon which of these three indicators you choose, America looks to be heading up, down, or more or less nowhere. From the standpoint of wealth creation, the 21st century is off to a roaring start. By this yardstick, it looks as if Americans have never had it so good and as if the future is full of promise. Between early 2000 and late 2016, the estimated net worth of American households and nonprofit institutions more than doubled, from \$44 trillion to \$90 trillion.

Although that wealth is not evenly distributed, it is still a fantastic sum of money—an average of over a million dollars for every notional family of four. This upsurge of wealth took place despite the crash of 2008—indeed, private wealth holdings are over \$20 trillion higher now than they were at their pre-crash apogee. The value of American real-estate assets is near or at all-time highs, and America's businesses appear to be thriving. Even before the "Trump rally" of late 2016 and early 2017, U.S. equities markets were hitting new highs—and since stock prices are strongly shaped by expectations of future profits, investors evidently are counting on the continuation of the current happy days for U.S. asset holders for some time to come.

A rather less cheering picture, though, emerges if we look instead at real trends for the macro-economy. Here, performance since the start of the century might charitably be described as mediocre, and prospects today are no better than guarded. The recovery from the crash of 2008—which unleashed the worst recession since the Great Depression—has been singularly slow and weak. According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), it took nearly four years for America's gross domestic product (GDP) to re-attain its late 2007 level. As of late 2016, total value added to the U.S. economy was just 12 percent higher than in 2007. The situation is even more sobering if we consider per capita growth. It took America six and a half years—until mid-2014—to get back to its late 2007 per capita production levels. And in late 2016, per capita output was just 4 percent higher than in late 2007—nine years earlier. By this reckoning, the American economy

looks to have suffered something close to a lost decade.

But there was clearly trouble brewing in America's macro-economy well before the 2008 crash, too. Between late 2000 and late 2007, per capita GDP growth averaged less than 1.5 percent per annum. That compares with the nation's long-term postwar 1948–2000 per capita growth rate of almost 2.3 percent, which in turn can be compared to the "snap back" tempo of 1.1 percent per annum since per capita GDP bottomed out in 2009. Between 2000 and 2016, per capita growth in America has averaged less than 1 percent a year. To state it plainly: With postwar, pre-21st-century rates for the years 2000–2016, per capita GDP in America would be more than 20 percent higher than it is today.

The reasons for America's newly fitful and halting macroeconomic performance are still a puzzle to economists and a subject of considerable contention and debate. Economists are generally in consensus, however, in one area: They have begun redefining the growth potential of the U.S. economy downwards. The U.S. Congressional Budget Office (CBO), for example, suggests that the "potential growth" rate for the U.S. economy at full employment of factors of production has now dropped below 1.7 percent a year, implying a sustainable long-term annual per capita economic growth rate for America today of well under 1 percent.

Then there is the employment situation. If 21st-century America's GDP trends have been disappointing, labor-force trends have been utterly dismal. Work rates have fallen off a cliff since the year 2000 and are at their lowest levels in decades. We can see this by looking at the estimates by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) for the civilian employment rate, the jobs-to-population ratio for adult civilian men and women. Between early 2000 and late 2016, America's overall work rate for Americans age 20 and older underwent a drastic decline. It plunged by almost 5 percentage points (from 64.6 to 59.7). Unless you are a labor economist, you may not appreciate just how severe a falloff in employment such numbers attest to. Postwar America never experienced anything comparable.

From peak to trough, the collapse in work rates for U.S. adults between 2008 and 2010 was roughly twice the amplitude of what had previously been the country's worst postwar recession, back in the early 1980s. In that previous steep recession, it took America five years to re-attain the adult work rates recorded at the start of 1980. This time, the U.S. job market has as yet, in early 2017, scarcely begun to claw its way back up to the work rates of 2007—much less back to the work rates from early 2000. U.S. adult work rates never recovered entirely from the recession of 2001—much less the crash of '08.

And the work rates being measured here include people who are engaged in any paid employment—any job, at any wage, for any number of hours of work at all.

On Wall Street and in some parts of Washington these days, one hears that America has gotten back to "near full employment." For Americans outside the bubble, such talk must seem nonsensical. It is true that the oft-cited "civilian unemployment rate" looked pretty good by the end of the Obama era—in December 2016, it was down to 4.7 percent, about the same as it had been back in 1965, at a time of genuine full employment. The problem here is that the unemployment rate only tracks joblessness for those still in the labor force; it takes no account of work-force dropouts. Alas, the exodus out of the

workforce has been the big labor-market story for America's new century. (At this writing, for every unemployed American man between 25 and 55 years of age, there are another three who are neither working nor looking for work.) Thus the "unemployment rate" increasingly looks like an antique index devised for some earlier and increasingly distant war: the economic equivalent of a musket inventory or a cavalry count.

By the criterion of adult work rates, by contrast, employment conditions in America remain remarkably bleak. From late 2009 through early 2014, the country's work rates more or less flatlined. So far as can be told, this is the only "recovery" in U.S. economic history in which that basic labor-market indicator almost completely failed to respond.

Since 2014, there has finally been a measure of improvement in the work rate—but it would be unwise to exaggerate the dimensions of that turnaround. As of late 2016, the adult work rate in America was still at its lowest level in more than 30 years. To put things another way: If our nation's work rate today were back up to its start-of-the-century highs, well over 10 million more Americans would currently have paying jobs.

There is no way to sugarcoat these awful numbers. They are not a statistical artifact that can be explained away by population aging, or by increased educational enrollment for adult students, or by any other genuine change in contemporary American society. The plain fact is that 21st-century America has witnessed a dreadful collapse of work.

For an apples-to-apples look at America's 21st-century jobs problem, we can focus on the 25–54 population—known to labor economists for self-evident reasons as the "prime working age" group. For this key labor-force cohort, work rates in late 2016 were down almost 4 percentage points from their year-2000 highs. That is a jobs gap approaching 5 million for this group alone.

It is not only that work rates for prime-age males have fallen since the year 2000—they have, but the collapse of work for American men is a tale that goes back at least half a century. (I wrote a short book last year about this sad saga.) What is perhaps more startling is the unexpected and largely unnoticed fall-off in work rates for prime-age women. In the U.S. and all other Western societies, postwar labor markets underwent an epochal transformation. After World War II, work rates for prime women surged, and continued to rise—until the year 2000. Since then, they too have declined. Current work rates for prime-age women are back to where they were a generation ago, in the late 1980s. The 21st-century U.S. economy has been brutal for male and female laborers alike—and the wreckage in the labor market has been sufficiently powerful to cancel, and even reverse, one of our society's most distinctive postwar trends: the rise of paid work for women outside the household.

In our era of no more than indifferent economic growth, 21st-century America has somehow managed to produce markedly more wealth for its wealthholders even as it provided markedly less work for its workers. And trends for paid hours of work look even worse than the work rates themselves. Between 2000 and 2015, according to the BEA, total paid hours of work in America increased by just 4 percent (as against a 35 percent increase for 1985–2000, the 15-year period immediately preceding this one).

Over the 2000–2015 period, however, the adult civilian population rose by almost 18 percent—meaning that paid hours of work

per adult civilian have plummeted by a shocking 12 percent thus far in our new American century.

This is the terrible contradiction of economic life in what we might call America's Second Gilded Age (2000—). It is a paradox that may help us understand a number of overarching features of our new century. These include the consistent findings that public trust in almost all U.S. institutions has sharply declined since 2000, even as growing majorities hold that America is "heading in the wrong direction." It provides an immediate answer to why overwhelming majorities of respondents in public-opinion surveys continue to tell pollsters, year after year, that our ever-richer America is still stuck in the middle of a recession. The mounting economic woes of the "little people" may not have been generally recognized by those inside the bubble, or even by many bubble inhabitants who claimed to be economic specialists—but they proved to be potent fuel for the populist fire that raged through American politics in 2016.

So general economic conditions for many ordinary Americans—not least of these, Americans who did not fit within the academy's designated victim classes—have been rather more insecure than those within the comfort of the bubble understood. But the anxiety, dissatisfaction, anger, and despair that range within our borders today are not wholly a reaction to the way our economy is misfiring. On the nonmaterial front, it is likewise clear that many things in our society are going wrong and yet seem beyond our powers to correct.

Some of these gnawing problems are by no means new: A number of them (such as family breakdown) can be traced back at least to the 1960s, while others are arguably as old as modernity itself (anomie and isolation in big anonymous communities, secularization and the decline of faith). But a number have roared down upon us by surprise since the turn of the century—and others have redoubled with fearsome new intensity since roughly the year 2000.

American health conditions seem to have taken a seriously wrong turn in the new century. It is not just that overall health progress has been shockingly slow, despite the trillions we devote to medical services each year. (Which "Cold War babies" among us would have predicted we'd live to see the day when life expectancy in East Germany was higher than in the United States, as is the case today?)

Alas, the problem is not just slowdowns in health progress—there also appears to have been positive retrogression for broad and heretofore seemingly untroubled segments of the national population. A short but electrifying 2015 paper by Anne Case and Nobel Economics Laureate Angus Deaton talked about a mortality trend that had gone almost unnoticed until then: rising death rates for middle-aged U.S. whites. By Case and Deaton's reckoning, death rates rose somewhat slightly over the 1999–2013 period for all non-Hispanic white men and women 45–54 years of age—but they rose sharply for those with high-school degrees or less, and for this less-educated grouping most of the rise in death rates was accounted for by suicides, chronic liver cirrhosis, and poisonings (including drug overdoses).

Though some researchers, for highly technical reasons, suggested that the mortality spike might not have been quite as sharp as Case and Deaton reckoned, there is little doubt that the spike itself has taken place. Health has been deteriorating for a signifi-

cant swath of white America in our new century, thanks in large part to drug and alcohol abuse. All this sounds a little too close for comfort to the story of modern Russia, with its devastating vodka- and drug-binging health setbacks. Yes: It can happen here, and it has. Welcome to our new America.

In December 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that for the first time in decades, life expectancy at birth in the United States had dropped very slightly (to 78.8 years in 2015, from 78.9 years in 2014). Though the decline was small, it was statistically meaningful—rising death rates were characteristic of males and females alike; of blacks and whites and Latinos together. (Only black women avoided mortality increases—their death levels were stagnant.) A jump in "unintentional injuries" accounted for much of the overall uptick.

It would be unwarranted to place too much portent in a single year's mortality changes; slight annual drops in U.S. life expectancy have occasionally been registered in the past, too, followed by continued improvements. But given other developments we are witnessing in our new America, we must wonder whether the 2015 decline in life expectancy is just a blip, or the start of a new trend. We will find out soon enough. It cannot be encouraging, though, that the Human Mortality Database, an international consortium of demographers who vet national data to improve comparability between countries, has suggested that health progress in America essentially ceased in 2012—that the U.S. gained on average only about a single day of life expectancy at birth between 2012 and 2014, before the 2015 turnaround.

The opioid epidemic of pain pills and heroin that has been ravaging and shortening lives from coast to coast is a new plague for our new century. The terrifying novelty of this particular drug epidemic, of course, is that it has gone (so to speak) "mainstream" this time, effecting breakout from disadvantaged minority communities to Main Street White America. By 2013, according to a 2015 report by the Drug Enforcement Administration, more Americans died from drug overdoses (largely but not wholly opioid abuse) than from either traffic fatalities or guns. The dimensions of the opioid epidemic in the real America are still not fully appreciated within the bubble, where drug use tends to be more carefully limited and recreational. In Dreamland, his harrowing and magisterial account of modern America's opioid explosion, the journalist Sam Quinones notes in passing that "in one three-month period" just a few years ago, according to the Ohio Department of Health, "fully 11 percent of all Ohioans were prescribed opiates." And of course many Americans self-medicate with licit or illicit painkillers without doctors' orders.

In the fall of 2016, Alan Krueger, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, released a study that further refined the picture of the real existing opioid epidemic in America: According to his work, nearly half of all prime working-age male labor-force dropouts—an army now totaling roughly 7 million men—currently take pain medication on a daily basis.

We already knew from other sources (such as BLS "time use" surveys) that the overwhelming majority of the prime-age men in this un-working army generally don't "do civil society" (charitable work, religious activities, volunteering), or for that matter much in the way of child care or help for others in the home either, despite the abundance of time on their hands. Their routine,

instead, typically centers on watching—watching TV, DVDs, Internet, hand-held devices, etc.—and indeed watching for an average of 2,000 hours a year, as if it were a full-time job. But Krueger's study adds a poignant and immensely sad detail to this portrait of daily life in 21st-century America: In our mind's eye we can now picture many millions of un-working men in the prime of life, out of work and not looking for jobs, sitting in front of screens—stoned.

But how did so many millions of un-working men, whose incomes are limited, manage en masse to afford a constant supply of pain medication? Oxycontin is not cheap. As Dreamland carefully explains, one main mechanism today has been the welfare state: more specifically, Medicaid, Uncle Sam's means-tested health-benefits program. Here is how it works (we are with Quinones in Portsmouth, Ohio):

[The Medicaid card] pays for medicine—whatever pills a doctor deems that the insured patient needs. Among those who receive Medicaid cards are people on state welfare or on a federal disability program known as SSI. . . . If you could get a prescription from a willing doctor—and Portsmouth had plenty of them—Medicaid health-insurance cards paid for that prescription every month. For a three-dollar Medicaid co-pay, therefore, addicts got pills priced at thousands of dollars, with the difference paid for by U.S. and state taxpayers. A user could turn around and sell those pills, obtained for that three-dollar co-pay, for as much as ten thousand dollars on the street.

In 21st-century America, “dependence on government” has thus come to take on an entirely new meaning.

You may now wish to ask: What share of prime-working-age men these days are enrolled in Medicaid? According to the Census Bureau's SIPP survey (Survey of Income and Program Participation), as of 2013, over one-fifth (21 percent) of all civilian men between 25 and 55 years of age were Medicaid beneficiaries. For prime-age people not in the labor force, the share was over half (53 percent). And for un-working Anglos (non-Hispanic white men not in the labor force) of prime working age, the share enrolled in Medicaid was 48 percent.

By the way: Of the entire un-working prime-age male Anglo population in 2013, nearly three-fifths (57 percent) were reportedly collecting disability benefits from one or more government disability program in 2013. Disability checks and means-tested benefits cannot support a lavish lifestyle. But they can offer a permanent alternative to paid employment, and for growing numbers of American men, they do. The rise of these programs has coincided with the death of work for larger and larger numbers of American men not yet of retirement age. We cannot say that these programs caused the death of work for millions upon millions of younger men: What is incontrovertible, however, is that they have financed it—just as Medicaid inadvertently helped finance America's immense and increasing appetite for opioids in our new century.

It is intriguing to note that America's nationwide opioid epidemic has not been accompanied by a nationwide crime wave (excepting of course the apparent explosion of illicit heroin use). Just the opposite: As best can be told, national victimization rates for violent crimes and property crimes have both reportedly dropped by about two-thirds over the past two decades. The drop in crime over the past generation has done great things for the general quality of life in much

of America. There is one complication from this drama, however, that inhabitants of the bubble may not be aware of, even though it is all too well known to a great many residents of the real America. This is the extraordinary expansion of what some have termed America's “criminal class”—the population sentenced to prison or convicted of felony offenses—in recent decades. This trend did not begin in our century, but it has taken on breathtaking enormity since the year 2000.

Most well-informed readers know that the U.S. currently has a higher share of its populace in jail or prison than almost any other country on earth, that Barack Obama and others talk of our criminal-justice process as “mass incarceration,” and know that well over 2 million men were in prison or jail in recent years. But only a tiny fraction of all living Americans ever convicted of a felony is actually incarcerated at this very moment. Quite the contrary: Maybe 90 percent of all sentenced felons today are out of confinement and living more or less among us. The reason: the basic arithmetic of sentencing and incarceration in America today.

Correctional release and sentenced community supervision (probation and parole) guarantee a steady annual “flow” of convicted felons back into society to augment the very considerable “stock” of felons and ex-felons already there. And this “stock” is by now truly enormous.

One forthcoming demographic study by Sarah Shannon and five other researchers estimates that the cohort of current and former felons in America very nearly reached 20 million by the year 2010. If its estimates are roughly accurate, and if America's felon population has continued to grow at more or less the same tempo traced out for the years leading up to 2010, we would expect it to surpass 23 million persons by the end of 2016 at the latest. Very rough calculations might therefore suggest that at this writing, America's population of non-institutionalized adults with a felony conviction somewhere in their past has almost certainly broken the 20 million mark by the end of 2016. A little more rough arithmetic suggests that about 17 million men in our general population have a felony conviction somewhere in their CV. That works out to one of every eight adult males in America today.

We have to use rough estimates here, rather than precise official numbers, because the government does not collect any data at all on the size or socioeconomic circumstances of this population of 20 million, and never has. Amazing as this may sound and scandalous though it may be, America has, at least to date, effectively banished this huge group—a group roughly twice the total size of our illegal-immigrant population and an adult population larger than that in any state but California—to a near-total and seemingly unending statistical invisibility. Our ex-cons are, so to speak, statistical outcasts who live in a darkness our polity does not care enough to illuminate—beyond the scope or interest of public policy, unless and until they next run afoul of the law.

Thus we cannot describe with any precision or certainty what has become of those who make up our “criminal class” after their (latest) sentencing or release. In the most stylized terms, however, we might guess that their odds in the real America are not all that favorable. And when we consider some of the other trends we have already mentioned—employment, health, addiction, welfare dependence—we can see the emergence of a malign new nationwide undertow, pulling downward against social mobility.

Social mobility has always been the jewel in the crown of the American mythos and ethos. The idea (not without a measure of truth to back it up) was that people in America are free to achieve according to their merit and their grit—unlike in other places, where they are trapped by barriers of class or the misfortune of misrule. Nearly two decades into our new century, there are unmistakable signs that America's fabled social mobility is in trouble—perhaps even in serious trouble.

Consider the following facts. First, according to the Census Bureau, geographical mobility in America has been on the decline for three decades, and in 2016 the annual movement of households from one location to the next was reportedly at an all-time (postwar) low. Second, as a study by three Federal Reserve economists and a Notre Dame colleague demonstrated last year, “labor market fluidity”—the churning between jobs that among other things allows people to get ahead—has been on the decline in the American labor market for decades, with no sign as yet of a turnaround. Finally, and not least important, a December 2016 report by the “Equal Opportunity Project,” a team led by the formidable Stanford economist Raj Chetty, calculated that the odds of a 30-year-old's earning more than his parents at the same age was now just 51 percent: down from 86 percent 40 years ago. Other researchers who have examined the same data argue that the odds may not be quite as low as the Chetty team concludes, but agree that the chances of surpassing one's parents' real income have been on the downslope and are probably lower now than ever before in post-war America.

Thus the bittersweet reality of life for real Americans in the early 21st century: Even though the American economy still remains the world's unrivaled engine of wealth generation, those outside the bubble may have less of a shot at the American Dream than has been the case for decades, maybe generations—possibly even since the Great Depression.

The funny thing is, people inside the bubble are forever talking about “economic inequality,” that wonderful seminar construct, and forever virtue-signaling about how personally opposed they are to it. By contrast, “economic insecurity” is akin to a phrase from an unknown language. But if we were somehow to find a “Google Translate” function for communicating from real America into the bubble, an important message might be conveyed:

The abstraction of “inequality” doesn't matter a lot to ordinary Americans. The reality of economic insecurity does. The Great American Escalator is broken—and it badly needs to be fixed.

With the election of 2016, Americans within the bubble finally learned that the 21st century has gotten off to a very bad start in America. Welcome to the reality. We have a lot of work to do together to turn this around.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a distinguished member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, the other day, a young man who lives in my neighborhood came over, and he asked me to try to teach him how to drive a car. And I told him: Son, it is real easy to drive a car. It is just kind of like these budget proposals you will see in Congress. If you want to go forward and do

things down the road, you put the car in D, like Democrat, for drive, and your car will go forward. But if you want to go backwards and reverse back to the 1950s, you put it in R, like a Republican.

He learned quick, and that is what these budgets are about. If you want to go forward, you go with the Democratic budget—forward on building highways, school construction, broadband expansion; research, research on the deadly diseases that are killing each and every one of us and our children in time to come, and research by the National Institutes of Health that are cut by the budget. There is nothing more important that can be in the budget than moneys for the National Institutes of Health, yet they are being cut. Cancer, Alzheimer's, AIDS, stroke, diabetes, all are going to come at us and our relatives.

Some will say, and I said this one time before, and Mr. Kingston on the other side said: Well, our children and our grandchildren will have to pay for it. Who do you think is going to get the cures and the treatments? Our children and our grandchildren and generations to come.

And they cut research. They cut opportunities for America. You talk about taxes and the debt, the Republican plan gives billionaires the biggest cuts in history, over \$50 billion with estate tax elimination for people like the Koch brothers and the Waltons and all those folks, and that money will never come back.

The alternative minimum tax is eliminated. That is the only thing that made clear that President Trump paid any taxes in the only tax return we know about. If it weren't for that, he wouldn't have paid anything. We are talking multimillion- and billion-dollar tax cuts for the richest that create deficits in the future, but that is okay when it is giving money to those who already have it.

Franklin Roosevelt was right. You judge a society not by what it does for those who have an abundance, but you judge it by what it does for those who have the least.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to say to my good friend and colleague from Tennessee that I think the D stands for debt for Democrats, and I think the R stands for Republicans and recovery.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished chairwoman of the Budget Committee for her outstanding work.

My friend from Tennessee talks about driving forward. I think we need to pump the brakes. You are driving right off a cliff with this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition. It is my strong belief that our Nation has a debt crisis on its hand, and I am astonished by how many people on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, just refuse to acknowledge the problem. It is as if the problem doesn't exist.

Under their plan, taxes are going to be raised nearly \$3 trillion. We are going to continue to raise spending to the tune of over \$6 trillion. We will have a meager \$2.6 billion in deficit reduction, by the way, compared to our budget that does well over \$6 trillion in deficit reduction.

Our Nation is \$20 trillion in debt, and it is a complete absurdity to think that we could begin to relinquish this process if we enacted such a burdensome budgetary proposal that is being offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

This budget would also diminish our national security apparatus. It would end the global war on terrorism fund by 2019. Let's go ahead and telegraph that we are going to end the global war on terrorism fund by 2019. The only people who I know who would support that would be our adversaries.

It seeks to promote the collapsing Affordable Care Act by keeping those burdensome mandates in place. This resolution before us right now refuses to do anything about the runaway entitlement programs that are the primary drivers of the deficit and debt in the country.

Mr. Chairman, their budget just will never balance. Never.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1030

Mrs. BLACK. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. It will give no reconciliation instruction so that we can finally get control and protect for long-term sustainability the social safety net program that many depend on.

The bottom line is, you either acknowledge we have a deficit and a debt crisis, or you do not. And if you believe as I do, you will refuse this budget, and you will support ours.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I rise in support of the Democratic budget alternative and in opposition to the Republican budget that has been proposed.

It has been often said that gracious living and good politics is all about gratitude. Paying something forward is how you show your gratitude.

Quite frankly, the simple truth about this Republican budget is that it rolls back a century of progress. It sets the stage for the dismantling of Social Se-

curity, which lifted more people out of poverty than anything, and for Speaker RYAN's plan to turn it over to Wall Street.

It sets the stage for turning Medicare over to the insurance industry—Medicare that provided our elderly with insurance and life opportunities that heretofore had not existed.

This century of progress that this budget rolls back includes clean air and water. It includes healthy, safe working places and conditions. It includes an opportunity society that invests in our people.

And guess what? In a little over a century, we doubled life expectancies. Wow, what a marvelous accomplishment.

We created the best and biggest middle class in the history of the world. We became a model for the world; jobs with living wages and healthcare benefits and pension benefits.

This Republican budget proposes to roll back that entire century of progress. It is nothing about paying it forward. It is nothing about paying things back. It is about rolling back a century of progress, and we can not let that happen.

That is what the Democratic budget is really all about, investing in people, investing in infrastructure, investing in America, and investing in people's jobs and living wages, and in their benefits. That is how you show your gratitude, and we have got a lot to be grateful for.

Let's vote and enact this Democratic budget proposal which invests in America, which invests in people, which invests in opportunities. That is what this debate is really all about.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I saw recently, and I remember Ronald Reagan said something when he finally got his tax reform package done back in 1986—why it took so long and why it was so difficult. And at the end the day, he said: You know, the lawmakers and the policymakers forgot one important factor in their calculations that brought us to this point; they forgot to include what the American people have to say about this.

That is what is happening here today, Mr. Chairman. The American people have told us they want economic growth. They want opportunities for their kids and their families, a better quality of life. They want Washington to live within its means and stop taking more and more and more from them out of their paychecks.

So let's do a little bit of comparison. Let's look at, my colleagues, the Democrat budget. It raises taxes by \$2.7 trillion, compared to the CBO January baseline. That is almost \$3.8 trillion more than revenue levels in our House

Republican budget. It increases spending by \$6.2 trillion, compared to the Republican budget over that 10-year period. It increases the debt held by the public by \$3.9 trillion, almost \$4 trillion relative to the House Republican budget.

And what is important, Mr. Chair, it never balances. There is not even an attempt to balance; not to mention that there are no reconciliation instructions that would give us an opportunity to deal with healthcare and other economic growth reforms.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a responsible budget that is being offered by our colleagues on the other side. I urge my colleagues to oppose it and to support the House Republican budget later today.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his astute analysis on what the American people really want. I thank the manager, the chairwoman of this bill, and I acknowledge the position that they take.

But what America really wants is for Washington, for America, for the government, to stand by them in their time of need.

I am very grateful to be part of a party that is not about politics but is about values. We are the better choice party. We offer a better deal on this project that we have worked so hard on called the American budget.

The American budget, in contrast to our friends on the other side of the aisle, recognizes, as I visited the National Institutes for Health, that 80 percent of their budget that we are going to lose goes for research and researchers—looking those researchers in the eyes when they explain the research in medical science to help save lives, and to know that the Republican budget cuts the NIH, the Centers for Disease Control, and takes up the TrumpCare that cuts trillions in Medicaid and \$500 billion in Medicare. That is the story of this bill.

Then, as my good friend from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) indicated, we invest in infrastructure, and we help this young man, not only with his healthcare but with education. Do we realize how many jobs go unable to find individuals in this country? Hundreds of thousands because of the lack of training.

So if my friends want growth, you know how you get growth? You invest in the American people. Or you tell the American people when tragedies strike, whether it is the Virgin Islands, or Puerto Rico, or Florida, or Texas, or tragically, in Nevada, that you will stand by them. You provide them with the infrastructure to be able to overcome.

Not the Republican budget, because the Republican budget is giving trillions in tax cuts, and the distribution of those moneys will not see the front door of low-income, moderate-income, middle class working Americans.

That is the distinction between the Democratic budget. It increases opportunity through a higher minimum wage. It believes in equal pay for equal work. It knows that immigration reform will bring in billions of dollars. It will create opportunities for work.

Then, of course, we know that the Democratic budget strengthens our healthcare, and it provides that her Social Security, her Medicare, will not be in jeopardy. The Medicare trust fund will not lose with a Republican budget and the trillions of dollars of tax cuts, her life, as she continues to seek some balance of good life will be lost.

We are the right direction. We are for the American people. We are standing by the American people with the Democratic budget. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Tennessee, the chair of the Budget Committee, for the wonderful work she has done on bringing us to this position.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute amendment.

As chair of the Education and the Workforce Committee, my priority this Congress is to ensure that our policies promote a climate of job creation through economic growth, a sound fiscal policy, and a global economic competitiveness.

Our budget helps achieve all of these priorities by laying the foundation for a robust and comprehensive simplification of our burdensome Tax Code. The Democrat substitute not only fails to do so but would decimate America's workforce.

Our budget reforms our broken Tax Code so that it works for every American at every income level, regardless of where they live or how much money they earn.

The top U.S. tax rate for individuals has been as high as 90 percent and as low as 28 percent. At the same time, income tax revenue has remained fairly steady, despite these sharp rate swings. It turns out that the biggest driver of Federal revenue is not higher tax rates but economic growth.

In fact, a sizeable majority of economists point out that a broad base and low rates are key in a tax system that fosters economic growth and competitiveness. Legislators on both sides of the aisle agree on this basic principle, and history has shown it to be true.

Instead of raising taxes, we should, instead, embrace the policies contained

in this budget resolution that encourages economic growth, like reducing regulatory burdens, welfare reform, and comprehensive tax reform for all individuals, not just a select few.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise, as well, in opposition to the substitute amendment, and I do so because I am struck by the ways in which you can, at times, agree on the diagnosis but disagree on the cure.

I think we would all agree, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we have a real problem in the way that wages have indeed stagnated over the last 30 years. A lot of my Democratic colleagues are nailing it in terms of that diagnosis.

The question though, is the cure. And the question there is: Can we fix that problem by raising taxes by \$2.7 trillion? Can we fix that problem by increasing spending by \$6.2 trillion? Can we fix that problem by increasing the debt by \$3.9 trillion and, in essence, having a budget that never balances?

I would argue, no, and I would say, instead, what we have to look at is the basics, which we have been dancing around, which is the mathematic formula that says: Savings drives investment, which drives productivity gain which, ultimately, impacts standard of living or wages. And what we don't focus on enough is this notion of the investment part of investment; if you want to increase productivity, you have got to increase investment.

In fairness to my Democratic colleagues, part of that is public investment, but another part is private.

What my colleague from Virginia was just getting at a moment ago was, for 50 years, regardless of tax rate, 90 or 28 percent, the take to government has been about 18 percent of GDP very consistently.

So what I would argue is we, indeed, need more public investment, but we also need private investment to go with it. And if we don't watch out, what is being contemplated with this Democratic substitute is a process that will ultimately crowd out that much more in the way of private investment so key to increasing productivity.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, in closing, it is clear that we have a very different budget and a very different understanding of the challenges facing our country. We see that so many Americans are working harder and longer and can't remember the last time they got a raise.

We know families are worried about how to pay for college, or if their parents' retirement is secure, or if they will ever be able to afford to stop working. And we know that trillions of dollars in tax cuts for millionaires and large corporations will turn these fears of hardworking Americans families into reality.

□ 1045

Just a few minutes ago, my Republican colleague from Ohio talked about what the American people want. On many of those things, we agree. But I know one thing the American people don't want. They don't want massive tax cuts for the top 1 percent of Americans.

The Democratic budget rejects tax cuts for the wealthy. We invest in programs that will grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, provide real support for working families and real security in retirement. We make education and childcare more affordable, and we support policies to help every American get the healthcare that they need.

Those are the priorities of our budget, and they are the priorities of the American people.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, I look into my children's and grandchildren's eyes, and I say: I want you to know that right now you owe \$63,000 for your part of the debt of this country.

What we are doing in Congress right now, if we were to vote on and accept this amendment, we would be increasing that burden on our children and grandchildren.

I, for one, cannot do that, and I think that we have got to be responsible. We have got to look at how we in this country can get back to the place, as has already been said, that we ask families and businesses to do, and that is to live within their means.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 268, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—156

Adams	Gabbard	Nadler
Aguilar	Galleo	Neal
Barragán	Garamendi	Nolan
Bass	Gomez	Norcross
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Panetta
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Pingree
F.	Heck	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Huffman	Quigley
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Carbajal	Jayapal	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sanchez
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kennedy	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Scott, David
Clay	Kilmer	Serrano
Cleaver	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Connolly	Lawrence	Sires
Conyers	Lawson (FL)	Slaughter
Correa	Lee	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Levin	Soto
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Speier
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lowe	Tonko
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,	Torres
DeLauro	M.	Tsongas
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Vargas
Demings	Lynch	Veasey
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Vela
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Velázquez
Dingell	Matsui	Wasserman
Doggett	McCollum	Schultz
Ellison	McEachin	Waters, Maxine
Engel	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Eshoo	McNerney	Welch
Espallat	Meeks	Wilson (FL)
Esty (CT)	Meng	Yarmuth
Evans	Moore	
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	

NOES—268

Abraham	Carter (TX)	Ferguson
Aderholt	Chabot	Fitzpatrick
Allen	Cheney	Fleischmann
Amash	Coffman	Flores
Amodei	Cole	Fortenberry
Arrington	Collins (GA)	Foster
Babin	Collins (NY)	Fox
Bacon	Comer	Franks (AZ)
Banks (IN)	Comstock	Frelinghuysen
Barletta	Conaway	Fudge
Barr	Cook	Gaetz
Barton	Cooper	Gallagher
Bera	Costa	Garrett
Bergman	Costello (PA)	Gianforte
Biggs	Cramer	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Crist	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Gosar
Black	Culberson	Gottheimer
Blackburn	Curbelo (FL)	Gowdy
Blum	Davidson	Granger
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Brady (TX)	Delaney	Graves (LA)
Brat	Denham	Graves (MO)
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Griffith
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Grothman
Brownley (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Buchanan	Donovan	Handel
Buck	Duffy	Harper
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Budd	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Burgess	Dunn	Hensarling
Bustos	Emmer	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	Estes (KS)	Hice, Jody B.
Calvert	Farenthold	Higgins (LA)
Carter (GA)	Faso	Hill

Himes	McKinley	Rutherford
Holding	McMorris	Sanford
Hollingsworth	Rodgers	Scalise
Hudson	McSally	Schneider
Huizenga	Meadows	Schrader
Hultgren	Meehan	Schweikert
Hunter	Messer	Scott, Austin
Hurd	Mitchell	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Moolenaar	Sessions
Jenkins (KS)	Mooney (WV)	Shimkus
Jenkins (WV)	Mullin	Shuster
Johnson (LA)	Murphy (FL)	Simpson
Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Sinema
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Smith (MO)
Jones	Norman	Smith (NE)
Jordan	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Joyce (OH)	O'Halleran	Smith (TX)
Katko	Olson	Smucker
Kelly (MS)	Palazzo	Stefanik
Kelly (PA)	Palmer	Stewart
Kind	Paulsen	Stivers
King (IA)	Payne	Suozzi
King (NY)	Pearce	Taylor
Kinzinger	Perry	Tenney
Knight	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Krishnamoorthi	Peterson	Thompson (PA)
Kuster (NH)	Pittenger	Thornberry
Kustoff (TN)	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Labrador	Poliquin	Tipton
LaHood	Posey	Trott
LaMalfa	Ratcliffe	Turner
Lamborn	Reed	Upton
Lance	Reichert	Valadao
Latta	Renacci	Visclosky
Lewis (MN)	Rice (NY)	Wagner
Lipinski	Rice (SC)	Walberg
LoBiondo	Richmond	Walden
Loeb sack	Roby	Walker
Long	Roe (TN)	Walorski
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi
Love	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Wenstrup
MacArthur	Rooney, Francis	Westerman
Maloney, Sean	Rooney, Thomas	Williams
Marchant	J.	Wilson (SC)
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Marshall	Roskam	Womack
Massie	Ross	Woodall
Mast	Rothfus	Yoder
McCarthy	Rouzer	Yoho
McCaul	Royce (CA)	Young (AK)
McClintock	Ruiz	Young (IA)
McHenry	Russell	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine	Kihuen	Titus
DeSantis	Murphy (PA)	Walz
Doyle, Michael	Napolitano	
F.	Rosen	

□ 1111

Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. GAETZ, MARSHALL, MAST, BANKS of Indiana, and FRANKS of Arizona changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mses. VELÁZQUEZ, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. KEATING, and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. WALORSKI). Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the hard work the Budget Committee has put forth to produce a budget that prioritizes our national defense and sets forth bold policy reforms that will get this country back on track to fiscal responsibility.

Specifically, I am pleased to see that this budget commits to reducing the substantial amount of improper payments throughout the Federal Government. The Government Accountability Office estimates that there were \$144 billion—I want to emphasize \$144 billion—in improper payments in 2016 alone, and that is not even a complete estimate. In fact, 18 Federal programs did not report their improper payments, so the total is undoubtedly higher.

To make matters worse, since 2013, the amount we have been incorrectly sending out has been trending upwards. Instead of reducing our fraudulent payments, the rate at which we pay them out has been increasing. Since 2003, there has been a total of \$1.2 trillion in improper payments. Let me repeat, that is \$1.2 trillion plus interest.

□ 1115

Because we have been running deficits over that timeframe, we have literally had to borrow that money to send it to fraudsters and others who would not have received it. This is unacceptable.

As you can see from this chart, this represents improper payments for 2016 alone. It is money borrowed that we pay interest on to send to people who are not supposed to get it. We are borrowing money and adding to our debt through improper payments.

This budget, for the first time, sets forth a bold strategy for cutting these payments in half over the budget window, saving us \$700 billion over our 10-year window.

While I hope, in the near future, we can zero these payments out, I am thrilled to see that we are beginning to tackle a problem that is putting an additional strain on this country's fiscal problems.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Chairwoman, I suppose I should be saying thank you. I will get a huge tax cut under the Republican tax cut plan, as well the majority of those people sitting here—the majority of our colleagues in Congress—who are, like me, fortunate enough to be millionaires already.

Forgive me if I am in no mood to say thank you, because I was elected not just to represent millionaires, but to represent aspiring millionaires, work-

ing families, seniors, and veterans. For all of them, for anyone who isn't already a millionaire, this budget is a slap in the face.

With all of the problems facing our country right now, all the people struggling to get ahead, it is unfathomable to me that this Congress could look at people like me and say: Hey, that guy, let's give him more money. In fact, let's give all millionaires hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax cuts.

Really, I am small potatoes. President Trump, according to his financial disclosure, will get hundreds of millions of dollars in tax cuts.

Where is all that money coming from? If you are listening to this and you are not a millionaire, probably from you.

To pay for our own tax cuts and the tax cuts for wealthy donors, Republicans are going to increase taxes on 45 percent of American families with children. That is just the start. Seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families will see their healthcare cut.

Poor seniors will lose benefits that help them keep food on the table and their homes heated in the winter. Veteran benefits, meals for hungry schoolchildren, programs that make education affordable and job training available, investments that generate economic growth and create good-paying jobs are all at risk in this budget.

They are also cutting corporate tax rates, which we will be paying for by plunging our Nation into deeper and deeper debt, giving multinational giants another advantage over small- and mid-size businesses in the name of perpetuating the myth of supply-side economics.

Supply-side failed. They renamed it trickle-down, but nothing trickled down. Now it is job creators. When that fails, maybe they will call it "I get mine now; you get yours later—maybe." But whatever they name it, it is a sham. This plan is a hoax on the American people, and it will make most people's lives more difficult.

So forgive me if I am in no mood to say thank you for the extra money in my pocket. With millions of Americans struggling and scraping to get ahead, and with my tax cut increasing their challenges, I cannot begin to justify my extra money, and, quite frankly, I cannot fathom how my Republican colleagues are able to justify theirs.

With this budget, Republicans aren't just passing the buck, they are pocketing it. Madam Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Republican budget.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his great leadership as the

ranking member on the Budget Committee in the House, and I thank all of the members of the Budget Committee for their great work to make the budget that was proposed earlier, the Yarmuth budget, a statement of our values. That is exactly what a budget should be.

A Federal budget should be a statement of our national values, and what is important to us as a country should be reflected in the priorities that we place into that budget. The budget before us, proposed by the Republicans, is just the opposite of that. It is accompanied by a tax proposal that they put in, one of the biggest transfers of wealth to the wealthiest people in our country in our country's history. Every time they do it, they make it worse.

I let you be the judge: Is a statement of our national values to cut a trillion dollars from Medicaid, cap and take Medicaid down a bad path, in order to give tax cuts to the richest people in our country?

Is it a statement of our values to take a half trillion dollars out of Medicare to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country?

Our distinguished ranking member has listed some of the things that would be cut if we went down this unfortunate path posed by our colleagues on the other side.

This is a budget that steals from the middle class. It steals hundreds of billions of dollars from critical job-creating, wage-increasing investments, infrastructure, job training, and clean energy. It harms veterans, it cuts education, it abandons rural America, and it guts education.

This is really a mystery to me. When you cut education, with the stiff competition we have, this is one of the worst budget decisions that you have made. Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than investing in education: early childhood, K-12, higher education, postgraduate, and lifetime learning for our workers.

That is how you grow the economy. That is how you bring money to the Treasury, and not by cutting it in order to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country.

Is it a statement of values to cut education so that you have a tax cut that benefits 80 percent?

I know you don't want the public to hear this, and I can understand why. How could it be a statement of the values of the American people to cut the education of our children in order to have a tax cut where 80 percent of it benefits the top 1 percent of people in our country? It is just not right.

As they do that, the deficit hawks, who seem to be an endangered species on the Republican side of the aisle these days, are adding close to \$2.4 trillion to the deficit, not counting debt service or interest on that national debt. Then they say: Oh, that is okay;

we need to increase the national debt by trillions of dollars so that we can give tax cuts.

Where do the tax cuts go? \$2.6 trillion goes to corporate America.

Guess what happens to the middle class. There are \$470 billion in tax increases to the middle class, about a half trillion dollars in increases to the middle class, \$2.5 trillion in tax cuts for corporate America. Again, it is adding so much to the deficit.

Now they say: Oh, trickle-down economics is going to pay its own way. We will get that money back.

Not so. It never happens. Nonsense. But don't take it from me. No less a figure than Bruce Bartlett, who worked for Congressman Jack Kemp, a real supporter of supply-side economics—and, as was said, supply-side turn into trickle-down, et cetera. As a proponent of supply-side economics, he said: We never said it would pay for itself. We just advocate it as an economic approach.

But anyone who says, and this is from him, that the whole supply-side dynamic scoring pays for itself—part of this argument—is all nonsense. It is not true. He went on to say that it was bull—you finish the sentence.

So, here we are at a place where we can increase the deficit, decrease job creation, hurt the middle class, benefit the top 1 percent, and add to the national debt in historic proportions that will be very hard to collect from deficit hawks—if any of you exist over there.

Instead, we have an opportunity today for a better deal for the American people—better jobs, better pay, better wages, and a better future—where we lower costs for America's working families and middle class families, and where we prepare them with the tools for the economy of the 21st century.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chair of the Bourbon Caucus, for his great leadership in bringing a better budget that is a statement of our national values, that supports American workers with responsible tax reform, calls for parity between defense and nondefense, and strengthens the ACA and protects Medicare.

Every time the Republicans come to the floor and try to stack the deck even further for their wealthy friends, we have to have this conversation. Democrats will fight these tax cuts and this unfortunate, deceptive budget that they have on the floor. I urge my colleagues to start by voting “no” today and to continue the conversation with the American people to fight this unfortunate path they want to take us down: the road to ruin.

I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chairman, I am going to be brief in my closing comments.

I do want to ask my colleague to consider this: Are we proud of a country where we are leaving our children and grandchildren in further and further debt?

During our discussion in this Chamber, we have shared our ideas for building a better America, an America that we would be proud to entrust to future generations. While it requires confronting real challenges along the road ahead, it is, undoubtedly, worth the journey.

First, our budget forces the Federal Government to live within its means, just like hardworking Americans and small businesses do on a daily basis.

Second, our budget identifies wasteful spending and finds much-needed savings and reforms for unsustainable mandatory spending. In fact, our committee has put forward the largest reform package for mandatory programs that has been seen in 20 years.

Third, it calls for a robust funding of our military, ensuring the resources that will allow us to be ready and protect our mainland. It also starts the process of restoring our military readiness, which suffered dramatically during the Obama administration.

Finally, our budget is the golden key that unlocks progrowth tax reform and takes us one step further to the great ideas unveiled in the framework last week.

Without question, our budget plan reflects American values and shared priorities. I urge my colleagues to join me in their support for a win for all Americans, because doing so will begin to ensure a brighter and better future for generations to come, and I urge a “yes” vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE) having assumed the chair, Mrs. WALORSKI, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, and, pursuant to House Resolution 553, she reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Members will record their votes by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 206, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—219

Abraham	Granger	Perry
Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Allen	Graves (LA)	Poe (TX)
Amodeli	Graves (MO)	Poliquin
Arrington	Griffith	Posey
Babin	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Guthrie	Reed
Banks (IN)	Handel	Reichert
Barletta	Harper	Renacci
Barr	Harris	Rice (SC)
Barton	Hartzler	Roby
Bergman	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis	Hice, Jody B.	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (MI)	Higgins (LA)	Rohrabacher
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Rokita
Black	Holding	Rooney, Francis
Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Rooney, Thomas
Bost	Hudson	J.
Brady (TX)	Huizenga	Roskam
Brat	Hultgren	Ross
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rothfus
Brooks (IN)	Hurd	Rouzer
Buchanan	Issa	Royce (CA)
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Russell
Budd	Jenkins (WV)	Rutherford
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Ryan (WI)
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Sanford
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Coffman	King (IA)	Shimkus
Cole	Kinzinger	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Knight	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Cook	LaMalfa	Smucker
Cramer	Lamborn	Stefanik
Crawford	Latta	Stewart
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Taylor
Davidson	Loudermilk	Tenney
Davis, Rodney	Love	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Lucas	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Tipton
Donovan	Marchant	Trott
Duffy	Marino	Turner
Duncan (SC)	Marshall	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Valadao
Dunn	McCaul	Wagner
Emmer	McClintock	Walberg
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Walden
Farenthold	McMorris	Walker
Faso	Rodgers	Walorski
Ferguson	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Fleischmann	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Flores	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Fox	Moolenaar	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Newhouse	Wittman
Gallagher	Noem	Womack
Garrett	Norman	Woodall
Gianforte	Nunes	Yoder
Gibbs	Olson	Yoho
Gohmert	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Palmer	Young (IA)
Gosar	Paulsen	Zeldin
Gowdy	Pearce	

NAYS—206

Adams	Beatty	Blumenauer
Aguilar	Bera	Blunt Rochester
Amash	Beyer	Bonamici
Barragán	Bishop (GA)	Boyle, Brendan
Bass	Blum	F.

Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Brown (MD)	Hanabusa	Norcross
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	O'Halleran
Buck	Heck	O'Rourke
Bustos	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Butterfield	Himes	Panetta
Capuano	Hoyer	Pascarell
Carbajal	Huffman	Payne
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Jeffries	Peters
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Jones	Pocan
Cicilline	Kaptur	Polis
Clark (MA)	Katko	Price (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Quigley
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Clyburn	Khanna	Richmond
Cohen	Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
Comstock	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Kind	Ruiz
Conyers	King (NY)	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Correa	Kuster (NH)	Ryan (OH)
Costa	Lance	Sánchez
Costello (PA)	Langevin	Sarbanes
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Crist	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Crowley	Lawrence	Schneider
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Schrader
Cummings	Lee	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Delaney	LoBiondo	Sherman
DeLauro	Loebsock	Sinema
DeBene	Lofgren	Sires
Demings	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Dent	Lowey	Smith (NJ)
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham,	Smith (WA)
Deutch	M.	Soto
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Doggett	Lynch	Suoizzi
Ellison	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	Carolyn B.	Takano
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Espallat	Massie	Thompson (MS)
Esty (CT)	Mast	Tonko
Evans	Matsui	Torres
Fitzpatrick	McCollum	Tsongas
Foster	McEachin	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Veasey
Fudge	McKinley	Vela
Gabbard	McNerney	Velázquez
Galleo	Meehan	Visclosky
Garamendi	Meeks	Wasserman
Gomez	Meng	Schultz
Gonzalez (TX)	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Gottheimer	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Green, Al	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Green, Gene	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva	Neal	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine	Kihuen	Titus
DeSantis	Murphy (PA)	Walz
Doyle, Michael F.	Napolitano	
	Rosen	

□ 1148

Mr. HOYER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call votes No. 556 through 557 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the Yarmuth of Kentucky Substitute Amendment No. 4, and no on final passage of the Budget Resolution.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House on account of Columbus Day. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act, sponsored by Senator RON JOHNSON. Dr. Kirkpatrick was a psychologist who was fired from the VA medical center where he worked after raising concerns about patients' medications. He committed suicide the day he was fired.

This bill will enhance whistleblower protections while ensuring supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers are punished. I look forward to the House passing this bill and continuing our work to fundamentally change the culture of the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I also expect the House to make a motion to go to conference on the National Defense Authorization Act.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I expect the House to consider an additional supplemental package to assist the ongoing recovery efforts following Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, will the supplemental that the gentleman mentioned—which is, as I understand, approximately \$29 billion, which will take care of forest fires in the West; \$16 billion, as I understand it, in debt relief, which will raise the borrowing level for FEMA; and then, of course,

money directly for the victims of the hurricanes. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there will be any, what I will call, extraneous matters that might be controversial, or will this be a straight supplemental without controversy? We all want to make sure that we have the resources to help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

The gentleman is correct. The White House has sent up a supplemental, and I do not believe this will be the last of the supplementals, based on the damage that has been done from the numerous hurricanes. But, yes, there will be more money for the Disaster Relief Fund to help throughout Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

As you know, too, the West had devastating forest fires, so there is roughly \$577 million there. And the National Flood Insurance Program has hit a ceiling. To deal with all of the flooding that has gone on, we have to deal with that, as well.

The Appropriations Committee has just received that last night. They are working through it now. I don't intend on seeing other things with it. I look forward to the Member working with me on that to make sure we get it right from what the President has asked.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his thought that there will not be anything in there that would make it a partisan bill. I think, as the President sent it down, it is, obviously, something that we need to do quickly and in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader and I have talked about the Dream Act. Another week has gone by and, therefore, the 6-month deadline is closer, and the President has urged us to pass legislation.

Can the gentleman tell me what the expectations are to address the Dream Act?

As you know, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, has filed a discharge petition on the bill sponsored by LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. Can the gentleman tell me what progress we are making on that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

Yes, we are dealing with the DACA situation and the situation along the border.

As you know, the Speaker has put together a task force. They have met numerous times. I have had dinner with the President just this week dealing with this issue, and you and I have talked, as well.

I think the best way to solve this problem, to make sure we get to the root cause, we have to secure the border, we have to deal with DACA, and,

more importantly, I think we do it in a manner where we are all working together.

I am, as you know, not a fan of a discharge petition. I think the best way to handle this is continuing to work through the matter with the committees—and on your side of the aisle, as well—to solve this problem. The President gave us 6 months. I would like to get this done before then.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Let me, if I might, Mr. Speaker, simply suggest to the gentleman, we certainly understand, and this side agrees, we want to have secure borders. There is, obviously, a disagreement on the President's proposal of a wall, I think, frankly, on your side as well as on my side of the aisle. I would hope that we would not, in effect, hold hostage the 800,000 students, workers, and young people brought here as children who know no other country.

In my discussions with Mr. RYAN, and his public comments have indicated, he is sympathetic to making sure that we address that issue. He urged, as you know, President Trump not to rescind DACA. The President did anyway.

I am hopeful that we can deal with the DREAMers, which I think certainly has very robust support on both sides of the aisle, in my view, Mr. Leader. I hope we can deal with that without clouding it with an issue, i.e., the wall. Not security; security I think we can reach agreement on. But I am hopeful that we can do that.

The DREAMers are extraordinarily anxious. I presume you have met with some of the DREAMers. They are really very impressive people and are enhancing our communities and our country.

So I would hope that we could do that. I look forward to talking to you personally about how we move forward and, hopefully, move quickly. I would like to have done it by next week.

As you know, I said that it would be nice to do it in this work period, to lay to rest the anxiety of the 800,000-plus people who will be affected. But, if we can't do that, certainly I would hope that we could do it shortly after we get back after the next district work period.

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

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2017, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1200

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Every day, nearly 1,000 women in this country receive a life-changing diagnosis that they will be affected by breast cancer. Nearly 200,000 of these diagnoses occur each year. One in eight women in our country will face breast cancer.

Breast cancer has a devastating effect on our families, taking away wives, mothers, aunts, uncles, sisters, and daughters.

I wish I was a brilliant scientist and could develop a cure. I wish I was a magician and could wave a magic wand and cure breast cancer, but I am just a Member of Congress. Actually, there are things this Congress could do to make breast cancer less likely, less deadly, and less painful.

Cannabis has shown promise in cancer research for over 2 decades. This research finally came to fruition in 2007, when Dr. Sean McAllister showed that cannabis-related compounds helped fight malignant forms of breast cancer. In the decade since, other research has confirmed and built on Dr. McAllister's findings, and there is now conclusive research that shows that cannabis-related compounds have antitumor properties.

Yet, despite these findings, scientists are going too slow. It is time for cannabis research to begin, and we should declassify it as a schedule I drug.

LOCKING PEOPLE UP WITHOUT DUE PROCESS IS UN-AMERICAN

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, this week, Congressman ADAM SMITH and I introduced the Dignity for Detained Immigrants Act. This legislation is critical to dismantle President Trump's mass deportation machine, to protect families, and to restore justice and due process to our broken immigration system.

Our detention system brings huge profits for large private corporations. About 38,000 people are detained every single day at a cost to taxpayers of over \$2 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about two things: dignity and justice for families,

pregnant women, people with serious illnesses, survivors of torture and violence. It is unconscionable that we are detaining these people sometimes for months or even years.

Congress can't afford to sit on the sidelines anymore. It is time to make clear that locking people up without due process is not only unconstitutional, it is un-American.

At a time when net migration is zero, when DREAMers are at risk of losing their DACA status, and the world reels from unprecedented numbers of refugees fleeing for their lives, we must act with compassion.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Dignity for Detained Immigrants Act, and I thank the over 55 cosponsors who have already come on to this piece of legislation.

GUN CONTROL DOESN'T WORK

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, within minutes of the tragic shooting in Las Vegas, Democrats and the liberal media called for more gun control measures.

A recent Washington Post op-ed describes how one gun control advocate researched restrictive gun laws in Great Britain and in Australia, only to discover that gun buybacks and gun bans do not reduce mass shootings or gun-related crimes.

She said: "The case for the"—gun control—"policies I had lobbied for crumbled when I examined the evidence. . . . But I can't endorse policies whose only selling point is that gun owners hate them. Policies that often seem as if they were drafted by people who have encountered guns only as a figure in a briefing book or an image on the news."

This researcher concluded that more lives would be saved by focusing on individuals instead of guns.

We should ensure that background checks work as intended and prevent those with mental health issues from acquiring guns. This actually will do some good, as opposed to meaningless gun regulations.

CONGRESS MUST REAUTHORIZE THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the swift reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

CHIP helps families provide care for their children. Throughout our Nation, it covers 9 million children and pregnant women. In California, it covers 2

million children. And in my district, half of the kids get their healthcare from Medicaid or CHIP.

Now, CHIP was implemented over 20 years ago, championed by two Senators on opposite sides of the political spectrum, ORRIN HATCH and Ted Kennedy, and it has continued to receive strong bipartisan support. But because of inaction by the House of Representatives, because of the distractions by this administration, millions of our children may be denied coverage.

They may not get to see their doctors for routine checkups. With the upcoming flu season, kids may not be able to get the necessary care when they are sick, and children with allergies may not have access to lifesaving medications and health services.

If this Congress does not step up to fix this mistake before it is too late, children will pay the price of our inaction.

Congress must take action to come together to pass CHIP for the millions of kids who continue to depend on us for this healthcare.

HELP IS ON THE WAY TO PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I sit as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs that deals directly with the jurisdiction of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and other territories of the U.S.

We had a very good briefing this week led by JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN from Puerto Rico, as well as STACEY PLASKETT of the Virgin Islands. It was very important information. As we all know of the difficult situation, especially we are seeing so much in Puerto Rico as well as the Virgin Islands; President Trump visiting Puerto Rico this week.

Help is on the way. Indeed, it has been on the way, and we need to just keep pushing to rebuild that infrastructure and push out into the islands where the need is still felt.

So we know, we see, we are aware, and we will keep working to achieve positive results in the short term as well, as we look at the situation with Puerto Rico and the difficulty with PREPA, the power company, and other issues that we will address as a committee in order to have a long-term, positive solution for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico and what they need.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO BEGIN WORK ON GUN SAFETY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, many of us will be going home to our

districts, facing constituents who will be asking the question: Why?

It really is painful when fellow Americans lose their lives. It is painful as we watch our soldiers go off into battle, and many of them do not come home in any other way but as a fallen soldier.

This past week, Americans, who were not in battle but were enjoying the life and the liberty of this Nation, fell by a murderous actor. I think we will have to go home and comfort our constituents, and we will also tell them what we are going to do.

I don't know why we have to climb this high mountain of understanding that laws can make a difference; not end all violence, but make a difference: legislation that says that guns have to be locked to save the lives of children; gun legislation that deals with banning armor-piercing bullets that would harm and injure our first responders; and then to get rid of the kits that this murderous individual utilized to make a semiautomatic an automatic.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress, together, to begin to do work on gun safety that will save American lives. I go home to my district to meet with my constituents, and I am going to tell them that I am going to do something that makes sense for the American people.

UNDERSTANDING WHAT LATE-TERM ABORTION IS

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Chamber took up H.R. 36, a bill dealing with pain-capable unborn children; and a bill that, in its result, would cause the United States to join the vast bulk of nations in the world wherein the termination of lives of children who are not only capable of feeling pain, but under what we understand to be the best science may, in fact, feel more pain because of the density of the nerve tissue, as they are in this roughly fifth month of development.

I guess four times in the brief time that I have been in this building, we have seen the Chamber erupt into applause, oftentimes over partisan-perceived victories.

The first time the Chamber erupted into applause is when my colleagues across the aisle were giddy with joy when a bill that would have ensured that the Department of Defense didn't spend money to perform transgender procedures on soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines failed in the form of an amendment. Another had to do with healthcare. Another had to do with the return of Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE. That was indeed a bipartisan eruption in applause.

Then there was an eruption from this side of the Chamber when H.R. 36 passed, as there was a recognition that late-term abortion is barbaric and counter to the ideas put forth to the world when, in the Declaration of Independence, it was written that we hold certain truths to be self-evident, and among those was life.

Too many people have failed to grasp the nature of what late-term abortion is, yet to grapple with the problem will require to understand what exactly that problem is.

So to look at the other six nations in the world that allow the termination of life after 5 months, we see nations like Vietnam, North Korea, China, and the United States.

Then to listen to the doctors who have performed these procedures describe in what was literally excruciating detail how the procedure is performed, that an instrument is inserted into the uterus, and probing is done until something is found, and the instrument is latched on, and then there is pulling, and out comes an arm or a leg or a piece of a head or a torso. Then, in fact, that unborn child, who science tells us can feel pain, dies by virtue of bleeding to death inside its very host. That is the nature of these procedures.

Estimates tell us that if the United States joined the fast bulk of the nations on the planet in outlawing late-term abortions, somewhere between 14,000 and 20,000 children every year wouldn't experience an unspeakable demise of literally being ripped from their host limb by limb and bleeding to death, all whilst, in the best estimates of scientists, feeling the pain of that death.

To put that in terms of Virginia's Fifth District, that is the population of Cumberland County twice every year, roughly.

So there was applause from the Members who saw that the United States would join the ranks of the civilized nations in the world who put appropriate value on life, Mr. Speaker, and disappointment from some on the other side of the aisle, other than a few brave individuals to be distinguished by departing from the herd and recognizing the value and sanctity of life thereto, and immediate news stories about how H.R. 36 was dead on arrival in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the American people will not let that be the case.

I often speak of the history of the Fifth District of Virginia that gave us great Americans like Booker T. Washington and Barbara Johns, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, James Madison, James Monroe, and Patrick Henry.

As I thought about how to best address the need for action in the other Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I determined that there were no better words than

those delivered by Patrick Henry from Virginia, slightly amended, on March 23, 1775, in St. John's Cathedral as he addressed the second Virginia Assembly in Richmond, Virginia.

So with all credit to the author, whom I paraphrase, I would read: Mr. Speaker, no man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism and abilities of the very worthy people who have served and do serve in this Senate.

□ 1215

But different people often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be a thought disrespectful to those Senators if entertaining, as I do, opinions of a character very opposite of many of theirs, I shall speak forth of my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony.

The question before the Senate is one of an awful consequence to this country. For my part, I consider it nothing less than a question of life or death, and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject, ought to be the freedom of debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to our creator and country.

Should I keep back my opinions at such times through a fear of giving offense or political loss? I should consider myself guilty of treason and of cowardice, an act of disloyalty towards the majesty of our creator, who I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. Speaker, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against painful truth and listen to the song of the siren until she transforms us into beasts. Is this the role of wise people engaged in a great and arduous struggle for life? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation?

For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth, to know the worst, and to provide for it. I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience, of history. I have no way of judging the future but by the past.

In judging the past, I wish to know for what has been the conduct of the abortion industry for the last 44 years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen are pleased to solace themselves.

The Senate, is that insidious smile which our petition has been received lately? Trust it not, sir. It will prove a snare at your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with the promise of later action. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with these nearly 60 million lives lost in this country alone, which

cover our waters and darken our lands. Is taking an unborn life a work of love and reconciliation? Is subjecting to pain a 5-month-old child as no other nation save six on the Earth allowed to happen? Let us not deceive ourselves. These are the implements of death and destruction.

I ask what means this perpetual delay of voting? What is its purpose? What is the force of inaction? Can gentlemen assign another possible motive for it than to ensure that it never occurs?

Destruction? No, sir, destruction. They are set to send and perpetuate this loss of life, and have so long supported this loss of life, and now an opportunity presents itself to vote, and what do we have to oppose inaction? Mr. Speaker, we have our voices. Shall we try again and again? Shall we bring this bill back next year? We have been trying that for 40 years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing.

We have held this subject in every light of which it is capable. It has all been, to this date, in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and supplication? What terms shall we find that have not already been exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, Mr. Speaker, deceive ourselves.

We have done everything that we could do to avert this death that has claimed nearly 60 million lives and 14 to 20 million unborn lives after the age of 5 months in utero every single year. We have petitioned, we have remonstrated, we have supplicated, we have prostrated ourselves and have implored its inner position to arrest the tyrannical hands of the abortion industry and its champions in Washington, and our petitions have been slighted. Our remonstrations produce additional death and insult. Our supplications have been disregarded, and we have been spurned with contempt from the floor of the Chamber of the opposing body. In vain these things we may indulge the fond hope of life and justice.

If we support life, if we mean to preserve and violate this fundamental right for which we have been so long arguing, if we mean not basely to abandon this noble struggle which we have been so long engaged in, in which we have pledged ourselves to never abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must hope the American people demand the Senate hold a vote.

An appeal to democracy and to the Lord of hosts is all that is left to us. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a promise of later action. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with the nearly 60 million lives ended.

We can be heard in numbers across the fruited plain. A vote should be held

for or against life. Let us have it. Let us have it. In this vein, sir, to extenuate the matter, gentlemen may cry: Later; later; next year. But there is no later. The killing has continued for over 40 years. The next gale that sweeps to the North will bring to our ears cries of the yet born. The House has voted. Why is the Senate idle? What is it that they wish? What would they have? Is political victory so dear or a title so sweet as to be purchased at the price of human life? Forbid it, Almighty God.

Mr. Speaker, I know not what course others may take, but as for me, my hope is that there is a vote. My hope is that we stand for life.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for October 4 after 8 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Ms. ROSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 178. An act to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 652. A act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 6, 2017, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2774. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Persimmons From New Zealand Into the United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0052] (RIN: 0579-AE26) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2775. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a determination that a negotiated comprehensive subcontracting plan did not meet the subcontracting goals negotiated in their prior fiscal year, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 637 note; Public Law 114-92, Sec. 872(d)(2); (129 Stat. 939); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2776. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that in FY 2017 and FY 2018, the Department proposed no military construction projects under the Sec. 2803(c)(1) of the Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2777. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's report on the Availability of Credit to Small Businesses, September 2017, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 252(a)(1); Public Law 104-208, Sec. 2227(a)(1); (110 Stat. 3009-417); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2778. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2779. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2780. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2781. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2782. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Office of the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding Among the Department of Defense of Australia, and the Ministry of Defence of the Kingdom of Denmark and the Department of Defense of the United States of America, Transmittal No. 01-17, pursuant to Sec. 27(f) of the Arms Export Act, and Executive Order 13637; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2783. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report entitled "Report of U.S. Persons Expropriation Claims and Certain Other Com-

mercial and Investment Disputes", dated October 2017, pursuant to Sec. 527(f) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, Public Law 103-236 dated October 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2784. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-44, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2785. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include the Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222 [Docket No.: 170316279-7279-01] (RIN: 0694-AH38) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2786. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Significant Improvements Needed in DCRA Management of Vacant and Blighted Property Program", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2787. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Endowment's FY 2017 Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2788. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's annual submission regarding agency compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and revised Office of Management and Budget Circular A-123; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2789. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Unified Listing Team, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Pearl Darter [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2016-0037; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BB55) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2790. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Negotiated Non-competitive Agreements for the Use of Sand, Gravel, and/or Shell Resources on the Outer Continental Shelf [Docket ID: BOEM-2010-0041] (RIN: 1010-AD90) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2791. A letter from the Acting Manager, Species Assessment Team, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Guadalupe Fescue; Designation of Critical Habitat for Guadalupe Fescue [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0099 and FWS-R2-ES-2016-0100; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BA74) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Pub-

lic Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2792. A letter from the SAT Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for the Iwi (*Drepanis coccinea*) [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2016-0057; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BB54) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2793. A letter from the SAT Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Sonoyta Mud Turtle [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0103; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ02) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2794. A letter from the Chief, Branch of FS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Technical Correction for Tonkin Snub-nosed Monkey [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2017-0026; 4500090024] (RIN: 1018-BC64) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2795. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's notice — Subsistence Taking of Northern Fur Seals on the Pribilof Islands; Final Annual Subsistence Harvest Levels for 2017-2019 [Docket No.: 170303228-7752-02] (RIN: 0648-BG71) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2796. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report regarding settlements and consent decrees/orders, approved by an officer of the Department of Justice (Second Quarter 2017), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2797. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revised Guidance Related to Obtaining and Reporting Taxpayer Identification Numbers and Dates of Birth by Financial Institutions [Notice 2017-46] received September 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2798. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Treatment Under Section 956(c) of Certain Inventory Temporarily Located in the United States Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria [Notice 2017-55] received September 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2799. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Fringe Benefits Aircraft Valuation Formula (Revenue Ruling 2017-19) received

October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2800. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extended Due Date under Notice 2017-10 for Participants Affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, or Maria [Notice 2017-58] received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2801. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the 23rd report of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act: Impact on U.S. Industries and Consumers and on Beneficiary Countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2704(a)(1); Public Law 102-182, Sec. 206(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-200, Sec. 211(d)(2)); (114 Stat. 287); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2802. A letter from the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on Medicare payments for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, pursuant to the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014, Public Law 113-93; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2989. A bill to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission; with an amendment (Rept. 115-340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HECK, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 3963. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in manufacturing positions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 3964. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to establish additional registration requirements for prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 3965. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations for the provision of transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces recently separated from active duty service and spouses of such members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 3966. A bill to provide that provisions of title 46, United States Code, popularly known as the Jones Act and relating to carriage of passenger and merchandise in coastwise trade shall not apply for 5 years with respect to such carriage to and from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 3967. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize States to restrict interstate waste imports and impose a higher fee on out-of-State waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. EVANS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 3968. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide loan guarantees for the acquisition of cybersecurity technology and services by eligible small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to include certain pension as administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3970. A bill to assist communities affected by stranded nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for community financial institutions with respect to certain rules relating to mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3972. A bill to clarify that family offices and family clients are accredited investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 3973. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require certain enti-

ties to develop internal risk control mechanisms to safeguard and govern the storage of market data; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 3974. A bill to limit the use of taxpayer dollars on non-commercial flights for cabinet officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3975. A bill to require covered entities to provide notification in the case of a breach of unsecured sensitive personally identifiable information in electronic or digital form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. COOK, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 3976. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to allow for certain third-party payments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 3977. A bill to establish the Infrastructure Bank for America to serve as a lender for infrastructure projects, both directly and through State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. KIHUEN):

H.R. 3978. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. SABLON, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3979. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PALONE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. McEACHIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CASTRO of

Texas, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 3980. A bill to establish a United States Commission on Hate Crimes to study and make recommendations on the prevention of the commission of hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 3981. A bill to establish a cost of greenhouse gases for carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide to be used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of, and remove the marriage penalty with respect to, social security benefits excludable from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3983. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to remove the statue to the memory and in honor of Albert Pike erected near Judiciary Square in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALMONE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 3984. A bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and provide for the discoverability and admissibility of gun trace information in civil proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TROTT (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 3985. A bill to establish a working group of public and private entities led by the Food and Drug Administration to recommend voluntary frameworks and guidelines to increase the security and resilience of Internet of Medical Things devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 3986. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national standard for incorporating a passive identification ability into all firearms sold in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3987. A bill to reduce gun violence, fund gun violence research and victim assistance, and enhance the tracking of lost and stolen firearms, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow above-the-line deductions for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 558. A resolution recognizing October 7th as National Trigeminal Neuralgia Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BOST, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 559. A resolution recognizing Navy Pier as a public community resource and treasured Chicago landmark; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VELA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SABLON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 560. A resolution encouraging observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

128. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 82, strongly denouncing and opposing the violent terrorism, totalitarian impulses, xenophobic biases, and bigoted ideologies that are promoted by radical hate groups and declare these groups to be domestic terrorist organizations; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 3963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises," and to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 3965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 3966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or the other Property belonging to the United States . . ."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes).

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 3969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To Make Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 3971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate commerce

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 3973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

. . . make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 3974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 3975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 3977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 3978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 3980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 8, Clause 18: To Make All Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 3981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Equal Access to Justice for Victims of Gun Violence is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 8

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 389: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 559: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 785: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 807: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 850: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 930: Mr. MESSER, Mr. LONG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 936: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1405: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1474: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1475: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1552: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1568: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 1626: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1651: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1655: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1676: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1683: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HARPER, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1832: Ms. ROSEN and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER.

H.R. 1898: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1919: Mr. ROKYTA.

H.R. 1953: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2004: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 2092: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2095: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2259: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2295: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2436: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2472: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 2482: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2583: Mr. NADLER and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2687: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2690: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2712: Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 2740: Mr. WELCH and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2832: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2836: Mr. SOTO, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2899: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2926: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 2936: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 2954: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 3117: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3124: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3145: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3161: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3192: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3222: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3227: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3271: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3273: Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3380: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3395: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 3473: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 3497: Mr. GIBBS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3509: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3699: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3712: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. POCAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3738: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3770: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KATKO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 3773: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3784: Mr. VALADAO and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER.

H.R. 3792: Mr. TONKO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3808: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 3822: Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 3832: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 3845: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3847: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3905: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3930: Mr. BARTON and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3936: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3947: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. COOPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 3957: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H. Con. Res. 56: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 128: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 142: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H. Res. 220: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FASO.

H. Res. 257: Mr. FERGUSON.

H. Res. 283: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 313: Mr. OLSON.

H. Res. 466: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 467: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 511: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PETERS.

H. Res. 555: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING SHELBY O'NEIL

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shelby O'Neil, a dedicated constituent of the 20th Congressional District. At just sixteen years of age, Shelby has found a passion for environmentalism that she has channeled in ways that are truly exceptional.

In my district on the central coast of California, we understand the importance of conservation and respect for the natural environment we all enjoy. Among the many parks and recreation areas in the 20th district, our crown jewel is the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. This pristine stretch of coastline, while enjoyed in many ways by residents and tourists alike, also stands as an enduring responsibility to the residents of the Central Coast to ensure its protection. Protected lands such as the sanctuary in our backyard are living postcards that we pass to future generations. It is up to those future generations to shoulder that burden and rise to the responsibilities. Shelby has answered this call, and has risen to this challenge in truly impressive ways.

Shelby has demonstrated sincere dedication to the cause of reducing ocean pollution and has built a framework with which to engage her peers, neighbors, and businesses in protecting our local environment. She came to develop a passion for this cause by volunteering at the Monterey Bay Aquarium, a world-renowned institution of marine biological research. During her time as a volunteer, Shelby quickly learned about the threat that pollution poses to the ocean. Determined to take action, Shelby founded her own nonprofit organization, the Junior Ocean Guardians. Under Shelby's leadership, the Junior Ocean Guardians have planned several beach clean-up efforts and done classroom presentations at schools around the Central Coast to raise awareness and build support for the organization's mission of protecting our oceans.

In addition, the Junior Ocean Guardians are championing a new initiative called "No Straw November." In my home state of California, a permanent ban has been issued on plastic bags due to the unnecessary pollution they cause in our oceans. However, there is still much work to be done in reducing other sources of plastic pollution. That is why I am so impressed with the Junior Ocean Guardians, who have taken on the goal of ending the use of single use plastic straws, which pose a serious risk to our diverse marine ecosystems on the coast of California. No Straw November represents an effort to raise the public's awareness of the importance of plastic pollution by challenging participants to go an entire month without using a single use plastic

straw. While there is much work to be done in the halls of Congress to address environmental pollution, real change begins by changing our habits and behaviors. By challenging her community to make the small sacrifices necessary to sustain the beautiful natural habitats we all enjoy, Shelby is performing a vital civic duty, and her efforts set her apart as an example for her peers.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to add my name to the recognition of Shelby's accomplishments, and wish her the best in her future endeavors. I encourage all of my colleagues in the House to show their support by joining me in taking the No Straw November challenge.

IN RECOGNITION OF LUZERNE
COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Luzerne County Community College, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. LCCC was founded in 1966 by the Luzerne County Board of Commissioners as a public, two-year college to provide affordable, accessible education for residents of Northeastern Pennsylvania and first began educating students in 1967.

When the College opened in 1967, Northeastern Pennsylvania was facing a pivotal moment in its history as the regional economy shifted away from coal industry jobs. The College responded to the demand for qualified, educated individuals to meet the needs of the area's rapidly changing industrial framework. From a two-building location in Wilkes-Barre, LCCC moved to its permanent, 122-acre location in Nanticoke in 1974. In the early 2000s, LCCC began expanding its reach beyond its Nanticoke Campus to include Hazelton, Berwick, Elk Lake, and its newest location in downtown Scranton.

Today, Luzerne County Community College offers associate degree, certificate, and diploma programs to over 5,000 students annually. The community college option provides affordable college education to a diverse student body from recent high school graduates to adult learners who are returning to the classroom for the first time since high school. LCCC offers programs in Nursing, Criminal Justice, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems.

For many students, their education does not end with Luzerne County Community College. Many choose to continue their education at one of over 40 baccalaureate degree-awarding institutions with which LCCC has matriculation or transfer agreements. Many students in Northeastern Pennsylvania are set on a path-

way toward success that begins with a strong educational groundwork from LCCC.

The College is committed to remaining at the forefront in affordable, accessible education in the Wyoming Valley and continues to adapt and respond to meet the needs of the area's growing and changing educational, economic, and industrial needs.

IN HONOR OF REVEREND ELIJAH
SMITH, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated man of God, community servant, Civil Rights Leader, family man and friend of longstanding, Rev. Elijah Smith, Sr. Sadly, Rev. Smith passed away on October 2, 2017. His funeral service will be held on Saturday, October 7, 2017 at 1 p.m. at the St. Peter A.M.E. Church in Fort Valley, Georgia.

Reverend Elijah Smith, Sr. was born on December 28, 1939, in Fort Valley, Georgia, to the union of the late Mr. Samuel L. Smith and the late Mrs. Ola M. Johnson Smith. He was educated in the Peach County School System.

On October 11, 1964, Reverend Smith received a calling that would change his life forever—he was called to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He acknowledged this calling at the Allen Chapel A.M.E. Church in Peach County. His first pastoral appointment occurred in 1967 in the Eastman Circuit in Eastman, Georgia. He served in Eastman for four years. He was then assigned to the Allen Chapel and Mountain Creek A.M.E. Churches in Sumter County where he served for a total of 13 years. In 1984, he was assigned to the St. John A.M.E. Church in Columbus, Georgia. During this time, the church was destroyed by a tornado and he was instrumental in the rebuilding of the church at its current location on Steam Mill Road in Columbus. He served at St. John for ten years. Because of his legacy of service and his commitment to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, he was appointed by Bishop Donald George Kenneth Ming as the Presiding Elder of the Eastern District. He was at the time one of three presiding Elders in the Southwest Georgia Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. At the time of his retirement as a Presiding Elder, he was senior Presiding Elder in charge of thirty-six churches. He also retired as a Civil Service Employee at Robins Air Force Base, as an electronic technician. He also was an entrepreneur, as he was the owner of D and S Florist in Fort Valley, Georgia.

Shirley Chisholm once said that, "Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth." Reverend Smith not

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

only paid his rent, as a minister of the gospel, but he paid his rent with his many social and civic affiliations. During his lifetime, he received many awards to include: Joseph Roscoe Campbell Freedom Award for service to the Concerned Citizens Movement for the Americus-Sumter County NAACP; Special Recognition Award for outstanding and dedicated service to the Americus Police Department and the Sumter County Community for his spiritual guidance as chaplain; The Martin Luther King, Jr. Minister's Community Service Award in recognition of outstanding and meritorious service to the church and community from the Columbus; Georgia Chapter of Push; the Sixth Episcopal District (state of Georgia) sons of Allen Award of Support; one of the 50 Most influential African Americans in the Columbus-Ft. Benning and Phenix City Area. He was also a lifetime member of the NAACP, since March of 1996. Reverend Smith served as a past President of the Americus-Sumter Branch of the NAACP. He was always pushing African-Americans to use their political power at the ballot box to effectuate positive social change.

Rev. Elijah Smith loved people and he always fought for what was right. He was guided by his love of God and his love of people. Mother Teresa once said that, "At the end of life we will not be judged by how many diplomas we have received, how much money we have made, how many great things we have done. We will be judged by 'I was hungry, and you gave me something to eat, I was naked and you clothed me. I was homeless, and you took me in.'" Rev. Elijah Smith used his life for good and to help others. He always believed that the "time is always right to do that which is right."

On a personal note, Rev. Smith and his family have been dear friends to my wife Vivian and me for many years, and I will always value the support, encouragement and counsel that he imparted to me over the years.

Rev. Elijah Smith was a great man and accomplished many things in his life, but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of his family. His legacy lives on through his wife, Janet, his children, step children, grandchildren and all of those that he touched in a special way.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730 000 constituents of the Second Congressional District of Georgia salute and honor the life of Reverend Elijah Smith, Sr. for his commitment to spreading the Gospel of Jesus Christ for over five decades and serving humankind. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest condolences to Reverend Smith's family during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL JAY SILVERIA, SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant General Jay Silveria, the Superintendent of the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado, and include in the RECORD the transcript of his powerful remarks. After five African-American cadet candidates found racial slurs written on the doors of their dorm rooms, Lt. Gen. Silveria gathered the cadets together and forcefully denounced the acts of racism in a speech that has gained national attention, with more than 1.7 million views on Facebook and over 22,000 shares on Twitter.

Our nation was founded on the principles of equality and the inalienable rights of our citizens. Throughout our history Americans like Lt. General Silveria have fought to defend these rights. His remarks are the masterpiece of a true patriot and one we should all remember and be inspired by as we continue to strive for E Pluribus Unum and a more perfect union.

[Full Remarks, 28 September 2017]

(By Lieutenant General Jay Silveria)

Ladies and gentlemen, you may have heard that some people down in the prep school wrote some racial slurs on some message boards. If you haven't heard that, I wanted you to hear it from me. If you're outraged by those words then you're in the right place. That kind of behavior has no place at the prep school, it has no place at USAFA, and it has no place in the US Air Force.

You should be outraged, not only as an airman, but as a human being. And I'll tell you, that the appropriate response for horrible language and horrible ideas, the appropriate response is a better idea. So that's why I'm here. That's why all these people are up here on the staff tower, so let me have everybody who's up here please pull forward to the rails. Also, there's so many people here, they're lining the outsides along the windows. These are members of the faculty, coaching staff, AOC's, AMT's, from the airfield, from my staff, from my headquarters, all aspects of the 10th Airbase Wing, all aspects that make up USAFA and the United States Air Force Academy leadership is here. You heard from Brigadier General Goodwin, Brigadier General Armacost is here, Colonel Block from the athletic department is here, Mr. Knowlton is in Washington, DC right now.

That's why they're here. That's why we're all here, because we have a better idea. Some of you may think that that happened down in the prep school and doesn't apply to us. I would be naive and we would all be naive to think that everything is perfect here. We would be naive to think that we shouldn't discuss this topic. We would also be tone-deaf not to think about the backdrop of what's going on in our country. Things like Charlottesville and Ferguson, the protests in the NFL, that's why we have a better idea. One of those ideas, the Dean brought people together to discuss Charlottesville because what we should have is a civil discourse and talk about these issues, that's a better idea.

We received outstanding feedback from that session at Charlottesville, but I also

have a better idea and it's about our diversity, and it's the power of the diversity, the power of the 4,000 of you and all of the people that are on the staff tower and lining the glass, the power of us as a diverse group, the power that we come from all walks of life, that we come from all parts of this country, that we come from all races, we come from all backgrounds, gender, all makeup, all upbringing. The power of that diversity comes together and makes us that much more powerful. That's a much better idea than small thinking and horrible ideas. We have an opportunity here, 5,500 people in this room, to think about what we are as an institution. This is our institution and no one can take away our values. No one can write on a board and question our values. No one can take that away from us.

So just in case you're unclear on where I stand on this topic, I'm going to leave you with my most important thought today: If you can't treat someone with dignity and respect, then you need to get out. If you can't teach someone from another gender, whether that's a man or a woman, with dignity and respect, then you need to get out. If you demean someone in any way, then you need to get out. And if you can't treat someone from another race or a different color skin with dignity and respect, then you need to get out.

Reach for your phones. I'm serious, reach for your phones. OK, you don't have to reach for your phones, I'm going to give you an opportunity to reach for your phones. I want you to videotape this so that you can have it, so that you can use it, so that we all have the moral courage together, all of us on the staff tower lining the glass, all of us in this room. This is our institution, and if you need it, and you need my words, then you keep these words. And you use them and you remember them and you share them and you talk about them. If you can't treat someone with dignity and respect, then get out.

IN HONOR OF THE HONORABLE SAM FARR AND THE ELEVATION OF PINNACLES TO A NATIONAL PARK

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my predecessor in this seat, the Honorable Sam Farr, for one of the most significant accomplishments of his public career. In 2012, he led a remarkable bi-partisan effort to pass legislation that elevated the Pinnacles National Monument to our nation's 59th national park. On Saturday, October 7, the Pinnacles National Park Foundation will recognize Sam for this instrumental contribution to the conservation and interpretation of our nation's natural heritage.

Mr. Speaker, the Pinnacles is a truly remarkable place, but the Pinnacles National Park is more than its stunning scenery. The remnant of a 23 million-year-old volcano, the San Andreas fault carried the Pinnacles several hundred miles north to its present location. Its unique habitats form an island of biodiversity that is home to numerous unique plant and animal species, including the California Condor and over 400 species of bees.

It is also a place for people. The indigenous Amah Mutsun and Pinnacih peoples lived amongst, traveled through, and revered the Pinnacles for thousands of years. The Spanish friars planted one of California's first vineyards in the shadow of the Pinnacles. After California became part of the United States, local ranchers would take summer trips to the Pinnacles caves to escape the heat. A rancher from one of those families, Schuler Hain, led a public campaign to have the Federal Government protect the Pinnacles. That culminated in President Theodore Roosevelt designating the Pinnacles a National Monument in 1908.

In the 5 years since its elevation to National Park status, even more people have come to visit the Pinnacles. This has provided a remarkable boost for the surrounding communities' economies, who have seen increases in their hospitality business. Prior to arriving to Congress, I heard Sam tell the story that the idea to author legislation initially came during a Rotary meeting in a community near the Pinnacles. A Rotarian suggested that making the Pinnacles a National Park would help the local economy.

Sam took that idea, added the environmental conservation element, and crafted legislation that could garner widespread support. He found a Republican partner in our colleague JEFF DENHAM. Together, they helped steer the bill through the House and ultimately to President Obama's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in thanking Sam for his years of service, and in particular for his efforts to designate Pinnacles National Park. The Honorable Sam Farr has given us a living postcard we can send to our children and grandchildren. Our community is forever grateful for his service.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BOB FRASCA

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, friends, partners and admirers of Bob Frasca are gathering in Portland to honor his career of over 50 years. Bob was a founder of one of America's leading architectural firms, Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects. Since its humble beginnings, ZGF has grown to be one of the premier architectural firms in the world with 600 design professionals networked across six offices in the U. S. and Canada. Portland, across the country, and around the world, ZGF has received accolades and awards for its design work.

The firm would not be where it is today without the leadership and influence of Bob Frasca.

Bob graduated with a Bachelor of Architecture from the University of Michigan, and a Master of City Planning from MIT. He moved to Portland in 1959 and became the partner-in-charge of design for ZGF in 1966. Over the years, I have witnessed his significant impact in the Portland region with his emphasis on

designs that build communities. He has played an important role in the evolution of Portland as livable city, thanks to his collaboration with others and his advocacy for the civic role architects and architecture play in making a great city. He was instrumental in the redevelopment of Portland's waterfront and defined the "heart" of downtown that later became Pioneer Square. His design influence is seen in the Portland skyline with projects like the Justice Center, the KOIN Tower and the Oregon Convention Center, as well as Portland International Airport.

His portfolio of user-driven buildings has been recognized for creating environments that foster health and innovation, demonstrated by the National Institutes of Health Mark O. Hatfield Clinical Research Center, the Duke University Fitzpatrick Center for Interdisciplinary Sciences, and the Dana Farber Cancer Institute Yawkey Center for Cancer Care. His work in urban contexts has continued with projects such as Twelve West in Portland and 1200 Seventeenth Street in Washington, DC, and his international reach has touched U.S. embassies and consulates in Istanbul, Sofia, and Manila.

With Bob's leadership, ZGF's design excellence and architecture raised the firm's profile worldwide. Clients have engaged them to develop projects from single structures to entire eco-districts, pioneering a new urban planning approach to create resilient neighborhoods, grounded in placemaking and community stakeholder engagement for a collective, sustainable vision.

Throughout his career, Bob has received numerous awards, including the AIA Northwest & Pacific Region Medal of Honor for his contributions to the built environment, his advocacy for design excellence and ongoing mentorship of emerging design talent, the Watzek Award for Contributions to the Enrichment of the State of Oregon, and the Honored Citizen Award from the Architectural Foundation of Oregon.

Bob Frasca's illustrious career deserves a hearty congratulations. His leadership, passion for the process of design, and ethic of environmental stewardship has raised the architectural bar and the quality of the urban experience throughout the nation, internationally, and most importantly, here at home in Portland, Oregon.

RECOGNIZING THE LEGAL SERVICES OF GREATER MIAMI

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize an inspiring organization located in my Congressional District, Legal Services of Greater Miami, that for over 50 years has fought tirelessly for equality and justice for low income families of South Florida.

Legal Services is dedicated to helping our most vulnerable neighbors including women, children, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, low wage workers and the homeless, and continues to create a positive impact on our community.

Legal Services of Greater Miami has transitioned to a new location and will be better able to assist people in need.

Thank you to all the attorneys, to the staff and to the volunteers of Legal Services for providing much needed assistance to the most vulnerable members of our community.

TRIBUTE TO LIANNE DENNSTEDT

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Lianne Dennstedt, who passed away in Flagstaff, Arizona on Monday, September 18, 2017. Lianne was the eldest daughter of Brenda Dennstedt, Vice President of the Western Municipal Water District Board of Directors, and Shawn Dennstedt, a 24-year veteran of the San Diego County Sheriffs Department, as well as the older sister of Jaimee Dennstedt. She will be greatly missed.

Lianne attended Murrieta Valley High School in Murrieta, California, where she was a decorated cross country runner in addition to being an excellent student. Following her graduation in 2016 with a full International Baccalaureate diploma, she decided to attend Northern Arizona University (NAU) in Flagstaff, Arizona, due to its high scholastic standards. In her freshman year at NAU, Lianne selected Environmental Science as her major and made the Dean's List both semesters.

Just a few weeks ago, Lianne had just begun her sophomore year at NAU when she became ill with a severe sore throat. A week later, she was admitted to the hospital with meningitis, double pneumonia and renal failure. Despite her strength, the unwavering support of her family and dedicated actions by her medical team, Lianne lost her battle with this aggressive illness. I join the Dennstedt family in expressing my heartfelt appreciation to the doctors, nursing staff and team of medical specialists at Flagstaff Medical Center for their heroic efforts, kindness and compassion during this incredibly difficult time.

I had the distinct privilege of knowing Lianne and her family for many years, and there are simply no words that soften the heartbreaking loss of Lianne's loving and bright spirit. I extend my heartfelt condolences to the entire Dennstedt family and her friends. Although Lianne may be gone, I know that the joy and happiness she brought to those around her will endure forever.

106TH NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 106th National Day of the Republic of China. The annual celebration commemorates the start of the Wuchang Uprising of October 10, 1911, which led to the

collapse of the Qing dynasty in China and the establishment of the Republic of China on January 1, 1912. Double Ten Day is marked every year in Denver, Colorado with an honorable reception organized by our local Double Ten Day Celebration Committee.

I rise today to acknowledge Chairman, Dr. Paul C. Cheng and the volunteers who serve on the Double Ten Celebration Committee. Additionally, I would like to recognize the past Chairs of the Double Ten Celebration Committee who have served since I have represented the Sixth Congressional District; Nancy Tan, Nelson Ho, Ming Der Liu, Sylvia Edgar, Dr. Tai Dan Hsu, Lily Shen and Kevin Hsu, who have each year managed to expertly execute this important event in our community. The United States and Taiwan enjoy a long-standing relationship that stems from our shared values: democracy, the rule of law, and free enterprise. The Taiwanese-Americans living in Colorado bring a wealth of knowledge and entrepreneurial energy to our community, contributing in an integral way to its growth and success.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my warmest and best wishes to the people of Taiwan on this 106th National Day of the Republic of China. I also extend my congratulations to Chairman Dr. Paul C. Cheng and the Double Ten Celebration Committee on organizing another successful Double Ten Celebration for our community in Colorado. The work of this committee has helped the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office to excel in its services to and relationship with the greater Denver area community. I look forward attending this event every year and to the continued and growing friendship and partnership between the United States and Taiwan.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF DUNCAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly voted no on Roll Call. No. 555 as I was distracted by reporters walking in to the Chamber due to the events in Las Vegas. I intended to vote yes on the Republican Study Committee Budget Substitute as I have for the previous six years.

TRIBUTE TO OREGON HONOR FLIGHT

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize 45 Oregon veterans who are visiting our nation's capital this Saturday, October 7, as part of the South Willamette Valley Honor Flight. These brave individuals risked their lives to protect and defend the United States and are now here to visit those monuments and memorials they helped inspire.

The veterans on this honor flight are as follows:

World War II—Bud Barnes, Army; Don Copenhagen, Army; Bud Garrett, Navy; Ed Hemmingson, Merchant Marines; Wally High, Navy; Arlie Holte, Army; Bob LeBlanc, Navy; Ray Maggard, Navy; Carl Mason, Navy; Ralph Morse, Marine Corps; Curt Wiese, Navy; Stan Wilson, Marine Corps.

Korean War—Larry Adair, Army; Gene Amundson, Army; Paulie Bokn, Army; Jim Broughton, Navy; Stan Clark, Air Force; Joe Couture, Air Force; John Dobson, Navy; Carl Gripenburg, Army; Marshall Heflin, Air Force; Don Hinkle, Navy; Terry Howard, Army; William Macauley, Air Force; Dorrance Mattson, Air Force; Ed Stelling, Army; Ida Stemple, Navy; Charlie Stoakes, Army; Ed Sullivan, Air Force; Jay Surgeon, Navy; Ron Swanson, Air Force; Maurice Thorne, Air Force; Les Warner, Army.

Vietnam War—Kham Bounnavong, Army; Paul Fiegener, Army; Joe Grace, Army; Ken Henderson, Army; Mike Kisinger, Navy; Dick Mann, Army; Tim Mulhern, Marine Corps; Bob Pieper, Air Force; Ralph Wendt, Army; Bob Whitehead, Navy.

It is my privilege to include their names in the RECORD and my sincere hope that you'll join me in recognizing them for their extraordinary service.

TAIWAN 106TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 106th anniversary of the founding of Taiwan, also known as the Republic of China, which occurred following the Xinhai Revolution to overthrow the last imperial Chinese dynasty.

Taiwan has been nothing short of an economic miracle. Increased investment in infrastructure, education, and communications during the latter half of the 20th Century spurred rapid economic growth and elevated Taiwan to prominence as one of the "Four Asian Tigers." Taiwan is home to Foxconn, one of the largest electronics manufacturers in the world, as well as other large technology companies such as ASUS, Pegatron, and Quanta Computer.

The United States and Taiwan enjoy a strong, albeit unofficial, relationship, which is maintained by the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT). On the commercial side, Taiwan is the U.S.'s 9th largest trading partner and the U.S. is Taiwan's second largest trading partner. In 2016, U.S. trade with Taiwan totaled an estimated \$84.9 billion. Cultural relations have also prospered in recent years. Travel from Taiwan to the U.S. has increased by 50 percent since Taiwan became a member of the U.S. Visa Waiver Program in 2012.

My home state of Georgia also has a strong trade relationship with Taiwan. In 2013, the Georgia General Assembly passed a resolution supporting a free trade agreement between Taiwan and the U.S. Last year, Georgia's exports to Taiwan generated over \$420 million. Georgia's position as a global logistics

and transportation hub has attracted investment from the Taiwanese auto parts industry. There are also a number of Georgia companies spanning across multiple industries that have operations in Taiwan.

As a member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the people of Taiwan on their economic development in the last few decades. The hard work and ingenuity of the Taiwanese people are testaments to their economic success and flourishing democracy. I look forward to continued cooperation and goodwill between our two countries in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. GEORGE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH OF SHREVEPORT

HON. MIKE JOHNSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise and recognize the 100th anniversary of the St. George Greek Orthodox Church in Shreveport, La. For over a century, this congregation has blessed our community by spreading the love of God and continuing the tradition of giving back to one's neighbors.

In the beginning of the 20th century, some of the first Greek immigrants settled in Shreveport, La., and recognized the need for greater unity among the small community of orthodox families. They then founded a congregation that would grow to what we now know as the St. George Greek Orthodox Church. The name, "Saint George," was chosen in honor of the Saint George Church of New Ephesus in Asia Minor, which was destroyed during the Turko-Grecian struggle in 1917. Religious liberty is a core principle in the United States. While fleeing religious persecution, many Greeks found their new home in Northwest Louisiana.

Today, the church is considered the heart of the region's beloved Greek community and is distinguished by its rich and colorful artwork and architecture depicting insights of orthodoxy. The congregation of St. George has a long history of generosity and compassion and includes some of our closest personal friends. The congregation has hosted countless charitable events to support its three major philanthropic organizations: the Ladies Philoptochos Society, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association and the Daughters of Penelope. For over 60 years, the Philoptochos have held an annual pastry sale to raise funds for numerous charitable organizations, providing aid to anyone who may need it.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress and the people of Northwest Louisiana, I am privileged to recognize the St. George Greek Orthodox Church and celebrate over 100 years of their dedication to the betterment of our community. I, along with my wife, Kelly, pray the Lord continues to bless this congregation and their important ministries.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKY ROSEN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 4th, on Roll Call votes 551, 552, 553, and 554. I was not present because I was tending to my community in Las Vegas, in the aftermath of the deadliest mass shooting in United States history. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call vote 551, NAY on Roll Call vote 552, NAY on Roll Call vote 553, and NAY on roll call vote 554.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE THE STATUE OF CONFEDERATE GENERAL ALBERT PIKE

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to require the removal of a statue of Confederate General Albert Pike, which is currently located on federal land near Judiciary Square in the District of Columbia. This statue was authorized by Congress in 1898, and was paid for by both federal and private funds—the Freemasons, of which Pike was a member, donated the majority of the money needed to build and install the statue in 1901. I oppose tearing down Confederate statues, because I believe they should be moved to more appropriate settings, like museums, to avoid erasing an important part of history from which Americans must continue to learn. However, Pike was a Confederate general who served dishonorably and was forced to resign in disgrace. Soldiers under his command were found to have mutilated the bodies of Union soldiers, and he was ultimately imprisoned after his fellow officers reported that he had been misappropriating funds. Adding to the dishonor of taking up arms against the United States, Pike dishonored even his Confederate military service. He certainly has no claim to be memorialized in the nation's capital. Even those who do not want Confederate statues removed will have to justify according Pike any honor considering his history.

After meeting with the Freemasons, I believe that the best course of action is to remove the statue and find a more appropriate place for it. The Freemasons themselves have said they “will support an action . . . to remove the statue forthwith so that it shall not serve as a source of contention or strife for the residents of our community.” The Mayor of the District of Columbia and the D.C. Council also support the removal of the statue.

My bill clarifies that no federal funds will be used to take the Pike statue down. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JOSEPH OF MARAMURES ROMANIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to help commemorate the 25th anniversary of St. Joseph of Maramures Romanian Orthodox Church. St. Joseph's, the only Romanian Orthodox Church in Luzerne County, has grown from humble beginnings to become a beacon of faith in our community.

In 1992, a small group of Romanians located in Hazleton, Pennsylvania decided to form a mission. With nothing other than faith and a desire to succeed, their mission became a reality.

On April 19, 1992, with the blessing of the Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America and His Eminence, Archbishop Nathaniel, St. Joseph's first Divine Liturgy was officiated by Rev. Fr. Onisie Morar. Over the next year, the Mission held its services in various locations, including Emil and Dorina Horga's property in Hazleton, where the first Resurrection Service was officiated, as well as St. Michael's Orthodox Church in Freeland. By the grace of God and the kindness of others, such as Fr. Lawrence Baigger, all of the church's services were officiated for its parishioners during this time.

While services were held at St. Michael's, the newly formed Mission began to organize and strengthen. The Mission Council and Ladies Auxiliaries Organization were formed and with them, so did the ability to obtain a personal place of worship. In 1993, the Mission Council purchased the United Methodist Church in Hazleton, adopting the name of Palm Sunday Romanian Church. When the mortgage was paid in 1999, the parish changed its name to St. Joseph of Maramures Romanian Orthodox Church.

Since then, through the dedication of its parishioners, the parish has formed a strong community within itself, as well as with others in the surrounding areas. With the guidance of Fr. Cristian Preda, the parish has continued to preserve the traditions of the Orthodox Christian faith, touching many lives in our community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing St. Joseph of Maramures Romanian Orthodox Church as it celebrates its 25th anniversary, and wishing its parishioners all the best in the years to come.

A HAPPY DOUBLE TEN DAY TO THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, October 10th is Taiwan's National Day—also known as Double Ten Day. I would like to take this opportunity now to offer my early best wishes to the people of Taiwan.

As my colleagues are aware, Taiwan is a close friend, as well as security and trade partner of the United States. Accordingly, the United States has declared its support for Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations where its membership is not possible. In my home state of Iowa, we are enthusiastic to build on our already strong trade ties. In 2016, Iowa's exports to Taiwan reached \$153.87 million, making Taiwan Iowa's 5th largest export market in Asia.

Iowa and every state in the nation would benefit from the signing of a free trade agreement between Taiwan and the U.S., which would eliminate tariffs on most products and increase Taiwanese demand and Iowa exports. Though a small country with a population of 23 million, Taiwan has the potential to become a strong export market for Iowa and the U.S. Taiwan is a major importer of U.S. agriculture goods. Other sectors such as Iowa's strong wind energy sector have potential for bilateral cooperation as well.

Mr. Speaker, again, I wish the people of Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day. And I take this opportunity to echo the words of Barry Goldwater when he said, “I have great affection for the Chinese people, their culture, their skills, and their potential.”

RECOGNIZING DANA FERREIRA

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the commitment and dedication of my Senior Field Representative, Dana Ferreira. Dana served 15 years as an essential member of my team.

Dana graduated from Hartnell College in 1989 with her Associate of Arts in General Studies. After graduating, she became a licensed Insurance Agent for Marini Insurance Agency. Six years later, she joined my team while I worked for the California State Senate. In 2010, I was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and she stayed by my side as District Scheduler and later as a Senior Field Representative. Dana has been an integral member of my staff and instrumental in the successes of my district office.

Dana has established solid and lasting relationships in California's 10th District as a pillar in our community. From Mayors to community leaders, she has entered the lives of many through her professionalism and personality. Since 2003, Dana has been profoundly involved in the Rotary Club, beginning in Salinas and then in Modesto. She selflessly volunteers her time for many organizations and causes and has been recognized for many worthy achievements and accomplishments.

One of Dana's many preferred pastimes is attending concerts; she especially likes seeing her favorite band, Tesla. On Saturdays, you can catch Dana cheering on the Oklahoma Sooners football team with her two cats, Milo and Luca.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending my good friend, Dana Ferreira, for her many years of service, devotion, and

outstanding contributions to our community. We wish her continued success in her future endeavors.

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS DISASTER
RELIEF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge this body to send urgent aid to the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and all of our Caribbean neighbors in its federal response to this year's devastating hurricane season.

Hurricanes Harvey, Jose, Irma and now Maria have ravaged our southern border, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and our friends and neighbors in the Caribbean.

Sadly, the pace of federal response in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico has been much too slow.

Nearly three weeks after Hurricane Irma, a category 5 hurricane, decimated the Virgin Islands, residents are still having trouble receiving appropriate aid and commodities.

Now, nearly two weeks after another category 5 storm tore through St. Croix, the U.S. Virgin Islands' three main islands have lost its economy, its physical infrastructure and scores of its people.

Insufficient quantities of food and supplies, lack of power, extremely long fuel lines, and lack of communication and cell phone coverage have left the Virgin Islands utterly decimated.

The Virgin Islands are in a humanitarian crisis, Mr. Speaker. No American citizen should be forced to endure these conditions, especially not with the level of resources at the disposal of our federal government.

My heart breaks for these families. I urge my colleagues and the Trump Administration to fund all necessary resources not only to address the urgent humanitarian crisis but also the sustained commitment support funding necessary to help rebuild and restore infrastructure necessary for their economy and people to move forward.

IN CELEBRATION OF 25 YEARS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN'S
WILLIAM DAVIDSON INSTITUTE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate 25 years of the University of Michigan's William Davidson Institute (WDI). The Institute has helped shape businesses and social welfare through its distinguished international service and education.

In 1992, Guardian Industries, an international manufacturer of glass products, determined the importance of establishing an educational institute to contribute to the economic transformation that was occurring throughout the world as new market economies began to develop in previously socialist countries. They

named it in honor of then Guardian Industries Chairman, President and CEO, William Davidson. Mr. Davidson envisioned a world class institute that helps "forge a path for those responsible for economic change in emerging markets." Since its founding, the William Davidson Institute has cultivated a repository of methods and resources for creating a market economy that is unmatched in its breadth and depth. From economic education to increased access to healthcare, WDI works with countries and world leaders to analyze specific areas of need and to institute change.

The Institute's main initiatives include education, financial sector development, health care, performance measurement and scaling impact. Staff at the William Davidson Institute work alongside businesses, government agencies and other academic institutions to implement initiative-based programs and economic change. Programs run by the Institute include: operating a community college initiative in Jordan that fosters business skills and vocational coursework, assessing equipment needed for a new hotel in Ethiopia, instituting wireless telecommunication service in rural communities in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, and upgrading the University of Liberia's accounting program to meet international education standards. The institute also serves as a partner to other international programs, including Goldman Sachs' 10,000 Women Program that helps underprivileged women in Rwanda grow their self-owned small businesses. Over the past 25 years, the William Davidson Institute has been a global leader in international economic development and social freedom. I know this Institute will continue to effect meaningful change in countries across the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the William Davidson Institute on its 25th anniversary. The Institute has been instrumental in growing economies and empowering business leaders internationally.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF LUZERNE COUNTY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to help commemorate the 50th anniversary of Luzerne County Community College. The College was founded in 1967 with just two buildings in Wilkes-Barre and 836 students, and has since become the largest college in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

As a student-centered learning institution, Luzerne County Community College gives students the tools they need to meet the world's most daunting challenges through practical access to real-world skills, classroom diversity that embodies the human experience, and quality teacher-student contact.

Seven years after its founding, the College moved to a permanent 122-acre campus in Nanticoke, which provided the necessary space to handle the increasing student population. Since 1974, the College has continued to expand its offerings to underserved areas throughout Northeastern Pennsylvania. It opened up sites in Hazleton, Berwick, Shamokin, Kulpmont, and downtown Wilkes-Barre. In 2008, Luzerne County Community College opened its Public Safety Training Institute. Two years later, the College expanded

its main campus into downtown Nanticoke by opening the Joseph A. Paglianite Culinary Institute. The following year, it opened the Francis S. and Mary Gill Carroza, R.N. Health Sciences Center.

Currently, the Luzerne County Community College offers 82 occupational programs, 24 liberal arts and transfer programs, and 10 credit-free career training programs. As of today, the College boasts more than 32,000 degree-holding alumni.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Luzerne County Community College as it celebrates its 50th anniversary. On behalf of a grateful community, I wish to thank the College, its faculty, and its staff for their tireless service to the community and unwavering commitment to accessible education.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CYBER
BREACH NOTIFICATION ACT

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, the data breach at Equifax, one of three major American credit-reporting companies in the United States, exposed the personal and financial information of up to 143 million Americans. The data breach gave hackers access to Americans' highly sensitive personal and financial information, including Social Security numbers, birth dates, home addresses, driver's license numbers, credit card numbers, and credit dispute claims.

The data breach occurred in May 2017, and, the agency became aware of the breach on July 29, 2017, but did not report it to the public until 40 days later. The delay in disclosing the breach is concerning because almost half of all Americans' sensitive information could be in the hands of cyber criminals, who are willing and ready to use that information for identity fraud and other crimes.

Cyber breaches like this one present a risk to privacy and individuals' personal financial welfare. In 2002, I helped pass California's data breach law requiring businesses and government agencies to notify residents of data breaches. This notification law was instrumental in ensuring the public was informed and could mitigate harm. It is imperative that breaches are reported in a timely manner for individuals to begin taking the appropriate steps in protecting their identities and financial information.

That is why, today, I am introducing the Cyber Breach Notification Act to establish federal standards modeled after California's data notification law and HIPAA's data notification provisions, which is currently in place to notify individuals of data breaches. This legislation will require businesses to notify individuals affected by data breaches "in the most expedient time possible and without unreasonable delay." Additionally, this legislation establishes a federal standard for data breach notification laws, but does not preempt current state breach notification laws or preclude states from creating more robust laws. This will ensure that millions of Americans are given proper and timely notice after a data breach to begin to mitigate harm.

SENATE—Friday, October 6, 2017

The Senate met at 10:30 and 5 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BOOZMAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY,
OCTOBER 10, 2017, AT 9:15 A.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:15 a.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 2017.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:30 and 40 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 10, 2017, at 9:15 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, October 6, 2017

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 6, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK MEADOWS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Reverend Phillip Ganir, S.J., Gonzaga Jesuit Community, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Loving God, source of all healing and hope, for the diverse people of this Nation we represent, thank You.

For strength of mind and body, thank You.

For the gift of freedom in our country, thank You.

Send Your spirit to guide our deliberations this day. May this work bring greater justice, peace, and healing, especially for those who suffer most.

Align our work with the freedom which defines and sustains us; amidst competing priorities, give us wisdom to discern wisely; in the face of disagreement, ground us in civility; when discouragement looms, let a sense of humor remind us of our humanity; and when the goals for the common good seem distant, inspire passion within us to act courageously, always mindful that Your good gifts become more apparent when we seek unity and peace.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Thursday, October 5, 2017:

H.R. 1117, to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1117. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, October 10, 2017.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 10, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV,

2803. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-42, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia,

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 3989. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to clarify and improve the procedures and accountability for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, to ensure that the barriers to sharing critical foreign intelligence among the intelligence community that existed before September 11, 2001, are not reimposed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 3990. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to reform the Antiquities Act of 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3991. A bill to amend section 303(g)(2) of the Controlled Substances Act to allow certain pharmacists to dispense narcotic drugs for maintenance or detoxification treatment pursuant to the same waiver provisions as apply with respect to nurse practitioners and physician assistants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3992. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay application of, transition to, and limit savings for the home health groupings model under the Medicare home health prospective payment system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN (for herself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mr. SABLÁN):

H.R. 3993. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include United States nationals among the eligible employees of an EB-5 commercial enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 3994. A bill to establish the Office of Internet Connectivity and Growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. PINGREE):

H. Res. 561. A resolution commending the cooperative business model and the businesses, employees, and practitioners nationally and internationally who use it for their contributions to the economy and social impacts they make on their communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Article III of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 3990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 3993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause I, it provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States"

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 246: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 273: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 392: Mr. FERGUSON and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 442: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 669: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 681: Mr. FLORES and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 685: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 719: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 741: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 799: Mr. TURNER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 821: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 849: Mr. CAPUANO and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1046: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1078: Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MENG, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1124: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 1276: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CRIST, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 1377: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1464: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1516: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1587: Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1697: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1815: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2029: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2133: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 2309: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 2340: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2401: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2404: Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2631: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2633: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2670: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2690: Mr. POLIS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 2747: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 2790: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2859: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2936: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 2996: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 3238: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3248: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3312: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUNN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3617: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3632: Mr. HURD and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 3641: Mr. KILMER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 3660: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3666: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3730: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3759: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 3814: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 3845: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3878: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3947: Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 283: Mr. SUOZZI.

H. Res. 307: Mr. MESSER.

H. Res. 367: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Res. 495: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 529: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KIND, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 3 by Mr. GARRETT on House Resolution 458: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING BOULTER INDUSTRIAL CONTRACTORS

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable achievement—the 125th anniversary of Boulter Industrial Contractors located in Webster, New York. Founded in 1892 by Thomas Boulter, the company started by delivering coal and ice by horse drawn wagons and is now Western New York's premier mover of heavy machinery for manufacturing and infrastructure projects. Even though decades have passed since those starting days, the company still displays their original wagons in remarkable condition as a reminder of how far they have come.

The growth of Boulter Industrial Contractors as a family-run business is a true success story in American entrepreneurship. Under the leadership of President and CEO William S. Boulter, a fifth-generation member of the Boulter family, and their hard-working employees the company is proudly carrying on Thomas Boulter's legacy. Congress should never lose sight of companies like this. That's why a flag that has flown over the U.S. Capitol flies over Boulter today. I congratulate the Boulter family and its employees, several of which are veterans.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF RACHELLE DEANNE O'NEIL

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Rachelle O'Neil, who served as a constituent services representative in my District Office for 15 years.

A Houston native who is proud of her Ragin'-Cajun roots, Rachelle is one of eight children born to the late Audrey Ann Colbert-O'Neil and George O'Neil, Sr. Her loving parents instilled a passion for education that inspires Ms. O'Neil to this day. In fact, Mr. Speaker, she recently graduated magna cum laude with master's degree in public administration from the University of Texas at Arlington.

While earning undergraduate degrees from the University of Houston in psychology and political science, Ms. O'Neil won the Mickey Leland Congressional Internship opportunity, which brought her to the U.S. Capitol where she worked in former Representative Carrie P. Meek's (D-FL) congressional office. The experience, which included meeting President Bill Clinton, cemented her passion in working on the behalf of the American people.

Within a few years of relocating to Atlanta, Ms. O'Neil joined my congressional staff, and Mr. Speaker, please trust me when I say that she hit the ground running. Rachelle assists constituents with judiciary, education, health, Social Security, child welfare, and transportation matters, and she is a tireless advocate for women and girls. Mr. Speaker, few people can match her passionate, fierce pursuit of justice and equity.

Over the years, Ms. O'Neil developed innumerable constituent service programs and initiatives, but perhaps none as personal as those that focus on future generations. Inspired by her time caring for Daniel, Princess, Annquenet, and TyRochelle, the children of her late twin sister, Michelle, Rachelle developed our office's Youth Council that sought to develop and engage young leaders in Metro Atlanta.

In her personal time, Ms. O'Neil puts family and service first—caring for her nieces, nephews, and mentees in the Through Their I's Mentoring Program, the Motherless Daughters Foundation, the Hank Stewart Foundation, and Source of Support. She also manages to make friends during her world travels and pursue exciting adventures like skydiving, white water rafting, and zip lining.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at Rachelle O'Neil, I see the spirit of Barbara Jordan and the fire of Shirley Chisholm. I am so proud to have her on my team, and I thank her for the many years of tireless service to our office and Georgia's Fifth Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING MS. CONSTANCE HADDELAND, 2017 RECIPIENT OF THE PATRICK HENRY AWARD

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Ms. Constance Haddeland, a 2017 recipient of the Patrick Henry Award from the National Guard Association of the United States, which honors local civic leaders who have distinguished themselves with outstanding and exceptional service to the Armed Forces of the United States and the National Guard. "Connie" as we know her is a Constituent Services Representative in my Saint Paul, Minnesota office. She was nominated for this recognition by MG Richard C. Nash, Minnesota National Guard Adjutant General, who presented this award to her this week at the 133rd Airlift Wing in Minnesota.

For more than 10 years Connie has exemplified a wholehearted commitment to the well-being of Minnesota service members, veterans and their families. Her efforts have resulted in quality of life benefits for National Guard members and Reservists, improved services to vet-

erans and all Armed Forces Service Members serving in Minnesota.

First in 2010 and again in 2012, Minnesota National Guard members returned home from deployments and found themselves without Post Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence Program (PDMRA) benefits and "bonus pay." Connie spearheaded communication between constituents and my office on this issue, providing updates to veteran service organizations and other stakeholders, and working to ensure benefits parity for Guardsmen and Reservists by correcting errors in the way the Department of Defense implemented this program.

As coordinator for U.S. Service Academy nominations in the Fourth District, Connie has led an exemplary program, shepherding applications from hundreds of students resulting in the nominations of scores of Minnesota's best and brightest high school students to attend our nation's prestigious service academies.

Connie has touched the lives of hundreds of veterans, military personnel and their families in deep and meaningful ways through her thoughtful, patient and tireless advocacy on their behalf. Among the most poignant casework successes include assisting the family of an ailing World War II veteran locate the service records necessary to award him the Bronze Star before he passed away. She also assisted a young soldier correct his military records, which allowed him to access GI Bill benefits to pursue a career in medicine and become a trauma surgeon.

The National Guard Association of the United States Patrick Henry Award citation states it best:

Connie Haddeland has distinguished herself by providing selfless and dedicated service to the Minnesota National Guard and the United States, by working long and tireless hours representing the members of the National Guard. Her steadfast professionalism, knowledge of Minnesota National Guard priorities, outreach efforts, and casework management have significantly contributed to successful and meaningful legislation advanced by Congresswoman McCollum on behalf of the men and women of the National Guard. Her dedicated service as a Constituent Services Representative and Service Academy Nominations Coordinator are in keeping with the finest traditions of the National Guard Association of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. Please join me in paying tribute to Ms. Connie Haddeland for her many past and future contributions to our veterans, servicemen and women and their families.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

IN RECOGNITION OF MR.
SANCHEZ'S SERVICE

HON. ANDY BIGGS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Roberto Sanchez, a resident of Arizona's Fifth Congressional District, who retired from 35 years of federal service on September 29, 2017. Mr. Sanchez began his career by serving for three years as a proud member of the United States Marine Corps. He then joined the legacy U.S. Immigration & Naturalization Service in 1985 as a Deportation Officer, which later became Immigration & Customs Enforcement (ICE) in 2003.

In 2003, Mr. Sanchez became a deputized member of the United States Marshal's Service Fugitive Apprehension Task Force for the Northern District of Florida and five years later, he was promoted to Supervisory Deportation Officer. He helped establish direct oversight to the Harris County Sheriff's Office 287(g) program in Houston, Texas. The 287(g) program enables federal immigration officials to work directly with state and local law enforcement to identify and remove criminal illegal aliens.

In 2010, Mr. Sanchez was promoted to his final position of 287(g) Field Program Manager for ICE, where he managed and provided oversight to various 287(g) programs throughout the southwestern United States. These 287(g) programs include Harris County Sheriff's Office in Houston, Texas, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, the Pinal County Sheriff's Office in Florence, Arizona, and the Mesa Police Department. He was last assigned to the ICE Field Office in Phoenix, Arizona.

Mr. Sanchez has been a resident of Gilbert, Arizona since 2007. Outside of the office, Mr. Sanchez is a loyal fan of all Arizona sports teams. Most importantly, he is a dedicated family man and spends most of his time with his wife of 36 years, Shirley, his two children, Robert and Sandra, and his two Boston Terriers.

I thank Mr. Sanchez for his extraordinary service and life commitment to our country, and congratulations to him on his retirement.

CONGRATULATING SARATOGA
COUNTY PROSPERITY PARTNER-
SHIP'S SILVER EXCELLENCE IN
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
AWARD

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Saratoga County Prosperity Partnership for receiving a Silver Excellence in Economic Development award for its 8@8 e-Newsletter.

Saratoga County Prosperity Partnership is the leading agency in advancing economic development in Saratoga County. The Saratoga

Partnership sends out a biweekly e-Newsletter featuring the top eight news items affecting the Saratoga County economy. 8@8 provides important information to stakeholders in the community as a way of creating opportunities that benefit business in Saratoga County. To recognize this important service, the International Economic Development Council presented the Silver Excellence award to the Saratoga Partnership at its annual conference held in late September. This award reflects the Saratoga Partnership's commitment to building a business environment where all companies can succeed.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to congratulate the Saratoga County Prosperity Partnership on its well-deserved award. We are grateful that the Saratoga Partnership can provide this informative e-Newsletter to the people of Saratoga County.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MS.
CHRISTINE DAVIS

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a 7th District resident, Ms. Christine Davis who made her transition to be with the Lord on September 30, 2017. Christine Davis was born on December 20, 1934 in Bernie, Missouri to the union of Emmitt Davis and Carolyn Davis, both of whom preceded her in death. She was also preceded in death by her son Calvin Davis, brother Robert Davis and sister Darlene Armstead. Christine accepted the Lord Jesus Christ as her personal savior at an early age under the leadership of Pastor Jesse G. Wilson of Bernie, Missouri. Later she joined Garden of Prayer Missionary Baptist Church—under the leadership of Pastor Johnnie Haynie. She was a proud member of the usher board and president of the Mother's Board.

Christine relocated to the West Side of Chicago in the 1950's. She loved her church and was a committed servant in attending worship, until her health prevented her to do so. Christine made sure her wisdom and knowledge was passed to her family. She did everything necessary to help them succeed in life. Christine lived a long and rich life. She will be remembered as a thoughtful, caring and generous person, who will be greatly missed and loved forever.

Christine was employed by various jobs and later retired as a caretaker after 20 years of service. She loved spending time with her family and her church family. She prepared many great meals at home, which were enjoyed by all. Her hobbies were cooking, sewing, reading and watching the Chicago Bulls.

Ms. Davis leaves to cherish her memories; her sisters Juanita Price, Jean Davidson and Margaret Hawes, her three daughters Elaine Rasberry (Eugene), Tarnesha Hawkins (Stanley) and Lawana, nine grandchildren, eleven great-grandchildren and a host of nieces, nephews, family and friends.

I have no doubt that Ms. Christine Davis lived a fulfilling life and will be missed by all because "the best and most beautiful things in the world cannot be seen, not touched. But are felt in the heart." Her family members are in my prayers, and it is my hope that her memory will give them comfort in the years to come.

CELEBRATING THE SERVICE OF
RUTH RILEY

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Ms. Ruth Riley, who served as my district scheduler for 16 years.

It is hard to believe how quickly time passes, and throughout the years Ruth remains consistent and constant with a warmth and grace, which endears her to all. A daughter of Ohio and a proud political science graduate of the University of Cincinnati, Ms. Riley moved to Atlanta to pursue a promising career in the private sector. In 2001, I invited her to join my Atlanta staff in the trusted position of serving as the district scheduler.

As you well know, Mr. Speaker, scheduling is one of the most challenging and key positions in any congressional office. This is especially true in Georgia's diverse and vibrant Fifth Congressional District. Every year, Ms. Riley works with me to review thousands of requests. In fact, there are more invitations for speeches, visits, and tours in Georgia's Fifth Congressional District and the State of Georgia, than there are days in the year. It is never-ending work.

Within our office, Ruth plays a critical role through a brand and perspective that is uniquely her own. As a result, many staff seek her counsel and comfort on difficult days. We all appreciate Ruth's vibrant, work-life balance and love of life and art. Many know her appreciation of photography as a shutterbug enthusiast, passion for beauty as a licensed esthetician, and commitment to service through the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

I know Ms. Riley's family and friends play a critical role in supporting and shaping this dynamic woman, and I personally believe the cherished memories of Ruth's beloved grandmother, Ms. V. Blondell Pryor, contribute to her work ethic and kindness. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am particularly grateful to her family—especially her husband, James Preston Riley, Jr.; beautiful children—James Heru Thornton Riley, III, David Nkosi Erskine Riley, II, and Langston Amon Pryor Riley; and mother—Sandra Elizabeth Fletcher.

Perhaps most importantly, Ms. Riley is a constant champion and advocate for each and every person; she treats everyone with a distinct professionalism, courtesy, and compassion, which reflect her corporate experience and commitment to the principles of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s vision of the Beloved Community. Ruth remains committed to protecting the principles of democracy and ensuring the access of the people to their elected representative.

It is for these reasons that I thank Ms. Ruth Riley for her trust, service, and commitment to my office and the people we serve.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKY ROSEN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 5th, on Roll Call Votes 555, 556, and 557, I was not present because I was tending to my community in Las Vegas, in the aftermath of the deadliest mass shooting in United States history. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call vote 555, NAY on Roll Call vote 556, and NAY on Roll Call vote 557.

HONORING EDGAR BALLESTAS

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Edgar Ballestas, an extraordinary local photographer and winner of my 2017 cover photo challenge. Edgar's image of the sun setting over the Rochester skyline is remarkable, and a testament to our city's great beauty.

Edgar is an English as a Second Language (ESOL) teacher for our local school district; and in his free time captures images throughout Rochester and Monroe County. His work often highlights our region's proudest attractions—the Susan B. Anthony and Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge, the Upper Falls in Letchworth State Park and much, much more. His pictures have even been hung in galleries like Image City Photography in Rochester.

We should never lose sight of the districts and the constituents we fight for every day. Edgar's photograph is a tribute and a reminder of why I come to Congress and work so hard for Rochester and Monroe County. I congratulate Edgar on his work and his achievement and thank him for his tremendous submission.

RECOGNIZING DR. CHRIS DOMES

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to today to recognize Dr. Chris Domes and congratulate him on the occasion of his inauguration as the sixth president of Neumann University in Aston, PA. Dr. Domes succeeds my friend of many years Dr. Rosalie Mirenda, who served Neumann and our wider community for more than four decades.

Neumann University is a well-respected Catholic institution founded with the mission of nurturing the intellectual and religious spirit of its students. Neumann opened its doors as Our Lady of Angels College in 1965, with the

Sisters of Saint Francis of Philadelphia educating 115 female students. In the years since, it has welcomed male students and changed its name to honor Saint John Neumann, the fourth Bishop of Philadelphia and a pioneer in Catholic education in the United States. Today, Neumann educates almost 3,000 students and nearly 14,000 alumni have benefitted from their Neumann education.

It was at a school not unlike Neumann where Dr. Domes found both his Catholic faith and his love of teaching—St. Bonaventure University, in Upstate New York. Since then, he has devoted his life to scholarship and worship.

Dr. Domes is exceptionally qualified for this position. He has over 31 years of experience in education and most recently served as president of Silver Lake College in Wisconsin. In this capacity, Dr. Domes oversaw a 52 percent expansion of the school's enrollment and a 64 percent increase in annual fundraising. He is a proven leader who will bring years of relevant experience to Neumann.

I know Dr. Domes will fit well into the Neumann University family and will work to make it stronger. I also wish Dr. Mirenda the best as she moves on from her position as President, and I wish the Neumann community continued prosperity with Dr. Domes at the helm.

HONORING ST. SYMPHOROSA PARISH ON ITS 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor St. Symphorosa Parish, an exemplary Roman Catholic Parish on the Southwest Side of Chicago, Illinois, which is celebrating its 90th anniversary.

Founded in 1927, St. Symphorosa Parish has remained a steadfast beacon to our local community. Father J. Leo Sharp established this parish as a place of worship to serve the religious and social needs of the people of the Clearing neighborhood. To this day, the parish continues to espouse the same welcoming spirit as it has from the outset.

In the 90 years since Father Sharp presided over the first Mass at St. Symphorosa, succeeding generations have come to worship at this parish. The church, located at 6135 South Austin, has arduously carried out its mission in faith and in service to its community. All worshippers at the parish have come together and worked towards the fulfillment of their faith and the betterment of their community.

The hard work that the parish undertakes has not gone unnoticed by the local community. St. Symphorosa runs a special ministry for children and young adults with developmental disabilities, hosts local Boy Scout and Cub Scout troops and operates a chapter of the St. Vincent de Paul Society to give back to those in need.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing St. Symphorosa Parish and congratulate them as they celebrate their 90th anniversary. May St. Symphorosa continue their great work in the community, while inspiring others through their mission and faith.

REMEMBERING FANNIE LOU HAMER, COURAGEOUS AND TIRELESS FIGHTER FOR VOTING RIGHTS AND SOCIAL JUSTICE WHO SPOKE TRUTH TO POWER AND TOUCHED THE CONSCIENCE OF THE NATION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Congressional Black Caucus and a Co-Chair of the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus, I rise in remembrance of Fannie Lou Hamer, a leading heroine of the Civil Rights Movement, a fearless fighter for voting rights and social justice who spoke truth to power and touched conscience of the nation.

On this day, exactly 100 years ago, October 6, 1917, Fannie Lou Hamer was born in Montgomery County, Mississippi to Lou Ella and James Lee Townsend, the youngest of twenty children.

Although she managed to complete several years of school, by adolescence Fannie Lou Hamer was picking hundreds of pounds of cotton a day.

She would later meet and marry Perry Hamer, known as Pap, and work alongside him as sharecroppers at W.D. Marlow's plantation near Ruleville, in Sunflower County, Mississippi.

From these humble beginnings Fannie Lou Hamer would go on to become one of the iconic figures of the Civil Rights Movement that succeeded in bringing down the Jericho walls of de jure segregation and winning passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the greatest victory for civil rights and human dignity since the Emancipation Proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, one of our proudest boasts as Americans is that "one person can make a difference."

The life of Fannie Lou Hamer demonstrates that this is not an idle boast but a simple truth.

Fannie Lou Hamer dedicated her life to the fight for civil rights, working for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, an organization that engaged in acts of civil disobedience to fight racial segregation and injustice in the South.

During the 1950s, when Fannie Lou Hamer was in her 30's, she attended several annual conferences of the Regional Council of Negro Leadership (RCNL), a civil rights and self-help organization that ignited her passion for activism.

In 1962 Fannie Lou Hamer took up the call to try and register to vote in Mississippi, a state whose constitution and laws erected barriers such as poll taxes and literacy tests to disenfranchise African Americans.

It was on the bus trip to Indianola, Mississippi to register to vote that, in what would become her signature trait as an activist, she began singing African American spirituals such as "Go Tell It on the Mountain" and "This Little Light of Mine."

Singing spirituals reflected her firm belief that the struggle for civil rights was a righteous cause and toiling in this vineyard was the Christian thing to do.

Fannie Lou Hamer's courage and leadership in Indianola came to the attention of SNCC organizer Bob Moses who recruited her to travel around the South doing organizing work for the organization.

Being an African American activist was at that time in that place was dangerous, but that did not deter the fierce Fannie Lou Hamer:

I guess if I'd had any sense, I'd have been a little scared—but what was the point of being scared? The only thing they could do was kill me, and it kinda seemed like they'd been trying to do that a little bit at a time since I could remember.

During one of Fannie Lou Hamer's trips she and other civil rights activists were arrested and badly beaten on the orders of police officials.

After recovering from the assault she returned to activism and the task of organizing voter registration drives:

Sometimes it seem like to tell the truth today is to run the risk of being killed. But if I fall, I'll fall five feet four inches forward in the fight for freedom. I'm not backing off.

In 1964, Fannie Lou Hamer helped organize "Freedom Summer," during which she was known by other activists as a motherly figure who strongly believed that the civil rights struggle should be broad-based and multi-racial.

Later that year, Fannie Lou Hamer helped to found and served as Vice-Chair of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MDFP), which challenged the seating of the all-white and anti-civil rights Mississippi delegation to the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

In Atlantic City, Fannie Lou Hamer addressed the Democratic National Convention's Credentials Committee, where she passionately recounted the problems she had encountered in voter registration, including the vicious beatings she received in jail:

All of this is on account we want to register to become first-class citizens, and if the Freedom Democratic Party is not seated now, I question America. Is this America, the land of the free and the home of the brave where we have to sleep with our tele-

phones off the hooks because our lives be threatened daily because we want to live as decent human beings—in America?

Fannie Lou Hamer's raw, authentic, and powerful testimony was so compelling that President Lyndon Johnson hastily called a White House press conference to divert media attention, which succeeded temporarily until the broadcast networks replayed her speech, unedited and uninterrupted, on the evening news.

Responding to Fannie Lou Hamer's speech, viewers flooded the Democratic National Credentials Committee with thousands of calls and letters demanding the seating of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party delegates.

Although the MDFP's delegates were not seated, as a compromise the Democratic Party changed its bylaws to require equality of representation of state delegations to the national convention, which led in turn to the selection of Fannie Lou Hamer as a delegate to the 1972 Democratic National Convention in Miami Beach, Florida.

Fannie Lou Hamer died on March 14, 1977 in Mound Bayou, Mississippi at the age of 59, due to her poor health, a combination of a lifetime in poverty, her 1963 beating, and a 1976 cancer diagnosis.

Mr. Speaker, Fannie Lou Hamer was always about paying it forward:

Never to forget where we came from and always praise the bridges that carried us over.

As the third African American woman elected to Congress from the State of Texas, the second to serve on the House Committee on the Judiciary, and the first to become the Ranking Democratic Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I am ever mindful and grateful of the sacrifices made by giants like Fannie Lou Hamer so that persons like me have the opportunity to serve and contribute to the greatness of our country.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of Fannie Lou Hamer on the 100th anniversary of her birth.

Happy birthday Fannie Lou, you made a difference; you made America better.

HONORING DARLENE TOOLEY ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Darlene Tooley, as she retires from Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority (NCIHA) after 39 years of exemplary service.

NCIHA was formed in 1978, with Ms. Tooley as its founding Executive Director, to provide affordable housing to native families in Northern California. Under her leadership, the organization has worked with member tribes to acquire and place into trust over 1,000 acres of land, created 371 affordable homes, and replaced over 30 dilapidated homes in native communities. Ms. Tooley also created First Time Homebuyer Down Payment Assistance and Tenant Based Rental Assistance programs, which have helped numerous individuals secure housing.

The breadth of Ms. Tooley's civic contributions include her service as a founding member of Indian Dispute Resolution Services, treasurer of the Nevada/California Indian Housing Association, and member of the board of directors of the Southwest Indian Housing Association. She was selected by the Secretary of HUD to be a member of the first two negotiated rulemaking committees to develop regulations to implement Native American Housing legislation.

Darlene Tooley has led a career of service, dedicated to providing affordable housing to the Native American community. Please join me in congratulating her on her retirement and expressing our deep appreciation for her outstanding contributions to the tribes of Lake and Mendocino Counties.

SENATE—Tuesday, October 10, 2017

The Senate met at 9:52 and 47 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ROY BLUNT, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ROY BLUNT, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BLUNT thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY,
OCTOBER 13, 2017, AT 8:30 A.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until Friday, October 13, 2017, at 8:30 a.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:53 and 25 seconds a.m., adjourned until Friday, October 13, 2017, at 8:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 10, 2017

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 10, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

PROTECTING THE PUBLIC HEALTH

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, going back to the days of Teddy Roosevelt, it has been a bipartisan principle that protecting the public health in America's environment is the sacred obligation of all of us who have the honor to serve this Nation in elective or appointed office. Unfortunately, the Administrator of the EPA, Mr. Scott Pruitt, didn't get that memo.

Yesterday, Mr. Pruitt announced that he is precipitously going to strike down the Clean Power Plan rule sometime later today, which will turn the clock back in this country in terms of trying to get our arms around the issue of rising carbon emissions that scientists from across all sectors have universally recognized are causing rising sea temperature, rising sea levels, affecting climate, and clearly are linked to manmade carbon emissions that have been tracked for decades going back in time.

Mr. Pruitt's argument is based on the discredited view that carbon pollution

does not fall under the Clean Air Act, which is what the last administration was proceeding on when they actually designed the Clean Power Plan rule.

The facts are these:

In 1963, this Congress passed the Clean Air Act. It was signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson and has been amended a number of times on a bipartisan basis to strengthen and enhance the protections that were built into that law when it was, again, enacted many years ago. In fact, in 1990, George Herbert Walker Bush signed the last update and upgrade to the Clean Air Act, which is exactly what the prior administration was proceeding under when they designed the rule.

The Supreme Court has weighed in on this question about whether or not greenhouse gases are covered under the Clean Air Act. In 2007, in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, a Republican-majority Court ruled in favor of the fact that greenhouse gases are in fact covered under the statutory umbrella of the Clean Air Act. This is what the Court said:

Because greenhouse gases fit well within the Clean Air Act's capacious definition of "air pollutant," we hold that EPA has the statutory authority to regulate the emission of such gases.

In 2014, the Court reenforced that ruling in a decision written by Antonin Scalia, the godfather of conservative lawyers all across this country, which reiterated the fact that greenhouse gases emitted from power plants are, in fact, subject to the scope and authority of the Clean Air Act.

Unfortunately, today, the EPA Administrator is completely striking down that important advance in terms of protecting the public health of this country and putting nothing in place. There is no alternative that Mr. Pruitt is putting out there in terms of trying to get this country to move forward on clean power.

It is unfortunate because, as the International Energy Agency announced this morning, for the first time ever, solar energy production now surpasses any other form of power production in the world. The same thing is happening here in the U.S. because of the renewable energy tax credits.

In my State of Connecticut, renewable energy solar panel jobs far exceed any other power production job in the State. We are seeing an incredible proliferation of people installing panels on their homes and businesses.

The U.S. Navy in Groton, Connecticut, now has solar panels on all Navy housing as well as a solar field to

power the Nation's oldest submarine base, which is there.

The decision by Mr. Pruitt is not a pro-growth, pro-economic decision. It is simply responding, unfortunately, to political forces that drove this administration to power from the fossil fuel industry.

The only saving grace of Mr. Pruitt's order is that he allows a large and long public comment period for the people of this country who do care about clean air and who do care about our environment to weigh in on this reckless decision that turns the clock back for public health and safety and for our economy. That is where the growth is going to be, in renewables, and not power production of the past.

It is not a war on coal. Coal production is not singled out in the Clean Power Plan regulations. But what it does say is that any plant, whether it is coal, natural gas, or solar panels, you have got to address the question of carbon emissions. You don't get to produce that power and then leave a mess behind you. That is a very simple principle that I think every American can understand.

Unfortunately, it is about to be torpedoed by the EPA Administrator, who, by the way, was in the courtroom trying to argue against this in the courts back in 2014 and came out on the losing decision. I guess he got his revenge not just on the Court but, unfortunately, all of us who have to live with this terrible rule.

Mr. Speaker, again, let's reverse that decision. Let's move toward the future with a type of power that will protect the environment and grow jobs.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TROOPER TIMOTHY O'NEILL

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a fallen hero. Tragically, Michigan State Trooper Timothy O'Neill made the ultimate sacrifice in an on-duty motorcycle accident.

I rise to offer my support and love to Trooper O'Neill's friends, family, and all who were fortunate enough to know him. As the proud parent of a police officer, I can only imagine the pain you must feel. Words are inadequate at such a time of sorrow, but please know you are in my prayers.

Trooper O'Neill was known by his friends, fiancée, and family for his sense of humor, compassion for animals, and deep love for his family. He

is also remembered for his commitment to bettering our community and our safety.

I ask my colleagues and all those watching to join me in a prayer for Trooper O'Neill; his fiancée, Carli Hicks; parents, Kristine and Michael O'Neill; siblings, Sara O'Neill and Brian O'Neill; and his entire family.

May God bless them all.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF THELONIOUS MONK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of the most innovative jazz musicians of all time, the legendary Thelonious Monk.

This legend, Mr. Speaker, was born in my congressional district in the State of North Carolina, and would have turned 100 years old today.

Thelonious Sphere Monk was the second of three children born to Thelonious, Sr., and Barbara Monk on October 10, 1917, in Rocky Mount, North Carolina. Though Monk and his family left Rocky Mount for New York City when Thelonious was a child, scholars and fellow musicians say Monk's North Carolina roots had an important influence on the man and his music.

Writer Sam Stephenson credited Thelonious Monk's Carolina roots in the "Oxford American," writing that Rocky Mount's flourishing tobacco culture and rail yard was one of the largest in all of the South the year Monk was born. Stephenson speculated those railways may have inspired Monk's composition "Little Rootie Tootie," which features train whistle sounds.

Mr. Speaker, incidentally, the city of Rocky Mount, North Carolina, is divided between two counties, Nash County and Edgecombe County. The railroad in that community is the dividing line.

Every day, the CSX and Amtrak trains come through that community. They have been doing that for a very long time. Those train tracks were first established in 1855, even before the Civil War. It was established as the Wilmington to Weldon Railroad. It was the longest railroad in the entire world, consisting of more than 160 miles of track. It came through Mr. Monk's hometown.

Thelonious Monk began studying classical piano at the age of 11 and showed an early aptitude for the instrument. By the time he was 13 years old, he had won the weekly amateur competition at the Apollo Theater so many times that management banned him from reentering the contest there in Harlem.

In 1941, Monk began working at Minton's Playhouse in Harlem, where

he joined the house band and helped develop the school of jazz known as bebop.

Alongside fellow jazz greats Charlie Parker, Dizzy Gillespie, Eubie Blake, and Ruble Blakey, Monk honed his fast and often improvised style that would later become synonymous with modern jazz.

Thelonious Monk's first known recording was made in 1944, when he worked as a member of the Coleman Hawkins Quartet. Monk did not record under his own name, however, until 1947, when he played as the leader of a sextet session for Blue Note.

In 1947, he married Nellie Smith, his longtime sweetheart. Two children were born to the marriage, whom they named after Monk's parents, Thelonious and Barbara.

In 1952, Monk signed a contract with Prestige Records, which produced pieces like "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes" and "Bags' Groove," which he recorded with Miles Davis in 1954. In 1956, Mr. Speaker, Monk released his third album, "Brilliant Corners," which is considered by many to be his first true masterpiece.

In 1957, the Thelonious Monk Quartet, which included John Coltrane, began performing regularly, with tours across the United States and Europe.

By 1964, Monk was popular with the mainstream audience and became one of the four jazz musicians ever to grace the cover of Time magazine.

The years that followed included several overseas tours, but by the early 1970s, Monk was ready to give it up. He was ready to retire from the limelight. After battling illnesses for several years, Monk passed away from a stroke in 1982.

Finally, Thelonious Monk, Mr. Speaker, has since been inducted into the North Carolina Music Hall of Fame and the Grammy Hall of Fame, added to the Library of Congress' National Recording Registry, awarded a Pulitzer Prize, and featured on a United States postage stamp.

Thelonious Monk left a legacy as one of the originators of modern jazz music. That is why the city of Rocky Mount is so proud of their native son. They celebrated this past weekend in various places throughout the city honoring and celebrating the life of this great musician.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to an outstanding artist, Thelonious Monk, as his family; the residents of Rocky Mount, North Carolina; and the country prepare to celebrate his 100th birthday.

BEAU BIDEN FOUNDATION

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the formation

of a partnership between the Beau Biden Foundation and Doylestown Health, which will clear the way for efforts to prevent, recognize, and react appropriately to child sexual abuse in our community.

This critical program will be funded through the generous support of the Cowhey Family ShopRite in Warminster and will train local medical staff in the Darkness to Light's Stewards of Children course utilizing online education tools.

There is no doubt that because of the compassionate efforts of these organizations, the Beau Biden Foundation, Doylestown Health, and the Cowhey Family ShopRite in Warminster, Bucks County, children will be safer and our community stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this vital new partnership and all efforts to protect our society's most vulnerable.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHRISTOPHER WARD, SR.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a lifelong Levittown resident, Christopher Ward, Sr., who passed away suddenly last month.

Born in Bristol, Pennsylvania, Chris became an accomplished businessman and a true pillar of our community. With all his success, he strongly supported local small businesses and always rooted for the underdog.

People in Levittown will remember Chris as the co-owner of Bailey's Bar & Grille and Bailey's Plaza. But to his friends, employees, family, and all those who had the pleasure of truly knowing him, Chris was a humble, kind, selfless man with a loving, caring heart. He loved to make everyone laugh with his unique sense of humor, but what made him the happiest was being "Chocolate Pop-Pop" and spending time with his family.

Mr. Speaker, Chris strove to be the very best father, son, grandfather, uncle, and brother. He will be sorely missed by our entire community.

□ 1215

DYSAUTONOMIA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as Dysautonomia Awareness Month. "Dysautonomia" is a general term used to address any disease that aggravates the autonomic nervous system, adversely affecting the body's involuntary functions. There are many types of dysautonomia, which can lead to other devastating illnesses, including Parkinson's disease and lupus.

Dysautonomia afflicts nearly 70 million people of all ages worldwide, including constituents in my district like Liz Kennerley. While there is no cure, there are many treatments to improve quality of life, including medications and lifestyle changes.

This month, we work to spread awareness of dysautonomia through education, community events, and lobbying, and we inspire family, friends,

and neighbors to get involved and to take action.

It is necessary that communities hold events for spreading the word about dysautonomia and for funding research to find a cure. It is on us to educate the public about this illness and to race towards a cure.

UNFAIRLY WITHHOLDING TEACHERS' SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS EARNED THROUGH SECONDARY EMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent thousands of teachers across west Texas who have dedicated their careers to educating and preparing our children for the future.

As a former member of the Midland Independent School Board, I understand the impact these selfless individuals have on our communities. Unfortunately, we honor their service to our communities by unfairly withholding Social Security benefits that they have earned through secondary employment.

While this policy, known as the windfall elimination provision, was well-intended, it has proven to be ill-conceived. Many educators have been harmed by the unintended consequences that have created uncertainty and put a damper on the otherwise joyous occasion of retirement.

It is imperative that we solve this issue and give our Texas teachers the ability to collect the Social Security benefits that they deserve. I remain committed to working with my colleagues in the House to find a fair and equitable resolution to this issue to ensure that our educators have access to the Social Security benefits and pensions they most certainly have earned.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

While Members come to the end of a long weekend of constituent visits,

bless them and those with whom they consult among those they represent with wisdom, patience, and generosity as they seek law and policy that benefits not only local interests but, where possible, the greater common good of our country.

We again ask You to impel those who possess power here in the Capitol to be mindful of those Americans who possess little or no power, most especially in these days those recovering in Puerto Rico.

Finally, we are mindful of yet another natural disaster unfolding in California, with massive wildfires. We ask You to protect those who combat these fires and comfort those who have or will lose their homes and possessions.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 5, 2017.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Upon further discussion with my family, I have made the decision to resign my position as Member of the House of Representatives for Pennsylvania's 18th Congressional District, effective October 21, 2017.

I am grateful for the opportunity to have served the people of southwestern Pennsylvania and to have worked with the talented and dedicated men and women of the United States Congress.

Sincerely,

TIM MURPHY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 5, 2017.

DEAR GOVERNOR WOLF: This letter serves to inform you I am resigning my position as Member of the House of Representatives for Pennsylvania's 18th Congressional District effective October 21, 2017.

Sincerely,

TIM MURPHY.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the many women who have lost their lives to breast cancer and those who have survived.

As you know, October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. In order to prevent additional loss of life, it is essential that women educate themselves on prevention and receive regular screenings.

In 2008, I cosponsored legislation supporting the observance of Breast Cancer Awareness Month, in part, to help get the message out that this disease can and does kill men and women of all ages.

According to the American Cancer Society, since 2007, death rates in older women with breast cancer are decreasing, yet death rates in women under the age of 50 are steady.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all women watching to get screened regularly for this devastating disease.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence is a scourge. Its physical and psychological effects have lifelong consequences for survivors, their families, and their children.

I appreciate South Carolina Governor Henry McMaster and Attorney General Alan Wilson, both of whom who are working hard to stop domestic violence in our State, encouraged by Laura Hudson of the Crime Victims' Council. The Governor issued a statewide proclamation that designates October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Attorney General Wilson's 20th annual Silent Witness ceremony, which he held last week, honored the past year's victims of domestic violence at the statehouse. Specifically, the South Carolina Office of the Attorney General works to combat domestic violence through the STOP Violence Against Women program, dedicated to providing representation to victims of domestic violence and raising awareness of the issue; also, with the Pro Bono program, dedicated to providing pro bono legal representation in prosecution of domestic violence cases.

Eliminating domestic violence should be something we fight for during the month of October and every day of the year.

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

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the last time Congress passed fundamental tax reform, I was 7 years old. It is long past time that our broken Tax Code is fixed and our country gets back on a path to robust and sustained economic growth.

As we consider tax reform legislation, we should look to my home State of Indiana for inspiration. During my time as a State senator, Indiana lowered business taxes by nearly 50 percent, and rates are scheduled to fall even further in the coming years.

By 2022, the Hoosier State will have the third lowest corporate tax rate in the Nation. At the same time, Indiana has removed many special interest loopholes and carve-outs to make the system simple and fair for all Hoosier taxpayers.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, Indiana has the eighth best business tax climate in the country, a number that will only get better as tax rates continue to go down.

The results speak for themselves: Indiana has an unemployment rate below 4 percent, strong economic growth, a AAA credit rating, and a \$1.8 billion surplus in the bank.

Lower taxes combined with simplicity and fairness—this is the model that we need to embrace if our country is going to return to sustained 3 percent and greater growth.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the tremendous impact forests have on our rural economies and natural environment nationwide. Next week is National Forest Products Week.

In Arkansas, we know that growing and sustaining jobs in forest communities begins with ensuring that working forests continue to thrive. Most working forests—over 70 percent—are privately owned by families, small and large businesses, and an increasingly broad array of Americans who invest in forest ownership.

When forest owners have confidence in their ability to manage and sell their timber productively, they will continue to grow and invest in forests and provide the foundation for the rest of the forest products supply chain. Federal policies have a significant impact on the long-term economic and environmental benefits we derive from these working forests and the livelihoods of those who own and manage them.

The forest products industry represents a key economic driver for rural economies nationwide, totaling nearly \$92.8 billion in GDP. In my home State of Arkansas, environmentally friendly forestry-related businesses support more than 62,000 jobs, with more than \$2.4 billion in annual payroll.

A strong marketplace for forest products helps keep rural America employed and U.S. forests robust. These healthy forests, in turn, provide crucial habitat for species, filter America's drinking water, sequester carbon, and provide outdoor recreation opportunities for the public.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 10, 2017, at 9:48 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 692.
That the Senate passed S. 1103.
That the Senate passed S. 1595.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COMER) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

STAFF SERGEANT RYAN SCOTT OSTROM POST OFFICE

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 1858) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1858

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

SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT RYAN SCOTT OSTROM POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1858 introduced by Congressman MARINO from Pennsylvania. The bill names the Liberty, Pennsylvania, Post Office at 4514 Williamson Trail the Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office in honor of Staff Sergeant Ostrom, who, in 2005, was killed in the line of duty in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation to rename the Liberty, Pennsylvania, post office after Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom.

Ryan was born on September 23, 1979, in Wellsboro, Pennsylvania, where he attended Liberty High School. While in high school, Ryan excelled in soccer, basketball, and baseball—serving as the captain for the soccer and basketball teams.

After graduating from high school, he attended Mansfield University and pursued a degree in education science. Ryan planned to become a teacher and a coach to help young people become successful students, athletes, and leaders within the community.

However, just months before Ryan was set to graduate from college, his National Guard unit was deployed to Iraq. While serving his country in Iraq, Ryan made the ultimate sacrifice, as he was killed in action on August 9, 2005.

Ryan enlisted in the Pennsylvania Army National Guard in 1997, serving with Company B, First Battalion 109th in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. Ryan was an accomplished soldier with a bevy of previous accomplishments and commendations.

During his time enlisted, Ryan earned a Purple Heart, Combat Information Badge, Gold Star, Armed Service Ribbon, and numerous other awards that gave Ryan the recognition he deserved for his heroic years of service.

Beyond these awards, Ryan also took advantage of what the military had to offer, graduating from the U.S. Army Europe Primary Leadership Development Course, which furthered his ability to lead both on deployment and in the communities about which he cared so deeply.

While Ryan will always be remembered for his valor and his years of military service, he will also be remembered for what he brought to the communities of which he was a part.

In his free time, Ryan could be found playing Monday night basketball with his friends at home and was an active member of the Eagle Base basketball team during his deployment.

Staff Sergeant Ryan Ostrom prioritized the world around him—his country, his community, his family—all over himself. His years of service and his record speak for themselves, but beyond that, Ryan made a positive impact as a friend and a role model wherever he was.

He was a soldier and leader on his deployments and an active member of the community back home in Wellsboro. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members support this legislation to honor Ryan by renaming the Liberty Post Office as the Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 1858, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Post Office located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office.

Born in Wellsboro, Pennsylvania, in 1979, Mr. Ostrom graduated from high school and then joined the Pennsylvania Army National Guard while beginning his studies at Mansfield University. A sports lover, Ryan could frequently be found playing and coaching basketball in his free time.

In 2002, Ryan joined his father, Scott Ostrom, on a peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, and he later deployed to Iraq with the 109th Infantry Regiment.

Staff Sergeant Ryan Ostrom tragically made the ultimate sacrifice in August of 2005, when he sustained fatal wounds from enemy small-arms fire in Iraq. He was, as mentioned, awarded the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Good Conduct Medal, and Combat Infantryman Badge from the Department of the Army, as well as the Pennsylvania Meritorious Service Medal from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize the bravery and selflessness of the honorable service of Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 1858, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill in recognition of Staff Sergeant Ostrom's sacrifice to our Nation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1858.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SPECIALIST JEFFREY L. WHITE, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 452) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 452

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

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST JEFFREY L. WHITE, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 452 introduced by Congressman LUETKEMEYER from Missouri. The bill names the Pacific, Missouri, Post Office at 324 West Saint Louis Street the Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office in honor of U.S. Army Specialist White, who, in 2012, was killed in action in an IED attack in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 452, legislation to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office.

U.S. Army Specialist White grew up in Catawissa, Missouri, with his parents, Jeff and Paula White, and his brothers, Michael and Kyle. He graduated from Pacific High School in 2008, and enlisted in the Army in October of 2009.

Specialist White served our country honorably as a member of the First Battalion, 501st Airborne, Fourth Brigade Combat Team, 25th Infantry Division, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska, unit.

Specialist White deployed for Afghanistan in December 2011, and after serving our country bravely, he gave his life for our country when an IED detonated near his unit on April 3, 2012, roughly one week before he was scheduled to return to the United States.

Specialist White was a highly decorated servicemember. His awards and medals include the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, and the NATO Medal, among many others.

As an avid sports fan, White shared my love of the St. Louis Cardinals. He witnessed their 2011 World Series Championship win shortly before his deployment and was planning to attend opening day in 2012. Specialist White was honored by the Cardinals, who invited his family to raise the 2011 World Championship flag on opening day in his memory.

Specialist White was an upstanding citizen and beloved by his family, friends, and community. Hundreds of individuals lined the streets in the pouring rain to honor his final journey home and memorial service.

We can never fully express our thanks to our military and their families. Their service and sacrifice for this country goes beyond a level of bravery most people have never seen. While the naming of this post office is not nearly enough to honor Jeffery White, nor will it heal the pain felt each day and every day by the family he left behind, it is my sincere hope each time the Whites and folks in the Pacific community pass by this building they are reminded of how grateful and how proud we are to call Specialist White one of our own.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Missouri delegation and Pacific community for their support of this designation, and I ask every Member of the House to join us in honoring our hometown hero, Jeffery L. White, Jr.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 452, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Post Office located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office.

A native of Missouri, Jeffrey White, Jr. graduated from Pacific High School in 2008, and joined the United States Army. After graduating from basic and advanced training at Fort Benning, Georgia, Specialist White was assigned to the 25th Infantry Division at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson.

He deployed to Afghanistan in 2011, and tragically lost his life in April of 2012, after insurgents attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device. Specialist White was just 21 years old.

Specialist White is remembered for his love of the St. Louis Cardinals, as well as his distinguished service, for which he received many awards, including a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart.

□ 1715

As an avid Dodgers fan, I think Specialist White would get a kick out of the fact that I am here and that the St. Louis Cardinals are still beating the Dodgers.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to commemorate the life of Specialist Jeffrey White, Jr., who selflessly sacrificed his life in defense of his country.

I urge the passage of H.R. 452, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill in recognition of Specialist White's sacrifice to our Nation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 452.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

JANET CAPELLO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2254) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2254

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

SECTION 1. JANET CAPELLO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, shall be known and designated as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Janet Capello Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2254, introduced by Congressman MIKE THOMPSON from California. The bill designates the post office located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the Janet Capello Post Office Building.

Janet Capello was a prominent citizen in her Vallejo, California, community. Born in 1935, she served on the city's Planning Commission, the Civil

Service Commission, and the Charter Review Committee, among others. She loved her community, and she gave back in whatever way she could before passing away in 2012.

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

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

I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 2254, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Post Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the Janet Capello Post Office Building.

H.R. 2254 was introduced this year by my colleague and friend from California, Mr. THOMPSON. Unfortunately, Mr. THOMPSON is unable to be here today, as he has remained in his district in California this evening to assist in wildfire relief and recovery efforts. I am, along with the entire House of Representatives, praying for Mr. THOMPSON and our fellow Americans in this time of need.

A lifelong resident of Vallejo, California, and granddaughter of Italian immigrants, Janet Capello took great pride in her heritage. Her deepest passion was the Sons of Italy, an organization where she served as a dedicated member of Lodge Number 1626 for over 63 years.

She held two of the organization's most prestigious posts—vice president of the Grand Lodge of California, and Secretary of the United Lodges—and led efforts to bring the group's scholarship program to Vallejo. In doing so, she helped hundreds of young men and women attend college.

Ms. Capello oversaw a number of charity efforts, and helped raise thousands of dollars each year for Alzheimer's research in conjunction with the University of California-Davis. Ms. Capello's dedication to these causes earned her the Dr. Vincenzo Sellaro Award, the highest honor granted by the Sons of Italy.

In addition to these accomplishments, Janet Capello was an active participant in local Vallejo politics, serving on the city's Planning Commission, the Civil Service Commission, and the Charter Review Committee, and others, and was an active member of the St. Vincent Ferrer Catholic Church until her passing in 2012, at the age of 77.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to commemorate the life of Janet Capello, and recognize the lasting contributions she has made to the Vallejo community.

I urge the passage of H.R. 2254, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr.

GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2254.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY POST OFFICE

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2464) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2464

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

SECTION 1. JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, shall be known and designated as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2464, introduced by Congressman STEPHEN LYNCH from Massachusetts. The bill designates the post office located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office.

John F. Kennedy was the 35th President of the United States. During his tenure, he is possibly most famous for his handling of the Cuban missile crisis, preventing a thermonuclear conflict with the former Soviet Union.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of President Kennedy's birth, and we thank him for his service to our Nation.

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2464, legislation that I introduced back in May of this year to officially designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office.

This bill reflects the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of President John F. Kennedy this year, otherwise known as the JFK Centennial.

I would like to thank our former chairman, Jason Chaffetz of Utah; our current chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY); the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS); the chairman of our Subcommittee on Government Operations, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS); our ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY); and all of the Subcommittee on Government Operations for their efforts to move this legislation forward.

I would also like to thank the entire Massachusetts House delegation for their effort in sponsoring this measure.

H.R. 2464 honors the life and enduring legacy of our Nation's 35th President, John F. Kennedy, and his impassioned commitment to public service, equality, peace and diplomacy, and ensuring a better quality of life for every American. Our special remembrance of President Kennedy this year also affords us a distinct opportunity to reflect on and appreciate his vision and wisdom in the context of the many challenges we are facing as a nation today both at home and abroad.

As we grapple with difficult issues ranging from healthcare to economic reform, let us recall President Kennedy's understanding that: "For one true measure of a nation is its success in fulfilling the promise of a better life for each of its members."

And in contemplating issues pertaining to equality and civil rights, we would be wise to remember President Kennedy's advancement of the principle that the rights of every person are diminished when the rights of one person are threatened.

As we continue to address matters of contention with adversarial nations, we must bear in mind President Kennedy's admonition and foresight that "civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof."

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank my colleague and friend, Congressman JOSEPH KENNEDY from the Fourth District of Massachusetts, for his work on this legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 2464.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the gentleman from California aware that I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill in recognition of President Kennedy's sacrifice for our Nation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2464.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ENDY NDDIOBONG EKPANYA POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 294) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the "Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 294

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

SECTION 1. ENDY NDDIOBONG EKPANYA POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1730

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 294, introduced by Congressman PETE OLSON of Texas. The bill names the Pearland, Texas, Post Office, located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard, as the Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building in honor of the Pearland police officer who fell in the line of duty in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), the sponsor of the bill, so that he can explain the bill.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my friend from Montana for bringing this bill forward this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great day back home in Pearland, Texas, because right now this House is about to honor a fallen hero from Pearland, Endy Ekpanya.

Endy was born in Nigeria in 1985, the same year I graduated from college. When he was 11, his family left Nigeria to come to America to provide a better life for them. They moved to Long Island in 1996. He obtained a degree in psychology and sociology from Hofstra University in New York and later earned his MBA and master's degree in criminal justice from the University of Maryland.

The call to serve his country and his community never left Endy, which is why, after moving to Pearland, Texas, he enrolled in the Alvin Community College Police Academy. He graduated with the 105th class in December of 2015, and he was sworn in as a Pearland police officer 6 months later.

In less than 6 months after December of 2015, his time with us was cut short just 2 days before his 31st birthday. At approximately 4 a.m. on the morning of June 12, 2016, Endy was hit head-on by a drunk driver while responding to an emergency call. He was the first officer to die in Pearland while on duty in over 40 years.

Endy's life embodies the selfless dedication of our law enforcement officials back in Pearland. His sacrifice will never ever be forgotten. That is why I am proud that today this House will pass a bill to name the post office at 2700 Cullen Boulevard after Endy. It will be a source of great pride for our local community and will ensure that his sacrifice is remembered for generations to come.

This small gesture can't make up for the loss of Endy's life. The grief his wife, his young son, and his parents have will never go away. The Pearland community has suffered, but this small gesture is a testament to Endy's commitment to protect and serve. It will

be an inspiration for future generations to strive to improve their community just like Endy did in his short time with us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

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

I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 294, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Post Office located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office.

Endy Ekpanya reflected the best of America. Born in Nigeria in 1985, Endy immigrated to the United States in 1996. Here, he obtained U.S. citizenship, a college education, and two master's degrees.

Endy's deep love of family and community inspired him to join the police force so he could help those in need. He hoped that his hard work in the classroom and the field would help him be a role model for his young son, Julian.

As a rookie member of the Pearland Police Department, Officer Ekpanya took his duty to protect his community seriously but always found a way to brighten his fellow officers' days. Tragically, on June 1, 2016, Officer Ekpanya was killed when a drunk driver struck his police cruiser as he was responding to a call.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor Officer Endy Ekpanya's dedication to his education, family, and community, and to remember the sacrifices he made while working to protect those he loved.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 294, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill in recognition of Officer Ekpanya's sacrifice to our Nation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 294.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAVIER VEGA, JR. MEMORIAL ACT OF 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1617) to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 77 North in Sarita, Texas, as the "Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1617

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Javier Vega, Jr. Memorial Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) A native of La Feria, Texas, Border Patrol Agent Javier Vega, Jr., served his country first a member of the United States Marines Corps and then proudly as a border patrol agent in the canine division with his dog, Goldie.

(2) Agent Vega was assigned to the Kingsville, Texas, Border Patrol Station as a canine handler and worked primarily at the Sarita Border Patrol Checkpoint.

(3) On August 3, 2014, Agent Vega was on a fishing trip with his family near Raymondville, Texas, when 2 criminal aliens attempted to rob and attack them.

(4) Agent Vega was shot and killed while attempting to subdue the assailants and protecting his family.

(5) Agent Vega is survived by his wife, parents, 3 sons, brother, sister-in-law, niece, and dog, Goldie.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION.

The checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 77 North in Sarita, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint".

SEC. 4. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the checkpoint described in section 3 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1617.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Javier Vega, Jr. Memorial Act of 2017 would designate the Border Patrol checkpoint on United States Highway 77 North in Sarita, Texas, as the Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint.

After serving his country honorably as a United States Marine, Agent Vega joined the United States Border Patrol in 2008. During his time in the United States Border Patrol, he served as a canine handler and was involved in 42 seizures of narcotics and 38 separate cases involving the apprehension of 238 illegal immigrants. He was a man of honor and duty, a man who loved his family, and a man who would give his life in service to his country.

On August 3, 2014, in Raymondville, Texas, Agent Vega took his wife, three children, and parents out for a day of

fishing. While fishing with his family, two illegal immigrants attempted to rob them.

These illegal immigrants had been deported multiple times for various crimes. Law enforcement believed they had conducted a string of similar robberies at the behest of a Mexican cartel.

Agent Vega sprung into action to defend his family. While drawing his firearm, Agent Vega was shot in the chest. His father was also shot and wounded. Though his family did everything possible to help, Agent Vega, tragically, passed away.

On September 20, 2016, Border Patrol determined that Agent Vega's actions were instinctive as a result of his law enforcement training. He did what law enforcement in America does: he put himself in harm's way. As a result, his death was determined to have been in the line of duty.

This bill honors the service of Agent Vega. He made the ultimate sacrifice for his family and his country. Today, the House will name the Border Patrol checkpoint after him where he and his service dog, Goldie, served.

Every day, the men and women of the United States Border Patrol put on their uniforms and put their lives on the line to protect America's borders. Tragically, as we see in the case of Agent Vega, even when spending time with family, they may be called to serve.

On Sunday, President Trump unveiled immigration enforcement policies that will ensure other families will not have to face the devastating loss of a loved one at the hands of an illegal immigrant. I hope Congress can work together to make those proposals a reality. I believe it is more than fitting to name this checkpoint after Agent Javier Vega, Jr.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my good friend from Pennsylvania, and I, too, rise in support of S. 1617, a bill to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 77 North in Sarita, Texas, as the Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint.

Javier Vega, Jr., was killed in the line of duty on August 3, 2014, while trying to stop a criminal act and trying to protect his family in Raymondville, Texas. While fishing with his wife, with his children, and with his parents, two men approached him and tried to rob his family.

Agent Vega attempted to stop the robbery by drawing his gun, and we know that Border Patrol agents may carry their guns when they are off duty because they are law enforcement officials. He was shot in the chest. Agent

Vega was rushed to the hospital after he was shot but died soon thereafter.

It was determined that Agent Vega was aware of a pattern of robberies in the area due to his role as a Border Patrol agent and that he identified himself as an agent before he was fatally shot. The U.S. Border Patrol considered those facts and later determined that Javier Vega, Jr., was murdered in the line of duty, ensuring that Agent Vega's name was enshrined at the Customs and Border Protection Valor Memorial.

Agent Vega was a U.S. Marine veteran and had served with the United States Border Patrol for 6 years before his untimely death. He served his country with honor and distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation honoring the life and death of Javier Vega, Jr., by naming this checkpoint after him. I urge my colleagues to pass S. 1617, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1617.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 585, DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 16, 2017, THROUGH OCTOBER 20, 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

MR. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-345) on the resolution (H. Res. 562) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal em-

ployees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from October 16, 2017, through October 20, 2017; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1858, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 2464, by the yeas and nays.

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

STAFF SERGEANT RYAN SCOTT OSTROM POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1858) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

YEAS—397

Abraham	Blum	Carson (IN)
Adams	Blumenauer	Carter (GA)
Aderholt	Blunt Rochester	Carter (TX)
Aguilar	Bonamici	Cartwright
Allen	Bost	Castor (FL)
Amash	Boyle, Brendan	Castro (TX)
Amodei	F.	Chabot
Arrington	Brady (PA)	Cheney
Babin	Brady (TX)	Chu, Judy
Bacon	Brat	Cioccilline
Banks (IN)	Brooks (AL)	Clark (MA)
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Clarke (NY)
Barr	Brown (MD)	Clay
Barragán	Brownley (CA)	Clyburn
Barton	Buchanan	Coffman
Bass	Buck	Cohen
Bera	Bucshon	Cole
Bergman	Budd	Collins (GA)
Beyer	Burgess	Collins (NY)
Biggs	Bustos	Comer
Bilirakis	Butterfield	Comstock
Bishop (GA)	Byrne	Conaway
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Connolly
Bishop (UT)	Capuano	Conyers
Black	Carbajal	Cook
Blackburn	Cárdenas	Cooper

Correa	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Taylor	Vela	Wenstrup	Byrne	Gohmert	Maloney,
Costa	Hunter	Napolitano	Tenney	Velázquez	Westerman	Calvert	Gomez	Carolyn B.
Costello (PA)	Hurd	Neal	Thompson (MS)	Wagner	Williams	Capuano	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Issa	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)	Walberg	Wilson (SC)	Carbajal	Goodlatte	Marchant
Cramer	Jackson Lee	Noem	Tiberi	Walker	Wittman	Cárdenas	Gosar	Marino
Crawford	Jayapal	Nolan	Tipton	Walorski	Womack	Carson (IN)	Gottheimer	Marshall
Crist	Jeffries	Norcross	Tonko	Walters, Mimi	Woodall	Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Massie
Crowley	Jenkins (KS)	Norman	Torres	Wasserman	Yoder	Carter (TX)	Granger	Mast
Cuellar	Jenkins (WV)	Nunes	Trott	Schultz	Yoho	Cartwright	Graves (GA)	Matsui
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran	Turner	Waters, Maxine	Young (AK)	Castor (FL)	Graves (LA)	McCaui
Cummings	Johnson (LA)	O'Rourke	Upton	Watson Coleman	Young (IA)	Castro (TX)	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Olson	Vargas	Weber (TX)	Zeldin	Chabot	Green, Al	McCollum
Davidson	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Veasey	Welch		Cheney	Green, Gene	McEachin
Davis, Danny	Jones	Pallone				Chu, Judy	Griffith	McGovern
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Palmer				Cicilline	Grothman	McHenry
DeFazio	Joyce (OH)	Panetta	Beatty	Johnson (OH)	Smucker	Clark (MA)	Guthrie	McKinley
DeGette	Kaptur	Pascarell	Bridenstine	Knight	Thompson (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Handel	McMorris
Delaney	Katko	Paulsen	Cleaver	Labrador	Thornberry	Clay	Harper	Rodgers
DeLauro	Keating	Payne	Davis (CA)	Long	Titus	Cleaver	Harris	McNerney
DeBene	Kelly (IL)	Pearce	Denham	McCarthy	Tsongas	Clyburn	Hartzler	McSally
Demings	Kelly (MS)	Pelosi	DesJarlais	Nadler	Valadao	Coffman	Heck	Meadows
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Perlmutter	Españallat	Pingree	Visclosky	Cohen	Hensarling	Meehan
DeSantis	Kennedy	Perry	Grijalva	Quigley	Walden	Cole	Herrera Beutler	Meeks
DeSaulnier	Khanna	Peters	Gutiérrez	Renacci	Walz	Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Meng
Deutch	Kihuen	Peterson	Hanabusa	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)	Collins (NY)	Higgins (LA)	Messer
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Pittenger	Hastings	Rouzer	Wilson (FL)	Comer	Higgins (NY)	Mitchell
Dingell	Kilmer	Pocan	Huffman	Shimkus	Yarmuth	Comstock	Hill	Moolenaar
Doggett	Kind	Poe (TX)				Conaway	Himes	Mooney (WV)
Donovan	King (IA)	Poliquin				Connolly	Holding	Moore
Doyle, Michael F.	King (NY)	Polis				Conyers	Hollingsworth	Moulton
Duffy	Kinzing	Posey				Cook	Hoyer	Mullin
Duncan (SC)	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)				Cooper	Hudson	Murphy (FL)
Duncan (TN)	Kuster (NH)	Raskin				Correa	Huizenga	Murphy (PA)
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Ratcliffe				Costa	Hultgren	Napolitano
Ellison	LaHood	Reed				Costello (PA)	Hunter	Neal
Emmer	LaMalfa	Reichert				Hurd	Courtney	Newhouse
Engel	Lamborn	Rice (NY)				Cramer	Issa	Noem
Eshoo	Lance	Rice (SC)				Crawford	Jackson Lee	Nolan
Estes (KS)	Langevin	Richmond				Crist	Jayapal	Norcross
Esty (CT)	Larsen (WA)	Roby				Crowley	Jeffries	Norman
Evans	Larson (CT)	Roe (TN)				Cuellar	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes
Farenthold	Latta	Rogers (AL)				Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	O'Halleran
Faso	Lawrence	Rogers (KY)				Cummings	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Ferguson	Lawson (FL)	Rokita				Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (LA)	Olson
Fitzpatrick	Lee	Rooney, Francis				Davidson	Johnson, E. B.	Palazzo
Fleischmann	Levin	Rooney, Thomas J.				Davis (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Pallone
Flores	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen				Davis, Danny	Jones	Palmer
Fortenberry	Lewis (MN)	Rosen				Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Panetta
Foster	Lieu, Ted	Roskam				DeFazio	Joyce (OH)	Pascarell
Fox	Lipinski	Ross				DeGette	Kaptur	Paulsen
Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Rothfus				DeLauro	Katko	Payne
Franks (AZ)	Loeb	Roybal-Allard				DelBene	Keating	Pearce
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Royce (CA)				Demings	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
Fudge	Loudermilk	Ruiz				Dent	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter
Gabbard	Love	Ruppersberger				DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Perry
Gaetz	Lowenthal	Rush				DeSaulnier	Kennedy	Peters
Gallagher	Lowe	Russell				Deutch	Khanna	Peterson
Gallo	Lucas	Rutherford				Diaz-Balart	Kihuen	Pittenger
Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (OH)				Dingell	Kihuen	Pocan
Garrett	M. Grisham,	Sánchez				Doggett	Kildee	Poe (TX)
Gianforte	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sanford				Donovan	Kilmer	Poliquin
Gibbs	Lynch	Sarbanes				Doyle, Michael F.	Kind	Polis
Gohmert	MacArthur	Scalise				Duffy	King (IA)	Posey
Gomez	Maloney,	Schakowsky				Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Price (NC)
Gonzalez (TX)	Carolyn B.	Schiff				Duncan (TN)	Kinzing	Raskin
Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean	Schneider				Dunn	Krishnamoorthi	Ratcliffe
Gosar	Marchant	Schrader				Ellison	Kustoff (TN)	Reed
Gottheimer	Marino	Schweikert				Emmer	LaHood	Reichert
Gowdy	Marshall	Scott (VA)				Engel	LaMalfa	Rice (NY)
Granger	Massie	Scott, Austin				Eshoo	Lamborn	Rice (SC)
Graves (GA)	Mast	Scott, David				Estes (KS)	Lance	Richmond
Graves (LA)	Matsui	Sensenbrenner				Esty (CT)	Langevin	Roby
Graves (MO)	McCaui	Serrano				Evans	Larsen (WA)	Roe (TN)
Green, Al	McClintock	Sessions				Farenthold	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Green, Gene	McCollum	Sewell (AL)				Faso	Latta	Rogers (KY)
Griffith	McEachin	Shea-Porter				Ferguson	Lawson (FL)	Rokita
Grothman	McGovern	Sherman				Fitzpatrick	Lee	Rooney, Francis
Guthrie	McHenry	Shuster				Fleischmann	Levin	Rooney, Thomas J.
Handel	McKinley	Simpson				Flores	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Harper	McMorris	Sinema				Fortenberry	Lewis (MN)	Rosen
Harris	Rodgers	Sires				Foster	Lieu, Ted	Roskam
Hartzler	McNerney	Slaughter				Fox	Lipinski	Ross
Heck	McSally	Smith (MO)				Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Hensarling	Meadows	Smith (NE)				Franks (AZ)	Loeb	Roybal-Allard
Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Smith (NJ)				Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Royce (CA)
Hice, Jody B.	Meeks	Smith (TX)				Fudge	Loudermilk	Ruiz
Higgins (LA)	Meng	Smith (WA)				Gabbard	Love	Ruppersberger
Higgins (NY)	Messer	Soto				Gaetz	Lowenthal	Russell
Hill	Mitchell	Speier				Gallagher	Lucas	Rutherford
Himes	Moolenaar	Stefanik				Gallego	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (OH)
Holding	Mooney (WV)	Stewart				Garamendi	Lujan Grisham,	Sánchez
Hollingsworth	Moore	Stivers				Garmendi	M.	Sanford
Hoyer	Moulton	Suozi				Gianforte	Luján, Ben Ray	Sarbanes
Hudson	Mullin	Swalwell (CA)				Gibbs	Lynch	Scalise
Huizenga	Murphy (FL)	Takano					MacArthur	

NOT VOTING—36

□ 1852

Messrs. VARGAS and ELLISON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 558.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY
POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2464) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the “John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

YEAS—395

Abraham	Bass	Boyle, Brendan
Adams	Bera	F.
Aderholt	Bergman	Brady (PA)
Aguilar	Beyer	Brady (TX)
Allen	Biggs	Brat
Amash	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Amodei	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (IN)
Arrington	Bishop (MI)	Brown (MD)
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brownley (CA)
Bacon	Black	Buchanan
Banks (IN)	Blum	Buck
Barletta	Blumenauer	Bucshon
Barr	Blunt Rochester	Budd
Barragán	Bonamici	Burgess
Barton	Bost	Bustos

Schakowsky	Smith (WA)	Wagner
Schiff	Soto	Walberg
Schneider	Speler	Walker
Schrader	Stefanik	Walorski
Schweikert	Stewart	Walters, Mimi
Scott (VA)	Stivers	Wasserman
Scott, Austin	Suozzi	Schultz
Scott, David	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Sensenbrenner	Takano	Watson Coleman
Serrano	Tenney	Weber (TX)
Sessions	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup
Shea-Porter	Tiberi	Westerman
Sherman	Tipton	Williams
Shuster	Tonko	Wilson (SC)
Simpson	Torres	Wittman
Sinema	Trott	Womack
Sires	Turner	Woodall
Slaughter	Upton	Yoder
Smith (MO)	Vargas	Yoho
Smith (NE)	Veasey	Young (AK)
Smith (NJ)	Vela	Young (IA)
Smith (TX)	Velázquez	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—38

Beatty	Knight	Taylor
Blackburn	Labrador	Thompson (CA)
Bridenstine	Lawrence	Thornberry
Butterfield	Long	Titus
Denham	McCarthy	Tsongas
DesJarlais	Nadler	Valadao
Espallat	Pingree	Visclosky
Grijalva	Quigley	Walden
Gutierrez	Renacci	Walz
Hanabusa	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
Hastings	Rouzer	Wilson (FL)
Huffman	Shimkus	Yarmuth
Johnson (OH)	Smucker	

□ 1901

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 559.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 10, I missed two votes to attend to constituent business in my district. Had I been present for the day's vote series, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 558, the passage of H.R. 1858, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office"; and "yea" on rollcall No. 559, the passage of H.R. 2464, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

CELEBRATING THE MIAMI LIGHTHOUSE FOR THE BLIND LEARNING CENTER AND PRE-K PROGRAM

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Miami Lighthouse for the Blind on its new Lighthouse Learning Center and Pre-K program.

The Miami Lighthouse has served south Florida since 1931, offering life-

changing programs and resources for those who have visual impairments. President Virginia Jacko and her staff are making history once again with the Lighthouse Learning Center.

The Miami Lighthouse is partnering with Miami-Dade County Public Schools to provide a comprehensive learning program for pre-K students using an evidence-based curriculum to support and empower visually impaired students to achieve their potential. Children in this program will receive the training they need to perform at the same level as their sighted peers by the time they enroll in school.

Mr. Speaker, it fills me with great pride to recognize Virginia Jacko and the entire staff at the Miami Lighthouse for the Blind for their tireless work in launching this wonderful learning center in the heart of Little Havana, located in my congressional district.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO REAUTHORIZE CHIP FUNDING

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, since 1997, the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, has provided low-cost health insurance for millions of children across the United States of America.

Unfortunately, in another apparent sabotage to our Nation's healthcare system, Congress failed to reauthorize CHIP funding before it expired on September 30. Without immediate action, States will soon have to curtail care for our neediest children.

In my home State of Illinois, alone, over 295,000 children rely on CHIP for everything from routine checkups to immunizations. Congress' continued failure to reauthorize this critical program is jeopardizing the well-being of millions of America's children.

Congress will be going into recess again next week without taking any action to reauthorize this bipartisan and essential program for children. Meanwhile, millions of kids could go without care because of our failure to act. We must do better.

MICHIGAN'S UPPER PENINSULA CELEBRATES 40 YEARS OF COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate 40 years of community revitalization in Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

When Kincheloe Air Force Base closed in 1977, a renewal of the Saulte Ste. Marie community began as it

transitioned from military to civilian use. These 40 years stand as a testament to the hard work and resilience of the folks of Chippewa County, who have overcome the job loss and revenue loss associated with Kincheloe's closing.

The transition from military to civilian is not always an easy one, but I am proud to represent a region that has remained focused on investing in the future of our communities. On this anniversary, we not only celebrate our current successes, but we also remember the contributions of our past.

Kincheloe Air Force Base played a significant role in shaping our national defense and making our community into what it is today. We are forever grateful to the Chippewa County community for preserving that history throughout these 40 years.

TRUMP RAMPS UP DEMANDS FOR NEW DACA DEAL

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Illinois and demand that the Children's Health Insurance Program that will help millions of children have healthcare be reauthorized now, and certainly it should be done before we leave for the work recess.

I also want to hold up the headline of the Houston Chronicle that says: "Trump Ramps Up Demands for New DACA Deal."

Sometimes we think that these are just statements that don't impact people's lives. The name of the young lady on this front page is Karen, who watches her parents work 17 hours a day, trying to ensure that the children who came here through no fault of their own can be contributing Americans.

We stood together yesterday with 122,000 in the State of Texas. We thought we had a reasonable deal to be able to work together to help these young people. But with the ridiculous demands that have been made by this administration—\$15 billion border wall, cutting legal immigration, sending out the door unaccompanied children—it is absolutely ludicrous.

Does anyone care about human life.

Then we stood together with the chief of police, the sheriff, the constables, and Moms Demand Action and fought against ridiculous nonregulation of guns that can kill people, military guns. We need gun safety legislation, and we need to do it now.

THE VIETNAM WAR MEMORIAL TRAVELING WALL VISITS CENTRE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, I had the opportunity to participate in both the opening and the closing ceremonies for the traveling version of the Vietnam War Memorial Wall. The traveling wall was in State College last Thursday through Sunday, and it was a truly moving experience for all those who visited.

The theme for Centre County was "Welcome Home." We all know that in many instances, our Vietnam veterans did not receive a warm welcome home when they returned from war. This is a scar on our history and one that we are working to heal.

The traveling wall serves as a reminder of the efforts to promote liberty and freedom that our Vietnam veterans put forth. It finally recognizes their struggles and thanks them for their service after years of underappreciation.

Mr. Speaker, the wall tells the story of so many Americans. They were sons and daughters. They were our friends and our neighbors. They are American heroes.

It is never too late to honor our veterans to ensure that they receive the recognition that they deserve.

RELIEF EFFORT IN PUERTO RICO AFTER HURRICANE MARIA

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, what a privilege it has been for me to know and do my best to help community leaders in Lorain, Ohio, who have been engaged in the Puerto Rican relief effort following Hurricane Maria.

Lorain Councilman Angel Arroyo, along with many of our constituents, have been organizing local shipments to Puerto Rico. Last week, working with celebrities like Bravo TV star Bethenny Frankel, Councilman Arroyo helped arrange seven truckloads of aid that were flown in on a private charter airplane.

Human stories from relatives across that vast region focused on the tragic lack of aid, especially within the vast interior parts of that island. Our district has the largest concentration of Puerto Ricans in Ohio, and families are very worried. FEMA is not doing its job, and the Trump administration should get an F for all of the citizens of this country that are being left behind.

Victor Leandry of the Lorain-based nonprofit El Centro noted that his sister and brother-in-law live in a smaller city, Ponce, and, as of this weekend, they still had no power.

I include in the RECORD a letter from a constituent's family member detailing the dire situation: no water, no electricity, no radio contact, with families' life savings destroyed, their crops and their land as well.

We need to address the humanitarian crisis in Puerto Rico. What is happening there is un-American. The Trump administration better wake up and help the citizens of this country.

Hi
My parents live in Lares Puerto Rico in the Barrio called Palmallanos. November will make two years since they moved back "home". They worked since day one to get their land aka finca to what it was when my grandparents owned the home. They did a great job. They had Banana and Avocado trees. Had just planted roughly 200 coffee trees and couldn't wait to watch them grow. They had planted different herbs as well as squash and beans.

All of that was lost on September 20th when Hurricane Maria ripped straight down the island. I could not get in touch with my parents for two long weeks.

Finally I received the call I had been waiting for. While my parents are safe and their house is intact, they lost everything on their land. They had some flooding in the home and a shed they had their washer and dryer in had its roof ripped off and flooding. The river that runs through their land rose so much that my dad could not sleep concerned that it would rise to their home. Fortunately it did not, however due to the rains and winds the house did get flooded, but they were able to work for hours nonstop to get the water out.

After two weeks they are still without running water, electricity and phone service. They drive 30-40 minutes to get cell Service as well as go get water. They have to take whatever containers they have to fill up. They have received no additional assistance. They went to the market and were lucky enough to get a bag of rice and some canned goods.

They have enough propane to have one warm meal a day and the rest of the time they eat whatever they have in cans or other non perishable items. They boil water to drink and shower with rain water.

As for eating any dairy or meat, well they haven't in two weeks. They are concerned to eat any meat they could get from the store for fear of getting sick due to no electricity anywhere and the inability to keep anything cold.

When getting gas, they waited in line for 2.5 hours and a letter they had mailed me on 9/24 finally arrived on 10/6. They have not received mail and are not able to get packages.

I asked if they wanted to come and stay with me and my family and they said no. Why? Well, they are afraid of leaving their home due to looting. They want to keep what they have left.

I know my parents are strong people, but honestly, I don't know how much longer anyone in their situation can make it.

Prayers for Puerto Rico.

SENY KERFONTA.

NEIL "SUDS" SUTHERLAND, A DEDICATED FIREFIGHTER FOR 53 YEARS

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding constituent and volunteer firefighter from the 22nd District, Neil Sutherland, otherwise known as "Suds."

Neil has been a member of the Stittville Fire Department since 1965 and fire chief since 1998. Throughout his 53 years of dedicated fire service, Chief Sutherland has led the Stittville Fire Department to become one of the most well-respected departments in the State.

Stittville Fire Department is also one of the busiest fire departments in our region, handling over 220 calls a month. Incredibly, Chief Suds Sutherland has responded to 90 percent of those calls.

Chief Sutherland is also an active player on the Stittville Volunteer softball team, the undefeated league champions for the past 3 years.

Recently, Chief Sutherland was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer. On Saturday, I had the honor of joining our community and the Sutherland family at a beautiful ceremony benefiting Chief Sutherland and his dedication and service to our community.

Tragically, medical research shows that firefighters have a much greater risk of contracting cancer due to increased exposure to smoke and toxins.

Chief Sutherland's enduring spirit and unwavering commitment to community is an inspiration to us all. I ask everyone to join me in sending our thoughts and our prayers to Chief Sutherland, otherwise lovingly known as "Suds," and his family during his courageous battle to beat cancer.

□ 1915

PRESIDENT TRUMP IS PLAYING A DANGEROUS GAME

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, \$15 billion for a wall. I thought Mexico was going to pay for it. Mr. Speaker, President Trump is playing a dangerous game with North Korea. He is playing a dangerous game with American lives.

The President probably thinks he is being clever when he taunts Kim Jong-un and calls him "little rocket man." The President probably thinks he is a tough guy when he threatens to rain down fire and fury on North Korea. But the President is not clever, and he is not tough.

A clever President would know that peace is preferable to war. A tough President would understand that threatening war with a highly armed, petty dictator makes the United States look weak and risks American lives.

President Trump's saber-rattling could draw the country into nuclear war that no one wants. If the United States is drawn into a war for the President's ego, people will die, Americans will die, and thousands, if not millions, of North Koreans will die.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Members are reminded to

refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ALTO "BUD" ADAMS, JR.

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Bud Adams, who passed away at his home on Adams Ranch in Fort Pierce, Florida, on September 22. He was 91 years old.

Mr. Adams was a larger-than-life cowboy. He was a fixture in Florida's agriculture community, and the patriarch of Adams Ranch, a 4-generation family operation that spans 80 years and spreads across 50,000 acres in Florida in four counties.

After serving in the Navy in World War II, Bud began managing Adams Ranch with his father and quickly became a legend among Florida cattlemen for innovations like the development of the Braford breed of beef cattle, a breed capable of withstanding Florida's hot and rainy summers.

He has also served as the president of the Florida Cattlemen's Association and is a member of Florida's Agricultural Hall of Fame.

He was an avid outdoor photographer and award-winning conservationist. He has shown a generation of farmers and ranchers and admirers like me that it is possible to work the land while still preserving God's beauty.

Bud is survived by his loving wife, Dot, of 67 years, his three sons, his 14 grandchildren, and his nine great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Florida has lost one of its greatest sons, and it was an honor for me to serve him here in the House.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION IS CRITICAL

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

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 21st Century AIRR Act. This critical FAA reauthorization offers the best possible plan to finally modernize our antiquated air traffic control system.

I recently traveled to Ottawa, Canada, with congressional colleagues to learn firsthand how Canada's private air navigation service provider has been efficiently and safely moving 12 million aircraft each year since 1996.

This model consistently upgrades and improves air traffic control technology and isn't subject, as it is in the United States, to onerous government procurement rules. It is clear that this system works far better than its U.S. counterpart.

These reforms would also benefit the environment, as the updated tech-

nology allows for more direct routes. For instance, in Canada, over the last 20 years, this has resulted in 1.4 billion fewer gallons of fuel that have been used just in the last 10 years, and twice that amount in the last 20 years.

This needed change has widespread bipartisan support, and it would guarantee consistent funding for modernizing our air traffic safety system.

WE CANNOT REST UNTIL CAITLAN COLEMAN AND HER FAMILY ARE FREE

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today, Caitlan Coleman, an American citizen from York County, Pennsylvania, which I am privileged to represent, was taken hostage by the Haqqani Network, an offshoot of the Taliban, while hiking near the Pakistan and Afghanistan border.

Caitlan has given birth to two boys while in captivity, boys whose only life experience has been that of a hostage and surrounded by violence and fear. I speak with Caitlan's mom and dad regularly. While my heart breaks for them, as fellow Americans, as a father with children of my own, I am crestfallen and horrified for them.

Caitlan and her family are Americans. We cannot rest until they are released and returned safely to the arms of the United States. I urge my colleagues to join me in praying for the safe return of Caitlan, her husband, and her two children, but also for her family and loved ones for whom time stopped 5 years ago.

I implore the U.S. State Department to use every resource at our disposal to bring our American citizens home.

RECENT DISASTERS THAT HAVE BEFALLEN OUR AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that we need to talk about. Important events are spilling upon Americans, just cascading upon us. We could spend hours and, indeed, should spend hours talking about North Korea. We should and will spend hours talking about tax reform, or tax reductions, or serious benefits for the superwealthy in America, and we will talk about that. We will debate that.

But what is on my mind right now are the disasters that have befallen our American people. We think about what has happened over the last 11 months—

floods on the East Coast, people forced out of their homes as the rivers rose in the Carolinas.

We think about California, and the massive floods, and the 200,000 people who were evacuated from their homes in my district.

We think about the recent hurricanes as they slammed into Houston, Florida, the Keys; and Hurricane Maria, as that hurricane devastated Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. These traumatic disasters are now in our memory, but they are also our reality.

In California today, in my district, and in my colleague MIKE THOMPSON's district, thousands of homes have been burned to the ground and people have died.

These disasters are not new to America, and, over the years, we have set up a mechanism to deal with them. That mechanism is the firefighters across this Nation who respond, the emergency plans that have been put in place.

I know during my period as insurance commissioner in California, I would often arrive at these disasters, some of which go back more than 30 or 40 years, and console people who will have lost their home and attempt to deal with their insurance issues. And I would always remind those who were in the path of these flames, or hurricanes, or tornadoes, to be prepared; that Boy Scout motto: Be Prepared.

And now, in California, the same message goes out by the first responders and, indeed, by myself here on the floor of the House of Representatives: Be prepared. Be prepared to evacuate. Think about what it is you need to take ahead of time, those important papers, those scrapbooks, those photo albums, the dog, the cat; and when the time to go arrives, when that message arrives on your cell phone, or on the loud speaker from the police car out in front, obey it. Get out. Get out because you have already prepared.

Yes, you should have had that insurance policy that you forgot, that flood insurance program. Yes, you should have had it. And all too often, we have to rely upon the generosity of charities, and, thankfully, they are there. And we also rely upon the Federal, State and county governments.

Today, here in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate, as well as in the administration, we are beginning to gear up for yet another emergency appropriation to pay for the relief efforts that are underway. It is not going to be enough. It may take care of part of what occurred in Houston, or in Florida, or in the Keys. It is certainly not going to be enough to take care of the devastation in Puerto Rico.

And I know, as the fires continue to rage in California, the appropriations that are being discussed, the emergency money for FEMA, will not be enough.

While we are looking at these disasters and the billions upon billions of dollars that will be needed to rebuild the infrastructure, to rebuild the schools and hospitals, to pay the bills for the emergency work that is going on, this House of Representatives, this week, is in the process of trying to figure out how to pass a massive tax cut that will take trillions of dollars of revenue away from the Federal Government.

It is estimated anywhere from \$2 trillion to \$5 trillion, depending upon the details, over the next decade, will not be available for the next disaster.

Will it be added to the deficit? Possibly.

Will those revenue reductions be balanced by cuts to Medicare? Yes. It is already being discussed. It is in the Republican budget.

Will those \$2 trillion to \$5 trillion reductions in revenue be added to the deficit, or will we cut Medicare? They tried to do it in the Affordable Care Act, now they are coming back with a budget bill that would cause it to happen again—more than \$1.5 trillion pulled out of the Medicaid program. And so there will be another disaster, a slow-building disaster of millions of Americans who will not be able to get healthcare.

So, added on top of the burden of rebuilding America, the emergency appropriations to pay for the ongoing and past disasters, we need to be aware of the inconsistency of thought that is going on here.

We are looking at an appropriation bill to pass something in the range of \$15 billion, in addition to the previous \$12 billion, which we know will not be sufficient to deal with the existing disasters; to say nothing of the billions of dollars that are owed to the counties and States for disasters going back, at least in California, 10 years, where the Federal Government has yet to reimburse the counties and State for the obligations that the Federal Government accepted, in some cases, a decade ago.

□ 1930

In the face of all of that, we are going to reduce revenues to the Federal Government.

Who gets the tax breaks?

Well, here is a fact that the Vice President—excuse me, Mr. Speaker, if I might—has suggested in California: that it is the poor that will get the tax break.

Not so. They will get a little, to be sure. The middle class is likely to get a tax increase.

But the real tax break, the top 1 percent get 80 percent of those revenue reductions. Eighty percent will flow to the top 1 percent of America's wealthy. So if you are concerned about income inequality, you better be paying attention.

One must wonder: What is the logic of what is happening here? What is the logic?

In the face of disasters that have occurred, historically, but more recently within the last year—floods in California, floods in the Carolinas, hurricanes, fires, tornados in the Midwest—in the face of all of that, we are going to massively reduce the ability of the Federal Government to respond. It doesn't make much sense to me, particularly when the beneficiaries of those tax reductions are the super-wealthy.

I think it is 2,500 families in America that would benefit from the elimination of the estate tax—2,000-plus families. It is some \$6 billion to \$9 billion of revenue lost every year so that 2,000 superwealthy families don't have to pay an estate tax.

What is going on here?

600,000 low-income housing vouchers gone so that they can pass on their wealth to the next generation. Income inequality.

In the face of the disasters, we need to stop for a moment as we begin the appropriations process for the FEMA emergency appropriations. We need to stop for a moment and consider the way these two things work together.

I was in my district, Davis, California, for an event on Sunday, and I had several students—some of whom are my interns—come to me and say: What are you going to do about the student loans? There is a lot of happy talk around here that we are going to make higher education free. It is a great idea.

It used to be that way when we were building the economy, when we knew, if we educated people, we would have a strong, growing economy. But tell me, in the face of a \$2 trillion to \$5 trillion reduction in the revenues to the Federal Government so that the wealthy can get wealthier, how are we going to ever reduce the cost of education to Americans?

I don't know. Maybe somebody has the answer here. It doesn't seem clear to me that that could be happening.

I am going to introduce a bill again this week—one that I introduced in the last session—that is kind of based upon the fact that Americans across this Nation are able to refinance their homes at a lower interest rate. It is a great idea. I have done it. I suspect many of the people who are listening, and certainly many of the Members of Congress, have refinanced their home to get a lower interest rate.

But if you have a student loan that may have been from 5 or 8 years ago, or you are about to sign a document this fall for a Federally financed student loan, you cannot refinance that.

Why?

The Federal Government—there is \$1.3 trillion of student loans out there. Nearly \$900 billion of that \$1.3 trillion is owed to the Federal Government.

Why don't we refinance those loans? What if we were to do that? What would it mean to the students out there who are paying 5, 6, 7, 8 percent interest to the Federal Government that is able to go out and borrow money for 10 years at 2 percent?

That is a pretty good margin.

Even the fat cats on Wall Street can't have a margin that big, but the Federal Government does. So these students are paying these high interest rates so that the Federal Government can literally profit on their backs. That is a fact. Let's allow those students to refinance those student loans. Let's just see what happens.

The Federal Government can borrow money at less than right around 2 percent—maybe a little less right now; add a percent for management fees, 3 percent; reduce all of the student loans, \$800 billion, \$900 billion of student loans. The government would go out and borrow it at 2 percent for 10 years and tell the students and those who are no longer in school: We are going to allow you to refinance. Take an interest rate that may be half of what you are getting now.

By the way, why are we charging a fee to these students so that they could borrow money? Don't we want them to get an education? Don't we want them to be able to improve themselves?

Yet we require a fee. So let's eliminate the origination fees.

It is as though the Federal Government were some sharks out there dealing with home mortgages. No. We are dealing with students and their lives. If we can do this, maybe it is a couple of thousand dollars over the life of that loan that that student can then invest in their life and in their family.

These are things that are possible. These are things that we ought to be doing. There is just a lot of happy talk around here: Oh, we are going to make education free.

It would be good if we could. We could if we don't cut the Federal revenues by \$2 trillion to \$5 trillion over the next decade. Eliminate origination fees. Save low-income borrowing. It is all possible. The art of the possible ought to be what we are doing, not the art of enhancing those who are so wealthy already.

I am going to paraphrase a fellow that is pretty important in American history. FDR said something like this: The measure of our success is not that we do more for those who have much, but, rather, that we do for those who have little.

So what of this tax cut that we are going to spend this week and next week, this next month, and, according to our Treasury Secretary, we will be done by the end of the year? So what does it mean?

It means maybe a small tax break for the working men and women of America. It means a huge tax benefit for

those who are already wealthy; the elimination of the estate tax.

It has been estimated by The New York Times that based upon our President's tax returns of a decade ago—by the way, he won't show us his present tax returns—that he could benefit to the tune of \$1 billion with his proposed tax program.

Not bad if you can have it. But is that good public policy?

I don't think so. I don't think so; not in the face of the needs of America. We have enormous defense needs. We have been fighting wars in the Middle East for almost three decades now. There are other needs that we have for our military.

You only need to listen to the Secretary of Defense and others as they talk about the need to rebuild much of the American military. The admiral responsible for the Pacific Theater says that he needs something rather important: munitions.

Munitions. Wow.

Yes, we have needs. We have students who are paying interest rates far higher than is necessary, unable to refinance their Federal student loans because the law doesn't allow it. But it is possible. In fact, it would make a lot of economic sense. These young men and women might actually start a family; might actually be able to buy a home or a car, start a new business, start a small business. There are a lot of possibilities.

But the superwealthy need another tax break?

I don't think so. I don't think so at all. And I don't quite understand the happy talk by our leaders of this administration who like to say: Not to worry. You are going to get to deduct the first \$25,000.

Well, yes. And then what?

Oh, by the way, there is this 20 percent increase in the bottom tax rate, from 10 percent to 12 percent. That is a 20 percent increase. At the top tax rate, it goes from 35, unless you are able to maneuver into their little scheme where you can actually reduce your tax rate to 15 percent by being an LLC—a limited liability corporation—or a subchapter S corporation.

Well, if you have the money to hire a good accountant and a lawyer, there are a lot of ways you can scheme and scam. And if you are a corporation, some of our largest corporations are able to hire the lawyers and the accountants and duck their taxes entirely.

The list is long. The list is actually rather maddening. Apple, GE, AT&T, and others, the big ones, their tax rates are down in the zero or in the less than 10 percent range, and they want more.

So Puerto Rico is devastated. My counties in California are facing rampaging fires, and perhaps as many as 2,000 homes have already burned. There will be another tornado and another hurricane.

The question for us is: Will there be the money for the Federal Government to provide the support that we should do to help Americans rebuild?

That is a fundamental question.

I know that there is a better way. I know that in the proposal that our Republicans have put forth there will be less money for infrastructure. I know that if you want good-paying jobs, the construction industry has good-paying jobs. I know that for every dollar we spend on infrastructure, the economy will grow by \$2 or more and have a foundation for future economic growth.

I know that when we rebuild the infrastructure of our communities that have been devastated by hurricanes, tornados, floods, and fires, that the communities can come back strong and the economies for those communities can flourish. I know that it takes a strong American Government to make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter this week, my heart and thoughts go out to those millions of Americans who have been devastated by the hurricanes, floods, and fires; those people in my district who have lost their homes, and those who have lost their lives.

I come here to the floor to say: Let us think seriously about what our obligation is to Americans, to those who have little, to those who have lost everything. What is our obligation to them?

FDR was correct: The measure of our success is not that we do more for those who have much, but, rather, that we do for those who have little.

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

□ 1945

THE RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to discuss the topics that are on my mind. Hopefully, you will consider these arguments as well, Mr. Speaker. I know that people across this floor and across the country have a lot of these same considerations in mind.

I want to come to the floor and address the DACA situation and take you through a little bit of the history of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals which was implemented by Barack Obama in an unconstitutional fashion. He knew it, and all of America knew it. We know that Barack Obama, 22 times, said that he didn't have the constitutional authority to implement a program that granted the equivalent of amnesty—at least temporary am-

nesty—let alone a work permit which he added to the program by executive edict, fiat, or order. Instead, it requires legislation in order to enable such a policy.

A President can't grant amnesty. A President can have prosecutorial discretion. Prosecutorial discretion is a legal term for what the Justice Department does when they are determining whether the resources they have to prosecute crimes are adequate to enforce against the most serious offenders. Barack Obama, President Obama, did implement some of those relatively prudent policies with prosecutorial discretion. He prioritized the most violent and evil criminals that he could identify, at least by policy. He turned a lot of them loose too, by the way, onto the streets of America in the course of all that. So it was a very confusing policy that emerged without consistency under President Obama. However, he exercised a legal prosecutorial discretion when they looked at each case on an individual basis.

But I recall when his Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, came before the Judiciary Committee to testify about this program on DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals—or some might say the deferred action for children of aliens. Her testimony and the memos that came down, the Morton memos, set up four different categories of people who would be granted a quasi-amnesty underneath the President's policy.

There, Secretary Napolitano testified over and over again, and it reflected the document itself which, seven times, referenced on an individual basis only—on an individual basis only—seven times. I can repeat it for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, but that is what was going on, which told me, as I listened to her testimony and had read the documents prior to the testimony, that they knew what the law said. They knew it required—that it required—an individual basis only and a prioritization of applying the law to bring about the best effect of the utilization of the resources of the Justice Department.

Yet Barack Obama, President Obama, around the country multiple times, in the 1½ or 2 years building up to his implementation of the DACA policy, multiple times he said that he didn't have the constitutional authority to implement the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. Multiple times. It turned out to be at least 22 that we have a videotape on.

The most recent that I recall was in a high school just outside of the Capitol here in Washington, D.C., where he was speaking to a high school group.

He said: You are smart students. You know that there is a separation of powers. I don't have the authority to grant this legal status to people who are here illegally even if their parents did bring

them in or even if they came in on their own under the age of 18. I don't have the authority to do that. That is Congress that has the authority.

I should remind everyone, Mr. Speaker, that President Obama taught constitutional law. He was an adjunct professor teaching constitutional law at the University of Chicago. The University of Chicago has a good reputation for understanding the Constitution, and Barack Obama demonstrated that when he said: You are smart students, and you know that we have three branches of government, a separation of powers. Congress is Article I. They make the laws.

He said: I am Article II, the executive branch. My job is to enforce the laws. And Article III is the judicial branch of government. They interpret the laws.

So when the courts interpret the laws that Congress writes, the executive's job is to carry them out. He knew he was violating the separation of powers because he defined that to America multiple times. But he did anyway.

I believe that President Obama made a calculation, a political calculation. The political calculation, in my estimation, was that he could get away with it. He wanted the policy, but Congress wouldn't pass the policy because we have great respect for the rule of law, and we don't want to reward lawbreakers. That happened in 1986, and we are paying the price for that amnesty act of 1986. He couldn't get the DREAMers legislation through Congress, so he calculated that he could get away with implementing that as a policy even though he knew it was unconstitutional.

So some of us went to work to initiate lawsuits to have the courts strike down the executive edicts of Barack Obama that was the foundation for DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

As it wandered through the courts. The lead in the primary case was Chris Crane, the president of the ICE, Immigration Custom Enforcement, union. His name was on the case first. It was Crane, et al. v. Napolitano, et al. in the beginning. It went through the courts, and by the time you follow it through a circuitous route, you find out that Crane, et al. v. Napolitano, et al. got shifted off to the side. It was declared to be a decision that had to do with the administrative rules that if he had a grievance, he had to take that grievance through the administrative rules process rather than through the courts to address the policy itself. So it got parked off on a side rail, so to speak.

Then we saw a parallel case come forward, the DAPA case, the Deferred Action on Parents of Americans was how the President described it. I would have said parents of aliens myself. But that case was found by Judge Andrew Hanen down in Texas to be unconstitutional.

It was a very similar and parallel case. The President couldn't grant amnesty to parents of children who were here, and the President couldn't grant amnesty to children who came here. That same constitutional principle applies to both.

We know that Ken Paxton, the attorney general of Texas, and others with about 9, 10, or 11 other State attorneys general, had prepared to file a suit to litigate the DACA case in parallel fashion that DAPA was litigated successfully. They set a date of September 5 and said to the President: If you don't end DACA by September 5, we are filing this case.

So that is about the day and probably exactly the day that President Trump came out with his decision on DACA.

I moved too fast forward, Mr. Speaker, and I need to back up to what happened. Barack Obama, President Obama, finished out his term while growing the DACA recipients by hundreds of thousands. By the time he finished his term, that number was estimated to be over 700,000 recipients who get a little card that says: You get to stay in America for 2 years, and there won't be any immigration law enforced against you as long as you don't commit any of these serious crimes, felonies, or a nasty combination of three different misdemeanors.

Then also he created out of thin air a work permit. Now, Congress isn't going to grant work permits to illegal aliens, but Barack Obama did. Congress isn't going to grant a "come out of the shadows and stay on the streets of America" permit for DACA recipients, but President Obama did. He went outside.

This Congress should have had its back up. I am frustrated. I am frustrated with the lack of conviction on the part of the Members of this Congress. Mr. Speaker, you stand in here once every 2 years, and you take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. That includes acknowledging that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. It includes the requirement that you understand the difference between Article I, Article II, and Article III.

Article I writes the laws—that is all of us here and over in the Senate. We write all of the laws for the United States of America. That is how the Constitution starts out: The legislative powers shall be reserved for we here that are the Representatives in this Republic of the American people.

We are as close to the people as anybody who is elected in the Federal Government right here in this House of Representatives—435 of us. That is what you take an oath to is that you are going to protect the Constitution of the United States. You should at least be able to defend Article I, the very authority that is the reason that you are here serving in the first place, Mr. Speaker.

Then we have an obligation also to look over the shoulder of the executive branch and have oversight over the function of the executive branch and conduct hearings and bring witnesses and dig into the methods and the effectiveness of the President of the United States, our Chief Executive Officer, in carrying out the execution of our laws.

The President of the United States takes an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. But also it requires that he takes care that the laws be faithfully executed. Now, that means carry them out, not kill them off. It looks like he was trying to kill off the Constitution rather than carry out the laws that are described by this Article I, Congress.

By the way, some of the laws that President Obama defied and gave orders to defy and to ignore were signed into law by Bill Clinton. So the legitimacy of the United States Congress and our effectiveness has been diminished by President Obama who went outside the bounds, the lines that are drawn between legislative authority, executive authority, and judicial authority.

Now, our Founding Fathers set that up to be a static relationship. They expected and believed that the courts would be the weakest of the three branches of government. They expected also that since you always have ambitious people reaching for more power, they wanted to divide that power, and they wanted to restrain the power.

That is why we have the system that we have today. That is why we redistrict every decade. That is why they called for a census so we can count all the people of America and set up congressional district so that there is a proportional representation in each of the 435 seats here offset by two Senators from every State so that we have a geographical representation—a small population State with a big voice or maybe a big population State with the same kind of voice—over in the United States Senate.

But here in this Congress, in this House, everyone has roughly the proportional same number of constituents, and your vote means the same amount here that it does for each one of us, whatever your particular role is.

So this was set up to have this balance of power. What our Founding Fathers envisioned was each branch of government would jealously protect the power vested in it through the Constitution. They didn't imagine that there would be a Congress that would be in opposite—they actually didn't imagine the two-party system, as I understand some of the history that I read, but they didn't envision that there would be a Republican majority in the House, a Republican majority in the Senate, and a Democrat President who clearly, openly, and blatantly defined it in advance and then violated the Constitution.

Our Founding Fathers never expected that this House of Representatives would sit on its hands and simply let that Constitution be violated for 2 years or longer just on DACA alone. But that happened. I brought amendments to the floor time after time after time that cut off the Federal funding that supported the unconstitutional acts of the President of the United States. Those amendments passed off the floor of the House of Representatives, and they were killed off over in the Senate.

□ 2000

Our Founding Fathers did not imagine that the Constitution could be openly, defiantly, and blatantly violated and not have this Congress hold together and shut off the funding. The power of the purse is the power of bringing that President back in line and making him keep his constitutional oath.

The will wasn't there.

As I went before a committee to present an amendment to get Rules Committee consent to an amendment, I reminded everybody on that panel: You all took an oath to support and defend the Constitution. If you meant it, if you take your word seriously, if your oath to the Constitution means anything, then not only do you have to open the door so that my amendment comes to the floor and we have an opportunity to debate it and force a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives, not only is that the case, if you don't support this, then your own oath to the Constitution is called into question.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I just remind people that I chair the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee. There are a couple of reasons for that—more than a couple—and I have defended this Constitution every day that I have been here in this United States Congress, and I take it seriously.

My father used to lecture the Constitution to me at the supper table. He would bring out the Constitution, set it down at the table. He would bring the Code of Iowa and set it down at the table. The Bible would be on the end table. The Constitution and the Code of Iowa would be on the kitchen table, and he would open it up and say: Now, we are going to trace back for you how “pick your law out of this book” gets back to the Constitution. Where is the authority for “pick your law out of this book?”

He would debate that and discuss it with me. That is where I learned that I shouldn't ever utter an opinion that hasn't been thoroughly thought out. He was the most effective critical thinker I ever met in my life. But he steeped me in the great respect for the rule of law and a great respect for the supreme law of the land, our Constitution, and the structure that is guaranteed in the

Constitution: a republican form of government.

That, Mr. Speaker, means a representative form of government, where the people select their Representatives and send them off to be their voice here in this Congress.

It was a fantastic piece of wisdom and historical knowledge that put this together in the fashion that it did. Now we have not just the oldest constitution on record, but we have the most successful constitution on record.

You can put this altogether. I believe that our Founding Fathers, as they put this together, were inspired by God to write the Declaration, to fight the war, to shape the Constitution. I think that our Founding Fathers were moved around like men on a chessboard to bring about this fantastic country that we have.

A big part of this fantastic country is the rule of law. When I write “rule of law,” for years, I capitalized the word “rule.” I capitalized “rule” with an “R” and “law” with an “L” so that it stands out on the page, so that it looks as important as it is when you read the phrase: rule of law.

Rule of law is an essential component of American exceptionalism. It is a pillar of American exceptionalism. If you think about what went together to make this great country that we have, I would add up a whole series of things.

I would trace our American exceptionalism back all the way to Mosaic Law. The Mosaic Law was borrowed by the Greeks. The Greeks kind of teased each other: Well, that isn't your original law. You borrowed that from Moses.

Well, they had great philosophers and they added to the culture, but the law came out of Moses from the Greeks to the Romans. The Romans set up republican forms of government. They also had a very good and healthy rule of law so that, at least in theory, they applied that to everybody.

That rule of law spread across Western Europe by the Romans all the way to Ireland. When the Dark Ages came—the Visigoths sacked Rome in 410 A.D. When that happened, historians, more or less, called that the signal of the world falling into the Dark Ages.

For several hundred years, not much happened that was reported to us. People lost the ability to think and reason in the fashion that they had from among the Greeks and among the Romans.

Christianity had to get itself spread into all of that and then emerge. It did emerge. It emerged sometime shortly before the end of the first millennium. It became the Age of Enlightenment and the industrial revolution.

We know, Mr. Speaker, these courses of history that have followed, but I would just point out what happened in America.

In America, we are about ready to celebrate—we did it on Monday, be-

cause it was a Federal holiday—Columbus Day on October 12, the day after tomorrow. It happens to also be my wife's birthday, Mr. Speaker. There are a couple of reasons we should celebrate Columbus Day.

He discovered the Western Hemisphere. He did so because he had a vision that the Earth was round and not flat. He was able to convince Ferdinand and Isabella that they should invest their capital in three ships to send him across the seas in the hopes that they would circle all the way around to India and maybe find a passage to come back. They could trade and be an even richer nation than Spain was.

By the way, that was the same year that the Spanish threw the Moors out. That is when the kingdom of Ferdinand and Queen Isabella was established in a more stable fashion than it had been prior to that.

They found the money for Christopher Columbus. He discovered the hemisphere. After that, we saw a lot of Spaniards emerge. They focused down in the south, in the Central American region, in the Caribbean, and settled in that area going south and north from the isthmus. They brought with them Christianity. They were driven by the idea of spreading Christianity around the world.

That went on through the 1500s, where they were settling and developing in that part of the world, and conducting some atrocities as well, Mr. Speaker—just to address what otherwise somebody would ask me to yield and listen to. Yes, they had some atrocities. They began to develop and bring Western civilization, though, to the New World.

The other end of this thing, in 1607, the first people who settled and built a permanent settlement in the North American continent were there at Jamestown, just down the road from us a little ways. It was 1607.

The Christians who landed there came for religious freedom. They sat across there on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean and they knelt at that cross and prayed. The prayer was: Lord, thank You for sending us to this new land. We hear Your call and we call out to You to guide us and bless us. We will listen to the mission that You delivered to us, which is to evangelize all people here and around the world and to settle this continent to please You.

That is the summary of the prayer. If you read that prayer, you can see and hear manifest destiny in that prayer. You can see religious emancipation in that prayer as well. They knew why they were here.

A country that is formed by people who have powerful faith, as they did, and then you have the pilgrims of Plymouth Rock in 1620, and the rest of America was built out. As the colonists began to throw off the yoke of King George, they still retained essential

principles. The essential principles would include those of the Magna Carta: the idea that a man's home is his castle and that the law has to be applied equally to everyone.

King John wasn't happy to sign that, by the way, but I think it came down to: It is your head or your signature. Why don't you decide, King John?

He decided his signature.

It has been a long time ago since the Magna Carta was signed, but it laid a foundation for the pilgrims and the settlers who came to America. They came here for religious freedom and to get away from the yoke of the old country, Great Britain.

We should remember that the pilgrims who came in on the Mayflower didn't sail out of jolly, old England. They sailed out of Leiden in the Netherlands. Several years before, they sailed the Atlantic Ocean. They pulled out and went to Leiden in the Netherlands. There, several hundred of them lived around in the area, in a community, in various different houses and apartment complexes that were there.

A lot of them went to church in Pieterskerk, which is the church in the center. They staged themselves until they were ready to go across the Atlantic Ocean to settle and land at Plymouth Rock in 1620.

These early settlers were driven by religious freedom. As they began to build their farms, their shops, and trade and build ships along the coast and our harbors, we reach the year of 1776. Then, of course, we know the Declaration was on July 4 of that year. But there is another seminal event, Mr. Speaker, and that is Adam Smith published his treatise on free enterprise capitalism. The name of it is "The Wealth of Nations."

No one has surpassed that document at this point. If you allow people to keep their own goods, earn their own profits, invest that, he explained with utter clarity how it will improve the productivity—they will invest it in efficiency—and how the invisible hand, that is the person who is buying the loaf of bread off the shelf, if that shelf is empty, you put more bread on there and sell more. If you are selling more than you can make, you raise the price a little. If somebody thinks you are making too much money, they start up their bakery. They get their bread on the shelf, and then it competes with each other. The shelf is always full of bread and the consumers get a product that they demand. That is the concept of free enterprise capitalism. I don't hear anybody talking about that today.

We also developed here a meritocracy. If you have freedom, you can be rewarded for merit. We don't talk about meritocracies anymore. We give out participation trophies for kids. They don't really want them to be winners or losers, just participants.

That is not the American way. The American way is: we get in, we compete. There is bound to be a lot of losers because there is only one winner at the end, but the losers all learn something and so does the winner. If the winner gets complacent, if the winner gets lazy, then the others who are competing are going to pass up that former winner, and he is going to have to get a little sharper in his game. That makes us all better.

When I look at my neighborhood, Mr. Speaker, I see that we have got some counties in particular that have excellent competition between the public schools and parochial schools. They have a number of different churches to choose from. They have a lot of banks that will loan money and compete with each other to invest back in the communities so entrepreneurs with ideas or families that need a bridge to the next month or two can have something to bridge them through that.

This is the kind of competition that I see. It is not just sports competition, but it is academic competition, it is competing for students, it is competing for tuition dollars, it is competing for the business investment dollars among the banks, it is churches competing for the faith and competition to save the maximum number of souls, and it is a very healthy environment.

If you take competition out, this goes flat and the vitality that exists today and just the vibrant humming of the lives that I am thinking of would be gone. It becomes complacent. I fear that is where America is going: if we are afraid to compete, we are afraid to defend our values.

Free enterprise capitalism. I think every college campus in the country has some professor who will speak against it. Some of them have many professors who speak against it. They are teaching against free enterprise capitalism. They are teaching socialism. They are teaching Marxism. They are rejecting conservatism.

By the way, I can't find a school in the country today that has an effective course on Western civilization itself. That doesn't mean they aren't out there. This is just me asking questions of people who should know the answer to that. They are saying: I can't name one, unless it would be Hillsdale College or maybe Liberty University.

I grew up in an era where every school had multiple courses on Western civilization. Because we understand our culture, we respect it. We know that, without Western civilization, the world would be so void of the contributions that came from Western civilization.

Sometime a year ago last summer, I found myself on a panel at MSNBC, Mr. Speaker. One of the panelists said: One could be an optimist and hope that this is the last Republican convention where old White people have anything to say about it.

There is no way to let a comment like that pass. So I pointed out: Charlie, that is getting a little tired, this criticism of old White people. I would challenge you to name another subgroup of people who have contributed more.

Then the lady on the panel started fanning herself. She was getting the vapors because I defended Western civilization. The host leaned over, almost with a leer, hoping that I would take the bait, and she said: More than White people.

And I said: More than Western civilization itself.

Western civilization is everywhere that Christianity has laid the foundation for civilization itself; where Christianity has been the footprint that has laid down the foundation of Western civilization itself.

□ 2015

And you don't have western civilization without Christianity; you don't have a successful history without Christianity; and you don't have people that abide by the moral laws so we don't have to have a lot of legal laws. You can't not manage a people of 300 million people and think you are going to get that done effectively if they fail to be a moral people, a people that reach over and pay forward and take care of their families and their friends and their neighbors.

I see it all over this country, Mr. Speaker. I have been to all 50 States in this country, met people in all 50 States. I have gotten behind the steering wheel in 48 of the 50, and I see good people, great people day after day after day that get out of bed, and all they want to do is help somebody. And they don't care about credit; they don't care if anybody ever notices it or sees it; they just want to help somebody. That is what makes this country turn and work the way it does.

If we wonder, we should take a look at the hurricanes that we have suffered in the South and all across, from Texas, Louisiana, and now Mississippi the other day, and Florida—Ira. American people, some people fled out of the hurricane and some people come to help, and I imagine there is a traffic jam there from time to time. But I am so grateful that we have the American character that it is.

American character is a can-do spirit, people that—I know that I had a banker visit me one day, and he showed me a picture. Actually, I met him at the airport. He showed me a picture of their bank, and the water was ready to run in the door of their bank. They had a flood that flooded the whole downtown. He said: Don't send us anything. We can handle this. It is only a flood.

I have been back to that community, and he was right. I am glad we have people like that, these spirited Americans who are part of a culture that is a

can-do culture. And I don't want to lose it, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to lose it by devaluing any of the pillars of American exceptionalism.

Now, I will just list a few others.

Aside from the rule of law, there is freedom of speech, religion, assembly, the press. There are all of those together in the First Amendment, and they are put up there in the First Amendment because, without them, without an open dialogue, without ideas having to compete in the public square, then we don't test those ideas, and our Founding Fathers understood that. They wanted debate to take place here on the floor of the House of Representatives. They wanted debate to take place in the Senate. They wanted these ideas to be tested.

For me, I have long believed that I should engage in debate; and if I can't sustain my position in debate, I only have two choices: I can either adopt the other guy's position, or I can go back and do my homework and get that research done, up my game, so to speak, and be prepared to defend myself for the next round. That is usually what happens if I am not able to defend myself. But over the years, I pay a little more attention to preparation than I used to when I was younger, and so that is how it is, and the best ideas can be sorted forward.

Sitting in a meeting here, we can be discussing these ideas; somebody brings up an idea, might get knocked down like that. I don't think the public gets to see how many ideas are not successful in competing with other ideas, but sometimes there is a power structure, too, that is involved. What troubles me is when good ideas can't have a fair hearing because others want their idea to come through to have their name on it. That is a bit of a side issue, but I point that out.

So freedom of speech, religion, press, the right to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances, First Amendment, all pillars of American exceptionalism.

Second, the right to keep and bear arms. We have had a lot of discussion about the right to keep and bear arms, but our Founding Fathers put that provision in the Bill of Rights, not so that we could hunt or collect or target shoot or even defend ourselves. The Second Amendment is in our Constitution so that we can defend ourselves from tyranny, from a future tyrant who would come in; and if they confiscated our weapons, then they can force anything upon the people of this country.

History has proven that over and over again. The first thing a tyrant does is go after your guns. The second thing they do is they go after all the other rights, and pretty soon you are a subservient people. Imagine North Korea or Cuba to get a model or an example of that. And you can go on up

the line: the protection against unreasonable search and seizure, constitutional right.

I am naming pillars of American exceptionalism. Without them, we would not be an exceptional nation. There is no pillar that we can pull out that the edifice wouldn't tumble if we lost our First Amendment or Second Amendment or Fourth Amendment.

Our Fifth Amendment, we have lost a part of it already with the Kelo decision, Mr. Speaker. The Fifth Amendment says, "nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." In the Kelo decision, the Supreme Court ruled—I believe it was a 5–4 decision. And I know that Justice Scalia dissented, as did Justice O'Connor in one of her last major dissents that she had written, but the Supreme Court essentially struck out—I will say, *de facto* struck out—the terms "for public use" from the Fifth Amendment.

They ruled that a locality could condemn private property and hand it over to another private interest, provided they had a government interest and the private interest being successful. And so they could take, let's say, a senior lady's home, a whole tract of land, and force that into the—and confiscate that and put it into the hands of a private investor.

That decision is a horrible decision that weakens American exceptionalism, weakens our property rights in America.

I had a private conversation with Justice Scalia, and he told me that he expected the Kelo decision to be reversed one day. But to amend the Fifth Amendment, effectively, by a decision in the Supreme Court, "nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation," this private property was taken not even for public use, but for private use.

Now, they didn't write in there "nor shall private property be taken for private use" because that was a given that that would not be the case. It is absolutely implied in the Fifth Amendment itself, but the Supreme Court ruled the way they wanted to rule, and they have weakened a pillar of American exceptionalism.

Trial by jury, no double jeopardy, you can go up the line. The powers that are not enumerated in the Constitution are reserved, respectively, for the States or the people. All of these are pillars of American exceptionalism.

Free enterprise capitalism, another pillar of American exceptionalism.

And, by the way, if you take the naturalization test, there is a series of flashcards, laminated flashcards, and these flashcards, you can hold them up and you can ask these aspiring citizens some questions. And part of some of the questions are this: "Who is the father of our country?" And then you flip that card over and it says: "George Washington."

"Who emancipated the slaves?"

"Abraham Lincoln."

"What is the economic system of the United States of America?" It is on a flashcard: "Free enterprise capitalism."

That is under assault. Our religious values are under assault. Our family values are under assault. The very definition of the Constitution itself is under assault, and Barack Obama landed some heavy blows to it while he was President of the United States.

So as we began bringing forward a nominee who could compete effectively and hopefully be elected to the Oval Office as President of the United States, 17 Presidential candidates came through my State. Many of them I knew before they announced, and I think I can say that all of them I knew by the time they got through with their campaigns.

Out of that all, hard fought, there was a platform that was hammered out, and Donald Trump earned the nomination. His platform is awfully close to the platform of TED CRUZ, who was the second to the last man standing, and that platform is a platform that I appreciate, I respect, and I worked for, Mr. Speaker.

I have watched as Presidential candidates can see themselves as President of the United States. They may not have all of their positions hammered out when they present themselves as candidates—in fact, I don't know if any of them ever actually did have all their positions hammered out when they presented themselves as candidates—but they give their speeches. There is a crowd reaction. There is some polling information that is there. They have a team, a team of advisers. We all talk to them and we try to convince them of the priorities that they should be bringing forward.

In the end, throughout all of this, by the time you get through the national convention and confer the nomination on your Presidential candidate, there is a platform to run on from June or July on through, all the way to November 8 it turned out to be last year. Donald Trump's platform was clear.

He said to me, one day, about the events that he has done for me—and I am very much appreciative of President Trump and the times that he has come in to help me politically, Mr. Speaker. He made that reference in a discussion among several of my colleagues, and I said: Yes, you helped me, and I appreciate it, Mr. President, but I market-tested your immigration policy for 14 years, and you knew how Iowans were going to respond and how most people across the country were going to respond because I market-tested it.

And he did a great job with it, and he gave it more clarity than I have given. But throughout all of that, it was: build the wall and secure our borders

and enforce domestic immigration law and reinforce ICE and reinforce Border Patrol and CBP, put that all together, and the birthright citizenship. Support English as the official language. These are just some of the pieces along the way, and we have refined some of this since then.

And also, it was the New IDEA Act, the act that denies deductibility for wages and benefits paid to illegals, and let's see IRS come in and do the enforcement through the normal audit process. So if the IRS came in under the New IDEA Act and did a normal audit, they would run the Social Security numbers and other pertinent information of employees through E-Verify. If E-Verify confirmed that these employees could legally work in the United States, the employer will get safe harbor for having hired them; if they couldn't verify it, the employer gets 72 hours to cure, we see, 72 hours to correct the record.

But, if he is hiring illegals, then the IRS would say: All right. But you can't deduct this \$10,000, \$20,000, \$100,000 that you paid this illegal, and so we are going to have to charge taxes on that because that deduction is not a business expense; it is actually income instead.

So the tax that would be applied to that \$100,000, so to speak, plus interest, plus penalty, and it would turn your \$10-an-hour illegal into about a \$16-an-hour illegal. That is the essence of it.

And we require, also, that the IRS and the Social Security Administration that is collecting Social Security deposits from workers all across this country, sometimes multiple sources on the same Social Security number—I mean, scores and scores of people on the same Social Security number.

Social Security stopped sending out no-match letters some years ago under the Obama administration. We put that all back together, and we require the IRS communicate with and trade information with the Social Security Administration to target and flag those false Social Security numbers. And then also bring the Department of Homeland Security to the table so that the IRS, Social Security Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security are all working together to cooperate to enforce immigration law and denying, then, the deductibility of the employer.

The employer will have all kinds of incentives to clean up his workforce. In fact, we have a 6-year statute of limitations that compiles or accrues over the years. And so if you are sitting there with a 6-year potential liability, you are going to want to be with a clean workforce.

That is another piece that is a policy that the President has been for, at least in the past. Now, things move on, but we are—we have an immigration policy that became part of the plat-

form for the President of the United States, and in that policy and throughout, there are multiple times in speeches he announced that he is going to end DACA. He is going to end DACA, and we all expected that that would happen at noon January 20 of this year when the President was inaugurated out here on the west portico of the Capitol not very far from where I stand right now. That would have been consistent with his campaign promise: build the wall, and the unconstitutional DACA.

And so while he was signing executive orders—and I give him credit. He went to the Oval Office, and at least he had a formal signing of multiple executive orders that day, launched his Presidency with work right on the spot instead of—he shortened up the parade for himself and went to work for America. Hats off to President Trump for that, and I support his entire agenda, and I am going to do my best to help him keep his word on that entire agenda.

But we found out weeks later that DACA permits were still being issued, and they were still being extended, and those permits also included work permits.

□ 2030

So President Obama's unconstitutional DACA—deferred action for children of aliens—program was continued, and it continues actually to this day under the Trump administration, completely in contradiction with the campaign promises he made. I would say many more times than Barack Obama made the statement that he didn't have the constitutional authority.

Barack Obama violated the Constitution. President Trump has continued that violation. And I am calling upon him to keep his campaign promise, restore the respect for the rule of law; and DACA, by the executive action, just sign it off and end it.

If we fail to do that—and I have worked for 31 years to restore the respect for the rule of law with regard to immigration. In 1986, Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act. At least he was honest about it. He called it the Amnesty Act.

I listened to what I could on the debate from the House and the Senate. And I didn't believe it would pass either Chamber, but it passed both Chambers, and it was messaged to President Reagan's desk. I read the material and I thought that through. I thought: I don't have to worry about this. Ronald Reagan will know that, if he signs the Amnesty Act, it does great damage to the rule of law and it will take years to restore it.

Now, the deal was to be that if you sign the Amnesty Act, we will give you the reinforcement and will enforce the law from this point forward, and illegal immigration will no longer be a prob-

lem in America. That is what the deal was. They promised us that this Amnesty Act in 1986 would be the last one ever, that they were going to then set about establishing respect for the law.

Well, it seems to me that most everybody in this Congress has lost any memory they may have had about what was going on in 1986. Things haven't changed. There is nothing really new under the Sun. Human nature is human nature. It is what it has been for 2,000 or more years.

But when there is a promise made that is "first you give us this, and then we will see to it that you get that," let me see, we had Ronald Reagan's successor, Bush 41—George Herbert Walker Bush, a great American as well—who took the promise and said: "Read my lips: No new taxes." He said that more than 22 times, too.

But when it got to the point where he was wanting to get some spending cuts, the Democrats went to him and said: Do you know what? We have to raise taxes if you are going to get spending cuts. We will follow through on our part of the deal if you just sign the tax increases that they pass.

So Bush 41, dealing honestly and straight up in believing that the people he was dealing with had the level of integrity that he had, signed the tax increase in exchange for the promise of the spending cuts. And we all know the answer to that, Mr. Speaker. We know the story. When you make a deal like that and you don't have the things on the table that you are supposed to get for that deal, never comes first. You don't see them.

So George H. W. Bush 41 signed the tax increase. He violated his pledge of: "Read my lips: No new taxes." Not only did he sign that and not get the spending cuts, but they beat him over the head with that at his reelection. He lost his reelection because of it, and we ended up with Bill Clinton.

I think that lesson should be enough to make us all smart enough to know not to make a deal like that. Ronald Reagan recanted and regretted that he signed the Amnesty Act because of the damage he did to the rule of law when he signed that. There were to be 1 million who would be recipients of the Amnesty Act of 1986. It turned out to be 3 million because, let's say, the estimates were wrong, but there was a lot of fraud and corruption, and people slipped through because we didn't have tight enough security on it.

So 3 million people got amnesty in 1986, and that was a path to citizenship—a fairly short path to citizenship—as well. I have talked to some of them, and they say: It was great for me.

And some of them think that amnesty for another group of people is all right.

But if the law means nothing to someone and they violate the law, or it

is an obstruction and they slip around that law, or, as we have today, some number that is 750,000 to 800,000 DACA recipients, they are demanding that we grant them amnesty. Illegal aliens came here to the Capitol, right out here on the grass, 2 weeks ago, on a Monday, gathering around, demanding that Congress grant them amnesty.

Now, how do you go to a foreign country and be unlawfully present in that country and you go protest to the government that they should ignore their own laws because you have something that you want that you slipped across the border to have access to?

And I do not buy the idea that most of these DACA recipients are kids. The average age is 23. Some of them go all the way up to 37. Some of them are bald. Many of them have gray in their beard. Some have a build like mine. I don't think of them as kids when I look at them. Yet there are some who came across the Rio Grande River on their mother's arm. And, no, they didn't know and they didn't form intent.

But there are a whole lot of them who would qualify under this, who did have intent and did know. And we know there are a whole lot of them also—and I have witnessed this with my eyes and helped to collar some of them as this goes on, and I have walked through the desert and seen the burlap backpacks that they haul marijuana in into the United States. And it is not only marijuana.

But some of these will qualify under DACA. Drug smugglers will qualify.

And they say: We will do background checks.

Well, how do you do a background check on somebody who doesn't have a legal existence in their home country?

If there is no record of them existing there, then they will say: Well, we didn't find anything negative.

Of course not. The person didn't exist.

I know I had an individual I wanted on my Hispanic Advisory Committee. A smart, personable, young businessman. I said: I would like to have you sit down and I would like to hear your advice. I would like to have your finger on the pulse because I want to know what is going on in the minority communities, and I want to make sure that I am doing a good job of representing them, too.

And he said: That is fine. I am interested.

And I said: But before I put you on this committee, I have to make sure. So I want to see—and he said he was born in America—no. Excuse me. He said he was born in Mexico, but he is a naturalized citizen.

And I said: Well, I would like to see your birth certificate.

And he said: Okay. I can get it for you.

And I said: How long will that take you?

And he said: Well, it will only take me a few days. What do you want the birth certificate to say?

Now, that is a legal document, and you don't get to ask that question if you have respect for the rule of law.

I just dropped him as a potential candidate on my advisory committee. And a year or two later, I found out that ICE had come in, picked him up, and deported him. I didn't know that he was illegal, even at that time. I just didn't trust him any longer when he asked me that question. So that is another individual that could have been, and may still be, qualified to be a recipient.

Those that come across the border, I have gone down and looked into the jail cells of the Border Patrol, and there were hundreds there at the times that I have been there—hundreds of them. They are sorted between children, women, men. And the men far outweigh the numbers of women or children. Some of the numbers we looked at were 80 percent men. Some of these men will present themselves as under 18—many of them will.

And I have seen the cell with those minor males that are in there. And some of those, supposedly, minor males have gray in their beard. They would also qualify, or at least apply for. And if we didn't have a way to do a background check on them—and many cases we don't—and they give you a false name, what do you do after that if they had never been printed? They would qualify.

And MS-13. We know that there have been a significant number of MS-13 gang members, who also are DACA recipients. That has been published multiple times throughout the last couple of years.

So many people that we would want to get out of this country would be granted a path of citizenship to stay in this country. That is why it is so wrong. And it disrespects natural-born American citizens. It even more disrespects naturalized American citizens, who came here the right way, applied the right way, and spent maybe 7 years to get in a position where they could take the naturalization test and then the oath; which is a grand day, by the way, Mr. Speaker.

I look forward to every opportunity I have to speak to the naturalization services that take place in the Federal building in Sioux City, Iowa. And I always tell them: Remember this date that you became an American citizen, and I want you to memorize it.

I hand them a Constitution with the date on it and my signature on it. Hopefully, they will have the reverence for the Constitution that I and many have developed as well.

But we have a vigor that comes into America. These are self-selected people. If you have ten kids growing up in a family in Bangladesh or Ireland or

Italy, or wherever it might be, and one of them has the inspiration to come to America, you are going to get the one who had the greatest aspirations, the one with the strongest ambition, the one with the deepest convictions in themselves. The most can-do sibling out of 1, 5, 6, or 10 is the one that has the dream to come to America. So they line up and come here legally. And they built this country for over 200 years. We need to respect the rule of law that they came here to embrace.

We have people who are leaving countries that don't have the rule of law, that are corrupt. And when I go to Mexico, I see the problems down there. Any country that I go to, I can put together a formula to put that country into the First World from the Third World, except for corruption.

How do you address the corruption?

Law doesn't mean law in Mexico and points south the way it does in this country. If you get pulled over by the police, they might pull you over because they might need an extra tip that week. You may not be speeding, you might not have run a stop sign, they might just pull you over, and you have to pay the "bribe," "mordida." That is corruption itself. That doesn't happen in this country hardly ever because we get their badge number and they are out of a job.

No country is free of corruption, but we have a healthy country with a rule of law. It is a pillar of American exceptionalism. We cannot, Mr. Speaker—and my message is to the President—we cannot reward lawbreakers. It destroys the rule of law. Our hearts cannot be leading ahead of our heads.

There is a DACA recipient that I would like to adopt, if that is what it takes to keep that individual in America. I think that much of that individual. I like this individual a lot and respect this individual a lot, but I love the rule of law. I love the rule of law because, without it, we descend into the Third World.

So this debate about, "don't you have a heart, don't you know that these are just 800,000 kids, and can't we just give them the confidence of having a legal status in America," I say, no, not if you love the country, you can't do that.

And it is not our doing. They either came here of their own volition, formed the intent, or their parents did. The law is the law. We don't tell the judge: Don't be putting this criminal in prison because he has kids at home.

We don't worry about the separation of families when it comes to enforcing the law against American citizens, but we worry about enforcing the law against people who have intentional and willfully divided themselves.

Now, what happens if we should grant amnesty to DACA recipients and then deport their parents?

That splits up the family.

I say: Get right with the law, go to your home country and apply to come in the legal way. By the way, when you arrive in your home country, if you truly are characterized for DACA, you will have a free American education that the American taxpayers pay for. You will be bilingual. You will have familial connections in your community. You will have a skill set that is there, a good educational set. You will know what it looks like to live in a country where things work generally right.

And if you think of the 7,000 Peace Corps workers that are working in about 130 countries in the world and how much good they do, they go to countries without speaking the language, they don't know where they are going to land, they find a way to help out and contribute. People going home is not being condemned to hell. People going home is like sending out 750,000 or 800,000 fresh Peace Corps workers back to their home countries.

What could be a greater economic development plan for Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua than for their best and brightest to go home and build their countries while they apply to come back to the United States?

That is the best solution we can have, Mr. Speaker. And we don't even have a serious debate on that in here unless I bring it up.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives this evening. I am hopeful that we made a little bit of progress. I will continue to defend the rule of law and the Constitution. I challenge my colleagues to do the same.

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

WORLDWIDE REFUGEE CRISIS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as with any moment in the history of our Nation, in the world, there are tragedies and disasters which sear the conscience and call us to action not only because we are American, but because we are human.

Some of these tragedies are man-made, others are the work of nature. Some hit close to home, such as the

hurricanes that devastated Texas—my home State—Florida, and Puerto Rico, taking many lives and inflicting billions of dollars in damage. Some are the work of one man, like the shooter in Las Vegas, who took 58 lives.

□ 2045

Like many in this Chamber, I have spoken up on these tragedies close to home.

Tonight, I would like to speak to a humanitarian crisis far away from us; that is, the ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya Muslims in Burma.

Since late August, 500,000 Rohingya have been forced out of their nation. The Rohingya, after being driven out of Burma, have sought refuge in Bangladesh, Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, and India. Some have even come as far as the United States of America.

These victims had been driven out of the country their ancestors have called home for hundreds of years through a systematic campaign of murder and rape and the destruction of entire villages and communities.

It can be challenging for host governments to care for these displaced populations, which can lead to additional instability, especially in countries with low incomes or with governments already under stress to provide services to their citizens. We see this pattern worldwide.

The refugees from the war in Syria have fled to Lebanon and Turkey, to Iraq, and across the Mediterranean to Europe. Over a million Syrian refugees are in Lebanon, which is over one-sixth of that nation's population. Over 3.2 million refugees have found their way to Turkey, and 600,000 in Jordan. Almost 1 million have sought refuge in Europe.

There are similar crises in the Central African Republic, Iraq, South Sudan, and Yemen. Millions of people have fled conflicts and instabilities in these regions, usually finding refuge in neighboring countries vulnerable to instability.

The United States, our own country, has already been affected by instability. In recent years, gang-related violence in Central America has driven hundreds of thousands of people both to the north and to the south. We remember the tens of thousands of primarily women and children who made their way to the United States and were able to find refuge here. Tens of thousands more, though, remained in Mexico, where the resources to care for these children are scarce.

These crises have global consequences, and failure to address them early will eventually affect the United States. The United States cannot afford to treat these crises as events "over there" or just far away. This affects us in a very real way.

These events highlight how important the concept of democracy and in-

clusive governance are. Democratic countries with inclusive governments respect the rights of citizens and address the concerns of even the most vulnerable and least empowered.

This is why U.S. foreign assistance matters so much. We invest in the rest of the world and build the capacity of states and societies to govern in a more democratic and inclusive manner. We also empower regional diplomacy through our engagement, allowing regions to address any such instability in a single country collectively.

Like many others in the global community, I welcomed Aung San Suu Kyi's rise to power in Burma a few years ago in 2015. Her election ended decades of military rule when the Burmese military government held elections and promised civilian rule.

This kind of democratization, enabled by the persistent diplomacy of President Obama and Secretary Clinton, is a precious and rare event in the world and occurs only now and then.

Last year, after the Burmese military drove tens of thousands of Rohingya out of the country, Aung San Suu Kyi moved to establish the Rakhine Advisory Commission under former U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan.

This was an important step towards addressing the concerns of the Rohingya, which includes disenfranchisement, statelessness, and widespread discrimination.

The situation today looks far different and far less flattering to Counselor Suu Kyi. This year, the crisis is much more devastating, with hundreds of thousands displaced.

I wanted to be able to show you some of these images of the catastrophe the Rohingya face. These are, of course, just a few, but as I said, they sear the conscience and call us to action.

This year, the crisis, as I mentioned, is much more devastating, with hundreds of thousands displaced. Like many others in Congress, I have been disappointed in the lack of moral leadership Aung San Suu Kyi has demonstrated.

When hundreds of thousands of people are driven out of the country, their villages burned, people slaughtered, women and children raped, I would expect a Nobel Peace Prize-winning leader of a country to take action. Counselor Suu Kyi rose to power because her moral leadership and her persistence in the face of adversity inspired millions. It is deeply saddening and disappointing to witness her lack of action today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), my colleague.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and for bringing up this very important issue.

I just want to make a few comments, and I just want to say, what makes the

United States exceptional among all nations is the moral courage and leadership we have displayed throughout our history.

So many times, in the face of great terror and significant moral crisis, the United States has acted as a force for good. We have supported our allies to restore order where there was once chaos. Where people have been suffering famine and drought, we have stepped up to provide food and water. Time and again, the world has faced crises, and the United States has stepped up to defend the moral good.

The crisis in Myanmar presents yet another challenge for the global community, but in this moral crisis is yet another opportunity for our Nation to once again lead.

As we speak, the Rohingya people are suffering undue hardship and violence under a government that has failed to uphold the values inherent to a vibrant democracy.

It has been reported that an average of 2,000 Rohingya are fleeing the country each day. Denied basic rights for decades, the Rohingya people have been subject to systematic discrimination as a religious minority in a predominantly Buddhist country. The state has gone so far as to completely deny citizenship to the Rohingya people since 1982.

Serious accusations of ethnic cleansing and genocide have been leveled against the government, which has failed to respond appropriately to the calls for calm and peace.

While the government has the right to defend itself against any form of insurgency, common, agreed-upon rules of warfare dictate that all civilians be protected. This rule is sacred and must not be broken. Despite this, reports of abuse against civilians are running rampant in Myanmar.

More than 200 villages have been destroyed, many burned to the ground by government forces. Communities are being wiped away as hundreds, possibly even thousands, of civilians are slaughtered. The crisis demands our immediate attention.

Just recently, the House Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing, and Chairman ROYCE stated plainly: "This is ethnic cleansing."

Mr. Speaker, I must agree.

Every conflict is complex, and this one is no different, but it must be made clear that under no conditions should the rights of innocent civilians be abridged. To the Government of Myanmar, we must make it equally as clear that their behavior will not be tolerated.

I recently met with constituents from Myanmar in my district office. Utica, the largest city in New York's 22nd Congressional District, is home to a vibrant refugee community. We are home to the largest Bosnian refugee population in the Nation, a population

that was also fleeing ethnic cleansing in their own home country of the former Yugoslavia.

My constituents shared with me their personal stories and deep despair over the violence in their home country. They asked that I do all I can to make their voices heard, and tonight I am proud to speak on their behalf.

They shared with me horrific pictures of violence and death, of torture of children, of young people, of women, of men, of families. It was simply just appalling.

Mr. Speaker, when our Nation faces moral challenges, it is in our nature not to back down. I must insist that this time be no different. I call on my colleagues to stand up and speak out and to act on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas and my colleague for highlighting this very important issue. I urge all of my colleagues to understand this is a tragedy of major proportions that is happening in our world today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas again for bringing this issue to the floor.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TENNEY for joining me at this late hour to speak on this issue.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is so important. I really am grateful to my friend from Texas for doing this.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her comments.

This humanitarian crisis in Burma, or Myanmar, requires international attention and action, as Representative TENNEY said. The actions of the Burmese State in ethnically cleansing hundreds of thousands of Rohingya demonstrate this need for international action.

The most immediate need is to facilitate access by NGOs and international organizations in the Rakhine State. There are tens of thousands of Rohingya internally displaced within the Rakhine State.

Violence against Rohingya, including the burning of villages, continues despite international condemnation. Just yesterday, a full month and a half after the beginning of this crisis, 11,000 Rohingya reportedly crossed over into Bangladesh.

Access by international groups would allow the rest of the world to deliver assistance to the Rohingya still within Rakhine and to help prevent further violence.

The United States, in partnership with our allies around the world, must also assist Bangladesh in providing for the hundreds of thousands of Rohingya they lost. This includes food, water, shelter, and medicine. We cannot allow this humanitarian catastrophe to escalate further.

We know a political settlement to repatriation is possible. Bangladesh and

Burma have arrived at such agreements in the past. The United States and our allies must support the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and the Bangladeshi Government's effort to identify all Rohingya who have arrived.

Given the Burmese Government's reluctance to acknowledge Rohingya as Burmese citizens, leaving them stateless, identification by the United States would assist in repatriation by defining who originates from Rakhine State.

The Rohingya have suffered violence and forced displacement for decades. Hundreds of Rohingya villages have been burned to the ground, and they can no longer return to their homes, because in many cases, those homes no longer exist.

The full extent of the catastrophe is not yet known, as thousands of Rohingya remain unaccounted for. More Rohingya have fled Myanmar in the past 2 months than remain in Rakhine State. Would the Rohingya want to return if given a chance? What would need to be done to create the conditions required for such a return?

Tackling the underlying issues that led to the violent displacement of the Rohingya will take decades to resolve, the most important of which will be a military that lacks transparency or oversight; that is, the Burmese military.

Burma's Government and military currently face a dozen separate insurgencies against forces claiming to represent minority communities. While the Burmese Government has taken steps to reach a cease-fire and political agreements with a number of these groups, continued fighting in various parts of the country undoubtedly contributes to the military's independence and free rein.

Allowing the Rohingya to be comfortable in Burma will require assurances by the Burmese Government to respect the rights of Rohingya to live on the land they have lived on for hundreds of years. This can only come with citizenship for the Rohingya, and greater democracy, where the government is responsive to the needs of the population and respects the human rights and civil liberties of ethnic and religious minorities.

Developing a political settlement towards greater accountability in the Burmese Government and citizenship for the Rohingya will be difficult and may take years.

Important actions the United States can take include limiting our support for the Burmese military, given their complicity in these crimes. For example, Congress considered expanding support for the Burmese military this year. That will not occur, given the actions of the Burmese military.

I also believe sanctions on individuals found to be complicit in ethnic

cleansing, including local military commanders, are warranted.

Designating military commanders in Rakhine State as Specially Designated Nationals, SDNs, would send a powerful message that these crimes will not be tolerated anywhere in the world, including in Burma.

On the other hand, I would like to recognize the immense generosity the people and Government of Bangladesh have shown during this crisis. Over 500,000 people, most of whom are women, children, and the elderly, have fled to Bangladesh since August 25. The Government of Bangladesh has accepted these people and worked to provide for them within the limits of their abilities, while supporting international efforts to address the root causes of the crisis.

□ 2100

Bangladesh, a country not much larger than Iowa, with a population of more than 150 million, faces significant challenges in taking care of this refugee population. The 500,000 Rohingya join hundreds of thousands who have arrived in Bangladesh during previous such forced migrations.

Bangladesh has done an admirable job, but the limits on the Bangladeshi Government to provide for these refugee populations are real, and the nation requires international assistance. This includes assistance from the United States, the United Nations, Europe, and Japan. Countries in the region must also step up and provide support for the refugee populations in Bangladesh, especially China and India, which maintain close relationships with both Bangladesh and Burma.

As I mentioned previously, we are in an age of accelerated news, and with social media, we are in an age of knowing. Things that were once far away that were hardly seen or known directly or firsthand can now be seen over the internet, on Facebook, on Twitter, on other social media. The pace at which news comes at us now can give us a case of whiplash, and governing in this body and trying to deal with even the things that just affect the United States of America, such as the hurricanes that have hit Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico, can sometimes feel overwhelming. There can be a temptation to hunker down, to look no further than our own borders, to try to solve the problems that confront us not only as Americans but as fellow human beings.

These days, with everything going on in our own Nation, sometimes it doesn't seem like there is a time to take our focus off of our challenges and speak about other things, some of them far away. But it is important that we think about, that we remember, that we reflect, and that we try to solve the problems and challenges of other peoples.

It is often said that the United States can't be the policeman of the world, and I believe that is true. But there are things that call our conscience that do move us to action where I believe that we do have a responsibility to act as the leader among nations in the world.

The crisis in Burma, the ethnic cleansing that has victimized the Rohingya people, is one of those instances, and I wanted to speak about it today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues tonight in calling the attention of Congress to the horrific ethnic cleansing against the Rohingya people that is underway in Burma.

On August 25th of this year, an illegal armed militant group known as the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army attacked police outposts in Rakhine state, Burma, killing twelve people. I condemn this attack in the strongest possible terms.

Forty-five years ago, Pope Paul VI said "If you want peace, work for justice." Especially in today's world, I do not believe that armed insurgency is the best path to justice, nor to peace.

But let me be clear: the Burmese government's response to the August 25th attack over the last several weeks has been so disproportionate that one is at a loss to describe it.

The military has carried out a massive scorched earth campaign in which hundreds of Rohingya villages and tens of thousands of homes have been burned and destroyed. There are many highly credible reports of people, including children, being shot in the back as they ran, and of rapes, torture and ill-treatment.

As many as half a million Rohingya have fled to Bangladesh and at least another 27,000 are displaced within Burma.

That is on top of the tens of thousands of Rohingya who fled after a previous armed militant attack a year ago. Most of the Rohingya population of Rakhine has now been forced out of the state. 120,000 of those who remain live in IDP camps.

Stunningly disproportionate? Unimaginably, brutally, barbarically disproportionate? Flagrantly, in-your-face, try-to-stop-me disproportionate? I am left without words.

Do I regret the killing of 12 policemen on August 25th? Absolutely. Do more than half a million people deserve to be punished for it? Absolutely not.

And please do not talk to me about a "growing terrorist threat" in Burma.

The Rohingya in Burma are stateless and subject to the most profound discrimination. They are poverty-stricken, denied access to education and work, and their movements within the country are restricted—and all of this was true before the militant attacks.

The Burmese government has allowed the conditions for radicalization and extremism to fester within their country. The current military campaign is only making things worse.

What should we be doing?

First, all available leverage should be brought to bear on the Burmese military to

end its violent campaign against the Rohingya people. Its actions to date are entirely removed from any concept of rule of law and make a mockery of the government's obligation to protect its people.

Second, the government must ensure full and unfettered humanitarian access to Rakhine state. Given the dimensions of the crisis, this means letting in experienced aid organizations in addition to the Red Cross.

It also means ending the threats, allegations and misinformation against humanitarian staff that have sparked fear among humanitarian workers, especially national staff, and contributed to an environment in which targeted attacks against humanitarian staff have taken place. Enough already.

Third, the Burmese government must grant access to the fact-finding mission authorized by the UN Human Rights Council last March, after last "clearance operation" the military conducted from October 2016 to February of this year. Now more than ever, we need an objective international presence on the ground.

Fourth, a roadmap to ending this crisis already exists. It's found in the Final Report of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State led by former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan.

International actors, including this Congress, must do all we can to make sure that the Burmese government implements the recommendations included in that report—especially the ones that have to do with ending statelessness and poverty. Otherwise, we should not be surprised if the situation in Burma just gets worse and worse.

Finally, we need to be clear-eyed about the nature of the Burmese government.

I have been among those in Congress who have welcomed the political transition in Burma that began with the 2015 elections. But the events of the last few weeks raise very serious questions about the extent to which that transition is real.

As events have unfolded in Burma in recent weeks, a lot of criticism has been focused on Aung San Suu Kyi, the Nobel Laureate and de facto leader of the civilian government. Her defenders have responded that the military still has a lot of power, and that she has to walk a very fine line.

But if that is true, what kind of "democratic" government are we talking about?

If the military is still in charge—if the civilian government is powerless to stop ethnic cleansing—then we need to recognize that.

If not, then let's be clear about the requirements of moral leadership. Standing by in silence—even worse, downplaying the seriousness of what is happening to the Rohingya people because of political convenience—is not the leadership we expect from Aung San Suu Kyi.

Those who want to claim the mantle of human rights leader must defend the human rights of all people.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative CASTRO for calling for this special order to discuss the ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya people from Burma.

It's a heartbreaking humanitarian disaster and day-by-day the situation continues to deteriorate.

Just today, Bangladesh Border Guards are reporting that more than 11,000 Rohingya refugees entered Bangladesh from Burma.

These refugees are the result of the unprecedented level of violence in Burma's Rakhine State.

Because of this bloody conflict, more than half a million Rohingya—60 percent of whom are children—have fled as refugees across the border into Bangladesh.

This is the swiftest exodus of any population since the 1994 Rwanda genocide and Serbia's 1999 ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.

The Burmese military has claimed that this brutal crackdown is the response to a clash that took place on August 25th, in which border security forces faced off against Rohingya insurgents reportedly using knives, small arms, and small explosives.

But this isn't a legitimate counterinsurgency or counterterrorism operation. The Burmese military and border security forces have specifically targeted Rohingya using medieval tactics: slash and burn, rape, indiscriminate killing. Twenty-one square kilometers of villages systematically burned to the ground.

As I see it, the only person in Burma who could put an end to the violence, clear the way for humanitarian aid, and allow for a full accounting of what has occurred is Min Aung Hlaing, Commander in Chief of the Burmese military. Unfortunately, the intentions of the military are clear: to remove the Rohingya people from Burma.

Welcoming these refugees, thankfully, is the Government of Bangladesh, which is now hosting nearly a million Rohingya refugees.

And while Bangladesh opens its doors, I consider it an embarrassment that the United States is closing ours. The Trump Administration has lowered our yearly cap on refugees from all over the world to 45,000 per year—the smallest number ever. As this crisis grew worse, Bangladesh took in that many people every four days.

This policy harms American leadership in the world. It undermines our ability to speak credibly about refugees, human rights, or living up to basic international humanitarian principles. It diminishes our standing in a part of the world where China is only too happy to fill the void.

The United States has allocated \$38 million to assist with the crisis. That number seems grossly inadequate considering the scale of the humanitarian nightmare now facing the Government of Bangladesh and the Rohingya who have found refuge there.

We need to do more, and that starts by shining a light on this tragedy. So I'm grateful to Mr. CASTRO, I'm grateful to all my colleagues who are putting this issue front and center. I hope that the Administration will give this crisis the focus and resources needed. This is a situation that calls for American leadership, and I'll keep making the case in Congress that we can and must do more.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 692. An act to provide for integrated plan permits, to establish an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman, to promote green infrastructure, and to require the revision of financial capability guidance; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 6, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1117. To require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 11, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2804. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tolfenpyrad; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0309; FRL-9967-72] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2805. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's notification of its 2017 compensation program adjustments, including the Agency's current salary range structure and the performance-based merit pay matrix, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1833b(a); Public Law 101-73, Sec. 1206(a); (103 Stat. 523); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2806. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0268; FRL-9969-10-Region 7] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2807. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tall oil fatty acids; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0012; FRL-9965-58] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2808. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Nutritional Yeast Manufacturing Residual Risk and Technology Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0730; FRL-9969-08-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS93) received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2809. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semicheical Pulp Mills [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0741; FRL-9969-06-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS46) received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2810. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Florpyrauxifen-benzyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0560; FRL-9963-66] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2811. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0513; FRL-9969-12-Region 7] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2812. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation; State of Utah; Salt Lake County and Utah County Nonattainment Area Coarse Particulate Matter State Implementation Plan Revisions to Control Measures for Point Sources [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0298; FRL-9969-01-Region 8] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2813. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Permitting and General Rule Revisions [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0333; FRL-9968-98-Region 10] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2814. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Ambient Ozone Monitoring Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0265; FRL-9969-18-Region 9] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2815. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of South Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0389; FRL-9969-23-Region 4] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2816. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Regional Haze Plan and Prong 4 (Visibility) for the 2012 PM2.5, 2010 NO2, 2010 SO2, and 2008 Ozone NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0104; FRL-9969-21-Region 4] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2817. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; KY; Miscellaneous Source Specific Revisions for Jefferson County [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0356; FRL-9969-19-Region 4] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2818. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Air Quality Implementation Plan; Iowa; Amendment to the Administrative Consent Order, Grain Processing Corporation, Muscatine, Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0143; FRL-9969-14-Region 7] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2819. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 3 [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0446; FRL-9969-46-Region 8] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2820. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Balancing Authority Control, Inadvertent Interchange, and Facility Interconnection Reliability Standards [Docket No.: RM16-13-000; Order No.: 836] received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2821. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Important Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Materials From the Republic of Mali [CBP Dec. 17-12] (RIN: 1515-AE32) received October 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 378. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2196. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients (Rept. 115-342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3031. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for flexibility in making withdrawals from a Thrift Savings Plan account, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3243. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 562. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from October 16, 2017, through October 20, 2017; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 115-345). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 3995. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to submit to Congress a report on promoting broadband internet access service for veterans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 3996. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit other courts to transfer certain cases to United States Tax Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 3997. A bill to waive the application fee for any special use permit for veterans

demonstrations and special events at war memorials on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 3998. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms or the issuance of explosives licenses to known or suspected terrorists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LANCE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 3999. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the manufacture, possession, or transfer of any part or combination of parts that is designed and functions to increase the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but does not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 4000. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mechanism to allow borrowers of Federal student loans to refinance their loans, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance to employer payment of interest on certain refinanced student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 4001. A bill to provide for the refinancing and recalculation of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4002. A bill to amend chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that in the case of an agency that appeals the ruling of a court under that chapter, and does not prevail on appeal, the court shall award the prevailing party reasonable attorney's fees and costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4003. A bill to require that in a notice of proposed rule making for a new rule, the notice shall identify two rules which the agency intends to repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4004. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require employees of the White House to enroll in Obamacare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on

Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4005. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for medical assistance under Medicaid for inmates during the 30-day period preceding release from a public institution; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. LEE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. EVANS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CRIST, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HILL, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H. Res. 563. A resolution honoring the accomplishments of the 9 historically Black colleges and universities that celebrated their sesquicentennial the week of September 24, 2017; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. BUDD):

H. Res. 564. A resolution affirming the constitutional power of Congress over the Nation's debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BASS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 565. A resolution expressing support for the recognition of October 9, 2017, as "World Post Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H. Res. 566. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of October 4, 2017, through October 10, 2017, as World Space Week and for the designation of the week of October 8, 2017, through October 14, 2017, as Earth Science Week; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently

determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

129. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, urging state and federal departments and agencies responsible for stewardship of public resources, as specified, to make collaborative, statewide salmon fishery restoration an urgent and high priority; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

130. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 2010, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

131. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 2013, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, urging the Congress of the United States to pass a law to reschedule marijuana or cannabis and its derivatives from a Schedule I drug to an alternative schedule; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

133. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, requesting the Governor to request the President of the United States, Members of Congress, and the Federal Highway Administration to dedicate increased funding to California to accelerate and support the planning and development of the plan and to accelerate the completion of existing nonmotorized recreational trails; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 3995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3996

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 3997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 3998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 3999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 4000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (Power to lay and collect Taxes); Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Commerce Clause); and the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 4001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 62: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 490: Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 535: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 586: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 592: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LATTI, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 613: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 620: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 638: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 669: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 685: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 772: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 807: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 820: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 848: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 866: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 959: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1017: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1038: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1046: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1111: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1150: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1179: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1225: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1243: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1251: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1267: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1270: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1276: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1279: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1298: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1300: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 1358: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1360: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 1406: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 1470: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1478: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1669: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1670: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1676: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1772: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1861: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1896: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1928: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 1960: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1982: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2034: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2063: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2095: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2101: Mr. BARR and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 2121: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2228: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2242: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2259: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2318: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 2319: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 2345: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2401: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2545: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2633: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 2651: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2670: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2740: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2790: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2856: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 2871: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BLUM, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2906: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2933: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2938: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 3031: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 3034: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3042: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 3107: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3108: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3122: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 3148: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3303: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3314: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 3324: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3329: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3380: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 3415: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3441: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. COMER, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 3452: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 3459: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 3530: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 3666: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 3711: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 3716: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3741: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 3749: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3757: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3759: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3761: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 3766: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3789: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3798: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 3806: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3808: Mr. REED.

H.R. 3814: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3832: Mr. FASO, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3852: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 3853: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3860: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3862: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3875: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3881: Ms. SINEMA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 3889: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3923: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3938: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3940: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 3947: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3987: Ms. MENG.

H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. WALZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 220: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 257: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 367: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 401: Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 529: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H. Res. 555: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. KIHUEN.

H. Res. 556: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 557: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 560: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H. Res. 561: Mr. GOSAR.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in S. 585 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROE OF TENNESSEE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in S. 585 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO CURT HAENSEL

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, according to their website, "The Office of the Legislative Counsel provides legislative drafting services to the Committees and Members of the House of Representatives on a non-partisan, impartial, and confidential basis. Our goal is to work with Committees and Members to understand their policy preferences in order to implement those preferences through clear, concise, and legally effective legislative language." For the last 30 years, no one has performed all of the above more professionally and more successfully than Curt Haensel.

Curt has specialized in transportation law his entire career. His sharp mind and relentless pursuit of perfection (sometimes in spite of staff and Member interference) ensured that bills considered by the Committee and the House were clear and coherent expressions of legislative intent. I and my predecessors have relied on Curt's expertise and creativity to draft legislative solutions to many complex issues. Even under immense pressure, Curt's guidance was always calm, balanced, and fair. I don't know how many bills or amendments Curt has drafted (it must be in the thousands), but I can tell you that a great many of our Nation's most profound laws bear his fingerprints.

Curt not only cared about the work product, but more importantly, he cared about the people he was working with. He has infinite patience, is humble, and is kind. He served as a mentor and tremendous professional example to many young legislative counsels and Committee staff over the last 30 years.

On behalf of myself, the staff of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the entire House of Representatives, I want to express my sincere gratitude to Curt for his years of service. His contributions to this institution have been invaluable and the impact of his guidance will be felt for many, many years to come. I wish him, his wife Meg, and his two children well. I wish him good luck with his future endeavors. He will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO CURT HAENSEL

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Curt Haensel, Senior Counsel of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives.

For the past 30 years, Curt has served as Legislative Counsel to the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure. In that time, Curt has worked to assist the Committee under eight different Committee Chairmen, half a dozen Ranking Members, and hundreds of our Committee colleagues. He formally began working with the Committee in 1989 and one of the first bills he worked on was H.R. 598, which banned smoking on commercial airlines. At the Committee markup, Curt drafted dozens of amendments as the smokers and their advocates worked to fill the amendment tree, as they tried to kill the bill by endless amendment. The back row of the dais filled with cigarette smoke as the Committee slowly worked its will and ultimately banned smoking on airlines.

After this baptism by fire, Curt went on to work on every single surface transportation, aviation, water resources, and environmental law that this Committee has enacted. He took our ideas, and working with our staffs, used his gifted legislative craftsmanship to shape our transportation future. ISTE, TEA 21, SAFETEA-LU, and the FAST Act; Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Acts; WRDA after WRDA; and dozens of other Acts all bear his stamp.

One of Curt's great achievements was his work, in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks, on the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (ATSA), which enhanced aviation and surface transportation security and created the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). After months of negotiation and as the Thanksgiving break approached, House and Senate Committee staffs and House Legislative Counsel spent 20-hour days drafting the agreement. The Committee Chairmen and Ranking Members finally resolved the remaining critical issues on a Thursday afternoon. House and Senate Leaders wanted the agreement passed the following day, Friday, before the House and Senate adjourned for Thanksgiving. As Committee staffs and Legislative Counsels Curt Haensel and Dave Mendelsohn finished drafting the conference agreement around 4:30 a.m., the Office of Legislative Counsel computers failed and the computer files of the agreement were completely lost. The Committees faced the prospect that Congress may not be able to pass the legislation before the Thanksgiving break. There was a genuine fear that, over the break, the hard-fought agreement could fall apart. Instead, Curt and his colleagues, after a walk around the block to clear their heads, recreated the text from memory and, later that day, both the House and Senate passed the agreement. Two days later, President George W. Bush signed the bill into law and the U.S. Department of Transportation began immediately implementing it to make our country safer. This little-known story is but one example of Curt's contributions to the House of Representatives and the American people.

Curt will continue to serve in his new role. He is joining the Office of Legislative Counsel

of the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD), where he will help develop DOD's request for the National Defense Authorization Act each year. I am hopeful that this new opportunity provides Curt more time to spend with his wife, Meg, and their two kids, Ada and Peter, and hopefully watching his beloved Wisconsin Badgers and spending longer vacations on Lake Michigan's shores.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will truly miss his expertise, wise counsel, and friendship. I join all of my colleagues on the Committee in wishing Curt all the best in his new endeavor.

106TH NATIONAL DAY OF THE
REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 106th National Day of the Republic of China (Taiwan). I would like to wish the people of Taiwan and Taiwanese Americans a very Happy Double Ten Day.

Taiwan is an extraordinary friend of the United States and continuing this strong relationship is important. Taiwanese companies employ more than 12,000 workers in the United States with a total worker compensation of almost a billion dollars. Taiwan also serves as a strong example of democracy in Asia, and provides the U.S. with an ally to further promote peace and stability in the region.

The state of California has deep and growing ties with Taiwan. More than 800 Taiwanese companies have offices or investments in the state. California exports \$7.46 billion worth of goods to Taiwan, serving as its 7th largest export market in the world. The majority of the Taiwanese-American community is concentrated in Los Angeles County, and many have gone on to settle in the San Gabriel Valley providing our local communities with new traditions, employment opportunities and economic growth.

With continued commitment to this important relationship, I would like to again wish Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FATHER
CAPODANNO'S PASSING

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50th anniversary of the passing of Father Vincent Capodanno.

Fr. Capodanno was born on February 13, 1929, in Mariners Harbor on Staten Island.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

Growing up, he attended P.S. 44 and Curtis High School, after which he attended Fordham University for one year. A proud lifelong Staten Islander, he loved volunteering in the Staten Island community. Perhaps this dedication to serving others led him to find his true calling from God.

Vincent Capodanno made a decision to devote his life to God and joined the Maryknoll Missionary Seminary in Ossining, New York. He was ordained as a priest in June 1957 and spent the rest of his life serving all of God's children. After his ordination, Fr. Capodanno traveled to Taiwan as a missionary and then ventured to Hong Kong to teach disadvantaged children. As America's involvement in Vietnam increased, he decided to join the Army as a chaplain. It was in the jungles of Vietnam where Fr. Capodanno sacrificed his life protecting others.

On September 4, 1967, as American troops were taking fire, Fr. Capodanno moved from soldier to soldier administering Last Rites. By then, the enemy had shot him over 20 times. Despite it all, he carried on and with his dying breath, he used his body to protect his fellow Americans from the gunfire. At just 38 years old, Fr. Vincent Capodanno died as a man of peace during a war of destruction. His heroic actions earned him the Purple Heart, Bronze Star, Silver Star, and the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, Fr. Vincent Capodanno embodied the virtues of courage, altruism, and piety. While many know him as the namesake of one of Staten Island's thoroughfares, we must never forget the sacrifices he made. He was a true American hero, and with the recent anniversary of his death, I rise to salute him and everything he did for his community, country, and faith.

CHRIS PENDLETON

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chris Pendleton, President & CEO of the Edison & Ford Winter Estates, who has announced her retirement at the end of the year. For the past 16 years, Chris has been a cornerstone of our community and is leaving the Estates well positioned for the future.

More than 250,000 people each year visit the Edison & Ford Winter Estates. In fact, the annual Holiday Nights event was named by USA Today as one of the '10 Best Historic Homes for the Holidays.' While the Estates and our entire community are still recovering from Hurricane Irma and the damage left behind, the Estates are open for visitors.

I thank Chris for her years of service to Southwest Florida. Her actions to preserve the history and honor of Thomas Edison and Henry Ford for future generations are invaluable.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF KEYS FOR KIDS MINISTRIES

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Keys for Kids Ministries on the celebration of its 75th anniversary. Keys for Kids Ministries, formerly known as the Children's Bible Hour, will be celebrating this momentous occasion on October 12.

Inspired by a group of West Michigan pastors, Children's Bible Hour first aired as radio programming in 1942. It utilized kid's choir, solos, and radio drama to help children learn about God and inspire a relationship with Jesus. Wildly successful, the Children's Bible Hour grew to television and—by the end of the decade—was filling churches and auditoriums across the country.

In 1982, the Keys for Kids devotional was introduced, followed by the Keys for Kids radio broadcast in 1989. Both continue to reach thousands of children each month. Always striving to reach more individuals with the story of Jesus, Keys for Kids recently launched the Creature Feature Storytellers. This marked the beginning of Keys for Kids International and plans to translate the Keys for Kids devotional into 100 different languages.

While its name has changed, its organization expanded, and ministries diversified, Keys for Kids remains true to the mission established by Rev. Gil Cosselman, Dr. David Otis Fuller, Rev. Malcom Cronk and Rev. Donald Hescott.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the work of Keys for Kids Ministries, the millions who have been impacted, and the millions yet to be reached. May we celebrate the 75 years of inspired work and look forward to the years ahead.

HONORING BAHÁ'Í FAITH

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Bahá'í Faith to recognize the two-hundredth year anniversary of the birth of Bahá'u'lláh.

Bahá'u'lláh, born in 1817, is the founder of the Bahá'í Faith which is currently practiced by people across the world. Its teachings promote oneness and human unity between all people regardless of race, religion, or class.

Bahá'u'lláh's teachings have proven to be timeless as followers continue to study and practice his teachings two centuries after his birth. As many as five million people make up the Bahá'í Faith in virtually every country. This includes Minneapolis and its surrounding areas where members of the faith continue to promote unity and serve their community.

The Bahá'í Faith has shown a continued commitment to peace and community globally

as well as in Minnesota. I am proud to represent members of their community as they celebrate the two-hundredth year anniversary of Bahá'u'lláh.

HONORING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF BUDDY RICH

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th Birthday of Buddy Rich, and to celebrate his status as the world's greatest drummer, along with his patriotism and love of country. Born in Brooklyn, New York, Buddy Rich was known for his virtuoso technique, power, and speed. His legacy to the genre of jazz will live on forever.

HONORING DR. EDWIN M. QUEZADA

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as a former educator in the public school system, I know just how hard the administrators and faculty work to help our kids achieve academic excellence. Today I honor one of those fine educators, Dr. Edwin M. Quezada, the Superintendent of Yonkers Public Schools, who is being recognized by the Nepperhan Community Center in Yonkers for all he has done for our students in the community.

As Yonkers Superintendent, Dr. Quezada moves the agenda of public education in Yonkers, New York, the fourth largest school district in the state serving almost 28,000 students and employing 3,600 staff. The Trustees of the Yonkers Board of Education appointed Dr. Quezada Superintendent of Schools on March 16, 2016 after serving as Deputy Superintendent for two years. Dr. Quezada supervises all functions of the school district's 39 schools and central administration—teaching and learning, budgetary, human resources, facilities, communications, technology and works with city, state and federal officials. Under Dr. Quezada's tutelage Yonkers boasts the highest on-time graduation rate, 82 percent, of New York State's Big 5 city school districts. In 2016, My Brother's Keeper Challenge was launched in the City of Yonkers, initiated by Dr. Quezada and flourishing through a coalition with Mayor Mike Spano and Nepperhan Community Center Executive Director Rev. Dr. Jim Bostic.

An immigrant from the Dominican Republic, Dr. Quezada came to the Bronx, New York in September 1983 at age 16. Completing most of his early education in the Dominican Republic, he graduated from James Monroe High School in 1985 and immediately began his college career at Herbert H. Lehman College, my alma mater. In January of 1998, Dr. Quezada joined the Yonkers Public Schools as a Human Relations Facilitator. Recognized

as a mover and shaker, he was encouraged to obtain a degree in school administration. He was appointed assistant principal at Gorton High School in 2000, Principal of Emerson Middle in 2003, and Principal of Lincoln High School in 2004. During his tenure as principal, Lincoln High School received state and local accolades for improving student achievement. After ten years as a principal, Dr. Quezada was promoted to Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Administration and Supervision, before finally rising to Superintendent.

When not shaping young minds, Dr. Quezada enjoys spending time with his family—his wife, Gladys, a Yonkers teacher and their two children, Edwin Joseph and Alyssa Marie. They are his pride and joy.

Dr. Quezada has been an exemplary public servant and is most deserving of this recognition. Congratulations to him on the occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF EMERICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BEING NAMED A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire Tenth Congressional District of Virginia, I would like to honor Emerick Elementary School in Purcellville, Virginia for being named a 2017 Exemplary High Performing National Blue Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education.

Now in its 35th year, the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program has bestowed recognition on more than 8,500 private and public schools across the United States. This coveted award affirms the hard work of educators, families and communities of Emerick Elementary School, in creating a safe and welcoming environment where students can cultivate and master challenging and engaging curriculum in all subjects. Based on their vision, "Today's Learners . . . Tomorrow's Leaders," Emerick Elementary School nurtures a strong academic foundation, incorporating library and computer lab visits, as well as a wided set number of opportunities from sports to crafting to computer coding, robotics, art nights, math club, Odyssey of the Mind and environmental classes. The 2017 National Blue Ribbon School Honor, recognizes Emerick Elementary School as an Exemplary High Performing School because of their graduation rates, as well as their exemplary performance amongst Virginia's schools measured by state assessments and national tests.

In addition to the recognition from the National Blue Ribbon School, for the past three years, Emerick Elementary has placed 90 percent or higher for each core subject tested in the Virginia Standards of Learning, and in 2016, emerged with scores of 97% percent or higher in all subjects tested. These results are remarkable and based on these recent successes, it is clear that Emerick is committed to developing productive problem solvers in the 21st century, who will become the future leaders of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Principal Dawn Williams, Loudoun County Superintendent, Dr. Eric Williams and the entire Emerick Elementary School community on this achievement in being named a 2017 Exemplary High Performing National Blue Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education. I can say in great confidence that this elementary school has been an irreplaceable part of this district and has had an exceptional impact on cultivating America's youth.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT E. DOYLE UPON HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY WITH THE EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Robert E. Doyle for serving 40 years with the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD), the largest local park agency in the United States.

Mr. Doyle began his career as a park ranger, serving at various parks within EBRPD. Throughout his tenure he moved to the Planning & Design Department, then working to develop a first of its kind Regional Trails Master Plan. He later became a Chief, then Assistant General Manager for Land and Planning in 1990, where he served for 21 years—leading the greatest expansion of parks and trails in the Park District's 80 year history. He now serves as General Manager.

In 1971, Mr. Doyle was a founding board member of Save Mount Diablo, a nonprofit land trust and conservation organization that serves to protect, restore, and add acreage to Mount Diablo State Park, one of the ecological treasures of the San Francisco Bay Area. He served on the board for 25 years, including several years as Board president. Mr. Doyle was also a founding board member of the East Bay Conservation Corps and the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council, and served as a board member of the Bay Area Open Space Council.

As part of his responsibility to advance the mission and vision of the East Bay Parks, Mr. Doyle works tirelessly to advance urban parks and recreation, garnering support nationally and internationally. He has presented twice regarding the Park District's Healthy Parks Healthy People initiatives at International Union for Conservation of Nature World Parks conferences, as well as at national park and open space conferences on a variety of impactful issues.

I congratulate Mr. Doyle on this milestone achievement, thank him for all he has done for EBRPD and the community, and wish him best of luck in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Number 555 on agreeing to the McClintock Substitute Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

HONORING MR. ED McMILLAN, 2018 RECIPIENT OF THE ORDER OF LINCOLN

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a very special purpose, to recognize Mr. Ed McMillan of Greenville, IL, as a 2018 recipient of the Order of Lincoln.

Established in 1964, the Order of Lincoln is the state's highest award and each honoree receives a warrant signed by the Governor and bearing the Great Seal of the State of Illinois, certifying his or her investiture as a Laureate of the Order of Lincoln.

The purpose of the award is to "honor individuals whose outstanding contributions to the betterment of mankind have been accomplished in or on behalf of the State of Illinois." Mr. McMillan is a worthy recipient of this award. He grew up in McDonough County on a family farm, graduated from the University of Illinois at Champaign, and is currently the President & CEO of Purina Mills. He has served on many industry boards of directors plus extensive civic and philanthropic organizations, including Chairman, Board of Trustees, University of Illinois System.

Mr. McMillan's selection by the Academy is in recognition of his leadership in state and national agribusiness. His investiture will occur during the Lincoln Academy's annual convocation next year, when he will join a cohort of 340 distinguished Illinois citizens who have been honored over the past 54 years.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to Mr. McMillan, as well as the other Order of Lincoln recipients, my sincerest congratulations and very best wishes.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. DENNIS PRESLEY

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Dennis Presley of Buncombe County, North Carolina. On behalf of the people of Western North Carolina, I would like to thank Mr. Presley for over 35 years of service to our communities and congratulate him on his recent retirement.

Dennis Presley began his career with Skyland Fire and Rescue in 1978. From here,

Chief Presley worked his way up from Firefighter to Chief of Skyland Fire and Rescue. While working in Skyland, Chief Presley also served Asheville Fire and Rescue as both a Captain and District Commander. During his time in Asheville, Chief Presley's team was the first to save a life using an automatic defibrillator, and he received an award from the Asheville City Manager for his heroism during a swift water rescue. All told, Chief Presley has earned over 10 awards for his leadership, heroism, and devotion to his community.

Outside of the fire station, Chief Presley continues his dedication to the firefighters of Western North Carolina by serving as an insurance agent for over thirty fire departments and as the first Chairman of the Buncombe County Fire Chiefs Association. In addition to this work in Buncombe County, Chief Presley actively serves in the Western North Carolina Association of Firefighters, the Buncombe County Firefighters Association, and as a Statistician with the North Carolina State Firefighters Association. While he has gone above and beyond the call of duty for his fellow firemen, Chief Presley has also found time to lead his family, serve his church, and invest in many friendships.

Chief Presley has earned the respect and friendship of the people of Buncombe County through his hard work and wide-ranging involvement in his community. For his service to Western North Carolina, I am honored to express to Chief Presley the gratitude and best wishes of the people of North Carolina on his retirement.

HONORING GERTIE SOLE ARCHER

HON. DAVID B. MCKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Gertie Sole Archer, who passed away in August, for her service and contributions to her community. Mrs. Archer was born in Muddy Creek, West Virginia and lived in Middlebourne, WV for most of her life. Mrs. Archer contributed to her community as a County Clerk in Tyler County, as an active member in the Muddy Creek Church of Christ, the Tyler County High School Athletic and Band Boosters, and offered her time to many other community organizations.

As a long-standing and active member of the Tyler County Republican Women's Club, she enthusiastically volunteered to support the election of Republican candidates. As the first Republican Congressman from the 1st District in 42 years, I benefited from her work and friendship. She also worked tirelessly to improve the streetscape, parks and recreational facilities in Middlebourne, her hometown for 50 years.

Today, we honor Mrs. Archer and her contributions to her community. We join her friends and family in mourning the loss of a stalwart in her community.

MR. TOM CAMP'S 55 YEARS OF SAFE DRIVING FOR UPS

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Livonia, Michigan resident, Tom Camp on achieving 55 years of safe driving for the United Parcel Service (UPS).

Tom Camp is the first driver ever in UPS history to achieve 55 years of safe driving with no Department of Transportation reportable accidents during this period.

Having driven over a million miles and transported over 5 million packages, 77-year-old Marine Corps veteran Tom Camp is always on the lookout. He attributes his safe driving record to his keen sense of caution and awareness of the other drivers on the road.

We should all take note from Mr. Camp's advice, "You just have to pay attention out there. You can't get distracted. Safety is No. 1."

His dedication to safety is perhaps only rivaled by his passion for customer service. "Anyone can deliver a package," he says. "It's the person delivering the package that makes all the difference," and, since 1962, Mr. Camp has taken this to heart, brightening the days of so many of his neighbors.

I congratulate Mr. Camp on this record-breaking achievement and applaud him for serving as a role model of conscientious driving and safety. Here's to many more years of safe driving.

IN RECOGNITION OF INTERNATIONAL PLASMA AWARENESS WEEK

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, on October 8 to 14, 2017, across the United States and throughout the world, patients, plasma donors and plasma collection centers will join together to observe International Plasma Awareness Week. There will be events to raise global awareness of the crucial need for plasma to create lifesaving therapies, recognize that plasma donors contribute greatly in saving and improving lives, and increase understanding of the many rare diseases and plasma protein therapies that help to treat them.

Plasma-derived therapies and recombinant blood clotting factors, collectively known as plasma protein therapies, are unique, biologic medicines that are either infused or injected to treat a variety of rare, life-threatening, chronic, and genetic diseases including bleeding disorders, hereditary angioedema, immune deficiencies, pulmonary disorders, neurological disorders, shock and trauma, liver cirrhosis, and infectious diseases such as tetanus, hepatitis, and rabies.

Plasma-derived therapies save and improve lives of individuals throughout the world, in-

cluding in emergency and surgical medicine. Plasma protein therapies have significantly improved the quality of life, markedly improved patient outcomes, and extended the life expectancy of individuals with rare, chronic diseases and conditions.

Healthy, committed donors provide the plasma essential to manufacture these lifesaving therapies; and there are more than 575 plasma collection centers in the U.S. that have demonstrated their commitment to plasma donor and patient safety and quality by earning International Quality Plasma Program (IQPP) certification.

I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me and rise in commemoration of International Plasma Awareness Week, honoring those committed donors and collection centers who make and collect needed and lifesaving contributions.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COMMANDER JONATHAN SCHAFER

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing United States Coast Guard Community Affairs Officer Jonathan Schaffer for his years of service as liaison to the District of Columbia.

Prior to his service as a Community Affairs Officer, Lieutenant Commander Schaffer served as a drilling reservist. He was deployed overseas several times, including for one year in Iraq with Patrol Forces Southwest Asia as the Liaison to the Iraqi Coastal Border Guard, and in Spain with Port Security Unit 305.

Since Lt. Cmdr. Schaffer began his position as a Community Affairs Officer for the District of Columbia, he and his coworkers have contributed more than 55,000 volunteer hours to the District; delivered over 200,000 pounds of food to pantries in the Ward 8 community as part of the "Feds Feed Families" outreach program; loaned over 2,300 tents to various community outreach events; and implemented a successful "Partnerships in Education and Services" program at six D.C.-area schools.

In addition to his work as a Community Affairs Officer, Lt. Cmdr. Schaffer served as the Coast Guard liaison to the Anacostia Coordinating Council (ACC), a group that has been dedicated to the Ward 8 community since 1983. Lt. Cmdr. Schaffer was designated as the liaison when he approached Vice Admiral Manson Brown at an ACC meeting.

Lt. Cmdr. Schaffer also worked at the United States Department of the Interior for 25 years as a National Park Service Ranger, Federal Game Warden and Wildlife Refuge Manager at nine locations, from Alaska to Puerto Rico.

Therefore, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Lt. Cmdr. Jonathan Schaffer for his years of service to the U.S. government and the District of Columbia.

HONORING NEPPERHAN COMMUNITY CENTER 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in my district there are several community focused organizations that do amazing work on behalf of my constituents. The Nepperhan Community Center in Yonkers is one of those standout organizations, and this year it celebrates its incredible 75th anniversary.

Nepperhan Community Center (NCC) was founded by a group of concerned neighbors in the Nepperhan section of Yonkers (now Runyon Heights) in the late 1930s. This group wanted a meeting place that could also accommodate recreational activities and classes for the youth. In 1942, NCC became officially incorporated, and with the help of United Way, purchased a building at 117 Palisades Avenue. The activities offered at this location expanded to include cooking, basketball, sewing and occasional social dances. Scholarships were also offered to deserving students for upstate campsites. Through the years, the programs and services offered by NCC increased by more than twenty-fold. Even though the demand for services was increasing, NCC was still functioning on a part-time basis. In the late 1960s, NCC relocated to 302 Warburton Avenue, where it undertook new programming, along with Yonkers YCAP, in the field of education, tutoring, remedial reading and math. NCC also started its first parental involvement program.

NCC initiated a Black Studies and Cultural Enrichment program, which for the first time, afforded many young individuals in the community the experience of going to black theater, plays, and seeing ballets. Today, NCC still carries on that tradition, in addition to presenting our own theatrical productions. During this time, NCC became aware of the many social ills that were affecting our community in the areas of employment, housing, education, high youth crime, etc. NCC addressed these issues by setting up an Ex-Offender Program and a few years later a Youthful Offender program, with built-in help that offered assistance with employment, housing, life coping skills and education. Other programs included: welfare rights, veterans services, pre-trial intervention, drug programs, social and recreational programs.

NCC has grown from a part-time social agency, serving a few people yearly, to now providing direct services, referral and supportive services on a full-time basis. The addition of these capabilities has enabled NCC to assist thousands of children and their families. Today under strong leadership from Dr. Jim Bostic and his team, it continues to offer invaluable service to the Yonkers community and beyond. I want to congratulate them on 75 terrific years and say here's to 75 more.

WELCOMING NEW CITIZENS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate thirty individuals who will take their oaths of citizenship on Friday, October 13, 2017. This memorable occasion will be held at the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. Oath ceremonies are a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On October 13, 2017, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Christopher Richard Sweet, Hikmat Mahmood Jbara, Abimbola Harninat Elenitoba-Johnson, Inessa Sergejevna Bodrova, Radoslaw Jan Nabrzyski, Bhavik Kapilbhai Pathak, Zivojin Gino Djuric, Petrica Murariu Botez, Corina Gabriela Murariu-Botez, Obiefuna Foster Eze, Ai-Anh Thi Truong, Pavel Veljanoski, Caterina Susana Bosio Ruiz, Kan-Wei Coduti, Alejandra Diaz, Bijan Farajzadeh, Angela Izchel Fonseca, Adrian Fuentes, Gabriela Herrera, Jean Yves Jean Mardy, Petra Pacheco Dorado, Maria Guadalupe Perretta, Patricia Reid-Sinclair, Liliana Romo, Samantha Wenz, Jade Yu Rui Yang, Radomir Cvetkovski, Lan Phuoc Mai, Gilles Jean Claude Charriere and Heidy Lobo Gibson.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country “. . . of the people, by the people, and for the people.” They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals who will become citizens of the United States of America on October 13, 2017. They, too, will be American citizens, guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN GABRIEL SMITH

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. John Gabriel Smith, a constituent in St. Mary's County, Maryland, whose courage broke barriers and advanced the cause of integration and equality in our country. This Saturday, he will be honored at the homecoming game at Gonzaga College High School in Washington, DC, where he made history in 1954 as its first African-American graduate.

Along with his two sisters, Gabe—as he is known to his family, friends, and neighbors in St. Mary's County—learned hard work and diligence from his parents amid the turbulent times of Jim Crow as he grew up in the 1940's. He found comfort and calm in the teachings of his Catholic faith and in fellowship at St. Peter Claver Church in Ridge, Maryland. There, he served as an altar boy and met the Jesuit priest who would become his mentor, Father Horace McKenna. Under the guidance of Father McKenna, Gabe developed a deep desire to find God and pursue the priesthood. Asking his spiritual guide what he would need to do, he learned that he would first have to study Latin. However, none of the segregated schools in Southern Maryland offered Latin courses.

From Father McKenna, though, Gabe also learned that Gonzaga College High offered Latin and all the other subjects prerequisite to prepare for the priesthood—and then-Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle had ordered the desegregation of the schools within the Archdiocese of Washington in 1948. Thus, in 1951, Gabe walked into Gonzaga College High as its first African-American student, bravely breaking the color barrier and preparing the way for the more than 1,100 African-American Gonzaga College High students who have followed him.

At Gonzaga College High, Gabe witnessed less of the abusive conditions of segregation that he had encountered in Southern Maryland, and many of his classmates stood with him in solidarity against bigotry outside the school walls. But as a member of the school's Purple Eagle football team, he had to face opposing teams from still-segregated schools whose players and fans directed their ignorance and hatred in his direction. His coach, Joe Kozik, stood by him throughout and presided over a team that rallied around Gabe. He would never forget the support he found among his peers and from Coach Kozik, who became as much a mentor to him as Father McKenna had been.

When Gabe became the first African-American student to graduate Gonzaga College High in 1954, the Supreme Court reached its historic decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* and required the complete integration of America's public schools. Gabe and others who had already been trailblazers inspired other young African-American students around the country to be the first in their communities to desegregate their local schools as our nation struggled to achieve full enforcement of the *Brown* decision in the years that followed.

While Gabe never ended up becoming a priest, he nonetheless rooted his life strongly in faith and built a career as a pharmacist upon the foundation in Latin and the sciences that he studied first at Gonzaga College High and then later at Howard University. He worked in the field for more than four decades, retiring this past spring. For many years now, Gabe has been an active member of the Mt. Ennon Baptist Church's Men's Ministry, helping to inspire others to achieve and pursue their own dreams as he did his. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Gabe on his retirement after a long and productive career serving the community in St. Mary's County and on being honored this weekend at his alma mater. I wish him and his wife of fifty years—Mrs. Jeanette Graves Smith—and their entire family well on this happy occasion.

RECOGNIZING THE QUINCY AIR
EVAC LIFETEAM'S 20TH ANNI-
VERSARY

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize the Quincy Air Evac Lifeteam for their commitment to our community as they celebrate their 20th anniversary.

For twenty years, the Quincy Air Evac Lifeteam provided lifesaving access to crucial medical services for those who need it most. By providing air ambulance support, the Quincy Air Evac Lifeteam provided safe and rapid emergency transportation to the most vulnerable in the Quincy community. The Quincy Air Evac Lifeteam is essential to the safety of citizens in the rural communities of Illinois' 18th Congressional District.

The Quincy Air Evac Lifeteam sets the gold standard for care among Air Evac Lifeteams around the country. In 2017, the National Paramedic of the year for Air Evac Lifeteam was awarded to a member of Quincy's team. I am grateful to the Quincy Air Evac Lifeteam for their service to our community and the lives they have saved.

I extend my sincere congratulations to the Quincy Air Evac Lifeteam on twenty years of service and I wish for their continued safety as they continue to protect the Quincy community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, owing to a leave of absence for personal reasons, I was unable to cast votes on October 4th and 5th. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On Roll Call No. 553, the Rep. Grijalva Progressive Caucus Substitute Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 (the FY' 2018 Budget Resolution), I would have voted "Nay."

On Roll Call No. 554, the Rep. Scott Congressional Black Caucus Substitute Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 (the FY' 2018 Budget Resolution), I would have voted "Nay."

On Roll Call No. 555, the Rep. McClintock Republican Study Committee Substitute Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 (the FY' 2018 Budget Resolution), I would have voted "Nay."

On Roll Call No. 556, Rep. Yarmuth Democratic Caucus Substitute Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 (the FY' 2018 Budget Resolution), I would have voted "Nay."

On Roll Call No. 557, Adoption of H. Con. Res. 71 (the FY' 2018 Budget Resolution), I would have voted "Aye."

On Roll Call No. 558, Approval of the Journal, I would have voted "Aye."

HONORING THE LIFE OF PATRICIA
YATES

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Patricia Yates, who passed away on October 2, 2017, after a lifetime of public service to her community. Born in San Francisco on February 18, 1921, Mrs. Yates was raised in a family with a well-regarded history of public service at both the state and local level. This environment helped mold in her a passion for service. She graduated from U.C. Berkeley in 1941 before immediately going to work for the federal government.

During World War II, Mrs. Yates worked as an economist for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and traveled across the country to inspect stores and track the prices of vital goods. This exposure to people from all walks of life and their diverse lifestyles, contextualized her dedication to public service.

By 1952, Mrs. Yates moved with her husband to Marin County, where she would reside for the rest of her life. She attained a Masters of Arts in teaching from Dominican University in 1967, and became a teacher at San Domenico High School in San Anselmo. There, she endeavored to instill her passion for civic engagement into her students, eventually becoming the chair of the school's social studies department. After 8 years of teaching, Mrs. Yates retired in order to pursue her growing passion for land and resource conservation in Marin County.

Following years of volunteer work with Marin Conservation League, Mrs. Yates became one of the first women to be elected to the Board of the Marin Municipal Water District in 1982. She occupied this role for six years over the course of two terms, serving as the Board President for two of those years. Even after retiring from the Board in 1991, she continued to volunteer her time teaching students and the public about ecology and the importance of the natural environment.

Mr. Speaker, the depth of Mrs. Yates' service to her community has left a lasting legacy in Marin County, and she will be dearly missed. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and honor her many contributions.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF DIANE GLASSER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous sadness that I rise today to honor the life and contributions of Diane Glasser. Diane was a former Vice Mayor of the City of Tamarac, a dear personal friend, a constituent, and an activist who contributed greatly to the growth of Democratic politics in Broward County and Florida. She passed away on October 10, 2017 at the age of 89, and is survived by her son Craig Glasser of Sunrise, Florida.

Originally from Mill Basin in Brooklyn, New York, Diane and her husband moved to the City of Tamarac in 1973. She worked in the construction industry for twelve years. In 2004, Diane was appointed First Vice Chairwoman of the Florida Democratic Party.

She was then elected to the Tamarac City Commission in 2008, where she served until her retirement in 2016. She also served on various Boards in Broward County, including the Broward School Board Senior Advisory Task Force and the Broward Human Rights Board.

Diane was an Elected Florida Delegate in the last six Democratic National Conventions, and cast her vote in the Electoral College for the State of Florida in 1996 for Former President Bill Clinton and in 2000 for Former Vice President Al Gore.

Mr. Speaker, Diane was a very special woman who profoundly impacted our community. Her spirit and loving memory will always live on. She will be dearly missed.

HONORING THOMAS MACAULAY'S
50 YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE
MASSENA VOLUNTEER FIRE DE-
PARTMENT

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas Macaulay for his 50 years of service in the Massena Volunteer Fire Department.

Since joining the department in 1967, Mr. Macaulay has proven to be an effective leader, advancing through the ranks of Lieutenant, Captain, and Assistant Chief of the department. As a testament to his distinguished service, he was chosen by his peers as Fireman of the Year in 1998. A decade later, Mr. Macaulay was elected to serve as Chief of the department until 2010. Currently serving as Treasurer, he continues to be a valuable asset to the Massena community.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to thank Mr. Macaulay for the sacrifices he has made in protecting the residents of Massena for over half a century. We applaud Mr. Macaulay for his selfless service, and for acting as an example for future generations of firefighters.

HONORING THE WORK OF REGISTERED NURSES IN AFTERMATH OF NATURAL DISASTERS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor registered nurses across our nation who have urgently worked on the front lines after the deadly hurricanes this past season. In particular, Dotty Nygard and Rhonda Risner, who are a part of a large network of volunteers that are deployed after natural disasters to help take care of patients.

Three weeks after Hurricane Harvey hit south Texas, registered nurses were deployed for weeks at a time. There these nurses gave dedicated care to their patients to ensure that the viruses had not spread to anyone and that they received the specific attention they needed. Their work was integral to the safety of victims after natural disasters. Viruses and diseases can spread quickly after natural disasters due to the number of different people in confined places. It is the nurses who spot the signs of these viruses as soon as they can, and it is the nurses who become the first defense against the spreading of flus and other life-threatening viruses.

While serving the victims of the hurricane, nurses encountered a multitude of chronic issues, including heart attacks, strokes, and hypertensive crises from patients who have either never had access to health care or lost their medications in the floods. It is because of nurses' insight, diligent observation, and quick response that these people are still alive today.

Nurses across the nation have created a network of 20,000 volunteers who have traveled the world, helping victims of natural disasters. The nurses have gone to the Philippines after a tsunami, Haiti following the earthquake, and worked with the U.S. Navy in Central and South America. Many of the patients they face have no access to their medications after a disaster or their access to medical care is severely limited or non-existent. These nurses are at the front lines saving lives in disasters all over the world, and their work cannot be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, across the nation registered nurses' dedication and benevolence in their care for victims of natural disasters all over the world are integral to patients' safety and well-being and the eventual recovery of any area. We must always remember to honor and thank those first responders in their work around the world, especially those nurses who give up their time in hospitals and health centers to care for victims after a natural disaster.

HONORING DR. DEIRDRE J. LOUGHLIN

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Deirdre J. Loughlin. Deirdre's

work as a teacher has touched the lives of so many students and families. As Manager of Staff Development, she poured her time and talent into creating an atmosphere of excellence throughout Worcester Public Schools, leaving a legacy of progress that will benefit our students for years to come.

But Mr. Speaker, her lessons extended far beyond the classroom. In fact, if you spent the day with her, you would think she taught the entire city of Worcester. Seldom does a day pass by that she doesn't run into a former student. Deirdre is the kind of teacher that becomes a friend for life: staying in touch as students grow and continue on to that next chapter, always remembering a name, a memory—and yes, even that homework assignment you missed in Chemistry class.

In the years I have known her, I have been personally inspired by her drive to make things better for every single young person in Worcester, no matter who they are or where they're from. She's worked with the School Committee to set strategic goals and measure success by the best benchmarks available. She's gotten creative, partnering with outside organizations to improve each school's curriculum and expand students' horizons. She's created a solid foundation which our schools will build upon for generations. And she's never lost sight of what it's all about at the end of the day: ensuring that each student has the support and opportunities he or she needs to thrive.

It is with warm wishes and a deep appreciation for her lifetime of public service that I send my congratulations on behalf of the people of Worcester and the United States Congress as together we celebrate "Dr. Deirdre J. Loughlin Day" on October fifteenth, two thousand seventeen.

IN HONOR OF SHERANDO HIGH SCHOOL'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate an excellent high school in the 10th Congressional District of Virginia, Frederick County's Sherando High School, while the school community is celebrating its 25th Anniversary.

The school's slogan, "where one person can make a difference," summarizes the caring, respectful culture that has been created at Sherando High School during those 25 years. Central to this special culture are the guiding words of the Mission for the staff, wherein they accept responsibility for providing "a safe and supportive environment that encourages intellectual, emotional, physical and social growth" and "a positive educational atmosphere which will encourage students to maximize their learning opportunities." The Sherando community is proud of the fact that the entire community supports students with learning differences and that these students are encouraged to be an important part of the school and to benefit from the daily educational and social activities of the school.

This caring attitude also extends to other students, including those struggling with severe depression. Hundreds of members of the Sherando community have participated in Out of the Darkness walks, raising funds for suicide prevention programs.

Another important aspect of Sherando High School's culture is summed up in the third sentence of the staff mission statement: "We will promote the active participation of parents and the community in the educational process." This welcoming attitude of the school has provided the community the opportunity to cheer on Sherando students in a variety of pursuits, including dramatic productions, D.E.C.A and FFA activities, choir concerts, The Widget Cup, a design/build interscholastic competition that shows off the talents of Career and Technical Education students, and the marching band, which recently took first place in General Effect, Drum Major, and Color Guard disciplines at the Hylton High School Marching Band Competition.

The motto of the school, "Once a warrior, always a warrior" certainly rings true in the area of athletics, where community residents and alumni get caught up with Sherando football and other athletics, and even travel long distances to see their athletes compete at regionals and at state championships. And at the very event that took place on October 7, 2017, several athletes from the past are going to be recognized as the first inductees into the Sherando Athletic Hall of Fame. Congratulations to Tyler Gaines, Kelley Washington, Emily Budnyk-Putt, Robyn Ritter-Browne, Zach Franz, Pepper Martin, and Jason Barbe for this special recognition.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our colleagues in congratulating Principal John Nelson, his dedicated staff and the entire Sherando High School community, on 25 years of extraordinary success and in wishing them a continuation of this success in the years to come.

YONKERS GUARDIANS ASSOCIATION

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Yonkers Guardians Association, an organization in the Yonkers community dedicated to promoting equal opportunities within the Yonkers Police Department.

The Yonkers Guardians Association, incorporated in 1988 under the leadership of first president, Lieutenant Lorenzo Paul, is a fraternal organization comprised of African American Police and Detention Officers. Dedicated to promoting equal opportunities of appointment, assignment and promotion for members of the Yonkers Police Department, and to devising and executing plans to assist its members morally, financially, educationally and culturally. The association's mission is to encourage community members to be conscience of the criminal justice system and to enhance the quality of life in the African American community. Moreover, the Organization's goal is to

foster an indispensable alliance with the community by creating partnerships, programs and building relationships with community based organizations that share the ideals and common principles of the Guardians Association.

In addition to working to increase the number of African American Police Officers the Guardians have honored outstanding women in our community through its "Mother's Day Award Dinner". Using the motto "Protecting our Future today" the Guardians have also made a commitment to programs that help our local youth partnering with the My Brother's

Keeper initiative to mentor our local youth. The Guardians had also formed alliances with the National Association of Black Law Enforcement (NABLEO), the Westchester/Rockland Guardians Association, the Nepperhan Community Center, Compact for Learning in the 21st Century, the Cluster Westchester Mediation Center, the Yonkers Department of Parks and Recreation, the Yonkers Drug Court, the Westchester Coalition Against Bigotry, the Yonkers NAACP, the Yonkers Public Schools, the Municipal Housing Authority and the Salvation Army. Under the leadership of

past presidents Lieutenant Lorenzo Paul, Detective Charles Morton, Detective Donald Wilson, Detective Stuart Barksdale, Police Officer Joseph Lecoq, Detective Vincent Tilson and current President Sergeant Charles Walker the Guardians seek to bridge relationships between Law Enforcement and the Minority Community, to be a voice against injustice and work to create opportunities for the members of the community which we are a part of. They have done a tremendous job with that, and I congratulate them on all they've accomplished.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 11, 2017

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

October 11, 2017.

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

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, next week is National Forest Products Week, which the Nation observes from October 15 through October 21. Each year since 1960, our Nation has celebrated the achievements of the forest product manufacturers and organizations throughout this country.

The forest products industry is an integral part of U.S. manufacturing competitiveness and is among the top 10 manufacturing sector employers in 45 States. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, this industry is home to 265 wood products, paper, and packaging manufacturing facilities that make more than \$16 million in products, annually, and contribute nearly \$3 million to State and local economies through wages and compensation. More than 53,600 hardworking men and women in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are employed by the forest products industry.

Forest products continue to meet the evolving needs of people across the country and around the world. The forest products industry directly employs about 900,000 people and supports 2.4 million jobs. It is 4 percent of the total U.S. manufacturing GDP. The industry meets a payroll of approximately \$50 billion, annually, and manufactures almost \$240 billion in products every year.

One-third of the United States is forested—751 million acres. Privately owned forests supply 91 percent of the wood harvested in the United States; State and Tribal forests supply approximately 6 percent; and Federal forests supply only 2 percent of the wood used by the forest products industry. More than 56 percent of U.S. forests are privately owned, much of it by family forest owners who manage their lands to provide value to future generations.

The industry has tremendous impact on our environment, too. A single tree can absorb more than 10 pounds of CO₂ each year. In the United States, forests and forest products store enough carbon to offset approximately 12 percent of the Nation's CO₂ emissions.

Forest products play a valuable role in the life of every American every day. Two-thirds of the Nation's drinking water comes from forests. From paper and packaging to wood products, tissue and other personal care items, these products are at the heart of modern life and a modern economy.

Paper products allow us to communicate, teach, and learn. They provide safe packaging for goods and consumables, as well as personal hygiene and cleanliness. Wood products provide shelter and necessary components of daily life.

Mr. Speaker, because the industry plays such an important role in the life of everyday Americans, in 1960, Congress designated the third week in October as National Forest Products Week. Next week, the country celebrates with events and advocacy campaigns to mark that occasion. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly join those across the Nation who applaud the forest products industry for its many contributions.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, the Obama administration

took a very positive and important step towards curbing greenhouse gas emissions by initiating the Clean Power Plan, the first-ever national limit on carbon pollution from power plants. The plan was devised to give States the option to tailor how they would reduce carbon pollution, following benchmarks set by the Federal Government.

For years, States, local governments, businesses, and universities have been making progress towards a low-carbon future, both in anticipation of full implementation of the Clean Power Plan and spurred on by a variety of other forces. Now, the Trump administration has vowed to unravel the Clean Power Plan, but the momentum will not stop because of this reckless act.

Donald Trump and Scott Pruitt cannot repeal engineering, science, or economics. Their attempts would only harm the economy and our citizens, mirroring us in the past to serve the interests of Big Coal.

The case for action in reducing carbon pollution is compelling. The Clean Power Plan encourages steps to reduce the dangerous extent of accelerating climate disruption and attendant extreme weather events.

Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria are only the latest example of those events. Now, millions of acres in the West are exploding in wildfires. More frequent, more intense, and more dangerous forest fires are the reality now, spurred by climate disruption.

Out-of-control wildfire has touched Oregon's beloved Columbia River Gorge, and the latest instances are in California wine country, taking lives, destroying property, and damaging crops.

Regardless of your view on climate change, the Clean Power Plan is a very important step for the United States. It stands on firm legal ground. The Supreme Court has ruled on three separate occasions that the EPA has the authority and the responsibility to protect our families from carbon pollution.

Cleaner energy and a cleaner environment under the Clean Power Plan would improve the lives of working Americans. By 2030, it would prevent 90,000 asthma attacks, 300,000 days missed from work and school, and 3,600 premature deaths every year.

Instead of protecting human health, particularly those in communities most impacted by carbon pollution, Trump and Pruitt are seeking to tilt the energy playing field back in favor of Big Coal.

Make no mistake: without subsidies and regulatory favoritism, most old, dirty, coal plants would have been shut down years ago if they had been required to meet carbon pollution and air quality standards, as they should have been.

Trump and Pruitt are making a big mistake when they assault the Clean Air Act and the Clean Power Plan. They are on weak legal ground, and they are on the wrong side of science, economics, the environment, and common sense.

The Clean Power Plan will not be easily unraveled. There is a process to unwind it, similar to what it took to put it in place. It will take a lot of hard work—and evidence that Pruitt doesn't have—to repeal it and prevent the EPA from regulating carbon emissions.

The plan has powerful allies. I am proud to stand with the environmental community, my fellow Democrats in Congress, many government and trade groups, citizens who care, and a number of businesses. Mars is the latest company to announce that they are going to follow through on their carbon reduction plan.

We will continue this fight for a low-carbon, healthier, more economical future. We will protect alternative energy and honor the commitments we have made to the wind and solar industries. We will continue to reduce emissions from our transportation sector by not rolling back fuel efficiency standards.

We will work with the agriculture sector, which makes up 9 percent of the total greenhouse gas emissions. A strong farm bill can reduce emissions and enhance productivity through low-carbon protections.

Ultimately, Trump and Pruitt cannot repeal science, engineering, or economics. I am proud to be part of this effort to ensure that the United States moves forward to exercise leadership in a low-carbon future to fight climate change and global weather disruption.

PROTECTING OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues' support for the Senior Citizen Protection Act, which I introduced along with my friend, Congressman BRAD SCHNEIDER.

Seniors are valued members of our society, and we must do everything we can to ensure that they can live with dignity and without fear of being abused by those entrusted to care for them.

This bipartisan bill seeks to achieve that goal by creating a national registry for those convicted of elder abuse

that will be accessible to senior care providers and families before they make a decision on whom they hire as a caregiver for their loved ones. This national database will bring together local and State registries in order to prevent abusers from continuing to inflict suffering on senior citizens by simply relocating from one community to another.

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. SCHNEIDER and me in support of this measure that will help ensure that our parents, grandparents, and loved ones are looked after by professional caregivers who will give them the treatment and respect they deserve.

CARING FOR SENIORS DURING NATURAL DISASTERS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Protecting Seniors During Disasters Act, which I introduced with my colleague, Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

The horrific deaths of 14 seniors in a Florida nursing home facility in the aftermath of Hurricane Irma made it abundantly clear that more must be done to protect seniors during and after natural disasters.

In times of emergency, many senior citizens find themselves disconnected from caregivers and without the treatments and resources that they so desperately need. Our bill seeks to reconnect seniors by requiring that Federal agencies assess how their emergency response efforts impact the elderly. It also calls for the implementation of standards to better protect and care for senior citizens and nursing home residents across our Nation during and after emergency situations.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan legislative initiative that aims to save the lives of many senior citizens and helps ensure that the tragedy that took place in south Florida will not happen again. I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this lifesaving measure.

BUILDING A NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN LATINO

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month and the many contributions of our vibrant community throughout our country, I would like to bring attention to a bill that I have sponsored that would permanently showcase the history and stories of American Latinos.

H.R. 2911, the National Museum of the American Latino Act, will establish a world-class educational institution on The National Mall for the millions of visitors who come to our Nation's capital every year eager to learn about American history.

Latinos have served our great country in every war dating back to before the Revolutionary War and continue to proudly serve in our military. They are small-business owners, job creators, TV stars, athletes, and public servants.

An initiative over 20 years in the making, this museum would be a visual representation of the difficulties that Latinos have overcome leaving their home countries, whether to flee an oppressive communist regime in my native homeland of Cuba, or Venezuela, or for the opportunity to partake in the American Dream, as well as the story of Hispanics who have made the U.S. their home for many generations.

As the first Hispanic woman elected to the U.S. Congress, I am proud to invite my colleagues to join me in this endeavor and cosponsor H.R. 2911, the National Museum of the American Latino Act.

ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, it has been 3 weeks since the eye of Hurricane Maria crossed over Puerto Rico. It has been 3 weeks, and there are still parts of the island that have not had contact with FEMA yet—3 weeks. For most people, that has meant no power, and most still don't have running water.

Hospitals and clinics were hit hard, as The New York Times reports. The daughter of one man who died because he couldn't receive oxygen treatment told the paper: "Because of the electricity situation, a lot of people died and are still dying."

Forty percent of the island still lacks running water because of the blackout, which still affects 85 percent of the island. As a result, many people are bathing in streams and receiving water from huge tanks, which is never a good idea.

This is after 3 weeks in the most powerful nation on Earth. This is unacceptable.

Our response to Hurricane Maria and the people of Puerto Rico is a national and international embarrassment and a tragedy. They are our own citizens in our own Caribbean colonies of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and we have not helped them all that we can.

I spoke to Chicago firefighters yesterday who have been in Puerto Rico for about a week, and they tell me it is worse than we are being told.

□ 1015

They told me yesterday that they are still making contact in towns where people come up to them and say, "Thank God, it is FEMA; you are finally here," only to be told, "No, we are not FEMA; we are from Chicago; we are firefighters," and they embrace and cry with gratitude.

Last week, a group of my colleagues and I got together. We represent large Puerto Rican communities here on the mainland in Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, Ohio, and Florida. All of us have been contacted by

our constituents who are in desperate need to get their loved ones back and out of Puerto Rico.

After 3 weeks, they have run out of patience and are not interested in excuses in our congressional district. They want their parents, they want their Tia with cancer, and they want their cousins on dialysis off the island, period, now. They want a plane ticket to get the hell out.

Our communities are ready. Lorain, Ohio; Hartford; Boston; Orlando; New York; Chicago; we are all ready, but the problem is transportation. If you have money, connections, or internet access, then you probably can find a flight out.

I know this because I was in Puerto Rico 2 weeks ago, and I saw the Land Rovers, the Jaguars, parked at the private airports in San Juan, because if you have the money, you have already put your loved ones on a flight out of Dodge.

The individuals from FEMA have been doing a great job, given the constraints, but I think now FEMA and the military resources should focus on the task of evacuating the elderly, the sick, and the vulnerable from the island.

Look, this is the way FEMA works. They say: Well, we only take on tasks that the Governor asks us to take on, and the Governor is not likely to go to FEMA to ask them to get thousands and thousands of his constituents off the island.

Number one, it is a difficult request for any local official to make. Captains of industry and leaders on the island want to make sure that there are Puerto Rican workers there to rebuild, and of course, to continue to buy their products. I get that. But at the same time, those same captains of industry and political leaders, guess what, I bet you most of them have already got their loved ones off the island.

Number two, we know the Governor has to be extremely careful how he asks for anything because we all know the President doesn't take criticism very well or even a hint of criticism. The Governor doesn't want to get blackballed by the President who might go off on a Twitter rant at any moment unless he is praised and stroked every step of the way.

But our Puerto Rican constituents don't vote for the Governor of Puerto Rico. They vote for us, for DELAUNO, for CROWLEY, for MCGOVERN, for ESPAILLAT, for MARCY KAPTUR, and they want us to help them get their families out of danger's way. They are demanding help getting their family members out, and I think FEMA and the U.S. military can do the job. They just need the orders from the people in charge.

Let's be clear: if anyone wants to leave Puerto Rico, they should have our help in doing so. For thousands, it

is a question of life and death and survival. That is what is needed to help Puerto Rico. We don't need the President tossing paper towels to storm victims like he was tossing a ball to a dog or maybe tossing peanuts to squirrels in the park. We need airplanes, ships, and helicopters to get the people the hell out; otherwise, it will be worse than let them eat cake; it is let them die.

CELEBRATING THE WORK OF TERESA LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the work of a very wonderful constituent of the Fifth District of North Carolina, Teresa Lewis.

Every September, we celebrate American Business Women's Day in order to recognize the many different backgrounds and diverse occupations of American businesswomen. However, it is my belief that we should celebrate American businesswomen like Teresa Lewis every day.

Teresa's success was born out of determination and the desire to provide a better life for her family. In 1986, Teresa founded WorkForce Carolina, a professional staffing service that includes recruitment, interview completion, and skills assessment.

As CEO of WorkForce Carolina, Teresa has employed thousands of people, and her company has served as a boon to the North Carolina economy.

Most importantly, Teresa serves as a role model to all women and men in our country. I commend Teresa Lewis on all of her many accomplishments and thank her for all she does for the community.

CRITICAL TIME OF LIFE AND DEATH FOR PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time of life and death for millions of U.S. citizens on the island of Puerto Rico and also in the Virgin Islands.

The efforts to rebuild will be great, and we each have a critical role to play to help these families recover following the aftermath of these catastrophic storms.

We have witnessed so much devastation this hurricane season, and the impact has been particularly destructive and wreaked havoc. It has left millions of U.S. families without shelter, electricity, and their lives in ruin.

We all have a part to play in the recovery efforts and must answer the

calls to provide relief and aid in the immense rebuilding efforts that will take place to assist all of them who have been affected.

The amount of help and heart I have seen in my home State of New York, including a recent effort of Uptown United this weekend, and from constituents of mine like Lin-Manuel Miranda, and even from children willing to crack open their piggybanks has been overwhelming.

If the Federal Government could have matched that compassion, then Puerto Rico would be well on its way to recovery.

Last night, the House Appropriations Committee released a \$36.5 billion disaster relief package: \$5 billion of that will go directly to Puerto Rico; \$14 billion for FEMA's disaster fund; and \$16 billion for the National Flood Insurance Program. I see this as an initial downpayment. I hope this is just the beginning.

Nearly a month into this crisis, the status of Puerto Rico today is such:

The Jones Act. On Sunday, the White House let the 10-day shipping waiver for the Jones Act expire for Puerto Rico, meaning that foreign ships can no longer bring aid to the hurricane-ravaged island from U.S. ports. I have been pushing for at least a 1-year waiver and a permanent waiver for oil.

Electricity. To date, only 15 percent of Puerto Ricans have power and electricity, not being able to get in contact with their loved ones and the great impact the lack of electricity has on patients with dialysis.

Water. Access to clean drinking water lingers around 20 percent. It is reported that seaborne bacteria are contaminating the water supply. This may lead to bacterial infections such as cholera, dysentery, E. coli, and typhoid. That can be really disastrous. The typical treatments for these illnesses, like tetanus shots and powerful antibiotics, are not readily available on the island where medical supplies are quickly running out.

The damage estimates. It is calculated around \$95 billion. This is roughly 150 percent of the Puerto Rican annual gross national product. The downpayment really should be \$10 billion to \$15 billion.

The budget. The White House has reported that they have asked Congress to authorize approximately \$30 billion in new disaster-related funding.

Fatalities. Mr. Speaker, the official death toll has increased to 43 deaths directly or indirectly related to Hurricane Maria. The death toll, unfortunately, will continue to rise, and this is becoming more and more our Caribbean Katrina. I urge my colleagues to pass the Disaster Relief Fund for Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Caribbean.

THANKING TEAM RUBICON

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to talk about and thank Team Rubicon and all other volunteers who are helping assist victims of Hurricane Harvey with storm cleanup, not only in the district I represent but throughout the State of Texas.

Many of our cities still have piles and piles of debris. Initially, it was trees and brushes cleared, but now, as people are starting to survey and repair the damage to their home, there is insulation, there is sheetrock, there are personal belongings all out along the street waiting to be picked up and cleaned up.

This Monday, I spent time with the Governor of Texas, Greg Abbott, visiting some of our cities, and they are telling me that the cleanup may not be complete in some cities, like Port Aransas and Rockport, until December or January. There is a big job ahead. It is going to take a lot of people.

Several weeks ago, Speaker RYAN and several members of the Texas delegation joined Team Rubicon in the Houston area aiding in demolition and cleanup in the flood-devastated areas. The group's positive attitude and commitment to service is inspiring.

Last week, Janice Dean of FOX News visited the district I represent and told the story about how Team Rubicon is helping with debris removal in Wharton, Texas. That is a city of about 9,000 south of Houston that was devastated by flood waters associated with the storm.

You know, Team Rubicon was founded in 2010, following the earthquakes in Haiti, by two marines, Jake Wood and William McNulty, who knew they could use their military experience and go out and help others.

Since then, Team Rubicon has drastically expanded across the Nation, uniting the skills and experiences of veterans and first responders to rapidly deploy emergency response teams.

I want to thank Team Rubicon for all the help they have provided the folks of Texas, especially Wharton, and the people around the world who have suffered disasters since 2010.

I also want to thank Janice Dean of FOX News for helping tell their story. Janice's commitment to Team Rubicon didn't stop with just telling the story.

In fact, once the story aired, she has donated \$15,000 from sales of her children's book, "Freddy the Frogcaster" to Team Rubicon and will continue to be donating all proceeds from this book to the group. Thank you, Janice.

Thank you, Team Rubicon, and thank you for everyone who is helping out those who are victims of Hurricane Harvey and the various other disasters that this Nation is facing right now.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF FIRST SERGEANT CHARLESTON HARTFIELD OF THE NEVADA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of my constituent, First Sergeant Charleston Hartfield of the Nevada Army National Guard. Our community lost a true-blue American hero on the 1st of October. Since the age of 18, Officer Hartfield valiantly served our country and our community, spending 16 years in the Army both on Active Duty and in the Nevada National Guard and 11 years in our local law enforcement.

First Sergeant Hartfield spent a year deployed to Iraq with the 82nd Airborne Division as part of the initial invasion in 2003, where they were awarded the Combat Action Badge for having bravely engaged in combat operations.

Those who knew Officer Hartfield remember him for his kindness to others and for pouring his heart into our community as a husband, a father, a friend, and a youth football coach.

Officer Charleston Hartfield was taken from us far too soon by a senseless tragedy. Our valley and this Nation will mourn his loss, and we will carry forward his spirit of courage and selflessness.

□ 1030

REDUCING GUN VIOLENCE

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to put into words the devastation and heartbreak my community suffered on October 1, 2017. This horrific violence has forever altered the lives of countless families in Las Vegas and across this country.

My heart breaks for those who lost a parent, a child, a sibling, and a friend. And while this was the deadliest mass shooting in modern American history, I know that we join a long list of communities: Sandy Hook, Aurora, Tucson, San Bernardino, and Orlando, all who have suffered way too much through similar heart-wrenching violence.

I have lived in southern Nevada for nearly 40 years, and I will tell you that I have been overwhelmed by the resilience of Las Vegas. We are not just "Sin City" or the glittering lights of the strip. We are also a tight-knit, compassionate community of hard-working families. The shooting on October 1 exemplified the worst of humanity, but our response represented the very best of people.

As we try to figure out how to move forward, I can tell you that we are finding strength and hope and courage in our brave first responders, in the heroic self-sacrifice of men and women who risked and gave their lives for others, and for the kindness of strangers who helped transport the wounded to the hospital, who stood in line for

hours to donate blood, and who came together to support the survivors.

I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find that same courage to come to the table and have real conversations about commonsense solutions to address gun violence. There is no single policy solution, but I know we can support the Second Amendment while taking reasonable steps to reduce the carnage inflicted on our communities by gun violence and mass shootings.

Mr. Speaker, devices designed to cause mass casualties, like bump stocks and high-capacity magazines, have no practical purpose for hunting or self-defense. They only increase the threat for potential victims trying to find safety, like those at the Mandalay Bay, and they make it more challenging for law enforcement to confront and neutralize an active shooter.

I urge all of my colleagues to please join together in a bipartisan effort. We need to take commonsense steps in Congress to decrease the scope of widespread destruction and tragic mass shootings.

No community should ever be forced to experience the grief and trauma that my constituents are now confronting. It is more urgent than ever that we take meaningful action to reduce the toll of widespread gun violence. The time is now.

RECERTIFY IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the significance of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding Iran, more commonly referred to as the Iran nuclear agreement.

I have always been a vocal advocate for tough sanctions on Iran. While I was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in 2010, I was a member of the conference committee which drafted the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act. These sanctions, in 2010 and subsequently, did make a difference.

Unfortunately, Iran continues to support terrorist organizations, and its record on human rights is well known. But we should not withhold certification of the Iran nuclear agreement without credible evidence that Iran is not complying. Let's remember, this agreement has always been about Iran, not obtaining nuclear weapons.

Doing so would strip the United States of our credibility in future international agreements not just with Iran, but with our allies as well.

In addition to Iran, we negotiated the Iran nuclear agreement with the United Kingdom, Germany, European Union, China, and Russia, and we must keep our word. In other words, to remain credible, the United States cannot change positions on international

agreements from one administration to another without serious justification and without the consent in working with our allies.

Especially now, as we are facing an increasing threat with North Korea, we must work with our allies and, together, make a safer world through a comprehensive strategy that involves diplomacy, sanctions, and, yes, deterrence, if we must use such force. We have methods for addressing Iran's nonnuclear behavior besides refusing to recertify the agreement, and I will continue to advocate for the use of these tools to take a strong stance against Iran for their support of terrorist state activities and their abuse of human rights.

But refusing to recertify the Iran nuclear agreement, without clear evidence that Iran has breached the agreement, will deeply damage our relationships with our allies, and it will weaken our credibility worldwide.

COMMEMORATING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to commemorate Hispanic Heritage Month, which is from September 15 to October 15 every year.

This month we honor and celebrate the history, culture, achievements, and contributions of Hispanic leaders in communities throughout our great country. From serving in our Armed Forces, to starting businesses that further develop our economy and provide employment for Americans, Hispanics have contributed great advancements in science, medicine, literature, and education. The Hispanic community and its people have been critical in shaping our Nation and the valley that I have the honor to represent.

For example, in my home State of California alone, there are over 815,000 Hispanic- or Latino-owned companies, which, together, generate over \$98.9 billion in general receipts in our economy. In Fresno, Merced, and Madera counties, which I represent, there are nearly 27,000 Hispanic- or Latino-owned companies, which, together, generated, last year, over \$2 billion, \$700 million in our economy.

The story of our Hispanic friends, neighbors, and loved ones is the story of the American Dream, as they have the same hope and aspiration that all Americans have: to make a better life for themselves and their families through hard work, access to a better education, and equal treatment under the law.

Let us remember, after all, we are a nation of immigrants past and present.

For over 250 years, since the formation of the United States, immigrants have come from all over the world to America to have a better life for themselves and, in turn, have made us the greatest country in the world.

During Hispanic Heritage Month, I am honored to celebrate the community whose determination and achieve-

ments are an integral part of not only our Nation, but the San Joaquin Valley that I have the honor to represent.

SUPPORT FOR NFL FOOTBALL PLAYERS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise and stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I am always honored that I have this opportunity, and I see it as a pre-eminent privilege to be able to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

I love my country. I have said it many times right here at this podium. I salute the flag, Mr. Speaker. I say the Pledge of Allegiance. I sing the national anthem. I love my country.

And because I love my country, I can stand here in the well of the House of the United States of America and announce that I support the NFL men, who are professional football players. I can say I support them because I believe in what the flag stands for: liberty and justice for all. I believe in this. And if there is to be liberty and justice for all, the cause that they are part of has to be called to the attention of the American public. I support the NFL players, Mr. Speaker.

To those who say that "they are so lucky, they are making millions, why don't they just play football, they ought to be happy," first, let me comment in this way: They are earning millions. Their bodies are being torn apart, in many cases. They are earning millions. They get concussions. They are earning millions. They suffer after they leave football. They are earning millions. And they are also earning pain as they play a game that amuses many.

So those who say they are making plenty of money and they ought to just go away, I contend that they are not doing it for the money. They are doing it because they understand injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere, as Dr. King put it. They want to eliminate the injustice that they see, and, in so doing, they have decided to take a knee.

I salute the flag. I support my country. I love my country. And I respect what they are doing in the form of peaceful protest to bring about change that ought to have been brought about decades or centuries ago; should have been, but has not been. Yes, we have come a long way, but we sure have a long way to go.

Now, to those who say "they have earned millions, why aren't they happy," well, it is not hush money.

Is that what you are saying, that when they get paid, that is hush money that says that they don't have freedom of speech? Does that check negate their freedom of speech?

I think not. Freedom of speech is something that you cherish, whether you live in a mansion or you live under a bridge. Freedom of speech belongs to you. It doesn't matter your station in life. It doesn't matter your ethnicity. It doesn't matter your religiosity. Freedom of speech belongs to you because you are a child of God and you live in the greatest country in the world.

So I stand in support of the NFL players. I want them to continue. I want them to stand their ground. I want this movement to continue. And I want those who were thwarted to know that you are trying to thwart injustice. When you try to change the subject and make it about something that it is not, you are trying to thwart injustice. Even if you don't do it with intentionality, that is the reality.

We cannot allow injustice to continue. And I thank God that there are those who are making millions, those who are having their bodies abused, who are willing to take a stand by taking a knee against injustice, and they still respect this country and its flag and this anthem.

If there is one among them who has other thoughts, then I don't support that. I support those who have a righteous cause and who are respectful of the country, who can love the flag and still protest. I support that.

I am an American. I was born in the United States of America. I am a patriotic American. I believe in this country. And if you believe in it, you ought to allow peaceful protest to continue, because John F. Kennedy was right when he was paraphrased by Dr. King:

Those who make peaceful protest impossible will make other forms of protest inevitable.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Molly Fraser, Gig Harbor United Methodist Church, Gig Harbor, Washington, offered the following prayer:

God of many names, we give thanks for the opportunity to serve. Remind us that we are servants of our country, our people, and the land. Let us not

forget all the blessings You have given us so that we might use our power and influence to help order the country in ways that allow each and every person to find life and liberty and to pursue happiness.

We come, perhaps, already weary from an onslaught of emails, texts, tweets, phone calls, and meetings where people make demands on how we vote and assumptions about every decision that we put forward. Help us, O God, to do the right thing, not just for a few, but for the many. Help us work together diligently so we might see the fruit of our effort grow into good throughout our country, which can serve to make this world more livable for all.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BABIN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND MOLLY FRASER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to welcome Pastor Molly Fraser from Gig Harbor United Methodist Church, my home church.

Our church isn't the biggest church, it isn't the oldest church, but it has left a large impact throughout Gig Harbor because it makes clear that all are welcome. Whether you are in pain and need somewhere to go or you are looking for fellowship, there is a welcome mat for you.

It makes clear to regular attendees and to newcomers that it is a place of open hearts, open minds, and open doors. It is a place that is committed to supporting the needs of those most in need throughout our community and around the world. It is a place to ask tough questions and to celebrate our faith.

Finally, it is a place that benefits from the tremendous leadership of Pastor Molly, who, during her brief tenure with the church, has brought incredible energy and heart and musical talent.

She is here in our Nation's capital today with her family. It is my honor to welcome them and, in spirit, the entire congregation of Gig Harbor United Methodist Church.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize the Army National Guard's 236th Engineering Company. Located in Stephenville, Texas, they were the first on the ground in Houston to assist with Hurricane Harvey relief efforts on August 27. Over the course of a week, they rescued approximately 2,300 civilians and 380 animals from flooded areas.

Mr. Speaker, these men and women who serve our country are true heroes, and I am honored to represent them in the 25th Congressional District of Texas. I had the opportunity to meet with these soldiers a few weeks ago and personally shake their hands to thank them for a job well done.

They stepped up in a moment of absolute crisis and when the people of Texas needed them most. They put their lives on the line in order to save others. Without them, the number of deaths could have been significantly higher.

It is because of selfless people like these that America is able to remain the strongest country in the world. The Lone Star State cannot thank them enough for their swift and noble actions, and we will always remember their heroism.

Hurricane Harvey victims are still recovering, and all of America is behind them. We will rebuild together because we are all Texas strong.

God bless Texas, God bless the military, and God bless the United States of America.

In God we trust.

HONORING JAHEIR MOORE FOR SERVICE TO HIS COMMUNITY

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jaheir Moore, a seventh grade student from Jersey City, New Jersey, for his service to people in need.

This young man from my district takes the time nearly every day to crochet hats, scarves, blankets, and other

items for people in homeless shelters and newborn babies in intensive care units. Over the past couple of years, he has donated dozens of bags full of his creations to make life a little better for others.

Jaheir is a straight A student who wants to become a fashion designer. In February, he was a guest on the "Rachael Ray Show." A week later, Jaheir had his first runway show in Jersey City. In April, I presented him with a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition for his charity work.

Mr. Speaker, Jaheir Moore's unselfish acts of kindness for people in need shows that our country's future is a bright one.

ALLEN COUNTY RIGHT TO LIFE

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

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, I had the privilege of attending the Allen County Right to Life's 20th annual Uniting Our City for Life Banquet.

The event was a wonderful time with fellow Hoosiers who share a common concern for the sanctity of innocent human life, from the moment of conception to the moment of natural death. It also was a celebration of the fact that our culture increasingly is recognizing the value of human life.

A poll released last year found that a majority of young Americans support increasing restrictions that protect the unborn. Another recent poll found that 61 percent of Americans oppose using tax dollars to fund abortions. This growing recognition that life is a precious and sacred gift is due, in large part, to the tireless efforts of organizations like Allen County Right to Life.

I want to express special thanks to Allen County Right to Life Executive Director Cathie Humbarger and Operations Director Abigail Lorenzen for all they do in northeast Indiana to promote life and defend the unborn.

I also want to congratulate Pat Miller on receiving the Daniel Award for pro-life commitment during Monday night's dinner. Throughout his career, he has been a consistent and compassionate voice for the cause of life, and there is no one more deserving of this prestigious award.

BILLIONAIRES FIRST TAX PLAN

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Republicans brought their extreme budget to the floor, a budget that forces the middle class to pay more in taxes just to give the wealthiest Americans a massive tax break.

This budget slashes investments in our future, such as rebuilding roads

and bridges and education, just so it can provide huge tax breaks to the absolute wealthiest Americans. Billionaires would receive a massive tax cut under this plan.

Under this “billionaires first” tax plan, according to the nonprofit, non-partisan Tax Policy Center, middle class families would pay an average of \$1,290 a year more in taxes, while 80 percent of the benefits would go to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans: the superwealthy. By repealing the estate tax, 5,400 families would receive a \$270 billion tax break.

Who pays for this? The middle class.

How? By passing the costs on to them and increasing our deficit at the same time. Trillions of dollars would be added to our deficit.

Giving billionaires a massive tax break is fiscally irresponsible and morally wrong. We ought to reject it.

PRaising PENNSYLVANIA NATIONAL GUARD FOR HELPing WITH PUERTO RICO RELIEF EffORTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend 42 members of the Pennsylvania National Guard who are currently in Puerto Rico assisting with hurricane relief efforts.

Thousands of National Guard members are working in both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to help our fellow Americans recover from devastating hurricanes.

Hurricane Maria, with its Category 5 winds, was the fifth strongest storm to ever hit the U.S. and the strongest storm to hit Puerto Rico in 80 years. What it left behind was vast devastation and great damage to infrastructure and energy distribution systems.

Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously proud of our Pennsylvania Guardsmen who are on the ground assisting with this humanitarian disaster. They welcomed the call to action and are working to restore Puerto Rico's infrastructure, install additional telecommunications equipment to connect families and businesses, and deliver more than 300 generators to provide electricity to those who need it.

We are working on rebuilding, and the Pennsylvania National Guard is there to aid in the recovery effort. It is the American way to have all hands on deck, and I am grateful for their efforts.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence often hides behind closed

doors and drawn curtains, but the problem is very staggering.

In my home State of Hawaii, 575 domestic violence survivors reach out to local organizations seeking help every single day. Their stories are heart-breaking and, too often, even if they are temporarily removed from the abusive environment, they are often returned to their abuser.

Survivors can seek legal protection from their abusers, but they aren't likely to do so or be successful unless they have a lawyer. Just 32 percent of victims successfully obtain a restraining order without legal representation.

I call on my colleagues to support the POWER Act, which requires every State's U.S. attorney to promote and expand pro bono legal services specifically for domestic violence survivors.

We all need to be more conscious of this problem because it is happening in our communities. As we observe Domestic Violence Awareness Month, let us have the courage to confront the pervasiveness of this crime and take action to help provide survivors with the safety and security they need.

MEDIA IGNORES DONATION TO ANTI-COP GROUP

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you may have heard of Colin Kaepernick, the football quarterback who started “the kneel” to protest the national anthem at NFL games. He was the originator of the resistance movement in the NFL against police officers. But you likely haven't heard that he donated \$25,000 to a group that was named after a convicted cop killer.

Neither national broadcast stations nor major daily newspapers reported the donation to an organization honoring Assata Shakur, who escaped prison and fled to Cuba after being found guilty in the 1973 murder of police officer Werner Foerster. Assata is currently on the FBI's Most Wanted Terrorists list.

Why did the liberal national media think this story was not newsworthy? Do they agree with Kaepernick? Do they approve of contributions to organizations named after cop killers?

The liberal national media seems to have a grudge against law enforcement and patriotism, as well as religion and traditional values, based on their lack of fair coverage of those subjects. This might explain why the media's credibility is at a record low.

CONTRACEPTIVE COVERAGE

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Trump administra-

tion rolled back contraceptive care for hundreds of thousands of women. They called it a victory for religious liberty. But let's be real. This is just one part of the White House's fight to strip women of their independence and healthcare.

First, they came for title X, scaling back the essential family planning centers that served low-income women. They attacked Planned Parenthood, pledging to block access for the millions of women who depend on it. They expanded the global gag rule, a policy that will limit the preventative healthcare options for women across the world.

Then, they turned their destructive sights on title IX, scaling back crucial guidances that protect sexual assault victims on our college campuses.

Now, they have opened the door for bosses to deny contraceptive coverage for their female employees.

Let's not pretend this is a victory for religious freedom. This is about taking away women's choices.

HONORING DR. DANIEL J. BRADLEY ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true champion for higher education, Dr. Daniel J. Bradley, the 11th president of Indiana State University.

During his 9-year tenure at Indiana State, Dr. Bradley has led ISU to achieve the highest enrollment in school history, added new degree programs to meet the demands of the 21st century workforce, and completed more than \$300 million in capital projects on the campus. Most importantly, Dr. Bradley has improved student success by increasing the student retention rate and increasing the student graduation rate.

From his service to our country in the U.S. Army to his service to the students of Indiana State University, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Bradley on his retirement at the end of this year.

□ 1215

CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS TO WORK TOGETHER TO PASS A DACA FIX

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, there are upwards of 800,000 DREAMers in our country—young, de facto Americans, people who grew up here, are as American as you or I, American in fact, albeit not in law. They are able to work

legally under the deferred action, or DACA program, that President Obama has set up. That has been jeopardized by an announcement that President Trump will be terminating that program within 6 months.

Now we are down to about 4½ months, a challenge to this body, Democrats and Republicans, to work together to rectify the legal situation of 800,000 de facto Americans. This body must act. We can't leave these young Americans in limbo with regard to what their future prospects are to work.

Make no bones about it, if this body fails to act, over 800,000 aspiring Americans will no longer be able to go to work legally the very next day after deferred action expires. In the interest of unifying families, in the interest of these young people who are as American as you or I, in the interest of our economic growth and prosperity, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stop playing politics and finally pass a DACA fix, like the Dream Act, into law to make sure that they can give back to the country that has given so much to them.

IMPACT OF RECENT HURRICANES

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it was great to participate in this morning's board of delegation meeting, during which we discussed the impact of recent hurricanes on our State and unmet needs to require further attention.

With the onslaught of natural disasters that have plagued our country in recent months, we must provide appropriate levels of Federal support to all who are suffering. However, we must also ensure that Florida's ongoing needs are not overlooked as we seek to fully recover.

Our two largest industries, tourism and agriculture, have sustained significant losses, which will have a long-term impact on our economy, unfortunately. We also learned valuable lessons during the hurricane as it relates to the care for our most vulnerable citizens, our seniors and the disabled. These lessons need to translate to action in order to prevent future tragedies.

I look forward to working with my colleagues as we evaluate the proposed natural disaster funding bill that will be voted on later this week and determine its impact on Florida.

HONORING DAVE DAVIS

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend of mine, Dave Davis, who passed away recently. Dave was a giant Purdue fan, but we first met at a UCLA basketball game over 20 years ago.

We immediately struck up a friendship, and in 2000, when I announced I was running for Congress, Dave was all in and, despite the long odds, took vacation time to drive me all around Madison County. We didn't win that one, but that is the kind of guy Dave Davis was. He put others first, sharing in your successes and your struggles as if they were his own.

Dave had a great smile and a rare quality: he saw everyone for who they could be, not just what they were.

Dave spent his career in public service for our State and our Nation, but his most important priority was his family. He never passed up an opportunity to talk about his wife, Robyn; or his kids, Alex, Amy, and Eric.

Dave Davis was a good man and my friend. Congratulations on a life well lived. Godspeed.

REFORMING THE TAX CODE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our efforts here in the people's House to reform our Tax Code and reduce the burden of the Federal Government on every American. Right now, Americans know that our Tax Code is unfair, it is too long, and it is too complicated.

It has been 30 years since we have made meaningful reforms, and the time for that change is now. House and Senate Republicans have announced reforms that will make the Tax Code simpler, with more than 90 percent of filers being able to do their returns on a simple postcard.

We have asked to make the Tax Code fair for middle class Americans, lowering their rates and doubling their standard deduction. We have asked to give relief to low-income Americans by eliminating the lowest 10 percent bracket completely and cutting the 15 percent bracket to 12. We have asked to crack down on tax avoidance by ending the dozens and dozens of loopholes that only the wealthiest taxpayers and corporations can take advantage of.

Mr. Speaker, we have a unique opportunity to do so much for hardworking families across America. I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us, offer solutions, and make this a bipartisan effort to give the American people the relief they deserve.

RIISING ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the many who have concluded that enough is enough. I rise today to speak on behalf of the many persons who believe that Article II, section 4 of the Constitution of the United States of America has meaning and that it is something that is appropriate for a time such as this, appropriate for a time when there is one among us who seems to incite hatred, bigotry, and invidious discrimination.

I rise to speak on their behalf today, Mr. Speaker, and I do so understanding that I am not doing it on behalf of Republicans, generally speaking, or Democrats, generally speaking. The people whom I reference are Americans, generally speaking.

So I rise to speak on their behalf.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I seek recognition to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Articles of Impeachment against Donald J. Trump, President of the United States of America, in the Congress of the United States of America. Resolution.

Resolved, that Donald J. Trump, President of the United States of America, has undermined the integrity of his office with impunity and has brought disrepute on the Presidency with immunity, has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the American people and is unfit to be President, and is impeached pursuant to Article II, section IV of the Constitution of the United States of America, and that the following Articles of Impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of Impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of all of the people of the United States of America against Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors of a nature which may, with peculiar propriety, be denominated as political, not requiring the commission of a crime, and exclusively the jurisdiction of the United States House of Representatives for impeachment purposes.

Article I: That Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, unmindful of his high duties of his office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and the harmony, respect, and courtesies, which ought to

exhibit and be maintained in American society, has under the inane pretext of dispensing with political correctness, produced a demonstrable record of inciting white supremacy, sexism, bigotry, hatred, xenophobia, race-baiting, and racism by demeaning, defaming, disrespecting, and disparaging women and certain minorities.

In so doing, Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, has fueled and is fueling an alt-right hate machine and its worldwide covert sympathizers engendering racial antipathy, LGBTQ enmity, religious anxiety, stealthy sexism, and dreadful xenophobia, perfidiously causing immediate injury to American society, to wit:

On September 23, 2017, Donald John Trump incited race-baiting and racism, engendering stealthy sexism and racial antipathy, when he disrespected, disparaged, and demeaned mothers of professional football players by calling them dogs as he made the widely published statement:

Won't you love to see one of these NFL owners, when somebody disrespects our flag, say, Get that son-of-a-B-I-T-C-H off the field right now, out. He's fired. He's fired.

On September 23, 2017, Donald John Trump incited race-baiting and racism, engendering racial antipathy, when he disrespected and disparaged professional football players, approximately 70 percent of whom are reportedly African American, by calling them sons of dogs as he made the widely published statement:

Wouldn't you love to see one of these NFL owners, when somebody disrespects our flag, say, Get that son-of-a-B-I-T-C-H off the field right now, out. He's fired. He's fired.

On September 30, 2017, Donald John Trump incited bigotry and race-baiting, engendering racial antipathy, when he disrespected, disparaged, and demeaned Puerto Ricans, who are Americans, by implying Puerto Ricans want others to do for them what they won't do for themselves, as he made the widely published claim:

They want everything to be done for them when it should be a community effort.

Further, on October 3, 2017, while in Puerto Rico, as was widely shown on American television, Donald John Trump incited bigotry, engendering racial antipathy, when he disparaged Puerto Ricans by stating:

I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico, but you've thrown our budget a little out of whack because we spent a lot of money on Puerto Rico, and that's fine. But we've saved a lot of lives.

The President did not make similar widely published statements about Texas or Florida.

□ 1230

On January 27, 2017, Donald John Trump incited xenophobia and hate against Muslims in the United States of America, engendering religious anx-

iety, when he disrespected Islam by issuing Executive Order 13769, fulfilling a campaign promise to ban Muslims from entering the United States of America. This widely published campaign promise is dated December 7, 2015, and reads as follows:

Donald J. Trump Statement on Preventing Muslim Immigration, New York, New York, December 7, 2015. Donald J. Trump is calling for the total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on.

On March 4, 2017, Donald John Trump incited race-baiting and racism, engendering racial antipathy, when he defamed, disrespected, and disparaged President Barack Obama by making the widely published statement, which has since been disclaimed:

Terrible. Just found out that Obama had my "wires tapped" in Trump Tower just before the victory. Nothing found. This is McCarthyism.

On July 26, 2017, Donald John Trump incited bigotry, engendering LGBTQ enmity, when he disparaged and disrespected transgender Americans by indicating that the costs of their medical care outweighs the sacrifice they are willing to make for our country as he made the widely published statement:

After consultation with my generals and military experts, please be advised that the United States Government will not accept or allow transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. military. Our military must be focused on decisive and overwhelming victory and cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail.

In so doing, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony, respect, and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained within American society, has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States of America, and, as a result is unfit to be President.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by betraying his trust as President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States of America.

Article II: That Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained within American society, did betray his trust as President and bring shame and dishonor to the office of the Presidency by associating the majesty and dignity of the Presidency with causes rooted in White supremacy, bigotry, racism, anti-Semi-

tism, White nationalism, and neo-Nazism when he, to wit:

On August 15, 2017, Donald John Trump made a widely published statement characterizing a group of anti-Semites, bigots, racists, White nationalists, and Klu Klux Klansmen who rallied in Charlottesville, Virginia, as "very fine people."

Thereafter, on August 23, 2017, the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination released a 2-page decision in which it was stated that they were "disturbed by the failure at the highest political level of the United States of America to unequivocally reject and condemn the racist violent events and demonstrations led by the aforementioned groups, thereby potentially fueling the proliferation of racist discourse and incidents throughout the State party, and deeply concerned by the example this failure could set for the rest of the world."

On October 7, 2017, hate groups were again back in Charlottesville, Virginia, at the statue of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate general, chanting, "You will not replace us." Since this event on October 7, the President has made many widely published statements about many things including, but not limited to, the National Football League, but has not made one widely published statement condemning the hate groups for returning to the place where an innocent person lost her life at the hands of hate.

In so doing, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the integrity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony, respect, and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained within American society, has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, and has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States of America, and is unfit to be President.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by betraying his trust as President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office and the disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States of America.

Article III: Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, unmindful of his high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained in American society, did engage in perfidy by making the widely reported claim that 3 to 5 million people voted illegally in the 2016 Presidential election and, further, expending tax dollars to establish a commission to investigate his claim, to wit:

On November 27, 2016, Donald John Trump made the widely reported claim that:

In addition to winning the electoral college in a landslide, I won the popular vote if you deduct the millions of people who voted illegally . . . in Virginia, New Hampshire, and California. So why isn't the media reporting on this? Serious bias. Big problem.

On January 25, 2017, Donald John Trump made the widely reported claim that:

I will be asking for a major investigation into voter fraud, including those registered to vote in two States, and who are illegal and . . .

On July 1, 2017, Donald John Trump made the widely reported claim that:

Numerous States were refusing to give information to the very distinguished voter fraud panel. What are they trying to hide?

On June 28, 2017, according to highly reported news stories, the commission previously referenced by Donald John Trump requested detailed voter registration data from all 50 States, including names, addresses, and other sensitive data from every voter in the country. Several States refused to send the information, and some States have been prevented by courts from turning over the information.

In so doing, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, has undermined the integrity of his office and has brought disrepute on the Presidency and has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States of America, and is unfit to be President.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by betraying his trust as President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States of America.

Article IV: Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and of the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony and courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained in American society, while aware of the widely reported history of unlawful abuses and brutality perpetrated by many, not all, police officers against innocent persons in the United States of America, did betray his trust as President, bringing shame and dishonor to the office of the Presidency by encouraging law enforcement officials to violate the constitutional rights of suspects in their custody and control, to wit:

On July 28, 2017, Donald John Trump, in a speech in front of the Suffolk County Police Department in Long Island, New York, stated that:

And when you see these towns and when you see these thugs being thrown into the back of a paddy wagon, you just see them thrown in—rough. I said, "Please don't be too nice." Like when you guys put somebody in the car and you're protecting their head, you know, the way you put their hand over? Like, don't hit their head, and they've just killed somebody—don't hit their head. I said, "You can take the hand away, okay?"

This statement is injurious not only to the rule of law, which presumes innocence until guilt is proven in a court of law, but also to the administration of justice, which requires that care is given to persons held in the custody of law enforcement. Our Nation is founded upon a social contract where the constitutional rights of the individual are not surrendered because he or she is accused of a crime. To speak to the contrary is a violation of the Presidential oath of office to which Donald John Trump is bound.

In so doing, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and the proprieties thereof, and of his oath of office, to "faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States of America, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States of America, and is unfit to be President.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by betraying his trust as President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of high honor, trust, or profit under the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 585, DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 16, 2017, THROUGH OCTOBER 20, 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 562 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 562

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from October 16, 2017, through October 20, 2017—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of October 12, 2017, or October 13, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 562, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee heard testimony from our colleagues, Congressman PAUL MITCHELL, Oversight and Government Reform Committee Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and Congresswoman ANN KUSTER.

This rule provides for the consideration of S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and provides for a motion to recommit.

S. 585 was authored by Senator JOHN-SON in the Senate, and the House companion was introduced by my friend, Congressman SEAN DUFFY. I want to thank my colleagues from Wisconsin for their leadership on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses a problem that is, unfortunately, far too common. When Federal employees blow the whistle on questionable practices, they face risk of retaliation and intimidation from their own employers, even though the current Federal law is supposed to protect them. In fact, the underlying legislation provided for by this rule is named after an individual who ultimately took his own life after he became the victim of retaliation related to his whistleblowing.

Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick was a Department of Veterans Affairs doctor who raised concerns that the VA might be overmedicating patients. A later VA investigation found that Dr. Kirkpatrick's concerns were warranted, but it was too late. Dr. Kirkpatrick had already suffered retribution from within the VA and was eventually dismissed from the agency. On the day of his termination, Dr. Kirkpatrick took his own life.

Dr. Kirkpatrick's story is a tragedy, one that none of us ever wants to see repeated.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has become a de facto poster child for hostility toward whistleblowers. In fact, according to the Office of Special Counsel—the agency tasked with investigation and redressing whistleblower retaliation—the OSC has seen a sharp increase in the number of whistleblower cases from VA employees.

OSC Special Counsel Carolyn Lerner went on to say that: “. . . it is clear that the workplace culture in many VA facilities is hostile to whistleblowers and actively discourages them from coming forward with what is often critical information.”

This disturbing trend may be most visible at the VA, but the problem of backlash against whistleblowers persists across the Federal Government.

Let me make something clear. There are good actors and bad actors within each agency. There are good actors who shine light on the legitimate concerns in order to help their colleagues and the American people. There are also good actors who listen to those concerns and address them with integrity, and treat whistleblowers with respect.

Unfortunately, there are also bad actors. These are the ones that this legis-

lation seeks to address, and the problem they create is the one that the underlying bill works to solve.

The underlying legislation provides for better training for Federal employees so that they understand Federal whistleblower protections. It also sets minimum disciplinary standards across all agencies for retaliation against whistleblowers while increasing protections for people who have the courage to speak up when they discover a problem.

The bill specifically requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to determine a plan to restrict unauthorized employee access to medical files, which—and it disturbs me to say this—has been used as a method of retaliation against whistleblowers.

This legislation would make much-needed changes to ensure that those who come forward with information necessary to maintain and increase accountability within our government do not suffer backlash as well.

Importantly, the bill also helps these individuals to know their rights and what protections and recourse are available to them.

It is unfortunate that we need this legislation, but evidence has indicated that we do. The underlying legislation puts bullies who have made their nest in government agencies on notice that their behavior won't stand. It defends brave whistleblowers and puts the bad actor Federal employees on notice: hostile work environments that target whistleblowers are on the bureaucracy's endangered species list.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act also builds on the work the current administration is doing to address retribution levied against whistleblowers at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Importantly, I have colleagues on both sides of the aisle who agree that we need to address this problem and that the time to do so is now.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act passed the Senate by unanimous consent on May 25, 2017. We need to continue their good work here today.

On behalf of the whistleblowers who have risked their careers and safety to right wrongs in our government, we need to support this strong and timely legislation. Calling for attention and action to address improper behavior within the United States Government should not be considered a risky undertaking.

Many Federal employees work day in and day out on behalf of the American people, yet some feel threatened when they try in earnest to make things better.

We need to continue the Senate's work on behalf of these individuals and the Americans that they serve. Everyone deserves a government that is accountable for its own decisions and for the actions of its agents.

Today we have a chance to make strides towards a more accountable government. We have the opportunity to address the most pressing problems facing whistleblowers at the Department of Veterans Affairs and across the Federal Government.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. As my colleague noted, Dr. Kirkpatrick was a psychologist at a VA medical center in Wisconsin. In 2009, he was fired from his job after allegedly questioning the overmedication of his patients, particularly related to opioids. Tragically, that very same day, Dr. Kirkpatrick committed suicide.

I think we can all agree that protecting whistleblowers helps to ensure that waste, fraud, and abuse in our government does not go unnoticed or ignored.

It is our responsibility to empower and encourage whistleblowers to come forward and speak out when something isn't right. No one should have to live in fear of retaliation for bringing the truth to light. No one should fear losing their job or career or their life simply for following the rules.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act increases accountability by enacting mandatory punishments for any manager or superior at an agency who has been found to have retaliated against a whistleblower.

The bill also contains VA-specific reforms to better protect the privacy of medical records. Employee medical records would now be prohibited from being accessed in the case of potential retaliation cases, which adds an additional level of accountability for supervisors; and protecting the whistleblower from attacks and threats based on their personal medical history, which would be completely inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker, while there are strong and necessary reforms in this bill, I want to make sure that you know that legislation can always be improved through the amendment process or at least through conducting a hearing and markup of a bill.

Sadly, but unsurprisingly in this Congress, this bill didn't have a markup in committee; didn't have a hearing; is considered under a closed rule, where amendments that were brought forward aren't even allowed to be debated on the House floor.

This might be a surprise even to the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, who himself requested a structured rule that allowed for debate on amendments.

Much of my statement today echoes the sentiment of Oversight and Government Reform Ranking Member CUMMINGS and his testimony yesterday evening in the Rules Committee. Though this bill isn't perfect, it can be improved and strengthened by a few relatively straightforward amendments, which, unfortunately, were shut down in the Rules Committee last night.

The first amendment, which was blocked today, would have addressed the bill's constitutional concerns first raised by the Office of Personnel Management by revising the mandatory disciplinary procedures to allow superiors their constitutional rights to due process in responding to accusations of retaliation. It would have improved the bill and made it more likely to stand up in court to challenge.

An amendment reaffirming the right to due process would have been something at least worth voting on, and, in fact, could have preserved the constitutionality of the core elements of this bill, ensuring that it stays in place to protect whistleblowers.

Another amendment blocked under this rule would have addressed privacy concerns contained in the bill. Specifically, the amendment would have protected the privacy of a whistleblower who commits suicide, by requiring the permission of the whistleblower's next of kin before an agency can share information regarding the suicide.

Again, it seems like a straightforward fix to protect the privacy of whistleblowers and their families. At the very least, even if Members of this body disagreed with it, why didn't we at least bring it forward for debate and a vote?

Another amendment that was blocked today contained the text of Mr. CUMMINGS' bill, H.R. 702, which was passed by the House of Representatives unanimously. As you know, this bill would expand protections for employees who face discrimination, and it solidifies our commitment to protecting whistleblowers and other employees from retaliation. It was a bipartisan bill. It passed the House unanimously. We simply should have allowed it under this bill to become part of a related effort.

Now, I know that my colleagues on the other side will say: Oh, the Senate is slow. They won't take up this bill on time. It is better for us to pass something now than have to wait for their approval.

But it only takes 10 minutes usually to debate an amendment. So we could have allowed three amendments and spent no more than 30 minutes debating them and still reported this bill out expeditiously.

Now, I happen to think that, while there are many on the other side of the aisle who would agree the House needs to return to regular order, it is time

that Members actually started by voting according to what they are saying. By voting "no" on this rule and rejecting it, we can send the message to House leadership that we want an open, regular order process.

Bills should come out of committee through markups. Republicans and Democrats should have the opportunity to amend bills on the floor of the House. Perhaps if we did that more often, the Senate would not simply cast aside many of the bills that have passed the House, knowing that they went through the process of deliberate consideration by our body, rather than a bill that appears fully formed where Members of this body simply get an up-or-down vote.

This bill will enjoy bipartisan support when it passes the House later today, as it should, but it also begs the question of: Why are we spending valuable time debating a noncontroversial bill, especially if it is considered under a closed rule? Why not have simply put it up on suspension in the first place?

To say things bluntly, we are actually running out of time this year. By my count, we only have 30 legislative days left in the first half of the 115th Congress, yet we are faced with so many important issues we need to move forward on.

Nine million children face losing their health insurance because Congress has not yet acted to reauthorize CHIP. Almost 1 million young, aspiring Americans have no idea what their lives will look like 6 months from now because of the President's decision to end DACA and Congress's continued inability to make it permanent law. The citizens of Puerto Rico, American citizens, still have not been granted a Federal aid package and are suffering from a lack of food, clean water, healthcare supplies, and electricity, jeopardizing many of their lives today.

Yet here we are debating a bill without even allowing an amendment process that we could have passed under suspension vote yesterday so we could move on to CHIP, to Puerto Rico, to DACA today, rather than spend one of our 30 remaining days of business this year avoiding the topics that the American people want us to take on.

Despite the important goals we have left to accomplish this year, it is misleading to assume that regular order isn't feasible. We have all seen how fast Congress can work when we are pushed right up to the edge. It is past time that we show that same urgency and commitment in considering legislation under regular order, even if it means we have to stay here on Thursdays and Fridays, even if it means we are working until 8 or 9 or 10 or midnight. The American people deserve no less.

Make no mistake, the Whistleblower Protection Act is an important piece of legislation that will help protect whistleblowers and hold Federal agencies

accountable, but if we are going to devote this much time to legislation that protects employees, let's take it a step further and talk about expanding worker protections for an even greater number of Americans.

For example, my legislation, the Giving Workers a Fair Shot Act—which I introduced last session and this session, and has yet to receive a hearing, no less a markup in the Education and Workforce Committee—would protect workers from wage theft, prevent taxpayer funds from going towards union busting, and establish first contract arbitration to prevent companies from dragging on labor negotiations unnecessarily to the detriment of workers.

□ 1300

We don't have time to waste. If we are going to consider an issue, let's dive in. We can protect whistleblowers from retaliation and strengthen the rights of workers at the same time. Given the minimal amount of time we have left to work with, 30 days this year, we have an obligation to do both.

By the way, the fact that we only work 30 more days this year here in the United States Congress probably comes as a great surprise to many hard-working Americans who are accustomed to working 5 days a week. We have the rest of the month of October, November, December. Well, many Americans might get Christmas Day off, perhaps even Christmas Eve, but I don't think Americans realize that Congress is only going to work 30 days out of the next 78 days. That is less than a half-time job, Mr. Speaker.

I think the American people deserve more from us in this body, especially when so many issues like CHIP, like DACA, like Puerto Rico, and many others have gone unanswered by us in this body, the House of Representatives, or by colleagues across the way in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill, S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

This bill strengthens penalties against those who retaliate against whistleblowers, adds protections and opportunities for whistleblowers placed on probation, and ensures Federal employees have a greater knowledge of whistleblower rights and protections.

Specifically, this bill forbids a supervisor from taking or threatening to take action against an employee because they refuse to obey an order that would violate a law, rule, or regulation.

I want to thank Senator RON JOHN-SON for his persistence in pushing this legislation even after the former Senator Harry Reid shut it down last Congress.

What a poignant and meaningful gesture to name this bill after Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick, a VA employee who took his own life after being subjected to cruel retaliation from VA officials. I hope it puts in perspective the immense emotional burdens that victims of retaliation face.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is personal for me. Unfortunately, I have seen exactly what retaliation against whistleblowers looks like, how easy it is to get away with it, and why we have to put a stop to it.

Last week marked the 3-year anniversary since the director of the central Alabama VA became the first senior manager in the country fired as a result of the wait-list scandal. That was a major step towards turning around one of the Nation's worst VA systems and restoring trust with the veteran population it serves.

Mr. Speaker, I can say, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that it would have never happened without brave whistleblowers inside the VA telling me the truth.

Two brave individuals in particular, Sheila Meuse and Rich Tremaine, told me the truth about major instances of misconduct and mismanagement when no one else would. Seeing no other way to achieve change, they finally told their story to the media, at great personal risk to their careers.

The stories that emerged from these exposures were almost unbelievable:

More than 1,000 X-ray cancer screenings were lost and unread for years, even though some showed malignancies. When alerted to the problem, top administrators tried to cover this up.

A pulmonologist manipulated more than 1,200 patient records but, even after being caught twice, was still given a satisfactory review.

A central Alabama VA employee took a recovering veteran to a crack house and bought him drugs and prostitutes in order to extort his VA payments. Even when caught, this employee was not fired until a year and a half later when we exposed it in the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, this behavior is egregious, and, trust me, there is a lot more where it came from.

However, had it not been for the courage of those on the inside to expose this wrongdoing, the world might not have ever known. To me and to the veterans whose lives they might have saved, they are heroes. But that is not how they were treated by VA officials. They were treated as enemies and outcasts, all because they tried to do the right thing.

Rich Tremaine actually testified here before the Veterans' Affairs Com-

mittee, detailing the systemic way that some VA officials attempted to silence and marginalize him. The effects of him blowing the whistle on wrongdoing follow him to this day, far away from Montgomery, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, my experience working to clean house at the VA taught me a fascinating and frustrating truth about the culture in some parts of the VA. The system routinely goes out of its way to protect those who don't do their jobs or even harm veterans, but then goes after those who try to stop that misbehavior.

For years, because of poorly written civil service laws and powerful unions, too many VA employees got the message that misconduct, negligence, and poor performance would be tolerated, but blowing the whistle on that kind of behavior would not be.

I have seen it too many times. All too frequently, VA employees caught for doing the wrong thing are reprimanded, shuffled around to different jobs, or allowed to quietly retire, but those who try to do the right thing by our veterans by shining a light on misconduct are persecuted, intimidated, or worse.

While I am proud of the work that we have done for the last 3 years to put an end to this unacceptable culture at the VA, there is much work left to be done.

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason why Federal employees face retaliation for speaking up. It is not because people are just naturally mean or because there is some kind of misunderstanding. The reason whistleblowers face systemic retaliation is because it works. When a brave whistleblower faces intimidation or persecution for their action, every other employee sees it, and they know what will happen to them if they tell the truth. It has a powerful, chilling effect—one we saw firsthand in Montgomery.

They retaliate because it works. That is just wrong, and it is time to punish those who do it with harsher penalties. We need to rethink our civil service laws in this country to make sure public servants live up to the honor and responsibility of the public trust, and I believe that this bill is another positive step in that direction. Mr. Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to bring it to the floor by supporting this rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump has been relentless on his attack on immigrant Americans, generally, and, in particular, DREAMers since he took office. Yet 82 percent of American voters, including about 70 percent of Republicans, believe DREAMers should be allowed to stay in the U.S. and apply for citizenship. Yet President Trump has continued to turn his back on these innocent young people.

Mr. Speaker, here is our chance to rectify President Trump's decision and

restore the American people's faith in us and our faith in our aspiring Americans.

When we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are de facto Americans in every way except for on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, by defeating the previous question today, we can bring forward the Dream Act, which I am confident would pass on the floor of the House probably by a good margin.

What the Dream Act does is it allows young people who grew up in our country, who know no other country, a pathway to become citizens. They have gone to our schools, they have been on the football team or cheerleaders like your own kids or grandkids, Mr. Speaker.

They are able to work legally in our country because of the deferred action program, which is scheduled by President Trump to be canceled in 4½ months. We need to act now to give these young people the certainty they need to live their lives as Americans, the only country they know, and the only country that they are loyal to.

We simply don't have time to waste. We need to give these young de facto Americans the certainty they need to continue with their lives to be able to contribute to our country, join our military, pay taxes, and all of the other responsibilities that Americans have.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, protecting whistleblowers is important. It is critical to ensure that our democracy functions honestly and with accountability and government is truly working in the best interests of the people that it serves. But we could get there a better way, by having an open process that allows Democrats and Republicans to suggest further improvements to whistleblower protection rather than having a bill that was never marked up in committee, that simply appeared fully formed for the full House to consider without the opportunity for Democrats or Republicans to make it any better.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act will strengthen the rights of whistleblowers and reaffirm their value and importance to our country. But once again, this bill should have gone through a regular process that allowed us to amend it.

The fact that this bill passed the Senate with bipartisan support

shouldn't stop us from making changes in this body, the House of Representatives, to improve the bill and make it work even better. We have an obligation to our constituents to thoughtfully consider every piece of legislation in front of us and to amend where we see fit.

As we move forward on addressing the pressing issues in front of us, such as finding a path forward on deferred action, which we will present if we can defeat the previous question, reauthorizing CHIP, or making improvements in our healthcare system, let's do it through a regular process that allows Democrats and Republicans, the 435 of us who serve here, to bring forward our ideas, not just the ideas of leadership in making the country a better place.

We have good, smart, deliberate Members on both sides of the aisle who want to work, want to legislate. It is ridiculous that we only have 30 days out of the next 78 in which Congress will even be working, and I suspect for most of the 30 days, like today, Democrats and Republicans won't even be able to offer their ideas and have them considered. The American people deserve better.

We as an institution, as the United States Congress, can do better, and we can begin by defeating the previous question and defeating the rule.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, especially for the piece of legislation that is before us. I think it is a step forward and things that we should be doing and things that are the oversight role of this Congress, especially when we are dealing with the issue of whistleblowers and the value that they bring, and also the culture that seems to have pervaded.

I so appreciate the gentlewoman from Alabama and her stories. We, in Georgia, have had similar issues. We had that in the Augusta medical center. We also had it in others.

I think the issue here today, though, and I want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, many times when we come to the floor, there is this discussion and it gets circulated that we are actually against all Federal employees, or that every Federal employee is bad, and that none of the Federal employees are worth their payment or whatever. That is just not true. The work of the vast majority of the VA employees, the workers of the vast majority of the agencies, although we may have philosophical differences on how big some of our agencies should be or if they should be in the role of Federal Government, at the end of the day, the value and the worth of the Federal employee is never questioned, at least by this Member.

But when we find bad actors, when we find bad policies, when we find bad procedures, when we find things that inherently are wrong and they are kept wrong, as the gentlewoman from Alabama so well pointed out, that when the culture becomes protecting the bad and punishing the good, then we have an issue that has developed far beyond the scope of what it should be.

These are some of the things that we are discussing today, and I think it is worth the time on this floor, it is worth the time on the Senate floor, as they have already passed this bill, and I think the concerns raised are the discussion of which has been addressed in this.

I think what we look at today is today's bill is a necessary step, but I believe toward integrity, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues and I owe it to our neighbors and to Federal employees who serve to increase whistleblower protections. We need a clear path for public servants to serve Americans with the knowledge that we will honor their good character and courage. They should not feel alone in their resolve to improve the VA or any other agency. Yet too often, we have seen the current law leave them at the mercy of bad actors. We must strengthen the existing statutes to address the litany of retaliations aimed at whistleblowers.

The bill today will deter agency officials from targeting whistleblowers for shining a light on dark flaws in their organization. Bad actors are even today evading discipline while whistleblowers who strive to do what is right too often endure punishment for their brave actions.

The whistleblowers are on the losing end of a system that often favors mischief, which means that the American public also suffers. This bill will bring relief to Federal truth tellers and the everyday Americans who depend on their services.

We best serve the American people by protecting whistleblowers, addressing their concerns properly, and investigating their claims with transparency.

□ 1315

The Federal Government exists to protect its citizens by holding wrongdoers accountable. It is designed to support those who work to root out wrongs in the system.

The underlying legislation brings us closer to a Federal system run by the people and for the benefit of the people, not for the benefit of a few bad actors who exploit its structure. It delivers justice to both victims and bad actors, protects whistleblowers who act in good faith, and ensures that the American Government better serves the American people.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, is that not what it is all about? At the end of the day, is it not what we as a

Congress and as a House and a Senate should be about, and that is assuring that the people who we are elected to serve are best served by their own tax dollars through the agencies and processes of the Federal Government to provide basic services to our veterans, who serve in our other agencies, who, at the core of this, actually comes down—to me, this is a protection of whistleblowers. But in a bigger role, it is actually a protection of the currency that is the best that can be used in our Federal agencies, and that is the trust of the American people.

When we are in the discussion of trust in the American people, right now, many times, if you look around, the Federal Government may not be in that trusted role because many times they see the actions of the bad actors as opposed to many times the very shining lights of the good actors. Those good actors who are willing to participate and to step forward and to be a part of the solution and not a part of the problem need that protection.

We cannot continue to perpetuate and turn a blind eye when this is so relevant in our government. When we do this, we stand for those whom we serve. We stand, not only for the districts in which we are elected, but the American people who have taken to this institution to say: I expect my trust to be exemplified in the employees of the Federal Government and through the stewardship of their tax dollars.

The question for us today is not do we continue to protect the system that is broken, but the question for us is to vote "yes" on this previous question, to move this rule, and to move this bill, because this is saying we value that integrity currency, we value those who are willing to step forward at risk of themselves, in courage, to say: This is wrong, we need to fix it, and let the chips fall where they may.

We protect the right. We punish the wrong. That is what this bill does.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 562 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against

provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule

[a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, the Speaker designates this as the time for the offering of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

The resolution has not been offered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 562, and

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 585, DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 16, 2017, THROUGH OCTOBER 20, 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on order-

ing the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 562) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from October 16, 2017, through October 20, 2017; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 190, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

YEAS—227

Abraham	Estes (KS)	LaHood
Aderholt	Farenthold	LaMalfa
Allen	Faso	Lamborn
Amash	Ferguson	Lance
Amodei	Fitzpatrick	Latta
Arrington	Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)
Babin	Flores	LoBiondo
Bacon	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Banks (IN)	Fox	Love
Barr	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Barton	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bergman	Gaetz	MacArthur
Biggs	Gallagher	Marshall
Bilirakis	Garrett	Massie
Bishop (MI)	Gianforte	Mast
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	McCarthy
Black	Gohmert	McClintock
Blackburn	Goodlatte	McHenry
Blum	Gosar	McKinley
Bost	Gowdy	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Granger	Rodgers
Brat	Graves (GA)	McSally
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	Meadows
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	Messer
Buchanan	Griffith	Mitchell
Buck	Grothman	Moolenaar
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mooney (WV)
Budd	Handel	Mullin
Burgess	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Byrne	Harris	Newhouse
Calvert	Hartzler	Noem
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Norman
Carter (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Chabot	Hice, Jody B.	Olson
Cheney	Higgins (LA)	Palazzo
Coffman	Hill	Palmer
Cole	Holding	Paulsen
Collins (GA)	Hollingsworth	Pearce
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Pittenger
Comer	Huizenga	Poe (TX)
Comstock	Hultgren	Poliquin
Conaway	Hunter	Posey
Cook	Hurd	Ratcliffe
Costello (PA)	Issa	Reed
Cramer	Jenkins (KS)	Reichert
Crawford	Jenkins (WV)	Renacci
Culberson	Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Davidson	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)
Davis, Rodney	Jones	Rogers (AL)
Denham	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Dent	Joyce (OH)	Rohrabacher
DeSantis	Katko	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Francis
Donovan	King (IA)	Rooney, Thomas
Duffy	King (NY)	J.
Duncan (SC)	Kinzing	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (TN)	Knight	Roskam
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Ross
Emmer	Labrador	Rothfus

Rouzer
 Royce (CA)
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)

Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker

Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

□ 1344

Messrs. ELLISON and LYNCH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. JONES and BRADY of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 185, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

AYES—234

Adams
 Aguilar
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta
 Bridenstine
 Connolly
 DesJarlais
 Hanabusa
 Huffman

Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hastings
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Hoyer
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham, M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal

Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rosen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Speier
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crist
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 Diaz-Balart
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes (KS)
 Farenthold
 Faso
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Garrett
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gottheimer
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Handel
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Katko

Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney, Francis
 Rooney, Thomas J.
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Rosen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce (CA)
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton

Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

NOES—185

Adams
 Aguilar
 Amash
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Correa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge

Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hastings
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Hoyer
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham, M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal

Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Speier
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta	Hanabusa	Meehan
Bridenstine	Huffman	Perry
Buchanan	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Connolly	Long	Thompson (CA)
DesJarlais	Marino	

□ 1350

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

NIST SMALL BUSINESS CYBERSECURITY ACT

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2105) to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to disseminate guidance to help reduce small business cybersecurity risks, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2105

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act”.

SEC. 2. IMPROVING CYBERSECURITY OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(2) RESOURCES.—The term “resources” means guidelines, tools, best practices, standards, methodologies, and other ways of providing information.

(3) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term “small business concern” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(b) SMALL BUSINESS CYBERSECURITY.—Section 2(e)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272(e)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vii), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (ix); and

(3) by inserting after clause (vii) the following:

“(viii) consider small business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)); and”.

(c) DISSEMINATION OF RESOURCES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in carrying out section

2(e)(1)(A)(viii) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, as added by subsection (b) of this Act, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall disseminate clear and concise resources to help small business concerns identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cybersecurity risks.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Director shall ensure that the resources disseminated pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) are generally applicable and usable by a wide range of small business concerns;

(B) vary with the nature and size of the implementing small business concern, and the nature and sensitivity of the data collected or stored on the information systems or devices of the implementing small business concern;

(C) include elements, that promote awareness of simple, basic controls, a workplace, cybersecurity culture, and third-party stakeholder relationships, to assist small business concerns in mitigating common cybersecurity risks;

(D) include case studies of practical application;

(E) are technology-neutral and can be implemented using technologies that are commercial and off-the-shelf; and

(F) are based on international standards to the extent possible, and are consistent with the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(3) NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The Director shall ensure that the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) are consistent with the efforts of the Director under section 401 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7451).

(4) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Director, to the extent practicable, shall consider any methods included in the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 1841(a)(3)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328).

(5) VOLUNTARY RESOURCES.—The use of the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) shall be considered voluntary.

(6) UPDATES.—The Director shall review and, if necessary, update the resources disseminated under paragraph (1) in accordance with the requirements under paragraph (2).

(7) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director and the head of each Federal agency that so elects shall make prominently available on the respective agency’s public Internet website information about the resources and updates to the resources disseminated under paragraph (1). The Director and the heads shall each ensure that the information they respectively make prominently available is consistent, clear, and concise.

(d) OTHER FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to supersede, alter, or otherwise affect any cybersecurity requirements applicable to Federal agencies.

(e) FUNDING.—This Act shall be carried out using funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated or made available to the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 2105.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership for giving us this time to debate this important bill. It is especially timely as October is National Cyber Security Awareness Month, so taking up this bill at this time is a perfect time. We must come together to protect all businesses—large, small, and medium—from the constant threat of cyber attacks.

America’s small businesses are the backbone of our economy, accounting for 54 percent of all American sales and 55 percent of American jobs. Unfortunately, small businesses are especially vulnerable, with some reports noting that 43 percent of cyber attacks specifically target them. These small businesses are more susceptible to attacks due to the limited access to the tools they need to prepare for such an event. Implementation of the NIST Framework into these small businesses will protect small business owners, their employees, and their customer base all while contributing positively to the economy.

H.R. 2105, the National Institute of Standards and Technology Small Business Cybersecurity Act, will help small businesses better address their cybersecurity risks to help them survive and thrive in the face of such adversity.

As an owner of a multigenerational family air-conditioning and heating business, I understand firsthand the importance of equipping and empowering small businesses to tackle these challenges so that they can grow and prosper.

About 10 months ago, my sons called me and said that there was a message on the screen of one of our computers that said: “Your data has been frozen. You have been attacked.” It had a little clock on there ticking down. “If you don’t pay a ransom by a certain time, then we will destroy your data. It is inaccessible.”

Well, there was something we had done, fortunately—not that we do every day, but we had done several days before—which protected us from that. We were able to fix our problem and wipe it clean and get started all over. But most small businesses may or may not—including ourselves—have done that just a few days before.

Thus, I introduced H.R. 2105 with the support and cosponsorship of many of my colleagues on the committee, including Chairman SMITH, Chairwoman

COMSTOCK, and Ranking Member LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2105 would provide small businesses in my district, State, and across the country with the tools they need to meet the threats and challenges of the modern world.

This bill describes the vital role played by small businesses in the U.S. economy, the devastating impact of cyber attacks on a majority of small businesses and large businesses and what they need to develop to specifically help themselves.

It directs the NIST Director—within a year of the act's enactment—to disseminate clear and concise resources, which are defined as guidelines, tools, best practices, standards, methodologies, and other ways of providing this information.

Dissemination would be in consultation with heads of other Federal agencies. These resources—based on the NIST Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity—will help small businesses identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cybersecurity risks.

□ 1400

H.R. 2105 also clarifies that use of the resources by small businesses is voluntary, directs the NIST Director and heads of Federal agencies that so elect to make the resources available on their government websites, and specifies that no new funds are authorized to carry out this act.

This bill is very similar to S. 770, the MAIN STREET Cybersecurity Act, which is supported by the National Small Business Association, National Restaurant Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the International TechneGroup. The Chamber and International TechneGroup have also come out in support H.R. 2105.

On September 28, 2017, the Senate passed S. 770 by unanimous consent, and I ask my colleagues to similarly support H.R. 2105.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2105, the NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act of 2017, a bipartisan effort to help small businesses implement the NIST Cybersecurity Framework for Critical Infrastructure.

I thank Mr. WEBSTER for his work on the bill and all of my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for their support of the bill.

I would also like to thank Senator SCHATZ and my colleagues in the Senate for working to pass the companion version over there, which I hope that we can follow suit on here today.

The NIST cybersecurity framework provides valuable guidance on cybersecurity best practices for organizations of all sizes, but small businesses often

don't have the time or resources to figure out how to adapt it to their needs and implement it. This bill directs NIST to create clear guidelines, tools, and best practices specifically for small businesses so that they can protect their networked resources.

Most small businesses do not have significant IT departments. Some do not even have any dedicated information security personnel. Thus, they may be more at risk of cyber attack than large enterprises.

According to data released last month, 53 percent of American businesses of all sizes suffered a cyber attack in the past year. Of those, 72 percent spent more than \$5,000 to investigate and recover. A 2016 report found that 42 percent of businesses suffered a cyber attack of some kind.

Incidents like these do not only hurt individual small-business owners, employees, and customers, they hurt American competitiveness.

In my district in the southwest suburbs of Chicago, there is a fourth-generation family manufacturing business that has suffered multiple sophisticated phishing attacks. The few times they have fallen victim to these attacks, the costs have been significant. The owners have told me that they would welcome guidance on affordable, off-the-shelf resources to strengthen their cyber defenses and let them get back to focusing on their business.

This is a story repeated across the country. That is why we must act, and we must pass this bill for our small businesses. The guidelines created under this bill, like the NIST framework, will be voluntary, so we won't be adding to the regulatory burden on small businesses. Instead, we will be offering them an opportunity to secure their networks so that they can compete on a level playing field.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2105, the National Institute of Standards and Technology Small Business Cybersecurity Act. This bipartisan legislation instructs the Director of NIST, in consultation with other Federal agencies, to disseminate guidance to help small businesses identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cybersecurity risks. As a small-business owner, I am honored to be a cosponsor of this bill.

We know the importance of keeping all records safe and secure from outside threats. With the recent hacking of Equifax and many others, there is clearly a growing risk of online hacking and cyber warfare in the world today. It is imperative that we ensure that the backbone of our economy, our small- and medium-size businesses,

have the resources they need to stay safe.

I strongly believe that the businesses in Florida's Second District would benefit from this vital information, which will help them keep their data safe and secure. By increasing cybersecurity efforts, we are protecting both small businesses and their millions of customers across the country.

This bill doesn't cost the taxpayers anything, but it could potentially save small-business owners and consumers both their privacy and livelihoods.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2105, the NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act of 2017, which directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology to provide more guidance, resources, and tools to small businesses to improve their cybersecurity and protect the personal information of their customers.

According to the Small Business Administration, the 28 million small businesses in America account for 54 percent of all U.S. sales and 55 percent of all U.S. jobs. Small businesses play a central role in our economy.

Unfortunately, the information systems and networks of small businesses are especially vulnerable to an increasing volume and sophistication of cyber attacks. Small businesses rarely have employees or leadership with education or training in cybersecurity. Further, small businesses typically have limited resources to invest in cybersecurity.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, is a leader in developing standards and guidelines for cybersecurity in both the public and private sectors. In 2009, NIST developed a guidance document called, "Small Business Information Security: The Fundamentals." The document described the fundamentals of an effective small-business information security program in nontechnical language.

In 2014, in response to an executive order from President Obama, NIST published the Cybersecurity Framework for Critical Infrastructure. The cybersecurity framework, as written, is most useful for larger businesses with at least some cybersecurity expertise. Therefore, in November 2016, NIST published an update of their small-business guidance document using the framework as a template.

These are just two examples of how NIST has long privatized supporting small-business efforts to strengthen cybersecurity. The requirements of H.R. 2105 are consistent with these ongoing efforts and help ensure that they will continue.

Ideally, H.R. 2105 would have also provided resources for NIST to expand

these activities because the need is very clear. We cannot effectively support small business in this country unless we provide the relevant government agencies the resources to help protect those businesses from cyber threats.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2105, and I thank the sponsors, including Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. ROSEN, for their strong support for small businesses and NIST's important role in cybersecurity. However, I am concerned that the House bill contains an explicit unfunded mandate clause and that the Senate passed a version that is silent in funding. I hope Congress will provide NIST the adequate resources to fulfill the mandates in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) for yielding me time and for introducing H.R. 2105, the NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act.

This important and timely bipartisan bill, cosponsored by 17 Members of Congress and approved by the Science Committee by voice vote, directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology to provide small businesses with cybersecurity guidelines, tools, best practices, standards, and methodologies necessary to better protect themselves from cyber attacks.

Small businesses help produce a thriving economy that benefits our entire country. They bring innovative ideas, cutting-edge products and services, and jobs to the marketplace. In my home State, for example, there are more than 2.4 million small businesses that employ almost 4.5 million Texans.

Major cyber attacks dominate news coverage, such as the Equifax or Yahoo hacks that impacted millions and billions of people. But small businesses, which often do not have sufficient information to adequately monitor and protect their computer systems, are frequently the target of cyber attacks, as well.

A 2016 Symantec report notes that cyber attacks against businesses with fewer than 250 employees have grown from 18 percent in 2011 to 43 percent in 2015. This bill can help those businesses.

October is National Cybersecurity Awareness Month, so it is appropriate that we consider a bill designed to help protect small businesses from cybersecurity attacks. Today's legislation provides small businesses with NIST expertise to reduce their cybersecurity risk.

NIST experts developed a cybersecurity framework through collaboration between the government and the private sector. This framework is accept-

ed and used by many private organizations to address and manage their information technology vulnerabilities in a cost-effective way.

The guidance described in this bill to help small businesses is based on the NIST cybersecurity framework. H.R. 2105 prioritizes dissemination of this guidance by NIST within its almost \$1 billion budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to show their support for small business by approving Mr. WEBSTER's fiscally responsible, innovation protection bill today.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2105.

When I travel around my district, which is rich with technology workers, the thing that I hear repeated concern about is the increasing need for individuals with the skill set, education, training, and knowledge of cybersecurity matters.

With the recent events with Equifax, WannaCry, and OPM breaches, it is clear that our cybersecurity infrastructure needs to be strengthened.

In December 2016, the Commission on Enhancing National Cybersecurity specifically recommended that the administration should "develop concrete efforts to support and strengthen the cybersecurity of small- and medium-sized businesses."

With small businesses accounting for most of the U.S. economy's jobs and sales, it is imperative that we provide guidance to help them identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cybersecurity risks. By making these resources readily available to small businesses across the country, this commonsense legislation will help them protect their sensitive data and business from cyber threats so they can grow our economy and provide more jobs instead.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this measure, the NIST Small Business Cybersecurity Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) for his leadership on this legislation.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

□ 1415

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2105, the National Institute of Standards and Technology Small Business Cybersecurity Act. This bill directs the National In-

stitute of Standards and Technology to issue guidance for small businesses to use voluntarily to assist them in identifying and assessing, managing, and reducing the cybersecurity risk.

As has been said, small businesses in the U.S. account for 54 percent of sales and 55 percent of U.S. jobs. However, a 2016 Symantec Internet Security Threat Report indicated that businesses with less than 250 employees are facing increased cybersecurity threats, up from 18 percent in 2011 to 43 percent in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I recently passed our real estate small business to my son Warren, so I understand the importance of equipping small businesses with the tools that will enable them to meet the emerging challenges.

I urge passage of H.R. 2105, which will help prepare small businesses in the future, and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Small Business Cybersecurity Act, a bill that I am proud to cosponsor. This legislation will help promote stronger cybersecurity practices amongst our Nation's small businesses, and it is fiscally responsible.

The well-being of our small businesses is important to the overall health of our economy. According to the Small Business Administration, small businesses account for 55 percent of total jobs in the United States. In my home State of Nebraska, small businesses employed 390,000 people in 2016.

Some small businesses are not able to prioritize cybersecurity efforts over other aspects of their business or they lack the resources to secure their networks and systems. We must promote greater preparedness to protect small businesses from cyber attacks.

H.R. 2105 directs NIST to disseminate guidance to help small businesses identify, assess, manage, and reduce their cyber risks based off NIST's extensive expertise. This is a big step towards promoting better cybersecurity practices amongst our Nation's small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2105.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all have come down here and talked about the importance of small business. We know how important small businesses are to our country, the real engine of our economic growth.

We also know that, in most small businesses today, they don't have the

capabilities to have an IT department or the expertise that they need to protect themselves from the continual cyber attacks, the theft of data that we hear about. But those attacks and that theft of data does not only happen for large companies; it is also a threat to small businesses. Therefore, we need to do all that we can to make sure that they are capable of protecting themselves so that our small businesses can continue to thrive and be the economic engine that they are.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. We get something good done for our small businesses. I urge them to support this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank those from both sides—Ranking Member LIPINSKI, Chairman SMITH, and others—who have supported this bill. It is a great idea. It is an opportunity to not only have available for us, it has bipartisan support and also bicameral support. This is a good opportunity to help all small businesses.

I know personally from my business and I know others who have small businesses who know that there is, in a sense, very little help right now for small businesses in this area of cybersecurity. The larger businesses certainly have their own IT people; we don't. So I am excited about the fact that this could happen, and I move passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2105, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH AND SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2763) to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as “The Small Business Innovation Research

and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act of 2017”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title, table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Requiring insertion incentives.
- Sec. 3. Additional SBIR and STTR technology insertion reporting requirement.
- Sec. 4. Encouraging innovation in United States manufacturing.
- Sec. 5. Encouraging innovation in cybersecurity.
- Sec. 6. Compliance of Phase III awards with competitive procedures.
- Sec. 7. Improvements to technical and business assistance in the SBIR and STTR programs.
- Sec. 8. Procurement center representatives and other acquisition personnel in the SBIR and STTR programs.
- Sec. 9. Increased outreach requirements.
- Sec. 10. Annual meeting.
- Sec. 11. Establishing the Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program.
- Sec. 12. Commercialization assistance pilot programs.
- Sec. 13. Phase 0 Proof of Concept Partnership Pilot Program.
- Sec. 14. Reporting requirements.
- Sec. 15. SBIR Phase flexibility.
- Sec. 16. Extension of deadline for assistance for administrative, oversight, and contract processing costs.

SEC. 2. REQUIRING INSERTION INCENTIVES.

Section 9(y)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(5)) is amended by striking “is authorized to” and inserting, “shall”.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL SBIR AND STTR TECHNOLOGY INSERTION REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Section 9(y)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(6)) is amended—

- (1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;
- (2) in subparagraph (C)(iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and
- (3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, and not later than December 31 of each year thereafter, submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, a report describing the goals set under subparagraph (A) and the incentives used or created under subparagraph (B).”.

SEC. 4. ENCOURAGING INNOVATION IN UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(tt) ENCOURAGING INNOVATION IN UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

- “(1) ensure that, in selecting small business concerns to participate in SBIR or STTR programs under this section, Federal agencies give high priority to small manufacturing companies and other small business concerns engaged in or planning to engage in manufacturing research and development for the purpose of developing and producing new products and technologies in the United States; and”
- “(2) include in the annual report to Congress under subsection (b)(7) a determination of whether the priority described in paragraph (1) is being carried out.”.

SEC. 5. ENCOURAGING INNOVATION IN CYBERSECURITY.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 4, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection.

“(uu) ENCOURAGING INNOVATION IN CYBERSECURITY.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

- “(1) ensure that, in selecting small business concerns to participate in SBIR or STTR programs under this section, Federal agencies engaged in cybersecurity research give high priority to small business concerns that are engaged in cybersecurity research and development, for the purpose of developing and implementing technology services and products to strengthen the security of United States Government and private computer systems, including software, hardware, and portable devices; and
- “(2) include in the annual report to Congress under subsection (b)(7) a determination of whether the priority described in paragraph (1) is being carried out.”.

SEC. 6. COMPLIANCE OF PHASE III AWARDS WITH COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES.

Section 9(r)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(r)(4)) is amended by inserting “as direct follow-on awards issued without further competition” after “developed the technology”.

SEC. 7. IMPROVEMENTS TO TECHNICAL AND BUSINESS ASSISTANCE IN THE SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.

Section 9(q) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(q)) is amended—

- (1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND BUSINESS” after “TECHNICAL”;
- (2) in paragraph (1)—
 - (A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—
 - (i) by striking “a vendor selected under paragraph (2)” and inserting “1 or more vendors selected under paragraph (2)(A)”;
 - (ii) by inserting “and business” before “assistance services”; and
 - (iii) by inserting “assistance with product sales, intellectual property protections, market research, market validation, and development of regulatory plans and manufacturing plans,” after “technologies,”; and
 - (B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “, including intellectual property protections” before the period at the end;
- (3) in paragraph (2)—
 - (A) by striking “Each agency may select a vendor to assist small business concerns to meet” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each agency may select 1 or more vendors from which small business concerns may obtain assistance in meeting”; and
 - (B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

(B) SELECTION BY SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—A small business concern may, by contract or otherwise, select 1 or more vendors to assist the small business concern in meeting the goals listed in paragraph (1).”; and

(4) in paragraph (3)—

- (A) by inserting “(A)” after “paragraph (2)” each place it appears;
- (B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$5,000 per year” each place it appears and inserting “\$6,500 per project”;
- (C) in subparagraph (B)—
 - (i) by striking “\$5,000 per year” each place it appears and inserting “\$35,000 per project”; and
 - (ii) in clause (ii), by striking “which shall be in addition to the amount of the recipient’s award” and inserting “which may, as

determined appropriate by the head of the agency, be included as part of the recipient's award or be in addition to the amount of the recipient's award";

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting "or business" after "technical";

(ii) by striking "the vendor" and inserting "a vendor"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: "Business-related services aimed at improving the commercialization success of a small business concern may be obtained from an entity, such as a public or private organization or an agency of or other entity established or funded by a State that facilitates or accelerates the commercialization of technologies or assists in the creation and growth of private enterprises that are commercializing technology.";

(E) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting "or business" after "technical" each place it appears; and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking "the vendor" and inserting "1 or more vendors"; and

(F) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

(E) MULTIPLE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—The Administrator shall establish a limit on the amount of technical and business assistance services that may be received or purchased under subparagraph (B) by a small business concern that has received multiple Phase II SBIR or STTR awards for a fiscal year."

SEC. 8. PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER ACQUISITION PERSONNEL IN THE SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION OF SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE.—Section 9(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12)(B), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(14) the term 'senior procurement executive' means an official designated under section 1702(c) of title 41, United States Code, as the senior procurement executive of a Federal agency participating in a SBIR or STTR program."

(b) INCLUSION OF SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVES IN SBIR AND STTR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(10) to coordinate, where appropriate, with the senior procurement executive of the relevant Federal agency to assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program with commercializing research developed under such a program before such small business concern is awarded a contract from such Federal agency."

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 9(b)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(3)) is amended by striking "and" at the end.

(c) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER ACQUISITION PERSONNEL.—

(1) SBIR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES.—Upon the enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directives

issued pursuant to this subsection to require procurement center representatives (as described in section 15(l)) to coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer or SBIR program officer, and the appropriate Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract, to assist small business concerns participating in the SBIR program, particularly in Phase III. The procurement center representatives shall coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract."

(2) STTR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(p)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(p)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) procedures to ensure that procurement center representatives (as described in section 15(l))—

"(i) coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer or STTR program officer, and the appropriate Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract, to assist small business concerns participating in the STTR program, particularly in Phase III; and

"(ii) coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the Federal agency letting the contract in providing the assistance described in clause (i); and"

(d) AMENDMENT TO DUTIES OF PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES.—Section 15(l)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(l)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (L); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraphs:

"(J) coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer or SBIR or STTR program officer, and the appropriate Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract, to assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 with Phase III;

"(K) coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to subsection (k) for the agency letting the contract; and"

(e) AMENDMENT TO THE DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (19), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(21) shall coordinate with the appropriate contracting officer of SBIR or STTR program officer to assist small business con-

cerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 with researching applicable solicitations for the award of a Federal contract (particularly with the Federal agency that has a funding agreement (as defined under section 9) with the concern) to market the research developed by such concern under such SBIR or STTR program; and

"(22) shall provide technical assistance to small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract, including coordination with procurement center representatives and the appropriate senior procurement executive for the agency letting the contract."

SEC. 9. INCREASED OUTREACH REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) SBIR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)), as amended by section 8, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) INCREASED OUTREACH REQUIREMENTS.—Upon the enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directives issued pursuant to this subsection to require outreach efforts to increase the participation in technological innovation under the SBIR programs among individuals conducting research at minority institutions (as defined in section 365(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) and Hispanic-serving institutions (as defined in section 502(a)(5) of such Act)."

(2) STTR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(p)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(p)(2)), as amended by section 8, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(H) procedures for outreach efforts to increase the participation in technological innovation under the SBIR programs among individuals conducting research at minority institutions (as defined in section 365(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) and Hispanic-serving institutions (as defined in section 502(a)(5) of such Act)."

(b) FUNDING FOR OUTREACH.—Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking the "and" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(K) the outreach efforts described under subsections (j)(4) and (p)(2)(G); and"

SEC. 10. ANNUAL MEETING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 5, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(vv) ANNUAL MEETING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency required to have a program under this section (or a designee) and the Administrator (or a designee) shall meet annually to discuss methods—

"(A) to improve the collection of data under this section;

"(B) to improve the reporting of data to the Administrator under this section;

"(C) to make the application processes for programs under this section more efficient; and

"(D) to increase participation in the programs established under this section.

"(2) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which an annual meeting required under paragraph (1) is held, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee

on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, a report on the findings of such meeting and recommendations on how to implement changes to programs under this section.”.

(b) FUNDING FOR ANNUAL MEETING.—Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)) as amended by section 9, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(L) the annual meeting required under subsection (vv).”.

SEC. 11. ESTABLISHING THE CIVILIAN AGENCY COMMERCIALIZATION READINESS PROGRAM.

Section 9(gg) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(gg)) is amended—

(1) by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: “CIVILIAN AGENCY COMMERCIALIZATION READINESS PROGRAM”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “to establish a Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program for civilian agencies” after “the covered Federal agency”;

(3) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(A) by striking “establish a pilot program” and inserting “establish a Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program under this subsection”; and

(B) by striking “the pilot program” and inserting “such Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program”;

(4) in paragraphs (3) and (4), by striking “a pilot program” each place such term appears and inserting “a Civilian Commercialization Readiness Program”;

(5) in paragraph (6), by striking “the pilot program” and inserting “a Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program”;

(6) by striking paragraph (7) and redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (7); and

(7) in paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) the term ‘Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness Program’ means each program established under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 12. COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE PILOT PROGRAMS.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 10, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(ww) COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE PILOT PROGRAMS.—

“(1) PILOT PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, a covered agency shall implement a commercialization assistance pilot program, under which an eligible entity may receive a subsequent Phase II SBIR award.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—If the Administrator determines that a covered agency has a program that is sufficiently similar to the commercialization assistance pilot program established under this subsection, such covered agency shall not be required to implement a commercialization assistance pilot program under this subsection.

“(2) PERCENT OF AGENCY FUNDS.—The head of each covered agency may allocate not more than 5 percent of the funds allocated to the SBIR program of the covered agency for the purpose of making a subsequent Phase II SBIR award under the commercialization assistance pilot program.

“(3) TERMINATION.—A commercialization assistance pilot program established under this subsection shall terminate on September 30, 2022.

“(4) APPLICATION.—To be selected to receive a subsequent Phase II SBIR award under a commercialization assistance pilot program, an eligible entity shall submit to the covered agency implementing such pilot program an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the covered agency may require, including—

“(A) an updated Phase II commercialization plan; and

“(B) the source and amount of the matching funding required under paragraph (5).

“(5) MATCHING FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall require, as a condition of any subsequent Phase II SBIR award made to an eligible entity under this subsection, that a matching amount (excluding any fees collected by the eligible entity receiving such award) equal to the amount of such award be provided from an eligible third-party investor.

“(B) INELIGIBLE SOURCES.—An eligible entity may not use funding from ineligible sources to meet the matching requirement of subparagraph (A).

“(6) AWARD.—A subsequent Phase II SBIR award made to an eligible entity under this subsection—

“(A) may not exceed the limitation described under subsection (aa)(1); and

“(B) shall be disbursed during Phase II.

“(7) USE OF FUNDS.—The funds awarded to an eligible entity under this subsection may only be used for research and development activities that build on eligible entity’s Phase II program and ensure the research funded under such Phase II is rapidly progressing towards commercialization.

“(8) SELECTION.—In selecting eligible entities to participate in a commercialization assistance pilot program under this subsection, the head of a covered agency shall consider—

“(A) the extent to which such award could aid the eligible entity in commercializing the research funded under the eligible entity’s Phase II program;

“(B) whether the updated Phase II commercialization plan submitted under paragraph (4) provides a sound approach for establishing technical feasibility that could lead to commercialization of such research;

“(C) whether the proposed activities to be conducted under such updated Phase II commercialization plan further improve the likelihood that such research will provide societal benefits;

“(D) whether the small business concern has progressed satisfactorily in Phase II to justify receipt of a subsequent Phase II SBIR award;

“(E) the expectations of the eligible third-party investor that provides matching funding under paragraph (5); and

“(F) the likelihood that the proposed activities to be conducted under such updated Phase II commercialization plan using matching funding provided by such eligible third-party investor will lead to commercial and societal benefit.

“(9) EVALUATION REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, a report including—

“(A) a summary of the activities of commercialization assistance pilot programs carried out under this subsection;

“(B) a detailed compilation of results achieved by such commercialization assist-

ance pilot programs, including the number of eligible entities that received awards under such programs;

“(C) the rate at which each eligible entity that received a subsequent Phase II SBIR award under this subsection commercialized research of the recipient;

“(D) the growth in employment and revenue of eligible entities that is attributable to participation in a commercialization assistance pilot program;

“(E) a comparison of commercialization success of eligible entities participating in a commercialization assistance pilot program with recipients of an additional Phase II SBIR award under subsection (ff);

“(F) demographic information, such as ethnicity and geographic location, of eligible entities participating in a commercialization assistance pilot program;

“(G) an accounting of the funds used at each covered agency that implements a commercialization assistance pilot program under this subsection;

“(H) the amount of matching funding provided by eligible third-party investors, set forth separately by source of funding;

“(I) an analysis of the effectiveness of the commercialization assistance pilot program implemented by each covered agency; and

“(J) recommendations for improvements to the commercialization assistance pilot program.

“(10) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means a Federal agency required to have an SBIR program.

“(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means a small business concern that has received a Phase II award under an SBIR program and an additional Phase II SBIR award under subsection (ff) from the covered agency to which such small business concern is applying for a subsequent Phase II SBIR award.

“(C) ELIGIBLE THIRD-PARTY INVESTOR.—The term ‘eligible third-party investor’ means a small business concern other than an eligible entity, a venture capital firm, an individual investor, a non-SBIR Federal, State or local government, or any combination thereof.

“(D) INELIGIBLE SOURCES.—The term ‘ineligible sources’ means the following:

“(i) The eligible entity’s internal research and development funds.

“(ii) Funding in forms other than cash, such as in-kind or other intangible assets.

“(iii) Funding from the owners of the eligible entity, or the family members or affiliates of such owners.

“(iv) Funding attained through loans or other forms of debt obligations.

“(E) SUBSEQUENT PHASE II SBIR AWARD.—The term ‘subsequent Phase II SBIR award’ means an award granted to an eligible entity under this subsection to carry out further commercialization activities for research conducted pursuant to an SBIR program.”.

SEC. 13. PHASE 0 PROOF OF CONCEPT PARTNER-SHIP PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL AGENCIES IN PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 9(jj) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(jj)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “The Director of the National Institutes of Health” and inserting “Each covered agency head”; and

(B) by striking “the Director” and inserting “each covered agency head”;

(2) by amending subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(A) the term ‘covered agency head’ means the Director of the National Institutes of

Health, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Secretary of Energy;";

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "The Director" and inserting "Each covered agency head"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "the Director shall consider, in addition to any other criteria the Director" and inserting "each covered agency head shall consider, in addition to any other criteria the appropriate covered agency head"; and

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking "The Director" and inserting "Each covered agency head".

(b) **EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORITY.**—Section 9(jj)(7) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(jj)(7)) is amended by striking "fiscal year 2017" and inserting "fiscal year 2022".

SEC. 14. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Section 9(b)(7) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(7)) is amended by striking "to report not less than annually" and inserting "to submit a report not later than December 31 of each year".

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT TO SBA AND THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY.**—Section 9(g)(9) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(g)(9)) is amended—

(1) by striking "make an annual report" and inserting "not later than March 30 of each year, submit a report"; and

(2) by striking "and the Office of Science and Technology Policy" and inserting ", the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate".

SEC. 15. SBIR PHASE FLEXIBILITY.

Section 9(cc) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(cc)) is amended by striking "During fiscal years" and all that follows through "may each provide" and inserting "During fiscal years 2018 through 2022, all agencies participating in the SBIR program may provide".

SEC. 16. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR ASSISTANCE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE, OVERSIGHT, AND CONTRACT PROCESSING COSTS.

Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking "September 30, 2017" and inserting "September 30, 2022".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation introduced by Chairman KNIGHT and Ranking Member MURPHY of the Committee on Small Business' Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce aims to modernize and improve the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer, or SBIR and STTR, programs.

The SBIR and STTR programs have helped thousands of small businesses create new technologies, commercialize their ideas, and generate new jobs. While creating these benefits in the private sector, the programs offer, in a cost-effective manner, ways for Federal agencies to solve operational problems. H.R. 2763 strengthens these two programs in quite a few ways.

First, the bill emphasizes agency accountability by creating several firm reporting deadlines for covered agencies and for the SBA to provide future Congresses with improved information that will lead to a better understanding of the programs' strengths and weaknesses.

Second, the legislation clarifies the congressional intent of the 2011 reauthorization to ensure that taxpayers reap the benefits of the SBIR and STTR programs by binding the technologies developed in the programs to long-term projects at the Department of Defense.

Third, the legislation extends a popular pilot program included in the 2011 reauthorization that would allow all participating Federal agencies to award a phase II contract immediately if the agency finds that the small business concern has already completed work typically done during phase I.

Fourth, it makes permanent the option for all participating agencies to establish commercialization readiness programs, or CRPs. As a pilot program from the 2011 reauthorization, these CRPs have been shown to provide much-needed support to small companies nearing the completion of the process and have helped advance technology to the commercialization phase.

Fifth, it extends, through 2022, the provision that allows participating agencies to utilize 3 percent of their allocation for administrative functions, conduct outreach in an effort to bring more companies into the SBIR and STTR programs, and increase deterrents to waste, fraud, and abuse.

I want to thank Congressman KNIGHT and Congresswoman MURPHY for the bipartisan work on this important legislation. I would also like to thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, as well as Chairwoman COMSTOCK and Ranking Member LIPINSKI of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology, for working together with us to produce this bipartisan bill that we have before us this afternoon.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2763, The Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act, which will modernize two programs that provide Federal funding to small technologically advanced firms to research and develop innovative products.

I am proud to have cosponsored this legislation with Congressman STEVE KNIGHT, and I am encouraged that my colleagues on the Small Business Committee and the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee on both sides of the aisle support the bill.

For decades, American innovation and ingenuity have bolstered our economic growth and solidified our country's status as a global leader in technology; and for more than 30 years, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs have provided a critical source of funding to small businesses that engage in research and development. These initiatives were established to help spur innovation and job creation throughout the country.

Since the inception of the programs, more than \$40 billion has been awarded to small, innovative firms to address our Nation's most important research and development challenges. Because of the high-risk nature of their ventures, SBIR and STTR grantees receive R&D funding that might otherwise be unavailable in the private sector.

As a direct result of the Federal investment in these programs, breakthroughs have been made in a wide range of sectors, including agriculture, defense, energy, and healthcare. In turn, these discoveries have generated tremendous economic growth and job opportunities across the country, including in central Florida.

For many research companies in my district, these two programs serve as a gateway to the Federal contracting field. That is why I am honored to have cosponsored this bipartisan legislation.

The final bill reflects bipartisan compromises and input from both committees of jurisdiction. Most importantly, it includes many provisions focused on developing innovative products that support important national priorities and that can be sold on the commercial market.

To improve oversight of the program, the bill requires the Small Business Administration to submit an annual report to Congress no later than December 31 of each year. This will enable us to better account for the use of funds and to better assess the progress of SBIR and STTR initiatives at participating agencies.

Another provision makes permanent the pilot program that establishes the Civilian Agency Commercialization Readiness program, which allows up to 10 percent of agency administrative dollars for sequential phase II awards to eligible businesses.

Finally, the bill includes an amendment that I authored to require participating Federal agencies to take additional steps to educate small firms about the SBIR and STTR programs and to encourage more small firms to apply for funding.

After more than a decade of fits and starts with these two programs, H.R. 2763 will make program improvements and provide much-needed certainty to small businesses seeking to commercialize. By authorizing the administrative fee to run these programs for an additional 5 years beyond its current authorization, Congress is taking proactive steps to give small firms the confidence they need to continue developing innovative products.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce on the Small Business Committee.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his hard work and for his leadership, and I want to thank my partner in this, Congresswoman MURPHY, for her cosponsoring of this bill and for her work on this important piece of legislation.

A 21st century military requires a 21st century acquisition process, one that is agile, efficient, and effective. I represent California's 25th District, and nowhere will you find a more exemplary place that demonstrates the important role that small businesses play in both our aerospace and defense industrial base.

□ 1430

I see firsthand the innovative effect small businesses make and how they can positively impact government functioning.

The Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer—SBIR and STTR—programs are critical to this impact. Now that these programs have been reauthorized until 2022, it is important that we continue to focus on spurring innovation.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2763, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act of 2017. My bill reinforces agency accountability by requiring the Small Business Administration to provide Congress with better information and reasonable, hard deadlines. It clarifies congress-

sional intent of the previous authorization to ensure that taxpayers reap the benefits of SBIR and STTR programs by tying them to long-term projects at the DOD. It also allows participating agencies to establish a new, separate commercialization assistance pilot program and extends three popular pilot programs through FY 2022, when the full program will need a full reauthorization.

With the use of SBIR and STTR programs, we can increase small business participation in the defense and aerospace industry while tapping into the true potential their American innovative spirit represents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to vote "yes" on H.R. 2763, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2763, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CHABOT, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, Chairman SMITH, and all other colleagues on both committees for their work to advance this bipartisan piece to the House floor.

SBIR and STTR are valuable programs that provide competitive research and development grants and contracts to innovative small businesses. Stability and continuity in the SBIR and STTR programs are important goals, which is why I supported the agreement in last year's National Defense Authorization Act to extend the program until fiscal year 2022 at the current allocation level.

In H.R. 2763, the two authorizing committees have come to agreement on a number of policy improvements and some strengthened oversight for the programs.

The policy changes in H.R. 2763 advances sensible ways to further leverage small business R&D to help meet Federal mission needs, as well as contribute more broadly to U.S. innovation and economic growth. The bill includes continued support for early-stage funding for entrepreneurial researchers, provides funding for important agency outreach and administrative activities, streamlines reporting requirements, ensures agency outreach for researchers at minority-serving institutions, and authorizes several additional activities to support implementation of the program.

I am particularly pleased that the bill includes a provision to address cur-

rent agency shortfalls in fostering the participation of women and minority-owned firms. Fostering diversity in STEM research and innovation is an economic imperative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we must continue to encourage such policies.

H.R. 2763 is a good bill that improves the SBIR program and maximizes the benefits of federally funded small business R&D.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairmen CHABOT and SMITH and Ranking Members VELÁZQUEZ and JOHNSON for their leadership on this bill.

The SBIR and STTR programs have helped countless innovative small businesses grow jobs through American ingenuity. This bill will make these programs work even better by providing small businesses with additional tools for bringing innovations to market. Better SBIR and STTR programs mean more successful small businesses and more jobs.

I especially want to thank my colleagues for supporting inclusion of two provisions that I put forward in committee.

First, the bill increases the amount of money that grant recipients are allowed to spend on business and technical services, like market research, intellectual property protection; or participation in entrepreneurial training programs, like the highly successful Innovation Corps program. This helps small businesses, especially startups, use their funds where they know they are needed most, for technical assistance, creative approaches to problem solving, and other types of guidance needed in today's complex marketplaces.

Second, this bill expands the highly successful Phase 0 Proof of Concept Partnership pilot program, which I helped create at the National Institutes of Health in a previous SBIR reauthorization. This highly successful program provides the earliest funding for researchers exploring the possibility of turning their research into a viable medical product.

After just 2 years in operation, the three hubs created by the NIH program have filed 30 patent applications, negotiated 14 technology licenses, formed 7 companies, and have 70 promising technologies in the pipeline.

This bill extends the Phase 0 program for another 5 years at NIH and expands

it to the National Science Foundation, NASA, and the Department of Energy. In doing so, we will be giving a needed boost to more researchers who are budding entrepreneurs who will create the jobs of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, our small businesses deserve support as they drive America's economic growth. This bill will give innovators and entrepreneurs additional tools to drive this growth that we so desperately need. So I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her work on this small business bill. I also thank Chairmen SMITH and CHABOT and Ranking Members JOHNSON and VELÁZQUEZ for including my amendment to benefit minority-serving institutions in H.R. 2763. This is essential to retaining American leadership in innovation and small business development.

The SBIR and STTR programs were both created to expand small business participation in the Federal research mission. One of the four objectives Congress had in mind in establishing the SBIR was to facilitate and increase the participation of minority and disadvantaged persons in technological innovation.

My amendment requires that the participating Federal agencies in the SBIR and STTR programs conduct outreach to minority-serving institutions—MSIs—and Hispanic-serving institutions and faculty conducting research at these institutions so that participation rates in Federal research and development opportunities will increase.

There are many great MSIs and researchers who work at these institutions across the country. For example, California State University Stanislaus, which has a campus in my district, is a Hispanic-serving institution and an MSI, and has been ranked one of the best colleges in our Nation. Our country depends on innovation of MSIs and the intellectual capital of its graduates.

In the 21st century, American economic growth is going to be determined by the innovation and growth of technology and STEM-focused businesses. It is critical to the growth of our economy that minority-serving institutions and minority-owned businesses are connected to this technological ecosystem.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Reauthorizing the SBIR and STTR programs are critical to supporting our Nation's most forward-thinking entrepreneurs and innovators. I am relieved that we are preserving the critical parts of the programs and continuing to improve upon the programs themselves.

These programs have proven to be one of the most successful Federal programs for technological innovation in United States history, delivering more than 70,000 patents and valuable innovations in agriculture, defense, energy, health sciences, homeland security, space, transportation, and other fields.

Through Phase I and Phase II SBIR, countless jobs have been created in the capital region of New York. It is through programs such as SBIR that our region has developed the underpinnings of support for a boom in high technology innovation and economic development.

One of many examples of this is Ecovative Design located within my congressional district in Green Island, New York, which has benefitted from the SBIR program over a number of years. These efforts will allow the company to continue its work on a replacement of engineered wood resins that will be economically competitive and nontoxic.

The resin system represents cost and energy savings, and is capable of leveraging existing manufacturing equipment in production today. This funding will help them deliver on the promise of this innovative technology.

Gavin McIntyre, cofounder and chief scientist at Ecovative said: "We're very excited to bring our new material technology to market and displace toxic formaldehyde-based resins. The SBIR/STTR program was fundamental to how Ecovative got its start and has enabled us to continue to take risks and develop game-changing technology."

While this bill is a positive step forward towards helping more small businesses, we must do more to help other small businesses develop these types of game-changing technologies.

I recognize the value of research and I will fight to see more funding for all these agencies and, in turn, more funding for the SBIR and STTR programs.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, supporting our entrepreneurs and small businesses are a top priority for both sides of the aisle. Our bill will make it easier for small firms that receive SBIR and STTR awards to bring their products to market and achieve commercial success.

The SBIR and STTR programs are also critical to our economy, as they

support our Nation's job creators and ensure that our country continues to produce cutting-edge research and development. This ingenuity is what makes our country a global economic powerhouse.

These programs, while successful, can be improved. The bill before us is a step in the right direction insofar as it will ensure that all Federal agencies are enhancing efforts to help more small businesses obtain SBIR and STTR funding and bring their innovative products to market.

Therefore, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who spoke on this legislation, a very bipartisan, good legislation, here this afternoon on the House floor.

In closing, whether it is new software system for tracking contract payments or a new medical device to help with cancer treatments, or a new piece of technology that literally saves lives on the battlefield, the SBIR and STTR programs have consistently delivered results to Federal agencies. They are worthy programs that do what they are supposed to do, but we can always do better. This legislation improves and modernizes these programs, and I ask that all of my colleagues support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2763, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Improvements Act of 2017.

And I thank the gentleman from California, Mr. KNIGHT, for introducing this important legislation. He serves on the two Committees that share jurisdiction over the SBIR and STTR programs: the Small Business Committee, chaired by my good friend, Mr. CHABOT, and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, which I chair.

Mr. KNIGHT took the lead on last year's timely reauthorization of the SBIR and STTR programs, and he is the sponsor of H.R. 2763, which makes a number of needed policy changes to increase the programs' efficiency and effectiveness.

The SBIR program was signed into law by President Reagan in 1982, followed by the STTR program in 1992. These programs help spur economic innovation and competitiveness, and increase small business participation in federal research and development activity.

SBIR and STTR award winners convert the results of taxpayer-supported pioneering research into products that are critical to our economic competitiveness and national security. Recent examples include parts for NASA's Mars Rover and a unique cockpit airbag system to protect Army helicopter pilots.

Today 11 federal agencies provide funding to small businesses through SBIR, and five agencies provide funding through STTR—a total of nearly \$3 billion this fiscal year. That's more than 66 times greater than the \$45 million spent under the original program in 1983.

Recipients of SBIR and STTR funding have boosted scientific and technological innovation and created hundreds of thousands of American jobs.

Several large, international companies like Qualcomm, Sonicare and Symantec can trace their initial growth to when they were small businesses that received SBIR and STTR support.

I want to call attention to two provisions of H.R. 2763 that were added by Members of the Science Committee.

A provision authored by Mr. HULTGREN requires participating federal agencies to give priority to SBIR and STTR projects that will strengthen American manufacturing innovation and increase manufacturing jobs in our country.

A provision authored by Mr. HIGGINS requires federal agencies engaged in cyber security research to give priority to SBIR and STTR projects that will spur advances in cyber security to protect the American people from increasingly aggressive and malicious cyberattacks.

The legislation before us addresses a number of red flags raised by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) about lax administration of the SBIR and STTR programs.

Several participating agencies do not produce accurate, timely information that Congress requires to evaluate program performance.

The U.S. Small Business Administration has not submitted its required, comprehensive annual report to Congress since 2013.

The last administration provided virtually no information to Congress and taxpayers about the SBIR and STTR programs.

It's reassuring that SBA associate administrator Joseph Shepard promised during a joint hearing of our Committee and the Small Business Committee that annual reports will be submitted on time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2763 was unanimously approved by both the House Small Business Committee and the House Science Committee. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2763, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

POWER AND SECURITY SYSTEMS (PASS) ACT

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 190) to provide for consideration of the extension under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of nonapplication of No-Load Mode energy efficiency standards to certain security or life safety alarms or surveillance systems, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 190

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Power And Security Systems (PASS) Act".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF NONAPPLICATION OF NO-LOAD MODE ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARD TO CERTAIN SECURITY OR LIFE SAFETY ALARM OR SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS.

(a) Section 325(u)(3)(D)(ii) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(u)(3)(D)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking "2015" each place it appears and inserting "2021"; and

(2) by striking "2017" and inserting "2023".

(b) Section 325(u)(3)(E) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(u)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking "July 1, 2017," and inserting "the effective date of the amendment under subparagraph (D)(ii)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) TREATMENT IN RULE.—In the rule under subparagraph (D)(ii) and subsequent amendments the Secretary may treat some or all external power supplies designed to be connected to a security or life safety alarm or surveillance system as a separate product class or may extend the nonapplication under clause (ii)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 190.

External power supplies are used for all sorts of devices, and we have learned from experience that the Federal energy efficiency standards sometimes don't work in the ways we want them to. In particular, we need an exemption from these rules for the security and life safety alarms and surveillance alarms.

S. 190, the Power and Security Systems, or PASS, Act, provides targeted exemptions that allow these critical uses to stay on the market.

Devices like home security alarms or fire detection need to be on 24/7, 365, but the 2007 energy law on energy efficiency standards for external power supplies does not allow for this. Since then, Congress has created exemptions for these "always on" devices, but this exemption ended on July 1 of 2017. S. 190 extends this exemption out to 2023.

The result of this bill would be that these important security systems will continue to be available, preserving the jobs of those who make them, and, most importantly, the safety of those who use them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 190, the Power and Security Systems, or PASS, Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide a noncontroversial technical fix to a Department of Energy efficiency standard, and it has widespread bipartisan support.

I would also like to acknowledge my colleagues, Mr. WELCH from Vermont, Mr. BROOKS from Alabama, as well as Senator GARDNER and Senator CANTWELL, for their work in sponsoring this bill and getting it to the floor here today.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would simply amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to require the Department of Energy to issue a rule by July 1, 2021, which would determine whether energy conservation standards for external power supplies should be amended.

The rule must contain any amendment standards and would apply to products manufactured on or after July 1, 2023.

Mr. Speaker, current law exempts external power supplies for security or life safety systems from energy conservation standards until July 1, 2017. This bill simply extends that exemption to July 1, 2023.

Mr. Speaker, this clarification is necessary in order to exclude power supply circuits, drivers, and devices that are designed to power security alarms, life-saving devices, and surveillance systems.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, this legislative fix has widespread support from both houses of Congress, from both sides of the aisle, as well as from industry and the energy efficiency community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this valuable piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I close with a short and sweet: good bill, vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 190.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CLINICAL CARE COMMISSION ACT

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 920) to establish a National Clinical Care Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 920

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Clinical Care Commission Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CLINICAL CARE COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established, within the Department of Health and Human Services, a National Clinical Care Commission (in this section referred to as the “Commission”) to evaluate and make recommendations regarding improvements to the coordination and leveraging of programs within the Department and other Federal agencies related to awareness and clinical care for at least one, but not more than two, complex metabolic or autoimmune diseases resulting from issues related to insulin that represent a significant disease burden in the United States, which may include complications due to such diseases.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of the following voting members:

(A) The heads of the following Federal agencies and departments, or their designees:

(i) The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

(ii) The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

(iii) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(iv) The Indian Health Service.

(v) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

(vi) The National Institutes of Health.

(vii) The Food and Drug Administration.

(viii) The Health Resources and Services Administration.

(ix) The Department of Defense.

(x) The Department of Agriculture.

(xi) The Office of Minority Health.

(B) Twelve additional voting members appointed under paragraph (2).

(2) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—The Commission shall include additional voting members, as may be appointed by the Secretary, with expertise in the prevention, care, and epidemiology of any of the diseases and complications described in subsection (a), including one or more such members from each of the following categories:

(A) Physician specialties, including clinical endocrinologists, that play a role in the prevention or treatment of diseases and complications described in subsection (a).

(B) Primary care physicians.

(C) Non-physician health care professionals.

(D) Patient advocates.

(E) National experts, including public health experts, in the duties listed under subsection (c).

(F) Health care providers furnishing services to a patient population that consists of a high percentage (as specified by the Secretary) of individuals who are enrolled in a State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act or who are not covered under a health plan or health insurance coverage.

(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The members of the Commission shall select a chairperson from the members appointed under paragraph (2).

(4) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at least twice, and not more than four times, a year.

(5) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

(c) DUTIES.—The Commission shall evaluate and make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and Congress regarding—

(1) Federal programs of the Department of Health and Human Services that focus on preventing and reducing the incidence of the diseases and complications described in subsection (a);

(2) current activities and gaps in Federal efforts to support clinicians in providing integrated, high-quality care to individuals with the diseases and complications described in subsection (a);

(3) the improvement in, and improved coordination of, Federal education and awareness activities related to the prevention and treatment of the diseases and complications described in subsection (a), which may include the utilization of new and existing technologies;

(4) methods for outreach and dissemination of education and awareness materials that—

(A) address the diseases and complications described in subsection (a);

(B) are funded by the Federal Government; and

(C) are intended for health care professionals and the public; and

(5) whether there are opportunities for consolidation of inappropriately overlapping or duplicative Federal programs related to the diseases and complications described in subsection (a).

(d) OPERATING PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after its first meeting, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Congress an operating plan for carrying out the activities of the Commission as described in subsection (c). Such operating plan may include—

(1) a list of specific activities that the Commission plans to conduct for purposes of carrying out the duties described in each of the paragraphs in subsection (c);

(2) a plan for completing the activities;

(3) a list of members of the Commission and other individuals who are not members of the Commission who will need to be involved to conduct such activities;

(4) an explanation of Federal agency involvement and coordination needed to conduct such activities;

(5) a budget for conducting such activities; and

(6) other information that the Commission deems appropriate.

(e) FINAL REPORT.—By not later than 3 years after the date of the Commission's first meeting, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Congress a final report containing all of the findings and recommendations required by this section.

(f) SUNSET.—The Commission shall terminate 60 days after submitting its final report, but not later than the end of fiscal year 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 920, the National Clinical Care Commission Act, a bipartisan bill that has received unanimous support within both the House and the Senate Chambers. S. 920 is the Senate companion to my bill, H.R. 309, which is cosponsored by over half of my House colleagues.

It has this level of support because our Nation faces an epidemic. Diabetes or prediabetes affects over 100 million Americans. Nearly one in three of our neighbors is affected.

This legislation will also help many others who are affected by other diseases like heart disease, obesity, and many others.

When I first came to Congress in 2009, it was crystal clear that we had a big problem. The benefits of all the Federal research dollars going into these diseases were simply not making their way to patients. Researchers at the NIH, the CDC, the DOD, the VA, and the FDA weren't sharing diabetes research. Who knows? Sharing information may have put us on a path to cure diabetes.

It was clear then, and it is still clear today: we need a laser-like approach to improve patient care by pursuing a strong Federal focus on research.

This bill accomplishes that goal by creating a National Clinical Care Commission comprised of doctors who specialize in diabetes care for patients.

This commission will have 3 years to strengthen the partnership between Federal stakeholders and health professionals who will bring hands-on, clinical experience to improve care.

This is not a new, unending bureaucracy. After 3 years, this commission will sunset. In 3 years, it will be gone.

We have already made such a huge investment of taxpayer dollars into research. It is time to leverage that investment into meaningful prevention and effective treatment options.

President Reagan once said: “There is no limit to the amount of good you can do if you don't care who gets the credit.”

That is why I stand here today in strong support of my bill, which became Senator SHAHEEN's bill, because this bill will help so many Americans who are suffering from diabetes.

So today I ask my colleagues to again help all those who suffer from diabetes and other complex metabolic and autoimmune disorders by voting for S. 920.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 920, the National Clinical Care Commission Act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation aims to help improve Federal efforts to treat and to prevent metabolic and autoimmune disorders related to insulin.

The most common metabolic disorder in the U.S. is diabetes, which affects more than 25 million Americans. Another 86 million Americans have prediabetes, a condition associated with an increased risk of developing type 2 diabetes and heart disease.

Mr. Speaker, diabetes takes a huge toll on human health; in fact, it is the seventh leading cause of death in our Nation.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, all too often diabetes leads to avoidable complications, such as blindness, such as limb amputation, and also kidney failure.

In addition to the effects on human health, Mr. Speaker, diabetes care makes up a large percentage of U.S. healthcare expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, currently \$1 of every \$5 of healthcare cost is spent caring for people with diabetes. The proportion of Medicare funding is even greater than this. Currently, \$1 of every \$3 of Medicare expenditure is spent caring for people with diabetes.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, that is why it is important to improve the Federal efforts that prevent avoidable cases of diabetes and other metabolic disorders, and to ensure that all Americans have the treatment and the management services necessary to successfully manage this and other similar conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was previously passed in the 114th Congress and again at the beginning of the 115th Congress. I am pleased to see that the Senate took action on this legislation to support passage of this bill into law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on S. 920, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of S. 920, the National Clinical Care Commission Act, sponsored by Senator SHAHEEN.

This legislation has been around for a while. It has been championed in the House by our good friend and fellow Texan, Representative PETE OLSON, as H.R. 309. This bill has strong bipartisan support. It passed this House unanimously earlier this year.

Diabetes and other endocrine disorders have been a great cost burden on Medicare and, in fact, our Nation's healthcare system in general. Thirty million Americans have diabetes, 84 million Americans have prediabetes,

and three out of four Americans on Medicare have diabetes or prediabetes. And \$1 out of every \$3 Medicare spends is spent on diabetes.

This bill will establish a clinical care commission to evaluate and recommend solutions for better coordination and use of Federal programs aimed at improving care for people with diabetes and other related endocrine disorders. This commission will be tasked with identifying gaps where new approaches are needed, eliminating duplication across Federal agencies, and leveraging the Federal resources and tools available to enhance the quality of patient care.

I am confident their work will improve the lives of tens of millions of Americans living with diabetes and with other endocrine disorders while beginning the process of reducing the staggering impact of these diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank and commend our colleague, Representative PETE OLSON, for spearheading this important initiative. I want to thank him for bringing it to the floor of the House as many times as he has. This has been a lengthy process, but today, with the passage of this bill, we are voting on final passage, and this bill will be sent to the President's desk for signature. Mr. Speaker, Mr. OLSON's long and arduous journey now will be completed with the passage of this bill, and we should all look forward to that.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for yielding time to me today to speak on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of S. 920, the National Clinical Care Commission Act. S. 920, as was mentioned already, creates a commission comprised of clinical endocrinologists, other physician specialists, primary care physicians, healthcare professionals, patients, and representatives from the Federal agencies most involved in diabetes care.

The commission is charged with making recommendations to streamline Federal investments in diabetes, to improve the coordination and clinical care outcomes for people with diabetes, prediabetes, and other insulin-related metabolic and autoimmune diseases.

Passage of this legislation will help the Nation undertake more and innovative approaches to diabetes and its disease complications, for which the United States spends some \$322 billion annually.

I urge the Secretary also to move expeditiously to set up the commission so it can begin its important work as soon as possible. Clinical training and expertise in diabetes and other insulin-related diseases will be needed to lead

the commission, and it is my hope that a clinical endocrinologist will be chosen to serve as the chairperson of the commission. I think that is very important.

With a clinical endocrinologist as chair and representatives from other medical specialties, healthcare professions, and patient advocacy groups, serving alongside with Federal diabetes experts, the commission created under S. 920 will help to ensure that new innovative medications and devices are effectively translated to the clinical setting for the benefit of patients. That clinical translation is so important.

The work of the commission will help improve the lives of the tens of millions of Americans living with diabetes while simultaneously beginning the process of reducing the staggering impact of diabetes and its disease complications and the dollars that, as has already been mentioned, are associated with that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank in particular Representative OLSON for his persistence, as was already mentioned, and for sponsoring this bill in the House. I was very happy to lead the way as the Democrat on this side of the aisle on this bill, and for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who supported this bill that enabled House passage of the legislation earlier, as was mentioned, and now we are finally going to get it over the finish line. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative OLSON in particular for his efforts on this.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Iowa for those kind words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, again, short and sweet. This is a good bill. It is the first step towards actually funding a cure for diabetes. Maybe we will do that. By the way, it leaves here and will be signed into law before this week ends. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" when this vote comes up for a final passage vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 920.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JOHN F. NASH, JR. POST
OFFICE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2302) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in

Princeton, New Jersey, as the “Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2302

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DR. JOHN F. NASH, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the “Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 2302, introduced by the gentlewoman, Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN from New Jersey. The bill designates the post office located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2, in Princeton, New Jersey, as the Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office.

John Nash was a brilliant mathematician, publishing groundbreaking work in many areas. One of his most famous contributions was to the field of game theory, creating what is known as the Nash equilibrium.

For his achievements, he won a Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 1994, and the Abel Prize from the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing more about Dr. Nash's life from the gentlewoman from New Jersey, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise to urge support for my bill, H.R. 2302, which would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street in Princeton, New Jersey, as the Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office.

As a legendary figure of Princeton University's mathematics department,

Dr. Nash was famous both for his genius and his life story. Born in Bluefield, West Virginia, in 1928, Dr. John Nash was a child prodigy who graduated from the Carnegie Institute of Technology at age 19, with both a bachelor's and a master's degree in mathematics.

Dr. Nash subsequently received his doctorate in 1950 from Princeton University and published a groundbreaking theory of noncooperative games later that year, which is now known as the Nash equilibrium.

His monumental work in mathematics, game theory, economics, and evolutionary biology has influenced generations of experts in these fields.

In addition to his academic contributions, Dr. Nash gained worldwide acclaim from the 2001 film “A Beautiful Mind,” which portrayed his vast accomplishments while living with schizophrenia and throughout his recovery from mental illness.

In recognition of his lifelong work, Dr. Nash was awarded a Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 1994, and the 2015 Abel Prize from the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters.

Tragically, he and his wife, Alicia, were killed in an automobile accident in 2015 on their return from receiving the award in Norway.

Finally, I want to end my remarks by congratulating Ms. Lyla Malloy, the student in my district whose essay submission to our post office naming competition was chosen out of 84 entries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 2302 in recognition of Dr. Nash's important contributions to our country, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2302.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONUSES FOR COST-CUTTERS ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 378) to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 378

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. COST SAVINGS ENHANCEMENTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 4511 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “Definition” and inserting “Definitions”; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(B) by striking “this subchapter, the term” and inserting the following: “this subchapter—

“(1) the term”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) the term ‘wasteful expenses’ means amounts made available for salaries and expenses accounts, operations and maintenance accounts, or other equivalent accounts—

“(A) that are identified by an employee of the agency under section 4512(a) as wasteful; and

“(B) that the Chief Financial Officer of the agency determines are not required for the purpose for which the amounts were made available.”.

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “The head of an agency may pay a cash award to any employee of such agency whose identification of wasteful expenses to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency has resulted in cost savings for the agency.” after the first sentence;

(B) in paragraph (1) by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$20,000”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “Chief Financial Officer,” after “Inspector General.”;

(ii) by striking “employee designated under subsection (b)” and inserting “designated employee”; and

(iii) by inserting “or identification” after “disclosure”; and

(D) in the matter following paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “, Chief Financial Officer,” after “Inspector General”; and

(ii) by inserting “or identification” after “disclosure”;

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “awards permitted under this section” and inserting “awards for the disclosure of fraud, waste, or mismanagement under this section”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) If the Chief Financial Officer of the agency determines that potential wasteful expenses identified by an employee meet the requirements of section 4511(a)(2)(B), the head of the agency shall notify the President for purposes of proposing the expenses for rescission under title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.).

“(2) In the case of an agency for which there is no Chief Financial Officer, the head of the agency shall designate an agency employee who shall have the authority to make the determinations for identification of wasteful expenses under this section.

“(d) The head of each agency shall make available, along with, and in the same manner and form as, the provision of information required under section 1116 of title 31, information on disclosures of wasteful expenses under this section, including—

“(1) a description of each disclosure of possible wasteful expenses identified by an employee and determined by the agency to have merit; and

“(2) the number and amount of cash awards provided by the agency under subsection (a).

“(e) An individual may not receive a cash award under this subchapter if the individual is—

“(1) an officer or employee of the Office of the Inspector General of an agency; or
 “(2) ineligible for a cash award under section 4509.

“(f) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

“(1) ensure that the cash award program of each agency complies with this section; and

“(2) submit to Congress an annual certification indicating whether the cash award program of each agency complies with this section.

“(g) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2017, and every 3 years thereafter for 6 years, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of the cost savings and awards program under this section, including any recommendations for legislative changes.”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4511 and inserting the following:

“4511. Definitions and general provisions.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 378, introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2017.

The people in the best position to identify waste throughout the Federal Government are the employees on the front lines at the Federal agencies. They are the ones on the ground who know when agencies waste money. It is in the taxpayers' best interest to encourage Federal employees to report waste when they see it.

H.R. 378 increases the incentive for Federal employees to report wasteful spending by authorizing a reward of up to \$20,000 for blowing the whistle on waste. This incentive is especially necessary at the end of the fiscal year when too many agencies adopt a “use it or lose it” mentality regarding their budgets.

Some agencies fear that if they do not spend every last dollar in their budget, that Congress will somehow decrease their future funding. That dynamic leads to the most outrageous expenditures in the last week before the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

Under the structure put in place by H.R. 378, agency leadership will also be able to verify that spending identified by whistleblowers is actually wasteful. This was a concern raised by our colleagues in the minority. We are thankful for their constructive work in getting this bill to a mutually agreeable compromise.

The bill also maintains Congress' constitutional role in the appropriations process. As we know, Congress is responsible for authorizing spending by the Federal Government, and this bill is careful to respect that authority.

After the agency's chief financial officer affirms that the spending in question is indeed wasteful, the agency must submit a report to the President. The President may then submit a recommendation to Congress to eliminate the wasteful spending in question.

H.R. 378 is the result of a bipartisan process, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill as an example of what we can achieve when both sides put their minds to reform and husband the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 378, the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act, as reported by the committee. This legislation enhances the existing award program for Federal employees whose identification of waste, fraud, and abuse results in cost savings to an agency.

Every day, Federal employees across the country provide vital services to the American people. They ensure that our veterans receive the benefits to which they are entitled. They work to keep our air safe to breathe and our water safe to drink. They spend long hours and put their lives at risk to safeguard our national and homeland security. And Federal employees are on the front lines in ensuring that these important missions are carried out as effectively and efficiently as possible.

I think we can all agree that no one benefits when taxpayer dollars are wasted. This bill aims to increase government efficiency and save taxpayer dollars by providing incentives to Federal employees to identify wasteful spending. The legislation allows an agency head to award an employee a bonus for the identification of wasteful expenses that result in agency cost savings.

The bill also doubles the amount that an inspector general may award an employee for disclosures of waste, fraud, and abuse that result in cost savings from \$10,000 to \$20,000.

In addition, the bill contains several accountability measures so that Congress and the American people can determine whether the legislation is working as intended. First, agencies must include information on disclo-

tures of wasteful spending and awards distributed under this legislation in their annual, publicly available, performance report.

The bill also includes a requirement that the director of the Office of Management and Budget submit a report to Congress each year certifying that each agency's cash award program complies with the bill.

In addition, the bill requires a GAO report on the operation of awards program within 3 years, including any recommendations for legislative changes. Democratic members of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee raised concerns about prior versions of this bill, and I want to thank Chairman GOWDY for working with us to address those concerns. The bill we have before us today reflects bipartisan concerns.

We must support Federal employees who identify ways to increase efficiency and reduce waste. I believe this bill does that, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2017. I wish to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, what we see today in my bill is what I think the American people want, Republicans and Democrats working together with good, commonsense legislation that makes sense and saves the American taxpayer's money.

Let's face it: whether we are a family or a business, we have to manage our money in the private sector; and the Federal Government, for far too long, has been guilty of spending waste, fraud, and abuse. There have been so many problems, and the American people know it.

When we go home and we talk with our constituents, they want us to be very good stewards of their money, and they deserve that. That is exactly what this bill does, and it does it in a way that does a lot of different things that I think is great.

First of all, as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have said, it incentivizes Federal employees to detect waste. We all know that government has a tendency, when they have a pool of money, to spend it, whether they need it or not. So if a Federal employee can go in there, find this problem out, tell the agency head, he or she now can get up to \$20,000 of incentive pay. So we have incentivized fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government. That is great, and that is just good government.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we look at the United States Constitution,

and that is a document that our Founding Fathers gave us and is so important. Why is that so important with this bill? Because when that agency head goes to the President of the United States with this recommendation, the President of the United States has to come where? Back to the Congress, where he should have to come.

When Congress looks at that recommendation from the President, Congress then can make the final determination. So we have fiscal responsibility, we have constitutional sanctity, and we have good government.

Most of all, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We have Republicans and Democrats working together, the way the American people want us to do, to be fiscally responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this good government bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 378, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECIPIENTS OF WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2196) to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2196

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RECIPIENTS OF WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES.

Section 2302(b)(8)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “or to the Inspector” and all that follows through “such disclosures” and inserting “the Inspector General of an agency, a supervisor in the employee’s direct chain of command and up to and including the head of the employing agency, or to an employee designated by any of the aforementioned individuals for the purpose of receiving such disclosures”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 2196, a bill I introduced with Ranking Member CUMMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. FARENTHOLD from Texas earlier this year to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients.

Whistleblowers in the Federal Government should be able to tell their supervisors when something is wrong. That is true no matter what, but especially so in cases involving classified information, which implies a matter of national security.

If whistleblowers cannot make a protected disclosure to their supervisors, they are more likely to make an illegal disclosure to people or entities without the proper security clearances.

Under current law, whistleblowers in the intelligence community can make protected disclosures to their supervisors. However, whistleblowers dealing with classified information outside the intelligence community do not have that same protection.

Federal employees inside the intelligence community can blow the whistle to their supervisors, to the appropriate inspector general, and to Congress. Employees outside the intelligence community do not have those protections when it comes to classified information, and they have fewer options when it comes to blowing the whistle, except to put it in the hands of those who have no clearances.

Federal employees outside the intelligence community must be reassured that they can report wrongdoing to the appropriate people, including their supervisors. With this protection, whistleblowers will be less likely to disclose potentially sensitive information on waste, fraud, and abuse to the media, or other entities or individuals without the proper security clearance.

This bill allows whistleblowers to make protected disclosures of classified information to individuals within their chain of command. There are very few conceivable circumstances in which a whistleblower complaint to a supervisor would jeopardize national security, but such disclosures are not currently protected, as strange as that may seem.

There is no reasonable basis for concern about giving whistleblowers throughout the Federal Government

the right to contact those individuals about waste, fraud, or abuse of a classified nature. These additional protections will make it easier for these employees to do the responsible thing when it comes to classified disclosures.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Representative STEVE RUSSELL for introducing this bill, along with Oversight and Government Reform Committee Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and Representative STEPHEN LYNCH.

This bill would provide important protections to whistleblowers who handle classified information and want to report waste, fraud, and abuse.

Under this bill, an employee who is covered by the Whistleblower Protection Act could disclose to any supervisor in his or her direct chain of command classified information the employee reasonably believes shows wrongdoing.

Under current law, if a whistleblower discloses classified information, the whistleblower is protected only if he or she makes those disclosures to the Office of Special Counsel, an inspector general, the head of the whistleblower’s agency, or an employee designated by the head of the agency.

This bill would encourage employees who handle classified information to use proper channels to blow the whistle on waste, fraud, and abuse. Allowing employees to go to a supervisor with evidence of wrongdoing may be less intimidating than going to the agency head or an inspector general.

This bill is modeled on language in the Presidential Policy Directive issued in 2012. That directive, PPD 19, provided whistleblower protections to intelligence community employees who are not covered by the Whistleblower Protection Act.

□ 1530

This bill will provide a more consistent approach for employees who handle classified information by ensuring that employees who are covered by the Whistleblower Protection Act will blow that whistle to a supervisor, the same way that intelligence community employees who are covered by PPD 19 can do so.

This is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS, Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas, and Mr. LYNCH of Massachusetts for their great bipartisan support in this needed reform, and I urge my colleagues to support my bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2196, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALL CIRCUIT REVIEW ACT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2229) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2229

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "All Circuit Review Act".

SEC. 2. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD DECISIONS RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7703(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "During the 5-year period beginning on the effective date of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012, a petition" and inserting "A petition".

(b) DIRECTOR REVIEW.—Section 7703(d)(2) of such title is amended by striking "During the 5-year period beginning on the effective date of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012, this paragraph" and inserting "This paragraph".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 2229, the All Circuit Review Act, which Ranking Member CUMMINGS of Maryland and Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas introduced earlier this year. It is critical that we guarantee whistleblowers have access to fair and efficient reviews of their claims of retaliation.

Between 1982 and 2012, whistleblowers could only appeal retaliation rulings

made against them by the Merit Systems Protection Board, or the MSPB, to the Federal circuit. That monopoly led to the Federal circuit shaping key interpretations of whistleblower protection law without a check by any of the other circuit courts.

In 2012, to the wide acclaim of the whistleblower community, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act ended the Federal circuit court's monopoly over whistleblower retaliation appeals. The result, as expected, was better case law and more expeditious appeals.

As a pilot program, that expansion was set to expire 3 years after enactment. In 2014, Congress acted to extend the program until November of this year. Now, this highly effective program will expire next month unless it is renewed. The whistleblower community has benefited tremendously from the pilot program. There is no good argument against making this permanent.

Critics had feared that expanding jurisdiction over the MSPB appeals would lead to a torrent of cases for those circuits, swamping dockets across the Nation. Those fears have proved to be unfounded. Instead, the whistleblower community has benefited from other circuits having an opportunity to interpret Federal whistleblower case law.

H.R. 2229 makes the all circuit expansion permanent, ensuring the benefits of the pilot program continue. This bipartisan initiative will put the question of appeal jurisdiction for whistleblower retaliation cases to rest once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2017.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOWDY: I write with respect to H.R. 2229, the "All Circuit Review Act." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 2229 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 2229 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect

to H.R. 2229 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 2229.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, September 22, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2229, the All Circuit Review Act. As you noted, certain provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I appreciate your willingness to forego action on the bill in the interest of expediting this legislation for floor consideration. I agree that foregoing consideration of the bill in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or any similar legislation.

I will include a copy of our letter exchange on H.R. 2229 in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the All Circuit Review Act.

This week the House is considering several bills to strengthen protections for whistleblowers. This is a bipartisan bill introduced by Oversight and Government Reform Committee Ranking Member CUMMINGS and Representative BLAKE FARENTHOLD.

This bill would help level the playing field for whistleblowers by making permanent a pilot program that allows Federal whistleblowers to file appeals in courts where they work or live rather than in the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Federal circuit has a terrible track record on whistleblower cases. Allowing other courts around the country to hear whistleblower cases will provide a check on the monopoly the Federal circuit has held for many years.

The bill would also authorize the Office of Personnel Management to appeal a decision of the Merit Systems Protection Board to any appeals court with jurisdiction.

This bill was listed on the Project On Government Oversight's list of legislative reforms Congress should enact in 2017. Protecting whistleblowers is not a partisan issue. It is a patriotic issue. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), ranking member of the full Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I introduced the All Circuit Review Act, Mr. Speaker, to send a clear message to all Federal employees who blow the whistle on wrongdoing that we here in Congress have their backs.

This bill would give Federal employees who face retaliation for blowing the whistle a more equitable playing field when they challenge that retaliation in court. Under the bill, whistleblowers could file appeals in the jurisdictions where they work or live, rather than having to file appeals in the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. Whistleblowers who live outside of Washington, D.C., should have the same opportunities as those who live in Washington.

I want to thank Representative BLAKE FARENTHOLD for cosponsoring this bill with me. Representative FARENTHOLD has been a steadfast supporter of this basic due process right for Federal employees.

The bill we are considering today makes permanent a pilot provision that was included in the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act, which was signed into law in 2012. That pilot provision will expire in November if we do not send this bill to the President before then.

Without this bill, whistleblowers could appeal a decision of the Merit Systems Protection Board only to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The Federal circuit has historically been overly restrictive of whistleblower rights.

According to the Merit Systems Protection Board, 29 cases have been appealed to courts other than the Federal circuit since 2012. The Project On Government Oversight sent a letter to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on May 2, 2017, in strong support of this bill. Executive Director Danielle Brian wrote as follows: "The pilot program has been a success. It has not resulted in a flood of whistleblower appeals as opponents of the program asserted it would do, and it allows for potential circuit splits, which encourage sister circuits to review the laws and allows for possible Supreme Court review. It is working exactly as intended and should be made permanent before it expires in November 2017."

The bill was approved by the Oversight and Government Reform Committee without opposition in May. Two years ago, Congress approved an extension of the All Circuit Review Extension Act pilot program in 2014 without a single negative vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the whistleblower bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Chairman GOWDY for his support of this legislation, and for the hard work of Ranking Member CUMMINGS of Maryland and Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas for all that they have done to bring this needed bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2229.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2989) to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2989

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Born into slavery on the Eastern Shore of Maryland in 1818 and given the name Frederick Augustus Washington Bailey after his mother Harriet Bailey, Frederick Douglass has been called the father of the civil rights movement.

(2) Douglass rose through determination, brilliance, and eloquence to shape the American Nation. He was an abolitionist, human rights and women's rights activist, orator, author, journalist, publisher, and social reformer.

(3) Taught basic reading skills by his mistress until she was forced to stop, Douglass continued to teach himself to read and write and taught other slaves to read despite risks including death.

(4) During the course of his remarkable life Frederick Douglass escaped from slavery, became internationally renowned for his eloquence in the cause of liberty, and went on to serve the national government in several official capacities.

(5) Forced to leave the country to avoid arrest as an escaped slave, he returned to become a staunch advocate of the Union cause and helped recruit African-American troops for the Union Army, including two of his sons, Charles and Lewis Douglass. His per-

sonal relationship with Abraham Lincoln helped persuade the President to make emancipation a cause of the Civil War.

(6) With the abolition of slavery at the close of the Civil War, Douglass then turned his attention to the full integration of African-Americans into the political and economic life of the United States. Committed to freedom, Douglass dedicated his life to achieving justice for all Americans, in particular African-Americans, women, and minority groups. He envisioned America as an inclusive Nation strengthened by diversity and free of discrimination.

(7) Douglass served as an advisor to Presidents. Abraham Lincoln referred to him as the most meritorious man of the nineteenth century. Douglass was appointed to several offices. He served as the United States Marshal of the District of Columbia under Rutherford B. Hayes' administration; President James Garfield appointed Douglass the District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds. In 1889, President Benjamin Harrison appointed Frederick Douglass to be the United States minister to Haiti. He was also appointed by President Grant to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Commission of Inquiry to Santo Domingo.

(8) Douglass lived in the District of Columbia for 23 of his 57 years as a free man, and in recognition of his leadership and continuous fight for justice and freedom, his home, Cedar Hill, was established as a National Historic Site in Anacostia, in Southeast Washington, DC.

(9) The statue of Frederick Douglass in the United States Capitol is a gift from the almost 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia.

(10) All Americans could benefit from studying the life of Frederick Douglass, for Douglass dedicated his own life to ensuring freedom and equality for future generations of Americans. This Nation should ensure that his tireless struggle, transformative words, and inclusive vision of humanity continue to inspire and sustain us.

(11) The year 2018 marks the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Frederick Douglass, and a commission should be established to plan, develop, and carry out, and to recommend to Congress, programs and activities that are fitting and proper to celebrate that anniversary in a manner that appropriately honors Frederick Douglass.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission (referred to in this Act as the "Commission").

SEC. 4. DUTIES.

The Commission shall have the following duties:

(1) To plan, develop, and carry out programs and activities that are fitting and proper to honor Frederick Douglass on the occasion of the bicentennial anniversary of Douglass' birth.

(2) To recommend to Congress programs and activities that the Commission considers fitting and proper to honor Frederick Douglass on such occasion, and the entity or entities in the Federal Government that the Commission considers most appropriate to carry out such programs and activities.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 16 members appointed as follows:

(1) Two members, each of whom shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President.

(2) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed

by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Maryland.

(3) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of Massachusetts.

(4) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Governor of New York.

(5) One member, who shall be a qualified citizen described in subsection (b), appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) Three members, at least one of whom shall be a Member of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(7) Three members, at least one of whom shall be a Senator, appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

(8) Two members, at least one of whom shall be a Member of the House of Representatives, appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(9) Two members, at least one of whom shall be a Senator, appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) **QUALIFIED CITIZEN.**—A qualified citizen described in this subsection is a private citizen of the United States with—

(1) a demonstrated dedication to educating others about the importance of historical figures and events; and

(2) substantial knowledge and appreciation of Frederick Douglass.

(c) **TIME OF APPOINTMENT.**—Each initial appointment of a member of the Commission shall be made before the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP.**—If a member of the Commission was appointed to the Commission as a Member of Congress, and ceases to be a Member of Congress, that member may continue to serve on the Commission for not longer than the 30-day period beginning on the date that member ceases to be a Member of Congress.

(e) **TERMS.**—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(f) **VACANCIES.**—A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the powers of the Commission but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(g) **BASIC PAY.**—Members shall serve on the Commission without pay.

(h) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Each member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(i) **QUORUM.**—Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(j) **CHAIR.**—The Commission shall select a Chair from among the members of the Commission.

(k) **MEETINGS.**—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair. Periodically, the Commission shall hold a meeting in Rochester, New York.

SEC. 6. DIRECTOR AND STAFF.

(a) **DIRECTOR.**—The Commission may appoint and fix the pay of a Director and such additional personnel as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.**—

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The Director of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to

the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(2) **STAFF.**—The staff of the Commission shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

SEC. 7. POWERS.

(a) **HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.**—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(b) **POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.**—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action that the Commission is authorized to take by this Act.

(c) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable the Commission to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(d) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(f) **GIFTS.**—The Commission may solicit, accept, use, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or devises of money or other property for the purpose of carrying out its duties.

(g) **VOLUNTEER AND UNCOMPENSATED SERVICES.**—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Commission may accept and use voluntary and uncompensated services as the Commission determines necessary.

SEC. 8. REPORTS.

(a) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than August 1, 2018, the Commission shall submit to Congress an initial report containing its recommendations under section 4(2).

(b) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than June 1, 2019, the Commission shall submit a final report to Congress, and shall include in the final report—

(1) a summary of its activities and programs;

(2) a final accounting of the funds the Commission received and expended; and

(3) any other information that the Commission considers to be appropriate.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after submitting the final report pursuant to section 8(b).

SEC. 10. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No Federal funds are authorized or may be obligated to carry out this Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. **RUSSELL**) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. **NORTON**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 2989, the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission Act, introduced by Ms. **NORTON** of the District of Columbia and Mr. **HARRIS** earlier this year.

Next year will mark the 200th anniversary of the birth of Frederick Douglass, a man who has been called the father—and rightfully so—of the civil rights movement.

Douglass was born into slavery in Maryland around 1817 but escaped by the age of 21. Douglass went on to publish an autobiography documenting his life as a slave, called, “Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass,” while a fugitive slave.

Throughout his remarkable life, Douglass advocated for justice for all Americans, encouraging President Lincoln to make emancipation a cause of the Civil War, and advocating for the full integration of African Americans into political and economic life in the United States both during and following the war.

H.R. 2989 establishes the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission to recommend the best ways to celebrate the legacy of a man who dedicated his entire life to ensuring freedom and equality for all Americans.

H.R. 2989 would do this by creating a 16-member commission to plan, develop, and coordinate activities fitting and proper to honor Mr. Douglass. The commission will submit two reports to Congress with recommendations for activities, programs, and other important information. The commission will end 30 days after the submission of its final report.

The amended text considered today adds a new section clarifying that the commission will not receive additional authorized funds and will, instead, rely on private funds for its operations.

The commission presents an important opportunity to recognize and support Frederick Douglass’ leadership and body of work. He was a phenomenal man, and I am proud to also be a cosponsor of this important bill.

I would like to thank Ms. **NORTON**, Mr. **HARRIS**, and the 16 other cosponsors for their hard work on this bill in honor of Frederick Douglass.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. **NORTON**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the lead sponsor of this bill, Representative ANDY HARRIS, for working closely with me on the bill of which I am a cosponsor, and I want to thank my good friend Representative RUSSELL, who is managing on the other side, for also being a cosponsor of this bill.

My thanks also to Chairman TREY GOWDY, Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY for bringing this bill to the floor in time to begin the commemoration, in 2018, of the bicentennial of the birth of Frederick Douglass.

I am pleased that this bill has not only bipartisan, but bicameral support. Senators CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and BEN CARDIN have introduced the companion bill in the Senate.

□ 1545

The bill would establish a commission to plan and carry out programs and activities, as well as to recommend to Congress programs and activities that the Federal Government could undertake to honor and celebrate the life of Frederick Douglass during the bicentennial of his birth in 2018.

Frederick Douglass was born into slavery in 1818 on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. He learned basic reading skills from his mistress and continued to teach himself and other slaves to read and write despite the risks he faced, including death. After two attempts, Douglass successfully escaped to New York and went on to become this country's leading abolitionist and antislavery lecturer.

He served in several administrations, including as close adviser to President Abraham Lincoln, U.S. Marshal of the District of Columbia under President Rutherford B. Hayes, and District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds under President James Garfield. In 1889, President Benjamin Harris appointed Frederick Douglass to be the U.S. Minister to Haiti. He was later appointed by President Ulysses S. Grant to serve as secretary of the commission of Santo Domingo.

Douglass dedicated his life to achieving justice for all Americans. He lived in the District of Columbia for 23 of his 57 years as a free man, and his home at Cedar Hill is an official National Historic Site in southeast Washington, D.C. Every year, thousands of Americans and others visit Cedar Hill. The Frederick Douglass statue that stands in his honor in the United States Capitol is a gift from the nearly 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), who is the original cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the committee for promptly re-

porting H.R. 2989 to the floor for consideration.

I rise today in support of a bill I have cosponsored with Delegate NORTON, the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission Act. As we approach the 200th anniversary of Frederick Douglass' birth, I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

The purpose of this bill is more than just honoring the birth of one great civil rights leader. Its purpose is to recognize his lasting impact on American Government, culture, and values. Frederick Douglass' work stretched far beyond the fight for legal freedom into the equally important fight for social and cultural equality.

Born on Maryland's beautiful Eastern Shore, Douglass escaped slavery to become an author, abolitionist, and true American hero. Frederick Douglass is a model for the values that make our Nation great: equality, liberty, and a commitment to working hard and helping others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to honor Frederick Douglass and the resounding impact his work has had on modern American culture by passing this legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo all of the comments that we heard. It is important that all of us take time and pause to recognize the tremendous work that Frederick Douglass did not only in his life, but how he impacted the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2989, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSP MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3031) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for flexibility in making withdrawals from a Thrift Savings Plan account, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3031

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "TSP Modernization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN ACCOUNT WITHDRAWAL FLEXIBILITY.

(a) POST-SEPARATION PARTIAL WITHDRAWALS.—Section 8433(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "and who has not made a withdrawal under subsection (h)(1)(A) may make one withdrawal" and inserting "may make one or more withdrawals"; and

(B) by striking "as a single payment" and inserting "in the same manner as a single payment is made"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) Withdrawals under this subsection shall be subject to such other limitations or conditions as the Executive Director may prescribe by regulation."

(b) LIMITATION ON RETURN OF PAYMENT RELATING TO A CHANGE IN ELECTION.—Section 8433(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "except that in the case of an election to receive an annuity, a former employee or Member may not change an election under this section on or after the date on which an annuity contract is purchased to provide for the annuity elected by the former employee or Member" after "this subchapter"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "change an" and inserting "return a payment that was made pursuant to an"; and

(B) by striking "on or after" and all that follows through "the former employee or Member".

(c) ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC ANNUITY IN ABSENCE OF ELECTION.—Section 8433(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "(1) Notwithstanding" and inserting "Notwithstanding";

(2) by striking "this paragraph" and inserting "this subsection"; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

(d) ALLOWANCE OF MULTIPLE AGE-BASED IN-SERVICE WITHDRAWALS.—Section 8433(h) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by inserting "limitations or" before "conditions".

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 8432b(h)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 8433(d), or paragraph (1) or (2) of section 8433(h)" and inserting "subsection (d) or (f) of section 8433".

(f) REGULATIONS.—As soon as is practicable, as determined by the Executive Director of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, but not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Executive Director shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date on which the regulations prescribed under subsection (f) take effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3031, the TSP Modernization Act of 2017, introduced by Ranking Member CUMMINGS from Maryland and Mr. MEADOWS from North Carolina earlier this year.

Federal employees enrolled in the Federal Employees Retirement System—known as FERS—enjoy the benefits of a three-part retirement structure. Those are a defined benefit pension plan, Social Security, and a 401(k)-style defined contribution plan known as the Thrift Savings Plan, or TSP.

With its low administrative costs and simple design, the TSP is an ideal retirement vehicle. Participants can choose from a variety of investment options, including index funds designed to track the Standard & Poor's 500 Index, the Dow Jones U.S. Completion Total Stock Market Index, or a low-risk government securities investment fund.

Participants can also passively manage their investments by putting money into a Lifecycle Fund, which allows the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board to purchase a combination of investments based on the year the employee is expected to retire.

Employees have a lot of options when investing their TSP funds, but when it comes to withdrawing their funds, the options are much more limited. This is because current statutory rules preclude employees from taking multiple post-service partial withdrawals. Employees cannot request a partial withdrawal or annuity purchase after making a periodic payment withdrawal election.

Statutory rules also require the purchase of an annuity if a participant fails to make an election by age 70½. The rules also restrict an employee's ability to make multiple in-service, age-based withdrawals.

The Board conducted a study in 2013, which found that separated participants moved \$9 billion from the TSP fund to other, costlier institutions. Nearly one out of every three of these participants cited a desire for additional withdrawal flexibility.

The study also found that, among currently employed participants, the same ratio of participants requested additional withdrawal flexibility for age-based withdrawals to address life events that arise. This bill would afford those additional flexibilities to address those concerns.

The bill provides more control to Federal employees over their own re-

tirement by allowing for multiple post-separation partial withdrawals and in-service, age-based withdrawals. H.R. 3031 allows employees to change withdrawal elections as they grow older, and it allows the Board to avoid purchasing expensive annuities if a participant fails to make an election by age 70½.

This bill puts power and control in the hands of the employees that make our Federal Government run to make retirement decisions based on their personal situations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3031, the TSP Modernization Act of 2017.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, which would help modernize the Federal Government's Thrift Savings Plan by aligning it with current practices for private sector 401(k)s.

I thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS and Chairman MEADOWS for their work on this important, bipartisan bill that would give TSP participants more flexibility in making withdrawals from their accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3031, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who is the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3031, the TSP Modernization Act of 2017.

I thank the Government Operations Subcommittee chairman, Mr. MEADOWS, for working with me in a bipartisan manner on this commonsense, good government bill. I also thank the Oversight and Government Reform Committee chairman, Mr. GOWDY, for his support of this legislation.

Congressman MEADOWS and I introduced this legislation to make the Federal Government's Thrift Savings Plan more closely align with private sector best practices by allowing TSP participants more flexible withdrawal options.

In 2013, the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board found that employees who separated from Federal service transferred \$9 billion out of their TSP accounts to other financial institutions. TSP participants do this because private sector 401(k) plans provide more flexibility, and they wanted more options for withdrawing money in case they needed it.

A 2014 survey of TSP participants who withdrew funds showed that more

than 50 percent reported that they wanted more flexibility to withdraw funds to address life events.

Current law limits participants to only one withdrawal from their TSP accounts while in Federal service after reaching age 59½, and participants who make this type of age-based withdrawal cannot take another partial withdrawal once they separate from service. Similarly, participants who are separated from Federal service and who have not made a prior age-based withdrawal are restricted to making only one partial separation withdrawal.

H.R. 3031 would eliminate these restrictions and allow participants to make multiple age-based and post-separation withdrawals from TSP accounts. The bill also would allow participants to elect to combine partial withdrawals with an annuity. It also would eliminate automatic annuities as a default option in the absence of an election by participants.

By providing greater withdrawal flexibility, studies show that participants would be more likely to keep their assets in their TSP accounts. For example, a study issued by Vanguard in 2013 found that 50 percent more participants and assets remain in retirement plans when partial disbursements are allowed.

Providing more withdrawal options for Federal employees and retirees in the TSP may help their financial security since administrative fees for the TSP are much lower than fees charged by other financial institutions.

This legislation is supported by the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, the American Federation of Government Employees, and the National Treasury Employees Union.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Chairman GOWDY, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, and Chairman MEADOWS for their outstanding work in addressing the needs of Federal employees who give selfless public service to our Nation and should have this flexibility in their retirement planning.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3031, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

FITARA ENHANCEMENT ACT OF
2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3243) to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows

H.R. 3243

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF SUNSET RELATING TO TRANSPARENCY AND RISK MANAGEMENT OF MAJOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.

Subsection (c) of section 11302 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking the first paragraph (5).

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF SUNSET RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PORTFOLIO, PROGRAM, AND RESOURCE REVIEWS.

Section 11319 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking paragraph (6).

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF SUNSET RELATING TO FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INITIATIVE.

Subsection (e) of section 834 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 44 U.S.C. 3601 note) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2020”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of H.R. 3243, the FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017, introduced by Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ISSA, Ms. KELLY from Illinois, and Mr. MEADOWS earlier this year.

Today, the Federal Government spends more than \$90 billion on Federal IT, with approximately 75 percent of

this money spent on archaic and legacy IT. This means we are paying more for less: less capability and less security. Meanwhile, major Federal IT investments often result in multimillion-dollar cost overruns and delays.

This state of affairs led the Government Accountability Office to designate Federal IT acquisition and management as high risk in 2015, meaning this area is at high risk of waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement.

In 2014, Congress passed the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, otherwise known as FITARA, to address some of these IT challenges.

Congress has maintained a watchful eye to ensure agencies fully implement the requirements of FITARA and use it as a vital oversight tool. In fact, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has held five hearings on FITARA implementation.

The committee also created a FITARA scorecard to hold Federal agencies accountable for meeting FITARA requirements, some of which sunset in the near term.

This bill will help us facilitate Congress’ oversight efforts by extending key FITARA requirements to improve Federal IT.

For example, this bill extends requirements for agencies to publicly report schedule and cost information and to assess the risks of major IT investments. This bill also extends requirements for each agency to regularly assess its IT portfolio, look for opportunities to reduce duplication, and find savings.

Finally, the bill will help us continue to hold agencies accountable for consolidating and optimizing their data centers by extending these requirements—and GAO’s verification of these requirements—through 2020.

The GAO, which has been instrumental in assisting Congress oversee FITARA implementation, supports extending the FITARA sunset dates.

Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia and Mr. ISSA from California have been the key leaders on the original FITARA law, and they have come together again to sponsor this bill, along with Representatives MEADOWS and KELLY.

The FITARA Enhancement Act is truly a bipartisan effort in making sure Federal agencies get their information technology management and acquisition houses in order.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, DARRELL ISSA, the cosponsor of this bill and the cosponsor of the original FITARA; and my good friend from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for his able management today.

The Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, or FITARA, was enacted 3 years ago. It represented the first major reform of the laws governing the procurement and management of Federal IT since the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996.

FITARA is the framework for IT procurement and ensures the Federal Government is making smart and effective investments to modernize its IT, which is badly needed.

It has seven pillars:

First, it enhances CIO authorities, responsibilities, and accountability.

Second, it enhances transparency and improves risk management by requiring detailed information on investments to be published on the IT dashboard.

Third, we increased the frequency of portfolio reviews from annual to quarterly and included key decisionmakers from the agency and OMB to not only look for ways to increase efficiency, but to eliminate duplication.

Fourth, we built on the Federal data center consolidation effort to push agencies to realize big savings from this low-hanging fruit.

Fifth, people. Recognizing that Federal IT success is only as good as the people behind it, FITARA calls for expanding the training and use of IT professionals.

Sixth, FITARA seeks to maximize new tools like the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative, taking a page from the private sector to reduce duplicative spending on common purchases and off-the-shelf items.

Finally, FITARA advances a government software purchasing program to allow for purchasing licensing agreements that can be made available for use by all Federal agencies.

FITARA is a rubric for IT procurement that, hopefully, someday enables initiatives like the Modernizing Government Technology Act to build on our success of improving how the government acquires and modernizes IT.

When the stakeholders met on Federal IT from government agencies and industry, both Mr. ISSA and I constantly were reminded of why previous major IT reform efforts had fallen short of their potential: the lack of robust implementation plan and congressional oversight.

As Mr. RUSSELL indicated quite clearly, in that latter regard, we have robust oversight, and it will continue.

One of the things we had in FITARA were some sunset provisions, in the hope and expectation that, by having that, we would encourage cooperation and implementation. That cooperation and implementation is uneven throughout the Federal Government.

The GAO, or Government Accountability Office, recommended that we have this bill to extend those sunset provisions to buy a little bit more time to get with the program for those Federal agencies.

So that is what this bill does, but it builds on FITARA, which is the framework for IT procurement and modernization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), an original cosponsor of this bill and also the former chairman of the Government and Oversight Reform Committee.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, no one has ever had a better partner on a piece of legislation than I have had. The best way I can describe Mr. CONNOLLY is, like anyone else who came to a realization of something, he came to it with a great deal of zeal. This partnership, which began before the passage in 2014, to modernize a 1996 initiative that had fallen short, has been his passion and mine.

Normally, when you are chairman, people talk about what divides the committee. But nothing united us more than recognizing that over \$80 billion was being spent—and much of it needlessly. We don't achieve what we want to because there is never enough. Part of it is how we procure.

Prior to the passage of this legislation, it certainly was possible to have major pieces of procurement have somebody in charge who could not, in fact, change or drop the expenditure and who could not simply say: This isn't working. On top of that, often the people who did have the authority lacked the expertise. This has been true in all sorts of areas. There is much more work to be done.

Unlike Clinger-Cohen, which went on for 18 years before being updated, we were just 3 years past the implementation of this bill. With Congressman CONNOLLY's effort, we are coming back and making real changes—ones that can continue the process and speed it up.

Obviously, there are some areas like the IT dashboard and others that simply need to be continued to be renewed. This bill does it.

When I first talked to Mr. CONNOLLY, he was the best known for absolutely wanting to consolidate processing centers; consolidate these server farms that had proliferated. The number he had at the time turned out to be, although exorbitant, less than a quarter of the number we found. So there is more work to be done.

Procurement has to be done smart and is often consolidated. With the help of my colleague and Senator WARNER, the passage of the DATA Act allowed us to find, with greater detail, redundancy of expenditure.

So as we reauthorize FITARA, we also have the information to consolidate purchasing across vast numbers of agencies, eliminate redundancy, and, in fact, buy better. More needs to be done.

As Mr. CONNOLLY said so accurately, more money is spent on legacy systems than is spent on new systems that will actually save money and provide better services both to government workers and to the public.

So as we reauthorize the bill, I look forward to the oversight that the Oversight Committee has done and is able to do, and I look forward to continuing to work with my partner from Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 3243, the FITARA Enhancement Act.

FITARA is bipartisan legislation that has made significant strides in reforming government IT and making agencies more accountable. I thank Representative CONNOLLY for all his hard work on this bill, as well as my good friend who has just spoken, Mr. RUSSELL.

This bill would extend three provisions of FITARA that are set to expire. These provisions include the provision on Federal data center consolidation; transparency and risk management of major IT systems; and agencies' IT portfolio, program, and resource reviews, also known as PortfolioStat.

These provisions provide transparency and accountability for agencies and should be continued. GAO reports that if we allow these provisions to expire, we will miss out on major savings. IT spending makes up roughly \$100 billion of government spending each year. We cannot afford to allow this legislation that will save funds and help modernize IT assets to simply expire.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to strongly support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOWDY, Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia, and Mr. ISSA from California for this important and continued work that will not only improve IT and reduce duplication but will continue to save billions of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3243.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1629

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 452, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 3243, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

SPECIALIST JEFFREY L. WHITE, JR. POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 452) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

YEAS—418

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Burgess
Adams	Bishop (UT)	Bustos
Aderholt	Black	Butterfield
Aguilar	Blackburn	Byrne
Allen	Blum	Calvert
Amash	Blumenauer	Capuano
Amodei	Blunt Rochester	Carbajal
Arrington	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Babin	Bost	Carson (IN)
Bacon	Boyle, Brendan	Carter (GA)
Banks (IN)	F.	Carter (TX)
Barr	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Barragán	Brady (TX)	Castor (FL)
Barton	Brat	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Beatty	Brooks (IN)	Cheney
Bera	Brown (MD)	Chu, Judy
Bergman	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Beyer	Buchanan	Clark (MA)
Biggs	Buck	Clarke (NY)
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Clay
Bishop (GA)	Budd	Cleaver

Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Españlat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin

McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano

Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor

Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski

Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta
Bridenstine
Curbelo (FL)
Flores
Granger

Huffman
Kelly (PA)
Lawrence
Long
Marino

Meehan
Olson
Perry
Smucker
Thompson (CA)

□ 1654

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FITARA ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3243) to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]

YEAS—418

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguiar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr

Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)

Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat

Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Españlat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster

Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin

Rooney, Thomas J.	Shinkus	Vargas
Ros-Lehtinen	Shuster	Veasey
Rosen	Simpson	Vela
Roskam	Sinema	Velázquez
Ross	Sires	Visclosky
Rothfus	Slaughter	Wagner
Rouzer	Smith (MO)	Walberg
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NE)	Walden
Royce (CA)	Smith (NJ)	Walker
Ruiz	Smith (TX)	Walorski
Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Walters, Mimi
Rush	Soto	Walz
Russell	Speier	Wasserman
Rutherford	Stefanik	Schultz
Ryan (OH)	Stewart	Waters, Maxine
Sánchez	Stivers	Watson Coleman
Sanford	Suozzi	Weber (TX)
Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Webster (FL)
Scalise	Takano	Welch
Schakowsky	Taylor	Wenstrup
Schiff	Tenney	Westerman
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	Williams
Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (FL)
Schweikert	Thornberry	Wilson (SC)
Scott (VA)	Tiberi	Wittman
Scott, Austin	Tipton	Womack
Scott, David	Titus	Woodall
Sensenbrenner	Tonko	Yarmuth
Serrano	Torres	Yoder
Sessions	Trott	Yoho
Sewell (AL)	Tsongas	Young (AK)
Shea-Porter	Turner	Young (IA)
Sherman	Upton	Zeldin
	Valadao	

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Kelly (PA)	McCaul
Bridenstine	Knight	Meehan
Flores	Lawrence	Perry
Granger	Long	Smucker
Huffman	Marino	Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1702

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 562, and "yea" on rollcall No. 563.

LIMITING TO A CERTAIN DATE APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS OF SECTION 7 OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 81

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall apply to H. Con. Res. 81 not earlier than November 2, 2017, but on the same terms that would have adhered on October 13, 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REMEMBERING SERGEANT DUSTIN WRIGHT

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a Toombs County native. Twenty-nine-year-old Staff Sergeant Dustin Michael Wright was one of the three U.S. Army Green Beret soldiers killed in the line of duty last week.

The U.S. Africa Command says Dustin was part of a team assisting in advising local forces in southwest Niger at the time of the ambush.

A 2007 graduate from Toombs County High School, Dustin joined the Army soon after graduation, following in the footsteps of his parents and his brother. His family remembers him as a beloved jokester and was always making people laugh. He took great pride in serving the country, and I am so proud to see the Toombs County community coming together to paint the town red, white, and blue in honor of Dustin's life. Dustin was truly a hometown hero, and Toombs County will remember him often.

As Jesus said: "Greater love has no one than this, to lay down one's life for his friends."

Dustin sacrificed his life for his brothers and sisters in service to this great country. I will never forget our freedom fighter from Toombs County.

MaST COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL NAMED A 2017 BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize MaST Community Charter School, an incredible institution in my district that was just named a 2017 Blue Ribbon School of Excellence by the Department of Education.

MaST is a groundbreaking educational community that emphasizes collaborative, technology-driven, hands-on learning. They are preparing the next generation of American leaders and visionaries who will change the future in ways we can only imagine.

Blue Ribbon schools are characterized by the highest level of academic excellence and by their success in closing achievement gaps across student populations.

These elite institutions are a gold standard of instruction, inclusion, and innovation. MaST Community Charter School was one of only 342 schools across the country to earn this honor this year.

I want to congratulate the teachers, staff, administrators, parents, and students of the MaST Community Charter School on their remarkable and well-deserved achievement.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JESUS A. PERMUY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor my constituent, Jesus A. Permuy, for a lifetime of service to our south Florida community and to the cause of liberty in my native homeland of Cuba.

Like my family and me and so many others in my congressional district, Jesus was forced to flee Castro's brutal tyranny. Jesus embraced his new life here in the United States and became involved in numerous civic and community affairs while working to restore freedom and democracy in Cuba.

In 1976, Jesus secured accreditation for the Christian Democratic Movement of Cuba to speak before the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

For decades, Mr. Permuy has been involved in a number of human rights advocacy organizations denouncing the systemic repression brought upon the Cuban people by the evil Castro regime. Jesus founded the Center for Human Rights in Miami. He is a dedicated husband, a proud father of 8 children, and a grandfather of 11 grandchildren. Jesus is a shining example to us all.

Thank you, Jesus A. Permuy, for your service to our community and to my native Cuba.

REFUGES HAVE A TREMENDOUS IMPACT

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, each year, millions of Americans visit wildlife refuges throughout the country. They generate over \$2 billion in economic activity and create 35,000 jobs. This wouldn't be possible without help from dedicated and hardworking volunteers.

That is why we have introduced H.R. 3979, bipartisan legislation that reauthorizes the National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer, Community Partnership, and Education Program. This program ensures public access to refuges for exploring, hunting, fishing, and studying wildlife.

Refuges have a tremendous impact, even in Brooklyn, where Fish and Wildlife Service staff and volunteers work with local public schools to cultivate the next generation of conservationists and wildlife enthusiasts through hands-on learning.

Carmen Wheeler, a second grade student in Brooklyn, recently wrote to me and said: "I think we should keep the wildlife refugees safe, even if they are far away, because they will always keep our world healthier."

We are with you, Carmen.

GIVING TO CHARITY IS CRUCIAL

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to announce the introduction of the Universal Charitable Giving Act. Many Americans believe that people, not the government, offer the best solutions to solve the ailments that face our society. Strong families, strong churches, and strong communities are the foundations of our Nation. By supporting charities, we can make our communities and our country a better place for Americans from all walks of life.

Giving to charity is crucial for economic prosperity, happiness, and the success of our people, but for too long only the most wealthy have been incentivized to give to the causes they believe in.

The Universal Charitable Giving Act incentivizes charitable giving for low- and middle-income taxpayers. It would allow everyone to deduct charitable giving, regardless of itemizing status.

With tax reform, our aim is to increase take-home pay for middle America. With my bill, our goal is to increase support for all charities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the great work of our faith-based and charitable organizations by supporting this bill.

NAFTA RENEGOTIATIONS BEGIN

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week, the fourth round of NAFTA renegotiations will begin. President Trump will have an opportunity to deliver on his promise last year to get a better deal for American workers. I hope he does.

Our current trade deals are rigged in favor of the largest corporations in this country and against working people. In my home State of Rhode Island, we have lost 41,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA and the WTO took effect. That is more than half of the manufacturing jobs in my State. The folks who kept their jobs have seen their paychecks get smaller.

Rhode Islanders know, most importantly, that we need a trade deal that is fair; but they know that trade deals that we have now help powerful corporations, but they are killing American jobs, helping corporations outsource jobs at the expense of working people.

This week I am asking President Trump to demand a new NAFTA agreement that has strong labor and environmental protections, that end foreign tribunals that allow corporations to sue the U.S. Government and force taxpayers to pay the bill, that has bet-

ter Buy American requirements, that has strict protections against currency manipulation, that has strong rules of origin on manufactured goods, and that has provisions that bring down the cost of prescription drugs.

These are commonsense provisions that will empower American working families, and they should be included in any new trade agreement.

HOPE FOR TRAFFICKED VICTIMS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for years, Lynda could not bring herself to speak about her past turmoil and nightmares.

Lynda is finally telling about her tortured life. When she was 16, two neighborhood boys drugged and sexually assaulted her. Highly drugged, the boys convinced her to have sex for money just once. But it wasn't for just one time, Mr. Speaker. They set up online advertisements to sell her and other girls.

When one of the other girls tried to escape, they tied her to a chair and beat her up mercilessly. They mixed drugs into the food to maintain control over the girls. It was years before Lynda finally escaped her turmoil.

Today, the rape and torture still haunts Lynda, but she works every day to become a survivor. I recently introduced the Abolish Human Trafficking Act that provides grants to ensure that victims like Lynda get help and services, such as mental health counseling, legal aid, job training, things that they deserve from us. This will help trafficking victims put their broken lives back together.

Trafficking is a scourge, and we need to send a message to everyone that our kids are not for sale.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1715

WHITE HOUSE IMMIGRATION PRINCIPLES

(Ms. JAYAPAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the cruel immigration proposal unveiled by the White House this week. This proposal goes beyond some of the worst immigration bills. It demands billions more for border security, tightens asylum standards, cuts off legal immigration, and implements a faulty points-based system, undercutting our core values as a country and destroying our economy and our future.

Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of all immigrants to the United States are women

and children, and these policies will disproportionately hurt them. A points-based system eliminates family-based immigration, and it is insulting to the valuable contributions of women, especially.

Nearly 70 percent of all women immigrants with legal status obtained it through the family system, and many are stuck in visa backlogs waiting years and even decades to reunite with their families.

Mr. Speaker, immigration has never been just about immigration. It has always been about who we are as a country and what we are willing to stand up for. I believe the majority of my Republican colleagues want to pass the Dream Act, and I ask them to join us in rejecting these anti-immigrant poison pills and proposing real solutions that benefit the American people and unify our country.

RECOGNIZING JEREMY RICH, NEW YORK'S 2017 NATIONAL DISTINGUISHED PRINCIPAL

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeremy Rich, the principal at Barringer Road Elementary School in Ilion, a constituent of the 22nd Congressional District. For his stellar record of service, professionalism, and contributions to the educational process, Mr. Rich was named New York's 2017 National Distinguished Principal by the National Association of Elementary School Principals.

In 2013, Mr. Rich became the principal of Barringer Road Elementary. Since that day, he has arrived at school promptly at 6:30 a.m. each morning, bringing a positive attitude and inspirational words to each morning announcement.

Prior to his service at Barringer Road, Mr. Rich served as principal at the now-closed Remington Elementary School, where he was integral in facilitating the successful merger of the Mohawk and Ilion school districts.

During his time at Ilion Junior High School, he served as the principal, the dean of students, and an English teacher.

Mr. Rich's commitment to his role is unparalleled. Both teachers and parents alike describe Mr. Rich as comforting, helpful, and passionate. One teacher described him as a "superstar principal and a fantastic human being." Mr. Rich's record exemplifies his clear dedication to public education, his students, and our community.

Please join me today in congratulating this well-respected educator and beloved member of the 22nd District.

FOCUS ON THE PAIN THAT PEOPLE ARE SUFFERING

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say what the world is coming to and how much our friends, our neighbors in America have had to go through: the most recent tragedy and massacre in Las Vegas, and now the horrendous, unspeakable tragedy by fires in California. I offer my sympathy to my friends, MIKE and JARED, Congresspersons in California, and we look forward to working with them, and offer our sympathy for those who are lost, those who are missing.

I think it is important, as we have these natural disasters, that we really attentively work on the pain that people are suffering; that is on the back side of Puerto Rico, where there is no power, and we don't know the assessment of loss of life, there is no housing; from Florida to the U.S. Virgin Islands, where people are still waiting for relief, and the attention is not at the peak that it should. Then, in my own community, we are in desperate need of housing. We have senior citizens, after Hurricane Harvey, being dismissed and out of their homes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are looking for a new disaster supplemental food program. We have the okay from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We have the State of Texas ready to work with us, but we must make sure that our local officials realize that this is a disaster and an emergency and that they move forward quickly to serve the people who are hungry and who are in need.

So, Harris County, you need to move faster to use the Federal funds that we now have.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF TOM PETTY

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Gainesville's native son, Mr. Tom Petty.

Thomas Earl Petty was born on October 20, 1950, and, over a career that spanned five decades, collected 28 top 10 hits, the most of all time.

But his contribution cannot be measured in hits or awards. He wrote America's soundtrack. Tom Petty's story sounds familiar. He grew up in a small town, struggled, persisted, and then succeeded—a true American Dream story.

But it is not what he did; it is how he did it that strikes us. It is the honesty, wit, and sentimentality that made his music special. Every hit Tom Petty crafted became an anthem, each song a

score to the memorable moments of our lives. American life would be much diminished without his work.

Jefferson and Madison wrote our system. Twain wrote our story that described Early American folklore. Petty wrote our songs. The songbook of America is bigger and brighter because of him.

Rest in peace as you continue "Runnin' Down a Dream."

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we are here today because, almost 11 months ago, the American people voted to give Republicans control of unified government. They were tired of being crushed by rising healthcare costs due to ObamaCare. They wanted America's economy to prosper again. They wanted a secure border.

During the months that followed, Congress worked with President Trump to sign over 50 bills into law. On top of that, the House passed over 270 laws that now sit in the Senate awaiting action.

Despite this legislation, there is a unified voice that is loud and clear arriving daily from our base, saying, "Get something done." The reason for that call is because Americans continue to be crushed by government policies, something that is very evident. These are the same policies that drove them to vote for us in the first place.

Americans are scarred by the broken promises of the former administration. They could not keep their doctor, even though they were told by the former President they could. Their premiums did not go down \$2,500, and their exchanges did not work.

ObamaCare resulted in fewer options and increased costs for many Americans. Out-of-pocket costs continue to soar, with average deductibles for bronze plans topping \$6,000 in 2017.

Some States, like Arizona, faced premium increases of 116 percent; Oklahoma, 69 percent. Tennessee faced a 63 percent increase. And one-third of counties have only one insurer offering coverage on the exchange. Some entire States like Wyoming, right below me, South Carolina, Oklahoma, and Alaska only have one insurer.

Think about that. This trend is predicted to worsen, with half of American counties only having one insurer in 2018.

As we have come to almost 8 years with the ACA, or ObamaCare, we run a risk of thinking that it is normal. Our healthcare system was not perfect before. We are not making that case. But

ObamaCare made what was already bad even worse.

We cannot think of these stats as mere numbers. Americans are really suffering under this law. Just because Senate Majority Leader McCONNELL gave up on repealing ObamaCare in the Senate does not mean Americans will give Congress and Republicans a pass. We cannot and we must not give up on this important promise.

The burden of ObamaCare is only made worse by the lackluster growth of the economy in recent years. During the Obama administration years, the economy failed to grow even once at the historic goal of 3 percent a year, something we just saw in our last quarter.

Americans are as industrious and innovative as ever. Americans' work ethic is not the problem. It is our antiquated tax system that has been bogged down over the years by regulators and lobbyists.

Since our last major rewrite of the Tax Code 31 years ago, the same year that "Top Gun" was number one in the box office, 1986, our Tax Code has added over 35,000 pages. Think about that—35,000 pages. That is about three changes per day. Each page is another carve-out or a loophole for the well connected, leaving the rest of the economy behind.

Our companies are at a disadvantage internationally, as our tax rate stands at 35 percent, the highest, as we know now, in the industrialized world.

Families continue to be punished with a marriage penalty.

Our Tax Code should be a competitive advantage for our companies competing with the world. It should encourage innovators to push the boundaries and find success.

The call to get something done that we hear loud and clear from Americans is also coupled with a call to make sure that we are doing our very best to secure the border. Perhaps there is no more vocal call from the past year than to build that wall.

In 2016, the United States saw a surge in illegal border crossings, with 46,000 illegals apprehended in that October alone. This is both a fiscal and a security issue.

Border security is more than just the border, though. Visa overstays are responsible for up to 40 percent of illegal immigration. We need a solution, and we need an action to this problem if we are truly to secure the border.

To add to these problems, more than 100 sanctuary jurisdictions have enacted policies which restrict cooperation with ICE, allowing potentially dangerous illegal immigrant criminals to remain in our country.

I am confident that the American people will deliver their final grade on Republicans over the next 3 months simply based on the three issues, the three promises that I am speaking

about today: number one, continuing to work and replace and repeal ObamaCare; number two, reforming the Tax Code; and, number three, securing the border. In short, repeal, reform, secure; repeal, reform, secure. We need to fulfill these promises in the next 3 months. The urgency and the time is now.

As I said before, the status quo on these policies is literally crushing Americans, and this is why they elected Republicans. In fact, since 1913, when Republicans expanded, or when the House expanded the 387 Members to 435, this is the only time in history when back-to-back Congresses, the Americans have elected 240 or more Republicans, and it is time we did our job. We need to keep our promises to the American people.

I am pleased to be joined by members of the Republican Study Committee today to talk about the importance of keeping these promises. That is why it is my privilege to introduce one of our newer members from Kansas, Representative RON ESTES.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, after a decade of inadequate economic growth across America, there is new growing optimism that our economy is about to be set free again. Consumer confidence in the economy is the highest it has been since 2000. Why? I believe this is because the American people expect us to reform our broken Tax Code, and they are excited about it.

Our outdated and overly complex Tax Code has held our economy down for the past decade. It is time we fix this and empower working families in America.

Real tax reform will be the best way to help America climb up the economic ladder. A stronger economy will bring higher wages and better jobs. The goal is to make our Federal Code simple and to make it fair.

□ 1730

The Tax Code, as it is, only benefits the rich and well-connected who can hire an army of lawyers to protect their interests. This is why Republicans are looking to enact real reform for all Americans. The argument against tax reform is this: the plan is just a tax cut for the rich.

The reality is, this tax reform framework is focused on helping middle class families. The tax system is laid out by Republicans that allows low- and middle-income workers to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks in order to save for their children's college, for their retirement, or any other things that they want.

I implore my colleagues across the aisle to do what is right and help to fix our antiquated Tax Code.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ESTES. Perhaps no one

knows more and has had more experience than the chairman of our Judiciary Committee, a former immigration attorney who has spent years working on resolving these issues.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman organizing this hour of Special Order remarks, and your leadership on these three important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the importance of bolstering enforcement of existing immigration law and securing the border. The interior enforcement and border security are vital to enhancing public safety, keeping the door open to law-abiding immigrants, protecting our borders, and restoring the rule of law.

Under President Obama, interior enforcement deteriorated dramatically as his administration refused to enforce immigration laws, rewrote the law through executive action, and implemented policies that enabled millions of unlawful and criminal aliens to remain in the United States free from any possibility of removal.

The Obama administration's policies had—and continue to have—disturbing consequences. The rule of law was undermined as hundreds of thousands of Central American unaccompanied minors and families arrived at the southwest border during the Obama years and were released into the U.S. Too many Americans were killed or seriously harmed at the hands of aliens who joined gangs or committed crimes.

Fortunately, the Trump administration has begun to reverse the Obama administration's disastrous policies and is enforcing the law as written by Congress. President Trump has issued executive orders to strengthen interior enforcement and implement strong border security measures. The Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security are already executing these executive orders, and there have been quick results.

Illegal border crossings at the Southwest border dropped dramatically at the beginning of the Trump administration due, in large part, to consistent enforcement of the law and the strong message that the U.S. no longer tolerates illegal immigration.

However, illegal border crossings are rising again despite the best efforts of the Trump administration, demonstrating that the President should be granted additional, long-needed legislative tools. The House Judiciary Committee has been hard at work to improve our Nation's immigration laws and has already approved bills that are crucial to enable our country to gain control of our immigration system.

The Davis-Oliver Act is the keystone of our interior enforcement efforts and is named after Placer County Detective

Michael Davis, Jr., and Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver, two California law enforcement officers who were murdered by an unlawful immigrant in October 2014.

The bill improves the enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws to enhance public safety. Specifically, the Davis-Oliver Act provides tools to crack down on dangerous sanctuary city policies and contains much-needed changes to protect American communities from unlawful immigrants who commit crimes in the United States, or are gang members.

The Davis-Oliver Act also enhances national security by improving our Nation's first line of defense, the visa issuance process. It provides thorough screening of foreign nationals seeking to enter the United States in order to prevent terrorists from entering our country. The bill also ensures the rule of law and removes the ability of any President to unilaterally shut down immigration enforcement by granting States and localities the authority to voluntarily assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration law and to enforce their own immigration laws consistent with Federal practices.

The House Judiciary Committee has also approved several bills to reform the asylum and refugee programs to curtail rampant fraud, while ensuring that our Nation continues to be a safe haven for those persecuted around the world. The surge of Central American unaccompanied alien minors and family units seeking to enter the U.S. illegally at our southern border put a strain on manpower and resources. It also exposed loopholes in our Nation's immigration laws that are being exploited by smugglers and others seeking to game the system.

The Asylum Reform and Border Patrol Act makes a number of improvements to our Nation's laws to prevent fraud and abuse in the system and assure that asylum is reserved for those truly fleeing persecution in their home country.

Further, the Protection of Children Act makes sure that unaccompanied alien minors who make the dangerous journey to the United States are swiftly and safely returned home. For those who stay with a sponsor in the United States while awaiting their immigration hearing, the bill provides for greater transparency and safety to these minors to ensure that they are not inadvertently delivered into the hands of criminals or abusers.

The Refugee Program Integrity Restoration Act reforms the refugee program by curbing fraud and strengthening public safety and national security. It also provides State and local governments the power to decide if refugees are to be resettled within their communities and gives Congress, not the President, the authority to set the overall refugee ceiling for each year.

The House Judiciary Committee also plans to bring up a bill that protects jobs for citizens and legal workers, the Legal Workforce Act. This bill requires all U.S. employers to check the work eligibility of all future hires through the tried and tested E-Verify system. E-Verify quickly confirms 99 percent of work-eligible employees and takes less than 2 minutes to use.

Over 740,000 American employers currently use E-Verify, and 83 percent of America's employers support a mandatory electronic verification system. While many aspects of our Nation's immigration system need to be improved, including our guest worker program for American agriculture, we must strengthen the enforcement of our immigration laws. Immigration enforcement is crucial to maintain our sovereignty, to protect national security, and to restore the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Congress to take up the House Judiciary Committee's immigration enforcement bills soon.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and appreciate those powerful words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), a colleague and one of the sharpest, most intellectual Members of Congress.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if you were trying to do damage to the United States and you wanted to design a Tax Code that hindered economic growth, that diverted a lot of productive energy, that basically kept America from reaching its economic potential, you probably couldn't do much worse than designing the code that we have.

It is enormously complex—70,000 plus pages. I confess, there is no way I can do my own taxes, and I think that is true for millions and millions of Americans. There is a frustration with that, but it also costs massive amounts of money and diverts energy. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars that get diverted to complying with the Tax Code, and that is not optimal for economic growth.

It repels capital and incentivizes companies to relocate overseas and take jobs overseas. You see companies reincorporating in Ireland or Canada. That is because we have the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world. We are almost trying to send businesses overseas.

It doesn't allow middle class families to keep enough of the money they earn. If you look over the past decade or so, family income really hasn't risen by that much, yet the cost of living has gone up. So by taking more and more from taxes, it makes it harder for middle class families to make ends meet.

So reforming the Tax Code, doing a nice, big tax cut, I think is long over-

due. It would be a boon to our economy. You would have a simple system—no more 70,000 pages. Fill out your taxes on a postcard. That not only is more economically efficient, it gives people a lot of peace of mind to know they can do their taxes themselves. It is going to incentivize us to bring all of the trillions of dollars in overseas profits, and bring it back to the United States so that we can invest it here through our companies and create more jobs here.

It will make our American businesses more competitive. Our business tax system is outdated. It is uncompetitive. This, I think, will change a lot of that by having a competitive business tax rate, and I think that that will mean more economic growth.

So I think all that is pretty obvious to most people who look at this in a fair way. The question for us now is, we have to produce this bill. We have been talking about tax reform for a long time this year, and I think that is great, but it is time right now for us to produce this bill, debate it here in the House, pass it, and send it over to the United States Senate.

I am not encouraged when, given the urgency of this, we are going on a recess next week. The House is not going to be here. You are not going to have a tax bill marked up in the Ways and Means Committee or unveiled to the public. Members are not going to be debating that. I think it is time that we do that, and I think there should be a sense of urgency with that.

We have got to get our job done. I think the bill should have been passed by now, but let's get it done. Send it to the Senate. I don't think you would probably have very smart money to bet that the Senate is going to come through in the clutch. They haven't shown they can do that yet. But this is going to be a big question for them: Can you get anything done in the U.S. Senate? This is something that we know we need to do. It will be good for our economy.

All of the Republicans have said that our Tax Code is a disaster. So if we send them a good bill, this is going to be a major test. Can you apply the majority that the voters gave us? Can you honor your promises and do something good for taxpayers? I hope the answer is yes. But I think in this body we have got to be focusing on, let's put the Senate to the test. Let's draft, debate, and pass a strong, bold, tax cut and tax reform.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I always appreciate the contribution that the gentleman makes to the House and to the American people.

I could not agree more. For those who may be listening or watching, you may have seen, in the last few months, a heightened energy, or an urgency when it comes to calling out our part-

ners in the Senate to begin to move and to begin to act—not just on things like repealing the healthcare, ObamaCare, but also moving, getting ready to move, hopefully, on tax reform.

I know there has been some agreement on the framework, but, as the details continue to be more and more clear, we hope our colleagues on the Senate are ready to move quickly and swiftly for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), a brand-new Member who came in from a special election to replace OMB Director Mick Mulvaney when he took the position with President Trump's administration. He has gotten up to speed quickly and is a huge asset to the Republican Study Committee and to the House Republicans as a whole.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Republican Study Committee's three promises in 3 months' pledge to repeal ObamaCare, secure the border, and enable comprehensive tax reform.

I applaud RSC's Chairman Mike Walker for his leadership on this and on this initiative. On the promises to repeal and secure, the House has begun to deliver by passing the American Health Care Act and providing \$1.6 billion in border wall funding.

Tonight, I want to focus on the third promise: passing comprehensive tax reform. Our Nation's Tax Code affects every family, business, and worker and is a key driver behind America's economic competitiveness. Congress has not passed comprehensive tax reform since 1986. That is 31 years.

The average cost of a new house then in the United States was \$89,430. For a new Ford F-150 pickup truck, the average price was \$8,350. Mr. Speaker, it has been way too long before we have taken comprehensive tax reform into consideration.

Since then, the number of pages in the IRS code has increased by nearly 50,000 pages. The corporate tax rate is at 35 percent, which is the highest in the industrialized world. Ireland's, to give you an example, is 12 percent. This is inexcusable.

Congress took an important step forward last week through passing a budget resolution, and now it is time for the Senate to do their job on the budget so that we can deliver comprehensive tax reform for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, our tax reform plan is both profamily, and proworker. The typical American family will receive a \$4,000 pay raise under our plan and will turbocharge the economy through enabling gross domestic product growth to reach 3.2 percent minimum for the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the House leadership, Chairman BRADY, and all of the congressional Members to pass this fair and

simple tax reform package to make this country as great as it can be.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. As you see, three promises, 3 months; October, November, December, three promises, 3 months: repeal, reform, and secure. That is the promise from the Republican Study Committee, making up 157 members, 17 of the 20 chairmen.

□ 1745

Now it is in our ability to make sure this gets through the Senate and passed into law by the President. We can't force all that, but what we are committed to is doing our part and doing our job to get these pieces of legislation through regular order to the House for a vote to fulfill the promises that most of us ran on over the last several elections.

It is also a wonderful privilege tonight to introduce our House veterinarian—the gentleman can define that as he would need if we need a House veterinarian—but the great Representative from central Florida who does fine work in the House, Dr. TED YOHO.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the three promises, 3-month initiative that you have outlined here, and I think it is so important that we follow through with this.

I want to start with tax reform. Members can say: Why do we need tax reform? I think it is self-evident. Our Tax Code, as you heard, is the most burdensome in the world. It stifles economic growth, entrepreneurship, and it creates noncompliance. So we need to simplify it. We have told the American people we were going to do that if we get in charge.

I think the repeal of ObamaCare—and some people get offended if we call it ObamaCare, so I will refer to it as the Affordable Care Act. It has disrupted over 20 percent of our economy, and I think it is not affordable. We can talk to so many different people. I know our premiums went up \$11,000 since I have come to Congress. In fact, our policy got canceled when I came to Congress because of ObamaCare.

Then I think the third part of that is we promised the American people that we would repeal this in its entirety and fix healthcare so that people have access to healthcare, it is affordable, and that it is quality care is the part that gets left out.

Then I want to touch on border security. This is something that we have all run on. Any nation needs a secure border. A sovereign nation has to have a secure border, and they have to have control over their border. However, due to the failures of politicians past and present, the U.S. southern border, in particular, remains porous.

I applaud President Trump for releasing a set of principles which I fully endorse and his priorities that are focused on making our borders more secure. President Trump's consistent message calling for better enforcement of our immigration laws and improving border security is one of the main reasons he won the Presidency.

President Trump is sticking to his campaign promises, which is refreshing to see in Washington, D.C., these days, a town where too many times there is an aversion to making tough decisions in fear of how that will be viewed in the next election. So it is refreshing to see President Trump do what he said he was going to do.

Protecting our borders, ending sanctuary cities, and facilitating State and local cooperation in immigration enforcement are commonsense ideas that will protect national security, promote public safety, and deter future illegal immigration. We are hard at work on solving these problems of illegal immigration in the House.

Just three real quick facts:

From November 2013 to July 2014, officials apprehended 143 individuals listed on the U.S. terrorist watch list trying to cross the Mexican border and enter the U.S. illegally. So many times I hear people say that this is not true and that this does not happen, but we know better.

As of 2014, illegal immigrants were convicted and sentenced for about 13 percent of the crimes in the United States.

Then, lastly, border security should also focus on maritime domain. Our Coast Guard, a hardworking branch of our military service, has set a new record for cocaine seizures at sea for the second consecutive year, seizing more than 455,000 pounds of cocaine in 2017 that was destined for the homeland.

So I am proud to join the Republican Study Committee in recognizing the necessity of border security today.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative YOHO, and we appreciate the gentleman's work in the United States House.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most accomplished men, sometimes a person whom we refer to as "Governor" around here when it comes to political minds, is the gentleman from South Carolina, Representative MARK SANFORD. Week in and week out, he is a very diligent and great leader in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield to the fine gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would make two quick points on the importance of tax reform. One, I would refer to an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Wall Street Journal. What it talked about was the nexus between deficits and tax reform.

Oddly enough, if you look at the numbers here of late and if you look at the 2017 CBO report, what it shows is that, in fact, deficits are creeping up again. Last year's number is \$668 billion.

What they point to in this editorial was that a good part of the reason why deficits have escalated has been tied to anemic economic growth and that, unlike other recoveries that had been more robust in nature, the revenues had not come in as they have in past recoveries. As a consequence, deficits have exploded.

So if you care about the deficits—and I do, and I know that the gentleman from North Carolina does, and I know that other members of the RSC do. If you care about deficits, then you have got to do something about tax reform this year was, in essence, the premise of the editorial.

The other point I would make is this. In a capitalistic society, capital matters. In essence, it is a mathematical formula.

Savings drives investment, which drives productivity gain, which ultimately impacts standards of living or wages, which we talk about. There are only two ways of increasing or improving human productivity. One is with gray matter: you can build a better mousetrap because you have been well educated and you can think of something different. The other is with physical capital. One person with a bulldozer can move a lot more dirt than one person with a shovel.

Yet what we oftentimes forget in the debate on tax reform is how important it is that we encourage and, in essence, complement the efforts of those who are out there risking on a daily basis. So with that in mind, it is important that we have tax reform that includes people who are actually, again, building businesses.

Think about this: the top 25 percent of the earners out there pay 90 percent of the taxes; the top 10 percent pay 60 percent of the taxes.

Now, let's define that for just a second. If you are in the top 25 percent, that begins at \$77,000. If you are in the top 10 percent, you are at \$133,000.

Now, tell me this: When I talk to a truck driver and a schoolteacher at home, their combined income could be around \$100,000. Are they rich? I would say no. But they are out there making the kinds of risks that are necessary to the building of capital that was exactly what The Wall Street Journal talked about.

If we want to do something about deficits, and if we want to do something about capital formation that is so necessary to raising wages, then we have got to do something about this equation. It is important that those earners and those small-business people not be left out, as is the case right now. That is yet another reason why tax reform is so important this year.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SANFORD; I appreciate the gentleman's good words, experience, and knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of Congress as a whole, it is well past time to make sure that tax reform and tax relief gets across to the American people.

A lot of times we talk about classes. The truth is it is probably better terminology to talk about income levels, lower, middle and higher income levels. That is one of the reasons that we are pushing forward the Charitable Giving Act, which is something that impacts both the lower and middle income levels.

We believe that is something that needs to be connected to tax reform to make sure that those folks who come from a background of teachers and truck drivers as we just heard about, but also other areas of the middle class and maybe lower income levels, something that they have a way where they are able to make sure that every dollar and every sacrifice they give back to a charitable organization—whether it is a local church or whether it is to the United Way—to make sure that every dollar is counted.

This is something that has been going on way too long. As we know, there are 75,000 pages right now of IRS Tax Code regulations. If the IRS wants to come after a private citizen, the private citizen doesn't have much of a resource ability to fight back whether it is in the legal or whether it is extended wealth. This is a machine that has been building, and the bureaucracy has been growing well past time.

It is time to neuter the IRS. One of the ways we can do that is reducing it from seven tax brackets down to three. It was erroneously shared by somebody across the aisle recently that we are driving up the lowest bracket from 10 percent to 12 percent. The truth is this: we are condensing it right now to three tax brackets—35 percent, 25 percent, and 12 percent—and doubling the standard deduction from \$12,000 to \$24,000. This is something that we are looking forward to doing to benefit the American people.

We talk much in these Halls about bipartisan support or bipartisan this or that. When did it become an issue, when did it become a problem, and when did it become a point of contention to allow the American people to keep more of the money from the hard work they put in day in and day out, week in and week out? That is something that we must do. That is something that should not even be a place of argument or a place of debate when it comes back allowing these folks to continue.

For some, we can get past the tax credit language. We can move on beyond the charitable deductions and all the different political and accounting words. What about just the family of

four that needs another car, that needs to be able to afford a car payment to get a mom or a dad back and forth to work, or maybe a teenager in the house? We have been through that twice now. We had more claims than we probably should, but we get it. But also, maybe it is a few more times out to eat or to the movies, the things that make you want to get up every day and continue to pursue that American Dream.

But not only from the individual side of this—certainly very important—but what about this corporate tax rate, this business rate that we talk constantly about that almost has become Washington jargon talking points? Why is that so important?

Over the years since the 1930s and 1940s, our corporate business rate has climbed to the highest in the industrial world.

Why is that? Why would we make it tougher on our manufacturers and our companies to have a higher tax rate? What incentive is it to stay here? We could track company after company.

I come from the State of North Carolina where textiles and furniture used to be two of our top three job providers. A lot of those companies now you will find in Vietnam or other places.

That corporate tax rate that literally has gone through the roof, why wouldn't we want to reduce that business rate? Why wouldn't we want to incentivize companies to begin to bring those jobs back to the United States?

I think it is crucial, and I think it is something that all of us should have the energy and the ability to be able to get behind and really push forward.

We have been promising this for how long? Since 1986? I was a junior in high school. Thirty-one years this has been on the docket, and the moment is now for us to deliver. If it is not now, as Reagan used to say, then when? Then how?

What should we be doing if it is not fulfilling the very promise that we have made to the American people, and that is that we are going to provide genuine—not some kind of phony legislation, not some kind of showboat, but genuine tax reform and tax relief for the American people?

Now, you may hear sometimes that, hey, the Republican plan is only for the most wealthy. Let's look at the numbers. Let's put a little math equation up, if we could, please.

Let's say that the most wealthy—if you are talking about somebody who makes \$1 million, let's say we reduce their taxes by 1 percent. My math that I am doing here in my mind, that comes to about \$10,000.

Let's say, if you go to that middle-income family, two parents working as hard as they can, they are bringing about \$50,000 a year annually, yet their tax break, their tax benefit is 10 per-

cent. Now, math tells me that is only \$5,000 compared to the \$10,000.

So you may hear the spin from time to time, well, the wealthier are getting the higher tax break, the wealthier are getting the higher tax credit. Listen, when it comes to dollar for dollar, the impact that that makes to the middle and lower income families is drastic. I will tell you this. Every time we turn around, every time that each Member goes back and forth to his district, he is hearing the same message: "Get something done."

Tax reform is one of those areas where, specifically, we are being compelled, we are being urged, and we are being called. My fellow Members in the House, please hear those urgent voices right now. Even if Members want to move past the tax relief and the humanitarian component, is it not politically strategic for us to do what we have promised to do on behalf of the American people?

As I said in my opening, I am confident that the American people will deliver the final grade over the next 3 months. The 115th Congress, what kind of grade will we have over the next 3 months if we do not deliver on these three promises?

I am hoping that that urgency is resonating. Repealing and replacing, continuing to fight to repeal and replace ObamaCare, to make sure that we are continuing to reform and do everything that we can to reform the Tax Code. Finally, the promise that we have been making year after year is to make sure that we are protecting the American people by securing our border.

I understand that each of these items is a major legislative item in its own right. To be frank, we should have been delivering on them throughout the year. It is October, the 10th month of year. It is high past time. We only have such a busy agenda this late in the game because we haven't delivered on our promises.

□ 1800

I want to thank my colleagues and fellow Republican Study Committee members tonight for joining us this evening.

I would ask the American people to continue to support and continue to urge their Members of Congress to deliver on these promises.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REAUTHORIZE CHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, as a father, and as a grandfather, nothing I do is more important than ensuring every child in

Arizona and America has the opportunity to live up to their God-given potential. No matter where they live, kids deserve to grow up healthy, with every chance to succeed.

That is why it is beyond unacceptable that, for the first time ever, Congress missed the deadline to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program.

For decades, CHIP has been a bipartisan program and has been reauthorized with broad support, until now. It has now been 11 days since CHIP expired. This is an outrage for children across the Nation who depend on the affordable, quality care they receive, thanks to CHIP. It is especially troubling for Arizona.

Arizona has had the unfortunate distinction of being one of the worst States for healthcare access for children. Until last year, it was the only State in the entire Nation without an active Children's Health Insurance Program.

Arizona froze CHIP KidsCare program in 2010. At its height, the waiting list for coverage after the freeze topped 100,000. I repeat: the list topped 100,000 because of a freeze put on by the State of Arizona.

Two years ago, Congress reauthorized CHIP and included enhanced match rate funding for States under the Affordable Care Act. Thanks to advocates on the ground and with bipartisan support in our State legislature, this enhanced funding finally paved the way for our State to reopen KidsCare.

Last year, KidsCare began enrolling children—over 23,000 so far. We have just begun the hard work of educating and reaching out to the working families who qualify for coverage.

Arizona is one of a handful of States, as you can see here in this chart in blue, that would run out of Federal funds to cover children by December of this year, absent congressional action.

Families in these States are the most at risk for losing critical access to care, until Congress steps up to the plate and passes a robust reauthorization with enhanced rate funding.

I have met and heard from many of these families and their providers. I know what is at stake for them.

Cate Arnquist is a mother from Tucson, Arizona, whose 8-year-old son, Zachary, was approved for coverage through KidsCare last month. This is a huge relief to Cate, who recently moved to Arizona with her husband and works at a local elementary school. Cate said:

It's important for me to know that if I need to take him to the doctor, I will be able to take him. As a parent, your kids are always your biggest priority. I think every parent wants to make sure their kids are healthy.

Cate, I couldn't agree with you more. Kids like Zachary deserve to know that their elected officials here in Congress are looking out for them.

Graciela is a working single mom who lives in Phoenix. Her 17-year-old daughter, who suffers from high blood pressure, relies on KidsCare coverage. Graciela says:

I just pray and ask everybody who is behind CHIP to think about it. They don't know how hard it is sometimes when you are a parent and you don't know what to do. Should I put a plate of food on the table or should I take my kid to the doctor?

These are questions no parent in Arizona or in America should have to ask themselves. Doctors in our community agree.

A pediatrician practicing in Gilbert, Arizona, shared an important story with us about a family with five children in her practice. The father works as a grocer, but makes \$20 too much to qualify for Medicaid. That is \$20.

One of the children has significant developmental delays and another child has a serious neurological disease. After the youngest child was born, it became clear that he most likely had the neurological disease as well.

The doctor referred this child for evaluation, but the family was unable to take him to the neurologist because they could not afford the office visits and diagnostic testing necessary. Had KidsCare been open at the time, the family could have applied for coverage, since they qualified, based on their income.

This story and our experience in Arizona should be a cautionary tale for the rest of the States who may freeze their program if Congress fails to reauthorize CHIP now.

No family should be put at risk when they need help for their kids. Working families like these are doing their best to make ends meet and raise healthy kids.

Reauthorizing CHIP isn't just the right thing to do morally, but it is the smart, economic decision for our communities. I understood that when I was a Republican State legislator and fought for KidsCare, and I understand it now here in Congress.

We all know that when children have meaningful access to quality, affordable, comprehensive healthcare coverage, our schools, families, and our State's bottom line all win.

Healthy kids have a better shot in school and grow up to be healthy adults. When we invest in them, when we invest in their families, we are investing in their futures and our future.

We must do better. Instead of playing partisan games and spending time on bills that make coverage and affordability worse for Americans, we need to make CHIP reauthorization front and center of our focus.

While I am pleased that the Senate Finance Committee and the House Energy and Commerce Committee have started to take up action, it is past time to get a robust bill to the President's desk.

CHIP has long been a bipartisan program, and I will keep working with anyone, regardless of office or party, to make sure our kids have the care they deserve. They are counting on us. We cannot let them down.

I am pleased to be joined this evening by my colleagues who are committed to fighting for kids in our communities. I want to thank them for joining this Special Order hour to fight for CHIP and a strong reauthorization process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding and for his leadership in organizing this Special Order hour.

There is no more sacred responsibility that we have than to ensure that the children in this country have access to quality, affordable healthcare. So I rise this evening to speak in support of the vital Children's Health Insurance Program, also known as CHIP.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, CHIP authorization expired on September 30, 2017—this past September. This program assures that 9 million children, including 27,000 children and pregnant women in my home State of Rhode Island, are provided with low-cost health insurance, which covers essential services such as routine checkups, immunizations, doctor visits, prescriptions, dental and vision care, inpatient and outpatient hospital care, laboratory and x-ray services, and emergency services.

This historically bipartisan program has been successful in lowering the percentage of children who are uninsured from nearly 14 percent when it started in 1997 to 4.5 percent in 2015. Historic achievements.

If not extended by Congress soon, many States will no longer be able to fund the program and will begin limiting coverage, some as early as the end of this year.

In fact, the Kaiser Family Foundation recently concluded that, without an extension of CHIP, "States would face budget pressures, children would lose coverage, and implementation of program changes could result in increased costs and administrative burden for States as well as confusion for families."

If not extended by Congress soon, many States will no longer be able to fund the program and will begin limiting coverage.

Congress must also act with urgency to extend and reauthorize the other programs that were enacted in the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, including extending funding for community health centers; the Personal Responsibility Education Program; the rural and Medicare-dependent hospitals program; Teaching Health Centers; Maternal, Infant, and

Early Childhood Home Visiting Program; and the Special Diabetes Program for type 1 diabetes and for Indians.

These critical programs, as well as CHIP, are vital to the American healthcare system, and they support access to high-quality, affordable care.

I want to again thank the gentleman from Arizona for providing this Special Order. This is urgent and should be an urgent priority for the Congress of the United States to reauthorize this critical program to absolutely insist that children—as I said, 9 million children across this country—have access to quality, affordable healthcare, including 27,000 children and pregnant women in my home State.

Democrats are urging our Republican colleagues to reauthorize this bill immediately so that the families who are so anxious about whether or not they will continue to have the ability to access quality, affordable healthcare can rest comfortably and know that this work is done.

I thank the gentleman again for his leadership and for yielding to me on this very important issue.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for caring about our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a new low for this Congress to allow the critical and bipartisan Children's Health Insurance Program to expire. This program is 20 years old, and this has never happened, where we have allowed the basic safety net healthcare program for children to expire.

We hear over and over again, Mr. Speaker, you talk about the ne'er do well, lazy ones of our constituents who are poor and don't want to work. But, Mr. Speaker, these are children who are ineligible for work and unavailable to take care of themselves. We are destroying the health safety net for children.

But it is not that we haven't had time to extend CHIP. We have renamed post offices. We have renamed a highway. We have advanced the House budget reconciliation riddled with unpaid tax cuts for the wealthy, including the repeal of the estate tax, which alone would increase our deficit by \$269 billion by 2025. Mr. Speaker, that is billion with a B.

Are Republicans in this body trying to solve the budget crisis and our deficit problem by cutting CHIP?

I don't think so.

Even more, Mr. Speaker, last week, we spent a considerable amount of time debating the 20-week abortion ban. We heard passionate speeches about how important it was to preserve the life of fetuses. We spent all this time and speaker after speaker making emotional demands on this body that we

restrict women's body autonomy, but we spent no time reauthorizing the program for little Junior, once he crowns and is born—the basic healthcare that he needs immediately exiting the womb.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, simply put, it is hypocritical for you to say that life ends as soon as the umbilical cord is cut. And, Mr. Speaker, your actions prove it.

You know, I am of the mindset of one of our news reporters, Rachel Maddow, that we ought to just watch what you do and not what you say.

Almost 9 million children depend on CHIP for healthcare; 9 million children from low- to moderate-income families who will lose access to vaccinations, routine checkups, dental care, mental healthcare, prescriptions, and some of these children are profoundly disabled.

Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen to the 24 percent of the children enrolled in CHIP that have special healthcare needs, including asthma and learning disabilities?

The health of our children depends on this program, yet, Mr. Speaker, all you can do to muster up a reauthorization for CHIP is to fund it by increasing Medicare premiums—Medicare, a program designed for people over 65—and cutting the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

All you can do, Mr. Speaker, is to pit old people against our babies in order to provide basic healthcare to children. This sounds really Faustian, and it is unimaginable, yet this is the reality that we are working with.

Mr. Speaker, it is now time to put these politics aside and to reauthorize CHIP now for 5 years. This is a disgrace not only in this Nation, but internationally. I, as an American, don't want to be judged by putting our kids last.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I am kind of new to this body, but when I came here, I came with the same intention as I did when I first got into the Arizona State Legislature. One of the first issues I worked on was this program, a program that helped kids stay healthy, a program so that they could be successful at school, a program that is imperative. Yet, today, millions of people around this country, millions of families around this country are asking themselves: What are they going to do about my children's health? What is going to happen? Who is going to be there for my child?

When I was a police officer, I had, sadly, the ability to see people in poverty day in and day out, what it meant to their families, but especially what sick children look like, what it means to see children taken out of homes in ambulances instead of having prevent-

ative care, what it means for a child to have to be in a hospital instead of having had the ability to have preventative care, what it means to a child with disabilities to have to go through that process and not have the physical therapy that is needed.

This happened time and time again before CHIP became reality. I don't think America wants to go back there. I think America wants to move forward and make sure our children are healthy and able to withstand the issues in our society that lead us to make sure that they do.

I cannot understand, for the life of me, why we would keep these families—it is 11 days now. It is going to mean many more. We will have to find some level of agreement. Yet, as was just mentioned by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, we are funding this by taking money away from the elderly, from those also in need, from those also at risk.

I have to say that when I patrolled the streets of Chicago, I did so to make sure that people were saved and safe. And I can't believe that I have come to this body and found out that we are willing to keep these families waiting, we are willing to sit back and not understand the core issues of what it means to those families to have to suffer through this process of the unknown of their child's future healthcare.

I have to say that this is an issue that most Americans and most of this body agree to. I don't know why we have gone down this path of taking money—or thinking of taking money away from the elderly. It is wrong. But I do know that we should get this dealt with quickly and make sure the families in America that need it can provide for their children's health.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative LANGEVIN, the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate all his time and effort he is putting into bringing attention to this vital issue. It is an honor to join him this evening as we highlight the imminent need to pass a full reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Now, I represent the great State of Rhode Island, a State with over 27,000 children and pregnant women at risk of losing healthcare if CHIP is not fully funded. It is deeply troubling to me and many of my constituents, my colleagues in government; and we fought hard over the years to make sure that we did better by our young people, by the most vulnerable, and by pregnant women in making sure that they had the healthcare coverage that they desperately need and deserve.

Now, in Rhode Island, the lack of a reauthorization endangers \$26 million in Federal funds that support this vulnerable population, many of whom will

not otherwise have comprehensive coverage. This is particularly frustrating because congressional Republicans knew that CHIP funding would expire on September 30. They had ample time to fix this problem in a bipartisan way and have chosen not to.

Instead of proactively crafting legislation to ensure 9 million low-income children and families maintain access to affordable, high-quality healthcare, Republicans focused their efforts on gutting the Affordable Care Act to the exclusion of everything else.

Now, in the service of their political priority to eliminate coverage for 23 million, they are passing on an opportunity to govern on multiple healthcare fronts. Rather than work to find meaningful bipartisan solutions, Republicans still seek ways of systematically unraveling ACA protections and have only offered untenable options to offset the cost of CHIP. That is no way to govern responsibly or to even remotely do it in a bipartisan way, which they could do.

Now, their plan to pay for healthcare for one population by stripping access to healthcare from another is wrong. This approach of robbing Peter to pay Paul does nothing to build a foundation for a healthier future, nor does it protect the communities with sufficient healthcare access today.

Proposing to slash the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund and creating a greater financial burden on seniors by suggesting destructive Medicare changes are not acceptable ways to bring Democrats to the table and pass a CHIP reauthorization with bipartisan support. Which, by the way, I am sure my colleagues have mentioned as they were speaking tonight, when CHIP was first authorized, it was done collaboratively in a bipartisan way at a contentious time in Congress, back when it was first enacted. But they found a way to do the right thing for vulnerable individuals, particularly our children, and we need to come together again.

We have a responsibility to move quickly, to ensure our children continue to have access to high-quality, affordable coverage. States like Rhode Island deserve to know that we will support the efforts to provide for the children in the State. The health professionals who treat these children deserve more certainty. Most importantly, the children who benefit from CHIP deserve much better than to be threatened with coverage termination because my colleagues in the majority can't set aside their political ambitions and goals.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again thank my colleague for raising an alarm bell on this issue, calling attention and focusing the American people on the need to reauthorize CHIP.

We take great pride in Rhode Island that over the years we have built a

very strong program to cover vulnerable children and pregnant women. We have been leaders in the country in having a very low rate of uninsured. Going back even before the ACA was enacted, we had a model program with our Rite Care and Rite Share program. There were hard-fought battles that moved the ball forward for providing better and more responsible health coverage for the people who need it and deserve it the most.

We need to come together now in a bipartisan way to make sure that CHIP is reauthorized. We cannot let this program fail. We cannot fail our children, our most vulnerable populations. We can come together in a bipartisan way. Democrats stand ready to do just that, come together in a bipartisan way to reauthorize CHIP, just as it had been authorized in a bipartisan way when it was first created.

Now, I know that there are many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who care as passionately about covering low-income children, providing affordable healthcare, doing the right thing by our children, and I look forward to reaching out across the aisle to do just that. Let's do this in a bipartisan way. Let's do the right thing and put partisan politics aside and cover our children.

Mr. Speaker, I thank again Mr. O'HALLERAN for his leadership on this vital issue, and I look forward to continuing to work with him as we reauthorize CHIP, hopefully in the very near future. Again, we got to do this together.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island not only for his discussion today, but also for all his work on behalf of the children of America. I think that his record speaks for itself, and it is obvious that what we just heard came from his heart. So I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I asked my fellow colleagues, when they start to work on this bill again—hopefully, they do it in a speedy fashion—that when they wake up in the morning, they think of what it means to have their child potentially without healthcare, what it means to have the unknown that we don't know if next month or the month later they will lose that coverage because Congress has failed to address the issue that they have all agreed on for 20 years. We have to and we must find a way to come to agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, Mr. HIGGINS from Louisiana.

THE PLIGHT OF THE CITIZENS OF LOUISIANA IMPACTED BY HURRICANE HARVEY

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise unscripted to bring to the attention of the entire Nation the plight of the good citizens of Louisiana who were impacted by Hurricane Harvey last month. Beside me at this graph shows the rainfall, the water event of Hurricane Harvey as it impacted Texas and Louisiana.

□ 1830

As anyone can see, it was a tremendous water event, unprecedented rainfall, that overwhelmed any water management system. And, as anyone can see, the parishes of southwest Louisiana were impacted, as well as many counties in Texas, yet, as we discuss disaster relief, Louisiana is absent from our conversation. I point out, to all who would choose to witness, the State line of Louisiana, as defined by the Sabine River, and the impact of Hurricane Harvey.

Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Harvey did not recognize the artificial State boundaries that we have created as a Republic, nor should we as we provide disaster relief for our citizens. Just after Hurricane Harvey had impacted Texas and Louisiana, my office drafted a letter to the executive branch to a President that I admire and respect, advising him of the impact, and begging his expedited approval of the disaster status once the formal request had been submitted by our Governor.

Sometime later, just 2 weeks ago, that formal request was submitted by the Governor of our State. Just after that submission, my office drafted and submitted a second letter requesting expedited approval of disaster status for these citizens of Louisiana, who were clearly just as impacted by this storm as many citizens in Texas.

Tomorrow, we shall send a third letter, this time signed by the entire Louisiana delegation. I ask that the Nation recognize the plight of the people I represent. The good and patriotic citizens of southwest Louisiana are suffering.

I respect and admire my President, I support him, I have supported him since day one, and I support him still. But it is important that we, as representatives of we the people, communicate clearly our intent and our service.

I beg that the leaders of the executive branch level would witness this clear evidence of the need for disaster declaration of the parishes of southwest Louisiana. And I beg that this message is received with the spirit with which it is delivered, which is respectful, yet in determined service of the citizens whom I have sworn to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding these precious moments to me.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had some interesting days here, but, over the weekend, being back in Texas, I am hearing the cries from people all over east Texas. There is a small number that say: Hey, I am not making much, and I am getting a subsidy from the government, so I am okay on my healthcare, I am young, I have no health problems, and that is fine.

But over and over, there is a cry going out around America that says: We elected Republicans in the majority in the House and the majority in the Senate to help us with our healthcare—with really health insurance. Everybody can get healthcare. You can just go to the emergency room, whether you have money or not.

This is really more about health insurance. Some of us have not wanted health insurance to make our major decisions for us on our own healthcare. We haven't wanted the government to make major decisions on our healthcare, but both are making those decisions for people across the country today.

Unfortunately, there are people telling me they are paying \$8,000, \$10,000, \$12,000. I heard one for \$20,000 yesterday from Texas, \$20,000 for the family's insurance, and they have a \$12,000 deductible, and they can't afford either one. They expected help.

President Trump is not the Congress. He has pushed, shoved, cajoled, done everything he could to try to get Congress moving in the House after a back and forth, wailing, gnashing of teeth. We got a bill. It wasn't perfect by any stretch. But at least it would have given people relief from high premiums, most Americans. Hopefully, Republicans won't misrepresent the truth, as some did.

Actually, we know some people just flat lied about ObamaCare. People who said, "If you like your insurance, you can keep it," they knew it was a lie. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. They knew that was a lie.

And now the people are suffering the consequences of trusting people in government who lied to them. They were deceived. But even with all the deception, most of the time it appeared that a clear majority of Americans did not want what was fraudulently called the Affordable Care Act. There was nothing affordable about it, unless you didn't have any healthcare problems at all.

People who are carrying the weight of the taxes in this country have needed help. They counted on us to provide legislative changes, repeal of ObamaCare, let's put a system in place where people can make their own healthcare decisions, and we sent the bill to the Senate, and I still believe we should have been demanding more of the Senate every day.

I know there are a lot of people who say: Well, Republicans can't lose the majority in the Senate because there are a bunch more Democrats whose seats are up this time instead of Republicans. Yes, we can lose the majority, even when there are more Democratic seats up for election.

That is what happens when people are sorely disappointed. Many stay home, and the wrong people will get elected when too many people stay home.

But the adage is, still true, democracy ensures people are governed no better than they deserve. So whether anybody liked or disliked President Obama as our President—and, by the way, for those who like to throw out the term "hater," I don't hate anybody, but I can certainly disapprove of conduct.

For 8 years, America deserved Barack Hussein Obama. Before that, whether you like him or not, I like him, America deserved George W. Bush. Before that, America deserved 8 years of William Clinton—I forget his middle name. Before that, 4 years of George H. W. Bush. Before that, 8 years of Ronald Reagan. And I am very pleased that America deserved Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton last November.

It is interesting, though, being in hearings today and hear people clamoring that they demand action from this department, that department, it is taking too long, while, at that very moment, Democratic Senators at the other end of this building are doing everything they can to prevent confirmation of President Trump's appointees to those departments so they can start getting things done.

It is amazing when one party like that can hold the ability, because of the filibuster rule, because of the requirement for 60 votes, apparently, they are able to hold up these appointees. To me, that is all the reason to go ahead and say: Do you know what, you are demanding action from people who you have not confirmed yet, so we are not going to let you play that game anymore. You have people saying, "Oh, my goodness, these departments aren't getting decisions made, aren't getting their work done," and all the while you are holding them back from being able to do it by not confirming the people who need to be doing that work.

The Senate ought to just say: We are not playing that game, we are not letting you play that game, we are going to call the game off, we are going to get serious about America's problems, and we are going to confirm President Trump's nominees with 51 votes, not just judges, we are going to confirm his nominees with 51 votes. We cannot tolerate people—really it is fraudulent activity to hold back the nominees from being confirmed and then vilify the ad-

ministration for not getting the work done that those nominees who hadn't been confirmed will have to do.

The Senate needs to respond. The Senate did not respond to the bill we sent to them. That was quite interesting. In my 12 years here, I have never seen a situation like that, Mr. Speaker, where some of us got calls from people in the Senate who don't normally get calls, and that included people from the Tuesday Group, the Freedom Caucus, the Republican Study Committee, and the Republican leadership. They all were asking the same question: Okay, would you please promise us that if we pass this healthcare bill in the Senate that you will not take it up and pass it in the House? Because it is only if you guys promise us, the Republicans promise us, you won't pass the bill that we have down here—apparently, it was so bad—that we will let it go to committee, or you will amend it, but you just promise us you won't pass the bill if we pass it.

Well, as far as I know, everybody I talked to gave reassurance to the Senators who called them and said: No, we promise, we won't pass your bill, it is terrible, we won't, we can assure you.

Even with those assurances, just the effort to get something passed so that we can come together in a conference between House conferees and Senate conferees, just to come together for the chance—this bill that the Senate was taking up to have some skinny repeal, they called it, of ObamaCare, and at least some measure of change to the suffering that people are enduring right now, and they still couldn't get 51 votes, which is all they needed under the reconciliation process.

Even when they were assured: We promise you, we won't pass this bill, you will get another chance to vote, just help the process, let's get it to conference, so we can get some relief to the American people who are suffering, suffering so much that they would go so far as to give us the majority in the Senate after they have given us the majority in the House, and give us the White House as a Republican Party—incredible.

But the American people are still suffering. And the budget apparently does not provide for ObamaCare to be repealed and replaced under reconciliation for the next 12 months. So unless the Senate feels enough heat from the American people—the Republicans that is—they are not going to do anything about ObamaCare that they promise to repeal and replace.

□ 1845

Apparently, it is going to have to get pretty hot in the kitchen down in the Senate to get people down there worked up enough to finally give the American people the relief that the Senate Republicans promised.

Now, I don't like talking about this, despite what some may think. It is

much nicer to get along and go along, but people are suffering because we haven't kept our promise. The Senate couldn't pass anything that would get the American people some relief from all the suffering from ObamaCare.

For those who are not aware, yes, there were bailouts for the monopoly insurance companies. Some made record profits, and yet they are still, under ObamaCare, the way it was written, supposed to get bailouts.

So it appears pretty clear the design of ObamaCare was to make it fail. Apparently, people at the top of some of these insurance companies have not been smart enough to figure out that they signed their own death warrants when they embraced ObamaCare, but it appears it was designed to make people angry at the greedy, allegedly corrupt health insurance companies.

I don't think they are corrupt, but there sure was a lot of greed there between some of the pharmaceutical companies and the health insurance companies signing on. Some of them tried to say: Well, oh, but we needed to be at the table.

We are going: Not if you are on the menu you didn't want to be at the table.

I am sure the executives that have their golden parachutes leave the health insurance companies after 5, 6, 7 years with their incomes.

The design was the health insurance companies make a fortune, people's premiums kept going through the roof, deductibles kept going through the roof, bailouts were provided to insurance companies that had record profits, and then the design ultimately would be the American people getting so angry that they would lash out and say: Enough already. I never thought I would say this, but anything has got to be better than these insurance companies, the handful that are left, so let's just let the government take care of everything.

Then we get a system that is twice as bad as the VA for all Americans, so all Americans can suffer fairly, equally, instead of getting what used to be some of the best healthcare ever in the history of the world.

We have another issue I want to touch on. Our Taxed Enough Already Caucus had a meeting yesterday and heard from Luke Rosiak, who has done more investigation on the IT scandal here on Capitol Hill, apparently done more investigation than anybody at the FBI. We keep hearing rumors that the FBI is reporting there is nothing to this, kind of like the Clinton scandal, the money that the Clinton Foundation got from the stockholders of Uranium One—she approves the sale of 20, 25 percent of America's uranium production; it ends up going to the Russians—the email scandal, that obviously there were efforts to destroy and obfuscate evidence that was being

sought, and Comey went out of his way to protect Ms. Clinton. There is just so much there that needs to be investigated.

The Attorney General apparently can't investigate because of his own recusal. Mr. Rosenstein is sure not going to investigate it and thinks Mueller will do it.

Mueller is disqualified from doing it. Although he is such a problem, he will not disqualify himself. Comey is a material witness—should be—in the investigation.

As the Washingtonian reported back in 2013 in this long expose they did on glorifying Mr. Comey and Mr. Mueller's relationship, that Comey knows that basically, in essence, if the world were on fire, the one person who would be there with him, protecting him, standing with him, would be Mr. Mueller. Mueller cannot investigate anything in which Comey is a witness. He can't.

So what does he do? Comey goes and hires more lawyers. He has already had more lawyers than anybody I am aware of—ever. He is already exceeding the very general charge he got, going back years before he needed to. I mean, this is just incredible.

They were a problem 10 years ago. The Obama administration had 8 years to get into it. Mueller, as FBI Director, had plenty of time to get into it.

So there is only one thing we can be looking at, and that is a vendetta by Robert Mueller after some people. He is clearly disqualified. Comey is in it up to his eyeballs. We have got to have a special prosecutor that will look into the matters that should be investigated.

Then we have this issue on Capitol Hill. We need to know how compromised our computer system, our IT system on the Hill has been.

We had a guy named Imran Awan working on Capitol Hill, started working with Democrats' computer systems 12 years or so ago. He was not even an American citizen at the time.

Apparently, if there has ever been a background check on Imran Awan, it certainly was not adequate, because in the Imran Awan family and cohorts, you have got bankruptcy; you have got massive indebtedness; there was money received by one of the team, \$100,000 or so, from a known consort with Hezbollah.

Then we find out yesterday—or I did; I had not heard of this before—that Imran Awan, for parts of the year, would not even be here in Washington. He would be in Pakistan servicing up to dozens of our Democratic colleagues' computer systems from Pakistan, making the maximum that somebody working on Capitol Hill could be working for different Members of Congress, and then you add the partial salaries together until you get around \$160,000.

We heard yesterday that as he would get one person up to \$160,000 working

for different offices, then they would add another to the payroll and get them up to \$160,000. One of the group owed another individual \$100,000. So with no indication that that individual who was owed \$100,000 ever even came to Capitol Hill or did any work here, he got put on the House payroll and made a couple hundred thousand dollars in return for the hundred thousand that he had loaned to one of the Awan team.

It is just almost inconceivable that we would have someone working with some of the highest privileged material. It seems to me the courts made it clear the speech or debate privilege to protect constituent information, information that people provide to us as whistleblowers, that that is probably more constitutionally protected than the attorney-client privilege. It is that important.

Yet knowing there are countries, there are companies that would pay large amounts of money to know some Members of Congress' schedule, have access to all their emails, see what they are saying about different bills, what they want to do, that is some valuable stuff. And yet, in some years, we were told yesterday, that Imran Awan was servicing Capitol Hill computers from Pakistan.

Now, I don't know how secure the Pakistani internet systems are, but it is kind of hard to believe that the American interests would be as protected in Pakistan and the Capitol congressional computer system would be protected as it is going through the Pakistani internet to be serviced.

We also heard that Imran Awan, from some of the emails that WikiLeaks put out—we don't know if he worked for the Democratic National Committee when they were hacked, but we know there were emails where someone was saying: We need to get into the chairwoman's laptop. We need her password.

Oh, well, Imran Awan has all of her passwords, so check with him.

So we don't know the extent that he could have compromised things, with all the indebtedness he had and the car dealership that he never reported. Anybody that makes over \$120,000 from Capitol Hill has to report any outside income. He never reported those things.

In fact, it appears to be a crime when he failed to even report that he had his wife on the payroll making money on Capitol Hill in those financial disclosures he filed.

We also know that he had some history of violence complaints. His stepmother complained of being kidnapped by him and forced to sign documents that would turn over money and property that Imran's father supposedly had coming.

We know that he has now been indicted simply on a bank fraud charge for lying in order to get a bank loan, the money from which was sent overseas.

We also learned that they were sending technological equipment over to Pakistan. They were fraudulently filing vouchers showing that \$800 iPads only cost under \$500 so they wouldn't have to be listed on inventory. That obviously makes things more easy to steal.

There were reports, in fact, by the person who rented his house when he and his wife appeared to flee—he was trying to flee when he was stopped at the airport. There were hard drives, all kinds of things.

We know that he and possibly some of those working—maybe they didn't work. We don't know. But \$6 million to \$7 million was paid to him and his family and his cohorts during the time they were working here, and yet he was downloading from Members of Congress' clouds or from their own servers all of their information into a spot where people who weren't authorized could access those Members of Congress' accounts.

This has got to be investigated more thoroughly than it has been.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Soto) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, it is Hispanic Heritage Month, and I want to take this time to honor some great heroes in my district of Hispanic descent, who range from reporters to civil rights heroes, to community organizers, to businessmen and women, and I am just proud to be here tonight to be able to do that.

HONORING DANIEL BARAJAS

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, the first gentleman I want to talk about is Daniel Barajas, the executive director of the Young American Dreamers.

Daniel Barajas was born in Winter Haven, Florida, to a family of migrant workers. Growing up, he worked in the orange groves of Florida. There, he witnessed firsthand how farmworkers were exposed to dangerous pesticides while working for poverty wages. He also learned about the long-term effects of failed immigration policies, seeing his own father be deported during a local operation.

As a teenager, Daniel saw his friends join gangs to survive poverty and defend themselves against deeply rooted racism within their communities. He joined this path but was dubbed "Lucky" because he survived.

Barajas dropped out of school in the ninth grade but earned his GED in 2001. During an incarceration in 2009, he noticed that inmates had no access to

books or to reading glasses. It was then that Daniel founded the Library of Hope to collect books and reading glasses to donate to inmates.

Daniel's younger sister, Maria Isabel, founded the Young American Dreamers, YAD, in 2010 to help local immigrant youth. Maria Isabel passed away in a car accident, tragically, in 2012, and to honor her legacy, Daniel joined YAD and was voted executive director in 2013.

Barajas also continues to fundraise for annual scholarships to local students and participates in philanthropic events in the community.

Daniel now speaks at high schools across Polk County, talks to students about his life, and shows them that one is not defined by their past, and that breaking down barriers is possible.

He also closely works with the Polk County Supervisor of Elections Office to help register voters, increase voter turnout, and distribute clemency applications to help felons restore their civil rights.

Daniel is an example of one who could turn their life around and benefit the community as a whole, and he works with the Mexican Consulate in Orlando to do community workshops to teach immigrant families of their constitutional rights.

Thank you, Daniel, for your contributions.

HONORING ERICKA GOMEZ-TEJEDA

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next is Ericka Gomez-Tejeda with Vamos4PR, Florida chapter. She is the civic engagement coordinator at 32BJ SEIU.

Ericka Gomez-Tejeda came from Colombia to the United States with her mom when she was 8 years old. Moved by her lifelong commitment to her birth country, Ericka moved to Medellin, Colombia, in 2009 and began a master's in the theology.

Upon her return to the U.S. 2 years later, she moved to Florida and was elected vice president of SEIU Local 1199 United Health Care Workers East for the Florida nursing home division, representing 11,000 nursing home workers in the State.

In 2014, under the leadership of 32BJ President Hector Figueroa, Ericka returned to the Local 32BJ as deputy director of the 12,000-member New York City security division, leading the field of operation for the division's first citywide contracts.

In 2016, Ericka moved back to Florida and became the 32BJ civic engagement coordinator and organizer of Vamos4PR, Florida division. With 40 percent of the Orange County Public Schools community speaking primarily Spanish, Vamos4PR parents, teachers, students, and organizations successfully worked with the Orange County Public Schools to ensure English-learning parents get information, orientations, and translation.

The coalition is currently focusing on offering immediate lifesaving re-

sources to Puerto Rico and the cancellation of crippling debt, while working locally to open doors for the newly arrived Puerto Ricans to our region so they can use their knowledge and skills to integrate and contribute to the local economy and society from the day they arrive.

HONORING ESTEBAN GARCES

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to highlight Esteban Garces, Florida State director of Mi Familia Vota.

Esteban directs the Florida operation of Mi Familia Vota, managing strategy, operations, local policy development, campaigns, civic engagement, organizing efforts, and nonpartisan electoral work.

Esteban's career was set in motion at an early age as a victim of landlord abuse. Continued exposure to immigration, education, and racial injustices spurred his interest in social justice. He began his career in social justice organizing, and then electoral organizing.

He joined Mi Familia Vota in 2015 to continue working to create positive change. He was previously the immigration campaign director for SEIU Local 615.

HONORING FRANK LOPEZ

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Frank Lopez of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Central Florida.

Frank Lopez is the president of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando. Lopez is passionate about what he does, and nothing is more fulfilling to him than being part of a team with similar interests of an organization that is philanthropic and mission driven, and that values and pays tribute to those communities he serves.

Lopez has been successful in creating substantive underwriting support to develop and sustain innovative youth learning and entrepreneurship services. These programs have produced an impressive array of community-building benefits, such as workforce readiness and leadership development, youth entrepreneurship experimental training camps, mentoring and coaching programs, community-based technology, and wealth-building programs.

Lopez served as a member of the U.S. Hispanic Council on Federal Employment that advises the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management on strategies for improving access of Latinos to the Federal workforce.

Lopez has also served as a founding member of the National Hispanic Outreach Advisory Council, established by Intuit Corporation, focusing on diversity and inclusion, and expanding penetration of equitable tax filing practices within growing Latino communities across the country.

Lopez is also a former president and CEO of the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Foundation, developing

strategic services to Latino entrepreneurs from across the Nation.

Throughout his career, Frank has served several philanthropic and social service governing boards, most recently with SourceAmerica, an organization created by Congress that manages over \$2.5 billion in Federal employment-producing contracts administered locally by affiliated nonprofit agencies across the United States and Puerto Rico.

HONORING INGRID MORFA

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Ingrid Morfa, immigrant, attorney, and activist, a leader in immigration law in central Florida.

Ingrid Morfa is an attorney and first-generation American. Her parents migrated from the Dominican Republic in the 1970s.

As a mother of four, she is a firm believer that educating our community and helping those in need will make the United States a better place for her children and grandchildren for years to come.

Her studies at Harvard University, Barry University School of Law, Cambridge College in the U.K., Kaplan University, and the New York City of Technology College have equipped Ingrid Morfa to help those around her.

As a member of the National Caribbean Leadership Team and the Democratic Hispanic Caucus of Florida, an advocate for domestic violence prevention with Nuevo Sendero, and an attorney who assisted more than 2,000 naturalization applicants and dozens of green card applicants who are victims of domestic violence and crime at no cost, she has shown a devotion to the community that is only surpassed by her love that she has for her family.

HONORING JIMMY TORRES

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Jimmy Torres, community organizer and activist, and also a major member of the SEIU union.

Jimmy Torres Velez grew up in Puerto Rico, where he went to public school. After he finished his bachelor's degree in labor relations at the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus, he went to work with migrant families in southern New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Since then, he has worked for various unions in many States and in Puerto Rico. In those years he has held various positions, including trustee, secretary-treasurer, organizing director, and AFL-CIO State director.

As part of his work, he has created and developed relationships with various Puerto Rican communities. After years organizing public and private sector employees, Jimmy organized and managed the State legislative office for SEIU in Puerto Rico and co-operated with the establishment of the legislative coordinating body for the AARP as well.

After moving to Florida to help with retired members of the Service Em-

ployees International Union, he became an activist of the Puerto Rican community and Latino community overall.

To improve the Latino representation in our area, he organized and coordinated the Boricua Vota movement. This movement is a nonpartisan educational and mobilization tool to improve activism and civic engagement and participation of Puerto Ricans in the political process. Jimmy also organized and became president of the Puerto Rico Action Initiative.

To respond to Hurricane Irma, Jimmy has helped to organize a coordinated group called Aid, Support, and Help Coordinating Group, otherwise known as CASA. When Maria devastated the island, CASA galvanized enthusiasm and desire of the Puerto Rican community in central Florida to help their fellow compatriots—my fellow compatriots—on the island and has collected and has sent hundreds of thousands of dollars in goods and merchandise to Puerto Rico.

HONORING JORGE ESTEVEZ

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Jorge Estevez, WFTV news anchor and journalist in Orlando.

Jorge Estevez is an anchor for the evening newscast of Eyewitness News at 10 p.m. on WRDQ TV 27. He also anchors and reports newscasts on WFTV Channel 9.

Jorge first came to WFTV in 2001 and covered the attacks of 9/11 and how they impacted central Florida's tourism industry.

During the next 5 years as an anchor and reporter for WFTV and WRDQ, Jorge worked on major news affecting the various counties that make up our central Florida community. Jorge anchored several major local stories, including the severe hurricane season of 2004, during which several storms impacted the Orlando area.

Since his return to central Florida, Jorge has been sent to cover major stories. His most recent trip was to Atlanta, where he interviewed Ronny Ahmed, one of three students injured when a shooter stormed the campus of Florida State University in 2014 and started firing at random.

The son of Cuban immigrants, Jorge is from West New York, New Jersey, where he graduated from Rutgers University, like myself, with a dual degree in journalism and communication. Now he is glad to be back in central Florida, where he enjoys the change of seasons each year. He enjoys the warm weather because it gives him a chance to leave the gym to take his 5-mile runs outdoors, where he can really break a sweat.

Thank you, Jorge, for your contributions.

HONORING JOSEPHINE BALZAC, ESQUIRE

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Josephine Balzac, Esquire, attorney, writer, and professor

at Rollins College, specializing in environmental law.

Josephine M. Balzac is currently a visiting assistant professor in the Department of Business, teaching in the social entrepreneurship major. She has had the honor of being part of Rollins College since 2014.

Her greatest honor is receiving two teaching awards from the students: a student government association's Outstanding Faculty Award, and the Walter E. Barden Distinguished Teaching Award. Throughout each of her classes, she makes sure to engage with the local community by bringing her legal professionals and organizations as guest speakers.

Professor Balzac is a licensed attorney admitted to practice law in Florida and the U.S. District Court Middle District of Florida.

In May of 2017, the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, FAMU, College of Law presented her law office with the Distinguished Alumni Award and Professional Excellence Award, Solo Practitioner.

She is also a community rights staff attorney for the Center for Earth Jurisprudence.

During the summer, she is an adjunct law professor at Barry University School of Law, teaching sustainability in business.

Professor Balzac previously worked as an associate attorney at an AV-rated trial litigation firm and worked for a food safety regulatory consulting group.

Ms. Balzac is actively involved in the local community, frequently educating and advocating as an avid speaker on environmental justice, sustainable development, climate change, human rights, food, and social justice issues.

Thank you, Josephine, for your contributions.

HONORING LUIS PASTRANA

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Luis Pastrana, attorney, activist, and professional at Ana G. Mendez University.

Luis Pastrana was born in Puerto Rico. He received his bachelor's degree in business administration from the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus, while simultaneously being commissioned from the Army ROTC as a second lieutenant in the artillery branch.

He taught at the Puerto Rico Junior College of Dona Ana G. Mendez, and many years later came full circle and is now a distinguished professor at the Orlando campus of the Ana G. Mendez University system.

□ 1915

Luis served in the Army for 20 years. He was with the Vietnamese irregular forces as an adviser for 2 years in the mountains of Vietnam, as well as an adviser to the Spanish Army for a couple of years in Spain and in many other

parts of the globe. After retirement, he began to pursue law at the University of Puerto Rico.

He has worked in banking as vice president for investments of the Cooperative Bank, as a general manager for a newspaper in San Juan; he was a candidate for Mayor of Guaynabo, director of finances for the Popular Democratic Party, trial attorney and senior partner of the law firm Pastrana, Perez, Martinez and Quevedo, executive director of the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration for the Southeast of the United States, and now professor of law of the bachelor's degree in criminal justice for the Orlando campus of the Ana G. Mendez University. He published five books, all honoring his Puerto Rican roots.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Luis for his contributions.

HONORING NANCY ALVAREZ

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Nancy Alvarez. Nancy was part of the first Hispanic anchor team on an English language TV station in central Florida. Along with Jorge Estevez, her coanchor, she brought the 10 o'clock news on Channel 27 TV to number one for the first time in more than 10 years.

Alvarez joined the team at the ABC affiliate in May 2010 and currently coanchors Eyewitness News This Morning, alongside Jamie Homes. She is the daughter of Cuban immigrants and was born and raised in south Florida, although she considers Orlando a second home. Alvarez has spent most of her journalism career in central Florida, where she has been front and center for every major news event in the last 15-plus years.

She spent years covering the space program at Kennedy Space Center, and was also in central Florida for Hurricanes Charlie, Frances, and Jean, reporting nonstop during the now-infamous 2004 hurricane season.

In recent years, Alvarez was a central part of her station's coverage of the Pulse nightclub shooting tragedy and covered various stories during the community's journey toward healing. She was also on the air for continuous coverage of Hurricane Irma and traveled to Puerto Rico to report on the devastating impacts of Hurricane Maria.

Alvarez is also a graduate of Florida's Atlantic University, with degrees in communications and history. She has dedicated her career to giving a voice to people in need and using honest journalism as a tool for community service.

Alvarez, a mother of two who is married to a news photographer, has dedicated her life to honoring the sacrifices made by her parents when they came to the U.S. from Cuba. It is her hope that her life, career, and impact have made the hardships they have endured worth it.

HONORING ORLANDO ROLON

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Orlando Rolon. Orlando Rolon was born in Bayamon, Puerto Rico, and has lived in central Florida since 1977. After high school, he served in the United States Marines Reserves for 4 years.

In 1992, Orlando Rolon was hired by the Orlando Police Department. In 1997, Officer Rolon was promoted to sergeant, and, in 1999, he was selected as the first full-time bilingual public information officer in the history of the Orlando Police Department.

In 2003, Sergeant Rolon was promoted to lieutenant. He served as the liaison to the mayor and, during that time, was named adviser for Hispanic Affairs for the City of Orlando. In 2010, he was selected as the special operations traffic enforcement section commander.

In 2013, Lieutenant Rolon was promoted to the rank of captain. He served as a patrol division commander and the crisis negotiation team commander. Prior to his appointment as deputy chief, he was serving as the professional standards division commander, which included internal affairs, planning, fiscal, and training under his command. In 2013, he was named as one of the 25 Most Influential Hispanics in central Florida.

In 2014, Mayor Buddy Dyer appointed Captain Orlando Rolon to the rank of deputy chief.

In 2016, Deputy Chief Rolon was then assigned to patrol services bureau commander, with nearly 400 of the department's sworn staff officers under his command.

Deputy Chief Rolon is a graduate of the Southern Police Institute Command Officers Development Course, the FBI National Academy Session 263, and the Major Cities Chiefs Association Police Executive Leadership Institute IV session.

Deputy Chief Orlando Rolon is a member of the FBI National Academy Associates, Florida Police Chiefs Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Major Cities Chiefs Association, and the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chief Rolon for his contributions.

HONORING ROXY SANTIAGO

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Roxy Santiago, board of directors for the LGBT Center of Central Florida and board of the Pulse Foundation.

Roxy Santiago was born in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico, and has lived in Orlando for over 30 years. Roxy has worked for over 12 years at Walt Disney World in numerous management roles and had the privilege of being a personal tour guide for former Presidents and other high-profile individuals.

She was a partner with Phish Phest Entertainment for 10 years. The orga-

nization held dozens of events, raising more than \$150,000 for charity over the past decade.

Roxy was Tri-Chair Federal Club Steering Committee member for Human Rights Campaign, in 2006 through 2009; and in 2014 to present, she is currently serving on the Web Communications Steering Committee and Community Engagement.

In 2014, she was honored with being selected among 50 distinguished local LGBT leaders by entering her biography and accomplishments in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and here it is happening again.

In 2015, she became a member of the Democratic Hispanic Caucus of Central Florida and assists in their web communications. In 2015, Roxy also became a volunteer at the American Red Cross of Central Florida. In the aftermath of Pulse, she was hired by the Red Cross in the position of community partnership.

In 2016, she was selected by the National Human Rights Campaign, with 19 other women around the U.S., to attend a workshop for Women and Leadership: Equality for the 21st Century. In 2016, Roxy became a board member for the LGBT Center of Central Orlando and serves as their secretary on the board.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Roxy for her contributions.

HONORING TIRSO MORENO

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Tirso Moreno. Tirso was born in Mexico and came to this country in 1971, with his family to do farm work. He is currently the director of the Farmworker Association of Florida.

In 1982, he became the lead organizer for the Farmworker Project of the Office for Farm Ministry, during which time he and several other farmworkers initiated the Farmworker Association. Under his leadership as general coordinator, the association has grown from a local to statewide organization with over 10,000 members.

Tirso is a cofounder and board member of the Farmworker Health and Safety Institute and serves on the boards of Southern Partners Fund, Domestic Fair Trade Association, National Immigrant Farming Initiative, and the Rural Coalition. He also advocates for farmworkers' and immigrants' rights in national and international meetings.

The Farmworker Association of Florida currently has five offices throughout central and south Florida. The mission of FFAF is to build power among farmworker and rural, low-income communities to respond to and gain control over the social, political, economic, workplace, health, and environmental justice issues that impact their lives.

FFAF's core strategy is to help farmworkers realize their power to be

effective agents of social change and personal change by: validating and strengthening the experience and understanding of farmworkers; building farmworkers' capacity to participate in decisionmaking processes that affect their lives; and raising consciousness about and advocating for farmworkers' and immigrants' rights.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Tirso for his contributions.

HONORING WILLIAM DIAZ

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor William Diaz, Spanish radio host. Identified as a consistent community leader and insightful journalist, William Diaz's passion to help fellow citizens in life's struggles has been evidenced in the last 28 years of his residency in central Florida.

William's activism in favor of Latin-American political development has granted him daily recognition with most of the Latin-American community in central Florida who listen to him and read his articles.

A native of Cumana, and raised in Caracas, Venezuela, he developed a natural way to start friendships and show loyalty and support for all humanitarian causes.

William was the recipient of a scholarship that brought him to the United States to obtain his postgraduate diploma. In 1976, the University of Texas at Austin gave him a master's degree in mass communications.

William served as a Venezuelan diplomatic official in Europe, when he was designated as general coordinator of the GMA Foundation and the educational attache to the Venezuelan Embassy in Paris, France.

Founder and president of several community organizations in his native Venezuela, in 1989, William brought all of his experience to the U.S. Since then, he has been very active within the Latino community, specifically advising and counseling new nonprofit organizations.

At this time, William is full-time with his radio show, "Cara a Cara con William Diaz," which broadcasts in 18 different counties, founder of Casa de Venezuela, 15 years ago, which gathered most of the Venezuelans in central Florida, and founder of Made in Venezuela Business Club, dedicated to developing networking and promotions of products and services for Venezuelan businessmen and professionals, and current executive secretary of MUD Central Florida, the political organization that hosts and coordinates most of Venezuela's opposition political parties.

HONORING ZORAIDA RIOS-ANDINO

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to honor Zoraida Rios-Andino, president of Mission Boricua.

Zoraida Rios-Andino has been a resident of Orlando, Florida, for 17 years. She has been very active in promoting cultural, social, and historic events in

the Puerto Rican community. Zoraida is currently president and founder of Mission Boricua, an organization dedicated to history and civic engagement of the Puerto Rican community. Zoraida supervised the creation and promotion of Mission Boricua's outreach efforts.

Zoraida has been part of the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women, Orlando chapter; United Front 436, National Boricua Human Rights Network, Orlando chapter; and Asociacion Borinquena. She is currently a board member for Speak Up Florida, and a member and cofounder of The Justice Project Coalition of Central Florida.

In addition, she was an English as a second language instructor, and worked as a personnel administrator for many years. Zoraida was also program coordinator for ALSE, where she assisted hundreds of high school students pursuing postsecondary education.

Zoraida has also led the movement to have the Florida Legislature pass a law in 2014, to put a honorary plaque along Semoran Boulevard in recognition of Rico Piccard, the late civil rights hero in central Florida.

Zoraida has received numerous awards for her community service, like the Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women; Roberto Clemente Community Service Award; Latino History Society President's Award; Outstanding Membership Award from the Asociacion Borinquena; Community Service Award from the office of Congressman Alan Grayson; 2014 Florida State Proclamation recipient from State Representative Victor Torres; Coqui de Oro Award from La Casa de Puerto Rico; the Rico Piccard Award from the Orange County Democratic Party, and more.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Zoraida for her contributions to central Florida.

I am excited to be able to have this opportunity to talk about these heroes—so many who are symbolic of the hardworking Hispanic Americans in central Florida who help out with everyone from our poor, to our civil rights, to education, to the news, to politics, to our environment, to families, to so many important issues that matter to Hispanics across central Florida and across our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 12, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 4006. A bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BOST, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LONG, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LANCE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4007. A bill to revise the quorum requirement for the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4008. A bill making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 4009. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a central parking facility on National Zoological Park property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States and title 28, United States Code, to enhance compliance with requests for information pursuant to legislative power under Article I of the Constitution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 4011. A bill to amend chapter 329 of title 49, United States Code, relating to average fuel economy standards for automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CORREA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOHIO, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4012. A bill to require a National Intelligence Estimate on Iranian proxy forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 4013. A bill making appropriations for the Bureau of the Census for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 31, United States Code, to require publication of information relating to regulatory conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4015. A bill to improve the quality of proxy advisory firms for the protection of investors and the U.S. economy, and in the public interest, by fostering accountability, transparency, responsiveness, and competition in the proxy advisory firm industry; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 4016. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the recoupment of separation pay, special separation benefits, and voluntary separation incentive payments from members of the Armed Forces who subsequently receive disability compensation under laws administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs and to impose limitations on the authority of the Secretary of Defense to recoup such pay from members who subsequently receive military retired or retainer pay; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 4017. A bill to authorize the President to take actions to ensure Israel is prepared for all contingencies if Iran seeks to develop a nuclear weapon after expiration of certain provisions of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 4018. A bill to provide for a 3-day waiting period before a person may receive a handgun, with exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. LOVE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4019. A bill to provide grants to States and Indian tribes to reform their criminal justice system to encourage the replacement of the use of payment of secured money bail as a condition of pretrial release in criminal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4020. A bill to amend the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 relating to the distribution of food; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4021. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide funding for public transportation services offered by high-performing public and private systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 4022. A bill to implement a strategic approach for providing foreign assistance in order to end preventable child and maternal deaths globally within a generation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 4023. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States educational agencies and local educational agencies to support, develop, and implement formal and informal engineering education programs in elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4024. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and title 39, United States Code, to provide the United States Postal Service the authority to mail alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4025. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand to all firearms the requirement that Federal firearms licensees report sales of 2 or more handguns to the same unlicensed person within 5 consecutive business days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4026. A bill to take certain land located in San Diego County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Pala Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 4027. A bill to require global economic and political pressure to support diplomatic denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, including through the imposition of sanctions with respect to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and any enablers of the activities of that Government, and to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 567. A resolution expressing support for the physician assistant (PA) profession and the designation of the week of October 6 through 12, 2017, as "National PA Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 568. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the justices of the United States Supreme Court should make themselves subject to the existing and operative ethics guidelines set out in the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, or should promulgate their own code of conduct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 4006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of

availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithsonian donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 9; Article III, Section 1; and Article III, Section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority to over the federal courts. In addition, the Necessary and Proper Clause of Article I, section 8 grants Congress the authority to issue subpoenas incident to its legislative power and require compliance with such subpoenas.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 4011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, To Regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 4012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article 1 states "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 4016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 4017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to "provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 4018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, subsection 3:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1; and

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 4022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 4023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 4025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 4026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Ar-

ticle I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(2) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 4027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 80: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 140: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 166: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 173: Mr. CORREA, Mr. ALLEN, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 176: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 184: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 296: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 350: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 377: Mr. FASO, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 398: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 450: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 501: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 535: Mr. BUDD, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 545: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 664: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 681: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 750: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 785: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 795: Mr. WELCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 807: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 919: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 936: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 960: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 964: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1066: Mr. COFFMAN and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 1111: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1133: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1164: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1223: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1438: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1456: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1472: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1478: Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIRE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1494: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1542: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1552: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1555: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

- H.R. 1563: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1575: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1585: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1626: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1645: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1651: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1655: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1699: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1762: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1779: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1784: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1824: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1825: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1832: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1861: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1865: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 1874: Ms. NORTON and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1896: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1920: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1949: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1953: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1999: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2010: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 2044: Mr. NEAL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2069: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2095: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2121: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2226: Mr. COLE and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2228: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 2230: Mr. PAULSEN and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2282: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2285: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2294: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2295: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2310: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2401: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2418: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2465: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2482: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YODER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2499: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2501: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2589: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2623: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2690: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2740: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2777: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2793: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2801: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2841: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2851: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2856: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2862: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2901: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2902: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2909: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2920: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2938: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2954: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 3010: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3030: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3032: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3042: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3186: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3227: Mr. POCAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3255: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3273: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3274: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 3282: Mr. HURD.
H.R. 3307: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3349: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3352: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3363: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 3452: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 3487: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3497: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3520: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3591: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3596: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3632: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3671: Ms. DELAULO.
H.R. 3680: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3730: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3731: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3758: Mr. HECK, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 3762: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3784: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3820: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 3822: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 3832: Mr. LATTI, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BUCHSHON.
H.R. 3847: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3852: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3871: Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3875: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3879: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3885: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3889: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3897: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3898: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 3917: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3936: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3947: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3948: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3957: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3962: Mr. NADLER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3968: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3969: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3999: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BERA, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4001: Mr. KATKO.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. COSTA.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H. Res. 90: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H. Res. 129: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 142: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 257: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 283: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 327: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 529: Mr. DENT.
H. Res. 555: Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 560: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PALONE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING FALLEN KISSIMMEE
POLICE OFFICER MATTHEW BAX-
TER

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to recognize the life of fallen Kissimmee Police Officer Matthew Baxter, who passed away August 18, 2017. Matthew and his supervisor, Sergeant Sam Howard, were fatally wounded while responding to a shots-fired call in the northern area of Kissimmee. Both officers sacrificed their lives in the line of duty protecting a woman, whose own statement said, "without question," the two men were responsible for saving her life.

Matthew lived and served honorably, proving that no matter where you come from or where you are going, you can make a difference. Matthew was born in Baltimore, Maryland. Throughout his youth Matthew demonstrated his energetic personality and desire to be a role model in the community through his participation in athletics like basketball, football, and wrestling. His motto was "pursue the dreams closest to the heart and never giving up," led to his graduation from Jefferson High School in 2009, graduation from Valencia College with a degree in Criminal Justice, and his pursuit of a graduate program at Eastern Florida State College.

Matthew joined the police academy to give back and help his community. Through his participation in programs such as Big Brothers and Big Sisters, and through his role as a police officer, Matthew was able to mentor youth. Instilling in them his dedication to pursue a path of helping those around them for the betterment of the community.

Matthew's message of love, encouragement, strength, and community live on in every one of the people he touched in the community and with his family; which includes his wife, Sadia Baxter, and his four daughters Sariah, Isabella, Zarah, and Sofia. For those who put the wellbeing of others before their own, they will never be forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 10, 2017, I was unable to be in Washington and missed Roll Call votes No. 558, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post

Office, and No. 559, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes on both bills.

IN HONOR OF EVAN MALISSA
WILLIAMS

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Evan Malissa Williams on her retirement from the Presidio of Monterey. Ms. Williams leaves behind a distinguished career in public service.

Ms. Williams has worked for the Federal Government for 37 years, providing exceptional service to the Presidio of Monterey as a Contract Officer with Mission and Installation Contracting Command, Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, and Installation Management Command. As a Contract Officer, Ms. Williams established a pattern of consistent merit, and her hard work served as an example to others. She excelled in her responsibilities of independently planning, directing and executing many complex contract actions while executing her duties promptly and professionally. It has been Ms. Williams' duty to ensure compliance and continuity in the office, even extending her retirement date six months later than planned to help meet great contracting demands.

Through her rigorous and thorough monitoring of purchasing and coordination efforts, Ms. Williams ensured critical deadlines were met while providing excellent service. Ms. Williams held many key contracts, enabling many projects supporting our service members.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the duty, tireless efforts, and consummate professionalism of Ms. Evan Malissa Williams. I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Williams' outstanding service.

RECOGNIZING MS. DIONE BUONTO

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Dione Buonto, CEO of the Grand Strand Boys and Girls Club, for being selected to win the 2017 Maytag Dependable Leadership Award. As one of only 10 recipients of this award nationwide, Ms. Buonto is among the best of the best and is truly deserving of this recognition.

In order to receive this award, recipients must possess three key traits: dependability, reliability and leadership. Throughout her time at the Grand Strand Boys and Girls Club, Ms. Buonto has exemplified all of these traits and more.

To see why she is so deserving, look no further than the success of the Club and the youth that are a part of it. Under the direction and leadership of Ms. Buonto, the Grand Strand Boys and Girls Club has become an award-winning program for students, with a dozen Club graduates currently attending college on scholarships made possible by their involvement in the Club.

Ms. Buonto makes it her mission to invest in every student. She is a true credit to the youth she coaches and to the entire Grand Strand community. Because of her leadership and being honored with this award, the Grand Strand Boys and Girls Club will now have the opportunity to continue to invest in and change the lives of youth all across the Grand Strand. Congratulations to Dione, and I thank her for all she does.

HONORING FALLEN KISSIMMEE
POLICE SERGEANT SAM
HOWARD III

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to recognize the life of fallen Kissimmee Police Sergeant Sam Howard III, who passed away August 19, 2017. Sam and his fellow officer, Matthew Baxter, were fatally wounded on August 18, 2017, while responding to a shots-fired call in the northern area of Kissimmee. Both officers sacrificed their lives in the line of duty protecting a woman, whose own statement said, "without question," the two men were responsible for saving her life.

Sam was born on September 20, 1981, in Bartow, Florida. Raised in Central Florida, he graduated from Osceola High School in 2000. Shortly after graduating, Sam joined the Florida Army National Guard and served in Iraq from December 2003 to March 2005. Fulfilling a goal his wife, Billie Jo Howard, says was always on his mind; to serve and protect.

After his military service, Sam's desire to serve and protect led to his pursuit of joining the Kissimmee Police Department on January 22, 2007. Sam was a Detective Corporal, Street Crimes Corporal, Traffic Homicide Investigator, DUI Officer, Motors Officer, and S.W.A.T. Sniper. On July 7, 2017, his impressive work effort and dedication led to his promotion to the rank of Sergeant.

Sam's sense of duty also carried over to his responsibilities as a father and husband. Sam had always kept his promise to be a role

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

model and good father to his daughter, Unique. Through hard times and good, Sam always put Unique as his priority; as he would always attend her sporting events. Sam's wife would say "everyone should be blessed to have a father like Sam."

Sam was not only a leader of our community in Kissimmee, but he was also a good person and friend to those who knew him. Through Sam's passion for cars and athletics, his positivity brought joy to those around him. As a leader, Sam only wanted what was best for the community, and to make sure the people knew he was there to help those in need. For those who guard over us are our fellow brothers and sisters, who give their hearts to the communities they serve.

**HON. SAM OLENS TO BE INVESTED
AS THE FOURTH PRESIDENT OF
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY**

HON. BARRY LOUDERMILK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 19, the Honorable Sam Olens will be invested as the fourth President of Kennesaw State University in my home state of Georgia. I congratulate my friend Sam, the University, and the Kennesaw State community on this historic day. KSU, as it is known, has been at the forefront of educational opportunities for students across Georgia and has grown to be the third largest institution of higher learning in the state. With an enrollment of nearly 40,000 students, it represents one of the most geographically and culturally diverse institutions in the region and I am proud to have this school in my district, and to recognize this historic moment.

Before joining Kennesaw State, Sam served as Georgia's 53rd Attorney General, Vice President of the National Association of Attorneys General, and Chairman of the Cobb County Board of Commissioners. He received his juris doctorate from Emory University School of Law, and holds a Bachelors and Masters degree from American University in International Politics.

As Dr. Olens and the University look to the future, I wish them continued success in their efforts on behalf of KSU students and faculty, the Kennesaw community, and the state of Georgia.

THE CRISIS IN ROHINGYA

HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my profound concern about renewed violence in the Western Myanmar State of Rakhine and the resulting refugee and humanitarian crisis.

The growing violence in Myanmar's Rakhine State has already claimed the lives of 1,000 men, women and children who were brutally

killed in recent clashes between the Myanmar military and Rohingya civilians. The military has also reportedly targeted some of the alleged survivors who sought justice and protection within Myanmar, leaving little recourse for those being victimized but to flee the country to neighboring Bangladesh.

Rohingya Muslims have long been victims of official discrimination, living as a stateless minority community under restrictive citizenship laws and constant threat of abuse and violence. The government of Myanmar must begin taking concrete steps to stop the downward spiral of sectarian violence, which imperils the safety of upwards of a million Rohingya Muslims.

More than half a million Rohingya have fled Myanmar since major clashes occurred on August 25, 2017. Using satellite imagery, Human Rights Watch has documented more than 700 buildings in the Rohingya Muslim village of Chein Khar Li have been burned, accounting for more than 99 percent of the village. An additional 450 buildings were recently spotted smoldering in Maungdaw, the administrative capital of Maungdaw Township. This destruction suggests a coordinated effort to drive the Rohingya population out of the country.

There are divergent reports regarding who is to blame for the chaos in Western Myanmar. Refugees blame the Myanmar military while the government blames the militant Arkan Rohingya Salvation Army (ARSA). For this reason, it is imperative that the government permit entry of a U.N. Human Rights Commission Fact Finding Mission to impartially document and assess the violence occurring in Rakhine State.

Timely and accurate information about the crisis is especially crucial in this conflict because Myanmar has cracked down on the media, using all the draconian tools at its disposal to keep criticism hidden from public view. The government has actually prosecuted scores of individuals under an egregious defamation law that has criminalized social media postings that merely express the plight of the Rohingya people. The international human rights community has criticized Myanmar's Telecommunications Law for its vagueness, its severity of punishment, and its sweeping chilling effect on freedom of expression.

The government of Myanmar should begin adopting the recommendations of the Kofi Annan Foundation Advisory Commission on Rakhine State contained in the August 2017 Final Report, which was released the day before violence in the region erupted. These recommendations include providing dignified living conditions in camps for internally displaced persons and granting national and international humanitarian groups full access to the communities of Rakhine State. The continuing censorship of the media suggests that the government does not want the world to witness the crimes that are being perpetrated in the Rakhine State.

It is my hope that Myanmar will begin taking substantial and sustained steps to prevent any further violence in Rakhine State. I urge my colleagues to join me in calling on Myanmar to take meaningful action to desegregate the Rohingya Muslim population, repeal its repressive criminal defamation law, and permit human rights observers access to monitor the situation.

**MEDICAL ADVOCACY AND
OUTREACH**

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to recognize Medical Advocacy and Outreach (MAO) for 30 years of dedicated service to the rural and underserved communities of Alabama. MAO, formerly known as Medical AIDS Outreach and Montgomery AIDS Outreach, is a private, non-profit, Rural Health and Wellness Organization and Community Based AIDS Service Organization in Montgomery, Alabama. It was founded in 1987 by a group of volunteers who were both directly and indirectly affected by HIV/AIDS.

In 1994, after being awarded Ryan White Care Act Part C funds, MAO transitioned from a volunteer education and service organization to a full-time, health care facility. Because of the hard work of many working together on the local, state and federal level over the years, MAO now operates the largest HIV-specific health care facility by geographic area within the state of Alabama, the Copeland Care Clinic. I am inspired by the small group of volunteers, many who are still involved and supportive today, who have been responsible for the growth of this organization over the past 30 years. Today, MAO provides education services to members of the community and medical and social services to those living with and affected by HIV/AIDS, Hepatitis C, and Diabetes. MAO and the Copeland Clinic currently provide services to over 1600 patients who live in Montgomery and 28 surrounding counties in Southeast Alabama.

In addition, MAO provides an array of comprehensive services and care for individuals living with HIV/AIDS, including: medication assistance, pharmacist consultations, housing services, an on-site food pantry, mental health counseling/case management, patient education, prevention education, free HIV and Hepatitis C testing, PrEP and interpretation services for Spanish-speaking individuals and the hearing impaired. Through their Telehealth Resource Center, they assist other providers with the integration of telemedicine technology into patient-centered environments in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, New York, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

In addition to providing direct health care services, MAO educates the public about HIV/AIDS and related illnesses and how to prevent transmission of infection. To this end, the organization has made significant progress in educating the public on the reality that a person living with HIV who has an undetectable viral load cannot transmit the virus to their partners. This is why the staff at MAO also works so hard to ensure that individuals living with HIV receive regular treatment. As a matter of fact, MAO has a new initiative called "Zero by 2020." The targeted goal is to have no new HIV diagnoses in Lowndes County, Alabama in the year 2020. I truly believe this can be done if we support organizations like MAO that provide free testing and educate citizens on the importance of getting regular health screenings.

MAO has two full service health and wellness clinics in Montgomery and Dothan where specialty care and related primary and dental care is provided to individuals living with HIV, Hepatitis C, and Diabetes. In addition to these full service facilities, MAO operates 10 rural telemedicine sites throughout Alabama in the following locations: Marengo County; Lowndes County; Dallas County; Perry County; Barbour County; Escambia County; Conecuh County; Covington County; Henry County; and Pike County. As the Member of Congress that represents the Black Belt, I am honored to be able to work with MAO and other partners in their work to provide health care services to rural populations through telemedicine.

The services that MAO provides have grown to include a licensed professional counselor, mental health counselling and assessments, including for substance abuse and addiction, social services, and maternal and infant services. MAO collaborates with three area substance abuse treatment centers to provide prevention education to recovering addicts. MAO also houses the Alabama AIDS Education and Training Center (AETC), a continuing education program serving healthcare providers and professionals statewide.

The board, staff, and community partners with MAO work every day to fulfill their vision, which is to eradicate HIV/AIDS and other diseases that impact our most vulnerable neighbors. The progress this organization has made in 30 years demonstrates what can be accomplished when dedicated and committed individuals work together for substantive change. I am proud to be the Member of Congress that represents MAO. The reality is that all individuals living with HIV/AIDS and related illnesses deserve to live a healthy life filled with dignity and respect. Thanks to MAO, countless lives have been touched and saved by their work.

KEITH SWERDFEGER TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Keith Swerdfeger of Pueblo, Colorado, who has been honored with the Lifetime Business Achievement Award from the Colorado State University–Pueblo.

Keith Swerdfeger was born and raised in Pueblo, Colorado, and has had a lifelong passion to start a business and make a contribution to his hometown. In 1968, Keith realized his dream of becoming a business owner, opening Swerdfeger Construction, Inc. with his wife Sharon. This was the beginning of a very successful business venture. Today, Swerdfeger Construction, Inc. is a vital part of Pueblo's economy as well as in Southern Colorado and six other states, employing 500 people. Keith readily gives all of the credit to his employees for his company's success, while continuing to strive to create more jobs and opportunities.

Keith is passionate about investing in the Pueblo community and firmly believes that part of his company's success has come as

the result of the work he, his family and employees have done to give back. Keith has been very active with the Pueblo Economic Development Corporation, Pueblo County United Way, the Colorado Contractors, the Distribution Contractor Association, the Greater Pueblo Chamber of Commerce and other civic and industry associations. Keith represented Colorado House of Representatives District 47 from 2011 to 2013 where he served on the Economic and Business Development Committee, the Finance Committee and the Local Government Committee. He was a strong advocate for his District and the community of Pueblo—and worked diligently to bring jobs and economic opportunities to the people of southern Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, Keith Swerdfeger has been a long-time business leader and tireless civic volunteer for his hometown of Pueblo, Colorado. I'm fortunate to consider him a dear friend. When we tell younger generations of Puebloans that the keys to a successful life are dedication and a strong work ethic, we can point to Keith as an example. Pueblo is grateful to have Keith Swerdfeger as one of its sons.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Soto amendment, Soto number 11 to Division H, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, increased funding to the Housing for the Elderly Program by \$2,500,000. It did so by shifting \$2,500,000 from the Policy Development and Research, Research and Technology account within HUD.

I support increased funding for the Housing for the Elderly Program and thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART and my colleagues for their support of my amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ALA- BAMA OUTSTANDING YOUNG FARM FAMILY FOR 2017

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the Alabama Outstanding Young Farm Family for 2017, the Lovvorn Family.

The Lovvorn's, Eric, Carry, Chole (2) and Landon (3 months), live in near Ranburne, Alabama, and have a four-house poultry farm and cattle. They also grow hay and are co-owners of LHT Trucking, a poultry house clean-out business.

Eric grew up around poultry farming and by the age of 12 had decided chicken houses

wouldn't be in his future. That changed when he bought his first poultry farm in Cleburne County at the age of 20. Eric and Carry met in 2008 at a University of Georgia football game and were married in 2011. Carry works at Georgia Power Company.

The Lovvorns love farming and want their children to know how important farming is. Eric serves as the Cleburne County Young Farmers chairman and participated in the Agricultural Leaders for Alabama program.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the Alabama Outstanding Young Farm Family for 2017: Eric, Carry, Chole and Landon Lovvorn.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 558, and YEA on Roll Call No. 559.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 150TH AN- NIVERSARY OF TRINITY UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, TAMAQUA

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Trinity United Church of Christ, Tamaqua which is celebrating its 150th anniversary this year. For a century and a half, Trinity has served as a place of worship and community for the residents of Tamaqua, from the early German settlers of the region to modern congregants from diverse backgrounds.

In 1835, Trinity's parent church, St. John's Evangelical Lutheran and Reformed Church, was founded by the German population of Tamaqua. In 1867, twelve men and their families left the congregation of St. John's to form Trinity Church under the guidance of Reverend Levi K. Derr. One of the original twelve, Daniel Shepp donated land to build the church at the corner of Lafayette and Washington Streets. In September 1868, Reverend I.E. Graeff became the first full-time pastor, serving until March 1873.

In 1961, the present church was dedicated and, over the following decades, improvements were made to the building and grounds. The church's distinctive exterior is marked by the Trinity chime, a landmark in Tamaqua. Additionally, Trinity is unique in that it is one of the very few churches that have its own hymn. In 1942, Rev. Dr. Henry A. W. Shaeffer wrote the words, and Mrs. Gertrude Wagner wrote the music to the signature piece.

Today, Trinity, under the leadership of Pastor Darryl Kensinger, celebrates a diverse, vibrant congregation dedicated to serving Tamaqua and the surrounding community in the tradition of the United Church of Christ, known for being open minded, inclusive, and welcoming.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes Tuesday, October 10, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on roll call votes 558 and 559.

TAX COUNSELING FOR THE ELDERLY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Soto amendment, Soto number 27 to Division D, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, increased funding to the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program by \$1,000,000. It did so by making an additional carveout of money from the overall Taxpayer Services Account.

I support increased funding for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program and thank Chairman GRAVES and my colleagues for their support of my amendment.

IN HONOR OF DONALD G. FREEMAN

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Donald G. Freeman, a constituent of California's Twentieth Congressional district on the occasion of his retirement. Don began his tenure as City Attorney for the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea in 1983. Since then, he has worked with seven mayors and is the longest serving city attorney in the city's history. During his tenure, he has provided a full range of legal services as the chief legal advisor to the city council, city administrator, the city's departments, boards and commissions. He has consistently provided sound legal advice to the council during the course of innumerable meetings and has served as counsel for several special districts, including the Carmel Area Wastewater and the Seaside Redevelopment Agency. He is also an active member of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, as well as the Mayor's Water Authority. He has also gone out of his way to provide the council, city staff, board and commission members with mentoring and training in areas of ethics, conflicts of interest, and the Brown Act.

In the performance of his duties, Don regularly evaluated projects that involved complex legal issues, recommended options to mini-

mize legal risk, and ensured due process in city decisions. As he managed and guided the city through various types of litigation, he demonstrated a mastery of negotiating lease agreements, and drafting ordinances and resolutions that helped protect and preserve the character and integrity of Carmel-by-the-Sea.

In addition to the vital role he played in service to the City, Don maintained a strong belief in public service, helping others, fundamental fairness, and the importance of law and education. Over time, he developed a keen appreciation for the history of Carmel and for its unique village character, eventually becoming one of its staunchest defenders. His understanding of Carmel-by-the-Sea, and his many contributions have proven to be indispensable to the city's officials and residents.

Don has built strong ties that have benefited Carmel. His counsel, guidance, and support to the City Council, city employees, and the community have made him a valued colleague. His historical and institutional knowledge will be missed by those who will carry on the work of the City or Carmel.

In honor and recognition of his service, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to Donald G. Freeman for his more than 33 years of counsel, advice, and dedication to the city of Carmel-by-the-Sea. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Freeman the very best in his future endeavors, and a very happy retirement.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROBIN MADSEN—LABOR LEADER AND FRIEND

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a dear friend, a committed public servant, and a fierce labor leader from St. Paul, Minnesota—Ms. Robin Madsen. Robin passed away last week at the age of 69 after a battle with cancer. Her death is a personal loss for me since I have known her for more than thirty years. Robin was a wonderful woman, a tireless believer in organized labor, a champion for children, and one of the kindest souls you could ever meet.

For thirty-six years Robin drove the St. Paul Public Library bookmobile. She was the "bookmobile lady" to thousands of children who were able to explore their interests, new ideas, and the world because Robin's bookmobile came to their neighborhood.

Robin also became the president of AFSCME 1842 where she served as a committed advocate for workers, public employees, and political candidates who were willing to invest in community services to meet the needs of families and children.

From my first campaign for Congress in 2000 I was honored to have Robin as a friend and supporter. She helped organize a Women of Labor effort and was never shy about speaking her mind or helping behind the scenes. Robin was all about getting results without worrying about getting credit.

Robin Madsen was a true friend and a strong woman who I admired and respected

greatly. My prayers and condolences are with Robin's children, grandchildren and countless friends.

Robin will be missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID ROUZER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, I was attending the funeral of a friend. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 558 and YEA on Roll Call No. 559.

HUANGLONGBING MULTI-AGENCY COORDINATION EFFORTS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Soto amendment, Soto number 24 to Division B, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, moved \$1,000,000 from the Office of the Economist account to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's Specialty Crop Pest Program, specifically the Huanglongbing Multi-Agency Coordination Efforts.

I support increased funding for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's Specialty Crop Pest Program's Huanglongbing Multi-Agency Coordination Efforts and thank Chairman ADERHOLT and my colleagues for their support of my amendment.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DELEGATE LACEY E. PUTNEY

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleagues, Representatives ROBERT J. WITTMAN, H. MORGAN GRIFFITH, DAVE BRAT, THOMAS A. GARRETT, Jr., and SCOTT TAYLOR, rise today to honor the life and service of Lacey E. Putney, a dear friend and the longest-serving state legislator in Virginia's history.

Born on June 27, 1928, Lacey passed away on August 26, 2017, at the age of 89. He was born and raised in Big Island, Virginia, and remained a well-respected member of the community his entire life. After earning his undergraduate degree in 1950 from Washington and Lee University, Lacey enlisted in the United States Air Force where he served for four years. He later graduated from the Washington and Lee University School of Law and went on to practice law for more than 55 years in Bedford.

Lacey was first elected to represent the 19th District in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1961. During his time in office, he held many important leadership positions, including Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman of the Privileges and Elections Committee, and as acting Speaker of the House in 2003. Lacey was a true force in the state legislature, and he knew how to get things done. Anyone who worked with him witnessed that firsthand, and his hard work can be seen throughout western Virginia. He was instrumental in establishing the Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine and Research Institute in Roanoke and the Virginia Horse Center in Lexington, creating the National D-Day Memorial in Bedford, and restoring Thomas Jefferson's Poplar Forest. He led many successful legislative initiatives during his tenure, including the creation of the Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant program, the Virginia Retirement System, and the Virginia community college system. In 2013, Lacey retired from public service after 52 years. It was only fitting that upon his passing Lacey lie in state in the rotunda of the State Capitol.

Lacey's legacy is one of service, kindness, and action. He was trusted by the people he represented and respected by his colleagues. He exemplified the role of a citizen legislator and set an example for all of us through his passion for serving his fellow Virginians. We are honored to have known Lacey Putney over the years, and the Commonwealth of Virginia is better because of individuals like him. With his passing, Virginia lost one of its greatest treasures.

We offer our condolences to his beloved wife, Carmela, as well as the entire Putney family. Our prayers are with them as they mourn this loss and celebrate his life. May God give them comfort and peace. While he may be gone from this earth, there is no doubt that his legacy will live on.

TRIBUTE TO JERRY KLECZKA

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Jerry Kleczka. He was a true public servant and legislator. He passed away on October 8, 2017. He was 73 years old.

Jerry Kleczka grew up on the south side of Milwaukee. He graduated from Don Bosco High School, attended the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for two years, worked as an accountant and served in the Wisconsin National Guard. Jerry Kleczka was elected to the Wisconsin State Legislature at age 24 where he served in both the Assembly and Senate. In 1984, he won a special election to replace Clement Zablocki in Congress and served for over two decades until his retirement in 2005. I succeeded Jerry Kleczka in the 4th Congressional District and appreciate his kindness in assisting me through the transition to Washington. He gave me a gift of African cloth from one of his trips that I cherish to this day.

While in Congress, Jerry Kleczka served on the powerful House Ways and Means Com-

mittee; he formed a warm and lasting friendship with Representative JOHN LEWIS during that tenure. He twice voted against going to war—the Gulf War in 1991 and the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Some of his signature legislation included support for seniors and preventing “drive-through” baby deliveries when insurance companies forced some women to leave hospitals too soon after giving birth.

Jerry Kleczka was a serious, hard-working legislator with a strong work ethic. He took pride in being the guy from the south side of Milwaukee.

When my alma mater, Marquette University began an internship program in Washington, D.C., in 1984 for students interested in careers in government and public service, Kleczka was a strong supporter. Jerry Kleczka donated his campaign funds of \$300,000 to endow what became in 2005 the Kleczka Internship Program. He was awarded an honorary doctorate of law degree in 2005 by Marquette University. Many of the interns serving in my office were members of this program; this is Jerry Kleczka's lasting legacy to the entire community.

Upon his retirement, Jerry moved to Middleton. Middleton was Bonnie's, his wife of 39 years, hometown. He lived quietly and was busy with hobbies that included gardening, woodworking and remodeling projects.

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Kleczka was a valued member of Milwaukee, the 4th Congressional District, and the entire State of Wisconsin. I applaud and value his stewardship. I urge you and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in a salute to the late Jerry Kleczka.

CONGRATULATING DR. R.W. BOBBY MARTIN ON A LIFETIME OF CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Bobby Martin on his retirement from the Dallas Baptist Association. For the past 48 years, Dr. Martin has devoted his time and efforts to providing Christian leadership and education to churches.

Dr. Martin has demonstrated a lifetime of passion for Christian education, including his own. Dr. Martin earned his Bachelor of Arts degree at Lamar University in 1972 and went on to earn his Master of Religious Education and Doctor of Educational Ministry both from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas. In 1976, Dr. Martin married Jennifer Langston, and together they have two children, Todd and Brandon, a daughter-in-law, Casey, and a grandchild, Kate.

In 1969, at the age of 19, Dr. Martin answered God's call to ministry by joining Rose-dale Baptist Church in Beaumont, Texas as a part-time Minister of Music and Youth. By 1974, Dr. Martin joined Fletcher Emanuel Baptist Church in Lumberton, Texas as the full-time Minister of Education and Youth. In 1982, Dr. Martin moved to South Main Baptist

Church in Houston, Texas as the Church Business Administrator. Soon after, Dr. Martin moved his young family to North Texas to start his service at First Baptist Church of Carrollton.

For 16 years, Dr. Martin served as the Associate Pastor of Education at First Baptist Church of Carrollton. During Dr. Martin's tenure at First Baptist Carrollton, the church was one of the largest and fastest growing congregations in the nation. He guided the total education program including Sunday School, discipleship training, missions and weekday education.

In 1999, Dr. Martin joined the Dallas Baptist Association as the Director of Leadership Development. Dallas Baptist Association serves over 500 churches in 40 different languages with the mission of multiplying disciples, ministries, and churches throughout Dallas and Rockwall Counties. Over the last 18 years, Dr. Martin has been charged with equipping Christian leaders with the tools they need for Bible study and discipleship. Dr. Martin's years of service at the Dallas Baptist Association have helped the organization grow and prosper. Throughout his tenure, he earned the reputation as a steadfast spiritual leader and an effective advocate who is dedicated to Christian education and spiritual advancement.

Dr. Martin has committed his time and energy to service in his community in different ministry outreach positions. Since 1997, Dr. Martin has served as the Lead Chaplain for the Carrollton Police Department. From 2001 to 2010, Dr. Martin served on the Board of Directors of the DFW Airport Interfaith Chaplaincy. He participated in organizing chaplaincy programs for military members returning home for “rest and relief” from Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. In 2008, Dr. Martin joined the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Dallas Division as Chaplain. He has been a visiting Chaplain at the FBI Academy at Quantico, Virginia, and part of the FBI's Critical Incident Team.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I would like to thank Dr. Bobby Martin for his lifetime of Christian leadership and service. I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in wishing Dr. Martin continued success as he enjoys his retirement.

GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Soto amendment, Soto number 23 to Division B, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, moved \$500,000 from the Office of the Secretary account to the Grassroots Source Water Protection Program.

I support increased funding for the Grassroots Source Water Protection Program and thank Chairman ADERHOLT and my colleagues for their support of my amendment.

HONORING THE LIFE OF
REVEREND DR. A.V. FISHER

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a community trailblazer, father, husband, and man of God, the Reverend Dr. A.V. Fisher.

The Reverend Dr. A.V. Fisher was born the sixth of seven children to Essie J. and Corine Caraway Fisher in 1933 in Marshall County, Texas. After graduating from Pemberton High School, Reverend Fisher forged his own path to become the first male student to graduate Cosmetology at Valarie Hurd Beauty College. In 1958, Reverend Fisher brought his expertise and work ethic to Fort Worth where he opened his first beauty salon. Reverend Fisher immediately transformed the salon into a community icon that caught the attention of Ebony and Beauty Trade Magazines, ranking him as one of the Top 100 Beauty Operators in the United States. The Texas Legislature joined their high praise by honoring Reverend Fisher for 50 years as a Hair Stylist and Beauty Owner.

Following his successful barbershop career, Reverend Fisher decided to embark on a new chapter of this life by transitioning into ministry. He entered the Gospel Ministry in 1963 under the spiritual guidance of Reverend James Warren and Dr. M.R. Lester, and later became pastor of the Salem Missionary Baptist Church. As a Reverend, Dr. Fisher has welcomed hundreds to his church; baptized many, ordained over 300 deacons, and installed over 200 preachers as pastors all over the United States. Additionally, Reverend Fisher's service did not waiver. He founded the Black Pastor's Association, coordinated the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Service and Prayer Breakfast for 30 years, and helped found the East Fort Worth Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance. Reverend Fisher graduated from the New World Bible Institute, and has received numerous awards including an honorary doctorate. He has preached all across the United States and the Bahamas.

Reverend Dr. A.V. Fisher passed away on Tuesday, October 3, 2017 and is survived by his wife, Verdell Knighten, and their three beautiful daughters, Avis Michelle, Ava LaNell, and Adrain Van.

I honor and celebrate the life of a dedicated community servant, Reverend Dr. A.V. Fisher.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present in Washington for voting on October 4–5, 2017 due to circumstances beyond my control. Had I been present, I would have voted: Yes on the Grijalva Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 (Roll Call No. 553), and Yes on the Scott

Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 (Roll Call No. 554). Additionally, I would have voted Yes on the Yarmuth amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 (Roll Call No. 556), and voted No on Final Passage (Roll Call No. 557).

IN HONOR OF QUEENS COLLEGE'S
80TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague, The Honorable JOSEPH CROWLEY, to recognize the 80th anniversary of Queens College, an institution of higher education in Queens that provides an exemplary education to nearly 20,000 students annually. Queens College opened its doors on October 11, 1937, and ushered in the first class of students to the first public college in Queens. On the first day of classes, Queens College President Paul Klapper remarked, "We are the pioneers of a new institution. We have no history to look back to, but we can look forward to progress."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that President Klapper would be proud to see the remarkable progress that Queens College has made. The Princeton Review has continuously commended the college for offering a world-class education by an illustrious faculty for an affordable price. It is no wonder that it places in the top 1 percent of colleges that successfully move its students from the bottom-fifth income distribution percentile to the top-fifth income distribution percentile. In its eighty years, 160,000 students have become alumni. Some have earned Pulitzer Prizes, Emmy Awards, becoming CEOs, or achieved scientific breakthroughs. As an alumnus himself, I know that Congressman CROWLEY is proud to join me in commending Queens College for its steadfast commitment in ensuring that students reach their potential.

Queens College has not only cultivated a reputation for investing in student success, but also for being one of the most diverse colleges in the country. Students who are currently enrolled are from 170 countries and speak over 110 languages. Queens College offers 69 undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences. In its eighty years of operations, the college has become a cultural hub for students to pursue and achieve academic success in Queens.

I am proud to stand with Congressman CROWLEY to commemorate Queens College's 80th anniversary. I look forward to seeing what the future will bring for this trailblazing beacon of higher education.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH
BIRTHDAY OF THELMA G. GOLDSTEIN

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Thelma G. Goldstein, a resident

of Falmouth, Massachusetts, who would have turned 100 years young on October 12th.

Thelma was born in Manhattan. Her family persevered through the Great Depression supported by her father's ice cream factory. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's government interventions during that period served as an inspiration that led her to discovering a passion for public service. Her other great passion was her family and no matter how busy she got, she always made time for family and she raised four children with her husband, a career military doctor.

Thelma was a devoted Democrat since she cast her first ballot in 1940. Her belief in community engagement followed her through life and led her to becoming the co-chairman of the Falmouth Democratic Town Committee.

A local legend in Falmouth, Thelma is remembered for her tireless efforts to improve the Democratic Party and as a strong advocate for women in politics. In her nineties, she was organizing trips to New Hampshire to campaign for Hillary Clinton and led local efforts to make phone calls, knock on doors, and hold signs. Unfortunately Thelma passed away on June 9, 2016. She had attended a Democratic Convention just one week earlier. Her commitment to public service continues with the Thelma Goldstein Award for Civic Involvement and with the legacy she left behind in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor the life of Thelma G. Goldstein on this occasion of her 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing her many years of dedication to the community.

INVASIVE SPECIES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Soto amendment, Soto number 49 to Division A, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, moved \$500,000 from the United States Fish and Wildlife general administration account to the National Wildlife Refuge System program, specifically for the Wildlife and Habitat Management of invasive species,

I support increased funding for the Wildlife and Habitat Management efforts to combat invasive species and thank Chairman CALVERT and my colleagues for their support of my amendment.

IN HONOR OF THE CAPITOLA
BEGONIA FESTIVAL

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important milestone in my district. The Capitola Begonia Festival has recently completed its 65th and final year. This

event has provided family friendly fun in the beautiful village of Capitola for thousands of people in our neighborhood and beyond. It has brought hundreds of families together and has created many memories that will always be remembered.

The Capitola Begonia Festival has been a cherished event in our community since it began in 1952. The begonias have been donated by several growers in our community, including the Antonelli, Vetterle, and Reinelt families. The Golden State Bulb Growers provided additional support that helped keep the tradition alive for 65 years. The begonias provided by all of these growers have been a part of one of the most prized events of the weekend, the Nautical Parade of begonia adorned floats. Each year, volunteers head down to the city of Marina in the early morning to collect the blooming begonias to adorn the floats. While begonias once grew abundantly in Capitola by the 1970's, they were eventually only to be found in Marina.

The Begonia Festival has allowed us to encourage imagination in our community. We have seen a giraffe created out of begonias for the 2007 "Jungle Safari" theme and witnessed the sunshine yellow form of SpongeBob SquarePants come alive for the 2008 "It Came From the Sea" theme. Whether it is creative ideas or creative structures, the Begonia Festival has been an incredible outlet for art, creativity, and imagination here in our community.

Along with the Nautical Parade, there have been many other activities created to help celebrate this special weekend. Among these, some favorites stand out, including the Horse-shoe Contest, Fishing Derby, and the Sand Sculpture Contest, where art is created from one of the finest mediums found on the Central Coast of California. All of these events are open to the community and beyond, making Capitola a warm and welcoming environment. These cherished events will be remembered fondly for creating a family friendly and historical tradition for Labor Day weekend in our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize this treasured community tradition that has brought together countless participants, volunteers, and sponsors. I thank all of those who have given their time and resources to make the Capitola Begonia Festival a gem of our community; one that will be truly missed.

IN HONOR OF THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF JUANITA VARNADO PIERCE

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the 80th birthday of Juanita Varnado Pierce.

Juanita was born to the late Howard and Maggie Lee Varnado and grew up in McComb, Mississippi. She graduated from Tuskegee Institute, now Tuskegee University, in 1974 with a B.S. in Early Childhood Education and from Auburn University with a Master's in Early Childhood Education in August of 1975.

Juanita was married to the late Booker T. Pierce, Sr. and was blessed with three children: Booker T. Pierce, Jr. (Nashville, Tennessee), Vincent B. Pierce (St. Louis, Missouri) and Lisa P. Grant (Alexandria, Virginia). They have two grandsons, Dominique Pierce (Pompano Beach, Florida) and Nicholas B. Grant, who is a third year Mechanical Engineering Student at Georgia Tech.

Juanita started teaching 2nd grade at Dean Road Elementary School in Auburn in August of 1975 and continued teaching 2nd grade for 17 years. After completing her Administration Certification from the University of Alabama, she was hired as the Assistant Principal at Dean Road Elementary in Fall of 1992 and became Principal in Fall of 1996. She retired as Principal of Dean Road Elementary School in the Fall of 1998.

After joining Washington Chapel A.M.E. Church in 1960, she started teaching the preschool Sunday School class and remained the teacher for nearly 50 years. She still serves in the Cathedral Choir, as a member of the Stewardess Board and is active in Sunday School.

In Summer of 2005, Juanita founded the S.M.A.R.T. (Science, Math, Art, Reading and Technology) Camp. Funded by grants and donations, this free two-week camp was started at Washington Chapel A.M.E. Church with approximately 40 students. Today, it is held at George Washington Carver Elementary School due to size and nearly 100 applications.

A surprise Ladies' Luncheon will be held with women who have blessed her life over the years on October 21st at O'Charley's in Opelika, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing Juanita Varnado Pierce a very happy 80th birthday.

PATTI CANCHOLA TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Patti Canchola, a well-respected veterinarian at Pueblo Animal Services. Patti was voted the 2017 American Humane Hero Veterinarian, which is a national honor bestowed upon an individual who improves the lives of animals and their owners in unheralded ways.

Patti performs 3,500 to 4,500 spay and neuter procedures a year, as well as 200 other surgeries. She voluntarily takes veterinary forensics courses that train her on identifying abused, neglected, and mistreated animals that are a part of criminal investigations. When off the clock, Patti operates Amazin' Amos Pet Food Pantry, a nonprofit food bank, as well as St. Martin's Well Pet Clinic, an independent low-cost health center. Both of these organizations help pet owners with low socio-economic status provide their animals with the care and food they need.

As a child in Pueblo, Patti would bring home wounded cats, dogs, squirrels, and birds in need of assistance. Her love of animals has continued throughout her entire life. We are

truly fortunate to have such an upstanding and dedicated member of our community and on behalf of the Third District I would like to thank Patti for her generous service to the community.

NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM AND COASTAL WATERWAYS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 2017

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Soto amendment, Soto number 48 to Division A, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, put the House on record of supporting a final funding amount of \$27,191,000 for the National Estuary Program and Coastal Waterways. It does so by removing and then reapplying \$468,000 within the \$2.3 billion appropriation for the Environmental Programs and Management account within the Environmental Protection Agency.

I support increased funding for the National Estuary Program and Coastal Waterways and thank Chairman CALVERT and my colleagues for their support of my amendment.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 12, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 17

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the cost of prescription drugs, focusing on how the drug delivery system affects what patients pay.

SD-430

15840	EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 163, Pt. 11	<i>October 11, 2017</i>
OCTOBER 18	OCTOBER 25	Navy's current and planned capabilities to meet those threats.
10 a.m.	9:30 a.m.	SVC-217
Committee on the Judiciary To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice.	Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on SeaPower To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing naval forces and the	
SH-216		

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 12, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 12, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRADLEY BYRNE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

OPIOID CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Dana Milbank had an interesting column in the morning Post about the feckless congressional response to the opioid crisis. Both the administration and Congress have been good at hyping the crisis, but when it comes time to actually taking action, almost nothing happens.

The failure to protect our citizens is appalling, especially since most of the opioid crisis is a result of failed public policies. We have spent over \$1 trillion on a failed war on drugs that concentrates on prohibition and punishment instead of treatment, which would help people break the cycle of addiction.

The challenges that drove people to abuse opioids in the first place, like chronic pain, depression, and lax policies prescribing vast quantities of evermore powerful opioids, should never have been allowed to happen in the first place. It was a public policy fail-

ure of government, the industry, and, sadly, some unscrupulous practitioners that allowed the addiction genie out of the bottle.

When denied access to opioids, people, understandably, turn to heroin and other damaging and addictive drugs because they were trapped by these powerful forces. Few people willingly damage their bodies and destroy their families and careers, if not for powerful forces beyond their control.

As appalling as this failure is, what is even worse is that we fail to take reasonable, commonsense steps to stop it. The easiest solution is to provide more access to medical marijuana, already available in 28 States. This availability, by the way, has been driven as a result of citizen action and not politicians, who have too often been afraid to touch it.

The evidence is powerful and overwhelming. Where there is access to medical marijuana to treat the problems that drove people on the path to addiction in the first place, there are fewer pills prescribed and overdose deaths drop.

It is clear that using medical marijuana is as effective, or perhaps even more effective, than opioids to treat pain. They cause less damage to people's health and are far less costly than pharmaceuticals. I provided the subcommittee taking testimony with the facts and citations that would justify digging deep into this potential solution.

Cannabis reduces overdose deaths, reduces opioid consumption, and it can prevent dose escalation and the development of opioid tolerance, which leads to that cycle, and too often, tragically, opioid deaths: 175 people a day.

As my friend, GREG WALDEN, pointed out in the subcommittee hearing yesterday, more people die in Oregon from opioid overdose than traffic accidents.

More benefits, fewer side effects, lower costs.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the evidence I gave to the Subcommittee on Health yesterday.

PHYSICIAN GUIDE TO CANNABIS-ASSISTED OPIOID REDUCTION

(Prepared by Adrienne Wilson-Poe, Ph.D.)

Cannabis reduces opioid overdose mortality.

In states with medicinal cannabis laws, opioid overdoses drop by an average of 25%. This effect gets bigger the longer the law has been in place. For instance, there is a 33% drop in mortality in California, where compassionate use has been in place since 1996.

This finding was replicated by Columbia's school of public health, using a completely different analysis strategy.

Cannabis reduces opioid consumption.

Cannabis is opioid-sparing in chronic pain patients. When patients are given access to cannabis, they drop their opioid use by roughly 50%. This finding has been replicated several times from Ann Arbor to Jerusalem.

This opioid sparing effect is accompanied by an enhancement of cognitive function once patients begin cannabis therapy: this effect is most likely due to the fact that patients reduce their opioid use.

Cannabis use is associated with a reduction in not only opioid consumption, but also many other drugs including benzodiazepines, which also have a high incidence of fatal overdose. In states with medicinal cannabis laws, the number of prescriptions for analgesic and anxiolytic drugs (among others) are substantially reduced. Medicare and Medicaid prescription costs are substantially lower in states with cannabis laws.

Cannabis can prevent dose escalation and the development of opioid tolerance.

Cannabinoids and opioids have acute analgesic synergy. When opioids and cannabinoids are coadministered, they produce greater than additive analgesia. This suggests that analgesic dose of opioids is substantially lower for patients using cannabis therapy.

In chronic pain patients on opioid therapy, cannabis does not affect pharmacokinetics of opioids, yet it still enhances analgesia. This finding further supports a synergistic mechanism of action.

Pre-clinical models indicate that cannabinoids attenuate the development of opioid tolerance.

Cannabis, alone or in combination with opioids, could be a viable first-line analgesic.

The CDC has updated its recommendations in the spring of 2016, stating that most cases of chronic pain should be treated with non-opioids.

The National Academies of Science and Medicine recently conducted an exhaustive review of 10,000+ human studies published since 1999, definitively concluding that cannabis itself (not a specific cannabinoid or cannabis-derived molecule) is safe and effective for the treatment of chronic pain.

When 3,000 chronic pain patients were surveyed, they overwhelmingly preferred cannabis as an opioid alternative.

97% "strongly agreed/agreed" that they could decrease their opioid use when using cannabis.

92% "strongly agreed/agreed" that they prefer cannabis to treat their medical condition.

81% "strongly agreed/agreed" that cannabis by itself was more effective than taking opioids.

Cannabis may be a viable tool in medication-assisted relapse prevention.

CBD is non-intoxicating, and is the 2nd most abundant cannabinoid found in cannabis. CBD alleviates the anxiety that leads to drug craving. In human pilot studies, CBD administration is sufficient to prevent heroin craving for at least 7 days.

Cannabis users are more likely to adhere to naltrexone maintenance for opioid dependence.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. There is a reason that up to 90 percent of the American public favors greater access to medical marijuana. Last year, voters in Florida approved their program by over 70 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government continues to interfere, threatening medical marijuana programs, which requires Congress to step in to shield it, as we have done last year and for the previous 2 years. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee denied us a chance to vote on it.

Last Congress, both Houses approved measures for VA doctors to be able to consult with veterans who have a serious overdose problem. Despite passing both Chambers, it was stripped out and the Rules Committee failed to allow us to vote on this as well.

Most tragically, Congress continues to allow the Federal Government to have a stranglehold on research to be conducted to be able to definitely answer these questions.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join my friend, Dr. ANDY HARRIS, and me on our research bill, H.R. 3391. There is no reason that the Federal Government denies research to be able to definitively answer these questions.

I am tired of looking at the opioid damage in my State and around the country, and have Congress propose Band-aids when there is a simple, commonsense, widely accepted, and popular approach: allow people access to medical marijuana.

The time to do it is now. Lives are being lost as we dither.

NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of The Academy of Our Lady of Peace in New Providence, New Jersey, and the Woodland School in Warren, New Jersey, for being named Blue Ribbon Schools by the United States Department of Education.

New Providence is in Union County, and Warren is in Somerset County, New Jersey, both in the district I have the honor of representing.

The National Blue Ribbon Schools award honors public and private elementary, middle, and high schools where students perform at very high levels or where significant improvements are being made in levels of achievement.

The Academy of Our Lady of Peace and the Woodland School were cited as exemplary high-performing schools, as measured by State assessments and national tests.

This recognition is a testament to the outstanding work and dedication of the faculty and staff in creating

schools where students master challenging content. These are among our youngest students, infectious in their enthusiasm because of the excellent schools they attend.

I commend Joel Castillo, principal of the Academy of Our Lady of Peace; and Jeffrey Heaney, principal of the Woodland School, for all of their hard work. I also commend the faculty, parents, and the communities in general.

This prestigious award is noted throughout the country, and certainly the United States Department of Education is to be commended for presenting these awards.

The Academy of Our Lady of Peace and the Woodland School are proud examples of academic excellence and worthiness of this national distinction.

ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, a little over a month ago, Hurricane Irma struck the Caribbean island of St. Maarten very hard.

Within a couple of days, I got a call from loved ones of a couple of constituents. They had family members trapped at a hotel in St. Maarten with dozens of other Americans. The power was out, they were running out of food and water, and incidents of looting were reported. So they called me, their Congressman, and I called the State Department to see what could be done.

Within 36 hours of my call, our U.S. citizens—nearly 150 of them—were evacuated from an island, in the ocean, surrounded by water.

Do you know where they were taken to for safety?

Puerto Rico. Yes, Puerto Rico, where it has now been 3 weeks since Hurricane Maria and most people do not have power or clean drinking water, and where the deterioration of the healthcare system is leaving people without critical treatments and causing the death toll to go up.

Now, in St. Maarten, this is what the State Department said, according to NBC News: "Evacuation efforts will prioritize U.S. citizens needing urgent medical care."

Within a few days, they had evacuated 1,200 Americans.

So, right now, if a thousand U.S. citizens are facing danger in Japan, Ethiopia, or Finland, our State Department would arrange to save them. But we have millions of Americans facing danger in Puerto Rico and we can't get the same help, not from the military, not from FEMA, and not from the State Department, because they don't assist U.S. citizens who are on U.S. soil, even if that soil is a colony in the ocean surrounded by water, as our President reminds us.

It took 36 hours to get evacuated from St. Maarten. Three weeks in

Puerto Rico and still no plan for evacuation.

This morning, the President is tweeting that he wants to pull FEMA and the military out of Puerto Rico.

How long do we have to stay in Puerto Rico, Mr. President?

Until every Puerto Rican's name is taken off the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall or erased from the records of the Korean war, Afghanistan, and Iraq. As long as it takes. They gave their lives and died.

Yesterday, a lot of us received military briefings from FEMA, the military, and Homeland Security. I wanted to know whether FEMA and the military are prepared to take people off the island, as we normally do in emergency situations. We did it in Houston, in Jacksonville, and New Orleans.

No, the Governor has not asked for help in evacuating people, they told me.

I asked: How many bridges, even temporary ones, have been constructed in Puerto Rico to replace those destroyed by the hurricane to allow for the transportation of supplies and the evacuation of people?

They said: None, Congressman. Zero. We have not erected any bridges. Again, because the Governor of Puerto Rico hasn't asked us to.

When I was there, I flew over the town of Maricao in the mountains, well known for coffee. There are six ways in and out of the town, and five of those bridges are gone.

Three weeks after D-day in 1944, the allies liberated the deepwater port of Cherbourg, one of the most important objectives in France. It took 20 days and we built bridges and communication lines along the way.

We made better progress in the 3 weeks after D-day than we are making on Puerto Rico. And in Puerto Rico, to the best of my knowledge, there are no Germans shooting at us.

Now, when I asked the officials about evacuating people from the island, they had no real answer. But if I remember correctly, FEMA and the military come to us to fund their budget every year. They are accountable to this Congress.

We are accountable to our constituents. Constituents are coming to me, as they did in St. Maarten, and are saying: Help us get our families out of danger's way.

Mr. Speaker, when will we be able to give these constituents an answer as to why their family members and loved ones aren't being allowed to leave the island and evacuated from danger?

This weekend, Members of Congress are going to Puerto Rico. I spoke with a few of them and said: Hey, at night, you should go to this place where it is really bad.

One stopped me, cut me off, and said: Congressman, we are not staying overnight.

So, on an island where 95 percent of the power is out, our Members of Congress are only going to see things during the day, not during the pitch-black darkness, which is what Puerto Ricans are living with every single night for the last 3 weeks.

Regardless of what my colleagues see during the day or what the President tweets in the morning, my friends stand in line for hours for food, if they can find it; my constituents are worried about their family members; and 5 million Puerto Ricans in the diaspora have run out of patience. We want our people free to live in the United States of America wherever they can.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents want the government to help get their families out of danger's way.

HONORING THE MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF STUART EPPERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize North Carolina Fifth District constituent, Mr. Stuart Epperson, whose work has positively affected so many in North Carolina and so many across this great Nation.

Stuart, or "Stu," as his friends know him, is living proof that not only is the American Dream possible, it is achievable if you are simply willing to work hard for it. Stu's story is a model one for all.

□ 1015

Growing up on a small tobacco farm in Virginia, Stu learned hard work and perseverance. In the 1980s, Stu and his brother-in-law started the Salem Media Group to minister to and report positive news to families across the country.

Under his leadership, Salem Media Group and Salem Radio now host 120 radio stations, 67 of which are in the top 25 markets, and operate 2,400 affiliates.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when many Americans opt to turn off the news due to the negative content, Mr. Epperson's audience is tuning in to be inspired and to be informed.

The content put forth by the Salem Media Group serves as a beacon of hope to the many families seeking positive and instructive stories.

Mr. Speaker, when I consider the body of Mr. Epperson's work, I am reminded of the parable of the faithful servant in Luke 12:48. The Good Book tells us that: "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required. . . ."

The Lord has certainly gifted Mr. Epperson with some amazing abilities, and in return, Mr. Epperson has used these talents to give back to multiple community activities.

Among those activities are the Winston-Salem Rescue Mission, Salem Pregnancy Care Center, One Kid at a Time mentoring program, and the Christian Association of Youth Mentoring, which he founded.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Stu would agree that the adage "behind every good man is a good woman" is a true one for him. Stu married the love of his life, Nancy Etsinger Epperson, 54 years ago. This lovely couple has 4 children and 21 grandchildren.

I commend Stu Epperson not only for his many accomplishments but also for his dedication to ensuring that radio remains family-friendly and value-focused. In recognition of Stu's life and work, I am pleased to announce that soon Stu will be receiving the highly coveted Vision and Leadership Award from the Family Research Council. This award is justly deserved by such an accomplished man, and I add my salute to him.

I know that the community in Winston-Salem, this Nation, and the wider world have benefitted from Stu Epperson's many efforts to make the world a better place. I commend Mr. Epperson on his many accomplishments and his service to our Nation.

STRUGGLES IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to tell where and in what direction Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are heading today. There is not enough food, millions are struggling to live without drinking water and electricity, and only 8 percent of the roads are open to traffic.

Containers with supplies, medical supplies, and food and other commodities are sitting in containers on the docks in the Port of San Juan and are not moving towards the people and the communities that need them the most. Struggles in the Virgin Islands are less heard about but no less real.

The question is whether we, as a nation, are doing all we can for the citizens of this Nation. Let's compare. After an earthquake hit Haiti in 2010, where the infrastructure was severely damaged, the U.S. military mobilized as if we were going to war.

The very next morning, after the earthquake hit, an Army unit was airborne. Within 2 weeks, 33 ships and 22,000 soldiers had arrived, and more than 300 helicopters were delivering millions of pounds of food and water, not just to the port, but the people of Haiti.

By contrast, today, there are fewer than 14,000 military personnel assisting in relief efforts in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and there are only 88

helicopters and only 4 naval ships, one of them the USNS Comfort that are aiding 3.5 million Americans—3.4 million Americans in Puerto Rico, 100,000 Americans in the Virgin Islands.

In Haiti, Mr. Speaker, we airlifted 15,000 U.S. citizens in 2010 after the earthquake, but in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, we are unwilling to evacuate a single American, even those who have relatives and friends in the many communities across the 50 States of this great country.

As Americans are starving and Americans are desperate, our response needs to be more vigorous.

Now, let's be sure, the military is doing what we are asking them to do. This is not a criticism of the military not doing what we are asking them to do, but the White House is not asking the military to do enough.

Mr. Speaker, the President must lead on this issue. We have got dedicated members of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard who are willing, ready, and able to be in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to deliver the relief to our neighbors and our citizens.

We need to ask the Department of Defense to send more engineers, more transportation companies, and expeditionary sustainment battalions.

Yesterday, I asked a senior military leader: How many pontoon bridges have been erected in Puerto Rico to cross those washed out roads? Zero. How many miles of power transmission lines have been reestablished to get electricity out to more communities? The answer is zero.

We have military engineers on the ground, but they have not been asked to do that. We need to direct our military to provide the direct services on the local or, in military parlance, on the tactical level. I am not talking about long-term rebuilding of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by the United States military. I am talking about directing the Department of Defense to establish the minimum infrastructure necessary to do the job that we should be asking them to do, which is to provide relief to 3.5 million Americans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Strategic movements are good, military assessments and evaluations help, but what is needed is no less than what was done 7 years ago in Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, the President must lead on this issue, and the President must ask our military to do more.

NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is National Farmers Day. From farm to fork, our farmers work hard to put food on dinner tables across this country and around the world.

Today has traditionally been a day to recognize farmers and thank them for all their endless hard work. Records of National Farmers Day events date back to the 1800s.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers are the cornerstone of our rural communities. They face tough odds by the very nature of the business, and food security is national security.

Right now, there is a critical shortfall of skilled young and beginning farmers and ranchers. That is why, together with Congressman JOE COURTNEY from Connecticut and Congressman JOHN FASO from New York, we introduced the Young Farmer Success Act.

This legislation provides incentives for those who would like to pursue a future in the agriculture industry by adding farmers to the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program, which currently offers loan payback assistance for professions such as government service, teaching, and nursing.

Under the program, eligible public service professionals who make 10 years of income-driven student loan payments can have the balance of their loans forgiven.

On Monday, I heard from a number of young farmers in upstate New York in Congressman FASO's district. The House Agriculture Committee hosted a farm bill listening session at SUNY Cobleskill, and we covered topics from dairy to specialty crops to nutrition assistance programs, and we heard a lot of excellent feedback from those who shared their stories with us.

As the House Agriculture Committee works to craft the next farm bill, these listening sessions have allowed us to hear firsthand from those who are directly impacted by the farm bill. They provide us with real world examples of what is working and what isn't working.

With farmers in every region of this country, we heard from many different perspectives. This feedback will help us write the best farm bill possible.

Mr. Speaker, food security is national security, and it aids the long-term sustainability of our country. They provide fresh produce and products to communities throughout the country, and there is no better food than something grown locally.

Today, we celebrate our food producers on National Farmers Day, but we should also celebrate them every day for putting food on our tables and in our grocery stores. Let's face it, farming is a tough business. Long hours, unpredictable commodity prices, and, even more, unpredictable weather conditions, but it is also exciting, rewarding, and full of opportunities.

Generations of farmers have worked every patch of American soil caring for the Earth, their animals, and their neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, as vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I want to wholeheartedly thank America's farmers for providing our country with safe, sustainable, healthy, and nutritious food every day. Happy Farmers Day.

AMENDMENT TO THE WAR POWERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, last weekend I was shocked to read the statements of the Republican chair of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate, Senator CORKER. He said that, "Trump has put us on the path to World War III."

This makes it essential that Congress assert its full powers under the Constitution of the United States.

In reaction to Nixon's secret bombing of Cambodia and the aftermath, Congress passed something called the War Powers Act. Unfortunately, there was a dispute between the two bodies, and, ultimately, the Senate prevailed and watered down the bill.

Instead of saying, "Before the President engages our troops in hostilities, that he or she must come to the Congress," instead, the bill ultimately adopted saying, "48 hours after the President has engaged our troops in hostilities, he or she must report to the Congress and then seek subsequent authorization, or the troops would be withdrawn after 60 days."

I have introduced legislation in this and preceding Congresses to fix that. That clearly does not represent the constitutional powers of the United States Congress. The Constitution is absolutely clear. Only Congress has the authority to declare war. Once war is declared, the President, under the Constitution, is the Commander in Chief and would act with one voice to conduct the war and coordinate military efforts.

So my bill would say—do away with the allowance of 48 hours and say: Before engaging U.S. troops and military in hostilities, that the President must first come to the Congress and seek a declaration of war. I think it is absolutely essential that this Congress act on this legislation and make it clear to the President of the United States that he does not have the authority to wake up one morning and tweet of an attack against another country and engage these people in an escalation that may end, as Senator CORKER says, in World War III.

This is a very dangerous time for our country. It is time for this separate and equal branch of the government to assert its full authority to rein in any and all dangerous activities by this President.

□ 1030

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment of our Constitution gives us this precious freedom of speech that we so cherish in America. Contrary to heated debate and public opinion, we, in the United States, rarely face the kind of persecution that necessitated this great protection. So I rise today to shed light on the abridgement of freedom of speech that is often widely discussed, but that few Americans ever have to endure.

Across the world, Mr. Speaker, individual freedom of speech is frequently infringed. A posted critique or just sharing one's views freely on the internet can be punishable, even by death.

Late one evening in September, a well-known Indian journalist, Gauri Lankesh, was murdered outside her home. She was "an anti-establishment figure with a reputation for her fearless criticism of undemocratic elements within the parties in power." The circumstances of her death were "strikingly similar" to the murders of three additional Indian activists.

Just weeks ago, another of India's most prominent political journalists, Professor Kancha Ilaiah, known for critiquing India's caste social order, was threatened by a Hindu member of India's parliament. This member of parliament, who is an ally of the current BJP government, issued a statement that Kancha should be "publicly hanged." Kancha subsequently received numerous death threats.

These threats had a significant effect. A mob tried to attack Professor Ilaiah with stones as he and a coworker were driving to a meeting. Kancha is now under self-imposed house arrest because he is simply not safe otherwise.

Was Professor Ilaiah's crime significant?

Kancha was called a modern-day Dr. Ambedkar, who is known as the "Father of the Indian Constitution," and Professor Ilaiah's crime was he was the author of "Why I am Not a Hindu."

A recent translation of his 2009 book "Post-Hindu India" is what seems to have sparked the threats against him. This book described the polarized context of modern-day India specifically dealing with the productivity of the Dalits and the "low" castes and the seeming spiritual and monetary monopoly of the "higher" castes. These critiques became even more relevant in India's growing agrarian crisis, the resulting farmer suicides due to hopelessness, and the massive joblessness due to demonetization and economic slowdown.

Mr. Speaker, I stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to state unequivocally that the

United States and the entire global community is, and should be, deeply concerned about this threat to the life of Professor Kancha Ilaiah, one of the world's well-known intellectuals.

Our trusted ally and friend, India, is better than this, Mr. Speaker. Professor Kancha Ilaiah's right and freedom to speak should not be infringed; and his protection, and that of those like him, should be of the utmost priority to the Indian Government. I am able to express freely this viewpoint because we have freedom of speech in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker. May we remember at what cost and for what purpose we were given this priceless freedom.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Breast Cancer Awareness Month for millions of us in the breast cancer community.

The statistics are sobering: one in eight women will get breast cancer in her lifetime.

Earlier this year, I received a note from a former staffer. I had watched this young woman blossom from a young and eager intern to ultimately serving as my executive assistant and scheduler before she departed the Hill for graduate school, marriage, and a future full of promise. In the note, she wrote:

"My wedding was about 2 months ago. It was the most magical night of my life. It was so incredible to be surrounded by so many friends and loved ones and good will. I can't imagine ever being happier than I was that night."

She went on to say:

"Unfortunately, things have gotten a little more complicated since then. While I was on my honeymoon, I noticed a small lump in my right breast. Since I had the benefit of working for you, I know that, while rare, it is possible that young women can get breast cancer, and I should take it seriously. I think you can probably guess where this is going . . ."

She continued:

"We have no idea how this happened to me. I guess some people get struck by lightning, some people are deathly allergic to peanuts, and some people get breast cancer at 29 with no family history.

"Luckily, it was caught early and the doctors have every confidence that it is fully curable and I will live a long and happy life."

She ended the note by thanking me for advocating for breast cancer awareness, specifically for younger women.

She said:

"DWS," as I am often referred to by staff, "keep fighting the good fight. It is saving the lives of people like me."

Today, she is fighting the good fight, and I know she will win.

Unfortunately, just like my former staffer, I know all too well that it can strike even when you are young. In 2007, when I was only 41 years old, I learned I had breast cancer.

Like many others before me, when I was diagnosed, and later identified as a BRCA2 gene mutation carrier, I worried about many things: Would I be there to see my children grow up? Would I be able to beat this disease? Wasn't I too young to have breast cancer?

Fortunately, with the passage of the ACA—the Affordable Care Act—insurance coverage cannot be taken away from people like me and like my former staffer. Access to affordable, quality healthcare is now a right, not a privilege.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to protect this right. Instead of calling for senseless votes to repeal this legislation, I call on my Republican colleagues to join me in recognizing Breast Cancer Awareness Month by supporting those of us who are living healthier, stronger lives every day because of the Affordable Care Act.

The statistics for breast cancer remain alarming. The American Cancer Society estimates that 40,610 women will die from breast cancer in 2017 alone, making it the second most common type of cancer death in women.

Between the ages of 60 and 84, breast cancer incidence rates are markedly higher in White women than Black women. However, Black women have a higher incidence rate before age 45, and are more likely to die from breast cancer at every age. This is wholly unacceptable.

We must take action to provide women with the preventative services and screenings available while educating them on their risks and treatment options.

That is why, in 2009, I introduced the EARLY Act, a bipartisan bill that became law as part of the Affordable Care Act, to focus on equipping young women with the tools they need to make informed decisions regarding their breast health.

I am proud that the EARLY Act was reauthorized in 2014, and even more proud that it has, and is, helping young women like my former staffer.

This Congress, I also introduced the PALS Act with my good friend from Indiana, Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS.

This bill would extend the moratorium on the United States Preventive Services Task Force mammography screening guidelines to ensure women have access to lifesaving mammograms beginning at age 40.

It would also ensure women who have served our country—our women vet-

erans—don't have to face these same obstacles in getting the care they and their healthcare providers deem necessary.

Because many insurance companies use the USPSTF guidelines as the basis for coverage, 22 million women between ages 40 and 49 could be at risk of losing coverage for this lifesaving screening.

The bottom line is the vast majority of experts recommend beginning screening mammograms at age 40. Women need to be able to follow this guidance until scientific consensus can be reached.

As someone who was diagnosed at just age 41, I can tell you that women need guaranteed access to these tests beginning at age 40.

We must also ensure the National Institutes of Health has the funding it needs to continue their progress.

I will continue to use my voice and my vote as an appropriator to ensure that critical funding is provided through the annual appropriations bill for breast cancer research, services, and support.

My story and my former staffer's story isn't unique. That is why we must do more to support our mothers, sisters, daughters, and friends who are battling or who have survived this deadly disease. And we must do everything we can to eradicate breast cancer once and for all.

I look forward to continuing to work together with all of you—my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—and with the advocacy community to help women know their risk, discover cancer early, and access the best treatment possible.

HONORING THE MEN AND WOMEN OF EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I, along with my good friend, MARCY KAPTUR, reestablished the NASA Caucus.

Last week, I spoke about the 50th anniversary of my father's absolute air-speed record flight that happened on October 3, 1967. Two weeks ago was the 70th anniversary of the Air Force. On Saturday, we welcome the anniversary of supersonic flight.

For years, there was a thought that there was a barrier present to stop aircraft or inhibit flight controls. Many believed attempting to pass through this barrier would be fatal.

Well, on October 14, 1947, Captain Charles E. "Chuck" Yeager was dropped from a B-29 at about 45,000 feet and quickly accelerated through that invisible barrier we know as the speed of sound.

The first man to achieve Mach 1, we know that as something simple today,

but for the last 70 years, it was because of one man that we get to do this.

General Yeager retired in 1975 as a brigadier general, after 34 years of flying, for the Army Air Corps and for the United States Air Force. What he achieved that day was something that many men didn't think would happen.

There were about two or three pilots at Muroc or the Army air field out at southern California that were trying to do it, but absolutely there was only one that did it. Captain Yeager, flying the Bell X-1, that he renamed Glamorous Glennis after his wife, was the man who achieved that.

I am proud to represent the men and women of Edwards Air Force Base with my good friend, Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY. And I understand what they do on a daily basis from the F-35, to the F-22, to all of the aircraft that happen out there at Edwards, to all of the flying expertise that they have on a daily basis. I am very proud of them. I am proud of what Edwards Air Force Base means to the country, and I am proud of what they mean to the history of this Nation. But I am most proud of the men and women because on a daily basis they create history. For that, I am most proud.

HONORING U.S. ARMY SERGEANT LA DAVID T. JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of U.S. Army Sergeant La David T. Johnson, who was killed in Niger, West Africa, during an ambush carried out by Boko Haram and other extremists linked to ISIS.

This tragic loss of a life, still so young and so full of promise and potential, is one of the saddest ironies that I could ever imagine. Sergeant Johnson was just 25 years old, the father of two children, and a beloved member of the Miami Gardens community in which I reside.

He and his two younger brothers, Keon and Richard, are proud members of the 5,000 Role Models of Excellence Project, an in-school dropout prevention program that I created soon after Sergeant Johnson was born, to ensure that he and other boys and young women of color have unfettered access to roads to success. Five thousand Role Models members all over the world are mourning his death.

Sergeant Johnson is married to Myeshia Johnson and has two children, and Myeshia is expecting their third child.

I sprung into action after Boko Haram kidnapped 276 schoolgirls in their boarding school in Nigeria. I traveled to Nigeria four times in my quest, and I have initiated the "Bring Back Our Girls Wear Red Wednesdays" in

the Congress of the United States. I appreciate the support, especially from our leader, NANCY PELOSI.

I traveled there in August and met over 100 girls who were once hostages of Boko Haram. I wanted them to know that this Congress loves them and we will never, ever forget them.

Boko Haram actually means "Western education is a sin." They believe girls should be denied the privilege of an education, and they have killed more people than ISIS. In fact, they have joined forces with ISIS in the region and have killed over 20,000 Africans, sexually abused women and girls, and sends them on suicide missions using babies as decoys.

More than 1 million people have been displaced from their homes and are starving to death. What a tragedy. It would be an even greater tragedy to allow the deaths of Sergeant Johnson and his comrades—Staff Sergeant Bryan C. Black, 35, from Washington; Staff Sergeant Jeremiah W. Johnson, 39, from Ohio; and Staff Sergeant Dustin M. Wright, 29, from Georgia—be in vain.

Nearly a year ago, this Chamber voted unanimously for legislation that Republican Senator SUSAN COLLINS from Maine and I introduced that directs the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to jointly develop a 5-year strategy to end Boko Haram's reign of terror. The law also calls for a plan to assist the Nigerian Government, the Multinational Joint Task Force, and international partners in their efforts to counter this regional threat.

□ 1045

Our soldiers were not there to fight but to provide training and assistance to the Nigerian Army forces and the multinational joint task force created to combat Boko Haram.

Yes, my heart breaks for this monumental loss, but it is also bursting with pride for all that he achieved and would have accomplished. During the few years in which he bravely served our Nation, he received several awards and accolades, including the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, and, ironically, the Global War on Terrorism Medal.

Boko Haram is a threat to the many nations across the globe that, like the United States, have committed monetary and human resources to help defeat this terrorist group, and we must never ever forget that this heinous organization's daily list of casualties could include one or more of our own, like Sergeant Johnson, Staff Sergeant Black, Staff Sergeant Jeremiah Johnson, and Staff Sergeant Wright.

May they rest in peace.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as an OB/GYN and now a U.S. Congressman, I want to continue to highlight October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

One out of eight women will develop breast cancer. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker. One out of eight women will develop breast cancer.

If you are a woman over the age of 35, you should ask your physician if you need a mammogram; and certainly if you are over the age of 50, every woman needs a mammogram every year.

A mammogram is quick, it is easy, and the great thing about mammograms is how easy it can be to catch breast cancer at its very early stages and give us a great chance to treat the problem.

Over my career as a physician, we have helped hundreds of women who have successfully fought this dreaded disease. There are great treatments out there and ways we can save lives, so I encourage every woman over the age of 35 to talk to their physician about a mammogram. It is one thing to be aware of breast cancer, but it is another thing to do something about it.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S SMALL BUSINESS MONTH

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the National Women's Business Council in recognizing October as National Women's Small Business Month.

Women bring unique and invaluable skills and experiences to the workplace. Across the country, there are over 9 million women-owned small businesses, and they contribute over a trillion dollars to our national economy.

In Kansas alone, there are more than 73 businesses owned by women, representing industries such as accounting, veterinary medicine, and management consulting.

As I have toured Kansas, I have met with women entrepreneurs in towns like Ellsworth and Emporia learning about how their businesses are growing local economies and the positive impact these businesses have on their communities. It is inspiring to see what these women have achieved and to hear their perspective on the challenges that small-business owners face.

I ask my colleagues to join me now in celebrating these women during National Women's Small Business Month.

RECOGNIZING THE KANSAS HEART AND STROKE COLLABORATIVE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, though mostly known as the top basketball program in the country, I want to acknowledge and salute the University of Kansas and our innovative work through the Kansas Heart and Stroke Collaborative.

The collaborative has worked diligently over the past 3 years to establish a new model and standard for how to efficiently treat the care of heart disease and strokes in rural areas. They provide better care in a way that saves overall costs and is truly a win-win.

Fifty-three counties in Kansas, with more than 90 hospitals, clinics, and offices, now are represented in the collaborative care model. Not only do they better the lives of patients in rural Kansas, they do so based on a model that is a poster child for other conservative-style demonstration projects.

In 2014, the University of Kansas partnered with Hays Medical Center and received a \$12 million, 3-year innovation grant. Now that 3-year window is closing, and I am pleased to say that the collaborative will continue as a self-sustaining entity.

Let me say that again. This will continue as a self-sustaining entity, continue to provide efficient care, and, literally, save thousands of rural Americans' lives and give them more meaningful life after their stroke or heart attack.

As a physician in rural Kansas for three decades, this is one of the greatest success stories I have ever seen, and it will always hold a special place in my heart, as I have seen it unfold right before my eyes.

The Kansas Heart and Stroke Collaborative provides hope and direction for rural healthcare in Kansas and beyond, and it should be looked at by other States.

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud Member of this House. I am always so honored to know that I have the preeminent privilege of standing in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. There are only 435 people who are elected as Members from the various States who have voting rights in Congress on legislation, who have this privilege, so it is an honor for me to do it. I want people to know that when I stand here, my words are sincere and my efforts are those that I believe can make a difference in the lives of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I called to the attention of the House of Representatives Articles of Impeachment, and I called these Articles of Impeachment to the attention of the House because it is a part of a process. It can be a three-step process, which has been used on multiple occasions in the past, a three-step process that allows the Member to give notice. After the Member gives notice, the Member does not

have to allow a vote to take place immediately.

The Member can decide that, rather than have the vote take place within 2 days, the Member can give notice a second time and then allow that process to move forward, and the Speaker can then set a time for the Member to give a final notice, or present the actual Articles of Impeachment.

I have chosen to use the three-step process: initial notice; thereafter to come back before this House, which every Member has the privilege of doing and which has been done before, and again notice the House; and, thereafter, have the articles considered with a final reading.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is any secret that I have indicated that the President should be impeached. It is no secret. I don't think it is any secret that I have indicated that there will be a vote in Congress on Articles of Impeachment.

If perchance I have been misunderstood, allow me to make it perspicuously clear today: there will be a vote. There is a three-step process that we are pursuing. That process will continue when we return. And when we return, I assure everyone there will be a vote.

There has been some confusion. My suspicion is because where there are few facts, there is much speculation, so there has been some confusion about why we didn't go forward yesterday.

So now allow me to make it abundantly clear: no person, no living, breathing child of God influenced my decision to move forward as I have.

Others can give their opinions. No one did. I did not receive an opinion indicating that I should not go forward as I did.

I have made my decision. This is where I stand. If I stand alone, Mr. Speaker, I have no fear of standing alone.

If Rosa Parks could sit alone in a racist Southern town to deal with injustice and bring about some form of justice, surely I can stand alone in the well of the Congress and stand alone on where I stand with impeachment.

If Dr. King could go to jail and write one of the greatest essays on human rights I have ever read, surely I can stand in the well of the Congress—if he could go to jail—and I can extoll and expand upon why I believe we have to move forward with impeachment.

Finally, this: those of you who bothered to read the Articles of Impeachment, and I beg that you would, because that is why this time is being made available, so that everyone can read it and understand why we are going forward, and those of you who will read them will find that I don't approve of anyone calling mothers dogs. I don't approve of it. I don't approve of it. I don't care who you are. When you say "SOB," you are saying that some-

body's mother is a dog. I don't approve of that.

By the way, that is not widely published that that is in the Articles of Impeachment, but it is there. It is there for all to see.

So for those who believe that motherhood is sacred, for those who believe that a President of the United States ought not say "SOB," and you know what it means—I never use the B word. I never use profanity. But I want you to know this: I am going to move forward with those Articles of Impeachment, and motherhood is sacred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING MATT BELLINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of my constituent, Matt Bellina, of Holland, Pennsylvania.

On April 9, 2014, at the age of 30, Matt was diagnosed with ALS, otherwise known as Lou Gehrig's disease. ALS attacks the nerve cells in the brain and the spinal cord, causing those with ALS to lose control of their muscles.

Matt graduated from Virginia Tech in May 2005 and received his commission into the U.S. Navy as a naval aviator. Following the onset of his symptoms, which include cramping hands, twitching arms, stiffness in his legs, Matt was grounded from flying. He continued to serve in the Navy in an administrative capacity until he medically retired in 2014, with the rank of lieutenant commander.

He eventually moved back home to Bucks County with his wife, Caitlin, and his young children to be surrounded by family and friends.

Although this disease stopped Matt's career in its tracks, he persisted and actively involved himself in the ALS community and became a strong advocate for right-to-try legislation.

Mr. Speaker, each year Americans like Matt Bellina receive the devastating news of a terminal diagnosis. Even with the amazing work done in American medical research, for too many families, access to these potentially lifesaving treatments will come too late or not at all.

Thousands of terminally ill patients suffer needlessly while awaiting final approval for drugs, therapies, and other medical technologies. While the Food and Drug Administration carries out its three-phase approval process, which can take years and cost billions of dollars, many patients simply want the chance to try treatments that are already demonstrated to be safe. A bill that was unanimously passed by the

Senate will offer them a chance to extend their lives.

The Right to Try Act would ensure that terminally ill patients, together with their physicians and pharmaceutical manufacturers, can administer investigational treatments where no alternative exists. In fact, this bipartisan idea is already the law in 37 States.

A Federal right-to-try law would prevent the government from blocking access to potentially lifesaving medications. It would require patients to first try all other available treatments and be unable to participate in clinical trials.

For those patients caught between the traditional drug approval delays, the clinical trial process for which they do not qualify, and limited time, the right to try simply establishes the freedom for patients and their doctors to try therapies where the benefits far outweigh the risks. It gives them an option of trying to save their life.

Mr. Speaker, whether it is a father courageously battling ALS or a brave child living with Duchenne muscular dystrophy, they deserve the right to try.

MASS SHOOTING IN LAS VEGAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the tragedy that happened in my home town of Las Vegas last Sunday, October 1.

Last week, a horrific mass shooting took place in the community that I grew up in. Immediately when I heard the news on Sunday night, like so many people, I felt helpless, and I rushed to the hospital to see how I could help.

This shooting was the deadliest in modern U.S. history: 58 innocent people have died, and over 500 were injured.

The 58 innocent victims came from all walks of life. They came to Las Vegas from all over the United States of America. Some were there to celebrate their birthdays, their favorite country singer, a night out with friends and family, and even celebrating their wedding anniversaries.

□ 1100

Even though these families will never get another Christmas, another Thanksgiving, or another birthday with their loved one, they will never forget them, and we won't either.

As we grieve for those who were killed or injured, and pray for their families, I want to recognize the heroes who bravely and selflessly rushed to help: law enforcement officers and first responders, including some who were off duty and attending the concert, who ran toward the gunfire to protect

the concertgoers and provide desperately needed care for victims; people at the concert who shielded those around them, gave them medical care, and led others to safety, exposing themselves to the hail of bullets while they tried to save others; people driving by who used their cars to help take shooting victims to the hospitals; strangers helping strangers; the healthcare professionals, doctors, nurses, support staff, and volunteers who have been working tirelessly around the clock to care for the more than 500 injured people; hospitality industry employees, who rushed to help however they could; and the Las Vegas businesses and residents, who have generously donated their money, time, and blood to help the victims.

To all of these heroes, I say: Thank you. Thank you so much.

Over the coming days and weeks, I plan to speak on this floor about each individual victim to honor their life and to tell their story. I will also be speaking out about what Congress needs to do to prevent another tragedy like this from happening.

We should never forget the victims of October 1, 2017, but as we embark on the long process of healing, I am forever grateful for the incredible heart and spirit shown by the Las Vegas community. I have never been prouder to be a Las Vegas, and I have never been prouder to be a Nevadan, and I know that my city is and will always be Vegas Strong.

COMMANDER SETH ANTHONY STONE WAS A SOLDIER FOR THE LORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Commander Seth Anthony Stone, a native Texan, a devout Christian, and a true American hero, who left us far too early on September 30, 2017, at the age of 41 years old.

Twice the recipient of the Silver Star Medal, our Nation's third highest combat award, Seth was among the most highly decorated U.S. Navy SEALs.

As a SEAL platoon commander in Iraq during the Battle of Ramadi in 2006, he served alongside my son, Leif Babin, as they led some of the toughest sustained urban combat operations in the history of the SEAL teams.

Seth was a storied and an exceptional combat leader that helped turn the tide for America in two of the most pivotal battles of the Iraq war.

Seth and his SEAL platoon played an integral role in the victorious efforts of the U.S. Army's 1st Armored Division's Ready First Brigade Combat Team that transformed Ramadi from the most violent and dangerous place in Iraq to a stable, secure, and peaceful city.

In more than 6 months of continuous urban combat, a number of his SEALs were wounded and killed in action, including Master-at-Arms Second Class Michael A. Monsoor, when he dove onto a grenade to save three of his SEAL teammates next to him. For his actions, Petty Officer Monsoor was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor.

Seth returned to Iraq 2 years later and led a SEAL task unit that included American Sniper, Chief Petty Officer Chris Kyle, also from Texas.

Seth's outstanding combat record placed him in a very special class that included Petty Officer Michael Monsoor, Chief Petty Officer Chris Kyle, Petty Officer Marc Lee, and Petty Officer Ryan Job.

Seth epitomized the warrior ethos, risking his life on many occasions in combat against our Nation's mortal enemies. He saved countless U.S. servicemembers, and he helped bring stability to embattled regions of the world.

About his military service, Seth said:

It was my honor to fight for my country. The best life is one lived as a sacrifice for others. I love my country, and I love the teams. That is what drove me to fight so hard for America while wearing the SEAL Trident. At the same time, I did not really consider myself to be a SEAL but, rather, a soldier for the Lord.

In everything he did and throughout his life he served the Lord from a place of deep faith. He was a very special person. I was proud to know him, and I will be forever grateful for his service to our great country and the friendship and camaraderie that he had with my son and all those whom he served with.

While Seth has left us on Earth, his passion for his friends, his country, and his Lord will certainly live on and never be forgotten.

FEMA CAN DO BETTER FOR OUR FELLOW AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, there was applause from the gallery, and every American applauds.

Mr. Speaker, I have an alert for the Trump administration. The Trump-led FEMA, that is the Federal Emergency Management Agency, part of the Department of Homeland Security, is falling far short on disaster relief in Puerto Rico. In fact, I think one could say they are actually perilously short on helping the people, our fellow citizens, in Puerto Rico.

It has now been 22 days, that is 528 hours, since Hurricane Maria destroyed Puerto Rico. Hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico still—still—have no fresh water, no power, little food, with many villages lacking any means for communication. Many have no dry cots or even dry sleeping bags to replace the wet mattresses and moldy surroundings that characterize the Puerto Rico of today.

Let me say that Puerto Rico is not a large island. It is a little over 100 miles wide, not much larger than my congressional district in Ohio which extends from Cleveland to Toledo. The difference with Puerto Rico is the topography is much more hilly.

I ask myself the question: Why hasn't FEMA had airdrops of vital sustenance from the very start? Where is that help to these far-flung villages that have been cut off because, when the rains came, they washed out bridges and roads that make all these tiny towns inaccessible? Inaccessible.

Fresh water packets can be airdropped. Our military does that all over the world. Why can't those fresh water packets be dropped in Puerto Rico?

We can drop packets with peanut butter and bread. We do that all over the world. Why can't we do that in Puerto Rico? Why can't we airdrop food?

Citizens in Ohio with families and friends in Puerto Rico about whom they are desperately worried have been told that many smaller towns where they have relationships lack relief and any assistance now 528 hours, 22 days, into this deep human tragedy.

I want to place in the RECORD, and I hope somebody at FEMA is listening, names of some of the villages that are completely cut off because roads and bridges were destroyed and no relief has come. No relief has come.

Ponce, in the south, is one. Utuado, Jayuya, Arecibo, Yauco, Corozal, Comerio, Loiza, Toa Baja, Cabo Rojo, and Llanadas. Those are names we have been given. Aid to these pockets of desperation is almost 3 weeks overdue. People need relief now.

FEMA also needs a better plan. In fact, they need a plan. I don't think they have any plan to immediately evacuate people to the mainland for respite. Places like Cleveland, Lorain, and Toledo, Ohio, we could accept people who now are living in conditions you would wish on no American.

We cannot risk more illness and death. Children should not be missing school after the horror they have experienced. We shouldn't have the level of hardship that has been subjected to people who are still enduring the devastation of Maria. What is happening there is inhumane.

Most of the television stations are down in San Juan, and that is where the Governor of Puerto Rico is most of the time when our codels go down there, but the desperation is in the countryside. It is outside of San Juan, which is inaccessible.

President Trump, the people of America and, let me tell you, those in Ohio need you to help their families and countrymen now. FEMA can do so much better for our fellow Americans.

FEMA's initials stand for Federal Emergency Management. So where is

the emergency? Where is the management? And where is the Federal reputation for excellence and leaving no man or woman behind?

FEMA, shape up. America demands more, and Americans deserve more.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL WAS A GIANT MISTAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge President Trump to decertify the disastrous Iran nuclear deal. There are reports that decertification may come as early as tomorrow, and I certainly hope so.

The Iran nuclear deal was a giant mistake. It has been bad for America's national security, bad for our ally Israel's national security, and bad for the world.

By decertifying the flawed Iran nuclear deal before October 15, the administration has a chance to send a strong message that the United States will not sit idly by while the Iranian threat continues to grow.

The deal was premised on a naive notion that Iran would somehow evolve into a peaceful global partner, but that couldn't have been further from the truth. Make no mistake about it: Iran is not our friend, does not share our values, and should not have been trusted.

For decades, Iran has called the United States the Great Satan, and their leadership continues to call for the total annihilation of our ally Israel. Iran remains the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world and is actively working towards obtaining a nuclear bomb.

This much is clear: Iran has not upheld the spirit of this deal. Now is the time to reassert our authority on the world stage and hold Iran accountable.

I look forward to working with President Trump to keep America, our allies, and the rest of the world safe from Iranian aggression.

□ 1115

HONORING THE DISCOVERY OF HERNANDO DE SOTO'S 1539 ENCAMPMENT AND THE LOST NATIVE AMERICAN TOWN OF POTANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the discovery of Hernando de Soto's 1539 encampment and the lost Native American town of Potano, by the University of Florida professors, Dr. Fred White and Dr. Michele White, and University of Florida Anderson Scholar Ethan White. This newly discovered archaeological site is the oldest confirmed New World contact site in the United States.

In one of the most important events in U.S. history, de Soto was the first European to discover the Mississippi River and explore an area that today would hold 10 States. Until this incredible archaeological discovery, there was no physical evidence of de Soto's 4,000-mile journey. The collection of artifacts recovered near Orange Lake, Florida, includes very rare King Ferdinand coins, Queen Isabella coins, and a King Enrique IV of Castile coin that is the oldest dated European artifact ever unearthed in the United States.

Other rare items include Murano glass beads and Spanish weapons and armor dated from the early 1500s. The artifacts were excavated in the lost ancient Native American town of Potano. Also discovered in the town of Potano were the remains of the first location of the San Buenaventura Franciscan mission built there in the 1580s. Within the floors of the 16th century mission, the team discovered the largest cache of medieval coins found in the American mainland so far.

Acknowledgment for confirmation and identification of the artifacts goes to a large and diverse group of scholars throughout the country. The recent scientific findings were published in the peer-reviewed International Journal of Archaeology and with the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Bureau of Archaeological Research in Tallahassee, Florida. The collection of artifacts is at the Florida Museum of Natural History on the campus of my alma mater, the University of Florida.

NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, additionally, I would like to recognize today is National Farmers Day, a day when we say thanks to all of our farmers and ranchers for the work they do. Our agricultural industry, in a lot of ways, is the backbone of this country. It feeds our Nation and a big portion of the world, and accounts for 11 percent of overall employment.

Most people don't realize how farmers affect their life, but it is important to reflect on the interdependence between rural and urban life.

People often associate Florida with tourism, but agriculture is actually Florida's number two industry, utilizing one-third of Florida's available land. Without agriculture, urban developments—in fact, all developments—could not flourish. There is a simple symbiotic relationship between families and communities, and that is, if

you are hungry, you are going to eat. Every time you get hungry you think about your farmer, so thank a farmer today.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BUD ADAMS

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting on National Farmers Day that I am able to rise and honor a true Florida legend, Mr. Bud Adams of Fort Pierce, Florida, and his contributions to the Florida cattle industry. He is an icon in Florida and the Nation's cattle industry.

Mr. Adams was a pioneer, a wildlife photographer, but more than anything else, he was a true American pioneer and cattle rancher. He was a real American cowboy in Florida, and they are known in Florida as Florida crack-ers. That name is derived from the sound of a bullwhip when it is used to round up and herd cattle.

After a stint in the Navy during World War II, Mr. Adams returned home to work and grow the family ranch. For the past 80 years, you could find Mr. Adams on horseback surveying the land and the cattle that they raised. He was a strong advocate for conservation and was nationally recognized for his leadership in preserving the land for future generations.

Even more so, Mr. Adams is known for creating the Braford breed of cattle, which is a cross between the Brahman cattle and the Hereford cattle, a heat-tolerant, heavy-beef-producing cow, ideal for the Florida climate. Mr. Adams was rightfully proud of this breed and went on to help found the United Braford Breeders Association.

Additionally, Mr. Adams was a proud member of the Florida Cattlemen's Association. He served as the president in 1958, and, for the last 59 years, he was always willing to offer a helping hand to the new Florida Cattlemen's leadership.

Mr. Adams will always be remembered for the impact he had on the Florida cattle industry and his willingness to nurture future generations of Florida cattlemen. He will be greatly missed.

SUPPORTING THE CARE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage my colleagues to support the Care Corps Demonstration Act.

By the year 2030, there will be more than 72 million older Americans. As they age, many of these seniors will require long-term support and services, placing a significant burden on our elder care system that is already struggling to provide and finance services to our seniors.

The Care Corps Demonstration Act, which my colleague Congresswoman

MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM and I have introduced, will address this growing need by placing Care Corps volunteers in communities where they will provide essential services to seniors that will allow these older Americans to remain independent. In turn, these wonderful volunteers will receive assistance in paying down their educational expenses.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, this program will help us train a new generation of healthcare providers to meet our Nation's demand for senior care services by giving our students essential, real-world experience in the field.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will create stronger communities across our Nation by bringing generations of Americans together. I encourage my colleagues to support our bill, the Care Corps Demonstration Act, of this session. The bill number, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 3493.

So please contact my congressional office or the office of Congresswoman MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM to cosponsor H.R. 3493.

NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize America's farmers on National Farmers Day.

I call our American farmers the thin green line because food security is national security. We can never discount the importance of our Nation's ability to feed itself, and we can do so only by the hard work of the men and women in the agricultural community.

In honor of National Farmers Day, I wanted to recite a poem first delivered by a radio personality, Paul Harvey, to the FFA Convention in 1978. The poem is as follows:

And on the 8th day, God looked down on his planned paradise and said, "I need a caretaker," so God made a farmer. God said, "I need somebody willing to get up before dawn, milk cows, work all day in the fields, milk cows again, eat supper, then go to town and stay past midnight at a meeting of the school board," so God made a farmer.

"I need somebody with arms strong enough to rustle a calf and yet gentle enough to deliver his own grandchild; somebody to call hogs, tame cantankerous machinery, come home hungry, have to wait for lunch until his wife is done feeding visit ladies, then tell the ladies to be sure and come back real soon, and mean it," so God made a farmer.

God said, "I need somebody willing to sit up all night with a newborn colt, and watch it die, and then dry his eyes and say, 'Maybe next year.' I need somebody who can shape an ax handle from a persimmon sprout, shoe a horse with a hunk of car tire, who can make a harness out of haywire, feed sacks, and shoe straps; who, planting time comes and harvest season, will finish his 40-hour week by Tuesday noon, and then paining from tractor back, put in another 72 hours," so God made a farmer.

God had to have somebody willing to ride the ruts at double speed to get the hay in ahead of the rain clouds, and yet stop in mid-field and race to help when he sees the first smoke from a neighbor's place, so God made a farmer.

God said, "I need somebody strong enough to clear trees and heave bales, yet gentle enough to tame lambs and wean pigs and tend to the pink-combed pullets, who will stop his mower for an hour to splint the broken leg of a meadow lark."

It had to be somebody who would plow deep and straight and not cut corners; somebody to seed, weed, feed, breed, and rake and disc and plow and plant and tie the fleece and strain the milk and replenish the self-feeder and finish a hard week's work with a 5-mile drive to church; somebody who would bale a family together with the soft strong bonds of sharing, who would laugh, and then sigh, and then reply, with smiling eyes, when his son says that he wants to spend his life "doing what dad does," so God made a farmer.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Joshua Leu, First Christian Church, Great Bend, Kansas, offered the following prayer:

God, I ask today that You would open these honorable men and women of the House to the significance, weight, and sacredness of the work that they get to do.

Remind them that the detailed decisions that they make here and now will not only have effects on the entire world, but will ripple through time for generations to come, making a way for all people.

So gift them, O Lord, with Your wisdom today and every day they serve so they can be a part of causing Your kingdom to come, Your will to be done, on Earth as it is in Heaven.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GABBARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND JOSHUA LEU

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute and say thanks during Pastor Appreciation Month. This one is particularly special, as one of my own church's pastors gave the opening prayer to this body just moments ago.

From baptisms to weddings to funerals, pastors give us encouragement to meet the demands of life. They give spiritual balance to a material world and are spiritual leaders for a nation deemed "one Nation under God."

I thank my current pastor, Pastor Josh Leu; his wife, Ashley; his lovely daughters, Karys and Khora. I also want to thank my pastor of 20 years, Pastor Bill Johnson, and his wife, Lois.

Thanks for all you have done for us, for my family, for my community, and for my church.

Like Pastor Bill always used to say: Have a good day, if you want to.

Mr. Speaker, let's all reach out to pastors and their families to tell them thanks for all they do for us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was grateful to join Secretary Rick Perry and my colleagues, Congressman CHUCK FLEISCHMANN, Congressman JOE BARTON, and Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, yesterday to celebrate the Department of Energy's 40th birthday.

The goals presented of progressing our science, protecting our Nation, and promoting our energy were meaningful to me, having served as Deputy General Counsel under Secretary Jim Edwards of the Reagan administration. I was also grateful to have worked at the Savannah River Site, where I saw firsthand so many dedicated personnel.

In Washington, I served with General Counsel R. Tenney Johnson; was welcomed by Administrative Assistant Marsha McQueen; and was trained by Deputy General Counsel Eric Fygi, who was recognized as an original DOE staff member.

I look forward to working with Secretary Perry to ensure continued progress on our nuclear cleanup missions, effective stewardship of the nuclear weapons stockpile, and continued research and development at our Nation's national labs. DOE now clearly promotes energy development to create jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear deal is far from perfect. There are outstanding issues, like ballistic missiles, that are and should be addressed outside the nuclear agreement.

Ultimately, the goal of this deal was to prevent Iran from attaining a nuclear weapon and averting all-out war. This is exactly what it has done.

Now, President Trump is threatening to pull out from the deal and break our commitments to Iran and our allies, with no evidence to prove that Iran has not complied. In fact, the IAEA and our U.S. military and intelligence sources unanimously agree that Iran has remained compliant to the agreement.

Walking away from the Iran nuclear agreement that, so far, is working will likely cause Iran to restart its nuclear weapons program, eliminate the possibility of diplomatic negotiations to denuclearize North Korea, kick off a nuclear arms race, and greatly increase the chances of nuclear war.

If President Trump breaks our commitment to the Iran deal, the American people have everything to lose and nothing to gain. For the peace and security of the American people, we must uphold our commitment to this nuclear deal.

RECOGNIZING ALABAMA STATE REPRESENTATIVE JAMES BUSKEY

(Mr. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alabama State Representative James Buskey.

Representative Buskey recently announced that he will be retiring from the Alabama House of Representatives after 42 years of representing people in Mobile, Alabama.

He was first elected to the House in 1976, making him one of the longest-

serving legislators in Alabama history. Outside of the legislature, Representative Buskey spent much of his life working in public education, including as a school administrator at E.S. Chastang Middle School in Mobile.

While we have had our share of political differences, I have always appreciated his institutional knowledge and respected his passion for our local community. I am honored to call James a friend and appreciate his decades of service to the people of Mobile and Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I wish James and his wife, Vergie, all the best upon his retirement and the years ahead.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HANNAH AHLERS

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 2017, a gunman opened fire on thousands of innocent people at a music festival in Las Vegas.

As our families mourn, I want to honor the life of Hannah Ahlers, a wife, mother, daughter, sister, friend to many, and beloved by her community, whose life was taken too soon. Her brother recently told me: "She was loved by everyone that met her . . . she was our sunshine."

Her beautiful personality was felt by all, from her family and friends, to the mothers she worked with in her children's schools, to the volleyball team she volunteered with. As her husband shared: "She wasn't too good for anybody; beautiful inside and out."

At 34, her dedication to family and community is felt in her home in the city of Beaumont and across the Inland Empire.

On behalf of my wife, Monica, and the entire 36th Congressional District, we join together as a community to mourn her heartbreaking loss and celebrate her life.

To Hannah's husband, Brian; her children, Briannah, Brice, and Hailey, our thoughts and prayers are with you. We commit to take up Hannah's mantle of dedication by serving our own communities. Her love and devotion will never be forgotten.

NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

(Ms. STEFANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, when you eat today, you can thank a farmer.

Across this great Nation, over 3 million farmers work tirelessly each day to produce the food that feeds our families and keeps our country running.

From Grace-Way Dairy Farm in Lowville to Everett Orchards in Peru, I have been blessed to meet with so

many farmers that make up the backbone of our north country economy. Many of these family farms in my district produce dairy, apples, honey, wine, and the most delicious maple in the country.

As Congress works on the next farm bill, we need to focus on supporting those who support our Nation's food supply.

Mr. Speaker, today, on National Farmers Day, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking the men and women who rise before the sun each and every day to make sure our families are fed.

HELPING FLOOD VICTIMS IN NEED

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Congress to help the neediest and most vulnerable flood victims from our Nation's recent hurricanes.

Our district in Houston and Harris County, Texas, is familiar with hurricanes and disaster recovery. We rebuilt our communities after Allison in 2001, and again in 2008, after Hurricane Ike.

Texans are proud and independent people. We take pride in our self-reliance and can-do attitude. However, many members of our community—low-income families, seniors, and disabled Americans—are in the greatest need and must rely on others for help.

Current rules can prevent the neediest victims from receiving assistance they need to recover and rebuild their homes, including denying individuals Federal assistance for being able to afford flood insurance premiums that can exceed over \$4,000 a year. That is out of range for most of these folks.

As America's elected representatives, we have a moral responsibility to act and protect our Nation's most vulnerable disaster victims, especially our seniors and disabled, from being left with nothing.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JAMES B. BRIEN, JR.

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Mr. Jim Brien of Mayfield in Kentucky's First Congressional District, who passed away on Friday, October 6.

Jim's decades of service established him as a titan within the western Kentucky legal community. Having served as assistant prosecutor for Mayfield, an assistant Commonwealth attorney, and as a partner at the Law Offices of Neely, Brien, Wilson, and Toombs, he developed an unparalleled legal knowledge and community network which he utilized to defend his fellow citizens and work tirelessly on their behalf.

He was widely respected for his selfless service to his family and community, as evidenced by his leadership in community organizations and his membership at the First Baptist Church in Mayfield.

For all who knew him, he was a dedicated public servant and a staunch advocate for Graves County, whose passion for bettering the community was rivaled only by his love for University of Kentucky football and basketball.

May God continue to bless his sons, James B. Brien III and Joshua V. Brien, and his family and friends, through which his legacy lives on.

NATIONAL FARMERS DAY

(Mr. ARRINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the people of west Texas, home to 14 million acres of farmland, making it one of the largest agriculture production regions in the world.

I have spent a lot of time with these plowboys and cowboys over the years, and I can tell you this: these men and women don't work our land and our cattle for the money, and they certainly don't do it for recognition.

But today is National Farmers Day. Let's pause and pay tribute to the American farmer.

Farming was man's first profession. Farming saved and sustained our first colony at Jamestown. Farming helped fund the Revolution, securing the very freedoms we have and cherish today.

Farming has allowed us to feed and clothe our own people, and that food and fiber independence has contributed to America being the most powerful, most prosperous, and most generous Nation in the history of the world.

God bless our farmers.

BEWARE OF POLLS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent Washington Post/ABC News poll professed to find that a majority of Americans supported amnesty for illegal immigrants. That is not hard to do, given how the survey was conducted.

The pollsters asked to speak only with the youngest adult at home; oversampled Democrats by at least 4 percent; used the word "undocumented" rather than "illegal;" questioned illegal immigrants, at least 3 percent of the population; and conditioned amnesty on requirements that can't be met.

Other than that, I am sure it was an accurate poll.

Beware of polls done by liberal media organizations that have an agenda of

their own. The American people may not be getting the facts. They deserve better.

ADDRESSING OUR COUNTRY'S NATURAL DISASTERS

(Mr. DENHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of the victims of the California wildfires.

We have seen some devastating fires throughout California, specifically huge fires in northern California, that have already burned over 142,000 acres. It is one of the deadliest weeks in California wildfire history, already seeing 23 lives perish in those fires.

Today, we will see disaster relief funding here on the floor. It is important that, while we have already passed one funding bill, we pass another to address all natural emergencies across the entire country. We must also have funding available for Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria in devastated areas like Puerto Rico, Texas, and Florida.

We have had big challenges in this country, and it is time to make sure that we pass a second relief funding bill that will address many of those concerns in the disasters that we have seen across the country.

Shortly hereafter, we are going to see another funding bill come forward that will address some reforms. While some of our States have building codes and are addressing the impacts so that we don't see this devastation in the future, we need to make sure that these reforms are passed in the coming bill as well.

We have three major bills. We will pass one today. Another one is soon to follow. We have to address the country's national emergencies.

□ 1215

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT RYAN MCCARTHY AND STAFF SERGEANT CHAD HICKEY

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two valued members of Missouri's defense community, Staff Sergeant Ryan McCarthy and Staff Sergeant Chad Hickey. They are both stationed out of Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri's Fourth District, and these soldiers are exceptional representatives of their base, their State, and their service branch—the United States Army.

Both men recently received top honors at the Association of the United States Army's Annual Meeting and Exposition, where they were recognized

for their leadership, excellence, and achievements.

Staff Sergeant McCarthy, who is right here, was named the Noncommissioned Officer of the Year by AUSA. A combat engineer with more than 9 years of service, McCarthy has served multiple deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan. His dedication and leadership represent the best ideals of our Army and America's fighting forces.

Another Fort Leonard Wood soldier, Staff Sergeant Chad Hickey, pictured here, was named Drill Sergeant of the Year. Hickey received the honor after winning a grueling fitness, endurance, and combat-readiness competition against the Nation's top drill sergeants.

The fact that Staff Sergeant McCarthy and Staff Sergeant Hickey are both from Fort Leonard Wood is no surprise. The men and women stationed there serve with strength, seriousness, and purpose, setting an example of military leadership for the entire Army.

To Staff Sergeants McCarthy and Hickey, and to all of the soldiers stationed at Fort Leonard Wood, I wish to extend to each and every one of you and your families our gratitude and congratulations.

CONGRESSIONAL APP CHALLENGE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, technology connects the world in ways like never before. From everyday conveniences at our fingertips to improved communications, technology plays an ever-increasing role in our lives.

We are becoming more dependent on applications, or apps, and the students of today will become the leaders of tomorrow by developing such technology. That is why my office is proud again to participate in the Congressional App Challenge.

This competition allows K-12 students from across the country to practice their code-writing skills by developing an app. Winning apps will be displayed in the Capitol Building later this year.

The 2015 winner from my office, Lachlan Campbell, created an app to store recipes and discover new dishes. I am proud that this State College student was able to show off his talents in our Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that students from across Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District will put their skills to work, create an app, and submit it to the Congressional App Challenge.

Submissions will close on November 1, and I can't wait to see what our students create.

RECOGNITION OF BIOENERGY DAY

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Bioenergy Day, a day we celebrate natural renewable energy in America. On October 18, organizations across America will mark this special day by opening their doors to the public and highlighting how bioenergy is fueling America.

Forest by-products are a primary source of bioenergy, making my home State of Arkansas a leading producer in this field.

Across the country, bioenergy keeps the lights on and so much more. Bioenergy produces just under 6 percent of the Nation's total energy supply and provides full-time jobs for tens of thousands of Americans, with more plants coming online in the near future.

We need to do more research to find economical ways to harness renewable energy in our abundant biomass that we all too often continue to see going up in flames and wildfires. As we approach October 18, I encourage all Americans to learn more about bioenergy, forest by-products, and the environmental benefits derived from our natural resources.

CREATING A TURNING POINT FROM A TRAGEDY

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise as a cosponsor of the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act the House will be voting on later today.

Dr. Kirkpatrick was a promising young clinical psychologist assigned to the Tomah VA in Wisconsin. Committed to finding innovative treatments for PTSD, he expressed alarm that patients of the VA were being overmedicated, preventing him from providing the treatment they so desperately needed.

Rather than listen to his concerns, the VA retaliated against him and, ultimately, Chris was fired; and that very day, he took his own life. The VA investigation later found that Chris' concerns about overmedication were entirely founded.

Chris' story is a tragedy, but can also serve as a turning point. Just as our veterans have earned world-class care, their allies such as Chris deserve full protection should they bravely decide to document VA wrongdoing or abuse. By increasing these protections today, we are honoring Chris' memory, serving as a fitting memorial to a life that was tragically cut short.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF REQUIREMENTS ACT, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 569) providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 569

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 2266, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017".

DIVISION A—ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF REQUIREMENTS ACT OF 2017

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER RELIEF FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief Fund" for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$18,670,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$10,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations related to disasters: *Provided*, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall publish on the Agency's website not later than 5 days after an award of a public assistance grant under section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172) that is in excess of \$1,000,000, the specifics of each such grant award: *Provided further*, That for any mission assignment or mission assignment task order to another Federal department or agency regarding a major disaster in excess of \$1,000,000, not later than 5

days after the issuance of such mission assignment or mission assignment task order, the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's website the following: the name of the impacted State, the disaster declaration for such State, the assigned agency, the assistance requested, a description of the disaster, the total cost estimate, and the amount obligated: *Provided further*, That not later than 10 days after the last day of each month until a mission assignment or mission assignment task order described in the preceding proviso is completed and closed out, the Administrator shall update any changes to the total cost estimate and the amount obligated: *Provided further*, That for a disaster declaration related to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, or Hurricane Maria, the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, not later than 5 days after the first day of each month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall publish on the Agency's website, not later than 10 days after the first day of each such month, an estimate or actual amount, if available, for the current fiscal year of the cost of the following categories of spending: public assistance, individual assistance, operations, mitigation, administrative, and any other relevant category (including emergency measures and disaster resources): *Provided further*, That not later than 10 days after the first day of each month, the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's website the report (referred to as the Disaster Relief Monthly Report) as required by Public Law 114-4.

Of the amounts provided in this division for the Disaster Relief Fund, up to \$4,900,000,000 may be transferred to the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account for the cost of direct loans as authorized under section 417 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5184) to be used to assist local governments in providing essential services as a result of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, or Maria: *Provided further*, That such amounts may subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$4,900,000,000 under section 417 of the Stafford Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 417 of the Stafford Act, a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof, of the United States shall be deemed to be a local government for purposes of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 417(b) of the Stafford Act, the amount of any such loan issued to a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof, may be based on the projected loss of tax and other revenues and on projected cash outlays not previously budgeted for a period not to exceed 180 days from the date of the major disaster, and may exceed \$5,000,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or the constitution of a territory or possession that limits the issuance of debt, a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof, may each receive more than one loan with repayment provisions and other terms specific to the type of lost tax and other revenues and on projected unbudgeted cash outlays for which the loan is provided: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 417(c)(1) of the Stafford Act, loans to a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof, may be cancelled in whole or in part only at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security in consultation with the Secretary

of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall determine the terms, conditions, eligible uses, and timing and amount of Federal disbursements of loans issued to a territory or possession, and instrumentalities and local governments thereof: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a): *Provided further*, That FEMA may transfer up to 1.5 percent of the amount under this paragraph to the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account for administrative expenses to carry out under this paragraph the direct loan program, as authorized by section 417 of the Stafford Act: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this paragraph for transfer, up to \$150,000,000 may be transferred to the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account for the cost to lend a territory or possession of the United States that portion of assistance for which the territory or possession is responsible under the cost-sharing provisions of the major disaster declaration for Hurricanes Irma or Maria, as authorized under section 319 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5162): *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this paragraph for transfer, up to \$1,000,000 may be transferred to the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account for administrative expenses to carry out the Advance of Non-Federal Share program, as authorized by section 319 of the Stafford Act.

The amount provided under this heading is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Wildland Fire Management", \$184,500,000, to remain available through September 30, 2021, for urgent wildland fire suppression operations: *Provided*, That such funds shall be solely available to be transferred to and merged with other appropriations accounts from which funds were previously transferred for wildland fire suppression in fiscal year 2017 to fully repay those amounts: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund", \$342,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2021, for necessary expenses for large wildland fire suppression operations of the Department of Agriculture and as a reserve fund for suppression and Federal emergency response activities: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(e)), such funds shall be solely available to be transferred to and merged with other appropriations accounts from which funds were previously transferred for wildland fire suppression in fiscal year 2017 to fully repay those amounts: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the

Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Wildland Fire Management", \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities and funds necessary to repay any transfers needed for these costs: *Provided*, That such funds may be available to be transferred to and merged with other appropriations accounts to fully repay amounts previously transferred for wildland fire suppression: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Each amount appropriated or made available by this division is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this division shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. The terms and conditions applicable to the funds provided in this division, including those provided by this title, shall also apply to the funds made available in division B of Public Law 115-56.

SEC. 304. Each amount designated in this division by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 305. (a)(1) Not later than December 31, 2017, in accordance with criteria to be established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as "OMB"), each Federal agency shall submit to OMB, the Government Accountability Office, the respective Inspector General of each agency, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate internal control plans for funds provided by this division and division B of Public Law 115-56.

(2) Not later than March 31, 2018, the Government Accountability Office shall review for the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate the design of the internal control plans required by paragraph (1).

(b) All programs and activities receiving funds under this division shall be deemed to be "susceptible to significant improper payments" for purposes of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note), notwithstanding section 2(a) of such Act.

(c) Funds for grants provided by this division or division B of Public Law 115-56 shall be expended by the grantees within the 24-month period following the agency's obligation of funds for the grant, unless, in accordance with guidance to be issued by the Director of OMB, the Director waives this requirement for a particular grant program and submits a written justification for such waiver to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. In

the case of such grants, the agency shall include a term in the grant that requires the grantee to return to the agency any funds not expended within the 24-month period.

SEC. 306. (a) The first proviso under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in division B of Public Law 115–56 is amended by striking “State or unit of general local government” and inserting “State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302))”.

(b) Amounts repurposed pursuant to subsection (a) that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of such Act.

SEC. 307. Section 101(a)(7) of division D of Public Law 115–56 is amended to read as follows:

“(7) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017 (division G of Public Law 115–31), except the language under the heading ‘FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund’ in the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior.”

SEC. 308. (a) Notwithstanding sections 1309, 1310, and 1310a of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016–4017a) and section 15(e) of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 2414(e)), and any borrowing agreement entered into between the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, of the indebtedness of the Administrator under any notes or other obligations issued pursuant to section 1309(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) and section 15(e) of the Federal Insurance Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 2414(e)) that is outstanding as of the date of the enactment of this Act, an amount of \$16,000,000,000 is hereby cancelled. To the extent of the amount cancelled, the Administrator and the National Flood Insurance Fund are relieved of all liability to the Secretary of the Treasury under any such notes or other obligations, including for any interest due under such notes and any other fees and charges payable in connection with such notes, and the total amount of notes and obligations issued by the Administrator pursuant to such sections shall be considered to be reduced by such amount for the purposes of the limitation on such total amount under such section 1309(a).

(b) The amount of the indebtedness cancelled under subsection (a) may be treated as public debt of the United States.

(c)(1) This section is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(2) The amount provided in this section is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 309. Notwithstanding section 19(a)(2)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028), not to exceed \$1,270,000,000 of funds made available for the contingency reserve under the heading “Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program” of division A of Public Law 114–113 shall be available for the Secretary to provide a grant to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for disaster nutrition assistance in response

to the Presidentially declared major disasters and emergencies: *Provided*, That funds made available to Puerto Rico under this section shall remain available for obligation by the Commonwealth until September 30, 2019, and shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 310. Notwithstanding section 2208(1)(3) of title 10, United States Code, during fiscal year 2018, the dollar limitation on advance billing of a customer of a working-capital fund in such section shall not apply with respect to the advance billing of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. In the preceding sentence, the term “advance billing” has the meaning given the term in section 2208(1)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

This division may be cited as the “Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act of 2017”.

DIVISION B—BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017

SECTION 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017”.

SEC. 1002. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES IN CERTAIN JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

(a) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES AUTHORIZED BY THE BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2005.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judges authorized for the following districts by subsection (b) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) are extended until the applicable vacancy specified in paragraph (2) in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the respective district occurs:

- (A) The district of Delaware.
- (B) The southern district of Florida.
- (C) The district of Maryland.
- (D) The eastern district of Michigan.
- (E) The district of Nevada.
- (F) The eastern district of North Carolina.
- (G) The district of Puerto Rico.
- (H) The eastern district of Virginia.

(2) VACANCIES.—

(A) SINGLE VACANCIES.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), the 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for each district specified in paragraph (1)—

- (i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and
- (ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(B) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

- (i) occurring 5 years or more after the date of the enactment of this Act, and
- (ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(C) DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.—

(i) The 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Maryland—

- (I) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and
- (II) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(ii) The 2d and 3d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Maryland resulting from the death, retirement,

resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(D) SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.—The 1st and 2d vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the southern district of Florida—

- (i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and
- (ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of subsection (b) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of bankruptcy judges referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES EXTENDED BY THE BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2005 AND THE TEMPORARY BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIPS EXTENSION ACT OF 2012.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judges authorized by section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and extended by subsection (c) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) and further extended by section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) for the district of Delaware and the district of Puerto Rico are extended until the applicable vacancy specified in paragraph (2) in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the respective district occurs.

(2) VACANCIES.—

(A) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 5th vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

- (i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and
- (ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(B) DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO.—The 2d vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Puerto Rico—

- (i) occurring more than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and
- (ii) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), all other provisions of section 3 of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1992 (28 U.S.C. 152 note), subsection (c) of the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 152 note), and section 2 of the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary office of bankruptcy judges referred to in paragraph (1).

SEC. 1003. TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGE AUTHORIZED.

(a) APPOINTMENTS.—The following bankruptcy judges shall be appointed in the manner prescribed in section 152(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, for the appointment of bankruptcy judges provided for in section 152(a)(2) of that title:

- (1) Two additional bankruptcy judges for the district of Delaware.
- (2) One additional bankruptcy judge for the middle district of Florida.
- (3) One additional bankruptcy judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

(b) VACANCIES.—

(1) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—The 6th and 7th vacancies in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the district of Delaware—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under subsection (a)(1) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(2) MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.—The 1st vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the middle district of Florida—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under subsection (a)(2) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

(3) EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.—The 2d vacancy in the office of a bankruptcy judge for the eastern district of Michigan—

(A) occurring 5 years or more after the appointment date of the bankruptcy judge appointed under subsection (a)(3) to such office, and

(B) resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge, shall not be filled.

SEC. 1004. BANKRUPTCY FEES.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(6) In” and inserting “(6)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) During each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, if the balance in the United States Trustee System Fund as of September 30 of the most recent full fiscal year is less than \$200,000,000, the quarterly fee payable for a quarter in which disbursements equal or exceed \$1,000,000 shall be the lesser of 1 percent of such disbursements or \$250,000.”.

(b) DEPOSITS OF CERTAIN FEES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 THROUGH 2022.—Notwithstanding section 589a(b) of title 28, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022—

(1) 98 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of such title shall be deposited as offsetting collections to the appropriation “United States Trustee System Fund”, to remain available until expended; and

(2) 2 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of such title shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to quarterly fees payable under section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this section, for disbursements made in any calendar quarter that begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1005. CLARIFICATION OF RULE ALLOWING DISCHARGE TO GOVERNMENTAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE DISPOSITION OF FARM ASSETS UNDER CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation

“(a) Any unsecured claim of a governmental unit against the debtor or the estate that arises before the filing of the petition,

or that arises after the filing of the petition and before the debtor's discharge under section 1228, as a result of the sale, transfer, exchange, or other disposition of any property used in the debtor's farming operation—

“(1) shall be treated as an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition is filed;

“(2) shall not be entitled to priority under section 507;

“(3) shall be provided for under a plan; and

“(4) shall be discharged in accordance with section 1228.

“(b) For purposes of applying sections 1225(a)(4), 1228(b)(2), and 1229(b)(1) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated in a case under chapter 7 of this title shall be the amount that would be paid by the estate in a chapter 7 case if the claim were an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition was filed and were not entitled to priority under section 507.

“(c) For purposes of applying sections 523(a), 1228(a)(2), and 1228(c)(2) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the claim shall not be treated as a claim of a kind specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 523(a)(1).

“(d)(1) A governmental unit may file a proof of claim for a claim described in subsection (a) that arises after the date on which the petition is filed.

“(2) If a debtor files a tax return after the filing of the petition for a period in which a claim described in subsection (a) arises, and the claim relates to the tax return, the debtor shall serve notice of the claim on the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for the collection of the tax at the address and in the manner designated in section 505(b)(1). Notice under this paragraph shall state that the debtor has filed a petition under this chapter, state the name and location of the court in which the case under this chapter is pending, state the amount of the claim, and include a copy of the filed tax return and documentation supporting the calculation of the claim.

“(3) If notice of a claim has been served on the governmental unit in accordance with paragraph (2), the governmental unit may file a proof of claim not later than 180 days after the date on which such notice was served. If the governmental unit has not filed a timely proof of the claim, the debtor or trustee may file proof of the claim that is consistent with the notice served under paragraph (2). If a proof of claim is filed by the debtor or trustee under this paragraph, the governmental unit may not amend the proof of claim.

“(4) A claim filed under this subsection shall be determined and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 502, or disallowed under subsection (d) or (e) of section 502, in the same manner as if the claim had arisen immediately before the date of the filing of the petition.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1222(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “unless—” and all that follows through “the holder” and inserting “unless the holder”;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) subject to section 1232, provide for the treatment of any claim by a governmental unit of a kind described in section 1232(a).”;

(B) in section 1228—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—(aa) by inserting a comma after “all debts provided for by the plan”; and

(bb) by inserting a comma after “allowed under section 503 of this title”; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “the kind” and all that follows and inserting “a kind specified in section 523(a) of this title, except as provided in section 1232(c).”; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting “, except as provided in section 1232(c)” before the period at the end; and

(C) in section 1229(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) provide for the payment of a claim described in section 1232(a) that arose after the date on which the petition was filed.”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) any bankruptcy case—

(A) that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) in which the plan under chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, has not been confirmed on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) relating to which an order of discharge under section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, has not been entered; and

(2) any bankruptcy case that commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in consideration of H. Res. 569.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present H. Res. 569, making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the current fiscal year to help respond to recent devastating natural disasters.

Over the past 2 months, millions of Americans have had their lives forever altered by destructive hurricanes in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and by raging and deadly wildfires in the West.

We all support those who are victimized, particularly those who lost their lives or lost loved ones, and we will continue to be with them every step of the way with the Federal support they need as they recover and rebuild.

Our thanks go to the first responders, volunteers, and States who saved countless lives, protected communities, and demonstrated the best of humanity; that includes FEMA, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and many other Federal agencies for getting the first installment of relief to those in need.

However, with such massive, unprecedented damage, more help is clearly needed to continue to respond to these recovery efforts, to rebuild communities with dollars, with resources, with manpower, and with our support.

This emergency funding legislation, the second installment, addresses urgent short-term immediate priorities: replenishing FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, supporting ongoing Federal wildfire suppression efforts, providing debt relief for the Federal Flood Insurance Program, and other assistance that will help our fellow Americans in their time of greatest need.

To summarize the \$36.5 billion in emergency funding provided in this bill, in total, \$18.7 billion is provided for the Disaster Relief Fund. This includes \$13.77 billion for the most immediate response needs: lifesaving missions, emergency protection, the repair and restoration of public infrastructure like communications, power, transportation, and, yes, shelter, and financial assistance to individuals and families affected as they rebuild their lives.

This package also includes \$4.9 billion for community disaster loans, which will ensure local governments are able to provide basic municipal services such as police and fire protection and public education throughout this trying time.

In addition to the Disaster Relief Fund, this bill provides a one-time payment of \$1.27 billion to allow Puerto Rico and our fellow citizens to receive the same access to emergency disaster and nutrition program benefits that other States receive.

The bill also ensures that the National Flood Insurance Program is able to meet its existing claim obligations as Americans cope with the tremendous flood damage to their homes and communities.

For wildlife suppression, the bill contains \$576.5 million. As we have seen, the situation out West has grown even more desperate and deadly. We must ensure that those heroic firefighters can continue to save lives and protect property.

As we know, the needs of each disaster area are ever changing. Consequently, our Appropriations Committee and all of our Members continue

to monitor the progress of recovery efforts as well as anticipate emerging needs.

This will be a long process, Mr. Speaker, and the second package or installment of the Federal support will certainly not be all that is needed over the long term.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill. It is important for the Nation, for the communities affected, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, since Hurricane Harvey wrought historic flooding in Texas, 12 major disasters have been declared. From a hurricane that damaged large swaths of Florida, storms that annihilated Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and wildfires burning in the West, Americans deserve certainty the Federal Government will stand by them in their time of need. This is particularly important after the President threatened to abandon Puerto Rico in his latest Twitter this morning.

Congress cannot turn its back on recovery, no matter how reckless the President's outburst may be, as Americans are suffering and simply trying to survive. This package provides critical disaster relief, flood insurance aid, and help for communities devastated by wildfires.

Puerto Rico would be aided by provisions to address its liquidity crisis by facilitating recovery, not paying creditors, and providing additional nutrition assistance. Additionally, the bill would continue aid to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands from the Department of Defense.

However, more must be done to provide medium- and long-term investments, including rebuilding ports, coastlines, airports, roads, bridges, repairing the electrical grid and other infrastructure, and ensuring the health needs of American citizens are met.

I urge your support for this bill and your continued focus on ensuring the full recovery of American communities devastated by natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the distinguished ranking member of the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

This bill is a first step in helping Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands recover from the devastation of Hurricane Maria. It will provide FEMA and the governments of the islands with the funds needed to address immediate relief needs and begin the recovery process.

I do want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their commitment

to this issue and for taking my phone calls at all different times, on weekends. You have been very helpful and very supportive.

□ 1230

Both will be visiting the island tomorrow and will be able to see firsthand the dramatic and comprehensive needs that Puerto Rico is facing.

Right now, 85 percent of the island still lacks electricity more than 3 weeks after the hurricane hit. One-third of the island doesn't have access to clean drinking water. Most of the island still lacks cellular service, hampering the vital information to deliver assistance in the areas that are needed.

Federal employees on the island now are doing important and vital work, but we need more boots on the ground. This funding provides them with the resources needed to do that in the short term.

But to succeed, there needs to be a commitment from the highest levels of government to ensure the recovery of all areas that are part of our Nation, including its territories. Unfortunately, given the President's latest Twitter rant this morning, it seems unlikely that we have that focus and commitment.

So it is up to us in Congress to make sure that the Federal Government doesn't forget about Puerto Rico, and that is what I intend to do in the days and months ahead. But to both of you and to our membership here, thank you for not forgetting Puerto Rico. This is an ongoing battle and an ongoing issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the supplemental appropriations bill.

I want to commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the committee staff for their quick and thorough work to put this supplemental package together, and I thank the leadership for its swift action in scheduling this for House consideration.

In fiscal year 2017, the Forest Service had a shortfall of nearly \$577 million in firefighting funds. To cover its immediate firefighting costs, the Forest Service borrowed from its nonfire programs, as well as the Department of the Interior.

The bill will replace and repay those borrowed funds and close the books on fiscal year 2017. Specifically, it provides \$526 million for the Forest Service and \$50 million for the Department of the Interior.

The cost of fighting fires on our national forests and other public lands has increased dramatically over the last 15 years, yet these fires and costs remain highly unpredictable.

Right now the West is on fire. In my home State of California, firefighters are battling 22 large wildfires that have burned nearly 170,000 acres. The bill gives the government the tools it needs to assist local officials to get those fires under control as soon as possible.

We, the Congress, need to fix the way we budget for wildland fire so that the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior can focus on managing our Federal lands appropriately. We also need to give them the necessary legal authorities and tools to improve the condition and management of our national forests.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the past few months have witnessed one of the most devastating natural disasters ever endured by our country. They include hurricanes, voracious wildfires in my home State of California that have killed at least 23 people, required mass evacuations, and burned more than 170,000 acres and thousands of homes and businesses.

By acting quickly on this emergency supplemental, we are sending a strong message that we are here for disaster victims, including our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. But this is just a downpayment. We still don't have the final damage estimates for many of the affected areas.

In the coming weeks and months, we will need to once again support FEMA's continued recovery efforts, including in Puerto Rico, despite the President's threats to abandon the people there. There will be more to do to address unmet needs through the Community Development Block Grant program and other disaster relief programs.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage support for this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this funding package. This bill is a downpayment on the recovery from the recent fires and hurricanes.

I am pleased that it contains \$576.5 million to fully repay the funds that the U.S. Forest Service borrowed last fiscal year to pay for wildfire suppression. We have all seen the devastation and the tragic loss of life from large fires burning across our country.

Fiscal year 2017 was the most expensive year on record for wildfire suppression,

costing \$2.4 billion. As the duration and severity of wildfires grows, costs will continue to rise.

Unfortunately, once again we have missed the opportunity to fix the way the Federal Government funds wildfire suppression.

Let me be clear: the next supplemental must include a legislative fix for wildfire spending, and it must adequately support the Department of the Interior and its vital efforts to help our country rebuild from the recent fires and hurricanes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), whose leadership in this time of crisis we all salute.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the Speaker of the House and the whole leadership, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and all of the members from the Appropriations Committee for allowing the Federal Government to help Puerto Rico in this dire situation.

On behalf of the 3.4 million American citizens that live in Puerto Rico and the nearly 5.5 million Puerto Ricans that live on the mainland, I rise today in strong support of this disaster supplemental appropriations bill. They have been focused on Puerto Rico since before the arrival of Hurricane Irma, and then during Hurricane Maria.

I also thank all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who have reached out during these past 3 weeks to express their encouragement and offer their assistance during this process. For that, my constituents and I will always be grateful to all of the Members of this House.

As you may know by now, Puerto Rico was hit by two major hurricanes. First, Hurricane Irma, which caused significant damage on the eastern part of the island. That was on September 6. Then, on September 20, a few days later, we got hit by Hurricane Maria, which caused unprecedented destruction throughout the whole island and which many people consider that hurricane to be the most catastrophic natural disaster ever on U.S. soil.

Today, 22 days after the storm hit, nearly 85 percent of our population remains without power, 44 percent without running water, and almost 58 percent without access to telecommunications. To this date, we still have towns like Las Marias, Maricao, Utuado, and many others in the central part of the island, that remain uncommunicated and can only be accessed by air since most of the roads and bridges were washed away. We are talking about more than 18 major roads and bridges that were just washed away. The death toll has reached 48 fatalities, and, unfortunately, certainly that number is going to increase in the coming days and weeks.

This unprecedented humanitarian crisis in our own Nation has begun what is likely to evolve into a mass exodus of Puerto Ricans to the U.S. mainland, further jeopardizing the island's long-term recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today telling you that the American citizens that live in Puerto Rico still are suffering in different ways. This is not the time to focus on how and when resources will be withdrawn from Puerto Rico, or how slowly we are going to rebuild the island. Today, 85 percent of our island is without electricity, yet 3.4 million American citizens living there just got less than 15,000 people working to recover the power grid. I just want to remind you that Florida got more than 61,000 people helping to recover their power grid in just 4 days. That is not acceptable in our case, and we are still American citizens.

I know a lot of problems persist. It is too difficult to address the issue when you are not part of the mainland, you are not part of the power grid. It is different when you get access and resources to Texas, Louisiana, or Florida, because you can drive or you can have helicopters. In our case, everything is by ship or air. That means it is more difficult for the Federal Government to assist directly. That is the reason we got more than 15,000 personnel from the Coast Guard, National Guard, Army Corps of Engineers, FEMA, Navy, and the assistance of all national guards—Virginia, Florida, and New York, just to name a few.

The Puerto Rican communities in the States and on the island are showing the way, along with private companies, NGOs, and countless volunteers throughout the whole Nation. But there is still a lot that needs to be done as we begin the reconstruction. That is the reason this supplemental is so important for us.

Allowing the people of Puerto Rico to access problems that we never have before, like SNAP, which will provide \$1.3 billion to receive the same emergency disaster and nutrition assistance benefits as the States, this is the first time this Congress has allowed this to happen to Puerto Rico.

I thank the Members and leadership of the House for allowing this money.

This is the bill that provides for \$18.7 billion to FEMA to have the disaster relief fund to help in lifesaving missions across the island for emergency protection and removal of debris—we continue to have a lot of debris on the island—and the repair and restoration of our infrastructure. That is going to be a matter of discussion on another day because we can't rebuild or redo the infrastructure we did before from the fifties or the sixties. We need to redo a lot of things on our power grid.

It will provide also—and this is a very important area—\$7.4 billion to have liquidity to the local government

of Puerto Rico just to match Federal funds that are needed to these recovery actions. This is the second step this House has taken in terms of helping the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, people that are American citizens. This is the second step. The first one was the first supplemental that was approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. So this is the second step. This is not going to be the last one. We are going to need a lot more help in the coming months, and I know we can count on this House and on this Congress to make that happen.

The people of Puerto Rico are grateful, they are resilient, and they are going to continue to show us the way to recover. It is going to take a lot of time, a lot of resources, a lot of money, and a lot of commitment as U.S. citizens, like we are.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member of the Military Construction, Veteran Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, let me just start by saying to the people of Puerto Rico: Despite President Trump's indifference and soft bigotry, we will be there for the people of Puerto Rico until the last American's life returns to normal.

While I rise to support this critical emergency appropriations bill, this supplemental leaves much to be desired. This legislation provides vital recovery funds to my home State of Florida, as well as Texas; the U.S. Virgin Islands; Puerto Rico; and California, where wildfires remain ablaze. However, it neglects to include SBA loans for small businesses and homeowners, as well as making smart investments in our ports, coastlines, water systems, and electrical grids.

This bill also neglects to address the devastating agricultural losses, especially to Florida's \$10 billion citrus industry. It is also important to note that, in Florida, this vital funding will not be able to address the public health hazard of debris strewn across our lawns and streets as Governor Scott shamefully refuses to allow our cities to fully access FEMA funds.

While the majority has said these and other issues can be part of future omnibus negotiations, this delay will leave constituents waiting months longer to receive the services they so desperately need. They should not have to wait.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1245

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman, and the ranking member from New York for their work.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Puerto Rico, 3.5 million of our fellow citizens, are suffering. The mayor of my home town, Yabucoa, where Maria made landfall, is predicting that as many as 5,000 residents are potentially facing starvation.

More than 85 percent of the island is without electricity. One-third of Puerto Ricans lack access to drinkable water, which will surge the number of bacterial infections and mosquito-borne illnesses.

As Puerto Rico faces this humanitarian crisis, the President of the United States is tweeting out threats to withdraw assistance. That is an outrage. It is an insult. It is an abdication of the President's solemn duty to protect the safety and security of the American people. American citizens everywhere deserve better.

Where the President is failing to lead, Congress must act, and act now.

The legislation we are debating today is far from sufficient. It is not enough, but it is a start. It is a downpayment in helping the response process. It will keep FEMA operating, removing debris and distributing food and water.

It also helps Puerto Rico's Government address a looming cash shortfall. With the government running out of money by November 1, vital services could be suspended when residents can least afford it.

This bill would provide a short-term cash infusion for the government to keep going. The way this assistance is structured under the law, these funds will likely not be paid back, which is reasonable, given the challenges Puerto Rico faces. Some of those challenges have been created by the lack of action of the Congress when it comes to Medicaid.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. There is going to need to be much more assistance in the future. Puerto Rico will need help rebuilding its energy grid, repairing telecommunications networks, and putting its ports, bridges, and roads back together, and we cannot forget shoring up the island's Medicaid system, something that was critical before Maria, but is even more important now.

This problem is of Congress' making, and we must fix it. Make no mistake. Those priorities will require more money, and we will need to come back and address them in a few weeks.

The people of Puerto Rico are American citizens. And, you know, what? Even when so many of my brothers and sisters are suffering in Puerto Rico, are facing a humanitarian crisis, at last, 50 percent of the people in this country who didn't know that Puerto Ricans are American citizens are learning that fact.

Yes, American citizens, when, in 1898, Puerto Rico was invaded and taken over by the U.S. Government. So now it is our responsibility to make Puerto Rico whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are once again reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), chairman of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by first recognizing one of our own, who has been a superb representative for Puerto Rico in these very difficult times. You rarely see somebody with the talent, the energy of the representative of Puerto Rico here in Congress. Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN has been, frankly, a hero, and I just wanted to mention that, because she has really made all of us understand the situation, and she has done so with great dignity and great passion and great brilliance. I just had to say that.

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the chairman for being incredibly accessible and engaged. Florida has gotten hit rather hard, as you know. This bill totals \$36.5 billion. \$18.67 billion of that goes directly to FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, and it also ensures that our National Flood Insurance Program has the resources that it needs to pay the claims, also an important grant food and aid loan eligibility to Puerto Rico, which is crucial.

So far, Mr. Speaker, Florida has received \$740 million for assistance for individuals through FEMA, and is working through over 608,000 applicants. Think about that.

As we continue to recover, again, I look forward to continue working with the chairman, who has been phenomenal.

Specifically, we are going to have to deal with the agricultural impact of this storm, and again, particularly on the citrus industry, that has been devastated by this storm.

This is an important bill. It is an important bill. I want to thank the chairman for bringing it up so quickly. We must pass it. I look forward to working with Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and

with all our colleagues through this process, because we are going to need more assistance as the days and the months go.

So this is an important bill. I urge your support.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, millions of our fellow Americans in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are looking to Congress and the administration to work together to provide aid and assistance in recovery and rebuilding.

I disagree with the President of the United States that we are going to leave Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands or any other American precipitously before we have done the job we need to do.

The recent hurricanes have left 3.6 million Americans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands still without power, fuel, clean water, food, electricity, and access to medical facilities. That is unacceptable, I say to the administration.

We are witnessing a humanitarian disaster of historic proportions, and it will get worse if we do not come together as a nation and bring to bear the full force of the Federal Government to assist.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor to effect that end.

That is why I have called on President Trump to muster every Federal resource, to muster and ensure that aid and supplies can reach those who need them, and to work on restoring power, water, and communications. Because many are still out of reach, we do not yet know the full extent of the damage and loss of life.

Today's Washington Post has a front page story chronicling the tragedy that continues as of now to unfold in Puerto Rico, where nightfall brings complete darkness, and diseases are spreading by way of contaminated water. The island has been plunged into the 19th century. The Virgin Islands shares that status.

This supplemental must be followed in the weeks and months ahead by additional measures to provide disaster relief funding and financial assistance to bring the infrastructure of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands up to 21st century standards in order to prevent a repeat of what has occurred.

According to a letter sent to the congressional leadership on October 7, by the governor of Puerto Rico, Ricardo Rosselló, the damage of that island is estimated to cost as much as \$95 billion, which is 150 percent of Puerto Rico's gross national product.

This funding package is an important step, though it fails to provide ur-

gently needed Medicaid funding to help the 1.6 million in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands who rely on Medicaid for their healthcare.

Congress must do its part and ensure that the resources are available, but it is up to the administration to make certain that the resources we provide get to those who need them.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in passing this bill, and I call on the President again to take every necessary measure to address this humanitarian crisis affecting our fellow Americans.

Mr. President, do not send a message to any American that we will turn our backs on them. That is not fair, it is not right, and you ought to correct the statement you made this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico has no power. The U.S. Virgin Islands has no power. St. Johns is completely collapsed in the U.S. Virgin Islands. The people are dying from contaminated water.

Mr. President, how can you abandon the American people?

This bill is going to provide FEMA assistance to keep giving so they can have it. It is going to give \$16 billion to the senior citizens in my district, who have paid their flood insurance, who are desperate to get their houses repaired, to get the mold out after being impacted by Hurricane Harvey.

Yes, I woke up this morning to the outrage of the fires and people dying in California. That is what is in this bill.

I can't imagine that a President would make this comment of walking away, but I am here to fight for those who have been impacted by Hurricane Harvey. We are still suffering. Senior citizens are out of their homes. We have been evicting people in public housing. We need community development block grants. The Army Corps of Engineers is greatly needed.

The funding that we ask for is not in here, block grants is not in here, and as well the restoration that we need. We will fight. I will not turn my back on Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands and vote "no". I will vote "yes"—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is out of order.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And help Americans, but Hurricane Harvey has to be in the next bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. ***

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to heed the gavel.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), who I believe just returned.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY for bringing more disaster relief legislation to the floor today.

I am pleased to see much-needed support for ongoing disaster response efforts in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and other hurricane-affected areas, including direct assistance to families, debris removal operations, and emergency protective measures carried out by FEMA, and additional activities of numerous other Federal agencies that are on the ground working around the clock to help us to recover and rebuild.

I cannot thank enough all of our Federal and local personnel helping us through this. I have been on the ground after Irma, after Maria, and just recently, and I tell you, their support is invaluable.

I am particularly pleased to see the subdivision of \$5 billion for Disaster Direct Loan Program to assist local governments and with measures taking into account the unique aid and flexibility needed for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

Multiple loans will be available based on different types of losses and unanticipated spending needs, and waivers of amount limits are also helpful. Additional loans to pay for local matching requirements is an important support.

However, I am deeply concerned about the important relief that was left out of this bill and the administration's disaster relief request last week. This does not incorporate the medium and long-term assistance that played a clear critical role in the recovery following previous disasters like Katrina and Sandy, and the Virgin Islands cannot afford to wait for this to be a higher priority of the Federal Government.

The package does not include community development and social service block grant funding, Economic Development Administration funds, supplemental housing assistance, nor additional funds for repair of our water infrastructure, ports, community facilities, airports, roads, parks, wetlands, and fisheries.

Damage sustained in all of these areas has been catastrophic, and waiting around until another end of the year for auxiliary funding for these pressing needs is not acceptable.

Perhaps most concerning is the lack of Medicaid program assistance to the territory. Even before two consecutive Category 5 hurricanes that decimated our hospitals and medical infrastructure, the Virgin Islands was forced to operate a Medicaid program that is capped in an amount that has no relationship to local needs, and our rate of Federal matching funds, our FMAP, is

limited to an arbitrarily low 55 percent Federal to 45 percent local contribution.

□ 1300

Thousands of our citizens go without adequate care due to this treatment every year, in addition to the impacts on our providers and hospitals due to uncompensated care, but after these back-to-back storms, there is no revenue being generated in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico at this time. Our tourism-related economy is gone. We will miss this entire year, at the very least.

With our public health and social welfare needs, we are in dire need of supplemental Medicaid support, including a temporary 100 percent Federal contribution, just like what was provided to Americans living in Louisiana and Texas following Katrina.

I was pleased to see Ranking Member PALLONE's proposal to provide this 100 percent temporary Federal share with a substantial plus-up to our allotment so that the American citizens—yes, American citizens—in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico can have the benefit of Medicaid in this time of greatest need.

This has not been a part of this package. Virgin Islanders cannot wait until Christmas for a Medicaid program. We need it now.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the destruction that this historic hurricane season has wrought on Texas, Florida, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Gulf Coast, I am very pleased that, in addition to the emergency relief funds for wildfires that are burning on both ends of California, the bill also includes liquidity and emergency nutritional assistance for Puerto Rico, where they are facing particularly difficult challenges in their recovery efforts. This bill also provides for partial debt forgiveness of \$16 billion for the National Flood Insurance Program.

I am encouraged to see that the administration finally understands what we have been saying for a long time: we need to forgive the debt of the NFIP, which FEMA has repeatedly stated it will never be able to repay.

Following the losses that will be incurred as a result of the recent hurricanes, the NFIP needs debt forgiveness more than ever. But let's be clear. The partial debt forgiveness will leave the NFIP with a crushing level of debt. Although this is a step in the right direction, we should forgive all of the debt that the NFIP has accrued from catastrophic storms like Katrina and

Sandy instead of burdening the NFIP policyholders with hundreds of millions of dollars in interest payments every year.

Before this hurricane season, NFIP policyholders were already paying more in interest than the entire NFIP spends on salaries and expenses or funding mitigation or paying for flood maps.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a senior member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our ranking member for yielding time to me and for her tireless leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from northern California, let me just say that my thoughts and prayers are with our neighbors in the North Bay.

I remember the Oakland Hills. I represent Oakland and Berkeley, California; and just as many helped us then, we will help our neighbors now.

I am deeply grateful to our firefighters and our first responders who have been working around the clock to extinguish these fires.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of this emergency supplemental. Our neighbors in the North Bay, the Gulf Coast, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Texas, they need our help, and they need it now. Communities are devastated, and many are still without power and water. This is a life-and-death situation for so many.

Make no mistake, the recovery process is just beginning, and we cannot forget our Caribbean neighbors who are also suffering.

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental is a good first step. It is a good first step in a very long process, but we must provide more long-term assistance to help communities rebuild and to help them recover very quickly, and we must leave no one behind.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with my partner, our chairman, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know that he understands, as we all do, this is not a Republican or Democratic issue. This is our responsibility, to face the tremendous challenge that we see: people are suffering, schools are closed, more than three-quarters of the island does not have any energy, no clean water, need for food, need for basic services.

I am very pleased to work with the chairman of the committee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and I know that we will both be going to the island of Puerto Rico to actually see firsthand what has to be done, and it is clear it has to be done now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to travel to Puerto Rico this past Saturday with a bipartisan group of legislators. We traveled there with Resident Commissioner GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, who has been an absolutely outstanding advocate for Puerto Rico during this difficult time. I have a few takeaways from that:

One, it was a sobering experience to see how widespread the devastation is on the island. Every single aspect of the island of Puerto Rico was affected.

Secondly, the full commitment of the Department of Defense, of FEMA, of every Federal Government agency and the effort to recover that is being conducted in conjunction with the Governor and folks on the ground in Puerto Rico is great to see. It is an effective initial recovery effort that has saved and has sustained lives. Millions of meals and millions of bottles of water have been distributed.

A third takeaway is this will require a sustained active and effective effort.

I want to thank the chairman for introducing this bill today, which is absolutely necessary to bring back the economy on the island of Puerto Rico. The top priority now is to rebuild the grid, which is absolutely essential to getting the economy in Puerto Rico moving. That is why we need this aid package. It is an important step along the long road to recovery for our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico, as well as for all of those impacted by hurricanes in the South and those out West battling wildfires.

One thing I saw as well: the American people come to the assistance of other citizens in need, and that is true whether it is in Houston, Florida, or in Puerto Rico.

Again, I would like to thank the chair for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my remarks with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) as well as with my colleague from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

On our committee, we try to get the work of the Nation done, and at this point in history we have had some incredible tragedies and natural disasters. As a group, as this House, we must act quickly to ensure that the Federal Government fulfills its duty to millions of Americans in need. Whether they are from Texas or whether they are from Florida or whether they are from Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, they are all citizens. Whether they are from the West, who have been fighting these deadly fires, they deserve our support.

This will be the second installment of emergency funding. There will be others. I know people are concerned that not every State's needs are met, but

this is a good step in the right direction, and I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation so we can get this money out the door as quickly as possible.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to stand with the hundreds of thousands of Texas families victimized by Hurricane Harvey, and urge our state and federal officials to use available resources to help our fellow Americans in their time of need.

With nearly four-and-a-half feet of rain and 130 mile per hour winds, Hurricane Harvey is the largest and most expensive natural disaster to hit Texas in living memory. At least 270,000 homes and residences were damaged in our state. Most tragically, over 75 innocent people lost their lives as a result of Harvey, most of them in Harris County.

Later today the U.S. House of Representatives will be voting on a \$36.5 billion disaster supplemental bill to sustain relief and recovery efforts in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

This is not a perfect bill. I would have strongly preferred Congress provide dedicated funds to rebuild Houston and the Texas Gulf Coast, especially dedicated funding towards our region's flood control infrastructure and immediate housing needs for hurricane victims.

However, this supplemental will sustain the current recovery efforts till the damages caused by these devastating hurricanes can be fully assessed. Today's supplemental is on top of \$15 billion in emergency funding Congress passed last month in the immediate aftermath of Harvey.

The bipartisan Texas Congressional Delegation is committed to securing the substantial federal funds Houston and the Texas Gulf Coast need to rebuild and be prepared for the next big storm before the holiday season.

Our local officials, in particular the Governor of Texas and the state legislature, have the opportunity right now to act and ramp-up rebuilding efforts through our state's Economic Stabilization Fund.

Popularly known as Texas's "rainy day fund," the ESF currently has over \$10 billion available for emergencies. There can be no question that the destruction caused by Harvey and the immediate needs of tens of thousands of Texans are an emergency and are the reason why our state has been investing in a rainy day fund in the first place.

Harris County Judge Ed Emmett and Houston Mayor Sylvester Turner have already called on Governor Greg Abbott to use his authority to tap the rainy day fund and help Texans in need and rebuild our infrastructure.

I join Judge Emmett and Mayor Turner in calling on the governor to immediately authorize emergency funding through our rainy day fund and help rebuild Houston and Harris County.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the disaster supplement because it provides critical funds to help rebuild communities in the U.S. states and territories, including Puerto Rico. Although I support this bill, I am concerned it is not enough. For example, it fails to provide funds for Community Development Block Grants, critical health care needs, Social Services Block Grants and public housing assistance.

I am proud to represent one of the largest Puerto Rican communities in the United States. Since the hurricane, I have worked closely with federal and state authorities to ensure help is delivered to the island in an efficient manner. In addition, I have worked closely with Puerto Rican communities in my Congressional district to answer questions and help them reconnect with friends and family. We need to assure people in these devastated areas Congress will stand with them in the short and long term—provide comfort and immediate needs now and also funds to rebuild infrastructure and restore and strengthen their economy that will sustain well into the future.

As these funds are dispersed, it is imperative they are managed responsibly so storm victims don't become targets of shady outsiders or crooked business owners.

This week, President Trump once again let down the people of Puerto Rico by announcing he plans to prematurely pull the military, FEMA and other critical agency support from the island. This approach is irresponsible and dangerous. The island and its people are still fragile and need to rebuild, not be burdened with further anxiety and uncertainty.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2266, which provides \$36.5 billion in aid to respond to the damage caused by Hurricanes Irma and Maria, and the wildfires currently raging in California.

Specifically, the aid package before us provides an additional \$18.7 billion in supplemental appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) under the continuing resolution (CR) that runs through Dec. 8 (P.L. 115-56).

Of this amount, as much as \$4.9 billion could be transferred to FEMA's Community Direct Loan (CDL) program to help local governments and U.S. territories provide essential services.

The legislation before also provides an additional \$16 billion in borrowing authority to the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), which reached its borrowing limit after Hurricanes Harvey and Irma.

To alleviate the damage and suffering caused by the wildfires in California, the legislation provides \$576.5 million for federal wildfire suppression programs.

There are particular concerns for our seniors who survived the terrible storms that ravaged the Texas Coast, Florida, U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico because so many of them are alone, while trying to do the difficult and hard job of cleaning out their homes, or removing debris from their yards.

Mr. Speaker, the work is not done in my State of Texas. There are thousands of families who have no home to return to following the historic flood.

We have low-income communities that are struggling to find the new normal that FEMA officials warned Texans would need to accept following the historic flood.

A substantial portion of Houston's residents live in multi-family dwellings.

The city has lost low-income housing for the elderly and the disabled.

The number of persons who remain displaced and unable to find permanent housing remains unacceptably high, with many towns

and cities left without space at hotels for visitors or tourists, which contribute much needed dollars to local economies.

As we rebuild the city must have sufficient numbers of low-income, affordable, and accessible housing within the city limits so that lives, families and communities can be restored.

The economics of a city requires that we make room for everyone as Houston recovers.

Part of the work of rebuilding is to be sure that post-Hurricane Harvey rebuilding and recovery leads to a better quality of life for all of the people of Houston.

If we have the right balance of low income, and affordable housing in the mix as we plan the rebuild the recovery efforts will be a great success.

We need a commitment that Community Development Block Grant Program dollars will have a dedicated amount to rebuild, repair, or replace low-income affordable housing.

Recovery work in homes damaged by flood water is hard work for young people, but it is almost an impossible task for the elderly and many are at risk of physical injury or falling into poor health due to their age or medical condition.

I am particularly concerned about the elderly who survived the Hurricanes in Texas, Florida, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

Our nation's seniors are proudly independent, but a hurricane was not part of their retirement plan.

Our seniors are trying to remove water-logged furniture, remove sodden carpets, or knock out damaged drywall. They are put at risk of being injured or becoming ill.

Our seniors should not have to face the task of recovery alone because they have survived their children or may not live near a relative who can help them.

My request to the appropriators is to remember that disasters do not visit only the young and healthy.

The disabled and elderly are victims and their needs during the recovery are very different and this should be addressed.

We need help our elderly and disabled with getting sufficient resources in place to do this difficult and heavy work of clearing their homes so that they are safe, sanitary and can be occupied.

If the homes of seniors are not cleared their lives are put at risk due to mold, which will come because Houston is a subtropical area where dampness will allow spores to grow within homes, which can cause health concerns.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention alerted my office that they were conducting surveillance in the Houston area for medical conditions that can arise from exposure to mold because of reported cases.

In future disasters there should be an effort to extend the work of federal relief including seeing to the needs of the elderly to be sure they are living in safe and sanitary conditions.

Harvey did not spare Houston's arts community or public spaces, but caused tremendous damage to the: Alley Theater; Wortham Opera; Jones Hall; and Hobby Center.

We must include plans to address the root cause of some of the most catastrophic flooding, water releases from the Addick and Barker Dams.

I am committed to the Army Corp of Engineers replacement of both of those dams.

The Army Corps should take the lead on ensuring that much needed work at the Port of Houston and throughout the impact zone for the flooding is done, after a post Hurricane Harvey assessment is completed to determine the source of the flooding and report on what needs to be done to mitigate the chance of a reoccurrence.

Texas is months away from seeing the worse effects of the flood event.

A record 51.88 inches fall in the Houston area during Hurricane Harvey's torrential rains before the rain gauge broke that was used to measure precipitation, although the storm punished the upper Texas Coast with several more days of rain.

According to the National Weather Service this was the largest recorded storm in the continental U.S. history.

It is not an exaggeration to say that Hurricane Harvey was an historic catastrophic event.

Hurricane Harvey dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metropolis.

This amount of rainfall could fill more than 24 thousand Astrodomes or supply the water for the raging Niagara Falls for 15 days.

Hurricane Harvey caused damage to more than 134 thousand homes of which 99 thousand are in Harris County.

The total number of homes with major damage or were destroyed was about 28 thousand, of which 16 thousand are in Harris County.

And today, nearly four weeks later, thousands of Texans are still without permanent and stable housing situations.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY, and Speaker RYAN and Democratic Leader PELOSI, for bringing this supplemental funding bill to the floor in a timely manner because it lets the people of Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands know that the American people, acting through the Congress, stand in solidarity with them in their moment of heartbreak and anguish.

Mr. Speaker, 21 days ago, on September 20, 2017, Hurricane Maria made landfall in Puerto Rico, along the southeastern coast, near the small town of Yabucoa.

The devastation wrought on that beautiful Caribbean oasis and its 3.5 million inhabitants, our fellow citizens of the United States, is unimaginable, except perhaps to those of us who have lived through and survived similar natural disasters, like Hurricanes Harvey and Katrina.

At least 48 people have died as a result of the storm as rescue and recovery operations proceed, and no electricity to combat the stifling heat, this number is likely to rise, especially with so many elderly, sick, and very young persons at risk.

As we speak, more than half of Puerto Rico's population (55 percent) is still without potable drinking water and 85 percent of Puerto Rico's 1.57 million electricity customers are without power, the majority of which can be expected to remain in this state for as many as 10 months since Hurricane Maria knocked out nearly all of Puerto Rico's 2,400 miles of transmission lines.

Hurricane Maria destroyed 80 percent of Puerto Rico's agricultural industry, including

banana, plantain and coffee crops, which translates into lost income of approximately \$780 million.

And yesterday, the Governor of Puerto Rico announced that four persons had died from leptospirosis, a disease spread by animals' urine, which they contracted by drinking from contaminated rivers and streams.

On August 30, 2017, Hurricane Irma struck, inflicting horrific damage on the U.S. Virgin Islands of St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John, the Caribbean nations of Barbuda, St. Maarten, Cuba, and Anguilla, before making landfall in the Florida Keys.

In Florida alone, 6.4 million people were told to evacuate to safety, leading to days of jammed highways and frantic searches for gasoline amid one of the nation's largest ever-emergency evacuations.

At least 124 persons are known to have lost their lives in Hurricane Irma and more than 200,000 Floridians took refuge in shelters.

Nearly 7.2 million homes and businesses were without power in the southeast part of the United States, 6.5 million of which were in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, we do not yet know the full extent of the damage and devastation suffered by our fellows Americans in Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico in the wake of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

But what we do know is that the costs of recovery and reconstruction will be extensive, best estimates place the cost in the range of \$50–\$100 billion.

That is why I strongly support the legislation pending before us appropriating an additional \$18.7 billion for the FEMA-Disaster Relief Fund as the initial response of the Congress to the damage caused by Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

But I must emphasize that what we are considering here is the initial response because much more funding will be needed because my state of Texas and Houston, my home city and the nation's fourth largest city, remains devastated by Hurricane Harvey.

I will be working closely with House and committee leadership to secure the substantial funding necessary to meet the needs of my constituents in the area of housing, community development, transportation, infrastructure, and water resource management that must be addressed in the next and subsequent supplemental appropriations measures to come before the House.

These are and remain the highest priorities for my Texas colleagues and me and we will not waver in this pursuit, nor falter or fail in our advocacy.

But while that works goes on, we must today rally to the aid of our fellow citizens in Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and California who are facing and striving to overcome the difficulties visited upon them by Mother Nature.

They were, and will be, there when Texas asked for help and are entitled to expect the same treatment in return.

It is the right thing—the American thing—to do.

I ask all Members to join me in voting to pass this House Amendment to Senate Amendment to H.R. 2266, Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Re-

quirements Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and to commit to providing our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Florida, and California the help and support they need to restore their communities to their previous greatness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 569.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1315

DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 562, I call up the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 562, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 585

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Stays; probationary employees.

Sec. 103. Prohibited personnel practices.

Sec. 104. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers.

Sec. 105. Suicide by employees.

Sec. 106. Training for supervisors.

Sec. 107. Information on whistleblower protections.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES

Sec. 201. Prevention of unauthorized access to medical records of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 202. Outreach on availability of mental health services available to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 203. Protocols to address threats against employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 204. Comptroller General of the United States study on accountability of chiefs of police of Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers.

TITLE I—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “agency”—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means an entity that is an agency, as defined under section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to whether one or more portions of title 5 of the United States Code are inapplicable to the entity; and

(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

(2) the term “employee” means an employee (as defined in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code) of an agency; and

(3) the term “personnel action” has the meaning given that term under section 2302 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 102. STAYS; PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.

(a) REQUEST BY SPECIAL COUNSEL.—Section 1214(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) If the Merit Systems Protection Board grants a stay under this subsection, the head of the agency employing the employee shall give priority to a request for a transfer submitted by the employee.”.

(b) PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.—Section 1221 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) If the Merit Systems Protection Board grants a stay to an employee in probationary status under subsection (c), the head of the agency employing the employee shall give priority to a request for a transfer submitted by the employee.”.

(c) STUDY REGARDING RETALIATION AGAINST PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report discussing retaliation against employees in probationary status.

SEC. 103. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.

Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) access the medical record of another employee or an applicant for employment as a part of, or otherwise in furtherance of, any conduct described in paragraphs (1) through (13).”.

SEC. 104. DISCIPLINE OF SUPERVISORS BASED ON RETALIATION AGAINST WHISTLEBLOWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 7515. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means an entity that is an agency, as defined under section 2302, without regard to whether any other provision of this chapter is applicable to the entity; and

“(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

“(2) the term ‘prohibited personnel action’ means taking or failing to take an action in violation of paragraph (8), (9), or (14) of section 2302(b) against an employee of an agency; and

“(3) the term ‘supervisor’ means an employee who would be a supervisor, as defined under section 7103(a), if the entity employing the employee was an agency.

“(b) PROPOSED DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the head of the agency employing a supervisor, an administrative law judge, the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Special Counsel, a judge of the United States, or the Inspector General of the agency employing a supervisor determines that the supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action, the head of the agency employing the supervisor, in accordance with the procedures required under paragraph (2)—

“(A) for the first prohibited personnel action committed by a supervisor—

“(i) shall propose suspending the supervisor for a period of not less than 3 days; and

“(ii) may, in addition to a suspension described in clause (i), propose any other action, including a reduction in grade or pay, that the head of the agency determines appropriate; and

“(B) for the second prohibited personnel action committed by a supervisor, shall propose removing the supervisor.

“(2) PROCEDURES.—

“(A) NOTICE.—A supervisor against whom an action is proposed to be taken under paragraph (1) is entitled to written notice—

“(i) stating the specific reasons for the proposed action; and

“(ii) informing the supervisor of the right of the supervisor to review the material which is relied on to support the reasons for the proposed action.

“(B) ANSWER AND EVIDENCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A supervisor who is notified under subparagraph (A) that the supervisor is the subject of a proposed action under paragraph (1) is entitled to 14 days following such notification to answer and furnish evidence in support of the answer.

“(ii) NO EVIDENCE FURNISHED; INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.—After the end of the 14-day period described in clause (i), if a supervisor does not furnish evidence as described in clause (i) or if the head of the agency determines that such evidence is not sufficient to reverse the proposed action, the head of the agency shall carry out the action.

“(C) SCOPE OF PROCEDURES.—An action carried out under this section—

“(i) except as provided in clause (ii), shall be subject to the same requirements and procedures (including regarding appeals) as an action under section 7503, 7513, or 7543; and

“(ii) shall not be subject to—

“(I) paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7503(b);

“(II) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and subsection (c) of section 7513; or

“(III) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and subsection (c) of section 7543.

“(3) DELEGATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (B), the head of an agency may delegate any authority or responsibility under this subsection.

“(B) NONDELEGABILITY OF DETERMINATION REGARDING PROHIBITED PERSONNEL ACTION.—If the head of an agency is responsible for determining whether a supervisor has com-

mitted a prohibited personnel action for purposes of paragraph (1), the head of the agency may not delegate that responsibility.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“7515. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers.”.

SEC. 105. SUICIDE BY EMPLOYEES.

(a) REFERRAL.—The head of an agency shall refer to the Special Counsel, along with any information known to the agency regarding the circumstances described in paragraphs (2) and (3), any instance in which the head of the agency has information indicating—

(1) an employee of the agency committed suicide;

(2) prior to the death of the employee, the employee made any disclosure of information which reasonably evidences—

(A) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation; or

(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety; and

(3) after a disclosure described in paragraph (2), a personnel action was taken against the employee.

(b) OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL REVIEW.—For any referral to the Special Counsel under subsection (a), the Special Counsel shall—

(1) examine whether any personnel action was taken because of any disclosure of information described in subsection (a)(2); and

(2) take any action the Special Counsel determines appropriate under subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 106. TRAINING FOR SUPERVISORS.

In consultation with the Special Counsel and the Inspector General of the agency (or senior ethics official of the agency for an agency without an Inspector General), the head of each agency shall provide training regarding how to respond to complaints alleging a violation of whistleblower protections (as defined in section 2307 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 107) available to employees of the agency—

(1) to employees appointed to supervisory positions in the agency who have not previously served as a supervisor; and

(2) on an annual basis, to all employees of the agency serving in a supervisory position.

SEC. 107. INFORMATION ON WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.

(a) EXISTING PROVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4505a(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(B) Section 5755(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(C) Section 110(b)(2) of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (5 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking “section 2302(f)(1) or (2)” and inserting “section 2302(e)(1) or (2)”.

(D) Section 1217(d)(3) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3657(d)(3)) is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(E) Section 1233(b) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3673(b)) is amended by striking "section 2302(d)" and inserting "section 2302(c)".

(b) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2307. Information on whistleblower protections

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the term 'agency'—

"(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), has the meaning given that term in section 2302; and

"(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

"(2) the term 'new employee' means an individual—

"(A) appointed to a position as an employee of an agency on or after the date of enactment of the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017; and

"(B) who has not previously served as an employee; and

"(3) the term 'whistleblower protections' means the protections against and remedies for a prohibited personnel practice described in paragraph (8), subparagraph (A)(i), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (9), or paragraph (14) of section 2302(b).

"(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF HEAD OF AGENCY.—The head of each agency shall be responsible for the prevention of prohibited personnel practices, for the compliance with and enforcement of applicable civil service laws, rules, and regulations, and other aspects of personnel management, and for ensuring (in consultation with the Special Counsel and the Inspector General of the agency) that employees of the agency are informed of the rights and remedies available to them under this chapter and chapter 12, including—

"(1) information regarding whistleblower protections available to new employees during the probationary period;

"(2) the role of the Office of Special Counsel and the Merit Systems Protection Board with regard to whistleblower protections; and

"(3) how to make a lawful disclosure of information that is specifically required by law or Executive order to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs to the Special Counsel, the Inspector General of an agency, Congress, or other agency employee designated to receive such disclosures.

"(c) TIMING.—The head of each agency shall ensure that the information required to be provided under subsection (b) is provided to each new employee of the agency not later than 6 months after the date the new employee begins performing service as an employee.

"(d) INFORMATION ONLINE.—The head of each agency shall make available information regarding whistleblower protections applicable to employees of the agency on the public website of the agency, and on any online portal that is made available only to employees of the agency if one exists.

"(e) DELEGATES.—Any employee to whom the head of an agency delegates authority for personnel management, or for any aspect thereof, shall, within the limits of the scope of the delegation, be responsible for the activities described in subsection (b)."

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"2307. Information on whistleblower protections."

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES

SEC. 201. PREVENTION OF UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO MEDICAL RECORDS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(A) develop a plan to prevent access to the medical records of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs by employees of the Department who are not authorized to access such records;

(B) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the plan developed under subparagraph (A); and

(C) upon request, provide a briefing to the appropriate committees of Congress with respect to the plan developed under subparagraph (A).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed assessment of strategic goals of the Department for the prevention of unauthorized access to the medical records of employees of the Department.

(B) A list of circumstances in which an employee of the Department who is not a health care provider or an assistant to a health care provider would be authorized to access the medical records of another employee of the Department.

(C) Steps that the Secretary will take to acquire new or implement existing technology to prevent an employee of the Department from accessing the medical records of another employee of the Department without a specific need to access such records.

(D) Steps the Secretary will take, including plans to issue new regulations, as necessary, to ensure that an employee of the Department may not access the medical records of another employee of the Department for the purpose of retrieving demographic information if that demographic information is available to the employee in another location or through another format.

(E) A proposed timetable for the implementation of such plan.

(F) An estimate of the costs associated with implementing such plan.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 202. OUTREACH ON AVAILABILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AVAILABLE TO EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a program of outreach to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to inform those employees of any mental health services, including telemedicine options, that are available to them.

SEC. 203. PROTOCOLS TO ADDRESS THREATS AGAINST EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure protocols are in effect to address threats from individuals receiving health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs directed towards employees of the De-

partment who are providing such health care.

SEC. 204. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES STUDY ON ACCOUNTABILITY OF CHIEFS OF POLICE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTERS.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to assess the reporting, staffing, accountability, and chain of command structure of the Department of Veterans Affairs police officers at medical centers of the Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 585, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

This bill addresses problems that were exposed in the tragic case of whistleblower retaliation at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick was a doctor employed on a probationary basis by Veterans Affairs, who committed suicide hours after he was fired for questioning overmedication of the veterans he cared for.

This bill would, for the first time, create minimum disciplinary standards to require that managers who retaliate against whistleblowers are punished. First offenders would receive at least 3 days of suspension, and repeat offenders would face mandatory termination.

The Kirkpatrick Act also adds whistleblower protections to Federal employees hired on a probationary basis, like Dr. Kirkpatrick. Agencies will be required to grant priority to requests for transfer from probationary period whistleblowers.

The bill would create a number of other whistleblower protections, many of which are overdue. For example, accessing the medical file of a whistleblower for the purpose of retaliation would be declared a prohibited personnel action. The Department of Veterans Affairs would also be required to devise a plan to prevent that sort of unauthorized medical file access.

The bill also requires apparent suicides by whistleblowers to be referred to the Office of Special Counsel for further investigation. Agencies would be required to initiate training programs for supervisors and information disclosures for employees regarding whistleblower protection.

The Senate passed this bill by voice vote earlier this year, and passage through the House would send the bill to the President's desk for signature and enactment.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to honor the memory of Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick and to protect future whistleblowers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the committee with oversight jurisdiction over Federal workers and agencies, I am one of the staunchest supporters of whistleblower protections in the Congress. I strongly support enhancing protections for the brave men and women who put their careers on the line to speak out against waste, fraud, and abuse.

I fully support the intent of S. 585 to protect whistleblowers who face investigations in retaliation for their disclosures. But I am disappointed that the Republican leadership chose not to consider this measure under regular order.

House Republicans rushed this legislation directly to the floor, bypassing any consideration by the Oversight Committee or the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which have jurisdiction over the bill. It is especially disappointing that my committee was not given the opportunity to address constitutional and privacy concerns raised by the Trump administration's Office of Personnel Management about the bill. That is what I said: the Trump administration's concerns about it.

It is even more disheartening that the Rules Committee issued a closed rule for this bill. They blocked all three germane amendments that I submitted, including an amendment to fix the problems identified by the OPM.

The measure before us today would change the procedures for disciplining Federal supervisors who retaliate against employees who blow the whistle. It would require agency heads to impose suspensions of at least 3 days for a first offense, and termination for a second offense whenever an agency head, administrative law judge, the Merit Systems Protection Board, a Federal judge, or an inspector general finds that a supervisor retaliated against an employee who blew the whistle.

It also would reduce the length of the notice requirement for proposed disciplinary action from 30 days to 14 days. It would eliminate the option to hold a hearing if a supervisor contests a proposed disciplinary action. It would change the current burden of proof for demonstrating retaliation from a preponderance of the evidence to require agency heads to impose disciplinary action in any case in which a super-

visor does not furnish evidence or if the head of the agency determines that such evidence is not sufficient to reverse the proposed action.

The bill also would require an agency head, when an employee may have committed suicide, to refer any information to the Office of Special Counsel indicating that the employee had blown the whistle and that the agency took personnel action against the employee.

The OPM has questioned whether some of the provisions in the bill would withstand constitutional scrutiny if challenged in court, and I agree with the OPM on that issue.

For example, the OPM explained that the bill's requirement to propose minimum penalties of 3 days' suspension for the first offense and termination for second offenses could violate due process protections. These protections require agencies to notify employees of factors they will consider regarding proposed penalties for findings of wrongdoing and to provide employees with meaningful opportunities to respond. The United States Supreme Court and Federal Circuit Courts have ruled that Federal employees are entitled to these protections. After all, they are Americans.

But according to the OPM, the bill would eliminate agency consideration of many of the 12 factors that were set forth by the Merit Systems Protection Board in *Douglas v. Veterans Administration* in 1981. The Board uses these so-called Douglas factors to assess the reasonableness of penalties, and agency officials who propose or decide adverse actions against employees must currently consider these factors.

Concerns have also been raised that by reducing the current requirement for 30 days' notice of adverse action to 14 days, lowering the existing burden of proof, and eliminating the option for hearings, the bill could be challenged on the basis that it does not give supervisors sufficiently meaningful opportunities to respond to accusations of retaliation.

In addition, although the intent of the bill is to enhance protections for whistleblowers, there is some concern that it would be misused to harm whistleblowers. For example, an agency head could utilize the bill's abbreviated disciplinary processes in bad faith to retaliate against supervisors who blow the whistle on high-level waste, fraud, or abuse.

Lastly, the provision requiring agency heads to refer information to the Office of Special Counsel regarding employees who may have committed suicide raises important privacy questions. The bill does not include any provision requiring agencies to obtain permission from family members before sharing information about an employee's death. It is unfortunate that the House has failed to take the oppor-

tunity to fix these flaws in this measure.

The second amendment that I presented would have protected the privacy interests of employees who commit suicide by requiring written permission from their next of kin before agency heads disclose the details about the death.

And another amendment that I submitted would have made corrections in the underlying bill to ensure that managers who violate whistleblower rights will be held accountable, while safeguarding due process rights.

Finally, the third amendment was the text of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination Act of 2017, which passed the House by a voice vote under suspension of the rules earlier in this Congress, and also passed the House by a vote of 403-0 in the last Congress.

This amendment would have expanded the protections for employees who suffer retaliation and discrimination. It also would have prohibited the use of nondisclosure agreements to prevent employees from disclosing waste, fraud, or abuse to Congress, to the Office of Special Counsel, and inspector generals.

I expect the bill, as it now stands, to engender substantial litigation that may have to be addressed by the courts. It would, indeed, be unfortunate if that litigation resulted in overturning disciplinary action against an employee who retaliated against a whistleblower, when we could have acted today to address the constitutional concerns.

As I said before the Rules Committee, sometimes I think we can get so caught up in our partisan battles, that even when we come with good suggestions as to how to make a piece of legislation better and more effective and certainly come within the bounds of the Constitution, we are blinded by what we see; and that is this battle between Republicans and Democrats, Mr. Speaker, and we don't come up, sometimes with the very best product.

But even with all that, because I am so concerned about whistleblowers, I plan to vote for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act, which will enhance whistleblower protections for employees at the VA and lead to better care for our Nation's veterans.

This bill is named in honor of Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick, a Wisconsinite, who tragically took his own life after being fired from the Tomah VA Medical Center in my congressional district in Tomah, Wisconsin.

Dr. Kirkpatrick was a clinical psychologist who specialized in treating some of the toughest and most pressing issues our veterans face today: PTSD, substance abuse, and chronic pain.

During his time at Tomah, Dr. Kirkpatrick noticed a disturbing trend of overprescribing of opioids to patients.

□ 1330

Dr. Kirkpatrick had the courage to blow the whistle to his superiors about what he rightly saw as dangerous pain management practices at the time. Sadly, the overprescribing issues that Dr. Kirkpatrick tried to warn about continued to occur at Tomah VA.

In 2015, a Wisconsin veteran named Jason Simcakoski tragically lost his life at the facility due to the dangerous pain management practices at the Tomah VA. Last year, I worked with the Simcakoski family to pass the bipartisan Jason Simcakoski PROMISE Act to improve pain management practices at the VA so that no other veterans and their families have to go through what the Simcakoski family had to.

Although Dr. Kirkpatrick is no longer with us today, his dedication to serving veterans and his courage to stand up for what was right is why we are here today. This act will ensure that no one is retaliated against for coming forward with concerns about waste, fraud, abuse, and malpractice at the VA. The bill offers a number of new protections for whistleblowers and will help ensure that supervisors found guilty of retaliation are held responsible for their actions.

Dr. Kirkpatrick was dedicated to improving lives and serving our Nation's veterans. The bill before us today will honor the memory of Dr. Kirkpatrick by helping to make sure no one has to go through what he did.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and one who has been a staunch supporter of whistleblowers.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with many of the gentleman's concerns and comments regarding the lack of a real legislative process here. The bill could be better. But nonetheless, like the ranking member, I will be supporting the legislation despite those concerns because it is absolutely urgent.

I have a totally dysfunctional management at the VA hospital in Roseburg, Oregon. A number of years ago, a whistleblower came to me and said that substandard care was being provided. We asked the Office of Inspector General to look into it. They

whitewashed it, and then it came out in the Senate testimony that the Office of Special Counsel had found that this doctor had been penalized as a whistleblower because he was pointing to substandard care.

I asked for another investigation and ultimately found, yes, indeed, substandard care was being provided by the head surgeon. He was suspended from his duties but is still the head surgeon. Now he has run another very accomplished doctor, under very dubious circumstances, out of my Eugene clinic. This is a surgeon who served 29 years, honorably, in the military, 10 years at my regional hospital with rave reviews, and, after 30 days at my new VA clinic in Eugene, was dismissed in the most unusual way with no allegations put forward.

Mr. Speaker, again, it seems that we are having issues here when the quality is substandard that this one person is able to basically just get rid of the folks who are raising concerns about the care of veterans. Again, this shouldn't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters regarding the dismissed doctor.

OCTOBER 17, 2017.

DEAR MR. DEFazio: I am a contracted physician in the emergency department at the Roseburg VA. I have been working at this facility since 2010. During that time I have truly enjoyed providing care for the veterans. However, I have significant concerns regarding the administration and inefficiencies in healthcare, in the VA system. Unfortunately, it seems that advancement of careers and the fluffing of numbers supersede patient care.

Despite the build up of these concerns over the years, I have recently become aware of an action that compels me to go beyond the normal chain of command. One of the surgeons working at the Eugene campus—still under the Roseburg administration—was fired recently under very concerning circumstances.

Dr. Scott Russi was working at the Eugene VA for less than 1 month when he was pushed out and fired. I know Dr. Russi from the private sector. In addition to working at the Roseburg VA, I have worked for the last ten years at Sacred Heart RiverBend—a trauma, stroke, and cardiac center—and one of the largest hospitals in the state. I worked alongside Dr. Russi for many years at RiverBend and I found him to be not only extremely competent and hardworking, but always very professional. I was sad to see him leave RiverBend, but I was encouraged that he would be working in the VA system as I felt he would significantly improve the quality of care for the veterans.

I find it very disheartening that a group of administrative physicians, who rarely practice medicine, are able to strike down such a promising figure simply because they seem to have felt threatened by him. I know there are many people who are upset by this firing and who have concerns about this system in general. I have tried many times to discuss my concerns with people in the administration and have been met with, at best, excuses and, at worst, threats. It is clear to me as somewhat of an outsider and observer (as I am not actually a VA employee) that physicians who are dedicated to patient care and

most skilled are threatening to the administration. These physicians are often ostracized and pushed out—and when they can't be pushed out, false rumors are spread about them. I have considered stepping away from the VA system due to these continuing frustrations. It is disheartening to see these veterans treated with such carelessness. However, I feel that someone has to stay and actually care for them, but, if I stay, I also want to try to make the system a better place for them. For many, this is their only health care.

I wish this was as exaggerated as it may sound, but unfortunately this is only a small piece of a huge problem. If you are interested in more details, I am more than happy to discuss this further. In general, I keep my head down and do what I think is best, but this presents itself as a moment when speaking out is necessary and right.

Thank you,

CHARLOTTE RANSOM, MD.

CONGRESSMAN DEFazio: I am writing to ask for your help. I am a surgeon and a veteran having attended the Usafa and graduating in 1984, completing medical school on Hpsp scholarship and spending the next 29 years on active duty. I deployed four times as a combat surgeon and once as a hospital commander, my last deployment in 2012 was at the Dccs of Craig Joint Theater Hospital, Bagram Ab, Afghanistan. I retired in October of 2013 and settled in Oregon as a trauma surgeon eventually becoming the Trauma Medical Director at Riverbend. I was the on-call surgeon the tragic day Ucc suffered the active shooter event. I recently left my civilian practice to serve our Veterans, for reasons I think you would understand; I have seen the care my comrades have been given and found it wanting, and serving my Vets is therapeutic for my Ptsd and the sorrow I carry for not being able to save more soldiers. I am the new surgeon at the Va Eugene Hcc and have been working there part-time since January of this year and full time since 23 July. Today I was handed a summary suspension of clinical privileges as a surgeon by the parent Va, Roseburg and Dr. Dinesh Ranjan the chief of surgery. I have been denied the opportunity to defend my reputation, denied the opportunity to stand before my peers, and denied any opportunity to see the allegations. And tonight, I have spoken with two Va physicians (Dr. Lisa Brandenburger and Dr. Philo Calhoun) whose lives were dedicated to serving Veterans but were irreparably damaged by Dr. Ranjan. I am now being targeted by Dr. Ranjan because he recruited me with the promise of a salary of \$385,000, I signed a contract for that amount but I am being paid \$280,000. Because I expressed to the Eugene Hcc administrator I felt I was misled about the salary, Dr. Ranjan has gone after my clinical privileges, had them summarily dismissed and placed me at risk of being reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank (Npdb). I have been suspended from patient contact for 30 days for an investigation. If the investigation finds me deficient, I will be reported to the Npdb. If the investigation extends beyond 30 days, I will be reported to the Npdb. If I am fired or quit my job, I will be reported to the Npdb. If I am reported to the Npdb I will never work again as a surgeon.

I know it all sounds unbelievable, I think it is unbelievable as I try and wrap my head around the events of these last few days. I ask you not to send a congressional inquiry to Mr. Paxton, as that would make my life

worse. What I thought would be my dream job, now has become a nightmare.

Respectfully,

SCOTT RUSSI.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, since this has come out, I have had dozens of calls from nurses and doctors and other workers in the VA system in my region—in Eugene, Springfield, and southern Oregon, down to Roseburg, at those two facilities—because of this mismanagement. They say that the care is not up to standards, just like this particular physician was not providing modern care when he did colonoscopies.

We need—vitally need—this legislation and the strongest protection for whistleblowers. This isn't about protecting bad managers. It is about promoting qualified and keeping qualified employees, which we are having a hard time doing in my area. It is about providing the best care to our veterans, and that isn't going to happen if people can be intimidated or just shown the door when they raise concerns.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS for yielding me time to speak about this important legislation to protect whistleblowers.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns that were brought up yesterday in the Rules Committee and today on the floor about the procedure for bringing this bill to the floor without full House committee process. However, I will support the bill because it is so important.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act will provide protection for employees at the Department of Veterans Affairs who blow the whistle on wrongdoing in the agency.

As the ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I know full well that whistleblowers are vital to the VA to protect the health and well-being of the men and women who have so bravely served our country. Although we have numerous protections currently in place for whistleblowers, those who are committed to silencing them still manage to find ways to retaliate, which we saw with tragic consequences at the Phoenix VA Health Care System and in Dr. Kirkpatrick's case.

In addition to serving on the House Veterans Affairs' Committee, my role as the founder and co-chair of the Bipartisan Heroin Task Force makes VA's retaliation against another VA doctor, Dr. Kirkpatrick, an especially troublesome tragedy. When he tried to raise the alarm over concerns that another VA doctor was overprescribing opioids that may have led to patient

deaths, he was aware that doing so could be harmful to his own position at the Tomah VA Medical Center.

Dr. Kirkpatrick's action was laudable. Veterans have been acutely impacted by the opioid epidemic, and his efforts to reduce prescription rates for veterans is not only a good example for VA physicians, but for all physicians in the U.S. today.

Title II of this bill puts in place a number of requirements for the VA to protect VA employees from several retaliatory measures. It requires the Secretary to put in place a plan to prevent unauthorized access to medical records of VA employees, along with outreach to ensure that VA employees are aware of mental health services available to them.

These and other improvements in title II will not only help prevent the type of retaliation that Dr. Kirkpatrick suffered, they will improve care for veterans to also help make the VA a better place to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I close, I take the opportunity to reiterate that I strongly support the objectives of S. 585. If there is anything that we agree on in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, it is that we must protect whistleblowers.

Many of the investigations that we have conducted have been as a result of somebody who saw something and said something. Like Dr. Kirkpatrick, I am sure, in most of those instances, it was very difficult for them because they, on the one hand, wanted to improve a situation or address a problem, but at the same time, they knew that it was possible that they, themselves, might be harmed and their families might be harmed. So they make a very, very difficult choice, a very difficult choice.

I am horrified that Dr. Kirkpatrick was so agonized by the treatment he endured at the Veterans Administration that he saw no options for himself. In other words, Mr. Speaker, he saw no way out. I worry that there are civil servants today who are enduring that same agony.

But we say to them that we will protect you with all we have got, and that is why I appreciate Senator JOHNSON's work on S. 585, and I share his commitment to protecting whistleblowers. For that reason, as I said earlier, I will vote in favor of this legislation.

That said, I wish that the Republican leadership had taken the opportunities that my amendments provided to improve this bill. These issues of equal protection are nothing to play with because we begin to chip away and chip away and chip away at employees' rights, and the next you know, those

rights begin to disappear. Those are the kind of rights that are a part and the fabric of this thing we call a democracy. I think we have to be very, very, very careful. It is going to be interesting to see what the courts have to say about this legislation.

My amendments would have addressed the constitutional concerns raised by OPM—and I emphasize OPM. This was not the Obama OPM. This was the Trump OPM.

My amendments would also have protected the privacy of employees who take their own lives.

My amendments would have added to the underlying bill additional protections for employees who suffer retaliation or discrimination, protections that the House has already approved.

I believe this is a missed opportunity and it is sad. I truly hope that future litigation does not undo the advances that this bill seeks to make in the protections provided for the courageous men and women willing to blow the whistle on wrongdoing. In this day and age, we need the whistleblower more now than we have ever needed them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to support this bill to protect some of the boldest, most courageous people in our Nation, the whistleblowers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 585 the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017. As Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, protecting whistleblowers at VA is of paramount concern to ensure that we provide high quality healthcare and benefits to our nation's veterans.

This bill authored by Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin was named in honor of Dr. Christopher Kirkpatrick, a former VA doctor who served our veterans at the Tomah, WI medical center. Many of us know that the Tomah VA medical center has been a facility plagued with the overprescribing of opioids to our veterans. Dr. Kirkpatrick was a brave patriot who blew the whistle on these over prescriptions and the harm that was being done to veterans, however, instead of commending him for coming forward, VA fired him on trumped up charges, which ultimately led to him taking his own life.

In my opinion, the corrosive culture within this facility and VA's actions toward Dr. Kirkpatrick left a chilling effect not only in Tomah, but across the Department. I believe that these actions made whistleblowers feel questioned and worried that they would be punished instead of being lauded and encouraged to come forward.

It is because of brave whistleblowers like Dr. Kirkpatrick that my Committee has been able to expose issues and scandals across the VA. It is because of whistleblowers that we were able to uncover the manipulation of wait times at the Phoenix Medical Center; the falsifying of records in the Philadelphia Regional

Office; the fact that a VA employee participated in an armed robbery in Puerto Rico and stayed on the job following their arrest; and many more egregious behaviors at the Department that put veterans in harm's way.

I have confidence that Secretary Shulkin is committed to protecting whistleblowers, so that we never again lose another talented doctor, like Dr. Kirkpatrick. The best way to help him in this mission is to send a clear message to all VA employees, at every level in the Department, and within every level of management, that there are stiff penalties for those who retaliate against the men and women who are brave enough to come forward and protect veterans.

S. 585 builds off of our work this Congress that started with the passage of the bill I championed, the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017, which provides the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the tools he needs to hold poor employees accountable. I am pleased that the bill before us today would make needed changes to our outdated civil service laws for all Federal Government employees, which have become so archaic and complex that they tend to put the rights of retaliators above the rights of whistleblowers.

The bill before us would also provide needed reforms to information regarding VA employees who die by suicide, additional penalties for accessing a veteran's medical record, and other needed provisions to ensure that we put the needs of whistleblowers and veterans first.

I appreciate Senator JOHNSON and Representative DUFFY for their work on this important bill and I encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress will have an opportunity to vote on legislation that will bolster protections for whistleblowing patriots, while vastly improving care for veterans at the VA.

The Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act is the product of hundreds of hours of Congressional hearings, meetings with stakeholders, and hard work by dozens of lawmakers here in Washington, to make sure that the tragic abuse that Dr. Kirkpatrick faced will never happen again.

As some of you may know, Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick was a clinical psychologist at the VA in Tomah, WI. He was a veteran, a graduate of Northwestern University, and a caring individual who dedicated his career to providing innovative treatments for veterans suffering from PTSD. Most notably, he created a yoga program to help vets at the VA in Chicago. He was known to be very well-liked by the patients he served.

In 2009, Dr. Kirkpatrick expressed concerns that his patients were being heavily overmedicated. It became so bad, he said, that he was unable to properly do his job. He wanted to do what was right for veterans, and as a veteran himself, he couldn't stand to see how careless some of the VA staff were being with high levels of dangerous medications.

Unfortunately, instead of looking into Dr. Kirkpatrick's claims, the facility's chief of staff told him to mind his own business, and to instead focus on his own work. Shortly thereafter, Dr. Kirkpatrick was called to a disciplinary meeting and given a written reprimand.

This type of retaliation went on for months.

Then, in July, Dr. Kirkpatrick complained again that a dangerous veteran had not been properly discharged, despite recommendations from a treatment team. A week after making the complaint, Dr. Kirkpatrick was fired from the VA.

He was devastated. He begged for an opportunity to stay, and expressed concerns that he had been given too many complex cases, and that the emotional toll was too high. Again, his concerns were ignored.

That night, Dr. Kirkpatrick wrote a note to his girlfriend in Chicago, another to the kennel he wanted to take care of his dog, and one final note for the mailman. It read: "Please call 911—tell them to go to red barn building."

He had taken his own life. He was 38 years old.

Dr. Kirkpatrick's death was the product of a broken system—a system that encourages retaliation against whistleblowers, while ignoring the underlying causes of their concerns.

If Dr. Kirkpatrick's death wasn't tragic enough, a subsequent investigation at the VA found that a patient had died from "mixed drug toxicity", and that Dr. Kirkpatrick's concerns were completely warranted.

Not only did whistleblower retaliation cost Dr. Kirkpatrick his life, it cost the life of a patient as well.

That's why I urge you all to vote yes on the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act.

A yes vote means that VA personnel will no longer be able to access a whistleblower's medical records as means of discrediting them, which a separate investigation found happens far too often.

A yes vote means that federal agencies have to notify the Office of Special Counsel when a suicide takes place.

A yes means clear disciplinary actions for supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, training for supervisors on how to properly respond, and a requirement that employees are made aware of the mental health services at their disposal.

A yes vote also means keeping upholding normal burdens of proof to strengthen protections for employees. This legislation calls for the Inspector General, Office of Special Counsel, or a Merit Systems Protection Board Administrative Judge to "determine" that a supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action, meaning through the normal preponderance of the evidence for any other disciplinary action under Chapter 75 of title 5. This does not mean some arbitrary process for some bureaucrat to create later on.

I want to be clear: this legislation strengthens protections for patriots—for those who are trying to do the right thing. For those who care about veterans and their safety. And for folks like Dr. Kirkpatrick, so that no one ever has to go through what he went through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 562, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'Halleran moves to recommit the bill S. 585 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title I the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ DISCLOSURE OF VIOLATIONS RELATING TO AIR TRANSPORTATION.

This Act, and any amendments made by this Act, shall apply to any employee who makes a protected disclosure of information relating to a violation by the head of an agency, or other political appointee, of any law, rule, or regulation concerning travel, including the improper use of air transportation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, increasing accountability and transparency across our government is a shared principle we can all agree on among this body. Whether at the VA or other Federal agencies, the American people deserve to know that Federal officials from the top down are being held to the standards we expect of them.

We owe it to our veterans, to our seniors, and to the hardworking American taxpayers to ensure that their tax dollars are utilized appropriately and efficiently, as intended. Waste, fraud, and abuse, have no place at our agencies, and those who help uncover it deserve our admiration and our protection.

I am proud that we are coming together to increase protections for whistleblowers of Federal agencies, a long overdue effort. But, Mr. Speaker, in light of recent reports and events that have revealed a disturbing pattern of improper use of tax dollars on air travel by senior Federal officials, I believe we must go further.

The reports of Cabinet officials abusing the rules for air travel that applied to them are not isolated. Not one, not two, not three, but at least four Cabinet officials are facing scrutiny for irregular and irresponsible use of agency resources for official and nonofficial air travel. In light of Secretary Price's recent resignation, it is clear that Congress must conduct greater oversight.

□ 1345

That is why I am offering this final amendment on the underlying bill.

My amendment simply extends whistleblower protections that are created under the bill to Federal employees who disclose information about travel, including improper use of aircraft.

Not only would this make clear to agencies that any violation of laws, rules, or regulations concerning travel or government aircraft is unacceptable, it will also ensure those who come forward to expose any wrongdoing will have appropriate protection from retaliation.

Regardless of party, those who serve the American public must be held to the highest ethical standards. Our ability to hold government officials accountable to taxpayers is a hallmark of our democracy, and we must work to uphold that principle. The resources invested to agencies to fulfill their missions of serving Americans should not be abused or frivolously flaunted for personal gain or convenience.

This is not about Republicans or Democrats. We must come together to stand up for accountability and transparency. The moment we begin treating disregard for the rules by our elected and appointed officials as partisan politics, we risk ceding the very values that make our democracy great and unique in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting my commonsense amendment on behalf of American taxpayers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to recommit.

This bill addresses critical flaws in how the Federal Government addresses whistleblower retaliation.

The consequences for whistleblower retaliation are very real. There is a chilling effect of whistleblower reports or unjust termination. In some cases, like that of Dr. Kirkpatrick in the Department of Veterans Affairs, the consequences are literally life and death.

We have the opportunity to send this bill to the President for a signature today and fix this now. Why wait? And at what cost to Federal employees, veterans, and taxpayers?

I support the gentleman from Maryland's effort to pass this provision which I previously cosponsored myself, but let's not let one good bill get in the way of another.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit and support the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1355

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Langevin moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2810 be instructed as follows:

(1) To disagree with subsection (c) of section 336 of the Senate amendment.

(2) To recede from section 1064 of the House bill.

(3) To disagree with section 1087 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gen-

tleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Army has a surplus of pistols. The M-1911 A-1, a .45-caliber pistol—the Armed Forces standard issue sidearm for more than 50 years—was replaced in the 1980s by a newer model.

Since then the Army has accumulated stores of surplus M-1911 pistols which are housed at taxpayer expense in Alabama.

There is no national security reason to keep these pistols. The Army stopped issuing them 30 years ago, yet the Army has been prevented from disposing of them due to parochial interests tied to the Civilian Marksmanship Program, or CMP.

The CMP's proponents basically want to transfer the pistols to a private corporation so that it can sell them. Do we want this to happen? We have the opportunity in this year's NDAA to stop this transfer of tens of thousands of M-1911 A-1 pistols which constitutes a multimillion-dollar government giveaway.

It is also important to note that this would make our streets more dangerous at a time when gun violence is all too common.

The CMP was established in 1903—just to put this in historical context—following the Spanish-American War when American militiamen demonstrated distressingly poor marksmanship. At that time, our Nation needed a better trained and organized militia, and the CMP helped the government build a broader base of able citizen-soldiers.

Now, the program was an important component of our national defense back then. But today, Mr. Speaker, over a century later, we have a professional military and many rifle clubs, and the CMP is, quite frankly, no longer needed. Congress clearly understood this when it privatized the CMP in 1996.

Now, as an initial capital investment at a time when earmarks were still common, Congress provided the newly chartered corporation with a stock of rifles, ammunition, and other spare parts. The CMP could sell the surplus equipment—mostly M1 Garand rifles—in order to fund its activities until it became self-sufficient.

□ 1400

However, it was never Congress' intent to equip the CMP with handguns, or it would have provided the corporation with surplus M-1911-A1 .45-caliber pistols at that time.

Now, more than two decades later, the CMP is running out of rifles to sell.

The reality is that it is in dire financial straits as, more than 20 years later, the program is still reliant on rifle sales to support its activities.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly not the taxpayers' responsibility to bail out the CMP. To do so would be an unprecedented government handout at a time when earmarks have been banned for years.

So what makes this program so special?

There is nothing.

Beyond this, it would flood our streets with handguns—the guns that are most often used by criminals. I believe this would be extremely dangerous when, more than 2 years ago, the first attempt was made to effectuate this earmark. I heard the argument that storing surplus pistols, as the Army is now doing, is a waste of government funds. Well, I agree. However, a handout is not the answer.

There is no national security reason to put these guns on our streets. In fact, an increase in the number of handguns will only result potentially in more violence.

So, Mr. Speaker, we should allow the Army to dispose of these pistols by melting them down, as it plans to do with other surplus arms.

Senate language in the NDAA exempts M-1911-A1 pistols from Army disposal, but I urge my colleagues to support the motion to instruct the conferees to reject this exemption. There is no reason to store these pistols. There is no reason to flood our streets with them. There is no reason to give an earmark, again, to a private corporation. They should be melted down and repurchased for other military uses, which is exactly what this motion supports.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise against the motion to instruct. I believe this is the first motion to instruct that the House has voted on so far this year and this Congress, so not all Members may not realize that, as the House and the Senate are about to go to conference committee to work out differences in the House and Senate versions of whatever bill they are focused on, procedurally it is possible to have a motion to instruct conferees, such as the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered.

That motion is not binding on the conferees, but it is an attempt to have a vote on an issue that a Member or group of Members think is important or that they can make a point upon.

The subject of this motion to instruct is the disposal of excess weapons, as the gentleman from Rhode Island mentioned.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, I know of no evidence that—as the government

has over the years disposed of these weapons, there is no evidence that any of them have been improperly used. They must be disposed of fully consistent with the law, and that includes background checks and the rest, and the proceeds support safety programs, which I would suspect that all of us think is a worthwhile endeavor.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, the House has regularly expressed its opinion and its will with amendment votes both on the floor and in committee over the years. We have voted on this program a number of times and it has consistently been the will of the House that this program should continue. As a matter of fact, in this year's bill, we had a vote in committee and the amendment to provide for this program was adopted.

So, to me, Mr. Speaker, the most important point to make is this: the bill before us is one that helps this Congress fulfill the first responsibilities of the Federal Government, and that is to defend our citizens.

It also provides the support that the men and women who serve our Nation in the military must have if they are to carry out the missions to which they are assigned.

That is the purpose of this bill, that is the focus of this bill: to defend the country and to support our troops. That will continue to be the focus as the House and Senate move into conference.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have great respect for the chairman and his leadership of the Armed Services Committee. No one questions his commitment to defending the Nation in support of our military, but we don't need to support earmarks to a private corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against provisions in the House and the Senate National Defense Authorization Act that would allow the transfer of all surplus pistols to the Civilian Marksmanship Program—or CMP—for sale to the public.

Allowing the transfer of this large volume of guns for sale to the public moves the CMP into the retail gun market and away from its statutorily mandated functions. This is a program meant to instruct citizens in marksmanship and promote safety in the use of firearms, not to deal firearms.

The Army has opposed such provisions in the past, and I am here to oppose any NDAA provisions that would allow the transfer of any surplus Army firearms to the CMP.

I join my colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN, in calling for all surplus firearms to be melted down and not distributed to the public.

There are over 300 million guns in America, nearly one for every citizen. We have lost way too many lives to gun violence.

The Department of Defense should not participate in freely distributing their guns onto our streets.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Civilian Marksmanship Program is an organization that was established initially by this Congress because we needed institutions to help people better understand gun safety and how to handle weapons. It has fulfilled a vital mission.

Fortunately, in recent years, we have been able to not have to fund it anymore by being able to self-fund through the refurbishment and sale of surplus weapons.

It has been their mission for a century. These 1911s are surplus pistols that were used up until the early nineties by our military. Since that time, statutorily, they were made available to law enforcement and allied countries.

As you might imagine, most law enforcement and allied countries would rather have new, modern weapons, rather than surplus. So we have approximately 100,000 of these weapons in storage at the Anniston Army Depot in my district. It costs us in the neighborhood of \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year in direct cost to store these weapons.

What the Armed Services Committee and this Congress in preceding NDAA's has repeatedly done has been to instruct the Department of the Army to start turning those over to the Civilian Marksmanship Program at 10,000 a year until the full 100,000 has been eliminated from our storage.

The CMP—the Civilian Marksmanship Program—takes those weapons as they get them, completely refurbishes them, and then sells them to collectors. These are not weapons that wind up on the streets. They generally cost between \$800 and \$1,000, and they are sold to collectors.

To be able to buy one, you have to go through the same background check as any other buyer. But not just anybody can buy these. You have to either be in law enforcement, the military, or an active member of a gun club.

These are not a danger to the public. In fact, this whole process of taking this money, the CMP then sells the weapons and it goes into their trust fund to allow them to continue to train Americans in gun safety, is a vital mission that we should be supporting. This Congress has repeatedly supported it over the years.

It is my hope that the full body will reject this motion by my friend and colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN. It has been defeated repeatedly in the Armed Services Committee, and I hope it will be defeated again today.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would just mention many wonderful organizations around the country that would love to have earmarks, but we don't do earmarks anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a provision in the NDAA authorizing the transfer of nearly 100,000 surplus military-grade firearms to the Civilian Marksmanship Program for sale to the public.

This multimillion-dollar government handout to a private corporation is bad policy. It places more military-grade weapons on our streets and in our communities.

The horrific violence on October 1 in Las Vegas, the deadliest mass shooting in modern American history, has forever altered the lives of hundreds of thousands of families related to those 22,000 victims that were there the day of the shooting.

It is now more urgent than ever that we take meaningful action on passing gun safety measures. That should be our priority, yet here we are taking a step backwards.

Instead of bringing legislation on the floor to ban the manufacture of bump stocks that allow semiautomatic rifles to fire hundreds of rounds per minute, instead of being on the floor to ban the sale of high-capacity magazines used to inflict widespread carnage, or instead of being on the floor to expand background checks to all commercial gun sales so that felons and the seriously mentally ill and terrorists cannot obtain access to dangerous weapons, we are here debating a provision that increases a number of military weapons on our streets.

I know we can uphold the Second Amendment while taking reasonable steps to reduce the toll of gun violence inflicted on our communities. Putting nearly 100,000 more military-grade firearms designed for Army use into our neighborhoods is not a reasonable step in the right direction.

According to its text, the provision included in this bill mandates the immediate transfer of an unlimited number of guns to the Civilian Marksmanship Program for sale to the public.

This program was originally created to instruct Americans in marksmanship, promote firearms safety, and conduct friendly shooting competitions in controlled environments.

The NDAA provision we are speaking of today would turn this program into a mass firearms retailer, with the new mission to sell as many military-grade weapons to the public as possible. It defies logic and common sense. Gun violence has become a public crisis.

So I urge my colleagues to join together and work across the aisle to decrease the scope and devastation caused by tragic mass shootings. No

community across America should be forced to experience the grief and trauma that my community and others like mine have gone through in these past few years.

I ask all Members of Congress to support the Democratic motion to instruct conferees to remove this dangerous provision from the NDAA.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Congress intended for the CMP to become self-sufficient after it was privatized in 1996. It was never meant to be the recipient of another multimillion-dollar government handout years later, especially not a handout of tens of thousands of pistols which then would be used immediately for sale to the public to fund its operations.

Again, perhaps one could argue that, when earmarks were around, they needed this to fund their operations. Again, there was a time when earmarks were in existence. Earmarks are no longer regular order. They don't exist anymore. They were done away with several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that I don't hold with the need for the CMP to receive Federal support.

On another note, I don't often see eye to eye with the NRA, but I must agree with the statement on the NRA's website that the Association is "the premier firearms education organization in the world."

□ 1415

Well, the NRA does not receive Federal support from its education programs, which are widely accessible, and in our professional military, the need for marksmanship training for national security purposes has evaporated. Even if we truly think the CMP is deserving of a government subsidy, Congress should do so through the appropriations process, not through a provision that is, quite frankly, again, an earmark.

As my colleagues so well know, earmarks were banned in the 112th Congress, yet the provisions at issue in the House-passed NDAA would transfer millions of dollars, ostensibly, in government property to a corporation that is in the congressional district of the measure's chief advocate. And while I have deep respect for my colleague, the government shouldn't be engaged in this type of practice.

The government has occasionally transferred surplus property to non-profit corporations for education or other purposes; however, it has never done so with the intent that the property be immediately sold, with the proceeds going to the corporation's bottom line. So if that isn't an earmark, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is. It is blatant subversion of congressional

order, and it would set, I believe, a very dangerous precedent.

I hope that my colleagues would join me in upholding the rules of the House and support the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to highlight the danger of this transfer, potentially, to public safety. Injecting tens of thousands of new pistols onto our streets by providing them to the CMP, I believe, could be disastrous, as handguns are regularly used in crime.

Now, in 2013, of the 6,498 homicides committed by a firearm for which the type of weapon was known, 89 percent were handgun related—89 percent. Only 4 percent were carried out using a rifle, the type of firearm the CMP has traditionally sold.

The qualities that made the M1911A1 .45-caliber pistol a fun sidearm is the fact that it is easily concealed, extremely reliable, and packs quite a punch, all qualities that make it prized also among criminals. In fact, the Department of Justice has tracked 1,768 M1911A1s over the last decade due to their involvement in criminal activity.

In a time when mass shootings have become all too common and 93 Americans are killed with guns every day, the last thing we need is more guns on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, the bill before us, overall, is a fine mark. I was proud to support it in committee, overall, because it provides for our national defense. It supports key programs of the Department of Defense to make sure our warfighters have every advantage possible. We never want to send our warfighters into a fair fight, and this bill, overall, goes a long way toward ensuring for our national defense and provides great support for our men and women in uniform.

Unfortunately, this CMP issue has been an unnecessary distraction. It is something I don't believe belongs in the bill. I believe that and, again, I made the point that we have done away with earmarks, and so we shouldn't be using an earmark and subverting congressional authority and will through the regular order process, through the appropriations process, to help to fund a private organization.

Again, there are many, I am sure, meritorious organizations around the country that would love to have an earmark, but we don't do them anymore, and we shouldn't be doing a side-step here to give a private organization such an earmark.

As I said, I have highlighted again the potential for guns to fall into the wrong hands. And although the owners of the weapons may be of good character and those who purchased the

guns, to fund, again, the operations of the CMP, a private organization, even if they have them in their home, if there is criminal activity that takes place, whether it is an act of violence or if the home is broken into and the weapon is stolen, which happens every day in America that a law-abiding citizen has a weapon that gets in the wrong hands, that weapon is then used in the crime. The more weapons out there, the more likely something like that could potentially happen.

This is what we are trying to prevent. We want to do this in a responsible way. Again, we want to make sure that the guns don't just wind up out in our streets, and we want to make sure that they are melted down like other surplus equipment.

The Army surely does not need to store them any longer. We want to get rid of them. We want the Army to be able to do that, but they should be able to do what they do with other surplus equipment, and that is melt it down, perhaps use that melted down material for making other weapons that the Army does need that are relevant at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the language in the current NDAA. We should work together and support my motion to instruct so that, as we go to conference, we have clear direction from the House as to what the House believes we should do and not allow these weapons out in our communities. We shouldn't be supporting earmarks.

As I said, I know that the Senate provision does in fact have a provision there that would allow these weapons to be melted down, and that is the way that we should go. I believe that we have an opportunity to make that statement right here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the full House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just really want to support Mr. LANGEVIN for his leadership on this issue, something that we brought up in committee, and a program that really should be just discontinued, and I think the motion to instruct is perfectly appropriate.

It was a program that was originally created, and the reason that we were selling back firearms to the public from the U.S. military, the program was literally created because we were worried that there wouldn't be enough people in our country that knew how to fire a weapon if we should need to draft them into a war. That is why the program was created.

Obviously, for a whole bunch of reasons, that is no longer applicable. We have an all volunteer military. They are trained to shoot. They know how to shoot. We don't need to train random folks with weapons from the military.

Also, originally, the program was simply aimed at rifles; and now they have thrown in, I think it is, around 100,000 pistols that they want to sell back to the public, in general. And this company makes money, the taxpayers don't, and we put 100,000 more weapons out on the streets.

I think if there is one thing we should be able to agree on is that there is more than enough firepower out there amongst the public. We should not be taking military weapons and selling them back out into the public, and this motion, this amendment that Mr. LANGEVIN first brought up has a very simple solution. We will hold onto those weapons; we will melt them down. I think that is the appropriate response. We do not need to sell more firearms out there into the public.

I think the gentleman from Rhode Island has done an outstanding job showing leadership on this issue. I urge us to adopt this motion to instruct, and I urge the conference committee to adopt this as part of the final National Defense Authorization Act that we ultimately will pass.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The gentleman from Rhode Island has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers other than myself, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member SMITH for speaking on behalf of this motion to instruct. I deeply appreciate his leadership on the Armed Services Committee and his years of service, as I do, again, have deep respect for Chairman THORNBERRY and his leadership as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Case in point, the NDAA this year, and as has been the case in past years, has been truly a bipartisan effort, and it's one of the reasons I truly enjoy serving in the Armed Services Committee is because of the bipartisan cooperation that is demonstrated when it comes to protecting our country, when it comes to providing for our national defense, especially supporting our men and women in uniform. It is a bipartisan effort. It is unfortunate that in this one particular case we have this difference of opinion.

We are, again, a program that was initially intended to train marksmen years ago when we didn't have a professional military. Maybe it had merit and the organization was supported, but we have a professional military now, great marksmanship programs and training programs, as well as private organizations that do this. But it doesn't require or need a government subsidy, and so it wouldn't be appropriate

in this case any further to continue to support this private organization, the CMP program with, ostensibly, a earmark.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering a National Defense Authorization Act measure that would transfer thousands of military weapons to a civilian nonprofit, the Civilian Marksmanship Program. These guns will then make their way into the public for purchase.

The Army has recommended against this proposal. One of their concerns, not a surprise, is public safety. For us to go against the recommendations of our own military on this matter is, frankly, absurd. Every single day, our country—our country—experiences horrific gun violence, and the last thing we should be doing is going against the advice of our military and putting more guns onto American streets.

Those who are in support of the measure claim that transferring these weapons to the Civilian Marksmanship Program will save the government the cost of storing these guns, but the amount of money to be saved to store some weapons is really negligible, and that small cost is nothing compared to the potential cost to human life by unleashing these handguns for the public to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to employ common sense here. Listen to the advice of our Army and support the motion to instruct.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her comments and support of the motion to instruct. I also want to commend her and thank her for her leadership on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, just to once again reiterate, a priority of the overall NDAA that we worked on in a bipartisan, collaborative way, this one sticking point is this provision in the NDAA that, again, amounts to an earmark, and it could potentially put tens of thousands of additional weapons on our streets that could wind up in the wrong hands. It is an unnecessary step.

□ 1430

Again, when the CMP was first created, it had a legitimate purpose. That purpose is no longer needed, per se, for the military in terms of marksmanship training. There are other organizations out there that do that, but we also have the professional military.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the provisions in the House-passed NDAA would give a multimillion-dollar handout in

the form of .45-caliber pistols to the Civilian Marksmanship Program. It is an unnecessary and unwise use of taxpayer property that would potentially make our streets less safe.

My motion will instruct our House conferees to reject this earmark and allow the Army to melt down and repurpose its surplus firearms, as it does with other firearms or surplus equipment.

Congress needs to find solutions to the endemic gun violence that is plaguing our Nation right now. We saw, it seems, time after time, multiple incidents where firearms get into the wrong hands and are misused, causing loss of life and sometimes, unfortunately, sadly, in significant numbers, just as we saw, as Ms. ROSEN mentioned, with the terrible shooting in Las Vegas: 58 people lost their lives and hundreds more were injured. It was a terrible tragedy for Nevada, for those who lost their lives, and for those who were injured; and, really, it was a tragedy once again that has plagued and affected our country.

It has to stop. We should not be adding to the problem by injecting tens of thousands of handguns onto our streets.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Rhode Island. As he said, we make every effort to ensure that the support for the men and women who serve in the military is on a bipartisan basis. The gentleman from Rhode Island is a key leader on a number of those issues, whether it is cyber, directed energy, and a host of others.

I appreciate all of the Members on both sides of the aisle who have spoken. That bipartisan support is what helped lead us to pass the House version of this bill by the biggest majority in 8 years. That does not mean we agree on everything, obviously, but when it comes to supporting the military, their interests are first, and I think we need to keep it that way.

The subject of this motion to instruct is a long-running program designed to support safety programs. While we have had votes on this on the floor and in committee over the years, it has never been a particularly controversial program, even though the gentleman from Rhode Island has consistently been against it from the start. But the point is that in both the House and the Senate bills this year, there are provisions dealing with these programs. We come to some resolution every year, and for 55 straight years the conference report has gotten signed into law.

I would like to correct one point, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that the

Army is opposed to this program. As a matter of fact, both Mr. ROGERS and I have talked to the Army about this, and they have not expressed in any sense that they are opposed to it. They were waiting to see what direction they are given, and they are happy to go implement that.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, our country has been buffeted by a number of tragedies: hurricanes; of course, wildfires going on now in the West. And the horrible, horrific murders in Las Vegas are much on our minds, as are the victims and the whole communities.

It is important to take time and to learn what that investigation yields so that we can, hopefully, prevent it from happening in the future.

I just want to point out that there is nothing, whether these provisions stay or go, that is going to have any effect on an event like we just saw in Las Vegas. As a matter of fact, in the history of this program, I know of no single instance where one of these weapons that has been disposed of for gun safety programs has been used improperly. As a matter of fact, most of these weapons go up on a mantle somewhere. They are collectors items. So it would be inappropriate, in my opinion, to try to tie that horrible tragedy in Las Vegas, or others, to these particular programs.

That leads me to the last point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, and it is similar to the first. On a bipartisan basis, this House and, indeed, this Congress, come together to support the men and women who risk their lives to defend us. The world is getting more dangerous, and, unfortunately—the fault of both parties in both the executive and legislative branches of government—we cut our military too much. We are seeing the effects of that through declining readiness, through increasing accidents, and a whole variety of things where the fruits of that neglect is becoming more apparent.

But I think it is crucial, as we begin to rebuild and repair our military, that we not let other agendas, other issues, impair our ability to do so. I am concerned, for example, that some Republicans say: Oh, yeah, I will increase funding for defense, as long as you can cut that money in other parts of the budget.

I am concerned when Democrats say: Oh, I am for increasing defense, as long as you increase other parts of the budget.

I am concerned when anybody brings any other agenda, any other issue, that impedes our ability to support the men and women who serve our Nation. We ought to do our best to support them on the basis of those issues alone and let other debates, whatever they may be, stand on their own as well.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, motions to instruct are, of course, non-

binding. I think, in this case, the better vote is to vote “no.” There are provisions dealing with this in both the House and the Senate bill. I hope that we can come to a reasonable conclusion on these provisions and the whole bill. But the goal is to defend the country and to support the men and women who serve. We can never be distracted from that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1440

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to instruct on H.R. 2810;

The motion to permit closed conference meetings on H.R. 2810, if offered;

The motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 569;

The motion to recommit on S. 585; and

Passage of S. 585, if ordered.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 2810)

to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

YEAS—184

Adams	Gallego	Neal
Aguilar	Garamendi	Nolan
Barragán	Gomez	Norcross
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Beatty	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Bera	Green, Al	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Gene	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hastings	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Peters
F.	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Bustos	Jayapal	Quigley
Butterfield	Jeffries	Raskin
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jones	Rosen
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Keating	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Rush
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Ciçilline	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lee	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Levin	Sherman
Crist	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Speier
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Suozzi
DeGette	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Takano
DeLauro	M.	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Demings	Lynch	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Torres
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doggett	Matsui	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Vela
F.	McEachin	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	McNerney	Walz
Espallat	Meeks	Wasserman
Esty (CT)	Meng	Schultz
Evans	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NAYS—237

Abraham	Amodei	Banks (IN)
Aderholt	Arrington	Barletta
Allen	Babin	Barr
Amash	Bacon	Barton

Bergman	Grothman	Peterson
Biggs	Guthrie	Pittenger
Bilirakis	Handel	Poe (TX)
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Poliquin
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Posey
Blackburn	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Blum	Hensarling	Reed
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Brat	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Hill	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Huizenga	Rokita
Budd	Hultgren	Rooney, Francis
Burgess	Hunter	Rooney, Thomas
Byrne	Hurd	J.
Calvert	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Rothfus
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Royce (CA)
Cole	Joyce (OH)	Russell
Collins (GA)	Katko	Rutherford
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Comstock	Kind	Schrader
Conaway	King (IA)	Schweikert
Cook	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Cooper	Kinzinger	Sensenbrenner
Costello (PA)	Knight	Sessions
Cramer	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Crawford	Labrador	Shuster
Cuellar	LaHood	Simpson
Culberson	LaMalfa	Sinema
Curbelo (FL)	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Davidson	Lance	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lewis (MN)	Smith (TX)
Dent	LoBiondo	Smucker
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Stefanik
DesJarlais	Love	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Stivers
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Duffy	MacArthur	Tenney
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Marshall	Thornberry
Dunn	Massie	Tiberi
Emmer	Mast	Tipton
Estes (KS)	McCarthy	Troott
Farenthold	McCauley	Turner
Faso	McClintock	Upton
Ferguson	McHenry	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Wagner
Fleischmann	McMorris	Walberg
Flores	Rodgers	Walden
Fortenberry	McSally	Walker
Fox	Meadows	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Weber (TX)
Gaetz	Mitchell	Webster (FL)
Gallagher	Mooleenaar	Wenstrup
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Gianforte	Mullin	Bishop (GA)
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Bishop (MI)
Gohmert	Newhouse	Bishop (UT)
Goodlatte	Noem	Cooper
Gosar	Norman	Correa
Gowdy	Nunes	Costa
Granger	Olson	Costello (PA)
Graves (GA)	Palmer	Courtney
Graves (LA)	Paulsen	Cramer
Graves (MO)	Pearce	Crawford
Griffith	Perry	Crist

NOT VOTING—12

Black	Huffman	Marino
Bridenstine	Jordan	Palazzo
Clyburn	Lawrence	Renacci
Eshoo	Long	Thompson (CA)

□ 1508

Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KIND, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. HOLLINGSWORTH, ROHRABACHER, DENHAM, DENT, and COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas and LOEBSACK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and the Senate on H.R. 2810 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be discussed, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 8, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

YEAS—414

Abraham	Carter (TX)	Dingell
Adams	Cartwright	Doggett
Aderholt	Castor (FL)	Donovan
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Allen	Chabot	F.
Amodei	Cheney	Duffy
Arrington	Chu, Judy	Duncan (SC)
Babin	Ciçilline	Duncan (TN)
Bacon	Clark (MA)	Dunn
Banks (IN)	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Barletta	Clay	Emmer
Barr	Cleaver	Engel
Barragán	Coffman	Espallat
Barton	Cohen	Estes (KS)
Bass	Cole	Esty (CT)
Beatty	Collins (GA)	Evans
Bera	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Bergman	Comer	Faso
Beyer	Comstock	Ferguson
Biggs	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Bilirakis	Connolly	Fleischmann
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Flores
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Foster
Blackburn	Correa	Fox
Blum	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Costello (PA)	Franks (AZ)
Bonamici	Courtney	Frelinghuysen
Bost	Cramer	Fudge
Boyle, Brendan	Crawford	Gabbard
F.	Crist	Gaetz
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Gallagher
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Gallego
Brat	Culberson	Garamendi
Brooks (AL)	Cummings	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Gianforte
Brown (MD)	Davidson	Gibbs
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Gohmert
Buchanan	Davis, Danny	Gomez
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (TX)
Bucshon	DeGette	Goodlatte
Budd	Delaney	Gosar
Burgess	DeLauro	Gottheimer
Bustos	DelBene	Gowdy
Butterfield	Demings	Granger
Byrne	Denham	Graves (GA)
Calvert	Dent	Graves (LA)
Capuano	DeSantis	Graves (MO)
Carbajal	DeSaulnier	Green, Al
Cárdenas	DesJarlais	Green, Gene
Carson (IN)	Deutch	Griffith
Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Grothman

Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant

Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Richmond
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell

NAYS—8

Amash
Blumenauer
DeFazio

Grijalva
Jones
Labrador

Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tennet
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walsh
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Massie
Sanford

NOT VOTING—11

Black
Bridenstine
Clyburn
Eshoo
Huffman
Lawrence
Long
Marino
Palazzo
Renacci
Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1515

So the motion to close portions of the conference was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF REQUIREMENTS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 569) providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with an amendment, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 69, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 566]

YEAS—353

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Barletta
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Dunn
Ellison
Engel
Españat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Duncan (TN)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant

NAYS—69

Amash
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Blackburn
Blum
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Chabot
Comer
Davidson
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Griffith
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.

Hill	Massie	Rokita
Holding	Meadows	Rothfus
Hudson	Messer	Rouzer
Johnson (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Sanford
Mullin	Johnson	Schweikert
Jordan	Noem	Sensenbrenner
Kelly (MS)	Norman	Smith (MO)
Kustoff (TN)	Palmer	Stewart
Lamborn	Pearce	Walker
Lewis (MN)	Perry	Walorski
Loudermilk	Pittenger	Wenstrup
Marchant	Ratcliffe	Williams

NOT VOTING—11

Black	Huffman	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Lawrence	Renacci
Clyburn	Long	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Marino	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1523

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 232, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

YEAS—190

Adams	Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny
Aguilar	Cartwright	DeFazio
Barragán	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Bass	Castro (TX)	Delaney
Beatty	Chu, Judy	DeLauro
Bera	Cicilline	DelBene
Beyer	Clark (MA)	Demings
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Blum	Clay	Deutch
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Dingell
Blunt Rochester	Cohen	Doggett
Bonamici	Connolly	Doyle, Michael
Boyle, Brendan	Conyers	F.
F.	Cooper	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Correa	Engel
Brown (MD)	Costa	Españolat
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Esty (CT)
Bustos	Crist	Evans
Butterfield	Crowley	Foster
Capuano	Cuellar	Frankel (FL)
Carbajal	Cummings	Fudge
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Gabbard

Gallego	Lowey	Ruiz
Garamendi	Lujan Grisham, M.	Ruppersberger
Gomez	Lujan, Ben Ray	Rush
Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Gottheimer	Maloney	Sánchez
Green, Al	Carolyn B.	Sarbanes
Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Grijalva	Matsui	Schiff
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Schneider
Hanabusa	McEachin	Schrader
Hastings	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Heck	McNerney	Scott, David
Higgins (NY)	Meeks	Serrano
Himes	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Hoyer	Moore	Shea-Porter
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Sherman
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Sinema
Jeffries	Nadler	Sires
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Slaughter
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Smith (WA)
Kaptur	Nolan	Soto
Keating	Norcross	Speier
Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	Suozzi
Kennedy	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)
Khanna	Pallone	Takano
Kihuen	Panetta	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Pascrell	Titus
Kilmer	Payne	Tonko
Kind	Pelosi	Torres
Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Kuster (NH)	Peters	Vargas
Langevin	Peterson	Veasey
Larsen (WA)	Pingree	Vela
Larson (CT)	Pocan	Velázquez
Lawson (FL)	Polis	Visclosky
Lee	Price (NC)	Walz
Levin	Quigley	Walters
Lewis (GA)	Raskin	Wasserman
Lieu, Ted	Rice (NY)	Schultz
Lipinski	Richmond	Waters, Maxine
Loebach	Rosen	Watson Coleman
Lofgren	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Lowenthal		Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NAYS—232

Abraham	Dent	Hultgren
Aderholt	DeSantis	Hunter
Allen	DesJarlais	Hurd
Amash	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Amodei	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)
Arrington	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Babin	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (LA)
Bacon	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Banks (IN)	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Barletta	Emmer	Jones
Barr	Estes (KS)	Jordan
Barton	Farenthold	Joyce (OH)
Bergman	Faso	Katko
Biggs	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (MI)	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Flores	King (NY)
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Kinzinger
Bost	Fox	Knight
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Kustoff (TN)
Brat	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Gaetz	LaHood
Brooks (IN)	Gallagher	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Garrett	Lamborn
Buck	Gianforte	Lance
Bucshon	Gibbs	Latta
Budd	Gohmert	Lewis (MN)
Burgess	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Byrne	Gosar	Loudermilk
Calvert	Gowdy	Love
Carter (GA)	Granger	Lucas
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Chabot	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Cheney	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Coffman	Griffith	Marshall
Cole	Grothman	Massie
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Mast
Collins (NY)	Handel	McCarthy
Comer	Harper	McCaul
Comstock	Harris	McClintock
Conaway	Hartzer	McHenry
Cook	Hensarling	McKinley
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	McMorris
Cramer	Hice, Jody B.	Rodgers
Crawford	Higgins (LA)	McSally
Culberson	Hill	Meadows
Curbelo (FL)	Holding	Meehan
Davidson	Hollingsworth	Messer
Davis, Rodney	Hudson	Mitchell
Denham	Huizenga	Moolenaar

Mooney (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Mullin	Roskam	Tipton
Murphy (PA)	Ross	Trott
Newhouse	Rothfus	Turner
Noem	Rouzer	Upton
Norman	Royce (CA)	Valadao
Nunes	Russell	Wagner
Olson	Rutherford	Walberg
Palmer	Sanford	Walden
Paulsen	Scalise	Walker
Pearce	Schweikert	Walorski
Perry	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Poe (TX)	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Poliquin	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Posey	Shuster	Westerman
Ratcliffe	Simpson	Williams
Reed	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Reichert	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Roby	Smith (TX)	Woodall
Roe (TN)	Smucker	Yoder
Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Yoho
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Young (AK)
Rohrabacher	Stivers	Young (IA)
Rokita	Taylor	Zeldin
Rooney, Francis	Tenney	
Rooney, Thomas J.	Thompson (PA)	
	Thornberry	

NOT VOTING—11

Black	Huffman	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Lawrence	Renacci
Clyburn	Long	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Marino	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1531

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 568]

AYES—420

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Butterfield
Adams	Bishop (UT)	Byrne
Aderholt	Blackburn	Calvert
Aguilar	Blum	Capuano
Allen	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Amash	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Amodei	Bonamici	Carson (IN)
Arrington	Bost	Carter (GA)
Babin	Boyle, Brendan	Carter (TX)
Bacon	F.	Cartwright
Banks (IN)	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Castro (TX)
Barr	Brat	Chabot
Barragán	Brooks (AL)	Cheney
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Chu, Judy
Bass	Brown (MD)	Cicilline
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bera	Buchanan	Clarke (NY)
Bergman	Buck	Clay
Beyer	Bucshon	Cleaver
Biggs	Budd	Coffman
Bilirakis	Burgess	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Bustos	Cole

Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbeo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Espallat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Galleo
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris

Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Loftgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry

McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schroeder
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)

Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney

Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Black
Bridenstine
Clyburn
Eshoo
Goodlatte
Huffman
Lawrence
Long
Marino
Palazzo
Renacci
Scott, David
Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1538

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2810:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. THORNBERRY, WILSON of South Carolina, LOBIONDO, BISHOP of Utah, TURNER, ROGERS of Alabama, FRANKS of Arizona, SHUSTER, CONAWAY, LAMBORN, WITTMAN, COFFMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, COOK, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. KNIGHT, BACON, SMITH of Washington, BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. LANGEVIN, LARSEN of Washington, COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. GABBARD.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 11 of rule X: Messrs. NUNES, STEWART, and SCHIFF.

From the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of section 1262 of the House bill, and section 4 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. JOHNSON of Ohio, BERGMAN, and YARMUTH.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 221, 551, 555, and 3509 of the House bill, and sections 236, 551–53, 3116, 5508, and 6001 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. FOXX, Messrs. BYRNE, and SCOTT of Virginia.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 313, 314, 601, 723, 727, 729, 732, 3118, and 3122 of the House bill, and sections 601, 701, 725, 732, 1089A, 1625, and 3114 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALDEN, BARTON, and PALLONE.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 862 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BARR, WILLIAMS, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of sections 864, 1032, 1039, 1040, 1058, 1201, 1203–05, 1211, 1222, 1223, 1231, 1232, 1234, 1243, 1246, 1247, 1265, 1270A, 1272, 1276, 1278, 1280, 1301, 1302, 1521, 1522, 1687, 2841, and 3117 of the House bill, and sections 111, 861, 867, 1011, 1203–05, 1212, 1213, 1231–33, 1241–45, 1250, 1261–63, 1270B, 1270C, 1282, 1283, 1301, 1302, 1531, and 1651 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, DONOVAN, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 515, 1062, 1063, 1067, 1080, 1695, 2843, and 3510 of the House bill, and sections 520A, 529, 1035, 1081, 1083, 1217, 1264, and 14013 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLATTE, ISSA, and CONYERS.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 601, 1062, 1265, 2827, 2828, 2831, 2832, 2844, 2863, subtitle F of title XXVIII, and section 2863 of the House bill, and sections 311, 338, 601, 1263, 1264, 2850, and 12801 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. GRIJALVA.

□ 1545

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 323, 501, 801, 803, 859–860A, 873, 1101–09 of the House bill, and sections 218, 544, 557, 801, 812, 821, 822, 829, 852, 902, 931, 934, 938, 1045, 1093, 1094, 1101, 1102, 1104–06, 1111–13, 2821, 2822, 6005, 6012, 10804, 11023–25, and 11603 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MEADOWS, ROSS, and LYNCH.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of section 223 of the House bill and sections 897, 898, 1662–64, and 6002 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SMITH of Texas, LUCAS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of sections 801,

860B, 867, 1701-04, 1711-13, 1721-23, 1731-37, and 1741 of the House bill, and sections 854, 862, 897, 898, 899C, 10801, and 10802 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CHABOT, KELLY of Mississippi, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 122, 311, 546, 601, 1082, 1617, 1695, 3501, 3502, 3505, and 3507-10 of the House bill, and sections 331, 601, 1048, 6002, 13501, 13502, 13508, 13513, 13607, and 14013 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri, HUNTER, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

From the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of sections 572, 573, 576, 578, 1077, and 2841 of the House bill, and sections 731, 1084, 1088, 1264, 11001, 11008, and 14004 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, BILIRAKIS, and WALZ.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of section 701 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. NEAL.

There was no objection.

STRENGTHENING STATE AND LOCAL CYBER CRIME FIGHTING ACT OF 2017

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1616) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 381 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 822. NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized for fiscal years 2017 through 2022 within the United States Secret Service a National Computer Forensics Institute (in this section referred to as the 'Institute'). The Institute shall disseminate information related to the investigation and prevention of cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and educate, train, and equip State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges.

"(b) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the Institute shall include the following:

"(1) Educating State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on current—

"(A) cyber and electronic crimes and related threats;

"(B) methods for investigating cyber and electronic crime and related threats and conducting computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

"(C) prosecutorial and judicial challenges related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

"(2) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers to—

"(A) conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations;

"(B) conduct computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

"(C) respond to network intrusion incidents.

"(3) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on methods to obtain, process, store, and admit digital evidence in court.

"(c) PRINCIPLES.—In carrying out the functions specified in subsection (b), the Institute shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that timely, actionable, and relevant expertise and information related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats is shared with State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers and prosecutors.

"(d) EQUIPMENT.—The Institute may provide State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers with computer equipment, hardware, software, manuals, and tools necessary to conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

"(e) ELECTRONIC CRIME TASK FORCES.—The Institute shall facilitate the expansion of the network of Electronic Crime Task Forces of the United States Secret Service through the addition of State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers educated and trained at the Institute.

"(f) SAVINGS PROVISION.—All authorized activities and functions carried out by the Institute at any location as of the day before the date of the enactment of this section are authorized to continue to be carried out at any such location on and after such date."

(b) FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, amounts appropriated for United States Secret Service, Operations and Support, may be used to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 821 the following new item:

"Sec. 822. National Computer Forensics Institute."

SEC. 3. PREVENTION, INVESTIGATION, AND PROSECUTION OF ECONOMIC, HIGH TECHNOLOGY, INTERNET, AND OTHER WHITE COLLAR CRIME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PART MM—PREVENTION, INVESTIGATION, AND PROSECUTION OF WHITE COLLAR CRIME

"SEC. 3030. SHORT TITLE.

"This part may be cited as the 'National White Collar Crime Control Act of 2017'.

"SEC. 3031. ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance is authorized to enter into a cooperative agreement with or make a grant to an eligible entity for the purpose of improving the identification, investigation, and prosecution of white collar crime (including each category of such crimes set forth in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b)) by providing comprehensive, direct, and practical training and technical assistance to law enforcement officers, investigators, auditors and prosecutors in States and units of local government.

"(b) WHITE COLLAR CRIME DEFINED.—For purposes of this part, the term 'white collar crime' includes—

"(1) high-tech crime, including cyber and electronic crime and related threats;

"(2) economic crime, including financial fraud and mortgage fraud; and

"(3) Internet-based crime against children and child pornography.

"SEC. 3032. PURPOSES.

"The purposes of this part include the following:

"(1) To ensure that training is available for State, local, tribal and territorial law enforcement agencies and officers nationwide to support local efforts to identify, prevent, investigate, and prosecute cyber and financial crimes, including those crimes facilitated via computer networks and other electronic means, and crimes involving financial and economic impacts such as intellectual property crimes.

"(2) To deliver training to State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, and other criminal justice professionals concerning the use of proven methodologies to prevent, detect, and respond to such crimes, recognize emerging issues, manage electronic and financial crime evidence and to improve local criminal justice agency responses to such threats.

"(3) To provide operational and technical assistance and training concerning tools, products, resources, guidelines, and procedures to aid and enhance criminal intelligence analysis, conduct cyber crime and financial crime investigations, and related justice information sharing at the local and State levels.

"(4) To provide appropriate training on protections for privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties in the conduct of criminal intelligence analysis and cyber and electronic crime and financial crime investigations, including in the development of policies, guidelines, and procedures by State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement agencies to protect and enhance privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties protections and identify weaknesses and gaps in the protection of privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

"SEC. 3033. AUTHORIZED PROGRAMS.

"A grant or cooperative agreement awarded under this part may be made only for the following programs, with respect to the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of certain criminal activities:

"(1) Programs to provide a nationwide support system for State and local criminal justice agencies.

"(2) Programs to assist State and local criminal justice agencies to develop, establish, and maintain intelligence-focused policing strategies and related information sharing.

"(3) Programs to provide training and investigative support services to State and local criminal justice agencies to provide

such agencies with skills and resources needed to investigate and prosecute such criminal activities and related criminal activities.

“(4) Programs to provide research support, to establish partnerships, and to provide other resources to aid State and local criminal justice agencies to prevent, investigate, and prosecute such criminal activities and related problems.

“(5) Programs to provide information and research to the general public to facilitate the prevention of such criminal activities.

“(6) Programs to establish or support national training and research centers regionally to provide training and research services for State and local criminal justice agencies.

“(7) Programs to provide training and oversight to State and local criminal justice agencies to develop and comply with applicable privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties related policies, procedures, rules, laws, and guidelines.

“(8) Any other programs specified by the Attorney General as furthering the purposes of this part.

“SEC. 3034. APPLICATION.

“To be eligible for an award of a grant or cooperative agreement under this part, an entity shall submit to the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance an application in such form and manner, and containing such information, as required by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

“SEC. 3035. ELIGIBILITY.

“States, units of local government, not-for-profit entities, and institutions of higher education with demonstrated capacity and experience in delivering training, technical assistance and other resources including direct, practical laboratory training to law enforcement officers, investigators, auditors and prosecutors in States and units of local government and over the Internet shall be eligible to receive an award under this part.

“SEC. 3036. RULES AND REGULATIONS.

“The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this part, including rules and regulations for submitting and reviewing applications under section 3035.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to carry out —

(1) part MM of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) section 401(b) of the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (34 U.S.C. 30103(b)).

Mr. RATCLIFFE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2266

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 85

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2266, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction: Amend the long title so as to read: “Making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2017, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

HONORING BRIAN MCQUEEN

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brian McQueen, a constituent and a dear friend from the 22nd District who has dedicated his life to public service.

For 34 years, Brian worked in the Whitesboro Central School District—as a teacher for 19 years and as a principal thereafter. Brian also took his compassion for our community to the Whitesboro Volunteer Fire Department, where he served as fire chief from 1999 to 2002. He currently serves as a lieutenant and safety officer, in addition to serving on the board of directors of the Firemen’s Association of the State of New York.

In 2013, Brian was diagnosed with B-cell non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Brian joined members of the Barneveld Fire Department to found the Believe 271, a foundation to assist volunteer firefighters and EMTs who are battling cancer and life-threatening diseases. Since that day, Believe 271 has provided financial and emotional support to firefighters and their families throughout Oneida and Herkimer Counties.

With increased exposure to smoke and toxins, firefighters are at a much higher risk of contracting cancer. Brian’s tireless advocacy is a testa-

ment to his dedication and his compassion for all volunteer firefighters who risk their lives to keep our communities safe, and it is an honor to recognize my friend and a great community partner, Brian McQueen, today.

REAUTHORIZING CHIP FUNDING

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey, nearly 231,000 children rely on the Children’s Health Insurance Program. CHIP gets them to the doctor. CHIP gets them to the hospital. CHIP saves their lives.

But last month, Republican Members of Congress made a choice to put on another repeal-and-replace dog and pony show and let CHIP expire.

Mr. Speaker, what do my Republican colleagues have against needy children? Who thought it would be a good idea to put 9 million children’s health at risk for political gains? So much for compassionate conservatism.

Mr. Speaker, CHIP is vital to the Nation’s future. Along with Medicaid, CHIP has cut the rate of low-income, uninsured children nationally by half—from 14 percent to 7 percent. But if Congress doesn’t immediately reauthorize long-term CHIP funding, children will not get to see their doctors. They won’t have access to hospitals, and some may die

TAX REFORM

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of our framework for tax reform to put American workers and businesses first.

I come from Michigan, and the last time our tax system was updated, Steve Yzerman was the captain of the Detroit Red Wings. Hockeytown is rebuilding, and it is about time our Tax Code was rebuilt. We have the opportunity to reform and reduce taxes for American workers and the small businesses that create jobs for those workers.

America’s nearly 30 million small businesses are the engine of our economy, employing nearly 60 million workers, half of the United States workforce. But our current Tax Code is a monstrosity. When combined with State and local taxes, small businesses pay up to 50 percent of their income to the government.

Polling indicates that small- and mid-size businesses would use their tax savings to invest in their businesses: opening new locations, upgrading equipment, and increasing hiring and wages.

Tax reform is about rewarding work and prosperity for all Americans. Let's get on with that work.

DACA

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, Delila is a graduate student at the University of California, Riverside, who exemplifies the American spirit. As a young woman, she worked two and three jobs to support her family and help her father, who was their sole provider.

Three years ago, when her father suffered a stroke, Delila stepped up and kept the family afloat while he recovered. She went on to take a full-time position as a sexual assault advocate in our community. Delila says that job allowed her to help those who live in fear and live without hope.

This year, she will graduate with a master's degree, and there is no question that she is destined to accomplish great things. The only question is where she will accomplish them.

Delila is a DREAMer, and her future in this country depends on whether we pass the Dream Act. Once again, I am asking my colleagues to do the right thing. Pass the Dream Act so people like Delila can continue to make our communities proud.

THE HOLY CITY OF JERUSALEM

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support our friend and ally, Israel, and to stand for the obvious proposition that the people of Israel and the Jewish people have an ancient connection to the city of Jerusalem.

This connection has been forged through millennia of shared faith and shared history, yet the U.N. is actually trying to rewrite history:

They condemn Israel and call it an occupying power in Jerusalem;

They prevent Israeli scientists from excavating, even though past findings have been significant to Christians, Muslims, and Jews alike;

They have been silent when Israel's culture has been attacked, including the desecration and burning of holy sites.

Each year brings new horrors from the U.N. Their cruelty and attempts to erase history and their anti-Semitism cannot be tolerated any longer.

Today I am introducing a resolution reaffirming the connection of the Jewish people to the city of Jerusalem and condemning UNESCO's attempts to punish and delegitimize Israel.

I encourage my colleagues to show solidarity with Israel, to support the

President's removal of the United States from UNESCO, and to support this resolution I have proposed.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Clean Power Plan. This rule was intended to combat and mitigate the effects of climate change and create first-ever limits to carbon pollution from U.S. power plants.

As we deal with the devastation created by some of the strongest hurricanes in recorded history and the wildfires that are raging through Western States, we can't stand idly by while this administration eliminates the Clean Power Plan, condemning future generations to scarce resources, harsher climates, and economic uncertainty.

Extreme weather has cost the U.S. economy at least \$240 billion over the past 10 years. Climate change increases the frequency and severity of extreme weather. Shouldn't we focus on hardening and securing our infrastructure and making it more resilient to climate change?

The Clean Power Plan would also reduce plant pollutants that cause asthma attacks and respiratory illnesses, and it is projected to prevent thousands of premature deaths, tens of thousands of asthma attacks, and provide at least \$20 billion in total health benefits.

The denial of science by this administration is alarming and dangerous. I urge my colleagues to stand up for clean energy and our environment and take positive action to address climate change.

□ 1600

HURRICANE RELIEF BAILOUT

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, buried in today's disaster supplemental spending bill is a \$16 billion taxpayer bailout of the National Flood Insurance Program. That is nearly half the cost of this bill. This bailout does not come with a single reform that would put the program on the path to sustainability.

This taxpayer bailout maintains a program that has resulted in taxpayer-subsidized development and reconstruction of homes that repeatedly flood.

Madam Speaker, why are we not reforming this program that puts residents and first responders in harm's way? How much more debt are we will-

ing to let this program pile onto the next generation?

Americans in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands need help, and I would have liked to vote for the relief portion of today's legislation, but the multibillion-dollar taxpayer bailout of an unreformed program made the bill unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider the path we are on. We could have had a bill that not only provided relief to hurricane victims, but would have provided relief for taxpayers and the next generation as well, but we did not.

We will get another chance for fiscal sanity in December, when we reconsider the additional disaster funding and funding for the rest of 2018. Let's hope we make better progress at that time.

TAX REFORM

(Mr. GOTTHEIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I came to Washington to cut taxes for the residents of north Jersey. Our taxes are simply too high.

This morning, at The Heritage Foundation, the Speaker claimed that the rest of the country is propping up New Jersey. That is backwards. Currently, New Jersey pays in so that States like Wisconsin can cash out.

New Jersey is already a grand subsidizer of other States. We are one of the top 3 percent taxpaying districts in the entire country and at the bottom in what we get back. We need to change that.

New Jersey only gets back 33 cents for every dollar we send to Washington. New Jersey residents get \$3,076 less, as this shows, than what they pay in. West Virginia, for example, gets \$4.23 back for every dollar it sends in.

New Jersey is not America's piggybank.

Our one saving grace has been the State and local property tax deduction: the ability to deduct those higher State, local, and property taxes before we have to send in our tax checks every April. It allows us to avoid double taxation. Eliminating these State and local tax deductions will cost New Jersey an average of a \$3,500 tax increase per resident. Property values will go down more than 10 percent.

So I am fighting to remove this tax hike provision from the tax reform bill that can hurt our businesses and our citizens.

PROUD OF VIRGINIA'S ASSISTANCE TO DISASTERS

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, Congress approved the second tranche of emergency funding for those affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Maria, and the wildfires in the Western United States.

I would like to take a second and shine a light on Virginians who have stepped forward to help our fellow Americans impacted by these natural disasters.

Just the other day, I pulled up to a restaurant in Virginia Beach, where there was a steady line of vehicles coming in the parking lot to drop off goods and essential items. Hundreds came together to give money and items for the people of Puerto Rico.

From Hampton Roads to Richmond, to Roanoke, Virginia rose to the occasion. We had soldiers and sailors and coastguardsmen and civilians deploy forward to help in Florida, Texas, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. We had National Guardsmen, Spanish speakers, FEMA workers, EMS units, helicopters, drones, boats, and medical supplies, and much more.

We should all be very proud of Virginia's vast efforts, their leadership, and their compassion. Virginia has never been afraid to lead.

REOPENING OF PFEIFFER CANYON BRIDGE

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to recognize the reopening of the Pfeiffer Canyon Bridge in Big Sur, California.

After 4 years of drought, my district on the central coast of California finally got the rain it needed, but a little too much. As a result, this year there were many large-scale landslides, including this one, as we see here to my right, which knocked out the pilings of the Pfeiffer Canyon Bridge, causing this bridge to fail.

This left a community of people isolated and numerous businesses without revenue for at least 8 months. But over that same amount of time, the people of Big Sur, the people and government of Monterey County, the engineers and construction crews, and the California Department of Transportation demonstrated a lot of grit, guts, determination, and dedication. They listened to each other and came together to fix this bridge.

Tomorrow I will be able to attend the opening of this bridge. We will be able to show our pride for the record pace of construction, of government working together to get things done, the businesses that struggled but remained open in Big Sur during this time, and, most importantly, we will show our pride in the people of Big Sur and the communities on the central coast of California.

UNIFIED SPAIN

(Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Spain Caucus to discuss why a unified Spain is both legally, culturally, and economically justified, and how it best serves United States foreign policy interests.

First, the illegal Catalan independence referendum was held in violation of the Spanish constitution and in defiance of the federal government. Catalunya, as an autonomous region within Spain, enjoys many rights and privileges under the Spanish constitution, but self-determination is clearly not one of them.

The historical and cultural ties between Spain and Catalunya are strong. Spain and Catalunya have a shared history, being united since the reign of Ferdinand and Isabel over 500 years ago, and later, under the governance of the Kingdom of Aragon, similar to how it is a part of the Kingdom of Spain today.

Because of this history, Catalunya has a pluralistic society, with a mix of Spaniards and Catalans, and where both cultures' languages are regularly spoken.

Lastly, the deep economic ties Catalunya shares with Spain are evidence that Spain should be united. Catalunya relies heavily on Madrid for its financial sector, infrastructure, and its social security deficit.

A united Spain is a friend of the United States. A strong, united Spain has been a reliable ally in fighting the spread of Islamic extremism. Our relationship with Spain is invaluable to our foreign policy interests, and we need to speak out on behalf of a unified Spain.

HONORING 50TH COMPANY, INFANTRY OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL CLASS OC 24-69

(Mr. BEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a special group worthy of our recognition for the sacrifices they have made for our country.

This month, the surviving members of the 50th Company, Infantry Officer Candidate School's Class OC 24-69 will have their first reunion at Fort Benning, 48 years after pinning on the gold bars of second lieutenants.

The men in the 50th Company came from 42 different States, representing all walks of life and backgrounds. They accepted the risks and volunteered to become Army officers at the height of the Vietnam war.

After graduation, over half received orders to Vietnam. Two classmates

made the ultimate sacrifice: James Du Pont and Thomas Edgren. Many others earned the Purple Heart.

At the reunion in Fort Benning, these men will renew the bonds forged 48 years ago. Please join me in pausing to reflect on their sacrifices and extending them our thanks.

CONGRATULATING ELIZABETH DENT

(Mr. ADERHOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the tremendous work of Elizabeth Dent, who has been an invaluable part of the staff of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture for the past 3 years. Elizabeth came to work with the subcommittee I chair after working several years with a former appropriator, Congressman Jack Kingston.

Elizabeth has been a valuable member of the subcommittee team. She is diligent, dedicated, and keen to details, something that is very important to the appropriations work.

She is always eager to volunteer and lend a hand to accomplish whatever tasks may be needed in assisting in the agricultural community. She has become an integral part of the team, and she will be greatly missed on our subcommittee.

Elizabeth will be leaving the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture to work for the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Committee. I thank her for her outstanding work. The Senate Appropriations Committee is very fortunate to have her work on the staff. We wish her all the very best, and we look forward to working with her in her new capacity.

ACA BIRTH CONTROL MANDATE

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in defense of every woman's access to healthcare and right to make her own personal healthcare decisions in private consultation with her physician and her family.

Last week, President Trump issued a shameful executive order that will allow employers to deny women insurance coverage for contraception. This rolls back progress under the Affordable Care Act that required insurance companies to cover birth control without a copay.

This is outrageous. Employers have no role dictating what healthcare women can and cannot have. That is a decision between a woman and her doctor.

Nearly 9 in 10 women will use birth control at some point in their lives.

This order is a direct attack on their healthcare.

President Trump tried to sneak this change through, announcing it on a Friday afternoon before a long weekend. Well, we noticed and so did millions of other women that this order will adversely impact.

We are paying attention and we are not about to stop speaking out and working to protect women's access to healthcare.

FALLEN TTU OFFICER FLOYD EAST, JR.

(Mr. ARRINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fallen hero, Officer Floyd East, Jr. Officer East was a police officer for the Texas Tech University Police Department. On Monday, October 9, Officer East completed his final patrol to protect and serve.

Officer East has been described by friends as someone you could rely on and someone who was always there to help or just listen. No doubt, he represented the very best of the values of Texas Tech.

His loss reminds us that policemen and -women put their lives at risk every day. He left behind a loving wife, Carmen, who generously allowed him to dedicate his life to keeping us safe.

To his children, Ana and Monica: Our prayers are with you. Scripture tells us that "there's no greater love than for a man to lay down his life for his friends." That was God's greatest gift to this world and that was your dad's greatest gift. Our Red Raider family is behind you, and we will never forget Floyd and how he held the thin blue line. God bless your family.

ALDO'S STORY

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Aldo Solano of Woodburn, Oregon.

Aldo was only 6 years old when his family first immigrated to the United States from Colima, Mexico. Economic distress, corruption, and a lack of opportunities pushed his parents to leave everything behind and head to the Willamette Valley. They wanted a different life for Aldo and his siblings, one where they could go to school and pursue their dreams.

Aldo has done just that. At Woodburn High School, he served as vice president of his class. While earning good grades, he participated in sports and volunteer opportunities like 4-H Latino Summer Camp, encouraging young people to enter the STEM field.

After graduating, Aldo became a DACA recipient. Through DACA, he has been able to work for the Latino Health Coalition, where he worked to pass Cover All Kids, a State law to ensure access to healthcare for every child in Oregon. This winter, he will begin working towards a public health degree at Portland State University.

Without DACA, none of this would have been possible for Aldo. Young people across the country are relying on us. We need to pass a clean Dream Act that will recognize Aldo and over 800,000 DREAMers as equal members of our community.

AMERICAN PHARMACISTS MONTH

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of October 2017 as American Pharmacists Month.

During this month, I would like to recognize all pharmacists across America to ensure that Americans have access to important and often lifesaving medications.

As the only pharmacist currently serving in Congress, I am proud to recognize the work that pharmacists are doing to promote a healthy America. Every day, pharmacists provide vaccines for a number of illnesses and carefully counsel patients on prescriptions and over-the-counter medications to help heal sickness and reduce pain. Pharmacists are also considered one of the top two most trusted professions in America.

During October, as well as throughout the year, I encourage everyone to visit your pharmacist, ask questions about your prescriptions, receive advice about preventative care, and get to know the person who provides your medicine and works to keep you healthy.

Thank you, fellow pharmacists, for all that you do. Please know that your work is appreciated and you are an important part of keeping our Nation healthy.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we are now a few days after the most violent and largest massacre in modern American history in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Many that you encounter has a story, amazingly, about who was there during that week. They obviously were not at that site, but they may have been in Las Vegas for work or otherwise. It will be on the minds of Americans for a long time.

Just this past Monday, I stood with Sheriff Acevedo, my chief of police, my sheriff, my constable; mothers who have lost loved ones and children; and a woman who had been abused and her significant other carried around a heavy weapon to scare her, threaten her, and abuse her.

Why we can't have gun safety regulation, I don't know, but I believe after Sandy Hook and after Pulse nightclub, we must pass real gun safety legislation. We must ban assault weapons, ban the bump stocks. We must have universal background checks.

Madam Speaker, it is a shame that we cannot save lives. We need gun safety now, not money in your pockets.

□ 1615

OVERCOMING PROBLEMS WITH THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I want to commend President Trump's decision this week with executive orders to do some of the work we have been unable to do so far in the House and the Senate, helping people overcome the problems with the ACA, the Affordable Care Act.

One of the measures he put forth was association health plans to allow employers' employees to form health plans that suit them—indeed, to associate with their type of business, their type of industry on a small scale in their neighborhoods. It makes perfect sense, if you want to give people more choices.

Also, short-term, limited-duration health insurance plans, which allow people to have, if they are in between jobs, instead of limiting it to just 3 months, perhaps just a little longer. In the interim, while they are in between jobs, they have choices that they could afford with the elements in the plan they would like.

Finally, health reimbursement arrangements, which make it where employees—if they want to provide benefits to their—employers to their employees, that they can reimburse for more issues in their plan, such as helping them pay for their premiums, if that is how the employee wishes to have that.

Flexibility is what we need; choices are what we need; and then Congress needs to be able to accomplish something in the Senate so we can bring it back and give this to the American people.

RESPONSE TO THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TENNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the

gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, before my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus and I begin our discussion about the response to the Republican tax plan, I wish to take a moment to express our sympathy for the people of northern California who are facing devastating and destructive wildfires.

I represent a Silicon Valley district where hundreds of our neighbors to our north and south remain missing. Tens of thousands are suffering at this very moment from the destruction of more than 150,000 acres and counting, as well as an increasing number of family homes and businesses. It seems that our Nation has been struck by one national tragedy after another. Our prayers are with the California residents, and I know that everyone in this body is committed to their relief.

I also, on a personal note, want to recognize Liz Bartolomeo, who has been my communications director and worked very hard with the Congressional Progressive Caucus. She is going on to work for Democracy Alliance. I wish her very well in her next steps, and I thank her for her service to our office and to the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The purpose of this hour is to discuss the Republican economic plan, and I have distinguished colleagues of mine who will be joining us. I just want to, at the outset, articulate the basic difference in philosophy.

The President and the Republicans believe that to grow our economy, to create jobs, the way to achieve that is by giving tax cuts to corporations, giving tax cuts to the investors in stock, giving tax cuts to the executives who already get large compensation packages; and that if we do that, if we cut corporate tax rates at a time where corporations are making record profits, if we give more tax breaks to those who are investing in our stock market, if we give more tax breaks to those who get dividend checks, then somehow, magically, people making 30 grand or 40 grand will see their wages go up, that somehow we are going to get many more jobs in places across this country.

And the question is why would we believe that? Why would we think the trickle-down economics, which has failed time and again, is going to help?

Does someone really believe, in my district, who is a construction worker or a nurse or a teacher, that lowering the corporate tax rate is going to do anything to put more money in their pocket, that it is going to do anything for a nurse who is struggling to get an apartment and pay rent to be able to afford that rent, or that it is going to do anything for people in Youngstown, Ohio, to be able to send their kids to school or get vocational training or get a college education?

The difference is very simple. Our belief is, if you want to raise wages—if you want to give more pay to average Americans, just go raise wages. Provide the tax credit to those making under \$75,000. For one-third of the cost of the Republican tax plan, which is geared towards corporations and the investor class, we could give every single American, who is making under \$75,000, a 20 percent pay raise. I believe that is bottom-up economics, and that is actually what is going to grow the economy.

It is not a matter of just the economics. It is a matter of common sense. Think about it. Who do you think is going to create more jobs in the United States? Someone worth 5 million bucks who gets tax money back and is going to invest in stocks? Or is that money going to create jobs in the United States? Or could that money be spent anywhere in the world, sheltered anywhere in the world? As opposed to if you give that money to someone making \$50,000, \$60,000, they are going to spend that money in their local community; they are going to buy more groceries; they are going to buy more things for their house; they are going to get more education; that money is going to go into the local economy, and it is going to actually create jobs. That is what is going to grow the economy. That is our only shot of getting 3 percent economic growth if we invest in actual workers, the people doing the work.

By the way, they haven't gotten a raise for the past 40 years. Since 1979, wages in this country have stagnated, and we heard the same thing: just cut the taxes on the top and the wages will go up. But the wages haven't gone up.

Guess who promised to help, finally, those forgotten Americans? Guess who promised to help them? President Donald Trump. That was his whole campaign: The stock market is doing great, but you are being left behind. The coasts are doing great, but you have been left behind. And I am going to come to the White House and I am not going to give the keys to the Wall Street bankers. I am going to actually worry about raising wages.

His biggest disappointment as President is that he went back on the promise that he made to ordinary Americans, and we know that he can do it if he wants to. All he has to do is tell his

Wall Street advisers: No, no more tax breaks for Wall Street. I want the tax credits going to Main Street, and I can do that at a third of the cost of the plan that you are selling to me and the American people.

This is the debate in this country, supply-side economics that believes the greatness of America is with the investor class and the CEO class and the elite class, or bottom-up economics that our party and the Progressive Caucus is putting forward that believes the greatness in America is with the people who actually do the work, who work 40, 50 hours, who go on the assembly lines and work in factories, who work overnight as nurses taking care of folks, who are doing the education as teachers.

Who do we believe is really contributing to the economy? Who do we believe is really driving America's economic growth? The Democrats believe it is ordinary workers across this country, that that is the greatness that drives the American economy, and the Republican tax plan believes it is the investor class.

It is a very clear difference, and our commitment is not just one towards fairness but also one about investing in people who are going to create jobs and create innovation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my distinguished colleague, who is not just a constitutional law professor and a leading thinker on issues of juris prudence but has also been a leader with the Congressional Progressive Caucus in helping us craft an economic policy that is really for ordinary Americans and not for just the very wealthy.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman KHANNA for his leadership in putting this together.

Madam Speaker, I want to invoke a great Republican member of this body who went on to become President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, who spoke of "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

The tax plan that has been presented to us by the GOP in the 21st century is government of the 1 percent, by the 1 percent, and for the 1 percent. It was written by a billionaire Cabinet of a billionaire President for the richest 1 percent of taxpayers in the country.

The same policy experts whose healthcare plan was to throw 30 million Americans off their health insurance and reduce women's access to complete reproductive services now have a tax plan to sell America. But read the fine print first. In fact, you don't even need to read the fine print. You just have to look at the headlines.

Under this plan, 80 percent of the total tax cut will end up going to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans who earn more than \$900,000 a year. Let me repeat that: 80 percent of the money that will be saved in this tax cut will

go to Americans earning \$900,000 a year. That is astounding.

In the meantime, tens of millions of middle class families making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year will pay higher taxes than they were paying before. And check this out. The very wealthiest sliver of Americans, those who make at least \$5 million a year, and, on average, \$16 million a year, would get an average tax cut of over \$1 million. That is a \$1 million tax cut for millionaires.

The slogan for this plan should be: The Trump tax cut, because the rich just aren't rich enough and everybody else is doing just fine.

Madam Speaker, if you know anyone who makes \$16 million a year, please ask them to write me and tell me what they are going to do with their extra \$1 million. Maybe they will send it to a Swiss bank account or to the Bahamas; maybe they will run for Congress; maybe they will invest it in Australia where a lot of the superrich are apparently now buying property in order to have a getaway plan from the escalating crises of climate change in North America.

□ 1630

So the billionaires make out like bandits.

What about the rest of us? How much will this plan cost us?

Well, the bipartisan Committee for Responsible Federal Budget's initial analysis shows that the GOP plan would add \$2.2 trillion to deficits over the next decade. This is the result of cutting taxes for the wealthy by a staggering \$5.8 trillion and then adding new tax revenue of only \$3.6 trillion, so we are going to be adding \$2.2 trillion in deficits.

What about the deficit hawks?

They are an endangered species, as Congresswoman PELOSI says now. Actually, they have mutated into a completely new species. We don't have deficit hawks anymore. We have deficit ostriches. They are willing to squawk and strut and kick dust like hawks when there is a Democrat in the White House, but when a budget-busting, deficit-ballooning, debt-deepening Republican occupies the White House and proposes inflating the deficit and the debt to unprecedented levels with the most breathtaking fiscal recklessness anyone has ever seen, they become deficit chicken hawks and transmogrify into deficit doves, and then finally turn into fast scurrying deficit ostriches and run away from everything they have been saying for years about the necessity to reduce the deficit, they simply bury their heads deep in the sand and let the debt and the deficits climb up all around them.

Speaker PAUL RYAN, when he was campaigning with Mitt Romney, said the national debt is threatening jobs today, it is threatening our prosperity

today. Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, while calling for changes to Social Security and Medicare in 2013, told supporters only one thing can save this country, and that is to get a handle on the deficit and debt issue. Well, that was then, this is now, as they say. Now the GOP leaders are twisting arms to vote for a tax plan that will blow up the deficit and drive our children and our grandchildren's generations deeply into debt.

What happened to all of the fine speeches we heard about how we owe it to our kids not to engage in deficit spending? What happened to all the magnificent oratory about how the national debt is a moral crisis?

Can any of the Members of Congress, who built their careers on the principle of deficit reduction and ending the debt, explain why it is responsible today to add more than \$2 trillion to our national deficit?

We await an answer, Madam Speaker.

Why are they doing this to America? Why are they proposing it? Who wins with this assault on the common good?

Well, let's see. Donald Trump and his family certainly do. The only President who ever bragged that he would be able to make money by running for President is showing what a good job he is actually doing at achieving his objective.

A New York Times analysis shows that Trump and his family could save more than \$1 billion under this plan. That is right, the President and his family could save more than \$1 billion under the tax proposal that has been sent to us in Congress. Of course, it is impossible to know precisely how much would be saved because President Trump, despite his campaign promise to release his tax returns, if elected, still refuses to release his tax returns, which constitutes not only a radical breach of faith with the people, but a radical break from past practices of other Presidents for the last half century, who have opened up their tax records for the rest of us to see.

But let's see what we can do based on information we know. This proposal would eliminate the estate tax, which would generate massive tax savings for President Trump and his family. If his assets, reportedly valued at \$2.86 billion, were transferred after his death under today's rules, his estate would be taxed at around the 40 percent level, still leaving his heirs with more than \$1 billion.

Repealing the Federal estate tax, which they propose to do, would save his family \$1.1 billion, at least, in estate tax costs.

Why would we do this?

The Founders of our country were passionately opposed to hereditary wealth, just like they were passionately opposed to hereditary government. They thought it was dangerous to have the intergenerational trans-

mission of wealth and great fortunes like that. They said that it would cause idleness and irresponsibility in the heirs to great wealth, and they would be able to convert their wealth not just into bigger estates, bigger land purchases, bigger houses, but actually in the public offices. They had a very profound democratic critique of that kind of intergenerational wealth inequality, because, at a certain point, you have bought enough houses, you have bought enough jets, and now you want a governorship, you want the Presidency, you want a Senate seat. In a democracy, we need to have much reduced levels of inequality that are being proposed under this idea of abolishing the estate tax.

They also are proposing to abolish the alternative minimum tax, which is the only reason that President Trump paid any taxes in the one year over the last two decades that we know he paid taxes in, in 2005. Remember, somebody mysteriously leaked information about that year to the Rachel Maddow show, and it turned out that the President paid taxes because of the alternative minimum tax which says that you can't push a good joke too far, you can only use all of your deductions and allowances, and so on, up to a certain point. If you are at a certain place, in terms of your wealth, you have got to pay something.

Well, The New York Times now estimates that the GOP tax plan to repeal the alternative minimum tax would save the President at least \$31.3 million. He would not have had to pay in that one year that we know where he paid taxes, and we don't know about the rest because he has refused to release it.

And let's just look at one more provision, which would change the treatment of pass-through business income. According to The New York Times, President Trump could save as much as \$6.2 million on business income and \$9.8 million on income from real estate and other kinds of partnerships under changes to the taxation of pass-through income.

Now, look, Madam Speaker, nobody likes paying taxes, nobody loves it, especially when we know that there are billions of dollars being wasted, for example, at the Department of Defense in boondoggles, fraud, and abuse taking place, according to a hearing that we had just this session in the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. So people don't love the experience.

But just as Oliver Wendell Holmes said, that he didn't mind paying his taxes because he understood that they were the price of civilization. It is what we all put in, in order to have roads and highways and airports and schools and universities. That is what it means to be a citizen. People don't mind, as long as there is a basic sense in the

public that everybody is participating and we are not getting ripped off.

And I am terrified that if they succeed in barreling this plan through Congress, that it is going to spread more cynicism and more disenchantment and more negativity about the tax system and about the government, and we can't afford it. Because of the escalating crises of climate change, which are all around us, our people are suffering. We have millions of people in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands tonight who have no access to power, no access to electricity or clean water. We have people in Florida and Texas and Mississippi and Louisiana who are still recovering from the last hurricanes. We have Californians, many of whom have died already, who are struggling against the forest fires out of control.

Now is a point when we need a tax system that brings our people together, that says that wealthier people can pay more because they are wealthy, but everybody is going to pay their share, and we are all going to participate together. That is the tax system we should be looking for, a tax system where we get rid of all of the special interest inflected deductions and allowances and loopholes and rip-offs that are built into the system, where it is simplified.

In the European countries, you can pay your taxes in about 10 or 15 minutes, and you don't have to go to the multibillion-dollar tax preparation industry, or go find a law firm to do it. We can simplify our taxes if we decide to get rid of all of the special interest loopholes. And wealthy people can pay more because they get more out of being part of this society, and they use more of the infrastructure of the country, instead of paying less than everybody else, instead of trying to rip off the system by paying nothing.

Madam Speaker, now is the time when we need the wisest and most principled leadership to get us through the accumulating crises of the time. This tax plan is totally irresponsible. I hope that it will be withdrawn and we can work together across the aisle on a bipartisan plan that will represent the best values of government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from California for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative RASKIN for his thoughtful points and comments on the President's tax policy.

I have a few other points before we conclude. The President has said that we can't afford foreign aid given our deficits, but the President thinks that the average American doesn't know math. Mr. President, the average American can do math.

The deficit is \$20 trillion. Our foreign aid every year is no more than \$30 billion to \$40 billion. Your proposal would

increase the deficit between \$200 billion to \$500 billion. So this red herring that somehow foreign aid is responsible for the deficit is just false.

What is responsible for the deficit is the massive tax cuts that you are proposing that would add, according to conservative economists, between \$2 trillion to \$5 trillion more to our deficit, and it is all to finance the corporate interests, all to finance the investor class.

We have, on the Democratic side, on the progressive side, proposed an alternative, and that alternative is based on the view that we need to encourage job creation and raise wages for mainstream America, that we need to invest in the people actually doing the work. It is based on the thinking of people who used to be Republicans and people like Jack Kemp, who said: Let us invest in areas that don't have jobs and economic growth and have heavy investment for training on the technologies of the future. That used to be the thinking on the other side of the aisle. We used to have differences, but there used to be creativity and a sense of what is actually going to invest in people to grow the economy.

And now, under this President, it is just a mantra of tax cuts for the very wealthy, tax cuts for the people who need it least, tax cuts for corporations, no sense of actually investing in new industries, investing in the training and skills of the 21st century, investing in bringing capital to places that need them. I hope and believe that as people in good faith will look at the two contrasting proposals, one that says tax cuts for corporations, the other that says let's invest in American workers, let's invest in American communities, that they will conclude that the way to actually raise wages, the way to actually create jobs, the way to actually grow our economy is by bottom-up economics by investing in the American workers and in those Americans who are part of the middle class.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1645

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it has been an interesting number of days here this week. We continue to have hearings and fight for good legislation, and we continue to hear from people back home that we simply must at

least work on our promises to repeal ObamaCare and bring their health insurance into a realm that is affordable.

They realize they were lied to. They will never get the insurance they liked back. They would like to try to get their doctors back.

One of the interesting things about the design of the devious architect of ObamaCare is the guy who bragged later: Yeah, we knew you couldn't keep your insurance, you couldn't keep your doctor, but we had to say that to sell it.

They actually incentivized the handful of remaining insurance companies not to put the best cancer healthcare providers in their network. ObamaCare actually incentivizes insurance companies not putting the best heart healthcare providers or, in fact, any chronic, expensive disease that the insurance companies, because of the design of ObamaCare—and I think it was intentional—basically were penalized if they put the very best cancer treaters, heart treaters in their network. So there actually are indications that insurance companies, they could see what the administration was encouraging them to do.

For example, I had read that MD Anderson was not in those networks as a cancer provider. Some would argue it is the best cancer treatment facility. That certainly can be debated. I think it still comes down to the effort to get to the point where government is completely in charge of every American's healthcare.

ObamaCare was a good start, but obviously if you design a system so that the insurance companies, they just get down to a handful of monopolies and they are having record years, and that same bill even allows those insurance companies to get what are called bailouts after they have had record profits, well, most people are going to end up hating the insurance companies. And we have seen that.

What would happen, of course, is eventually people get so outraged with premiums going up, whether it is 10 percent or 70 percent—I have heard of it being doubled, being tripled since the last 7 years. I have heard all kinds of horror stories from people in east Texas. Around other places I have visited, it is the same thing happening. They can't afford their policy, yet they can't afford to pay an extra tax for not having a policy that the government says they have to have; and yet if they pay for their policy, the deductible is so high, they are still not going to get any benefit out of it.

So it is easy to see, when you start looking at the way in which ObamaCare was created, the rules in place for it, the day would come when people got so outraged at how expensive their health insurance was that they would scream: Look, I just can't stand it anymore. I never wanted the

government to be in charge of my personal life, but anything's got to be better than the current system. Just let the government take it over.

Then, there you are, government controlling everybody's body, everybody's personal life.

Of course, we have got this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau out there created during the Obama years by the Democrats. We were not helpful in that. We thought, sure, we want to help people who are being taken advantage of by unscrupulous lenders, but we don't need a Bureau to monitor everybody's debit and credit card transactions. There were those who argued: Yeah, but this way, they can monitor and they can tell if somebody's being taken advantage of.

There was a time, as a felony judge in Texas, that, if someone wanted your bank records, under the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution, we are supposed to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizures, and that includes anyone's bank records. So people would come to me as a judge, they would have affidavits, and they hoped that would prove under oath probable cause that a crime had been committed and that this person committed it, and if so, I could sign the warrant that allowed them to go get bank records.

We used to care about the Fourth Amendment. I know my friends across the aisle, our Democratic friends, they cared greatly, because I have heard over and over in Judiciary Committee arguments about the protections against unreasonable searches, and yet they set up a Bureau that violates that, says: Just give us all your information.

Well, sure, if somebody is being taken advantage of by an unscrupulous lender, then the remedy is they go complain to the appropriate government law enforcement or the SEC, whoever it is, and then they come to a judge like I was, get the warrant, get the records, and then make the determination if there is probable cause. We just lost so much of our privacy.

Several years ago, we said, well, since ObamaCare is going to allow the mass gathering of people's medical records and our Democratic friends set up this consumer protection racket here in Washington, we could conceivably have a day—and if we don't do something about ObamaCare and the CFPB, then it is closer than I imagined—when you get your mail, Madam Speaker, and you see: Oh, I have got a letter from the government here. And you open it, and it says: We noticed, when you were at Brookshire's grocery store the other day, that you bought a pound of bacon; and we also noticed, from your healthcare records, that your cholesterol rate is at this certain level, and so, therefore, since we control your healthcare now and we monitor your debit and credit purchases,

here is the deal: you are either going to join a health club and start working out once a week and stop buying bacon, or we are going to have to raise the amount you pay in each month.

I mean, this is where it goes when you have the Orwellian Big Brother that was advanced more through ObamaCare than anything that has ever occurred in U.S. history. It has got to be repealed.

I want to applaud and thank President Trump for taking steps today through executive order. He shouldn't have had to do that. I am very, very grateful he did. God bless him for doing it. But we should have already taken care of that stuff. That is our job.

What do we do here in the House? It was contentious. The first bill was a disaster, but we got it to where it actually was going to bring premiums down for the middle class in America. It was going to make their premiums cheaper. It was going to make their deductibles lower. Then we had people in the Senate who got elected on the promise of repealing ObamaCare that voted "no." We still have to do something.

I loved seeing the President's interview with our good friend, Sean Hannity, last night. I love this about President Trump. I think it is why he got elected. When Sean asked him about, basically, is this over, he gets this smile and says: No. We are not giving up, not giving up.

The truth is we cannot give up. People are counting on us. They don't know what to do.

There are small-business employers like the one in Tyler who told me that a few years ago he was paying \$50,000 for his employees' health insurance. He has the same number of employees, and this year it is \$153,000, and he is going to have to start letting people go or drop their insurance. It just cannot continue. People are already taking losses. It can't continue.

Well, with the proper President in place, and here in Congress we have taken some steps to ameliorate some of the damage to jobs in America, things seem to be turning around some. But we actually have to keep our promise, and I think we do that by putting a lot more heat on the Senate as the House body, House Republicans. We have got to put pressure on the Senate. Like the President said, this fight cannot be over.

Normally, I have been told since my freshman term, you can't do big things in an election year. But I am beginning to wonder, if America makes it clear to the Republicans in the Senate that you either will keep your promise on ObamaCare, you will keep your promise on tax reform or you will not be back in the Senate, then I think we could buck tradition in this place.

The idea was that we were told back in 2006, in January: Okay. Well, we didn't keep any of our promises last

year as the Republican majority, but now, you veterans know we are into an even-numbered year. That means it is an election year, so we can't do any of those big things, because everybody knows you just can't do big things in an election year or you might lose.

Well, it would have been a lot better if we had already done those things, if we had repealed ObamaCare and put a system in place that was affordable, that gave people the healthcare they needed and with actual insurance and encouraged, instead of spending \$700, \$800, \$900, sending it to the insurance company, how about putting \$700, \$800 in your own medical health savings account you control, debit-card coded where it can only be spent on healthcare, whether it is crutches, medicine, doctor visits, hospital stays, whatever, and you could have a high deductible. We could have a day where \$700 goes to your account, \$200 goes for catastrophic coverage. That is the kind of thing that we should have been pushing for and gone to, but, instead, we are pouring that money into health insurance companies.

Just in case, Madam Speaker, there are those who are already wondering, "Maybe we should just let the government take over everything; that has got to be better," I heard on the news again today another horror story. Just when you thought the VA was being cleaned up, here comes another horror story.

Some doctor at the VA was allowed to do 80-some-odd surgeries that were unnecessary, inappropriate, or terribly done, even surgeries not even needed at all, on the wrong person, but it had been covered up for some time. Well, when the government is in charge of your healthcare, you can't expect any more than the lowest common denominator in the government.

I am very, very grateful we do have some good doctors, some good nurses in the VA, but I have also talked to good doctors and nurses in the VA who are so frustrated with such an albatross of a system.

□ 1700

Why not just let people—if you want to go to the VA clinic, here is your card, you go.

We thought we were doing a good thing, and I think it was a step in the right direction when we were going to allow veterans to go to a civilian clinic, hospital, healthcare provider if there was not one within a minimum number of miles. I believe it was 40, but I have heard horror stories about how people have been jerked around and not been allowed to utilize the program as it was designed. Here, again, we come back to what you get when the government is in charge. We have got to do that.

Stuart Varney was asking today again about tax reform. We promised

it. We have got to deliver on that. These rumors I hear emanating from people at the Senate side of this building that: Yeah, well, the House can do the reform. They did their ObamaCare repeal and we didn't pass that, so maybe we won't do their tax reform package like we are working on.

It takes a lot of work to pass a major reform like we did on ObamaCare. It takes even more work, perhaps, to do a significant tax reform package where it becomes simplified, people pay less tax, the economy explodes. You would think it would be a no-brainer, but apparently there are too many people up here with no brains and it is not getting done. We do have to do that. We promised we would. We have got to do it for the sake of the economy that will make people's lives so much better.

But in the meantime, if we are going to be an effective Congress, we have got to make sure that we maintain proper systems in place that we can do our business without inappropriate outside influence, whether it is coming from Russia or Pakistan. Wherever it is coming from, we need to know and we need to protect ourselves.

That is why this Taxed Enough Already Caucus meeting we had, we invited people in the tradition of my friend Tim Huelskamp, the former chair of that caucus from Kansas. Just a great guy, a great American. It was great to talk to him recently. Tim started with this caucus having representatives of outside groups with important information we should share coming in and having Members of Congress come in and share information, figure out how we can help get the Nation's business done.

We have been concerned about articles we continue to read, especially by Luke Rosiak of The Daily Caller. No one has done more investigation on the issue of the Awan family cohorts that were working here on Capitol Hill for House Members. They happened to be Democratic House Members. I think the same thing could happen where one Republican could say, "Oh, these folks are great," and before you know it, you have dozens of people having the same IT computer workers working part time. People are allowed to do that, hire somebody part time so it doesn't overwhelm your budget. Others can hire them part time, but under no circumstances can anybody working on the Hill make more than around \$160,000.

We found out this week from the lead investigator, oh, not law enforcement, oh, no, FBI, apparently they are not getting anything done, and I will explain why in a moment. But as he has gone around and investigated and asked witnesses questions that have direct information about what is going on, Luke Rosiak would also ask: Has anyone from the FBI talked to you, or has any law enforcement talked to you?

He said 80 percent of the time the answer is no. No one from the FBI has talked to me. No one from any law enforcement has talked to me. Staggering.

I hear rumors that there are people from the FBI telling the Department of Justice: Yeah, we have looked into it. There is nothing there.

Yeah, just the way the FBI looked into the notice from Russia that the Tsarnaev older brother had been radicalized.

What do they do?

I know because I have asked Director Mueller after he had run off thousands of years of our best experienced FBI agents, done more damage to the FBI than anybody since Hoover. He has got plenty of young aggressive people without enough experience to call him out when he was making mistakes, as he made many.

They send out an FBI agent to talk to the older Tsarnaev after the second notice from Russian agents that this guy has been radicalized. He is going to be a threat. But because Director Mueller—now Special Counsel Mueller, who is hiring lawyers and investigators right and left—built up a beautiful, comfortable nest for himself, that same Mueller, as Director of the FBI, had the FBI training materials on radical Islamists purged of anything that might offend radical Islamists.

Yes, he was more concerned about the little lunches and dinners he had with CAIR—or the Council of American-Islamic Relations—than he was about people being killed in Boston, because if he had, he would have made sure that the Tsarnaev brothers were properly investigated after they got two heads-up.

If they had bothered to look, they would have seen where the older Tsarnaev went and would have known he went to a hotbed of radicalism. They would have known to investigate: What has he been reading? What scriptures from the Koran has he been reading? What has he talked about? Is he doing more memorization? What is his appearance looking like now? Who is he hanging out with?

But no. Because he was too concerned about what he called the outreach program to Islamic Americans, he didn't want to offend anybody. He was more worried about offending somebody than saving the lives and limbs of Bostonians.

He created a massive problem at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and now we are turning special counsel over to this man?

We heard from Mr. Comey himself that he talked to Mueller even before his testimony before Congress. We heard from he himself that he leaked information that was clearly FBI information that should not have been leaked.

So there is a question of did he commit a crime, or did he just commit a

breach of FBI ethics? What action should be taken?

Oh, no. We have got FBI Director Mueller on the case, and if you go back and look at the Washingtonian back in 2013, they did a big expose on how wonderful Mr. Comey was; and they point out in there that, gee, basically if the whole world were on fire, Comey knew there would be one person that would still be standing with him there to protect him, Mr. Mueller; the same guy that is protecting him instead of investigating the leaks that have come from the FBI that appear to have gone through the exact same person through whom he leaked what he admitted. But, no, we have got Mueller, the same man who is going to be there through thick and thin to protect Comey; he is the one investigating.

If Jeff Sessions as Attorney General cannot investigate Mr. Comey and his violations, potential breaches of the law, then we need another special counsel, and it sure ain't going to come from Mr. Rosenstein, that is for sure.

We need a special counsel. I think the Attorney General could do it, but I am not sure the extent to which he has recused himself. But this has to be investigated. Unfortunately, because of the damage done to the FBI, I still have questions arise on things they investigate because I know the damage that Mueller did to their training materials, to their ability. As one of our intelligence agents explained, we have blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemies.

But don't worry, the guy that was the biggest blinder is now the special counsel growing his little bureaucracy. And I am sure, knowing how vengeful he is, when he hears what I have had to say, then he probably will open an investigation on me. That is just how vengeful this man has been.

But the truth is the truth. He damaged the FBI, running off thousands of years of experienced people. He purged the training materials that would have—and Michele Bachmann and I went through these, and another Congressman from Georgia went through some, and there were some things, sure; cartoon stuff, sure; take them out, fine. But there were some things in there very clearly that every FBI agent needs to know to help them spot a radical Islamist, and Mueller blinded them of the opportunity to do that.

I will never forget, at one of our hearings, after it was so clear that he was more concerned about offending CAIR than he was of protecting Boston, and he was so defensive, I said: You didn't even go to the mosque where Tsarnaev went to see if he had been radicalized.

After fumbling around, I finally got him to tell me how he thought that was wrong, and he said: We did go to the mosque.

And I didn't hear it at first. Unfortunately, I didn't hear it until I had it found on the video.

He said: We did go to that mosque in our outreach program.

Oh, the outreach program. Yeah, you didn't go to investigate Tsarnaev to find out if he had been radicalized by asking questions in the mosque where he worshipped to find out if he was now acting like a radical. And there are clear indications. That is why we don't have to worry about most Muslims, but you sure need to know what you are looking for.

For those that want to call people like me an Islamophobe, well, it is another lie. But there are plenty of lies around Washington. I have got enough Muslim friends in the Middle East and Afghanistan and other countries. They know they don't want radicals. I am so proud of the President of Egypt, el-Sisi, a man who would stand before imams and tell them: We have got to get our religion back from the radicals.

That is a courageous great man. We owe him a lot of help.

So what do we have here on Capitol Hill?

We had guys that apparently never had a background search. And as we found out from the investigator for The Daily Caller, there were actually three or more months of the year when Imran Awan would be in Pakistan doing his job, supposedly making sure Capitol Hill computers were secured. We find out that there was suspicion when they saw this Imran Awan clan. His wife got involved. As we heard, when they would get up to the maximum amount one person could make on Capitol Hill, they would add another family member, and then they would get up to \$160,000; add another family member, get them up; add another family member. And apparently all of these people didn't work.

□ 1715

The people that had a lot of experience working at McDonalds probably didn't have that much experience on computers, but he was still making \$160,000 or so a year and, we find out—I had no idea, just this week found out—they were able to gain \$6 million to \$7 million from the House of Representatives' budget.

And we find out, gee, one of them, had gotten \$100,000 from an individual with known ties to Hezbollah, and we don't know for what reason, but clearly never came to Capitol Hill. He was put on the payroll of the U.S. House of Representatives, the guy that was owed \$100,000 with ties to Hezbollah, and made over \$200,000 or so before he was taken off the payroll.

That is a good way to pay back a loan, isn't it?

So we had Imran Awan; Hina Alvi, his wife; Abid Awan; Jamal Awan; Rao Abbas; and possibly a couple of others

we found out—just incredible that this kind of thing could happen.

But the suspicion grew when he was supposed to be working on the computer system of Congressman, now attorney general in California, Becerra. No indication Becerra knew anything was wrong, but people here on the Hill watching this saw there have been 5,700 accesses to his computer system and 5,400, at least, were not from people who should have been getting into his computer system.

Then we find out, actually, he downloaded other Members of Congress' servers completely onto Becerra's server, and, actually, he had 2 terabytes of information that he said was for their child's homework—a little child's homework taking 2 terabytes.

But we also know, apparently, from what came out this week, he was downloading dozens of Members' computers onto one server so that anybody he wanted to could access any of that information.

Now, there is no indication that classified information was revealed through the access to all these computer systems by people who were not hired by that Member of Congress. But we also know—I mean, General Petraeus, I read somewhere that it was actually a calendar that he gave to the lady who was to do a book, that he was having an affair with, that had some stuff that was considered classified.

Well, on every Member's computer system, you get their calendar, you get all their email, you get all their appointments, things that are going on in the office, you get reactions to people who come in over different bills, you get reaction to different things that have been learned in the intelligence community. There are all kinds of things that people would pay a lot of money for.

Then we find out, you had a bankruptcy in the Awan history, you had domestic violence in the history, and now we find out this week, newly reported, that his wife is now upset. We can maybe get some answers now that she is upset because, now, she has found out that not only was he being corrupt to the banks here in the United States and on Capitol Hill, but he also, without his wife's knowledge, married another lady. So that may help bring his first wife around to giving us more information about just how bad things got.

But the report was, this week, investigators with the IG's office here on Capitol Hill have been quietly tracking the five IT workers—that is, the Awan group—their digital footprints for months. They were alarmed by what they saw.

The employees, the Awans, appeared to be accessing congressional servers without authorization, an indication that they "could be reading and/or re-

moving information," according to the documents distributed at the previously unreported private briefings.

So I know that there are people who have reported here on Capitol Hill, well, it is being looked into, but there is no evidence of crime. Really?

Because we have also learned that there may have been hundreds of vouchers filed falsely for, say, an \$800 iPad. But if you say that it is under \$500, then it doesn't go in the inventory, and it is easier to steal and sell, for example, hypothetically, in Pakistan, where there are reports that he sent technological systems and sold them to make extra money.

We know that he was not truthful and honest in his financial disclosures. That can be a crime. But just one voucher where you claim something only cost \$490 and the server system cost \$310 when you know that item actually cost \$800 and should go into the inventory, that could be a crime. It appears that happened countless times, but we need to be trying to count anyway.

We know that there were many pieces of computer equipment found at his home after FBI agents said his wife appeared to be fleeing, to not come back, even though she had a trip back. We don't know what representations have been made to get her to come back, but we know that the tenants who leased the house where they fled from had been threatened by Imran Awan's lawyer for allowing law enforcement to have access to that computer equipment that was there at his house. Hard drives appeared to be destroyed so they could not be properly investigated.

We got a report that one of the group appeared to be home most of the time and was not here in Washington, D.C. But what a great gig, when you can make \$160,000 a year for servicing computer equipment. And it appears all of these five, six, seven people in this group didn't have competence to do computer or IT work, yet they were sure making a good living doing it.

But for those who continue to say "we just don't think there is much there," all that should tell you is the report by Luke Rosiak, of all the witnesses to this whole sordid matter, only about 20 percent of them have ever been interviewed by FBI or law enforcement. It tells you somebody around here in this town, this Hill, somebody does not want to get to the bottom of this. If law enforcement wants to get to the bottom of this, they will get to the bottom of it.

Kind of like Benghazi, if we really wanted to get to the bottom of it, we would do like Judicial Watch and be relentless till we got to the bottom of it. We haven't gotten there yet.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that needs to be investigated, a lot that needs to be done. We need—somebody,

sounds like, needs to be investigating Mr. Mueller, but certainly needs to be investigating the various leaks that appear to have come from Mr. Comey through the same sources as the one he admitted. That has got to be investigated. And Mueller can't do it and, apparently, the current Attorney General can't. We have got to have somebody appointed to get to the bottom of what was happening at the DOJ during last year when an election was going on.

We need to have an investigation to thoroughly get into this matter of having a U.N.—our representative to the U.N. is unmasking American information. We were assured that kind of thing would not happen if we would just reauthorize that program: Oh, no, no. If there are Americans who happen to be incidentally picked up by the monitors, the wiretap, by listening in on conversations, look, if there is an American, we mask the name. You can't just get that. You are protected. It is minimized.

Well, we find out that wasn't true, that anybody that wants to go skipping and looking into any political opponents can do that if you are corrupt enough. And if you are corrupt enough and you have corrupted other people, then it won't be investigated.

Maybe there are things other people around here don't want found out, but it is time we cleaned up the mess that has been left here, we clean up the wiretapping capability. It is coming up for reauthorization here. It has got to be done before the end of December, and I still need a lot of answers before I could even consider doing that.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we have got to help the American people by keeping our promises.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN PAKISTAN AND SINDH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for yielding me 30 minutes, more than enough time to deliver three separate speeches that I have prepared for presentation. The first two are informed, or two of these speeches are informed. The first and the third are informed by my 20 years of experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the second speech I will deliver is informed by 40 years as a CPA in the world of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking member on the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee and the founder of the Sindh Caucus. In those two roles, I have focused on human rights and the rule of law in Pakistan, and particu-

larly in its perhaps largest province, Sindh, comprising most of southern Pakistan.

We have dedicated ourselves in the Sindh Caucus to efforts to preserve the culture and the language of the Sindhi people, and particularly their dedication to religious tolerance. Unfortunately, the human rights picture in Pakistan and in Sindh are not good.

I would like to say a few words about the disappearance of Punhal Sario, the leader of the Voice for Missing Persons of Sindh movement, and about the very serious problem of disappearances in Sindh in southern Pakistan.

Just this past summer, Punhal Sario led a march between Sindh's two major cities, Hyderabad to Karachi, demanding accountability for Sindhi activists who have been abducted by Pakistani security forces or simply disappeared.

Where is Punhal now? It appears that he, too, has fallen victim to the very serious forces that he marched against.

□ 1730

Punhal's case is hardly an isolated one. The Human Rights Commission of Pakistan reported that over 700 people disappeared, were kidnapped, and never heard of again in Pakistan in the year 2016 alone.

In the past year, the United Nations Human Rights Committee, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and the State Department's own Report on Human Rights have all noted serious concerns about extrajudicial and targeted killings and disappearances in Pakistan and, particularly, in Sindh.

Elements of the government or military see an opportunity to simply make their opponents disappear. Here are a few particulars. In 2016, Amnesty International reported that the Pakistani security forces had, and these are their words, "committed human rights violations with almost total impunity."

While Human Rights Watch observed that, "law enforcement and security agencies remained unaccountable for human rights violations."

The State Department itself noted in Pakistan, "the most serious human rights problems were extrajudicial and targeted killings, disappearances, torture, the lack of the rule of law."

Two years ago, in 2015, Sindhi leader Dr. Anwar Laghari was brutally murdered in Pakistan. Days before his death, he had sent a memorandum to President Barack Obama about human rights violations by the Pakistani military and its ISI, the Inter-Services Intelligence, agency, an important part of the Pakistani military.

I attended a memorial service for Dr. Laghari here in Washington and have come to know of his work for human rights for the Sindhi people of southern Pakistan. The Pakistani Government has not been responsive to numerous

inquiries into the reason for Dr. Laghari's death and for why his perpetrators have not been brought to justice.

Two months ago, on August 18, I sent a letter to the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs and the U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan expressing strong concerns about human rights violations of the Pakistani Government in Sindh. Six of my House colleagues—three Democrats and three Republicans—joined me in that effort.

There are other human rights concerns in Pakistan that I should also bring to the attention of this House. The people of Sindh face religious extremist attacks. ISIS, for example, claimed responsibility for an attack on a Sufi shrine in Sindh that killed 80 people. Yet the government has not acted to protect religious minorities and, in general, has not acted to protect the people of Sindh from Islamic extremism.

In addition, in Sindh, there are forced conversions of Sindhi girls belonging to minority communities. While the numbers are unclear, reports suggest that every year perhaps 1,000 girls and young women in Pakistan, including many in Sindh, are forcibly converted upon a marriage, not of their choice, to Muslim men. The Pakistani Government has not done enough to stop this practice, and reform measures have been circumvented and not enforced.

Human rights abuses of this type cannot go unanswered. Activists disappear under suspicious circumstances. It is our obligation to speak out and demand accountability. These disappearances and other violations of human rights should be a major topic of conversation in all bilateral discussions between our government and the government in Islamabad.

TAX PROPOSAL DELETES DEDUCTIONS

Mr. SHERMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker I would like to move on to a second speech, one dealing with the tax proposal of the Trump administration.

The provisions I would like to focus on chiefly are those involving taking away the deductions, the itemized deductions that so many Americans take to reduce their tax liability.

Now, these deductions are eliminated on the theory that, oh, they just go to the wealthy, and, for those purposes, they define the wealthy as the wealthiest 30 percent or so of the American people—say a family with an income of \$100,000 or \$150,000. We are told that is the same thing as increasing taxes on the top one-tenth of 1 percent, say a family with an income of \$1 million or \$2 million a year.

There is a difference in the ability to pay of those two typical families, typifying their income brackets. The fact is, that taxing hardworking families with incomes of \$100,000 or \$150,000, in

order to provide reduced tax rates for those with incomes of \$1 million or \$2 million, makes our tax system more regressive. You cannot put the entire top 30 percent in one category for these income calculations.

That is why, and that is only one reason why, I oppose the elimination of the home mortgage deduction. Another reason that I oppose it is elimination of the home mortgage deduction and reduction for local property taxes will probably decrease the value of homes by 20 percent, is the best estimate I have seen.

Well, if you lose 20 percent of the value of your home, you may very well lose all of the equity in your home. How is that going to affect the economy? How is that going to affect the ability of homeowners to go and spend money in their communities and support the economy of their communities?

What does it do to the Federal budget when we are responsible through Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac for underwriting home mortgages? We know that if you wipe out the equity of many homeowners in their homes, this can lead to defaults and cost the Federal Government perhaps more than we give up by having a home mortgage deduction.

Another element to keep in mind is that the entire idea of an income tax is that we tax people based on their ability to pay. If you are in a State with high income taxes, high property taxes, that diminishes your ability to pay. If you make a certain salary and money is taken out by your State government before you ever see it, your ability to pay is only on that net paycheck.

It is simply wrong to take away the deduction for State and local taxes. But make no mistake about it, the purpose of removing that deduction is not just to hurt the top 30, or 40 percent, or 50 percent of the American people who itemize their deductions, it is designed to punish those who are dependent on State and local government.

All the conservative theorists say: If we can just eliminate the deduction for State and local taxes, we will cut the size of State and local governments. We will create a political atmosphere in which they slash money for local schools, slash money for local health programs for the poor, slash money for police.

Who will be hurt from those cuts? Not just the top 30 percent or 50 percent, but everyone in America, most particularly, the poor.

Finally, I want to focus on the medical deduction. They take away the medical deduction in this program, this proposal of the Trump administration. Now, keep in mind that we already have severe limits on deducting medical expenses. You can deduct medical expenses only if they exceed 10 percent of your family's income. So medical ex-

penses are itemized and deducted only by those families including someone with very significant health costs.

Now, we have worked hard in this House to make sure that people have health insurance. But even with health insurance, there are copays; there are deductibles. These can be absorbed in a family budget where no one has a particular strong medical need. But what if there is some member of the family who needs experimental treatments that are not covered, therapies that are not covered?

Under the present system, at least they get to deduct these extraordinary—not the first 10 percent of AGI, of adjusted gross income—but when they start spending out-of-pocket costs in excess of 10 percent income, they can take a tax deduction—a tax deduction taken away in the Trump tax proposal.

I speak not just as someone who spent a lot of time as a tax expert who headed the second largest tax agency in the country, but as the father of a child with special needs. What does this tax proposal mean for such a family? Well, first, there is a cut in Federal revenue under this proposal of between \$150 billion and \$200 billion a year. Deficit hawks will demand that these revenue cuts be matched by cuts to Federal spending.

What does that do to the \$13 billion the Federal Government dedicates to the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, also known as special education? And what do these cuts in our Federal expenditures mean to the \$293 million that are spent by the National Institutes of Health on research designed to prevent and treat autism and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, ADHD?

So the first impact on a family with special needs is a slashing of the money the Federal Government spends for special education and medical research. But second, I talked about those out-of-pocket medical expenses. Parents with special-needs children know that health insurance pays only a portion of what is needed, or perhaps none of what is needed, for behavioral therapy, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, developmental pediatricians, neuropsychological services, et cetera.

Medical insurance will pay nothing toward anything branded an experimental treatment, and, of course, medical insurance does not cover special schools required to meet the needs of some special-needs children.

Under current law, a special school designed to meet those with a physical or mental handicap are considered medical expenses. All of these tax deductions are taken away from a family whose ability to pay is diminished by the costs of providing these therapies to a special-needs child.

In addition, right now, the tax law provides a personal exemption of \$4,050 for each dependent child. The Trump administration proposal takes that away. It does say, in some vague language, that there will be a child tax credit to compensate parents who are losing the personal exemption. But this credit will be limited to children 16 years of age and younger.

So what about parents supporting children in their teenage years, and older? Remember, some special-needs children will need parental support for a lifetime. Those parents lose the exemption and are ineligible for this credit available only to parents of younger children.

But perhaps parents of children with special needs should support the Trump tax program. While it will tremendously increase their taxes, while it will cut Federal expenditures on special education and on health research and medical research, parents of children with special needs can take solace in knowing that this plan will reduce taxes for the Trump family by over \$1 billion in estate taxes and by tens of millions of dollars in income tax.

Perhaps we should tell parents of special-needs children that they should stop worrying so much about their children and start worrying about Donald Trump's children. If they did, they would support the Trump tax proposal.

IRAN NUCLEAR CONTROL DEAL

Mr. SHERMAN. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the issue of Iran and the nuclear deal, nuclear control deal that we signed with Iran.

First, a little background. In 1997, I said at the Foreign Affairs Committee that Iran and its nuclear program were the number one threat to American national security.

□ 1745

For the last 20 years, I have supported every effort to impose sanctions on the Iranian regime. When the Iran nuclear deal was finalized and published, I was the first of either party to come to this floor and say that Congress should not vote to endorse that deal.

But the question before us now is: Should we renounce the deal?

Now, it would be one thing if Iran decides that we are so tough on them on other issues that they choose to renounce the deal, but that is not the issue before us today. The issue before us today is whether America should renounce the deal, and the resounding and clear answer is that is not something we should do at this time.

Now, I will give you an example. Let's say you bought a flawed automobile. In some jurisdictions, you take back the automobile and you get back your money. But what opponents—what some are proposing now is that we renounce the deal. Imagine you are in a jurisdiction where you have to

take back the car and the dealer keeps your money, too. Taking back the car doesn't look like such a good idea anymore.

Now, like a flawed automobile, the Iran nuclear deal is liable to not be working next decade. But that doesn't mean you take back the car and the dealer keeps the money.

What happens if we renounce the deal?

Iran keeps the money. We unfroze very roughly \$100 billion of their money. If we renounce the deal, they keep the money. We delivered over \$1 billion in currency on big pallets. If we renounce the deal, Iran keeps the money. If we renounce the deal, Iran is liberated from all of the restrictions that it agreed to on its nuclear program.

I opposed the deal because the restrictions on Iran's nuclear program in the deal were temporary. I believe we need to extend and enforce those limitations on their nuclear program. If you listen to the Prime Minister of Israel, Bibi Netanyahu, he has identified the fact that we have not been able to extend and make permanent the limitations on Iran's nuclear program as the chief flaw in the deal and the chief thing to correct to turn it into a better deal.

But if we renounce the deal, we don't extend and enforce the limitations on Iran's nuclear program, we end and eliminate immediately the restrictions on Iran's nuclear program. I cannot think of a worse result.

Now, there are two mechanisms that we could use as a nation to renounce the deal, give Iran all the benefits, and liberate them from all their obligations. The first of these is on our mind now because it could be triggered on October 15. That is the day on which the President could, in effect, decertify this deal under the Iran Nuclear Review Act. I hope that, if he does that, the press will not overplay it, because a decertification does nothing more than focus Congress' attention on whether we want to reinstitute the exact sanctions that were waived as part of the nuclear deal. A decertification does nothing more than focus our attention and, over in the Senate, provide for a reinstitution of the old sanctions.

Now, I don't think that Congress would be stupid enough to do that because, as I have explained, if we renounce the deal, Iran keeps the benefits and is liberated from its obligations.

But the President should not decertify the deal and focus the world's attention on whether America will stand with the deal at this time.

The second way that America could renounce the deal will occur next January because the basic element of the deal—the basic thing Iran got from the United States—was an agreement that

the President would, every 4 months to 6 months, it depends on the exact statute, waive particular identified sanctions. As it happens, the existing waivers all expire in the middle of next January. If the President were to fail to issue those waivers, that would be an American renunciation of the deal. So it does not meet our national security objectives to renounce the deal.

What meets our national security objectives is to impose tough sanctions on Iran, draft those sanctions carefully, and explain them to the world not as a renunciation of the deal, but as appropriate sanctions given Iran's non-nuclear, outside-the-deal, wrongful behavior.

Now, the question is: Can we have sanctions on Iran and continue to force them to abide by the deal?

The answer is clearly yes.

In July of 2015, Secretary Kerry came before our committee, and I raised this very issue: If we adopt the deal, can we impose sanctions on the Central Bank of Iran to deter terrorism? Or would that violate this agreement?

I specifically asked: Are Congress and the United States free under the agreement to adopt new sanctions legislation that will remain in force as long as Iran holds American hostages or supports the murderous Assad regime?

Secretary Kerry's answers were clear. He stated: We are free to adopt additional sanctions as long as they are not a phony excuse for just taking the whole pot of past ones and putting them back.

So we can and should impose new sanctions on Iran to the extent justified by Iran's behavior outside the area of nuclear research and uranium enrichment. Look at that as an opportunity because you could make a list of every sanction any one of us here on this floor has thought of. And add in the creativity of the United States Senate and make a list of every sanction we could impose. I assure you that those sanctions and more are justified by the non-nuclear evil committed by the regime in Tehran.

Iran is more responsible than Russia for the hundreds of thousands of deaths in Syria. The lifeline of Assad's murderous regime is a lifeline to the aid, money, weapons, thugs, and training that Iran has provided—hundreds of thousands of deaths, an immoral responsibility of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Turn to Yemen, where tens of thousands of people have died because of Iran. Look at worldwide terrorism, and Iran is the number one state sponsor of terrorism year after year, according to our State Department. Look at the treatment by Iran of its own people, the murders by the state of anyone they identify as being part of the LGBT community, the murders by the state of women—it is usually women—accused of adultery.

The evil that comes from the Islamic Republic far exceeds the ability of this House to identify sanction points. That is why the proper policy for the United States is to impose the maximum sanctions and to explain to the world that this is not a phony renunciation of the nuclear deal, but it is the appropriate response to Iran's actions that are outside of the nuclear deal.

If we do that, we will have substantial support from Europe, Asia, and elsewhere first for demanding that Iran continue to be subject to all the nuclear limitations and inspections that they agreed to under the deal and which continue to be enforced well in the next decade.

What we shall do next decade, well, I will come back here and give another speech next decade. But at least many years deep in the next decade, this deal provides us with valuable limitations and valuable inspections of the Iran nuclear program, and Europe will insist that those be adhered to.

Second, Europe may join us in the sanctions when we sanction Iran for its actions in Syria, its actions to its own people, its actions in Yemen. One more I should add, and that is Iran's violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions by testing and developing missiles and exporting weapons.

So if we stick with the deal and we sanction Iran, they may choose—if those sanctions are as effective as I think they can be—to walk away from the deal. But if they do, we will have the whole world with us enforcing sanctions against Iran.

Now, there is one part of the policy I put forward that may not meet the psychological needs of the President of the United States, for he has shown an uncontrollable personal need to pour disgusting liquids on anything associated with President Obama. Maybe it meets his psychological needs to say he is renouncing the nuclear deal. But the fact is we don't have to renounce the nuclear deal and liberate Iran from its obligations in order to impose the toughest imaginable sanctions on this regime that is doing so much evil.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me just note I believe that our President is doing a terrific job. I think that the last Presidents of the United States have left us an incredibly dangerous situation, and this President is trying to deal with it with strength and purpose, and, yes, being a forceful leader.

For example, during the Clinton administration, we provided \$4 billion to \$5 billion to North Korea, the same way the last administration tried to provide funds for Iran.

What do we have now?

A crisis with possible nuclear weapons and missiles in North Korea. That is called kicking the can down the road. They sure kicked it down to us, and now the people want to kick the can down the road with the Iranians. No, let's not do that again and leave future generations to face the music that we left them.

Our President wants to make sure that Iran does not become a nuclear power as long as it is controlled by radical, fanatic mullahs who don't even represent their own people. In fact, if Iran was more peaceful and actually more democratic, then we wouldn't have to worry about that because they wouldn't want to have a wasteful program of nuclear weapons.

Those are the type of issues we face today. We face a lot of uncertainties at home and abroad, and it behooves us to look for explanations for the shifts in power, the dangers, and the influence that are taking place in the world today.

Europe, along with the United States, for five decades, seemed to be the center of world order and progress. NATO, the European Union, and the common market all seemed to be the epitome of sophisticated and proper governance needed to offset humankind's destructive and combative inclinations. World Wars I and II had undercut, if not destroyed, the expansion of classical liberalism that was in the process of retiring royalist and imperialist domination of the world, which, of course, is where the world was at the turn and the beginning of the 20th century as classical liberalism began to replace imperialism and monarchy.

Yes, the two World Wars that we experienced were traumas that still impact our lives. The Treaty of Versailles that ended World War I was the last gasp of European colonialism.

□ 1800

Maps drawn at that international gathering brought on World War II. Some of those other lines that they drew on that map plague us to this day.

Those national borders mandated by the Versailles Treaty made the world temporarily tranquil. Maybe we just heard about that a few moments ago, how we have got to overcome the tragedy right now, like we did in Korea, by not having confrontations with those people who were engaged in hostile activity.

Yes, the Treaty of Versailles gave the world temporary tranquility, but doomed following generations to instability and conflict. Such future challenges were left to the League of Na-

tions. When that failed, the baton was passed to the United Nations.

Humanity, obviously, hoped that global government, in one form or the other, would solve everything. The EU, the common market, NATO, and other multinational bureaucracies would demonstrate how nation-states can cooperate and achieve a collective peace, freedom, and prosperity.

Well, just as things changed dramatically after the 19th century turned into the 20th century, and it became a different world, so, too, is our world changing. We must make sure that we have turned from the 20th century into the 21st.

The 20th century was dominated by the wars and by the defeat of the Soviet Union. Yet we are plagued with conflicts and upheavals that can be traced back to border and sovereign decisions made long ago by people who are now dead, not only from the 20th century, but, as I said, from the end of World War I.

Many of the confrontations between various nationalities that we face today could be solved and the greatest threats of violence, insurrection, and war itself could be defused if our world would again recognize the right of self-determination.

It seems to have been forgotten that the United States was not only founded on the principles of liberty and independence, but also of the right of people to demand their rights, and, yes, that right of independence. They had a right to declare their independence.

This was the revolutionary idea that people have a right to select their government. This was the revolutionary idea that gave our Founding Fathers and Mothers the moral high ground to free themselves from the British Empire. Without this, they probably would not have won, if it were just a battle between powermongers.

No. This was what the fundamental beliefs were: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but also the right of people to declare themselves free and independent to create a country based on shared beliefs and shared ideals and values.

This is what we hope—those shared values and beliefs in liberty and justice—are the things that unite us today. That is what united had our Founding Fathers and Mothers and that is what made us a nation. After all, we don't have one race or one religion or one ethnic group to identify us as being Americans and create that unity.

But that said, there are many other countries of the world whose nationalism and patriotism are based on the fact that they have an identity with other people that share their cultural and racial identities. This is what unites them as a people. They are ethnically the same, they are culturally the same, and they have the same type

of national and racial roots in their past.

Yes, this is what most countries are like. That is what defines a nationality. Recognizing that people of similar values and culture do not want to live in the subjugation of others has been ignored and/or rejected by the powers that be throughout the world.

So we live in a world where this idea of just recognizing that people want to be like people with similar people. For example, you have differences between Catholics and Protestants in many areas of the world.

Yes, they like to have people who maybe speak their same language and have the same culture, enjoy the same music. There is nothing wrong with people identifying others as being part of their national family. We should promote that as a positive, rather than as a negative. We should encourage people to work together.

There are many, for example, Jewish charities, which is wonderful that Jewish people now, because they have gone through a certain amount of oppression throughout the world, take care of each other in Jewish charities. We have that. We have Catholic schools and different things.

Yes, it is meant because people do share certain values that they can work together on. That is a good thing. However, the idea that people like that might want to be in their own country, which is what our Founding Fathers said, because it was only shared values, it wasn't specific that we wanted freedom of religion for all people.

Well, today the world is threatened by people who want to be independent of domination of others who don't share their same values and their nationality. The reason why it is being rejected is basically by the power brokers throughout the world because it threatens those in power with losing authority over people who don't want to live under their domination.

That is what self-determination is all about: letting people decide their own fate. If a majority of people in an area want to be independent of a country, that is what they should be, according to our Declaration of Independence. And this is something that brings a more peaceful world, rather than trying to have subjugation of one people by another.

There has been a major cause of conflict in the world today when people don't recognize that, yes, there are others who feel that they are being oppressed by being forced under the jurisdiction of a particular government. They would like to have their own independence.

This, of course, has been especially true where people, since the end of the Cold War, have started looking at their own self-identification. When the right of self-determination is recognized, disputes are usually settled peacefully, as

happened when, for example, after the fall of communism, the Czechs and the Slovaks, who had one country before, under the Treaty of Versailles, Czechoslovakia became the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. Well, that is fine. It is a good thing that they were able to separate. Now they can be friends.

But when they were one country, if the Czechs and Slovaks felt like they were being oppressed, they weren't satisfied. It was a good thing to permit them right off the bat: If you don't want to be part of the country with us, yes, you can be a separate country. Otherwise, there would have been turmoil at one level or another.

We also saw a peaceful solution in countries like Slovenia. Yugoslavia was breaking up, Tito was dead, the Cold War was over, and guess what. Slovenia and a bunch of other republics within Yugoslavia wanted to be independent, and they were able to do it.

Well, perhaps they were able to do it because the Serbs had already launched attacks on the Croats and the Kosovars and other people in Yugoslavia that now was splitting apart because these people wanted to be independent and free, but the Serbs attacked them.

They didn't attack Slovenia, because I think by that time they realized that they could not succeed going to war with all of these various groups. Had the Kosovars and the Croats been free to go and separate and become independent countries—as Croatia is today, and as the Kosovars would like to be, and as we are trying to help them to be—that would have been better for Serbia. It would have been better for everybody. There would have probably been by now an agreement for some kind of free trade zone.

Instead, when the Serbs used force to keep those people under its jurisdiction, we had violence throughout the Balkans that has lasted for several decades. That is a tragedy. We should be working today in the Balkans.

Let me just note that the Serbs today are an example of people who are reaching out, for example, to the Kosovars and others to try to find peaceful solutions and trying to come to some agreements that will make peace more likely.

But, again, if you would have had people who were under their thumb, nobody would be talking to them because they would be afraid of them. No. People who treat other people as equals and have rights as people in the world, they are more likely to reach understandings that are of mutual cooperation that will bring peace to the world.

I am not trying to say you have to submit yourself to some other group of people. The former Soviet Union, Ukraine, and other of the so-called Soviet republics were actually permitted at the end of the Cold War to, basi-

cally, peacefully establish their own independence. I know it is not as simple as that, but it happened in a peaceful way in which thousands of lives were not lost trying to force groups of people who do not want to be under Moscow's control.

Those people, whether Ukraine or elsewhere in the Baltics or the Balkans, had the right—and also in Central Asia—and people were permitted to have, basically, an independent government free from being only suppressed by Moscow and have to follow its orders.

That happened relatively peacefully. Had that not happened, there probably would be conflict throughout that part of the world today. There certainly would have been, as communism faltered in Russia itself.

So it took a lot of prodding for us to make sure that the Russians in the Soviet Union, in Moscow, understood that they could not keep people under their thumb. It was the Cold War.

Thank God, we ended the Cold War peacefully, because that was the great gift that Ronald Reagan gave to us. I am very proud to have served with Ronald Reagan for 7 years in the White House as a senior speechwriter to the President for 7½ years, as well as being a Special Assistant to the President and very involved with his efforts to try to move peace in the world. A lot of it was peace by recognizing people's right to independence.

Look back, for example—Ronald Reagan was an Irish American—at the needless violence that the British perpetrated and what happened in Ireland because the British insisted that the Irish be kept under British rule for so long, when it was clear that the Irish people wanted to be independent of Great Britain.

Look at what happened, in contrast, in Singapore and Malaysia, where the British just peacefully permitted those countries that were basically under the domination—they were part of Great Britain and the British Empire—to leave and establish their independence peacefully. Then Malaysia and Singapore separated from Great Britain, and then separated from each other, peacefully.

But in any one of these cases, if somebody demanded that these people stay in this particular status within this particular government, there would have been a lot more violence.

When self-determination is respected, peace is more likely. When a people are subjugated to the orders of a government in a country they don't want to be part of, violence is more likely.

How easy is that?

Special interests and power elites throughout the world are not so inclined to this obvious reason.

Why?

Because it is not in their interest to let people just go when they have them right there under their control.

So let's look at a few examples where self-determination has manifest itself in conflict.

Today, one of the greatest conflict areas of the world is the Middle East. Again, many of the conflicts that we have seen, if not a majority, can be traced right back to the Treaty of Versailles, right back to World War I, and the decisions of colonialists and imperialists and royalists to draw borders in the Middle East, just as they did in Africa and elsewhere, which made no sense.

Yes, we ended up separating whole nations. For example, one nation of people that we are aware of today are the Kurds. The Kurds were separated into various countries in the Treaty of Versailles by these British and French colonialists.

And we are supposed to just abide by their decision of what the borders should be today, 100 years later?

No, I don't think so.

□ 1815

The Kurds, of course, were not living just subjugating themselves to what they had been dictated. No, the Kurds have been our greatest ally in the fight against radical Islamic terrorism, and what they are doing today and what they just voted on recently was they had a vote to determine if their people wanted self-determination and wanted to be an independent country from Iraq.

Yes, that was a good thing, and we should recognize that. They won overwhelmingly, and we should look at the map of—the Middle East needs to be changed so you can have a Kurdistan that flows all the way from Turkey and Iraq and Iran and Syria. There are more, for example, Kurds in Iran than there are in Iraq. In Turkey, there are more Kurds, and, of course, in Syria.

This should be a modern country. Why are we letting this turmoil go on when our greatest allies are looking for their own self-determination and these other countries are becoming or are already our enemies? Yes, it will behoove the United States to support the independence of Kurdistan and all the Kurds. We should support in bringing together these Kurdish people as a nation, because that is what they are. They are a nation without a state. Let them have their country.

There has been so much bloodshed in trying to repress the Kurds from the Iranians, from the mullah regime, but also the Shah before him. The Kurds were oppressed by Saddam Hussein, and right now, what we have is a repression of people even in Iran where the mullah regime is oppressing not only the rest of its people, not only the other people who make up Iran, but the Kurds, in particular.

Look at what is going on with the Baloch, for example. Now, a small

group—there are groups of people. There is an area in Iran where the vast majority of people are of the Baloch extraction. They would like their independence. They deserve their right to self-determination, and they are not suffering from the oppression of Iran.

By the way, if we are going to try to deal with Iran, let's not ratchet up our military and threaten to attack them that way. Let's ratchet up our support for people like the Kurds and the Baloch and the Azaris and other people who live in Iran who don't like the oppression of the mullahs, and we can even be supportive of the Persian people who hate the mullah regime.

These are not our enemies in Iran. It is the mullah regime, the fanatics that would drop a bomb on us and not even think twice because they think they are doing God's work. They are the enemy. So we need to be supporting, for example, the Baloch, when I talk about in Iran. The Baloch are also persecuted, mainly persecuted by the Pakistanis who have them under their thumb, and they murder people constantly. They pick these young people up and they murder them, and then they drop their bodies in little villages just to show people what is going to happen to them if they try to resist Pakistani authority.

This is the history of Pakistan. Right now they are doing it to the Baloch, to the Sindhis, to the Singhs, you name it. You have got just a group of people—except for, of course, the Punjabis and then others, the Pashtuns who control that Government in Pakistan.

Well, remember what happened before. We have seen it before. When the people of Bangladesh wanted to be a little independent of the Pakistani Government, have some way to, you know, control their own lives and control their own government, they were brutally repressed by the Pakistani Government, and that is what led to, basically, the uprising of the people in Bangladesh when they freed themselves.

Remember, that same type of oppression is continuing not only on the Baloch, but, for example, the populations that came over from India, after India and Pakistan split. A lot of them went to Karachi. Those people in Karachi now, there are people who want to have Karachi—it is like a Singapore of that part of the world, an independent. That is what they want to do because they have a right of self-determination.

They don't want to be subjugated by this corrupt, militaristic, proterrorist Government in Pakistan. We should be siding with people like that who want their independence and believe in these same values that we believe in.

Another example of that, of course, is what we see in Spain today. Today, of course, now there are groups of people who live in Catalonia. Catalonia is a

province with a long history in Spain. People identify themselves as Catalonians. Yes, Spanish, but also Catalonians. They should have a right to vote on whether or not they want to remain part of Spain, whether or not they give up their sovereignty to a central government in Madrid or do they want to have a government of Catalonia that they can have their own government, and yes, their own sovereignty.

Well, the Spanish overreaction to the efforts of the Catalonians just to have a poll—basically it was a vote on independence, but it was—you know, basically it had to be recognized for it to have effect. But instead of letting them do this and just saying, "Well, it has no legal effect," instead, the Spanish Government came down with brute force and conducted violence, as you would think violence coming from terrorists would exert on a group of people in Spain. It was their own government that was exercising violence and force and intimidation against the people of Catalonia.

Now, of course, the people of Catalonia are united because they know the brutality and subjugation of what is going on with Madrid.

Now, the British knew how to do it. Unlike Madrid and Spain, the British permitted their people in Scotland to have a vote, and that was a wonderful thing. The Scots had their vote, there was no interference, and if they didn't want to be part of Great Britain, they didn't have to be, and that was a wonderful example to the world of how you should do this.

Now, the Scots decided to stay part of England, part of Great Britain. That is fine, but they had their chance. The people in Spain weren't given that chance. No, instead their government came down and beat them up when they tried to go to the polls. And let's say also, the British seemed also to be demonstrating, they believe, in self-determination.

They are exiting—they are taking the Brexit issue of whether or not you should have Britain as part of the EU and the common market. That vote that they allowed their people to decide, it wasn't decided by an elite. The Brexit vote let all the people of Britain decide whether or not they were going to be basically part of a subjugated people in Europe or whether they were going to be an independent force and a nation, which is their history as a people of Great Britain.

I am proud that they permitted Scotland to vote, and I am also proud that they voted not to subjugate themselves to the EU and to the common market, et cetera.

We need to make sure that we stay true to our principles and have a vision about what this world will be. If you are just looking at things of what we can do every day, Ronald Reagan suc-

ceeded because he had a vision of a peaceful world based on those individual rights and those concepts of freedom and democracy that were at the heart of the American experience, but also an America that encompassed people from all over the world.

Reagan had a vision, and it wasn't to get into a war with the Soviet Union and destroy communism. Reagan's vision was let's have—yes, we have to have strength in our military in order to defeat this enemy of Soviet communism, because it was threatening the world peace. It was taking over countries and overthrowing governments and replacing them with atheist dictatorships. Reagan knew we had to stop that.

Just like today, our primary enemy today is no longer the Soviet Union because Reagan helped eliminate the Soviet Union, the communist threat. The threat today is radical Islamic terrorists who will murder our people and are murdering people all over the world and murdering people in their own countries in order to terrorize them into submission.

Well, the bottom line is, Ronald Reagan's vision succeeded with Russia because, at that time, it was the Soviet Union, and now we have a Russia that we have so much more potential.

Now, there are a lot of flaws. There are a lot of flaws in the Russian Government, and there are things that we have to make sure that we are taking care of and standing firm on, but, by and large, we have to understand that they, today, are being attacked and murdered by radical Islamic terrorists as well. They know that, and they know the dangers that we face because they face a common danger.

We need to work to build a new alliance because what is happening is, Islam is making such inroads into the stupidity of our western European allies that the western Europe that we know—here again, time is going on, 19th century into the 20th century. Now we are in the 21st century. The 21st century will see that Europe becomes a whole different place than what it has been for the last 150 or 200 years.

There will be Islamic countries in Europe, and they will be, then, either part of or they will not fight against a radical Islamic terrorist threat that today threatens the peace of the world just as the Soviet Union did that 10 years, or I should say, 10 decades ago.

So with that, we need a vision, and one vision that we should have is, number one, a vision of self-determination that we all agree on.

Number two, let's make sure that we ally ourselves in a positive way with people who are not going to be weakened by the onslaught of Islam. I would suggest that America will be a more peaceful place and our country will be more secure and the world will be more

peaceful and secure if we establish a new relationship in which we are watching out for each other with four countries. The United States, of course; the other one is India, and I will soon be going to India. In fact, I will be going to India tomorrow. And number three, Japan; and number four, Russia.

Now, there is some work that needs to be done to make a coalition like that real, but a coalition of those countries working together, not mandated that we have to do this and we have to subjugate ourselves to decisions of what the four say, but, instead, seeking out cooperation with those countries where there is mutual benefit to do, we can make this a better world. We can secure our prosperity and secure the peace of our own country and the security of our own country.

So with a vision and with a recognition of fundamental things like the right of self-determination and the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that our Founding Fathers talked about, and limited government where they said government only derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, let us champion these values and these ideals.

Let us have a vision for the future, as Ronald Reagan did, and we can make this a more peaceful world as we side with people all over the world who want to control their own destiny by having their own nation rather than being subjected to someone else.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1595. An act to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary; and to the Committee on Financial Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 16, 2017, at 10 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3669. A bill to improve and streamline security procedures related to general aviation and commercial charter air carrier utilizing risk-based security standards, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3017. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 9, 2017.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to establish cybersecurity supervision and examination of large consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4029. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make reasonable adjustments to earnings data for graduates of cosmetology gainful employment programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms.

BONAMICI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 4030. A bill to amend the Department of Education Organization Act to codify into law the "Revised Sexual Harassment Guidance: Harassment of Students by School Employees, Other Students, or Third Parties", issued January 19, 2001, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; the Dear Colleague letter issued April 4, 2011, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; and the "Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence" issued April 29, 2014, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4031. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress an-

nual reports on beneficiary travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4032. A bill to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 4033. A bill to reauthorize the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 4034. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to issue to the Pat Harrison Waterway District a long-term special use permit to develop approximately 8,307 acres of National Forest System land within the Bienville National Forests in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4035. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to repeal certain loan guarantee programs of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SINEMA):

H.R. 4036. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a defense to prosecution for fraud and related activity in connection with computers for persons defending against unauthorized intrusions into their computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the non-applicability of non-Department of Veterans Affairs covenants not to compete to the appointment of certain Veterans Health Administration personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4038. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reassert article I authorities over the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4039. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the number of local wage areas allowable within a General Schedule pay locality; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JUDY

CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4040. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. DENT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4041. A bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CURELO of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 4042. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the "Borinqueneers Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUM (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 4043. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HECK, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DUNN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 4044. A bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 4045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for shareholder ownership

and passive income rules of the personal holding company tax provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 4046. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of a military department to make certifications regarding the feasibility of using existing space in property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense prior to entering into certain agreements to acquire or lease real property for the use of such military department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4047. A bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4048. A bill to require institutions of higher education to provide students with statistical employment information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 4049. A bill to establish a grant program to ensure that students in high-need schools have equal access to a quality education delivered by an effective, diverse workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4050. A bill to support research, development, and other activities to develop innovative vehicle technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4051. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a bollard installation grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BASS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HIMES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SIREN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms.

LEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 4052. A bill to prohibit the transfer or possession of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 4053. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require an independent audit of the cybersecurity practices of certain consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 4054. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to submit an annual report on sources of funds used to finance the non-Federal share of expenditures under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 4055. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain information when denying claims for traumatic injury protection under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4056. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and other laws to return primary responsibility for disaster relief to the States, to establish a private corporation to insure States against risks and costs of disasters otherwise borne by the States, and to provide for reimbursable Federal assistance to States for activities in response to disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 4057. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. COMER, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SOTO, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 4058. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide for the establishment of a trust for the benefit of all unpaid cash sellers of livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 4059. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that physicians of the Department of Veterans Affairs fulfill the ethical duty to report to State licensing authorities impaired, incompetent, and unethical health care activities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GONZÁLEZ of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 4060. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit and to provide for equitable treatment for residents of Puerto Rico with respect to the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BARR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MESSER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. KIND, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HILL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RENACCI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. TIBERI, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 4061. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 4062. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to establish a constituent-driven program to provide a digital information platform capable of efficiently integrating coastal data with decision-support tools, training, and best practices and to support collection of priority coastal geospatial data to inform and improve local, State, regional, and Federal capacities to manage the coastal region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 4063. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to maintain a database of information on electricity outages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 4064. A bill to impose restrictions on the sale of binary explosives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4065. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish grants to reduce the incidence of hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4066. A bill to establish a program to accurately document vehicles that were significant in the history of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4067. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. ROSS, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4068. A bill to make necessary changes to the competitive need limitations provision of the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4069. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to clarify the treatment of authentic Alaska Native articles of handicraft containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. GALLEGU, Mr. BACON, and Mr. PANNETTA):

H.J. Res. 118. A joint resolution authorizing the use of United States Armed Forces against al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, and any associated persons engaged in hostilities against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 2266; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 569. A resolution providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with an amendment; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 570. A resolution affirming the historical connection of the Jewish people to the ancient and sacred city of Jerusalem and condemning efforts at the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to deny Judaism's millennia-old historical, religious, and cultural ties to Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Mr. SABLON, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. TAKANO):

H. Res. 571. A resolution recognizing Filipino American History Month and celebrating the history and culture of Filipino Americans and their immense contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself and Mr. MACARTHUR):

H. Res. 572. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Red Ribbon Week during

the period of October 23 through October 31, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H. Res. 573. A resolution calling on the President to work toward equitable, constructive, stable, and durable Armenian-Turkish relations based upon the two countries' common interests and the United States' significant security interests in the region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 4032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 4033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 4034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 4035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 4036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 4037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 4038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 4042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUM:

H.R. 4043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 US Constitution

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 4044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures."

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 4049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8 "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 4051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 4052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 4053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 4054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 4055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 4058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the understanding and interpretation of the Commerce Clause, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation in accordance with Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 4059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following :

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have the Power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes"

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 4063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 4064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, specifically Clause 3 regarding regulating commerce with foreign nations

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, specifically Clause 3 regarding regulating commerce with foreign nations

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 "To make all Laws, which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into the Execution the foregoing Powers, and for all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof."

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.J. Res. 118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 113: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. GABBARD, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 121: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 149: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 173: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 233: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 246: Ms. CHENEY, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 299: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 331: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 391: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 392: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 449: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 451: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 495: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 502: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 535: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 564: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 620: Mr. TURNER and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 638: Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 733: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 747: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 778: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 821: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 826: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 846: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 870: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 878: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 959: Mr. GALLEGÓ.
H.R. 960: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1017: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1046: Mr. POCAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 1078: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1098: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1116: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1148: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1164: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1298: Ms. STEFANIK and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1311: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 1360: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1374: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1380: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1406: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1421: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1437: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1475: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1478: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1562: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 1612: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1617: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1626: Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1651: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1661: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1676: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1710: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1731: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1739: Mr. WALZ and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 1783: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1796: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1810: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1825: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1828: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. REED.
H.R. 1832: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1841: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1849: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1864: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1865: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1898: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1953: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1957: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2024: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 2069: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2079: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 2092: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 2133: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 2148: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 2151: Mr. CRIST and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2232: Mr. DUNN, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2234: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2293: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 2306: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 2319: Mr. BARR and Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 2340: Mrs. LOVE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2401: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2403: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 2404: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2405: Mr. FASO.
H.R. 2431: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2501: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2584: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2587: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2599: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2628: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 2641: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2670: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2686: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2687: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2723: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 2740: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 2748: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2790: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2797: Mr. WOODALL and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2806: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 2821: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 2826: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2839: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2840: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2859: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2871: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2881: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2885: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 2899: Mr. STIVERS and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2902: Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2909: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 2920: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2926: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2972: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2973: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 2987: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2999: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3010: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3030: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3034: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3042: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 3111: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3117: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3120: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 3148: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3263: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3272: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3274: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3312: Mr. WALKER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MESSER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 3325: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3327: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3329: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3331: Mrs. TORRES and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3347: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3419: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3478: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3489: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HECK, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3513: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3515: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3516: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3534: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3545: Mr. EVANS and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3548: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3572: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3591: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3635: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3687: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 3711: Mr. BABIN and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3717: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3721: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 3730: Ms. TITUS and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3738: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3748: Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3759: Mr. KILMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3767: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3770: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. BASS, Mr. DENT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 3773: Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3774: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 3792: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3793: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3796: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 3798: Mr. COLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 3806: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3827: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 3832: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3849: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3855: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3857: Mr. HULTGREN and Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 3858: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 3859: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 3861: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 3862: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3864: Ms. SINEMA and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 3869: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3897: Mr. OLSON, Mr. REED, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GALLEG0.
H.R. 3898: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3906: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3929: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3931: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3941: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. LOEBSSACK.
H.R. 3947: Mr. CLAY and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3966: Mrs. HANDEL.
H.R. 3976: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DUFFY, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 3979: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3980: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 4012: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 4013: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Con. Res. 81: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 142: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H. Res. 274: Mr. POCAN and Mr. REICHERT.
H. Res. 401: Mr. LANCE and Mr. PANETTA.
H. Res. 428: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H. Res. 443: Ms. MOORE.
H. Res. 495: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 521: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H. Res. 528: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 556: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 557: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 560: Mr. HASTINGS.
H. Res. 564: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. MASSIE.
H. Res. 566: Mr. GRIJALVA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE SCALISE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, during my medical recovery, I missed the following Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

June 15, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 308
June 20, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 309
Yea on Roll Call No. 310
June 21, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 311
Yea on Roll Call No. 312
Yea on Roll Call No. 313
Nay on Roll Call No. 314
Yea on Roll Call No. 315
June 22, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 316
Yea on Roll Call No. 317
Nay on Roll Call No. 318
Yea on Roll Call No. 319
June 23, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 320
Yea on Roll Call No. 321
Yea on Roll Call No. 322
June 26, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 323
Yea on Roll Call No. 324
June 27, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 325
Yea on Roll Call No. 326
Yea on Roll Call No. 327
Yea on Roll Call No. 328
Yea on Roll Call No. 329
Yea on Roll Call No. 330
June 28, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 331
Yea on Roll Call No. 332
Yea on Roll Call No. 333
Yea on Roll Call No. 334
Yea on Roll Call No. 335
Nay on Roll Call No. 336
Yea on Roll Call No. 337
Yea on Roll Call No. 338
June 29, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 339
Yea on Roll Call No. 340
Nay on Roll Call No. 341
Yea on Roll Call No. 342
Nay on Roll Call No. 343
Yea on Roll Call No. 344
July 11, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 345
Yea on Roll Call No. 346
July 12, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 347
Yea on Roll Call No. 348
Yea on Roll Call No. 349
Nay on Roll Call No. 350
Nay on Roll Call No. 351
Yea on Roll Call No. 352

July 13, 2017
Nay on Roll Call No. 353
Yea on Roll Call No. 354
Yea on Roll Call No. 355
Yea on Roll Call No. 356
Nay on Roll Call No. 357
Nay on Roll Call No. 358
Nay on Roll Call No. 359
Nay on Roll Call No. 360
Nay on Roll Call No. 361
Yea on Roll Call No. 362
Nay on Roll Call No. 363
Nay on Roll Call No. 364
Nay on Roll Call No. 365
Yea on Roll Call No. 366
Yea on Roll Call No. 367
Yea on Roll Call No. 368
Yea on Roll Call No. 369
Yea on Roll Call No. 370
Nay on Roll Call No. 371
July 14, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 372
Yea on Roll Call No. 373
Yea on Roll Call No. 374
Yea on Roll Call No. 375
Yea on Roll Call No. 376
Nay on Roll Call No. 377
Yea on Roll Call No. 378
July 17, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 379
Yea on Roll Call No. 380
Yea on Roll Call No. 381
July 18, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 382
Yea on Roll Call No. 383
Yea on Roll Call No. 384
Nay on Roll Call No. 385
Nay on Roll Call No. 386
Nay on Roll Call No. 387
Nay on Roll Call No. 388
Nay on Roll Call No. 389
Nay on Roll Call No. 390
Yea on Roll Call No. 391
July 19, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 392
Yea on Roll Call No. 393
Yea on Roll Call No. 394
Nay on Roll Call No. 395
Nay on Roll Call No. 396
Nay on Roll Call No. 397
Yea on Roll Call No. 398
Nay on Roll Call No. 399
Nay on Roll Call No. 400
Nay on Roll Call No. 401
Yea on Roll Call No. 402
July 20, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 403
Nay on Roll Call No. 404
Nay on Roll Call No. 405
Yea on Roll Call No. 406
July 24, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 407
Yea on Roll Call No. 408
Yea on Roll Call No. 409
July 25, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 410
Yea on Roll Call No. 411

Yea on Roll Call No. 412
Yea on Roll Call No. 413
July 26, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 414
Yea on Roll Call No. 415
Nay on Roll Call No. 416
Nay on Roll Call No. 417
Nay on Roll Call No. 418
Yea on Roll Call No. 419
Nay on Roll Call No. 420
Nay on Roll Call No. 421
Nay on Roll Call No. 422
Nay on Roll Call No. 423
Nay on Roll Call No. 424
Yea on Roll Call No. 425
July 27, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 426
Yea on Roll Call No. 427
Yea on Roll Call No. 428
Yea on Roll Call No. 429
Nay on Roll Call No. 430
Nay on Roll Call No. 431
Nay on Roll Call No. 432
Nay on Roll Call No. 433
Nay on Roll Call No. 434
Yea on Roll Call No. 435
July 28, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 436
Yea on Roll Call No. 437
Yea on Roll Call No. 438
September 5, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 439
Yea on Roll Call No. 440
September 6, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 441
Yea on Roll Call No. 442
Yea on Roll Call No. 443
Yea on Roll Call No. 444
Yea on Roll Call No. 445
Yea on Roll Call No. 446
Yea on Roll Call No. 447
Nay on Roll Call No. 448
Yea on Roll Call No. 449
Nay on Roll Call No. 450
Yea on Roll Call No. 451
Yea on Roll Call No. 452
Yea on Roll Call No. 453
Yea on Roll Call No. 454
Yea on Roll Call No. 455
Yea on Roll Call No. 456
September 7, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 457
Yea on Roll Call No. 458
Nay on Roll Call No. 459
Nay on Roll Call No. 460
Nay on Roll Call No. 461
Yea on Roll Call No. 462
Yea on Roll Call No. 463
Yea on Roll Call No. 464
Nay on Roll Call No. 465
Nay on Roll Call No. 466
Yea on Roll Call No. 467
Yea on Roll Call No. 468
Yea on Roll Call No. 469
Yea on Roll Call No. 470
Nay on Roll Call No. 471
Yea on Roll Call No. 472

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Nay on Roll Call No. 473
 Yea on Roll Call No. 474
 Nay on Roll Call No. 475
 Nay on Roll Call No. 476
 Nay on Roll Call No. 477
 Yea on Roll Call No. 478
 Yea on Roll Call No. 479
 September 8, 2017
 Yea on Roll Call No. 480
 Yea on Roll Call No. 481
 Yea on Roll Call No. 482
 Nay on Roll Call No. 483
 Yea on Roll Call No. 484
 September 12, 2017
 Yea on Roll Call No. 485
 September 13, 2017
 Yea on Roll Call No. 486
 Yea on Roll Call No. 487
 Yea on Roll Call No. 488
 Yea on Roll Call No. 489
 Nay on Roll Call No. 490
 Nay on Roll Call No. 491
 Yea on Roll Call No. 492
 Nay on Roll Call No. 493
 Nay on Roll Call No. 494
 Nay on Roll Call No. 495
 Nay on Roll Call No. 496
 Yea on Roll Call No. 497
 Yea on Roll Call No. 498
 Nay on Roll Call No. 499
 Nay on Roll Call No. 500
 Nay on Roll Call No. 501
 Nay on Roll Call No. 502
 Nay on Roll Call No. 503
 Yea on Roll Call No. 504
 Nay on Roll Call No. 505
 Nay on Roll Call No. 506
 Nay on Roll Call No. 507
 Yea on Roll Call No. 508
 Yea on Roll Call No. 509
 Yea on Roll Call No. 510
 Yea on Roll Call No. 511
 Yea on Roll Call No. 512
 Yea on Roll Call No. 513
 Nay on Roll Call No. 514
 Yea on Roll Call No. 515
 September 14, 2017
 Nay on Roll Call No. 516
 Yea on Roll Call No. 517
 Yea on Roll Call No. 518
 Yea on Roll Call No. 519
 Nay on Roll Call No. 520
 Nay on Roll Call No. 521
 Nay on Roll Call No. 522
 Nay on Roll Call No. 523
 Yea on Roll Call No. 524
 Yea on Roll Call No. 525
 Yea on Roll Call No. 526
 Nay on Roll Call No. 527
 Yea on Roll Call No. 528
 Yea on Roll Call No. 529
 September 25, 2017
 Yea on Roll Call No. 530
 Yea on Roll Call No. 531
 September 26, 2017
 Yea on Roll Call No. 532
 Yea on Roll Call No. 533
 Yea on Roll Call No. 534
 Nay on Roll Call No. 535
 Nay on Roll Call No. 536
 Yea on Roll Call No. 537
 September 27, 2017
 Yea on Roll Call No. 538
 Yea on Roll Call No. 539
 Yea on Roll Call No. 540

September 28, 2017
 Nay on Roll Call No. 541.

HONORING STEPHEN CONQUEST

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Stephen Conquest, who is celebrating his 50th Birthday.

Defying all odds, Mr. Conquest has outlived the life expectancy given to him by doctors, who estimated that he would not make it past his teenage years. Born with Down Syndrome, a genetic anomaly that leads to developmental delays, the likelihood of Mr. Conquest developing life threatening conditions was higher than most.

Mr. Conquest went on to join the Boy Scouts, receiving the Order of the Arrow; became an active member of the Future Farmers of America; won state gold medals in the 100-meter dash and long jump in the Special Olympics; and has been an invaluable employee at The McAllen Monitor since 1990.

Among his many accomplishments, Mr. Conquest is also a valued friend, coworker, and son. I am proud to represent constituents like Mr. Conquest, who set the example for how life should truly be lived.

Mr. Speaker, I again offer my congratulations to Mr. Conquest and his family. His perseverance, compassion, and versatility to leading a full life is exemplary and has not gone unnoticed. He has made the South Texas community a better place, and it is my honor to acknowledge him today.

HONORING DRISCOLL'S

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Driscoll's, a company based in California's 20th Congressional District as the Second Harvest Food Bank of Santa Cruz County's 2017 Food Donor of the Year. The company, made up of dedicated independent growers, has been donating their fresh berries to the Second Harvest Food Bank in Watsonville for over two decades. In 2016 alone, Driscoll's donated nearly one thousand tons of berries. Because of Driscoll's efforts, many food insecure families on the central coast of California now have access to the vitamin-rich and highly nutritious berries and can make them a part of a healthy diet.

The Driscoll and Reiter families, the founders of Driscoll's, have been producing berries in the Pajaro Valley since 1904. Officially founded in 1950 as Driscoll Strawberry Associates, Inc., the company originally sold only fresh California strawberries. Their creation of the first patented strawberry variety in 1958 made Driscoll's the national berry of choice by extending the crop's growing season and allowing berries to be shipped long distances.

Today, they have expanded their operations from just strawberries to include raspberries, blueberries, and blackberries. Driscoll's innovative work, along with the contributions from many other farmers and ranchers of the Central Coast, has contributed to my district's reputation as an agricultural powerhouse.

Driscoll's has always been committed to giving back to the local communities that have given them so much. Through their Berry Donation Program, Driscoll's works to make sure families throughout their community have access to berries during local growing seasons. The company also supports a variety of food banks and related organizations such as the California Association of Food Banks and Ag Against Hunger. Driscoll's culture of philanthropy is not limited solely to their senior leadership, but extends to their employees who are closely involved in the company's efforts to support their communities. Together, Driscoll's and their employees have donated over 5 million pounds of berries to the Second Harvest Food Bank.

As the representative of the 20th Congressional District, I commend Driscoll's for working to ensure that families on the Central Coast have access to the fresh and nutritious berries grown in their own backyard. We are lucky that they call the 20th Congressional District home. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Driscoll's on their 2017 Food Donor of the Year award.

HONORING DR. TED CHRISTOPHER ON HIS INAUGURATION TO PRESIDENT OF THE PENNSYLVANIA MEDICAL SOCIETY

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of our nation's most dedicated advocates for doctors and patients, Dr. Ted Christopher of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, who is to be sworn in on October 14, 2017 as the 168th President of the Pennsylvania Medical Society.

As a leader in emergency medicine, Dr. Christopher is the epitome of a physician who goes above and beyond—who uses his or her talents to not only serve individual patients, but also the practice of medicine as a whole. Not only has he been a trustee of the Pennsylvania Medical Society since 2011, but he has also served as president of the Association of Academic Chairs of Emergency Medicine, the Pennsylvania Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians, and the Philadelphia County Medical Society.

Dr. Christopher's invaluable contributions to the field of emergency medicine are displayed through his robust academic research. As Professor and Chairman of the Department of Emergency Medicine at the Sidney Kimmel Medical College at Thomas Jefferson University Hospital in Philadelphia, he has long been a leader in his field and an inspiring mentor to countless students.

I am confident that Dr. Christopher will bring his extraordinary skills and experience to this new position to the benefit of all advocates of best-practices in medical care, and represent Pennsylvania's doctors with honor and distinction.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I wish him my utmost congratulations and all the best for his coming term.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE SILICON VALLEY COMMUNITY FOUNDATION ON THE OCCASION OF ITS TENTH YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today alongside my colleagues, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN and Congressman JIMMY PANETTA to honor the Silicon Valley Community Foundation (SVCF) as it celebrates its Tenth Year Anniversary. The Peninsula Community Foundation and Community Foundation Silicon Valley merged in 2007 to increase their impact by creating SVCF. Under the superb leadership of CEO Dr. Emmett D. Carson, SVCF has grown to become the world's largest community foundation with more than \$8 billion in assets. SVCF has been able to do this by engaging, empowering, and collaborating with families, individuals, and corporate donors to generate positive impacts and by supporting organizations within and beyond county lines and national borders.

SVCF has become a comprehensive center for philanthropy and over the last decade has continued to advocate in pursuit of public policy issues and strategic initiatives in support of those in need. It also serves as a key leader and partner to nonprofit groups and institutions who work to advance ideas and direct resources strategically toward the pressing local needs of the community. SVCF has awarded \$4.3 billion in grants since 2007, and the strong support that it has from the community and donors has enabled it to award \$2.3 billion to local charities in nine Bay Area counties, with an additional \$245 million awarded to other California charities. In their effort to assist students in their higher education and careers SVCF also awarded close to 400 scholarships totaling \$1.7 million to students in high school, community college and university programs during the 2014 to 2015 school year.

SVCF exemplifies its values of collaboration; diversity; inclusiveness; innovation; integrity; public accountability; respect; and responsiveness. It is fitting and proper that we recognize the tremendous impact of philanthropy, and the spirit of generosity and community service that SVCF has had in the Bay Area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join my colleagues and me in expressing our collective gratitude to the trailblazing Silicon Valley Community Foundation for its extraordinary contributions to charities and nonprofit organizations throughout our state and nation. We offer our congratulations on the occasion of its decade of philanthropic

work and accomplishments in each of our Congressional Districts.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. SHARON RESCH AND HER LIFELONG COMMITMENT TO THE FINE ARTS, COMMUNITY PHILANTHROPY, AND WORLDWIDE HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Sharon Resch of Green Bay for her ongoing commitment to community philanthropy, worldwide humanitarian efforts, and the fine arts. Mrs. Resch has achieved this by being a dedicated supporter of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay's mission and a vital resource and partner to its students.

Mrs. Resch has helped transform the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay through her leadership in bringing the American International Czech and Slovak Voice Competition to campus on a semi-annual basis. Mrs. Resch has also founded the Sharon J. Resch Endowed Scholarship for Fine Arts, which is reserved for students who graduate from the non-profit Fine Arts Institute and continue their music studies at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

Mrs. Resch's efforts are not limited to the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. Her generosity can be seen all across northeastern Wisconsin, with contributions to the Resch Center, Miracle League of Green Bay, and Resch Aquatic Center at Fisk Park.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of this body to join me in commending Mrs. Resch for her continued commitment to the betterment of our communities both at home and abroad.

IN HONOR OF BISHOP CLIFFORD M. JOHNSON, JR.'S 48TH ANNIVERSARY AS PASTOR OF MOUNT PLEASANT CHURCH AND MINISTRIES

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great American and a visionary leader—Bishop Clifford M. Johnson, Jr.

This month, Bishop Johnson celebrates his 48th anniversary as Pastor of Mount Pleasant Church and Ministries, which is located in my Congressional District in Baltimore, Maryland.

For nearly half a century, Bishop Johnson has used his God-given talents and abilities to uplift the people of his church and those in the surrounding community.

As a passionate Bible scholar and avid reader, Bishop Johnson was drawn to studying the Word of God at a young age.

A native of Baltimore, he graduated from Kenwood High School in Baltimore County

and pursued additional studies at the Baltimore College of Commerce and the Community College of Baltimore. Bishop Johnson earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Pastoral Theology from the Washington Bible College and Capital Seminary. In 1975, he received an Honorary Doctor of Divinity degree from the Virginia Seminary and College of Lynchburg, Virginia.

Under Bishop Johnson's dynamic leadership, Mount Pleasant Church and Ministries has grown to serve a congregation of 8,000 people. He turned a deteriorating shopping center into a thriving 17-acre campus with several ministries that reach beyond the walls of the church to bring resources and support to neighbors in need. Those ministries include: Kingdom Men Bible Class, the Prison Ministry, the Adult Learning Center, the Word of Life Ministry for children, the Evangelism Ministry, the Food and Banquet Ministry, and the Lampstand Christian Bookstore.

Because of Bishop Johnson's deep belief in the power of education to change the trajectory of the lives of young people, he established the Mount Pleasant Christian School. The school serves children from Kindergarten through grade five, and everyone involved with the school—from teachers, to parents and support staff—has committed to the mission of "awakening the genius in every child."

Bishop Johnson's influence runs deep through the City of Baltimore. He is highly regarded by elected officials, business and civic leaders, and the people of the community. I witnessed this influence first-hand during the city's unrest following the killing of Freddie Gray. Bishop Johnson was one of the first pastors to join with me and other spiritual leaders to help bring calm to the streets of Baltimore. Bishop Johnson then helped to devise a long-term plan to heal the shattered relationship between police and the communities they serve and protect. His genuine connection to the people of the community helped us assess and respond to their real needs.

Bishop Johnson has such a powerful ministry because he relates the Word of God to people's everyday lives. He has made an impact throughout the world by ministering in Canada, Israel, Sweden, France and Africa. He recently earned the distinction of being the first African American to preach and evangelize in Cuba.

A loving family man, Bishop Johnson has been married to Dorothy Johnson for more than 50 years. They have five children and thirteen grandchildren.

I am honored to pay tribute to Bishop Clifford M. Johnson, Jr. for his 48 years of pastoring Mount Pleasant Church and Ministries. He is a noble American who continues to serve his church, his community, and his country with distinction, and I thank him for his ministry.

CELEBRATING THE REUNION OF
THE 50TH COMPANY, INFANTRY
OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL
CLASS OC 24-69

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a special group of Americans who are worthy of our recognition for the sacrifices they made for our country.

In October of this year, the surviving members of the 50th Company, Infantry Officer Candidate Schools Class OC 24-69 will have their first reunion at Fort Benning, Georgia, 48 years after pinning on the gold bars of Second Lieutenants. It was a time when the United States was still deeply mired in the Vietnam war.

The young men who made up the 50th Company came from 42 of our 50 states and represented all walk of life and ethnic heritages. Almost all of them had recently graduated from college, and were of an age at which most of their contemporaries were starting their careers, not facing military service and the rigors of war and sacrifice.

They were fully aware that the Vietnam war did not receive the near universal support that the country had offered the servicemen and women of World War II, in whose shadow they had grown up. The feelings of these men toward the war in Southeast Asia were as varied as those of their countrymen.

Nevertheless, they accepted the risks inherent in their decision to become Army officers. Despite their varied backgrounds and their support for, or opposition to, the Vietnam war, they shared more important traits—a love of the United States of America, an abiding belief in democracy, and a devotion to duty no matter the consequences. They had all volunteered for the OCS.

Within a year of graduation, over half would receive orders for Vietnam. Two classmates made the ultimate sacrifice for our country—James DuPont from North Canton, Ohio and Thomas Edgren from Libertyville, Illinois. Many others were awarded the Purple Heart.

They all, no matter where they served, made sacrifices as previous generations who had served in the armed forces had sacrificed—separation from families, missed holidays, arduous and often dangerous work, and sometimes miserable living conditions. And sadly, for these men of the Vietnam era, their sacrifices were often met upon their return with indifference and even open hostility from a seemingly ungrateful country.

Some of these men made the military a career. But most were classic “citizen soldiers” who returned to civilian life once they had served. They raised families and became successful lawyers, doctors, ministers, teachers, government workers, farmers, and business men.

Over the years, most of the men of the 50th Company put their time in the service behind them. They lost contact with each other as other life issues took precedence. But through the efforts of a few determined classmates, plans were laid for this fall’s reunion. They will

gather again at Fort Benning, another generation of Americans who laid down their plowshares to pick up rifles, only to beat them back into plowshares when duty was honorably done.

At the reunion, these old comrades-in-arms will renew the bonds that were forged 48 years ago through the long marches in the brutal Georgia heat, the early morning runs in combat boots and rain, the countless pushups, and the brotherhood of blood and sweat of hard Army training. Now they will share their pride in having served.

I ask my colleagues to join me in pausing to reflect on the sacrifices made by these men and the millions of others they represent, and to extend to them our personal thanks and the thanks of our country.

ST. OMER FOUNDATION

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the St. Omer Foundation as it commemorates a great American family, the Carrolls, who played a tremendous role in securing our constitutional freedoms, and the founding of our country.

Prior to the American Revolution, and before the freedom of religion was enshrined in the United States Constitution, Catholic families sent their children to France for an education. Many of these students attended an English-speaking, Jesuit-run university in St. Omer, France. Notable among these children were the sons of the distinguished Carroll family, who owned much of Maryland, including the future site of the United States Capitol.

Charles, Daniel, and John Carroll all studied at the Jesuit University in St. Omer before returning to the colonies to play significant roles in the American Revolution. In St. Omer, the Carrolls learned the values that helped inspire their participation in the fight for independence from the British Empire. Charles Carroll signed the Declaration of Independence, Daniel Carroll was involved in the ratification of the Articles of Confederation and the United States Constitution, and John Carroll became the first Catholic Archbishop of the United States, founded Georgetown University, and established the first Catholic seminary in our country.

During the French Revolution, the Jesuit University in St. Omer was disbanded, many of its buildings were destroyed, and the memory of the Americans who studied in France began to fade. Recently, the people of St. Omer, alongside many friends in the United States, sought to refresh this memory, and remind Americans and Frenchmen alike that the American Revolution took some of its impetus from a Jesuit university in the North of France. Together, they restored the handsome Jesuit chapel where the Carrolls attended mass as students in the 18th century.

On October 15, Archbishop Lori of Baltimore will cut the ribbon on this newly renovated chapel and kick off a weekend of celebration and dialogue surrounding the Carroll family and their contribution to our great nation.

I thank the St. Omer Foundation for its contributions to help preserve the legacy of heroes of the American Revolution.

**HONORING THE MEMORY OF
JIM McLOUGHLIN**

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Jim McLoughlin, an outspoken advocate for working families for over forty years. The San Antonio Redevelopment Plan’s twelve story tower located in the heart of downtown San Jose, constructed in 1975 and 1976 thanks in large part to his efforts, will be renamed in Jim’s honor.

Jim first joined Local 428 of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union (then the Retail Clerks International Association) in 1937 as a clerk at Piggly Wiggly. A quick learner and a natural leader, he was elected to lead Local 428 that same year. His leadership continued for the next forty-three years, during which time Jim expressed solidarity for his brethren in labor throughout the world by serving as a trade union delegate to labor organizations in China, Argentina, Israel, Iceland and Sweden.

Jim dedicated his life to organizing and civic engagement. He was a member of the Committee on Political Education and the AFL-CIO for over forty years. He participated on various state task forces, including Governor Pat Brown’s Committee on Automation and Employment in 1958, the Industrial Commission-Mercantile Wage Board in 1972 and the California Attorney General’s Volunteer Advisory Council in 1973. Serving as Vice President among the 1.5 million members in the California Labor Federation from 1972 to 1980, Jim made a substantial impact for a generation of working families in California.

Committed to social justice, Jim became a lifetime member of the NAACP in 1955 and was a delegate to the Labor Assembly for Peace in Vietnam in 1967. He served on the Santa Clara County Democratic Central Committee for over twenty years and acted as a McGovern delegate on behalf of Northern California Labor at the Democratic National Convention in 1972.

Jim advocated for “guaranteed employment rights, wages, and benefits which match the cost of living to enable workers to be a force and active contributors in the communities.” His worldview that the treatment of workers is critical to the wellbeing of the community remains as relevant now as it was in Jim’s time. I am proud to have been Jim’s friend, and thankful for the many ways in which Jim advocated for workers in California and throughout the world.

RECOGNIZING HERMAN ROBERTS

CONGRATULATING WAUKEGAN TO
COLLEGE (W2C)HONORING REVEREND SAMUEL E.
GASKINS, SR.**HON. BOBBY L. RUSH**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Herman Roberts who is to be inducted into the Chicago Blues Hall of Fame this Sunday, October 15, 2017.

Born in Beggs, Oklahoma in 1924, Herman Roberts and his family moved to Chicago when he was 12. He entered the workforce a few years later working for a cab company washing cars. At the age of 15, he was given the responsibility of driving those cabs and by 1944, he became owner of his own business, the Roberts Cab Company.

Mr. Speaker, like many young men of the era Mr. Roberts fulfilled his patriotic duty by serving in the army during World War II. After returning from war, his ambition drove him to innovation when, as he recalls, in 1947, he became the first to install two-way radios in his cabs.

Mr. Roberts has been a longtime resident of the Southside of Chicago and a pioneer in Chicago's entertainment industry. He was one of the first club owners in Chicago to provide a non-segregated venue for Black entertainers and in 1960, he expanded his enterprise to include motels.

His success as a club owner is evidenced by the headliners he booked: Nat "King" Cole, Sammy Davis, Jr., Count Basie, Lionel Hampton, R&B acts like the Treniers, Brook Benton, Sam Cooke, and Jackie Wilson, and jazz diva Dinah Washington. While Mr. Roberts focused primarily on black acts, he would make exceptions for people like Tony Bennett and Gene Krupa.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roberts' pioneering spirit wasn't limited to the musical sphere. In fact, he was the first entertainment business owner to give the famed Dick Gregory a chance when he hired him as a late-night emcee at the Herman Roberts Show Lounge in Chicago in 1958. In the political realm, his motel served as the original meeting place for another pioneer when he hosted Chicago Mayor Harold Washington's initial campaign.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roberts' venues served as the epicenter for Chicago's Black civil society and he served as the Godfather of Chicago's Black entertainment industry.

Finally, after decades of hard work, Mr. Roberts retired in 1992 and still, today, maintains his home on Chicago's Southside.

Mr. Speaker, clearly Mr. Roberts is an accomplished individual and we, in Chicago, are proud to call him one of our own. I am delighted to congratulate my longtime friend and supporter, Mr. Herman Roberts, on this important achievement. On behalf of all my constituents in the 1st Congressional District of Illinois, I extend my heartfelt congratulations.

HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Waukegan to College (W2C) Program for its recent selection as an exemplary organization for promoting Latino success in higher education by Excelencia in Education.

This is a true honor, and the staff, volunteers, students, and families of Waukegan to College should be very proud.

Waukegan to College demonstrates how community support, resources, and encouragement can help students achieve their dreams of attending and graduating college.

Through services such as tutoring, mentoring, college and scholarship application coaching, and advising sessions that include parents, Waukegan to College equips students with the tools they need to succeed not just in higher education, but in life.

This prestigious award is a testament to their commitment to the youth of Waukegan. The time, effort and energy that they invest in this program do not go unnoticed—and sets a national example of the impact that a community-based organization can make.

I congratulate the team at Waukegan to College on this impressive accomplishment, and thank them for all they do to make a difference in the lives of our youth.

HONORING TERESA P. PEREZ**HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Weslaco, Texas native, Mrs. Teresa P. Perez, who is celebrating her 80th birthday.

Born on October 14, 1937, she has been a pillar in the community. Mrs. Perez has resided in Weslaco since 1938 and been a lifelong member of St. Joan of Arc Catholic Church.

Mrs. Perez has held many successful roles throughout her life but none more important than those to her family as a daughter, sister, mother and grandmother.

Mr. Speaker, I again offer my congratulations to Mrs. Perez and her family: Cindy, Tommy, Louie, Rose, Arturo, Terry Ruben, Mike, Andrew, Cathy, Danny, and all 20 of her beloved grandchildren. Mrs. Perez and her family have made South Texas a better place, and it is my honor to acknowledge her today and wish her a very happy birthday.

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend Samuel E. Gaskins, Sr. for his tireless dedication to improving the lives of residents in my district.

Born in Lake City, South Carolina in 1937, Rev. Gaskins enlisted in the United States Army at the age of fifteen. By the age of seventeen he was promoted to Staff Sergeant and later a Chief Petty Warrant Officer, a testament to his innate leadership skills. After twenty four years of military service, including two tours as a chaplain in Vietnam, Rev. Gaskins settled in Seaside, California where he continued serving the public. In the late 1990s, the United States Army donated the former Fort Ord's Army chapel to Rev. Gaskins. Through tireless work, he restored and converted the building into the Christian Memorial Tabernacle's chapel still in use to this day.

Rev. Gaskins' efforts to improve the lives of his fellow citizens extend far past the walls of his church. Rev. Gaskins has founded numerous organizations and initiatives aimed at helping those in our community who are most in need. One such program is a new homeless ministry named "The Stepping Stone Outreach Program." Rev. Gaskins' five year program aims to provide housing and education for over 500 people in need. I commend Rev. Gaskins for his dedication to caring for those in my district who need help the most.

Apart from his work to care for the less fortunate, Rev. Gaskins has worked to foster solidarity and strong relationships among communities in my district. One such initiative is "One Great Fellowship," which he created in conjunction with Jason Harbert of the Carmel Presbyterian Church. One Great Fellowship aims to promote racial harmony between communities on the Monterey Peninsula. The program, which involves multiple Peninsula churches, has held several interracial and interdenominational services per year which regularly drew hundreds of people.

Rev. Gaskins has proven himself to be a natural leader in service to his country and community. His life's work adds up to nothing short of transforming the lives of the residents of the Central Coast. We are lucky to have someone as selfless and dedicated as Rev. Gaskins call the 20th district home. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing Rev. Samuel E. Gaskins, Sr. for his many accomplishments and contributions to the betterment of his community, country, and fellow man.

HONORING THE CAREER OF DR.
JEROME E. JACKSON

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Dr. Jerome Jackson, professor of Criminology at California State University, Fresno. Dr. Jackson has had a remarkable career, spanning over 30 years. He is a renowned criminologist, author and lecturer known for his work for various civil rights causes.

Dr. Jerome Jackson was born in Texas before relocating to California. He earned his Bachelors in Arts in Political Science from Southern University in Baton Rouge Louisiana, a Master's in Public Administration from Texas Southern University and a Doctor of Philosophy in Criminal Justice from Sam Houston State University. Currently, Dr. Jackson is the first and only African American born in the state of Texas to graduate from the distinguished Ph.D. program at Sam Houston State University. He also holds a Masters in Theological Studies and Doctorate in Theological Studies from the Faith Seminary in Tacoma, Washington.

Currently, Dr. Jackson is a tenured Full Professor of Criminology at California State University, Fresno. During his tenure at Fresno State he took on a number of roles. This includes serving as the president of the Black Faculty and Staff Association and chairing the Martin Luther King Monument Statute Committee, helping to raise over \$75,000.00. His work has been well recognized and he has received a number of honors throughout his career. This includes the Provost's Award for Excellence in Teaching in 1998. His outstanding work has also been recognized by the cities of Fresno and Clovis.

Mr. Speaker, it with great pleasure that I ask you to join me in celebrating the career of Dr. Jerome E. Jackson. I wish Dr. Jackson and his family continued success and happiness going forward.

CELEBRATING 30 YEARS OF ZF
FRIEDRICHSHAFEN IN GAINESVILLE

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my hometown in celebration of ZF, one of the top automotive suppliers in the world. For thirty years, this company has been a part of our Hall County, and I commend the city of Gainesville for establishing September 23 as "ZF Day."

When ZF opened its first North American production facility on Palmour Drive back in 1987, no one could predict the impact that this company would have on our community in northeast Georgia. What began as one location and a few jobs quickly grew to more than 50 locations and 31,900 jobs across North America.

Hall County alone is now home to four production facilities and over 1,000 employees representing ZF.

The Greater Hall County Chamber of Commerce played a significant role in bringing this company to Georgia and helping them achieve success. I want to thank them for all of their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in the number of international companies, like ZF, that have chosen to invest in my home state over the last several decades. These companies have provided many neighbors with careers and the means to pursue their dreams.

I wish the company well as it continues to expand and create more opportunities for hard-working men and women.

TRIBUTE TO VICTIMS OF THE
LAS VEGAS MASSACRE

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to residents of California's 42nd Congressional District who were tragically killed during the massacre at the Route 91 Harvest country music festival in Las Vegas, Nevada on Sunday, October 1, 2017.

Thomas Day, Jr. was born and raised in my hometown of Corona, California. After graduating from Corona High School, Tom attended Riverside Community College and later went to work for Portrait Construction, a home building company founded by his father, Tom Sr. Those who worked with Tom knew him as someone who was easy to talk to and get along with. The Day family has been active in our community for many years, making a number of important contributions to non-profit organizations. Attending concerts and music festivals with his children was a win-win for Tom because it allowed him to do two things he loved at one time—listen to music and spend time with his family. Tom was attending the Route 91 Harvest country music festival with his children when he was senselessly taken from us.

Rocio Guillen grew up in Anaheim, California and attended Katella High School, where she ran track and cross country. Most recently, she worked as an assistant manager at a California Pizza Kitchen. Rocio was a tireless worker both at her job and at home caring for her children. She was blessed with four children: 18-year-old Marcus, 13-year-old Christopher, 1-year-old Sofia and 1-month-old Austin. Marcus recently described Rocio as "an amazing mother. She worked so many hours at work and would come back and take care of all of us." Rocio's fiancé, Chris Jaksha, attended the Route 91 Harvest country music festival with her and comforted her in those terrifying final moments of her life.

Pati Mestas lived in Menifee, California and was a graduate of Garey High in Pomona. While she previously helped manage the deli at a Corona gas station, Pati recently stopped working to spend more time with her three children, eight grandchildren and one great-grandchild. Pati loved going to country music

concerts and having a good time with her friends. Her son Brandon wrote, "She left this world surrounded by friends, singing and dancing with thousands of people. If I had to write the script myself, I could not have done a better job."

Christopher Roybal proudly served his country in the U.S. Navy as a dog handler, completing multiple tours in Afghanistan. After leaving the Navy, Chris returned home to Corona, California, and managed Crunch Fitness gyms. According to family and friends, Chris loved to sing and enjoyed all genres of music—they say he was a karaoke king. Chris is survived by his wife Dixie Roybal, his mother Debby Allen, father Samuel Roybal brothers Jacob, Jayson and Nicholas, and sisters Nina and Jillian. We are eternally grateful for Chris' service to our nation.

Our hearts ache for all of those whose lives were cut short and forever impacted by the evil acts of that evening. We pray that their loved ones, colleagues and friends find comfort in the memories shared with those we have lost. We also pray for the speedy recovery of all of the wounded. As a country we must stand together in the wake of this horrific event and demonstrate that the love, decency and compassion inside all of us is far stronger than any evil act.

CELEBRATING THE CITY OF BELLFLOWER'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Representative SANCHEZ, rise today to recognize the City of Bellflower on its 60th anniversary. We hope our colleagues will join us in paying tribute to the city and its residents.

The City of Bellflower was incorporated in 1957 after a measure to do so was endorsed by most of the civic organizations in town and supported by the local newspaper. Several of the supporting groups that played a critical role at the time still exist today, including the Bellflower Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis Club, Masonic Temple, and Bellflower Woman's Club. At the time of incorporation, Bellflower was already a 51-year-old community, fully matured in all areas but that of city government.

Over the years, Bellflower has become a vibrant city with an innovative approach to enhancing services and generating revenues to support its growing community. There has been a long tradition of implementing programs that uphold the mission of the city, which is "to protect and enrich the quality of life, to make Bellflower an excellent place to live, work, and play." Bellflower places a high value on programs that attract new businesses, provide recreation activities and community services, preserve the environment, and protect the safety of city residents.

Through fiscal conservatism and the establishment of a redevelopment strategy, the city continues to grow and expand by attracting new businesses, improving business facades,

and upgrading infrastructure. Since 2011, as a result of these strategies, Bellflower has seen more than \$60 million of direct investment into its community. This includes the construction of Auto Zone, Biomat USA, and Kaiser Permanente offices, as well as unique restaurants like Golden Corral and Fronk's.

More recently, the city has placed a high priority on economic development and the revitalization of its downtown area. The new Bellflower Events Center and Los Angeles County Fire Museum will open in mid-November, and they are destined to become centerpieces of the resurgence and redevelopment of the city. The Events Center will provide an elegant indoor and outdoor venue for small groups, gatherings and larger parties, while the Fire Museum will house a tremendous display of Los Angeles County Fire Department history.

The city is also excited to welcome SteelCraft, with its rapidly growing reputation as a unique dining and social experience, into Downtown Bellflower. A lease was recently approved by Bellflower's City Council for SteelCraft to develop its third shipping container retail park on a 15,000 square foot city-owned lot located on Bellflower Boulevard and Oak Street. SteelCraft will perfectly complement Bellflower's unique retail stores and delicious home-grown restaurants.

Capital improvements have also been at the top of Bellflower's priorities. With the completion of the Bellflower Boulevard Pedestrian Enhancement Project in July of 2016, Bellflower's streets, sidewalks, and crosswalks have undergone immense improvements, adding to the beautification and safety of its downtown area.

We hope our colleagues will join us in sending their best wishes and congratulations to the City of Bellflower on its 60th anniversary. Let us salute its optimistic spirit, and its commitment to embracing the future through smart investments, innovation, and creativity.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MORRISTOWN & MORRIS TOWNSHIP PUBLIC LIBRARY'S WILLIS WING

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Morristown & Morris Township Public Library's Willis Wing, located in Morristown, New Jersey on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

Library services have been available in Morristown since 1792. The first circulating library consisted of 97 members and 96 books. The Morristown Library Association was formed in 1812 and by the middle of the 19th century the library had grown to several thousand volumes. From 1875 to 1914 the Library was housed on South Street in the Morristown Library and Lyceum, an organization that officially incorporated in 1866. Its collection grew from 8,000 books to over 30,000 when the building, and almost everything in it, was destroyed by fire in 1914.

A temporary library was soon opened in the old YMCA building on South Street. With money from both insurance and the sale of the land on which the Library and Lyceum stood, the property at the corner of Miller Road and South Street was purchased with the intention of building a new library building. In 1916, Grinnell Willis, a retired textile merchant who lived in Morristown since 1889, approached the Library Trustees and offered to pay the entire cost of a new fireproof building.

The new Library would be built in "grateful remembrance of the love and affection bestowed on his late wife by her friends and neighbors in Morristown." The day after Mr. Willis made his offer, an Act of Incorporation for the Morristown Library was filed. Its objective was "to establish and maintain a free public library and reading rooms, to establish and maintain an art gallery and museum for the encouragement of arts and science, to establish and maintain a collection of books and documents of historic interest and to advance the literary and educational interests of the community." On December 13, 1917 the Library, with 8,000 volumes and a staff of four was opened to the public.

In 1929, with the collection now totaling 43,500 volumes, Mr. Willis funded the cost of an addition to the original 1917 building. This addition, which opened in 1930, contained the Children's Wing. Grinnell Willis died shortly after the new wing was completed. In his will he left the library an endowment of \$200,000.

The Library continued to grow and serve its public as an association library until 1966 when the residents of Morristown and Morris Township united in the support, maintenance, and control of a joint free public library.

In 1987 the cornerstone was laid for an addition to the Library largely financed by Edythe and Dean Dowling, which became the Dowling Wing. In addition to the generosity of the Dowlings, many members of the community contributed to this addition which doubled the size of the Library. In 2006, the latest addition of the Library was completed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating the Morristown & Morris Township Public Library's Willis Wing, on the occasion of its Centennial Anniversary.

CONGRATULATING THE TAI LOOK MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION ON THEIR CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY GALA

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate the Tai Look Merchants' Association on their Centennial Anniversary Gala. I thank you for your commitment to bettering the community of Chinatown and the community of New York City as a whole.

The Tai Look Merchants' Association was established on 1917 in Hong Kong but expanded to New York less than a decade later, and has been a part of our community ever since. For a century the Tai Look Merchants'

Association has contributed to the community through the mission, "for the love of the Country and Motherland."

Under the leadership of Teddy Mui and representing over a hundred members and small businesses, Tai Look Merchants' Association has shown the good that can be done when people work together, from raising money for victims of the Sichuan Earthquake and Hurricane Katrina to holding local Mid-Autumn Festival celebrations for Chinatown's seniors.

As they celebrate 100 years of tremendous work, I am confident the Tai Look Merchants' Association will continue to build on its history of service and find many more years of success.

IN APPRECIATION OF REGINA MILLEDGE-BROWN AND HER SERVICE TO THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, I join with my colleague, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, in expressing our appreciation for Regina Milledge-Brown's service to the Committee.

Regina has enjoyed a distinguished career in service to our Nation. Regina is an employee of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), who joined us on detail at the beginning of this year. An attorney who graduated from the University of Georgia School of Law, Regina has worked for over fifteen years at ATF in various capacities. In her detail to the Committee, her experience with law enforcement and firearms issues has been an invaluable assistance to the Members and staff of the Committee.

Regina has worked on a variety of important issues as the Committee has pursued its legislative and oversight agenda during 2017. In addition to her work on firearms-related issues, Regina has worked on issues such as hate crimes prevention, forensics, DNA identification, law enforcement grants, the protection of law enforcement officers, operation of federal prisons, reauthorization of the United States Secret Service, protecting the victims of trafficking, and preventing violence against women.

In these and other legislative issues, Regina has displayed a high degree of professionalism and personal commitment, providing Members of the Committee and staff with wise counsel.

In all of this, Regina has demonstrated magnanimity, energy, and enthusiasm, which has helped all of us immensely.

We thank Regina for her selfless service to the Committee and our country, and wish her the very best as she returns to the ATF at the end of her detail.

All of her colleagues here will miss her dearly and continue to value her friendship into the future.

FORT JACKSON—REMEMBERING
LIVES LOST**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, America was deeply saddened by Friday's tragic accident at Fort Jackson Army Base that claimed the lives of two brave soldiers and injured six others. Fort Jackson is a crown jewel of the Midlands of South Carolina. Established in 1917, Fort Jackson is the Army's largest training center, where my three sons and I have trained. Maj. Gen. Pete Johnson is commanding with compassion and professionalism.

We are grateful for the sacrifices of every soldier whose service brings them to Fort Jackson, and we consider each of them part of the Midlands family. Today, I would like to honor the memory of those soldiers: Pvt. Ethan Shrader, from Prospect, TN, and Pvt. Timothy Ashcraft, from Cincinnati, OH. They will never be forgotten.

The following soldiers are still recovering from injuries:

Pvt. Emmett Foreman, from Daleville, AL.

Pvt. Hannah New, from Cartersville, GA.

Pvt. Benjamin Key, from Livingston, TN.

Pvt. Alan Kryszak, from Clarksville, TN.

Pvt. Cardre Jackson Jr., from Laurel, MD.

Pvt. James Foster, from Macon, GA.

As the father of four sons who have served with the military, I would ask that everyone pray for those families who are grieving and for the speedy recovery of those who were injured. I know the opportunities for recruits to have fulfilling and meaningful lives through military service protecting American families.

In conclusion, God Bless our Troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF
WYANDOTTE COUNTY AND KCK**HON. KEVIN YODER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the formation of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas, and recognize the community and people who helped make the consolidation possible.

In 1997, the governments of Kansas City, Kansas and Wyandotte County opted to consolidate into one entity in the effort to help the city and county become a prosperous community in Kansas. That vision and foresight led to 20 years of growth and prosperity in the area.

I've witnessed firsthand some great successes of Wyandotte County in the last 20 years—rebuilding neighborhoods, diversifying the local economy and expanding the tax base. The consolidation has led to a better quality of life for residents, and a booming tourism industry for the state. The Kansas Speedway really led the way out west and

Sporting KG's Children's Mercy Park stands out as one of the best, state of the art soccer stadiums across the country and the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Unified Government should be proud of their successes on this 20th anniversary. I'm honored to represent this county in Congress and to be a part of their enriched community. Thank you to the local leaders and residents who came together to make this vision a reality.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
DANIEL RUIZ**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Special Agent Daniel "Danny" Ruiz for his outstanding work as Resident Agent in Charge (RAC) at the Homeland Security Investigations (HSI), a directorate within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency (ICE). Special Agent Ruiz serves as RAC in the Fresno, California office.

Special Agent Ruiz began serving as the Resident Agent in Charge at HSI Fresno on November 1, 2015 and was responsible for fulfilling the mission of HSI in Tulare, Merced, Madera, Mariposa, Fresno and Kings Counties.

In his capacity as the Resident Agent in Charge at Fresno HSI, Danny is always available to discuss and work together on issues of concern with me and my staff.

Danny has been a U.S. Government employee since 1994. Before his Fresno HSI assignment, Danny served in multiple capacities and positions in Newark, New Jersey; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Jacksonville, Florida; Dallas, Texas, and two separate tours in Washington, D.C.

Danny holds a Bachelor of Arts Degree from Saint Peter's University, Jersey City, New Jersey with a Major in Political Science and Minor in Criminal Justice.

It is with great pleasure that I applaud and congratulate Daniel Ruiz for his many years of tireless work on behalf of the United States Government and to our local community. His ongoing dedication to public service is extremely commendable.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the commitment, dedication and success of Daniel "Danny" Ruiz, and wish him well as he embarks on new endeavors in his role with HSI Florida.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHER
EDUCATION EMPLOYMENT AND
TRANSPARENCY ACT**HON. ANDRÉ CARSON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Higher Education Employment and Transparency Act. This impor-

tant legislation would help ensure that students are adequately informed of their choices as they navigate the process of applying to college.

While a college degree is as valuable as ever, the choices facing students as they attempt to choose the right school remain daunting. While most students cite employment as a prime motivator for college attendance, they nevertheless are often inadequately informed about the employment outcomes at various institutions of higher education and for various fields.

Navigating the college application process is hard enough. While in some cases data on employment and earnings information does exist, in too many cases it is unclear or not easily accessible to prospective students. Making this information more transparent—and pointing prospective students in the right direction—would go a long way in ensuring that students are making the best choices tailored to their individual needs.

The Higher Education Employment and Transparency Act seeks to tackle these challenges. This bill represents one piece of the puzzle to ensure data on higher education outcomes is presented in a manner that is clear, transparent, standardized, and above all easily accessible to prospective students. Without requiring the collection of new data, the bill would give students better access to higher-quality information about the schools they are considering.

The legislation would make a number of key changes:

First, it would expand on current requirements for Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to disseminate certain information to prospective and enrolled students, through appropriate publications, mailings, and electronic media. The Higher Education Employment and Transparency Act would update this requirement to include disaggregated earnings and employment information, and require the use of data from more reliable sources.

Second, it would expand and improve the College Navigator, which is already a useful tool presenting a variety of information about IHEs. The Higher Education Employment and Transparency Act would require additional information to be included on this site, in addition to what is currently required: a link to a page with that same, higher-quality information that IHEs are newly required to disclose; a link to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Occupational Outlook Handbook website, which includes regional data on starting salaries in all major occupations; and, a link to a website that provides information about former students' employment and earnings information, based on high-quality federal or state data.

Last, under this legislation, IREs would also be required to provide prominent links on their own websites to each of these new pieces of information.

While disagreements exist regarding potential longer-term changes to our higher education data regime, this bill is a key step that would improve students' access to data that already exists. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

MIDNIGHT CIRCUS IN THE PARKS

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an initiative launched to raise community funds and to rebuild parks—Midnight Circus in the Parks.

The program is presented in part by the Chicago Park District's Night Out in the Parks, which brings over 1,000 cultural events to neighborhood parks each year. The program is in its 5th year and the Night Out in the Parks series has brought more than 1,000 events to neighborhood parks throughout the City of Chicago, making community parks safe havens and hubs of cultural activity.

Jeff Jenkins, founder and executive director of Midnight Circus in the Parks, envisioned a perfect opportunity to bring his circus to the community and raise money for park improvements. Midnight Circus tours Chicago parks every year bringing over 15,000 people together in their park to celebrate and make a difference. This venture is a true family collaboration; Jeff's wife, Julie, is the artistic director; their son, Maxwell, is an acrobat and musician in the show, and their daughter, Samantha, does the trapeze. Their rescued pit bull also performs. Every year, they add new and incredible artists.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Jenkins Family for launching Midnight Circus in the Parks, and the Chicago Park District for having the vision to bring a circus to the Chicago communities and for all their countless hours of volunteer efforts.

IN RECOGNITION OF LT. KEN HOBBS FOR BEING NAMED YPSILANTI'S 2017 FIREFIGHTER OF THE YEAR

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Ken Hobbs for being named 2017 Firefighter of the Year by the Washtenaw 100 Honors' Board of Membership. He has distinguished himself through his outstanding public service and advocacy on behalf of the Ypsilanti Fire Department and community.

Since joining the Ypsilanti Fire Department in 1986, Lt. Hobbs has worked tirelessly to protect Ypsilanti residents and promote a positive relationship between the department and city at large. The City of Ypsilanti Fire Department is a full-time department that provides prevention and protective fire services to Ypsilanti and the Eastern Michigan University campus, and Lt. Hobbs is well regarded by the more than 40,000 constituents served by the department. Throughout his career, he has made it a priority to give back to the community he serves by holding community fire prevention and education workshops and attending various fundraisers throughout the year.

In addition to being recognized as Washtenaw 100 Honors' Firefighter of the Year, Lt. Hobbs has served as President of the Ypsilanti Firefighters Union for many years and has received widespread acclaim for promoting unity between the union and fire department. Additionally, he has played a key role in securing grants for the department through the Department of Homeland Security, which has allowed for increased firefighting staff and much-needed equipment. Their success in securing federal grants over the years speaks to the quality of their applications and the great work being done by Lt. Hobbs and his fellow firefighters. Lt. Hobbs has also been instrumental in fostering greater diversity at the department and advocated for hiring a female firefighter with a 2014 Department of Homeland Security grant. His dedication and efforts on behalf of the city of Ypsilanti are worthy of commendation, and I know that Lt. Hobbs will continue his diligent work on behalf of the area residents in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Lt. Ken Hobbs for being named Ypsilanti's Firefighter of the Year. His advocacy and service on behalf of the citizens and firefighters of our community are worthy of public acclaim.

IN RECOGNITION OF JEFF CARROLL'S 20 YEARS OF SERVICE ON MY STAFF

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to honor my longtime Chief of Staff and the current Staff Director for the Energy & Commerce Committee Democrats, Jeff Carroll, on 20 outstanding years serving on my staff.

My office, the Energy & Commerce Committee, the Congress, and the entire state of New Jersey have benefited enormously from Jeff's steady leadership, strategic guidance, and commitment to achieving meaningful progress.

Jeff is known on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol for his candor, negotiating skills, and boisterous laugh. He is a diehard fan of the Mets, Giants, Bruce Springsteen, and the vaunted pork roll. He's a Jersey guy, through and through.

A native of Lyndhurst, N.J., Jeff joined my office as an Executive Assistant in 1997 after graduating from George Washington University and briefly serving as a Staff Assistant to Senator Robert Torricelli. Within six years, he became my Chief of Staff, serving with distinction the people New Jersey's Sixth Congressional District for 12 years. In 2015, when I was elected the Ranking Member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Jeff became the Democratic Staff Director.

Jeff has been by my side through my greatest trials and achievements in office, relentlessly pushing forward and always holding himself and my staff to the highest standards. He is my most trusted advisor, and I thank him for his unwavering commitment and immeasurable contributions over the years.

I also want to acknowledge the support provided to Jeff by his wife Shannon, daughter Lizzie and son Ryan, who share this dedicated husband and father with the House.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have benefited from Jeff Carroll's 20 years here in the House. I look forward to our continued work together in the future.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MOTHER GENEVA GREEN RUSSELL

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Geneva Green Russell of Boynton Beach, Florida, who passed away at the age of 100 on May 6, 2017. Georgia-born and Florida educated, Mother Russell received her primary education in Delray Beach public schools.

Mother Russell spiritual life began at the young age of twelve. She was one of the charter members of the then, newly established Church of God in Boynton Beach and served over the years in numerous capacities, including church secretary, musician, and the Women's Ministries President. On June 21, 1936, Mother Russell married Bishop Milton Russell of Abacoa, Bahamas, and alongside him ministered to the needs of her church, family, and community.

She was also a passionate philanthropist, serving as past president of the Parent Teacher Association and distinct member of the Senior Citizens Community Help Club. During this time, she provided medical transportation for sick and elderly citizens and amongst her friends and neighbors, became the "Designated Driver" for her group known as the "Golden Girls."

Mother Russell led her family by example as a strong Christian loving mother, and endlessly server of her community. Fond memories of her will forever remain with her seven children: Milton Jr., Jean, Joyce, Marjorie, Bernard, Evelyn and Stanley; fifteen grandchildren, twenty-one great-grandchildren, and twelve great-great-grandchildren, along with many relatives and friends.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Geneva Green Russell will be remembered by the many people she touched in her 100 years of life. She was truly a shining star of the Boynton Beach community. I am so pleased to honor her life and legacy. She will be dearly missed.

HAPPY 100TH ANNIVERSARY FORT STOCKTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. WILL HURD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th Anniversary of Fort Stockton Independent School District, a premiere public

school district dedicated to the education of students in West Texas.

Fort Stockton Independent School District was approved in the 35th state legislature on May 17, 1917. It is now home to five public schools and over 2,500 students, teachers, and staff. Over the past two-and-a-half years, I have visited Fort Stockton Independent School District on numerous occasions. In fact, I was able to participate in the Coin Toss at a Panther football game this month.

Today I applaud the graduates and countless faculty and staff members who have helped spread the knowledge, skills, and values they learned at Fort Stockton Independent School District with Texas, the United States, and the entire world. The positive impact of this public school system resonates across Texas' 23rd Congressional District.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HORSE TRANSPORTATION SAFETY ACT OF 2017

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Horse Transportation Safety Act, a bill I introduced earlier today along with my esteemed colleague, Rep. JONES from North Carolina, to ensure the humane and safe transportation of horses.

The Horse Transportation Safety Act seeks to end the exploitation of a regulatory loophole designed to ban the transport of horses in double-deck trailers, whereby drivers have an incentive to inhumanely transport horses to assembly points, then reload them into single level trailers just outside their final destination.

The practice is dangerous and inhumane not only to the horses, it poses a threat to the travelling public.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, "double-deck trailers do not provide adequate headroom for equines, with the possible exception of foals and yearlings. We do not believe that trailers that have two or more permanent levels that are not collapsible can be adequately altered to accommodate adult equines, especially tall equines."

The legislation is strongly supported by agricultural interests and animal protection groups alike. Among the organizations endorsing the bill are the Humane Society of the United States, the Animal Welfare Institute, the National Black Farmers Association, and Return to Freedom Wild Horse Conservation.

Moreover, in 2010 the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure unanimously adopted this bipartisan legislation.

This is common sense legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the swift passage of the Horse Transportation Safety Act.

HONORING THE HARRIET TUBMAN PRESS IMPRINT

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the Harriet Tubman Press on the occasion of its first publication.

The Harriet Tubman Press, an imprint of Tsehai Publishers, is an important new publishing platform based in Los Angeles, California. It is named after one of the great icons of American history, and it is one of the only imprints in the country dedicated to providing a platform for the voices of today's African-American scholars and writers.

The Harriet Tubman Press is housed in the Marymount Institute for Faith, Culture, and the Arts at Loyola Marymount University, which is one of the centers of higher learning in my congressional district—the 43rd District in California.

The first publication of the Harriet Tubman Press will be *Voices from Leimert Park Redux*, a diverse collection of poetry that beautifully captures the heartbeat of the Leimert Park community. For decades, this Los Angeles neighborhood has been a thriving beacon of African-American activism, culture, and the arts. At a time when gentrification and displacement threaten neighborhoods across Southern California, the preservation of African-American cultural heritage in Leimert Park could not be more important.

I congratulate Loyola Marymount University, Tsehai Publishing, the Harriet Tubman Press, and all the members of the South Central Los Angeles community that worked so hard to make this first publication possible. Your dedication and fortitude is necessary to the preservation of the African-American voice. I'd like to further thank the artists, authors, and poets who stand up and propel that voice into our country's consciousness. Your voices are the only currency that can never be taken from you.

May the first publication of the Harriet Tubman Press signal the birth of a new force devoted to propelling, celebrating, and highlighting African-American culture through literature.

RECOGNIZING RUBY'S PLACE ON ITS 45TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ruby's Place on the celebration of its 45th anniversary, to take place on Thursday, October 19.

Ruby's Place is a nonprofit organization founded in 1972 in Hayward, California. It was a pioneer in California in recognizing the need to provide shelter to victims of domestic violence.

Ruby's Place today provides services and shelter to homeless individuals and families,

with a focus on helping victims of domestic violence and human trafficking. These services include a 24-hour crisis hotline, case management, mental health treatment, and children's programming. As this shows, Ruby's Place helps people both in their time of immediate need and provides assistance so they can get back on their feet.

Just as one example, during the 2015–2016 fiscal year, the counselors at Ruby's Place answered over 4,500 calls on its crisis hotline and provided 724 individual counseling sessions. One hundred seventy of these sessions were with children who have been affected by domestic violence.

I had the honor of recognizing Ruby's Place on the House Floor in October 2013, in support of Domestic Violence Awareness Month. I am committed to continuing to fight domestic violence and working with organizations on the front lines, like Ruby's Place.

Over an amazing 45 years, about 6,000 adults and children have benefitted directly from Ruby's Place. I am incredibly grateful for its commitment to securing stable housing and supportive services for those in need, and I am honored to represent it in Congress. Our community is better and stronger for its tireless efforts.

I want to congratulate Ruby's Place on stabilizing the lives of individuals and families in the Bay Area for the last 45 years, and I wish it continued success in the future.

HONORING THE HALL COUNTY REACT PROGRAM AND THE NEW WELDING SHOP

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the grand opening of the Hall County Correction Institute's welding shop—a new addition to Hall County's Reentry Accountability Court Transition program—which will equip inmates with skills that they can take with them as they re-enter society.

Since 2014, the local accountability court program has assisted offenders by providing vocational resources that can help deter recidivism and restore these individuals as productive members of the community. By allowing program participants to obtain state certifications in welding, the program will help people who will soon be released to find job security upon their departure.

Criminal justice reform is a priority for north-east Georgia as it is for me in Washington, which is why I introduced the Prison Reform and Redemption Act to help lower recidivism rates among federal prisoners through vocational training and other evidence-based programs.

Mr. Speaker, every person has value, and efforts like the Hall County Correction Institute's welding shop recognize and seek to magnify that value and potential. Investing in all of our neighbors—even those who have broken the law—can pave the way for stronger, safer communities for every man, woman, and child.

I thank Sheriff Couch and the Hall County Sheriff's Department for their commitment to improving the lives of inmates, and look forward to seeing the impact that the welding initiative will make on northeast Georgia.

HONORING THE CARDOZA FAMILY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, family reunions are a great way of staying connected, strengthening bonds and recognizing heritage. As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate the Cardoza Family on the occasion of their 100th Anniversary and Family Reunion which was held at the Bird Ranch in Gustine, California on Saturday, September 9, 2017.

There is nothing quite like a family reunion. Family from far and wide gather and share in the joy of fellowship, love and precious memories that reunions generate. Therefore, I commend and congratulate them and pray that they had a wonderful weekend.

The Cardoza family story begins in the early 20th century. In approximately 1915–1916, Manuel S. Cardoza, an orphan, emigrated from the island of Terceira, Azores, Portugal. He was sponsored by his uncle, Joe S. Cardoza, and arrived to the San Joaquin Valley to work on his dairy farm. Manuel worked for room, board and a cow as his compensation. Their implied agreement was that as soon as Manuel had a string (15) of dairy cows he would go out on his own as a dairy farmer. He quickly accomplished his goal.

At approximately the same time, Manuel Coelho emigrated from the island of Terceira, Azores, Portugal. His name has never appeared on any ship roster, but it is rumored that he was a stowaway destined for Stratford, California in the San Joaquin Valley. By 1916, Manuel had earned enough money to send for his family. Shortly thereafter, his wife, Rose, her daughters Lucy, Lucille, Olympia, and Margaret, and sons, John and Manuel, boarded the Cornucopia and sailed for the United States.

Shortly after, Manuel S. Cardoza met Lucy Coelho, they married and started a dairy farm in partnership with another Azorean immigrant. The two were blessed with three sons and 5 daughters, whose descendants are here today. Through hard work, tenacity and faith, they survived World Wars and the Great Depression. They always managed to have enough to eat, clothes on their backs, and a roof over their heads.

The first generation consisted of dairymen; a butcher; an HVAC specialist; and a grocer. The occupations of the second generation consist of a wine specialist; a graphic artist; a doctor; a nurse; a teacher; an accountant; HVAC specialists; a real estate appraiser; a real estate broker; a politician; a cattleman; an office manager; CEO and a medical supplies specialist. The third generation includes marketing professionals; lawyers; accountants; teachers; financial advisors; construction man-

agers; a pharmacist; tech professionals; an environmental consultant; and a software engineer. What the next generation will achieve only time will tell.

Mr. Speaker it with great pleasure that I congratulate the Cardoza family on the occasion of their 100th anniversary and family reunion. The Cardoza family truly embodies the American dream. They are one of hundreds of thousands of Portuguese that came and settled in California to seek the opportunities that our state has given to immigrants past and immigrants present. I ask that you join me in wishing them continued success and prosperity.

DAVID DREIER RECEIVES ORDER OF THE AZTEC EAGLE AWARD

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend, former colleague, and leader in promoting international cooperation and understanding, who was recently recognized by a key U.S. ally for his outstanding work. Last month, David Dreier received the Order of the Aztec Eagle, the highest honor bestowed to a foreign national by the Government of Mexico.

Those of us who served with Representative Dreier know him as the former chairman of the House Rules Committee, as a faithful representative of his Southern California district for more than three decades, and as a forceful champion of democracy, free trade, and the rule of law. An avowed "Reagan Republican," Dreier was instrumental in crafting many of our nation's trade policies, including the North American Free Trade Agreement.

What some may not realize is that Representative Dreier was also a leader in cultivating closer ties and cooperation between the United States Congress and its partner legislatures around the world. Through our work on the House Democracy Partnership (HDP)—which he served as the founding chairman and I as chairman during the years of Democratic leadership—we had the opportunity to work together to advance the cause of parliamentary democracy, traveling widely and memorably to parliaments from Peru to Pakistan and hosting dozens of delegations of visiting legislators and staff in Washington. During these engagements, Representative Dreier was a consummate diplomat and a skilled mentor, navigating sometimes-difficult bilateral issues but also the practical questions of how parliamentary institutions could be more effective. Our work together epitomized the maxim that partisanship should end at the water's edge—a spirit that persists today under the leadership of current HDP chairman PETER ROSKAM.

While our work with HDP focused on less developed democracies, Representative Dreier always had a special interest in—and fondness for—the parliamentary democracy on our southern border, Mexico. He was an active member of the U.S.-Mexico Binational Commission, a leader of the U.S.-Mexico Inter-par-

liamentary Group, a co-chair of the U.S.-Mexico Congressional Caucus, and a frequent participant in congressional delegations to Mexico. During our work with HDP, he often invoked Mexico as an example of democratic development and spoke fondly of his work as an election observer in the country.

It is fitting that Representative Dreier has been acknowledged for this work by receiving the Order of the Aztec Eagle, joining leaders such as President Eisenhower, Nelson Mandela, and Queen Elizabeth II as well as cultural icons such as Walt Disney, Plácido Domingo, and Bono. I know I speak for many in extending him my warmest congratulations, and in wishing him well in his continued post-congressional service.

SCIENCE COMMITTEE COS JENNIFER Y. BROWN TO RETIRE

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Jennifer Young Brown's last day as Chief of Staff of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. For more than 28 years she has helped me represent the residents of the 21st District of Texas and, more recently, helped the Science Committee enact numerous policies that benefit the American people.

Jennifer started working in my personal office after she graduated from the University of Colorado. She has held five different positions, including Chief of Staff. For several years, she served as COS both in the personal office and on the Science Committee, a rare double COS, before becoming the full-time Science Committee Chief of Staff in 2016. Her talents and skills are many. She has mastered the difficult art of multi-tasking—no one does it better.

Jennifer is simply a remarkable woman. She manages to balance well the demands of husband, children, school activities, Science Committee work, and friends, almost 200 of whom attended a reception for her yesterday.

If Jennifer is going to leave us, at least it is for a worthy cause—Texas Tech University. Over the years Texas Tech has supplied our office with impressive interns and graduates and even made me an honorary alumnus.

Jobs may end but friendships continue. Jennifer and her family—husband Barry, son Leighton, and daughter Gipson—will always be special friends and I know I will continue to see them often.

So Jennifer, I thank you for all you have done for me. Her family is fortunate to have her as a role model. And I am fortunate to have had her influence on my life for over 28 years.

As I've learned to say, "Go Raiders."

HONORING DIANE GLASSER
(1928–2017)

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Vice Mayor Diane Glasser of Tamarac, Florida, who passed away Tuesday, October 10, 2017 at the age of 89.

Diane was a woman who wore many hats in her time. She served as a Commissioner and Vice Mayor on the Tamarac City Commission, as Broward County's State Committeewoman to the Florida Democratic Party, and as a delegate to six consecutive Democratic National Conventions.

In an era when western Broward County was synonymous with massive developments of senior condos, Diane became a nationally-known political powerhouse through her ability to bring the ward-style organization from her native Brooklyn to the 5,000-unit 55-plus community known as Kings Point in Tamarac.

If you were a candidate or elected representative planning to set foot in Kings Point, you did so only with Diane's blessing. She was an indomitable civic force in our community and built a get-out-the-vote operation in the condos that brought thousands of seniors to the polls for each and every election.

If Diane stumbled on a wrong, she was determined to make it right. She was a passionate advocate for the underserved, a defender of civil rights and someone who helped make Broward County a kinder, more compassionate community. She was a problem-solver and a leader, and brought people along where she saw a chance to make a positive impact on the lives of others.

Her passing brings with it the end of an era in South Florida politics. Diane is survived by her two sons, Craig and Lloyd Glasser, and one granddaughter, Dara.

RECOGNIZING RABBI JONATHAN
BIATCH OF TEMPLE BETH EL

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Temple Beth El was founded in 1939 as Madison, Wisconsin's first and only Reform Jewish congregation; and

Whereas, Rabbi Jonathan Biatch has been the spiritual leader supporting the vision and mission of Temple Beth El since 2004; and

Whereas, boys celebrate Bar Mitzvah when turning 13; and

Whereas the Temple Beth El community proclaims Rabbi Jonathan Biatch a "Bar Mitzvah" celebrating his 13th year of service,

Now, therefore, I congratulate Rabbi Jonathan Biatch on his 13 years of leadership at Temple Beth El.

CONGRATULATING MAJOR GENERAL MIYAKO SCHANELY ON HER PROMOTION TO COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE 416TH THEATER ENGINEER COMMAND

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Major General Miyako Schanely on her assignment as the Commanding General of the 416th Theater Engineer Command.

MG Schanely will lead the 416th Theater Engineer Command in conducting theater-level engineer operations supporting a joint force, and execute unified land operations while providing a training and ready combat-capable force to support mission requirements.

MG Schanely has had a long history of serving her country. Since she received her commission as a Second Lieutenant in 1986, she has served in both active and reserve units of the U.S. Army for over 31 years. MG Schanely is a graduate of the Army War College and holds several civilian master degrees. Previously assigned as the Commander of the 102nd Training Division, MG Schanely has become the first female Japanese American to become commander of the Theater Engineer Command as a two-star and is ready to take on the challenges associated with this rapidly evolving role.

On behalf of the 21st District of New York, I would like to congratulate MG Schanely on her well-deserved promotion, and wish her luck in her new role. I want to thank MG Schanely for her service to our country and for the sacrifices she will make in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THOSE AFFECTED
BY INFLAMMATORY BREAST
CANCER

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to Breast Cancer including one of the rarest, but most lethal forms, Inflammatory Breast Cancer, or IBC.

One in eight women in the United States are diagnosed with Breast Cancer every year, and too many women die because of late diagnosis. Any opportunity to raise awareness is an opportunity to save lives.

October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Although IBC is not the most common form of breast cancer, it is one of the most aggressive. It is critical that we recognize the severity of IBC and the importance of education and prevention efforts.

IBC is not commonly known as it accounts for only 1 to 5 percent of all breast cancer cases. However, it is one of the most aggressive and deadliest forms of the disease. This form of cancer does not display the early

symptoms ordinarily looked for by medical professionals. Since it is one of the rarest forms of Breast Cancer, many nursing and medical programs do not train students on IBC screening, leading to misdiagnosis and increased fatalities. The patients who start to show symptoms of this disease tend to be correctly diagnosed at stage 3, leaving little to no time to seek treatment.

The courage of women battling Breast Cancer and IBC should not go unnoticed and they deserve our continued support for continued research efforts to seek for prevention and treatment for this deadly disease.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately on October 10, 2017, I missed Roll Call vote no. 558 and Roll Call vote no. 559 both under Suspension of the Rules due to family-related medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both.

TRIBUTE TO BILL HENDERSON

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Mr. William Henderson of East Lyme, upon his retirement, for his outstanding 47-year career with the Connecticut Union of Telephone Workers/CWA and a lifetime of service to his community, country, and family.

Mr. Henderson has dedicated himself to the Connecticut Union of Telephone Workers/CWA as a steward and eventually as CWA Local 1298 president. Throughout his distinguished career, Bill has fought for justice and an even playing field in the workplace for men, women, and minorities. As a member of the CWA's Family Care Committee, he has worked diligently to assist employees in balancing work and family life.

Additionally, Bill has served his local communities of Waterford and East Lyme in countless roles, including as a member of the East Lyme Board of Education and the Waterford Board of Selectman, and as chairman of the Waterford Democratic Town Committee. He has coached little league, basketball, and lacrosse, and taught Sunday school. He is currently a deacon at Flanders Baptist Church and a justice of the peace. Bill has served not only his local community but also his country in the submarine force as a Navy sonar technician, achieving the rank of Second Class Petty Officer. He is the loving husband of Brenda and a father to four children and six grandchildren.

On a personal note, Bill was a tireless supporter of mine in every campaign I've run—even when it wasn't so easy during my first two races as a challenger. I will be forever grateful to him for his loyalty, amazing energy, and friendship over the years.

Please join me in congratulating Mr. Henderson on an impressive career of service with the Connecticut Union of Telephone Workers and Communications Workers of America. We thank him for his unrelenting dedication to his community and wish him a wonderful retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call votes 560 through 563 because I was traveling to Pennsylvania with President Trump.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on roll call No. 560, YEA on roll call No. 561, YEA on roll call No. 562, and YEA on roll call No. 563.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

HON. NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because nearly 9 million children are in danger of losing health insurance.

The Children's Health Insurance Program has reduced the uninsured rate among children from 14 percent in 1997 to 5 percent, today.

Nearly 30,000 children from my state, California, stand to lose their healthcare coverage this winter because of Congress's failure to reauthorize this vital program.

Healthcare is a human right, and working-class families need affordable doctors for their kids. This is especially true for Latinos. More than half of Latino children have Medicaid or CHIP coverage.

Congress must act immediately to pass a five-year extension for CHIP funding.

Every day we delay, we give families another reason to worry—that their son or daughter will fall sick and they won't be able to afford a doctor. That ongoing care for a chronically ill child will become too expensive. That hospitals will close their doors to them.

It's time to stop playing politics and get to work on a bipartisan reauthorization for CHIP.

HONORING DIANE GLASSER

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Diane Glasser, a committed public servant in South Florida who passed away on October 10th at 89 years of age. Diane served for over 40 years as an activist, Broward School Board member, City

Commissioner, and Vice Mayor of the City of Tamarac.

From her childhood and career in Brooklyn to her many years in South Florida, her passion for activism made an impact on everyone she met. She was never shy about urging others to fulfill their civic duty by voting, even when she wasn't on the ballot. And she was always encouraging of my efforts, working with me on many initiatives to strengthen the community.

In addition to holding elected office, Diane served on several boards, including the Senior Advisory Task Force and the Broward Human Rights Board. She selflessly used her voice to advocate for those whose voices she felt weren't adequately heard.

Diane also had unique experiences representing the State of Florida as a delegate to the past six Democratic National Conventions and as an elector in the 1996 and 2000 Electoral Colleges.

Our community has lost a leader whose service will always be appreciated and remembered. I am honored to have called Diane Glasser my friend.

HONORING THE CAREER OF LOU PARDINI

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legendary career of Mr. Lou Pardini. Lou is a Grammy nominated keyboardist, vocalist, composer and Fresno, California native. For the last 8 years he has been a member of the legendary rock band Chicago. Lou has successfully worked alongside various high profile musicians throughout his career. He is a distinguished composer that has base fans all over the world.

Lou Pardini was born in Omaha, Nebraska and raised in Fresno. He attended local schools including my alma mater San Joaquin Memorial High School. Lou would go on to attend Fresno City College and California State University, Fresno. Eventually he enrolled at the renowned Berklee School of Music in Boston to follow in his favorite musician's footsteps. Lou met and married the love of his life Betsey and the two would eventually move to Los Angeles, where Lou could fully pursue his music career.

Lou's natural talent was apparent early on in his childhood. He could easily perform songs on the piano by ear. His parents took notice and enrolled him in private guitar and piano lessons when he was just five years old. As he grew older his taste in music progressed. Among his favorite artists were Stevie Wonder, Donny Hathaway, Marvin Gaye, Led Zepelin, Deep Purple, and Black Sabbath.

Lou is a remarkable multitalented artist. He is known for his work with Stevie Wonder, The Doobie Brothers, The Temptations, Elton John, Smokey Robinson, Earth, Wind and Fire, Patti Austin, Larry Carlton and many more. He has worked with artists in Rock/Pop, R&B, Jazz, Blues and Gospel genres.

Lou's biggest break came when his song "Just To See Her" was recorded by the leg-

endary Smokey Robinson. The song won Smokey his first and only Grammy for "Best Rhythm and Blues Vocal". Lou has also recorded two solo albums which are fan favorites to this day.

In 2009, he got a call that would truly change his life. Following the departure of longtime member Bill Champlin, Lou was asked to join Chicago on a permanent basis. This was the culmination of a career marked by hard work and a true passion for his craft.

He continues to build his fan base around the world. As a member of Chicago, Lou tours the world, drawing sell-out crowds wherever they go. On April 8, 2016, Chicago was inducted into the 31st Rock and Roll Hall of Fame cementing their place in history.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask that you to join me in celebrating the career of Lou Pardini as he makes his homecoming to the city of Fresno. We are honored to have Chicago performing today at the Big Fresno Fair. I ask you to join me in wishing Lou and his family continued success and prosperity.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LESTER MANDELL

HON. STEPHANIE N. MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Lester Mandell, who transformed countless communities in central Florida though his work as a builder and transformed countless lives through his generosity as a philanthropist. Lester passed away recently at the age of 96, leaving behind a large and loving family, but his legacy will live on.

Born in a hardscrabble Brooklyn neighborhood, and a veteran of World War II, Lester did not graduate from college. However, neither his lack of formal education nor the anti-Semitism he frequently faced could stop Lester from achieving his professional goals, because they were no match for his talent, tenacity and toughness. Lester's life was a quintessentially American story of success earned though hard, disciplined, joyful work.

As one of Lester's grandsons said about his grandfather: "He believed that, if you did things the right way, you would get the right result." This is the essence of character.

Lester was a master builder, in both the literal and figurative sense. The homes, neighborhoods, and public parks he developed throughout central Florida over the course of many decades are his most visible legacy.

Lester also built bonds of a more intangible nature. He donated generously to many causes he cared about, from scholarships for inner-city children to support for the Jewish community he loved so much. Lester often donated anonymously and rarely spoke about his donations, even to his own family.

As his grandson recounts, Lester was a serious man who did serious work, but he did not take himself too seriously. He had a sense of humor and light-heartedness that disarmed friend and stranger alike.

Lester's greatest legacy, of course, is his family. He leaves behind his wife and partner

for life, Sonia. They were married for 70 years. Sonia and Lester had four children, eight grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren.

I know they miss Lester. But I hope their loss is eased by the knowledge that Lester was a great man and, even more importantly, a good man.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO LOCAL
SOUTH FLORIDA ARTIST,
XAVIER CORTADA

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a constituent and local South Florida artist, Xavier Cortada, and congratulate him on his inaugural art exhibit titled "Florida Is" at the Hibiscus Gallery at Pinecrest Gardens.

Throughout the years, Xavier's passion has been to generate awareness for our environment and global climate change through his art work.

His work is included at my alma mater, Florida International University, where he serves as Artist-in-Residence.

His current exhibit "Florida Is" truly allows viewers to immerse themselves in the beauty of Florida's natural beauty.

His exhibition will be available until November 15th at Pinecrest Gardens where visitors will have the opportunity to connect with his incredible art while walking around the garden.

Mr. Speaker, I would once again like to congratulate Xavier Cortada and invite my fellow colleagues to celebrate our nation's artists and their endeavor to change the world through the power of art.

HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE MARKUP

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we heard yesterday in testimony from General Wald, the Iran deal "places Iran on a trajectory to become as intractable a challenge as North Korea is today—and very possibly worse." The general noted that "while Pyongyang's relentless pursuit of nuclear weapons has only deepened its isolation and driven it toward bankruptcy, the JCPOA is doing the opposite for Iran."

It was clear from the beginning that this deal was deeply flawed. It was clear that it was based on a fundamentally misguided premise: that Iran's manifest desire for a nuclear weapon could be considered separate from its development of a delivery capacity for that weapon or from the rest of Iran's violent campaign for regional hegemony. It should be self-evident that a nuclear warhead without a delivery vehicle is not going very far very fast. Iran's ballistic missile program is inseparable from its desire to impose nuclear blackmail on the U.S., Israel, and other regional allies.

Iran also exports its extremist revolution through proliferation of conventional weapons to terrorist proxies. The deal gave Iran an infusion of an estimated \$115 billion dollars in unfrozen assets—and as John Kerry said in an interview that was carried by CNN, we don't know where that money is going and it will probably wind up in the terrorists' hands—not to mention other financial sweeteners like the \$1.7 billion in small bills. As we heard yesterday, this money has helped Iran extend its malign influence to an unprecedented extent across the region—in Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, and Yemen.

I'd like to thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on Iran these past several years, of which yesterday's hearing was but one example. Today we are considering one key measure, the Chairman's H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, which enjoys broad support in the House with 320 co-sponsors. This bill expands sanctions against organizations and individuals that facilitate Iran's ballistic missile program as well as its trade in conventional weapons. This bill is critical to our national security and that of our allies in the region, especially our good friend and ally Israel. It's time we start turning the tide back against Iran to guarantee that it never realizes its genocidal designs on the Jewish State or the other freedom-loving peoples of the region.

We help do that by passing H.R. 1698 out of committee. It is a bill I have cosponsored and I strongly support.

I also strongly support the Taiwan Travel Act (H.R. 535) and commend Chairman CHABOT for introducing this legislation, of which I am a cosponsor.

The Communist Party leadership in China has tried to isolate democratic Taiwan, pressuring countries to break diplomatic relations and bullying the UN and multi-lateral agencies, such as the World Health Organization and INTERPOL, to exclude Taiwan from membership. These actions have created needless blind spots in global anti-terrorism cooperation and hampered coordination on key global health issues.

Just this March, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) confirmed the first human fatality from the H7N9 avian flu in Taiwan. This is a pressing global concern, as we know that SARS virus spread from Mainland China and Taiwan in past.

The U.S. and Taiwan are cooperating in containing H7N9 virus, as we did 14 years ago to contain SARS. As such, China's actions to exclude Taiwan from the WHO and other international bodies is dangerous and unacceptable. Taiwan should be allowed to join the WHO. It is not only an interest of Taiwan, it is in the interest of global public health.

Restrictions on the travel of Taiwanese officials to the U.S. and on high-level U.S. officials to Taiwan are self-imposed rules intended to placate Mainland China. In the current strategic climate, these rules are now counterproductive and the policy should be changed.

We should be expanding cooperation with Taiwan on a number of fronts, particularly now that Communist China has stepped up efforts to isolate and bully democratic Taiwan. If China persists in its efforts to exclude Taiwan

from international bodies like Interpol and WHO and the International Civilian Aviation Organization, the U.S. should be sending cabinet level officials from HHS, Transportation, and the Justice Department to consult with Taiwanese officials—and to host their counterparts here in Washington. Such meetings will advance and protect American interests.

Under Xi Jinping's leadership, China has become more repressive domestically, more protectionist in its trade policies, and more assertive globally. As documented by the Congressional-Executive Commission on China (CECC), which I cochair with Senator MARCO RUBIO, China's domestic repression is the fuel for its international aggression, threatening American jobs and security, including in the South China Sea, in the Taiwan Straits, and in Hong Kong, where the "one country, two system" model is fast eroding. China has also imprisoned Taiwanese citizen and democracy advocate Lee Ming-che, whose wife Lee Ching-yu, sat in this very room in July at a hearing I chaired and asked the international community to work for her husband's release.

China will never be happy with U.S.-Taiwan policy or the Taiwan Relations Act. Communist China will never be placated by our self-imposed restrictions on travel and consultations. We should not try. As China squeezes Taiwan's international space and openly threatens it militarily, the U.S. must have more direct consultations with democratic Taiwan, not less.

HONORING EDWARDS AIR FORCE
BASE AND THE LEGACY OF
CAPTAIN CHARLES E. YEAGER

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an integral component of California's 23rd Congressional District and the U.S. Air Force—Edwards Air Force Base—and the life and legacy of Captain Charles E. Yeager, who played an essential role in achieving a critical milestone in U.S. aviation history.

This year, the United States Air Force observes its 70th birthday. Edwards Air Force Base, the second largest base in the Air Force, has long played an important role in the success and development of this branch and its weaponry. From the 412th Test Wing to the NASA Armstrong Flight Research Center, Edwards has always been a leader in developing and testing new technology to ensure that our warfighters operate with the most advanced weapons systems and platforms.

Coincidentally, the Air Force also celebrates the 70th anniversary of the very first supersonic flight, which occurred at Edwards Air Force Base, this year. Captain Charles E. Yeager became the fastest man in the sky on October 14, 1947, when he flew faster than the speed of sound in the rocket-powered Bell X-1, high above Edwards and over Southern California's famed Mojave Desert. Captain Yeager paved the way for a new era of air and space travel on that day and ushered in the development and eventual practical use of

the X-Plane, an advancement that has greatly benefited NASA and the U.S. Air Force. I want to recognize Captain Yeager's fearlessness and desire for adventure, which was pivotal in advancing American aviation.

Throughout its history, Edwards Air Force Base has always remained on the forefront of various scientific initiatives and discoveries. After Captain Yeager broke the sound barrier, pilots at Edwards were eventually able to fly at more than six times the speed of sound. Additionally, and among many other accomplishments, the very first space shuttle mission landed at Edwards on April 12, 1981. As we celebrate the Air Force's 70th year, it is important to take a moment to recognize the rich legacy and history of installations like Edwards, which, having been established in 1933, predates the creation of the Air Force itself. Prior to the establishment of the United States Air Force in 1947, Edwards was the Muroc Army Airfield.

I am reminded of Edwards Air Force Base every time I get the opportunity to visit the Smithsonian's Air and Space museum here in Washington, D.C. The very Bell X-1, in which Captain Yeager broke the sound barrier, is displayed in the main hall on the first floor of the museum. It serves as a reminder of the critical importance that Edwards has played to advance the greater mission of the Air Force.

I am incredibly grateful for the many men and women who have served and currently serve at Edwards Air Force Base. Their creativity, dedication, and sacrifice reflects the same spirit that Captain Charles Yeager exemplified 70 years ago. Edwards plays an important role in California's 23rd Congressional District, and this is due to my constituents who work tirelessly to innovate and to further its mission. I wish Edwards, and the United States Air Force, many more years of innovation and success.

CELEBRATING ALL PEOPLES COMMUNITY CENTER'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate All Peoples Community Center, a community-based organization in my 40th Congressional District, on the celebration of its 75th Anniversary.

The center was originally founded as All Peoples Christian Center in the 1920s, in the historic area of South Los Angeles. During World War II, the center was vacated due to the tragic relocation of its Japanese American members to internment camps.

In 1942, Pastor Dan Genung and his wife Frances moved from Chicago to Los Angeles with the primary goal of establishing a church, and founded the All Peoples Christian Church. Pastor Genung was hired to minister to the remaining Japanese American families and other community members who were African American, Latino, Armenian, and Chinese, and this multicultural community made an impact on Pastor Genung's vision to turn the church

into a "house of prayer for all peoples." Over time, Pastor Genung saw the need to minister to not only the spiritual needs of the people in the community, but to their social needs as well.

In the early history of the church, the minister served both as the pastor to the church and the executive director of the community center. Until 1964, the church and center worked as a single entity, which allowed both of them to pursue their separate but united goals.

Over its 75-year history, All Peoples has survived numerous changes in demography and culture while continuing to serve thousands of clients. The center is—and has always been—a safe haven, a beacon of hope and help, and a problem solving resource for the community of South Los Angeles.

In the 1960s, All Peoples responded to the civil rights movement by opening its doors to social activists for dialogue and discussion. Cesar Chavez and farm workers were hosted on-site during their campaign to defend immigrants' rights. During the 1965 Watts Riots, All Peoples remained open and distributed food to community members due to local markets being burned to the ground or closed.

As the community transitioned from African American to Latino in the 1970s, the center responded to its new neighbors by hiring staff who were bicultural, and who spoke both English and Spanish. In addition, multicultural activities were held at All Peoples to build a sense of community that was inclusive of the changing demographics in South Los Angeles.

All Peoples has become, and continues to be, one of Los Angeles' most senior and trusted place-based community organizations. It helps diverse, economically challenged residents measurably improve and transform their own lives by providing a comprehensive range of vital services, leadership, and hands-on care.

Through hard work, perseverance, and dedication to the community, Sandra Bryant has been the Executive Director of All Peoples for the past 34 years. Her first experience with All Peoples was as a two-year-old in the center's day care facility. She continued to participate in the center's programs throughout her adolescence, and served as a summer employee during college. Her commitment and passion for her community is demonstrated by her lifelong tenure of serving others.

In 2016, All Peoples was designated by the City of Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department to operate as the new FamilySource Center for the Southeast area of Los Angeles. The center's philosophy has an emphasis on education as the tool for successful community building. Thus, all of its programs have an educational component that integrates entire families and individuals. All Peoples is also committed to providing employment opportunities and leadership development to all community members.

All Peoples offers its neighbors a comprehensive after-school program, parenting and women's leadership classes, community micro-farming, financial literacy and health education workshops, case management, food distribution, a VITA Center, and the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP). It also offers YouthSource, FamilySource, and

WorkSource services that provide training to new employees, and retraining to those whose traditional skills have become obsolete; immigration services, which provide residency establishment, legal services, and education about basic rights and obligations; English as a Second Language classes; domestic violence support groups and counseling; and extended day care.

All Peoples Community Center is proudly celebrating its 75th Anniversary of continuous service to the community, and will hold its annual gala on October 19, 2017.

The 75th Anniversary gala will feature awards for three special honorees. First, actress, model, and recording star Meredith O'Connor will receive the Inspiration Award for her strong public advocacy on bullying and domestic violence issues. Ms. O'Connor is also a Celebrity Youth Ambassador for United Nations Project 50/50.

The Dan B. Genung Visionary Leadership Award will be given to Anne Tremblay, Director of the Los Angeles Mayor's Office Gang Reduction and Youth Development Program.

The Joe Ide Spirit of Community Award will be given to Ricardo Mendoza, Associate Vice President for Community Outreach and Business Development for Lee Andrews Group, a public relations firm.

I hope my colleagues will join me in sending best wishes and congratulations to All Peoples Community Center on its 75th Anniversary. The center has played a vital role in providing services to families in South Los Angeles over the past 75 years. I wish All Peoples Community Center continued success as it continues to enhance and empower our communities.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS DAY, JR.

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Thomas Day, Jr., who was tragically killed during the massacre at the Route 91 Harvest country music festival in Las Vegas, Nevada on Sunday, October 1, 2017. Tom was born and raised in my hometown of Corona, California. He will be greatly missed.

After graduating from Corona High School, Tom attended Riverside Community College and later went to work for the home building company, Portrait Construction, that was founded by his father. Those who worked with Tom knew him as someone who was easy to talk to and get along with. Tom Sr., Tom Jr. and the entire Day family have been active members of the Corona community for many years and made a number of contributions to many organizations in and around the city.

Tom Jr. had many passions in life. He loved sports and rooting for the Los Angeles Angels and Pittsburgh Steelers. He especially loved playing and coaching baseball. Attending concerts and music festivals with his children was a win-win for Tom because it allowed him to do two things he loved at one time—listen to music and spend time with his family. Tom was attending the Route 91 Harvest country

music festival with his children when he was senselessly taken from us, along with so many others. Our hearts ache for all of those whose lives were cut short and forever impacted by the evil acts of that evening.

I had the distinct privilege of knowing Tom and the Day family for many years, and there are simply no words that soften the heart-breaking loss of Tom's kind and caring soul. I extend my heartfelt condolences to his daughters Whitney, Candice and Kelsey, his son Nolan, the extended Day family, as well as his friends and colleagues. Although Tom may be gone, I know that the joy and happiness he brought to those around him will endure.

HONORING DEPUTY CORONER
GOSS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Lumpkin County's Deputy Coroner Frank Goss. Recently, the Georgia Coroner's Association awarded him the title of Deputy Coroner of the Year—a hard-earned honor given to only one nominee each year.

When Deputy Coroner Goss first assumed leadership in the Lumpkin County Coroner's office, he had a difficult job ahead of him. For-

tunately for my friends in Lumpkin County, he wasn't afraid to rise to the occasion—to put in the extra hours, to make the tough decisions, and to offer support to families as they grieve the loss of a loved one.

Deputy Goss's empathy for his community, along with his professional experience, made him the obvious choice for Deputy Coroner of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, adversity cultivates strength in leadership—as exemplified by Deputy Goss. I thank him for his service to our friends and neighbors back home, and applaud him for his new title and the continued impact that he will make on northeast Georgia.

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARTE AMERICAS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Arte Américas on the occasion of their 30th anniversary. Arte Américas is the largest Latino Cultural Arts Center in the San Joaquin Valley, located in the heart of my district in downtown Fresno, California. Since its creation 30 years ago, Arte Américas has made a significant impact on the Valley by making the arts accessible to the local community.

Beginning in rented space in downtown Fresno in 1987, Arte Américas has developed into a significant center on Van Ness Avenue, housing the Valley's Latino arts culture. Arte Américas serves the important role of both preserving Latino culture and introducing it to the Valley. The museum not only showcases Arts in Mexico, Latin America, the Southwest, and California, but an array of cultures from throughout the Central Valley. Arte Américas has become a hub of activity for the Latino and arts communities, frequently hosting receptions, meetings and special presentations. They frequently collaborate with local groups furthering their mission "To make Central California a flourishing place for Latino arts."

Over the years Arte Américas has been fortunate to have the support of a truly dedicated and vibrant staff, board members, and devoted volunteers. Their hard work has been the key to their years of successful events, installations and exhibits. Over the years poets, musicians, playwrights, novelists, sculptors, writers, dancers, and painters both local and from across the world have been featured at Arte Américas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating Arte Américas' 30th anniversary. I look forward to the opportunity to continue to work together to further the arts in the Central Valley. Once again, congratulations on this special milestone.

SENATE—*Friday, October 13, 2017*

The Senate met at 8:30 and 2 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 13, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the Provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. CAPITO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
OCTOBER 16, 2017, AT 4 P.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Monday, October 16, 2017.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:30 and 28 seconds a.m., adjourned until Monday, October 16, 2017, at 4 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 16, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 16, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Monsignor Stephen Rossetti, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious God, You love all people equally and completely—young and old, Black and White, Republican and Democrat, Muslim and Christian, saint and sinner. Help us to love as You love. And by this love, make us one with each other and one with You.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 562, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE TIM MURPHY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable TIM MURPHY, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 12, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules

of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena for documents and testimony, issued by the Court of Common Pleas for Allegheny County.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

TIM MURPHY.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 562, the House stands adjourned until noon on Thursday, October 19, 2017.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, October 19, 2017, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2822. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Council's final rule — Description of Office, Procedures, and Public Information [Docket No.: FFIEC-2017-0003] received October 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2823. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's interim final rules — Religious Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act (RIN: 1210-AB83) received October 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2824. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefit Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's interim final rules — Moral Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act (RIN: 1210-AB84) received October 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2825. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Guide Concerning Fuel Economy Advertising for New Automobiles received October 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2826. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the

sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2827. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-47, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2828. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-46, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2829. A letter from the Assistant Director, OSD SMO, Department of Defense, transmitting fifty-eight (58) notifications of a vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2830. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting three (3) notifications of a nomination, and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2831. A letter from the Presidential Appointments, Department of State, transmitting ten (10) notifications of a vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, discontinuation of service in acting role, and change in previously submitted reported information, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2832. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period July 1, 2017 to September 30, 2017, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 115–70); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2833. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the final map and perimeter boundary description for the Cache la Poudre Wild and Scenic River, in Colorado, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274(b); Public Law 90-542, Sec. 3(b) (as amended by Public Law 100-534, Sec. 501); (102 Stat. 2708); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2834. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — September 2017 Supplement to Rev. Proc. 2014-64, Implementation of Nonresident Alien Deposit Interest Regulations (Rev. Proc. 2017-46) received October 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2835. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Adjusted Applicable Dollar Amount for Fee Imposed by Sections 4375 and 4376 [Notice 2017-61] received October 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2836. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Treatment of Amounts Paid to Section 170(c) Organizations under Employer Leave-Based Donation Programs to Aid Victims of Hurricane and Tropical Storm Maria [Notice 2017-62] received October 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2837. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's interim final rules — Moral Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act [TD 9828] (RIN: 1545-BN91) received October 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2838. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's interim final rules — Religious Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act [TD 9827] (RIN: 1545-BN92) received October 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2839. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Automatic approval for certain funding method changes for single-employer defined benefit pension plans subject to the minimum funding requirements of Section 430 (Rev. Proc. 2017-56) received October 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2840. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Procedures for Requesting Approval for a Change in Funding Method (Rev. Proc. 2017-57) received October 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2841. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Fringe Benefit Aircraft Valuation Formula (Revenue Ruling 2017-19) received October 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 469. A bill to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1096. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; with an amendment (Rept. 115-348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1769. A bill to affirm an agreement between the United States and Westlands Water District dated September 15, 2015, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 4070. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to enhance Congress' ability to defend its legislative power under Article I of the Constitution in litigation in the courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4071. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to create a program to provide funding for organizations that support start-up businesses in formation and early growth stages by providing entrepreneurs with resources and services to produce viable businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. PARNETTA):

H.R. 4072. A bill to designate certain Federal land in the State of California as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4073. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to strike the definition of "imminent danger to the public health or safety" that was added by Public Law 114-145 for purposes of suspending a registration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4074. A bill to strengthen and expand proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. MACARTHUR):

H.R. 4075. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require certain training as a condition of registration to prescribe or dispense opioids for the treatment of pain or pain management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 4076. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living adjustments indexed to the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

134. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 2013, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 2010, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 67, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 4070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 9; Article III, Section 1; and Article III, Section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority to over the federal courts. In addition, the Necessary and Proper Clause of Article I, Section 8 grants Congress the authority to take actions to assert and defend its legislative power in the courts.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H.R. 4071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 4072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 4074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 4075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 4076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 140: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 176: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 669: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 785: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1094: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1229: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1276: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 1290: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1626: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1683: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1731: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2092: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2093: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2148: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 2315: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2472: Mr. RUSH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 2902: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2908: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2909: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 3186: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 3368: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3748: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3770: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 3784: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POLIS, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3822: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 3926: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 3938: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 4007: Mr. FASO.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. PETERSON.

H. Res. 307: Mr. GARRETT.

H. Res. 571: Ms. ROSEN.

SENATE—Monday, October 16, 2017

The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we bless Your Holy Name. Provide our lawmakers with the wisdom to obey You completely and receive Your guidance. May Your guiding presence inspire them so that they can find, even in troubles, opportunities for joy.

Lord, remind them of the blessings that come from being challenged, as they learn from experience that the things that test them produce endurance. When their endurance is fully developed, give them the satisfaction of possessing such integrity that their faith will not shrink, though pressed by many foes.

Lord, help our Senators to seek You repeatedly each day with their prayers, fully expecting You to answer their intercession and direct their lives.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Gingrich nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Pleni-

potentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

If no one yields time, the time will be equally divided.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

WORK BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, as I discussed with the President and the Vice President at our working lunch today, the Senate has a full schedule of important work ahead of us.

The Senate's fall agenda includes confirming more nominees to the judiciary, administration, and other important positions. Later today we will resume consideration of another nominee, Callista Gingrich, who has been nominated to serve as our Ambassador to the Vatican. That agenda includes providing continued assistance to communities affected by the recent hurricanes, and we will process the President's supplemental funding request to do just that. The Senate's agenda also includes completing work on the budget resolution and advancing tax reform—two things that are critical to helping our economy finally realize its true potential after the stagnation of the last decade.

This budget will be the next step to spurring growth in our economy. It provides a pathway to balance, it reins in Federal spending, and it honors our commitments to Social Security and provides for the national defense.

In addition to these important aspects of this budget, it will also provide the legislative tools to advance tax reform. As I have said before, tax reform is the single most important thing we can do today to get our economy moving again.

We think taxes should be lower, simpler, and fairer for middle-class workers so that Americans can keep more of their own hard-earned money in their paychecks. We think taxes should be reformed to end the perverse incentives that help keep American jobs and profits offshore and so it is easier to make and keep American jobs where they belong—right here at home.

We think it is time to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more money in the pockets of the American middle class. That is why we know it is time for tax reform.

The tax reform goals I just mentioned are shared by many, including the President, his team, Chairman ORRIN HATCH, and Chairman MIKE ENZI.

As I said, to get there, we first need to pass the budget before us. I want to thank Chairman ENZI and the members of the Senate Budget Committee for all of their work in getting us to this point. As we advance that budget on the Senate floor this week, Senators on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer their input.

I look forward to putting our finances on a better path with this budget, just as I look forward to continuing with the other important initiatives on the Senate's fall agenda.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, on the issue of healthcare, last week, President Trump committed two acts of pointless sabotage of our Nation's healthcare system. He signed an Executive order that would give insurers more latitude to sell temporary, junk plans that are not only incredibly risky to the consumer but undermine the rest of the healthcare market by drawing healthy Americans out of the pool. Even worse, President Trump decided to stop the cost-sharing program, which reduces premiums, deductibles, and copays for 7 million Americans a year. There is literally no upside to the President's decision to end the cost-sharing program.

Because of the President's actions, premiums will go up between 20 and 25 percent, according to the CBO. Just today in Pennsylvania, we saw premiums rise by 30 percent as a direct result of the President's actions. Deductibles and out-of-pocket costs will go up by thousands of dollars. Deficits will rise by \$194 billion because the government will have to pay more in subsidies to make up for the lack of the cost-sharing program, and the marketplaces will become less stable because more people will go uninsured.

The Republican Governor of Nevada, Brian Sandoval, may have said it best:

It's going to hurt people. It's going to hurt kids. It's going to hurt families. It's going to hurt individuals. It's going to hurt people with mental health issues. It's going to hurt veterans. It's going to hurt everybody.

That is from Republican Governor Brian Sandoval.

Another point that the President should hear is that nearly 70 percent of the Americans who benefit from these cost-sharing payments live in States that Donald Trump won in the election.

Make no mistake about it—the President is deliberately undermining our

healthcare system with these two actions. When premiums go up because of this action, the blame will fall on his shoulders.

There is a way out. The way out of all of this is for Congress to aggressively pursue a bipartisan healthcare bill that will take cost-sharing out of the President's hands by locking in the payments. For many months, Democrats have been pushing to stabilize the markets and to work toward a bipartisan agreement that would keep premiums down for millions of Americans. Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY have been negotiating a package that would include cost-sharing as well as some provisions that the Republicans want. These negotiations began long before the President's decision to end cost-sharing last week. I am encouraged by the progress of the negotiations, and I am hopeful that we are nearing an agreement that makes clear that we have no intention of supporting the President's reckless efforts at sabotage.

If President Trump is now supportive of an agreement that stabilizes and improves the existing system under the Affordable Care Act, we certainly welcome the change of heart. We have been asking for this for a long time. We hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in their realizing the damage the President has done, will join us in strengthening, not in sabotaging, the healthcare system.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Madam President, now a word on the Republican tax plan.

This week, the Republican majority will likely move to pass a budget resolution that includes reconciliation instructions to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Amazingly, it also includes a total of \$1.5 trillion in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid. Cutting taxes on the wealthy to be paid for by cutting Medicare and Medicaid? How many Americans want that—Democrat, Republican, Independent, liberal, conservative? The GOP budget makes it as clear as day that the Republicans will try to pay for a massive tax cut for the wealthy by cutting Medicare and Medicaid. It is the same formula they used for TrumpCare—cutting healthcare to pay for tax cuts for the rich. The American people rose up against that plan, and it failed. This plan should fail for the same exact reason.

Now the White House is out with a new report today, which reads that a giant tax cut for big corporations will increase wages for middle-class Americans. President Trump complains about fake news. Well, this is fake math, and it is as bad as any of the so-called fake news the President has complained about. This is a deliberate manipulation of numbers and facts that, quite frankly, is appalling. History shows that tax cuts like these

benefit the wealthy and the powerful to the exclusion of the middle class. History shows that corporations will use tax cuts for CEO bonuses, stock buybacks, and dividends rather than for increasing worker pay or creating new jobs.

In fact, none other than Goldman Sachs concluded that shareholders, not workers, "typically get most of the benefits of tax cuts." This is not a liberal think tank or CHUCK SCHUMER talking; this is Goldman Sachs, which represents shareholders—a lot of them. The two authors of this plan, Gary Cohn and Steve Mnuchin, who are from Goldman Sachs, should heed what their former employer says. Even Goldman Sachs is saying that the Trump tax cuts will not create massive growth or new jobs or higher wages. In fact, another recent report by Goldman Sachs predicts only the most minor growth effects from this tax cut, not more than 0.1 or 0.2 percent.

As the President likes to point out, the stock market is at record highs, and companies are raking in unprecedented profits; yet wages have remained relatively flat. The companies are already flush with money—record profits. They are not creating jobs; they are enriching their shareholders and enhancing their CEOs' salaries with stock buybacks. It is proof positive that companies already have the cash reserves but do not use them to boost wages.

To assert the opposite, which is that giving corporations and the wealthy a tax cut leads to higher middle-class wages, belies the facts and the history, and it is a blatant attempt to fool Americans into thinking that the GOP plan would benefit them when in reality it is a sop to the rich. No wonder our Republican friends cannot talk about what the plan does—cuts taxes for the wealthy and powerful. They have to hide it and say that this is job growth. Those are fake numbers, and I would like my friends on this side of the aisle to admit that they believe in trickle-down economics, because that is what their plan is all about.

Rather than helping the biggest corporations avoid paying their fair share, tax reform ought to reward those companies that create jobs and raise wages here at home. Similarly, tax reform ought to directly benefit the middle class, but the Republican tax plan slashes a key middle-class deduction in the form of the State and local deductibility.

Now let's talk about Vice President PENCE. He is visiting Buffalo, NY—a city I love in my home State. Since Vice President PENCE is traveling to Buffalo, I thought that I would share some numbers about how the elimination of the State and local deduction affects western New York.

In Representative COLLINS' district, which stretches from East Buffalo to-

ward Rochester, 29 percent of the residents claim the State and local deduction. They get an average deduction of \$12,125. In Representative HIGGINS' district, which is in the heart of Buffalo, 27 percent of the residents claim the State and local deduction, with an average deduction of \$12,083. In Representative REED's district, which is just south and east of Buffalo, 22 percent of the residents claim the State and local deduction, with an average deduction of \$11,716. Their constituents get clobbered, as do just about all New Yorkers and so many in the rest of the country, when you eliminate the State and local deductibility. It affects the middle class and the upper class. The State and local deduction elimination is a dagger to the heart, not just to Buffalo but to Rochester, Syracuse, Albany, and all of Upstate New York.

Will Vice President PENCE have the courage to answer questions about this deduction elimination? Will he tell middle-class New Yorkers that they are going to get a huge tax increase under this bill? When the Vice President arrives in Buffalo tomorrow, I hope he is prepared to explain why he wants to hike taxes on thousands of middle-class families in the Buffalo area, in the Rochester area, in the Syracuse area, and in the Albany area.

Eliminating the State and local deduction hurts the middle class, and it hammers the New York economy. Businesses, if they do not have this State and local deduction, are not likely to relocate in Buffalo or Rochester or Syracuse or Albany. It also hurts homeowners. Make no mistake about it—if we get rid of the State and local deduction, the values of homes will go down. That is why the realtors are so opposed to this elimination. It is not just true in New York or in California or in Connecticut or in New Jersey; it is true across the whole country.

As for my dear friend and chairman of the Finance Committee's State of Utah, because of the great charity of his people—and so many tithe—35 percent of the taxpayers will get a huge, huge increase in their taxes with the elimination of State and local deductibility. So many of them do not use the standard deduction because they are so charitable, but they are penalized for that charity.

Eliminating the State and local deduction, while slashing taxes for the wealthy and huge corporations, will hurt middle-class taxpayers.

Now there are some efforts to compromise State and local deductibility. They don't work. Some have proposed letting taxpayers make a choice between getting rid of the mortgage deduction and getting rid of the State and local deduction. That is like saying: Should I chop off my left hand or my right hand, Mr. Middle-Class Taxpayer?

Others have said: Let's limit it to people who earn below \$100,000. That

still leaves lots of people at risk, particularly in high-priced areas like Long Island, and it doesn't reduce the deficit by much. It is estimated that a large percentage of the deficit will still go up.

It makes no sense to eliminate State and local deductibility. Vice President PENCE ought to go to western New York, but instead of going just to a small business—and we want to lower small business taxes—he should go to a middle-class family in Amherst or in Orchard Park or Tonawanda and tell them that he is there to raise their taxes.

NOMINATION OF TOM MARINO

Madam President, I want to address the President's nominee to lead the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Representative MARINO.

An article in yesterday's Washington Post described Representative MARINO's advocacy for a law that may have prevented the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, from going after the worst practices of drug distributors. It is a profoundly troubling revelation about the man who has been tapped to lead the primary agency in our government that focuses on stopping the opioid crisis.

The opioid crisis was in part fueled by wholesale drug distributors sending millions of unnecessary pills into communities. As my friend Senator MANCHIN has pointed out, one company shipped 20 million doses of opioids to pharmacies in his State of West Virginia over a 5-year period. That included 11 million doses sent to Mingo County, WV, where the population is 25,000. There were 11 million pills sent to a county of 25,000 people over a 5-year period. No wonder there is a crisis.

What the Washington Post revealed yesterday was that Representative MARINO worked to pass a bill in 2016 that made it "virtually impossible for the DEA to freeze suspicious narcotic shipments." Confirming Representative MARINO as our Nation's drug czar would be like putting a wolf in charge of the henhouse.

The American people deserve someone totally committed to fighting the opioid crisis, not someone who has labored on behalf of the drug industry. So tonight I am calling on President Trump to withdraw the nomination of Representative MARINO for the ONDCP. We can do better. Senator MANCHIN has made such a call, and he is right. President Trump ought to withdraw Representative MARINO's nomination.

If the President presses forward with Representative MARINO, it will be another betrayal in a long line of betrayals on issues near and dear to rural America. The President's healthcare proposals would have put daggers into the heart of rural America, decimating Medicaid and rural hospitals. The President's tax plan lavishes the

wealthy and the big corporations but does little for the working man or woman in rural America. The President promised several months ago to label the opioid crisis a national emergency, yet he still hasn't done it. He said this afternoon that he will finally do it next week. We will see.

By now, the idea that the President is sticking up for the forgotten man and woman in the forgotten parts of rural America should be dismissed. President Trump seems to have forgotten the forgotten parts of America, and his lack of action—we don't need talk; we need action—on the opioid crisis and his nomination of Representative MARINO is just another example.

CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

Madam President, over the weekend, several parts of California were swept by some of the most devastating wildfires the region has seen. At least 40 people have died, thousands of homes and businesses have been utterly destroyed, and at one point over 100,000 people were evacuated. As Gov. Jerry Brown said, "This is truly one of the greatest, if not the greatest, tragedies that California has ever faced."

Our thoughts are with everyone affected by these wildfires. We are enduringly grateful for the firefighters and all our first responders. And our response here in the Senate must be to send aid where aid is needed.

For our country, this has been a devastating few months of fires and floods. Hurricanes Harvey and Irma buffeted Texas, Louisiana, and Florida. Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are contending with a humanitarian crisis on an unprecedented scale in the wake of Hurricane Maria. Our job is to speedily send aid, and I am hopeful that we can pass another supplemental aid package this week as well as another more comprehensive package later in the year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, today I want to talk to you about time and how little of it we have to accomplish two incredibly important legislative priorities, one that is national in scope and potentially historic in impact. The first of those priorities is tax reform. We have a target date on the calendar, and now the clock is ticking. We have to get to work.

The budget resolution that we will consider this week sets November 13 as our deadline for the Finance Committee to report a bill, and of course the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator HATCH, is on the floor, and that is a commitment I know he takes very seriously.

This bill, I hope, will broadly cut taxes on individuals and businesses alike and put more money in the pockets of working families across the

country. What I like most about the plan I have seen so far is that it is bold. We are not trimming a little here and a tiny bit there. We are slashing rates, consolidating brackets, and eliminating pet credits and deductions. This is not JV tax reform. This is tax reform that is serious and based upon our commitment to get the economy growing again.

Two weeks ago, the House approved its version of the resolution, and the Senate Budget Committee reported out its version. Now the Senate will consider the committee's resolution in the coming days. Why do we need that budget resolution? How is this all going to work?

Well, these resolutions from each Chamber are the first step in passing pro-growth tax reform. They authorize the use of a tool called budget reconciliation. That means when the tax reform legislation is considered, it can't be stopped by less than a majority of the Senate. Of course, this isn't our first choice.

I wish our colleagues across the aisle, our Democratic friends, would join us in bipartisan tax reform, but passing a budget resolution in the Senate is a must because this is something we can hold in reserve if our friends across the aisle simply refuse to participate in the process of pro-growth tax reform. It is a key procedural step because we have to fundamentally change the Tax Code before the end of the year.

How well our economy does next year, how many jobs are created, and how much investment occurs here in the United States will depend largely upon our success in passing pro-growth tax reform this year. The clock is ticking, and we have to act with dispatch and with determination.

As the President said last week in Pennsylvania, "we want lower taxes, bigger paychecks, and more jobs for . . . American workers." He is absolutely right. Lower taxes, bigger paychecks, and more jobs are the things we all ought to want, and they are worth the fight.

Under this administration we are already seeing results. The economy is bouncing back. Unemployment is at a 16-year low. Wages are rising and the stock market is soaring. The slumbering giant, which is the U.S. economy, is now slowly awakening. Our economy reached more than 3.1 percent growth last quarter. Confidence, as the President stressed in Pennsylvania, is back when it comes to our economy and our future, but that confidence will not last long if we let this opportunity pass.

We have to find ways to get companies to stay in America, to expand, and to hire in America. We have to find ways to take the money out of Washington's pocket and put it back into the pockets of those who earned the money in the first place—American families.

We have to find ways to simplify the Tax Code, which, let's remember, hits families multiple times each year by taking their earnings, by stealing their time through compliance, and by trying their patience with complexity. Each tax return feels like three.

I find it appalling that a majority of taxpayers are forced to pay someone else to do their taxes for them because they simply don't have the time or expertise to do it themselves.

The unified framework released a few weeks ago will help. It calls for collapsing seven separate tax brackets down to three. That is what I call simplification. It expands the zero bracket so that if you are a married couple earning less than \$24,000 a year, you will pay zero income taxes. It enhances the child tax credit. It repeals the death tax and special interest tax breaks, and it reduces the uncompetitive corporate tax rate to 20 percent and cuts tax rates for small businesses to the lowest level in more than 80 years. So let's make this happen before time runs out.

HURRICANE RECOVERY EFFORT

Madam President, the other item I can't stop thinking about is one that has taken a great toll on my State and our region of the country, and that is Hurricane Harvey, the most extreme rain event in the history of the United States. Literally 50 inches of rain fell in 5 days in the Houston area.

Last week, I saw images of the Texas World Speedway, a racecar track at College Station that is being used as a processing lot. Here is a picture of that.

At its peak, tens of thousands of cars were parked there, awaiting damage assessments by insurance companies. A sea of them had filled the entire speedway, as can be seen on this chart, and it was starting to spill into surrounding areas, too—cars in all directions, as far as the eye could see.

How could Hurricane Harvey damage so many cars? Well, cars these days—the newer ones—are basically computers on wheels, and when they get wet in an extreme flooding event like this, they essentially become a total loss, like these cars at the Texas World Speedway. It is an amazing picture. All the cars there, mind you, represent only a tiny percentage of all the vehicles damaged in the storm. Some of the estimates I have heard are that as high as one-half million personal vehicles were damaged and even totaled.

The speedway is just one of the images that continue to keep me up at night. How are my constituents, these Texans, going to get to work? How are they going to take their kids to school? When will their car and their house be ready so they can live in their home? When will their highways and drive-ways be fixed? What is being done to ensure that history doesn't repeat itself when, year after year, many

parts of the Harris County-Houston area are flooded because many of the important Corps of Engineer projects have not been started, much less completed, which would have diverted the rain and saved many of these homes and many of these cars.

Last Thursday, the House passed a \$36.5 billion hurricane and wildfire relief bill. The vote sends the measure over to the Senate, and I look forward to debating the supplemental appropriation in the days ahead.

The House's emergency measure is intended to replenish the Federal Emergency Management Agency's nearly depleted coffers with \$18.7 billion to the Disaster Relief Fund. If we don't act soon, I am told, FEMA could run out of money as early as October 23.

The House bill will also address the National Flood Insurance Program by forgiving \$16 billion of its debt and allowing it to pay more claims for property owners in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Nevertheless, I must say I am more than a little bit disappointed by this piece of legislation. I share the frustrations of Gov. Greg Abbott and Members of the Houston area congressional delegation, who have pointed out that this bill doesn't come close to fulfilling the very reasonable requests that have been made to rebuild and recover from Hurricane Harvey. Texas needs more, and the State deserves it, too, after all it has gone through. We are not going to throw up our hands and relent. We are going to keep on pushing.

I appreciate the assurances from Speaker PAUL RYAN and the administration that Texas will get what it needs to rebuild the homes and businesses lost in the hurricane and the funding that it needs to expand bayous and develop critical flood mitigation projects.

Governor Abbott told me the Speaker told him Congress will take up the State's recent request as soon as November. I am grateful to him for that promise, but we don't need any more general statements of support. We are not asking for any more expressions of sympathy. We need specifics and a specific commitment to follow through on Texas's demonstrated need for assistance.

I predict that the House bill will not move through the Senate until the bill provides the sort of specific commitment we could take to the bank. This isn't about Hurricane Harvey either. This is about Hurricane Irma and Hurricane Maria.

We cannot afford to wait much longer. The Texas families who have been out of their homes since Hurricane Harvey hit can't afford to wait much longer. The people who have lost their mode of transportation as a result of this flood and this hurricane can't afford to wait much longer. The

small businesses that have been simply wiped out and who have been denied access to the funds they need in order to restart and rebuild their lives cannot afford to wait much longer.

The clock is ticking, and I will continue to work with the Governor and the rest of the Texas delegation, as well as our friends from Florida and others who were hit by other natural disasters, to make sure that collectively we present our case to the Appropriations Committees and to the Senate. We are not asking to be treated any better than anybody else after a natural disaster like this, but we sure will not accept being treated worse. We are going to work together, on a bipartisan basis, to make sure that is the case.

Let me just close with a few words from my good friend and colleague from Laredo, TX, Representative HENRY CUELLAR. Now, HENRY is what they call a Blue Dog Democrat, somebody I have worked with a lot on border issues in particular. He is on the House Appropriations Committee, and he was asked whether the House's most recent bill was going to be the final appropriation to address the losses as a result of Hurricanes Harvey, Maria, or Irma. "No," he said emphatically, "we are going to do more," and he is absolutely right.

I am here to say that speaking as one Senator, I intend to make sure the U.S. Government keeps its commitments to the people in Texas, to the people in Florida, to the people in Puerto Rico, and to the people in the Virgin Islands when it comes to assisting them to recover from this terrible natural disaster.

We are not going to continue to take the promises of the Office of Management and Budget or the administration or our friends in the leadership in the House, for that matter, that we are going to get to this later. There is an expression in my part of the country that when somebody asks you when are you going to do something, the response is *manana*—tomorrow. To every question of when, it is *manana*.

We demand that this problem be dealt with on a timely basis, and we are going to keep the feet to the fire of the administration and our friends in the House to make sure they follow up on their commitments to deal with the victims of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida be granted the floor as soon as I finish.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENSURING PATIENT ACCESS AND EFFECTIVE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, over the weekend, the Washington Post ran

an article about a piece of legislation I helped negotiate last Congress. It was entitled the "Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act" and was intended to encourage greater collaboration between DEA and the regulated community in the fight against opioid abuse. The Post article was sharply critical of this legislation, suggesting that it effectively gutted DEA's ability to do its job. It also suggested the pharmaceutical industry put one over on Congress. I rise to set the record straight on these allegations and to provide a fuller account of how this legislation passed the Senate and became law.

First, some background. The Controlled Substances Act requires drug distributors to obtain a "registration" from DEA in order to distribute controlled substances, including prescription drugs. The act further authorizes DEA to suspend a distributor's registration in certain circumstances, such as where a distributor has been convicted of a crime involving controlled substances or had a State license suspended. Before suspending a registration, DEA must issue a show cause order directing the distributor to explain why its registration should not be suspended. A court then decides whether DEA has met its burden to suspend the registration.

The Controlled Substances Act empowers DEA to bypass this standard suspension process in cases where DEA determines there is "an imminent danger to the public health or safety." In such cases, DEA can issue an immediate suspension order that immediately and without court process terminates the distributor's ability to distribute prescription drugs. Prior to last Congress, the Controlled Substances Act did not define what constitutes an imminent danger to the public health or safety. This left DEA's ability to immediately suspend a party's ability to distribute prescription drugs essentially unfettered. Such unfettered discretion concerned the patient advocacy and drug manufacturing community because an immediate suspension order cuts off all drugs from a distributor, including those intended for legitimate users. A balance is needed to ensure that individuals who need prescription drugs for treatment receive them but that such drugs are not diverted for improper purposes.

So the bill I helped negotiate last Congress, for the first time, defined what constitutes an imminent danger to the public health or safety. In doing so, it created a standard for when DEA may suspend a party's registration to distribute prescription drugs without any prior court process, and that standard is that there must be a "substantial likelihood of an immediate threat" that death, serious bodily harm, or abuse of a controlled substance will occur in the absence of an immediate suspension.

In both committee and floor statements, I made clear that this standard is intended to cover situations where evidence of diversion indicates there is a substantial likelihood that abuse of a controlled substance or of any controlled substances will occur.

The Washington Post article glosses over much of this background. It does not explain that the immediate suspension order is intended to be an extraordinary measure. It does not explain that prior to the bill, DEA had basically carte blanche authority to impose this measure. It does not explain the DEA has other enforcement tools available, including show cause orders which are supposed to be the agency's standard operating procedure. Equally problematic, the article barely even mentions the patient advocacy concerns that motivated the bill to begin with.

I want to quote from a letter that a coalition of patient and health advocacy groups sent to Congress in support of the legislation:

Federal agencies, law enforcement, pharmaceutical industry participants and prescribers each play a role in working diligently to prevent drug abuse and diversion. However, it is also imperative that legitimate patients are able to obtain their prescriptions without disruption. Your legislation addresses both goals by fostering greater collaboration, communication and transparency between industry stakeholders and regulators, leading to more effective efforts to combat abuse while protecting patients.

The letter was signed by, among others, the American Academy of Pain Management, the Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Support Network, and the Drug Free America Foundation.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 2015.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS HATCH AND WHITEHOUSE: On behalf of the patient and health professional groups listed below we would like to express our support for the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2015 (S. 483). We appreciate your leadership and commitment to combating the inappropriate use of prescription medicines. Your legislation will help improve the balance between effective enforcement against prescription drug diversion and abuse, while ensuring patients who are appropriately prescribed medications continue to have access to their treatments.

As patient advocacy and health professional organizations, we are committed to combating illegal use of prescription drugs. Millions of Americans depend on prescription drugs to treat and cure illness, alleviate pain, and improve quality of life, yet prescription drug abuse remains a persistent problem that requires collaboration from all

those with a stake in improving patient care and protecting against abuse. In considering the burden on patients, it is important to remember that the vast majority of patients who use prescription drugs do so legitimately to address a variety of health issues. Efforts to prevent drug abuse should also consider legitimate users so that actions do not impede patient access or lessen the effectiveness of patient care.

Federal agencies, law enforcement, pharmaceutical industry participants and prescribers each play a role in working diligently to prevent drug abuse and diversion. However, it is also imperative that legitimate patients are able to obtain their prescriptions without disruption. Your legislation addresses both goals by fostering greater collaboration, communication and transparency between industry stakeholders and regulators, leading to more effective efforts to combat abuse while protecting patients. We commend you for including a report to congress, which will illuminate the issue and ultimately benefit patient care. Including patient advocacy groups in the process will ensure those involved in patient care will be able to identify challenges and will emphasize appropriate and workable policy approaches to preventing diversion and abuse of controlled substances.

We commend you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Patient Access; American Academy of Pain Management; American Pharmacists Association; American Society of Consultant Pharmacists; American Society for Pain Management Nursing; Center for Lawful Access and Abuse Deterrence; Drug Free America Foundation, Inc.; Fibro Warriors Living Life; Fibro Friends of Tennessee; Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Support Network; Fibromyalgia-ME/CFS Support Center, Inc.; Florida Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Network.

Hematology/Oncology Pharmacy Association; Interstitial Cystitis Association; Kentuckiana Fibromyalgia Support Group; Lake Oswego Health Center; National Association of Chain Drug Stores; National Community Pharmacists Association; National Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Association; The Pain Community; Pain Connection-Chronic Pain Outreach Center, Inc.; Project Lazarus; Richmond Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Association; Save Our Society From Drugs; U.S. Pain Foundation; Virginia Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Support Group.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, the Washington Post article discusses virtually none of this. Rather, it baldly asserts that Congress cut out DEA's legs from underneath it through a sinister conspiracy of deep-pocketed drug companies and their cunning allies in Congress. Nothing could be further from the truth.

To begin with, I have spent 40 years of my life in the Senate fighting the scourge of drug abuse. I stood side by side with Ronald Reagan in the War on Drugs. In 2000, I coauthored the Drug Addiction Treatment Act, or DATA 2000, one of the first efforts in Congress to address the opioid epidemic. Last year, I led conference negotiations on the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act, a landmark piece of legislation that is making a real difference in the fight against opioid and heroin abuse.

Currently, I am working on legislation to address opioid addiction in the veteran community. I am no patsy when it comes to drug abuse—prescription or otherwise—and neither are my colleagues.

Indeed, forget me for a moment. Let's take Senator WHITEHOUSE, who helped me negotiate the bill with DEA and DOJ. Are we to believe that Senator WHITEHOUSE, a former Rhode Island attorney general and a former U.S. attorney, a crusader against corporate interests, is somehow in the pocket of the drug companies? Of course not. The charge is laughable on its face.

How about the fact that this bill passed both Houses of Congress by unanimous consent? Did the entire U.S. Congress decide to shield its eyes to the true sinister intent of this legislation? Did the Senate Judiciary Committee, which approved the bill by voice vote, decide to look the other way? This is a committee that includes former prosecutors, state attorneys general, and U.S. attorneys who, at the time, included both the current Attorney General of the United States and the current Senate minority leader.

Are we seriously to believe that Jeff Sessions, the toughest foe of illegal drugs I have ever known in my entire life, sat on his hands while Congress eviscerated the DEA's enforcement authority? No, of course not.

To merely state these allegations is to make clear how utterly ridiculous they really are. Not one Senator or Member of the House opposed this bill. Do you know why? Because DEA, the very agency the bill impacts, the very agency that supposedly can no longer do its job because of this legislation, agreed to let it go forward.

Let me be clear. The DEA could have stopped this bill. They could have stopped it at any time. In fact, they did stop a previous version in 2014 that had different language. I spent months negotiating with DEA and with DOJ until they were at a point they were comfortable allowing the bill to proceed. If they had asked me to hold the bill or to continue negotiations, I would have done so.

I brought the bill to markup only after DEA and DOJ agreed with me on a path forward. Anyone who claims that I or anyone else steamrolled DEA and DOJ on this bill is either ignorant or woefully misinformed.

That brings me to another point that was largely lost in all the insinuations in the Washington Post article. The language that purportedly eviscerated DEA's enforcement power—that is, the requirement that the DEA show a substantial likelihood of immediate threat before issuing an immediate suspension order—was written by DEA and DOJ lawyers and provided to Hill staff as a proposed compromise.

So let's get this straight. Congress took language that DEA and DOJ

wrote, inserted it into the bill, and now Congress is the bad guy? I should note that other aspects of DEA and DOJ's proposed language changed, but that key phrase "substantial likelihood of an immediate threat"—the phrase that critics now point to as gutting DEA's enforcement authority—came from DEA and DOJ. And lest we forget, President Obama signed the bill into law on the advice of his own DEA Administrator.

I think we need to be candid about what is going on here. Opponents of the current administration are trying to derail the President's nominee to be head of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Representative TOM MARINO, by mischaracterizing and trying to rewrite the history of a bill that he championed. They are being aided in their efforts by a group of former DEA employees who took an extremely hard line against drug companies when they were at the Agency and who are upset that the DEA chose to pursue a more collaborative approach after they left. I don't fault these individuals for their passion, but I do reject the notion that there was some sort of sinister conspiracy at play. And I find it unconscionable that critics of the bill and of Representative MARINO would flat-out ignore the very real patient concerns that motivated this bill and motivated my personal involvement with it. You think this bill was a sop to the drug industry? Tell that to the Fibromyalgia and Chronic Pain Network. Tell that to the American Academy of Pain Management. Tell that to the Drug Free America Foundation.

If we are going to make this bill a political football and try to use it to sink Representative MARINO's nomination, let's tell the full story. Let's be fair. Let's at least be honest. Let's not gin up a one-sided narrative based entirely on the statements of former Agency officials who disagreed with the change of leadership.

No matter how you try to spin it, this is not the latest episode of "House of Cards." Rather, let's be clear that Members of this body negotiated this bill in good faith with the DEA and the Department of Justice. Let's be clear—the DEA and DOJ themselves generated the language that critics now claim is so problematic. Let's remember that this bill passed by unanimous consent and that every single Member of this body and the House of Representatives agreed to it. Let's remember, too, that the DEA and DOJ could have stopped this bill at any time if they had wanted to but instead chose to allow it to proceed. After all, they stopped an earlier version in 2014 that had different language. They could have stopped it again. And even after the bill passed Congress, they could have advised President Obama not to sign on. Don't forget that the bill bears his signature. Let's not pretend that

DEA, both Houses of Congress, and the Obama White House all somehow wilted under Representative MARINO's nefarious influences.

Provocative headlines and clever framing may drive page hits, but this body's decisions should be based on the full story. It should be based on all the facts. A single news article that tells only one side of the story should not derail a nominee who has a long history of fighting illegal drug use and of helping individuals with chronic conditions obtain treatment. Let's not ignore the full story here in the rush toward easy politics.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

PUERTO RICO RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to talk about a matter of life and death. It is happening, as we speak, in Puerto Rico. I went there yesterday. I didn't want to have a flyover of the island, but at the invitation of Governor Rosselló, I got into a helicopter so that I could get up into the mountains and into the areas that have been closed because people hadn't been able to get there on the roads. That is what I wanted to see.

We have had colleagues come back and, because of a flyover in a helicopter, say that they say don't see a lot of damage. Of course not, because they are flying over parts of towns in which most of the structures are concrete blocks. But if you get down there on the ground and go into the structure, then you will see a different story.

First of all, you will smell a different story because the water has accumulated, and now it is turning to mold and mildew—inhabitable conditions. But when you get up into the mountains, you see the places that were cut off. Not until a week ago did they have the roads cleared so that people could get up there. And as we speak, as of yesterday, they are still reconstructing the roads so that people can get on these narrow, winding, little dirt roads that go up through the mountains. So for 2 and a half weeks, communities have been completely cut off, like the one that I saw yesterday, Utuado, which is way up in the mountains.

I want to show you some pictures, but I want you to realize that today is Monday. Next Wednesday will be 4 weeks since the hurricane hit. Can you imagine going into a State with 3.5 million people and 85 percent of the people do not have electricity? And by the way, these are our fellow American citizens; they are just in a territory. Can you imagine going into a State where a month after the hurricane, 50 percent of the people do not have potable water? It is an absolute outrage. And I don't think the American people realize what is happening.

Let me be your eyes by what I saw yesterday. This is a river bottom in the

little town of Utuado. This side of the river is cut off from this side of the river because the one bridge washed out. If you look at this structure, the question is, How long is this going to last? It is tilting to the left. Any major rush of water is going to take out this section.

I want you to see how creative these people are. It is hard to see at this distance, but they erected a cable system going over to the other side. They took the basket of a grocery cart, took the wheels and handles off, and this is on a pulley, and these guys are pulling it over here and then they pull it back. This is how people on this side of the river are getting food and water and medicine if they can't walk across. This is how people are surviving. If this section of the bridge goes—and it is just a matter of time—they are going to try to hook up a cable over here at the top of this riverbank over to the top of this riverbank and do the same kind of pulley.

Here in the States, on the mainland, if something like this happened, the Corps of Engineers would be there. We would be rebuilding. The Department of Transportation would be rebuilding that bridge. These are our fellow American citizens, and they are going with-out.

Let me show you another picture. This is the bank of another river. Let me show you the result. This is what happened. You see this whole house right behind here. I will show you the church in a minute. I asked the pastor: Did the people survive? He said that one was trapped in the house. They were able to get that person out. The others had already fled. But you can see that with the force of the extra rain and the water coming down, houses like that are history.

Here is that same section of the river with the church in the background. The church survived. I talked to the pastor of the church. Here I am having a conversation with the people who live on this side. I asked the pastor whether he lost any parishioners. He did not. On the side of his church, he has a dish, and because he has a generator, he is the only person in this town who has any kind of communication—in this case, through the satellite dish for television. Everything else is being run on generators because there is no electricity. As you know, these generators are not powerful enough to run air-conditioners; therefore, the water accumulates. Mold and mildew start to accumulate, with all the health effects as a result of that.

Does this look like something we would have in this country, or does this look like a third world country? Do the images in these photographs bring to mind other Caribbean nations that we have seen that have been devastated by earthquakes and hurricanes? Think about what happened to Haiti.

When people go to San Juan—by the way, 85 percent of San Juan is without power. You see these little pockets, and of course they are trying to get the generators going in the hospitals for obvious reasons. They need the generators to go to stations where people are getting their dialysis treatments. That is obvious. But what about the wear and tear on the generators and the replacements?

The Governor of Puerto Rico, Governor Rosselló, has a very ambitious schedule: He wants to restore 95 percent of power by the middle of December. I hope the Governor is right. It has been turned over to the Army Corps of Engineers to get the electrical grid and structures up and running. I am afraid it is going to be a lot longer. I asked for estimates on the immediate needs, especially rebuilding the grid. He said \$4 billion. Are we going to be able to get that for them?

What are going to be the ultimate needs of Puerto Rico? We just heard the Senator from Texas talk about his State and the estimates that you heard out of Texas being as much as \$100 billion. What about the needs of Puerto Rico? What about the needs of Florida? What about the needs of the Virgin Islands?

We have a supplemental coming up, but is that going to take care of the needs of all of those four areas that have been hit hard? If Texas is \$100 billion, a long-term fix for Puerto Rico may well be \$80 billion to \$90 billion. And who knows what it is going to be for Florida and the Virgin Islands. Therefore, are we in this Congress, with or without the leadership of the White House, going to have the stomach to help our fellow American citizens? I am sure we are going to help Texas, and I certainly hope we will help my State of Florida, but are we willing to help the American citizens in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico? It is not a rosy picture, but we hear some Members of Congress come back and say they didn't see a lot of damage. It is people using a pulley they have jerry-rigged across a river to survive with daily supplies of food and fuel and water. You can't see that from the air. If you have no power, you have no water, and you have no sewer systems, then, what you have is chaos.

It has been a month since Hurricane Maria hit Puerto Rico. The hospitals are rationing services while they struggle to get the medicines and the fuel they need to power the generators. The dialysis centers are struggling to get the water and fuel they need to operate.

Like many, I have written, in this case, to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, to urge the Department to do more to help these dialysis centers obtain the supplies they need.

I wanted to come to the floor of the Senate, having gotten back very late

last night from Puerto Rico, and tell the Senate that more needs to be done, and it is going to have to be done for a very long period of time. We have to do more to ensure that the supplies that are reaching the island are getting to those who need them.

Remember, things got piled up in the ports in the first week, and they didn't get out to be distributed. Senator RUBIO and I were saying at the time that it is going to take the U.S. military, which is uniquely organized and capable of distribution of long logistical lines. It wasn't until a week after the hurricane that three-star General Buchanan was put in charge. I met with him and the head of FEMA down in the Puerto Rico area. Finally, those supplies are getting out. These are supplies for survival.

We need to pass a disaster relief package that fully funds Puerto Rico's recovery. We need to provide Puerto Rico with the community development block grant money that Governor Rosselló has requested, just like we need the CDBGs for Texas and Florida and the Virgin Islands as well. We need to make Puerto Rico eligible for permanent work assistance so they can start to rebuild their infrastructure immediately.

I want to make something fairly clear. There should be absolutely no ambiguity about what is going on in Puerto Rico. It isn't rosy. It isn't that you can sit in a comfortable seat in a helicopter looking down from 1,500 or 2,000 feet on structures that look like they are intact, when, in fact, the reality on the ground below is completely different. Certainly, they didn't go up there and see all those bridges washed out in the mountains. They didn't see people scrambling for food. They didn't see the Puerto Rican National Guard rebuilding that little narrow dirt road winding along the banks of that river. They didn't see or walk into the buildings where you would almost be overwhelmed with the smells—the smells, particularly, of mold and mildew.

People have died as a result of this hurricane. People have died because of the lack of supplies and power. Our fellow Americans are dying, and they desperately need our help.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I have seen it with my own eyes on the ground, and I am here to urge this Congress and the administration that we have to act and act for a very long period of time.

Our citizens in Puerto Rico need our help. We have the responsibility to help fellow citizens in need.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gingrich nomination?

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 217 Ex.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Ernst	Murray
Baldwin	Feinstein	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Bennet	Flake	Reed
Blunt	Franken	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Cantwell	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heitkamp	Sasse
Cardin	Heller	Schumer
Carper	Hoeven	Scott
Casey	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kaine	Strange
Coons	Kennedy	Sullivan
Corker	King	Thune
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Toomey
Cotton	Lee	Warner
Crapo	Manchin	Whitehouse
Cruz	McCaskill	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Young
Donnelly	Murkowski	
Enzi	Murphy	

NAYS—23

Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Stabenow
Brown	Leahy	Tester
Duckworth	Markey	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Nelson	Warren
Harris	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—7

Cochran	McCain	Portman
Graham	Menendez	
Isakson	Moran	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Gingrich nomination, the motion to consider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Trachtenberg nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David Joel Trachtenberg, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF TOM MARINO

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the addiction epidemic is a national emergency that takes far too many lives and destroys too many families across the country. Unfortunately, my State, in some ways, leads the way. Four thousand Ohioans died from drug overdoses last year, more than any State in the United States. Four thousand families lost a mother, a father, a daughter, a son, a sister, or brother.

We need to treat this epidemic like the public health emergency it is. We asked the President to proclaim it a public health emergency. He talked about it but still hasn't done it.

That is the same reason I can't support Representative TOM MARINO's nomination to head our country's drug control policy. First of all, fundamentally, I don't want an elected official, a politician, in that position. I want somebody from the treatment community. Congressman MARINO is a nominee who, in his time in Congress, showed he was too cozy with the drug companies that helped create this epidemic.

Earlier today, President Trump responded to reports about Congressman MARINO and said he is looking at those reports very closely. I hope he does. I hope he withdraws that nomination. Make no mistake, Congressman MARINO does not want to take us in the right direction in this fight.

Today I was in Austintown—a township on the edge of Youngstown, in Mahoning County—talking to Officer Toth and Chief Cavalier at the Austintown Police Department about the opioid crisis. It is coming up on Drug Take Back Day, where on Saturday all over the country, the DEA is asking police departments to allow people to bring their unused drugs in to get them out of the medicine cabinets. We were talking about much more than that. We were talking about how State governments and the Federal Government haven't stepped up the way we should to partner on prevention and education in medication-assisted ther-

apy treatment and all the things we should be doing.

Mr. MARINO seems to think we arrest our way out of this problem, but that is not what law enforcement officials across this country are saying. Detective Toth and I didn't talk about arresting people's children and arresting parents. We talked about how to promote the Department's Drug Take Back Day.

Addiction isn't an individual problem or a character flaw; it is a chronic disease. We need someone running our drug policy who understands that, not someone who simply wants to pull patients out of treatment in the middle of an epidemic. We know what that was about when on this floor, not much more than a month ago, only by one vote were we able to preserve the treatment that so many opioid-addicted people are getting. Right now, in my State, 200,000 Ohioans are getting opioid treatment because they have insurance under the Affordable Care Act.

We need the enforcement piece. That is why I have introduced the bipartisan INTERDICT Act and why I have worked with Senator PORTMAN on this to make sure we have resources for Customs and Border Protection agents to screen packages effectively and safely before they reach our neighborhood.

It has been more than 8 weeks since President Trump promised a national disaster declaration. We have yet to see a strategy from the White House. Other than a nominee who thinks one locks people up to defeat the opioid epidemic, we have seen no strategy from the White House to deal with the epidemic. Ohio families cannot afford to wait.

Let me close with this. A few months ago, I was in Cincinnati, at the Talbert House, and I met with a father who was there with his 30-year-old daughter. He told me that his daughter would not be there right now, that she would not still be alive, if it were not for Medicaid and the treatment for addiction that she received because of it.

We know what we have to do to deal with this epidemic. I ask the President to do the right thing, and I ask the Senate to do the right thing and move forward. It is the biggest public health emergency in our lifetimes. We need the people who are in charge of our drug control policy to treat it that way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me echo the remarks of the senior Senator from Ohio.

Like Ohio, Rhode Island has a very significant opioid problem, and we came together in this Chamber to support the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. I had the privilege of being the principal Democratic author of that piece of legislation, and Senator PORTMAN of Ohio was the principal

Republican author of that legislation. We worked for years to set it up—to hold the hearings necessary, to get the information together, to make it work. When we did, it passed this body with a massive bipartisan expression of support.

It makes no sense to nominate somebody to this position who does not understand what we understand, which is that the drug epidemic is, at its heart, a public health emergency and an illness. A reversion to law enforcement harshness in dealing with this problem will simply not be effective.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, now, if I may, I turn to my 182nd appearance to remind us of the global crisis of climate change, which has recently come so perilously close to our American shores.

This recent graphic from NOAA shows above-average temperatures in our oceans. Anything that is pink is above average; if it is reddish, it is much warmer than average; and if it is really red, like here, that is a record. That is the warmest record.

As one can see, from 2015, 2016, and 2017, the oceans have warmed significantly, and warmer oceans mean stronger storms. It is as simple as that. In this hurricane season, Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria have all struck the United States. It is the first time ever that the United States has been hit by three category 4 Atlantic storms in 1 year. Hurricane Ophelia, now out in the Atlantic, has become the 10th consecutive hurricane-strength storm. That ties a record that was set way back in the 1800s. We have gone more than a century without having this kind of storm activity. It is a rarity, but it is going to be less and less of a rarity because the oceans are warmer. That powers up those big storms, and those big storms bring damage to property and infrastructure. They destroy businesses and homes.

Away from the coastline, other aspects of climate change bring an array of other harms, like longer and fiercer wildfire seasons, as California is experiencing; depleted fish stocks, as our Rhode Island fishermen are experiencing; decreased agricultural yields, as the Midwest is experiencing; acidifying seas, as the northwest coast is experiencing; and risks to human health from new disease vectors and hotter heat waves felt across our country. All of these harms carry costs. Together, these costs are known as the social cost of carbon pollution. It is the cost to people and to communities of carbon pollution and climate change.

During the Obama administration, by scientists and economists from across the Federal Government who relied on scientific literature and well-vetted models, the social cost of carbon was put at around \$50 per ton of carbon dioxide. There is a new book out by a number of conservative economists and

scientists that looks at the climate change problem and recommends a revenue-neutral, border-adjustable carbon fee as a solution. In that book, the exemplar carbon price also runs at about \$50 per ton of emitted carbon. It tracks from the Obama administration to conservative analysts as well.

This social cost of carbon is well established. Over and over, courts have instructed Federal agencies to factor the social cost of carbon into their permits and regulations. States are using a social cost of carbon in their policy-making. Major American corporations—even ExxonMobil—factor a social cost of carbon into their planning and accounting, and the social cost of carbon is at the heart of the International Monetary Fund's calculation that the fossil fuel industry gets an annual subsidy in the United States of \$700 billion—that is “billion” with a “b.”

The point of this particular speech is that a new calculation has emerged, not just of the harm of carbon pollution, but of how individual fossil fuel companies have contributed to that harm. This was not just some op-ed, nor was it the phony hack science that the fossil fuel industry cranks out to propagate climate denial on the talk show circuit. This is a peer-reviewed study that was published in the scientific journal *Climatic Change*.

The study tells us that major fossil fuel producers are responsible for as much as half of the recorded global surface temperature increase. Then it dives down into the data for individual companies and demonstrates a method for attributing the real, observable effects of climate change to the likes of Chevron, ExxonMobil, ConocoPhillips, Peabody Energy, Arch Coal, and Devon Energy, among about 50 investor-owned, carbon-producing companies.

The history here is telling. More than half of all emissions that were traced to carbon producers from 1880 to 2010—across a span of 130 years—were produced after 1986, which was just in the last 24 years. This was when the climate risks of fossil fuel combustion were well established. Those were the years in which we knew. Many of these companies knew the harm of their fossil fuel products; yet they carried out a decades-long campaign to deceive the public about the risks of fossil fuel energy production and to bring influence to bear on this institution.

These companies knew that their products posed a threat to the global environment. They could have taken steps to reduce emissions. They could have invested in new technologies and emissions reduction technologies and renewable energy. They could have communicated honestly with their shareholders and with the public. They chose not to—an infamous decision that has kept carbon pollution dumping into the atmosphere, where it will

affect the chemistry, the physics, and the biology of our planet for centuries to come. This is this generation's sad and sordid legacy.

This study shows that we can trace those harms back to individual companies, to their boards of directors, and to their managers. We can use the emissions data from this study. In using those established social cost of carbon estimates, we can estimate individual corporate accountability. This is new.

In using the study's emissions data and the social cost of carbon, we can calculate, for instance, the carbon pollution cost for which ExxonMobil is accountable. If one does this for 2010—just that 1-year's worth—the cost to the rest of us was over \$22 billion. For Chevron, in 2010, it was \$14.5 billion. For BP, it was \$18.8 billion just for the harm that they caused in 2010. What about some of the major coal companies, like Peabody and Arch? Pollution attributable to Peabody Energy had a cost of \$17.8 billion just for 2010. For Arch Coal, it was \$11.7 billion. For Devon Energy, it was \$3 billion. Devon, one may remember, is the company whose lobbying letter EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt put on his official Oklahoma attorney general letterhead, in the masquerade of official duty on behalf of special interests, which is still his hallmark now that he is at the EPA. If we add up all of this, we are looking at \$88 billion in attributable damages—attributable to ExxonMobil, Chevron, BP, Peabody, Arch, and Devon—just for 2010. That is a 1-year cost that we all bear for allowing these polluters to pollute our air and oceans for free. That is why the IMF said that the subsidy was \$700 billion.

As nature has so powerfully shown us this year, taxpayers, communities, and local businesses, especially those in vulnerable coastal areas, bear the cost of the irresponsible choices these big polluters have made. This is the cost these companies transferred to us by spending millions of dollars in deceiving the public about climate science and in using millions more in political spending in order to block sensible limits on carbon emissions. They spent millions to dodge billions, and we let them get away with it.

Perhaps judges and juries will be less manipulable. After all, one of the reasons that the Founding Fathers set up an independent judiciary and independent juries is that, in their being experienced politicians, they had seen that the political branches of government could be captured by special interests—what the Founders would have called factions—just as we now are captured by the fossil fuel industry here in Congress.

The average number of billion-dollar weather disasters is about five per year. That is the average in any given year, about five over the long term.

Here we are, and it is only October, and 2017 has already seen 15 billion-dollar weather disasters—15 of them just this year, so far.

But the real multibillion-dollar disaster is a captured Congress. We actually have a remedy right before us that ought to be a bipartisan remedy: a carbon fee like the one Senator SCHATZ and I introduced in our American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act. Virtually every Republican who has thought the climate change problem through to a solution comes to the same place. They all come to the same place: Put a price on carbon emissions, let the market work, avoid what is called the negative externality of the carbon polluters not having to pay for their harm, make the economics correct by virtually everybody's economic principles, and take the revenue that is collected from that price on carbon and return it all to the American people. It is a border-adjustable, revenue-neutral carbon fee. Former Republican Treasury Secretaries Baker, Schultz, and Paulson, and former Republican EPA Administrators Ruckelshaus, Thomas, Reilly, and Whitman and leading Republican conservative economists and former Republican Presidential advisers Arthur Laffer, Gregory Mankiw, and Douglas Holtz-Eakin, among many, many others, support a revenue-neutral, border-adjustable carbon fee. It is the market approach of properly pricing this pollution to eliminate that negative externality and to put the cost into the price of the product in the way that Economics 101 suggests it should be to avoid giving this industry this massive subsidy. That is where the Republicans who thought this through want us to be.

On my side, our answer is yes, but here in Congress, are we there yet? We just will not do it. We just will not do it because the shadow of the fossil fuel industry's millions of dollars in deception and political muscle power falls too darkly on this supposedly august institution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 164.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Kerner, of California, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, for the term of five years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there any further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kerner nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 217, on the nomination of Callista Gingrich to be Ambassador to the Holy See. Had I been present, I would have voted yea. •

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA, Oct. 12, 2017.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-26, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Kuwait for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$342.6 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-26

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Kuwait.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$0.0 million.

Other \$342.6 million.

Total \$342.6 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE: Non-MDE items and services for three years (with option for two additional years) of follow-on support of two (2) C-17 aircraft includes participation in the Globemaster III Integrated Sustainment Program (GISP), contract logistic support, Class I modifications and kits support, in-country contractor support, alternate mission equipment, major modification and retrofit, software support, aircraft maintenance and technical support, support equipment, personnel training and training equipment, additional spare and repair parts, technical orders and publications, airworthiness certification support, engine spares, engine maintenance and logistics support, inspections support, on-site COMSEC support, Quality Assurance and other U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics and program support. Required upgrades will include fixed installation satellite antenna, Mode 5, plus installation and sustainment, Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast Out, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-QAH).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: KU-D-SAA.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 12, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Kuwait—Continuation of C-17 Logistics Support Services and Equipment

The Government of Kuwait has requested three years (with option for two additional years) of follow-on support of two (2) C-17 aircraft, which includes participation in the

Globemaster III Integrated Sustainment Program (GISP), contract logistic support, Class I modifications and kits support, in-country contractor support, alternate mission equipment, major modification and retrofit, software support, aircraft maintenance and technical support, support equipment, personnel training and training equipment, additional spare and repair parts, technical orders and publications, airworthiness certification support, engine spares, engine maintenance and logistics support, inspections support, on-site COMSEC support, Quality Assurance and other U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, and program support. Required upgrades will include fixed installation satellite antenna, Mode 5, plus installation and sustainment, Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast Out, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$342.6 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country. Kuwait plays a large role in U.S. efforts to advance stability in the Middle East, providing basing, access, and transit for U.S. forces in the region.

This proposed sale is required to maintain the operational readiness of the Kuwaiti Air Force C-17 aircraft. Kuwait's current FMS contract supporting its C-17's will expire in September of 2017. Kuwait will have no difficulty absorbing this support.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be the Boeing Company, Chicago, IL. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

There is an on-going Foreign Military Sale (FMS) case providing C-17 sustainment services. There are currently nine (9) contractors from Boeing Company (aircraft) in-country providing Contractor Engineering Technical Services (CETS) on a continuing basis.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-26

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. This sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to the Government of Kuwait in the performance of services to sustain two (2) Kuwaiti C-17 aircraft. While much of the below equipment supporting the C-17 is not new to the country, there will be replenishment spares of these following sensitive technologies purchased to support the fleet.

2. The Force 524D is a 24-channel Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) based Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver with Precise Positioning Service (PPS) capability built upon Trimble's next generation GPS technology. The Force 524D retains backward compatibility with the proven Force 5GS while adding new functionality to interface with digital antenna electronics to significantly improve Anti-Jam (AJ) performance. The host platform can select the radio frequency (RF) or Digital Antenna Electronics (DAE) interface. In the digital mode, the Force 524D is capable of controlling up to 16 independent beams. The hardware and software associ-

ated with the 542D receiver card is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. The C-17 aircraft will be equipped with the GPS Anti-Jam System (GAS-1) antenna which consists of a multi-element Controlled Reception Pattern Antennas (CRPA) and separate antenna electronics which is able to recognize multiple sources of deliberate jamming and other electrical interference allowing the navigation equipment to function safely, accurately, and efficiently in the presence of multiple jammers. The hardware is UNCLASSIFIED.

4. The GPS Inertial Reference Unit (IRU) is a type of inertial sensor which uses only gyroscopes to determine a moving aircraft's change in angular direction over a period of time. Unlike the inertial measurement unit, IRUs are generally not equipped with accelerometers, which measure acceleration forces.

IRUs are used for altitude control and navigation of vehicles with relatively constant acceleration rates, such as larger aircraft as well as geosynchronous satellites and deep space probes. The GPS IRU is UNCLASSIFIED.

5. Crypto appliqué for Mode 5 Identification Friend or Foe (IFF), which includes hardware that is UNCLASSIFIED.

6. Software, hardware, and other data/information, which is sensitive, is reviewed prior to release to protect system vulnerabilities, design data, and performance parameters. Potential compromise of these systems is controlled through management of the basic software programs of highly sensitive systems and software-controlled weapon systems on a case-by-case basis.

7. Kuwait is both willing and able to protect United States Classified Military Information (CMI). Kuwaiti physical and document security standards are equivalent to U.S. standards. Kuwait has demonstrated its willingness and capability to protect sensitive military technology and information released to its military in the past. Kuwait is firmly committed to its relationship with the U.S. and to its promise to protect CMI and prevent its transfer to a third party. The Government of Kuwait signed a Technical Security Arrangement (TSA) with the USG on 01 January 1989 that commits them to the protection of CMI.

8. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware or software source code in this proposed sale, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of systems with similar or advanced capabilities. The benefits to be derived from this sale in the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons.

9. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Kuwait.

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION

AGENCY,

Arlington, VA, October 11, 2017.

Hon. BOB CORKER,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-47, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Govern-

ment of the Czech Republic for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$575 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,

Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-47

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of the Czech Republic.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$335.9 million.

Other \$239.1 million.

Total \$575.0 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): Twelve (12) UH-1Y Utility Helicopters. Twenty-five (25) T-700 GE 401C Engines (twenty-four (24) installed, one (1) spare). Thirteen (13) Honeywell Embedded Global Positioning Systems (GPS)/Inertial Navigation System (INS) (EGI) (twelve (12) installed, one (1) spare). Twelve (12) 7.62mm M240 Machine Guns.

Non-MDE includes: Brite Star II FLIR system, Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) (includes the AN/AAR-47 Missile Warning and Laser Detection System, AN/ALE-47 Counter Measure Dispensing System (CMDS) and the AN/APR-39 Radar Warning Receiver (RWR)), Joint Mission Planning Systems, Helmet Mounted Displays, communication equipment, small caliber gun systems including GAU-17A and GAU-21, electronic warfare systems, Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Mode 4/5 transponder, support equipment, spare engine containers, spare and repair parts, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 11, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Czech Republic—UH-1Y Utility Helicopters

The Government of the Czech Republic has requested the possible sale of twelve (12) UH-1Y utility helicopters, twenty-five (25) T-700 GE 401C engines (twenty-four (24) installed, one (1) spare), thirteen (13) Honeywell Embedded GPS/INS (EGI) (twelve (12) installed, one (1) spare), and twelve (12) 7.62mm M240 Machine Guns. This request also includes Brite Star II FLIR system, Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) (includes the AN/AAR-47 Missile Warning and Laser Detection System, AN/ALE-47 Counter Measure Dispensing System (CMDS) and the AN/APR-39 Radar Warning Receiver (RWR)), Joint Mission Planning Systems, Helmet Mounted Displays, communication equipment, small caliber gun systems including GAU-17A and GAU-21, electronic warfare systems, Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Mode 4/5 transponder, support equipment, spare engine containers, spare and repair parts, tools and test

equipment, technical data and publications, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$575 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO partner that is an important force for ensuring peace and stability in Europe. The proposed sale will support the Czech Republic's needs for its own self-defense and support NATO defense goals.

The Czech Republic intends to use these helicopters to modernize its armed forces and strengthen its homeland defense and deter regional threats. This will contribute to the Czech Republic's military goal of updating its capabilities while further enhancing interoperability with the United States and other NATO allies. The Czech Republic will have no difficulty absorbing these helicopters into its armed forces.

This proposed sale of equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractors will be Bell Helicopter, Textron, Fort Worth, Texas; and General Electric Company, Lynn, Massachusetts. There are no known offset agreements proposed in conjunction with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require multiple trips by U.S. Government and contractor representatives to participate in program and technical reviews plus training and maintenance support in country, on a temporary basis, for a period of twenty-four (24) months. It will also require three (3) Contractor Engineering Technical Service (CETS) representatives to reside in country for a period of two (2) years to support this program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-47

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The following components and technical documentation for the program are classified as listed below:

a. The UH-1Y model has an Integrated Avionics System (IAS) which includes two (2) mission computers and an automatic flight control system. Each crew station has two (2) 8 x 6-inch multifunction liquid crystal displays (LCD) and one (1) 4.2 x 4.2-inch dual function LCD display. The communications suite will have COMSEC ARC-210 Ultra High Frequency Very High Frequency (UHF/VHF) radios with associated communications equipment. The navigation suite includes Honeywell Embedded Global Positioning System (GPS) Inertial Navigation System (INS) (EGI) w/Precise Positioning Service (PPS), a digital map system, a low-air-speed air data subsystem, and an AN/APX-123A(V) IFF Transponder.

b. The crew is equipped with the Optimized Top Owl (OTO) helmet-mounted sight and display system. The OTO has a Day Display Module (DDM) and a Night Display Module (NDM). The UH-1Y has survivability equipment including the AN/AAR-47 Missile Warning and Laser Detection System, AN/ALE-47 Counter Measure Dispensing System (CMDS) and the AN/APR-39 Radar Warning Receiver

(RWR) to cover countermeasure dispensers, radar warning, incoming/on-way missile warning and on-fuselage laser-spot warning systems.

c. The following performance data and technical characteristics are classified as follows for the UH-1Y Airframe: countermeasure capability—up to SECRET, countermeasures capability—SECRET, vulnerability to countermeasures—SECRET, vulnerability to electromagnetic pulse from nuclear environmental effects—SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness.

3. The consequences of the loss of this technology to a technologically advanced or competent adversary could result in the compromise of equivalent systems, which in turn could reduce those weapons systems' effectiveness, or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that the Czech Republic can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale of the UH-1Y helicopter and associated weapons will further U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the Czech Republic.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY
Arlington, VA, Oct. 11, 2017.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-46, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the Netherlands for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$53 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-46

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: The Government of the Netherlands.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment * \$48 million.
Other \$5 million.
Total \$53 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Twenty-six (26) AIM-120 C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM). One (1) AMRAAM Spare Guidance Section.

Non-MDE: Twenty (20) AMRAAM Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM), missile containers, control section spares, weapon systems support, test equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documentation, personnel training, training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, technical support

services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-YAE).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: NE-D-YME for two hundred (200) AIM-120B.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 11, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of the Netherlands—AIM-120 C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM)

The Government of the Netherlands has requested a possible sale of twenty-six (26) AIM-120 C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM), one (1) AMRAAM Guidance Section Spare (MDE items), twenty (20) AMRAAM Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM), missile containers, control section spares, weapon systems support, test equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documentation, personnel training, training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, technical support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value is \$53 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally which continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve the Netherlands' capabilities for mutual defense, regional security, force modernization, and U.S. and NATO interoperability. This sale will enhance the Royal Netherlands Air Force's ability to defend the Netherlands against future threats and contribute to current and future NATO operations. The Netherlands maintains the AIM-120B in its inventory and will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, AZ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government personnel or contractor representatives to the Netherlands.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-46

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. AIM-120C Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) is a radar-guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic counter measures, and interception of high flying, low flying, and maneuvering targets. The AMRAAM is classified CONFIDENTIAL, major components and subsystems range

from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL, and technology data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary obtains knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the Government of the Netherlands can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the Netherlands.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA, Oct. 6, 2017.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-28, concerning the Missile Defense Agency's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$15 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA Director.

Enclosure.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-28

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

- (i) Prospective Purchaser: Saudi Arabia.
- (ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment * \$9 billion.
Other \$6 billion.
Total \$15 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Forty-four (44) Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) Launchers.

Three hundred sixty (360) THAAD Interceptor Missiles.

Sixteen (16) THAAD Fire Control and Communications Mobile Tactical Station Group.

Seven (7) AN/TPY-2 THAAD Radars.

Non-MDE:

Also included are THAAD Battery maintenance equipment, forty-three (43) prime movers (trucks), generators, electrical power units, trailers, communications equipment, tools, test and maintenance equipment, repair and return, system integration and checkout, spare/repair parts, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics personnel support services, facilities construction, studies, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Departments: Missile Defense Agency (XX-I-W1B, XX-I-WIC); Army (XX-B-TFP, XX-B-BDP, XX-B-ZAO, XX-B-DAH, XX-B-ZAQ, XX-B-OZY, XX-B-HFA); NSA (XX-M-AAG).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: SR-I-WIA Basic, 2 February 2015; Amendment 1, 25 August 2016.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 6, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Saudi Arabia—Terminal High Altitude Area Defense and Related Support Equipment and Services

The Government of Saudi Arabia has requested a possible sale of forty-four (44) Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) launchers, three hundred sixty (360) THAAD Interceptor Missiles, sixteen (16) THAAD Fire Control and Communications Mobile Tactical Station Group, seven (7) AN/TPY-2 THAAD radars. Also included are THAAD Battery maintenance equipment, forty-three (43) prime movers (trucks), generators, electrical power units, trailers, communications equipment, tools, test and maintenance equipment, repair and return, system integration and checkout, spare/repair parts, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics personnel support services, facilities construction, studies, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$15 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a friendly country. This sale furthers U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, and supports the long-term security of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf region in the face of Iranian and other regional threats. This potential sale will substantially increase Saudi Arabia's capability to defend itself against the growing ballistic missile threat in the region. THAAD's exo-atmospheric, hit-to-kill capability will add an upper-tier to Saudi Arabia's layered missile defense architecture and will support modernization of the Royal Saudi Air Defense Force (RSADF). Saudi Arabia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractors for the THAAD system are Lockheed Martin Space Systems Corporation, Dallas, TX, Camden, AR, Troy, AL and Huntsville, AL; and Raytheon Corporation, Andover, MA. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require one hundred eleven (111) contractor representatives and eighteen (18) U.S. Government personnel in country for an extended period of time.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-28

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Terminal High Altitude Area Defense System (THAAD) Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) System contains classified CONFIDENTIAL/SECRET components and crit-

ical/sensitive technology. The THAAD Fire Unit is a ground-based, forward deployable terminal missile defense system that represents significant technological advances. The THAAD system continues to hold a technology lead over other terminal ballistic missile systems. THAAD is the first weapon system with both endo- and exo-atmospheric capability developed specifically to defend against ballistic missiles. The higher altitude and theater-wide protection offered by THAAD provides more protection of larger areas than lower-tier systems alone. THAAD is designed to defend against short, medium, and intermediate range ballistic missiles. The THAAD system consists of four major components: Fire Control/Communications, Radar, Launchers, and Interceptor Missiles.

2. The THAAD BMD System contains sensitive/critical technology, primarily in the area of defense and production know-how and primarily inherent in the design, development and/or manufacturing data related to certain critical components. Information on operational effectiveness with respect to countermeasures and counter-countermeasures, low observable technologies, select software documentation and test data are classified up to and including SECRET.

3. The THAAD BMD System contains Controlled Cryptographic Items (CCI) that are used for both system internal links and for external communications. These items consist of key loading devices, network encryptors, secure telephones, voice radios, tactical data radios, and mission data radios. Specific CCI used for the Saudi Arabia case will be determined through the COMSEC Release Request (CRR) process, initiated through USCENCOM once an interoperability requirement has been established. NSA will identify releasable items, in parallel with staffing and validation of the CRR by the Joint Staff. The Committee for National Security Systems (CNSS) reviews and provides final approval of the items and quantities.

4. AN/VCR-90, AN/VCR-91, AN/VCR-92 are different configurations of the Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINGARS) family. SINGARS is a tactical radio providing secure jam-resistant voice and data communications of command, control, targeting, and technical information for the Terminal High Altitude Air Defense (THAAD) system. The spread-spectrum frequency hopping Electronic Counter-Counter Measures (ECCM) technology resident in the radio is sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED. While sensitive, the frequency-hopping algorithms used to generate the ECCM waveform are unique to the country of ownership and cannot be manipulated by potential adversaries for use or interference with other countries possessing SINGARS technology. Should a potential adversary come into possession of one of these radios, they would have the potential to intercept operational command, control, and targeting information. This potential problem is mitigated by the fact that the customer can secure information passed over the radio network using a commercial grade security capability equivalent to an Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) 256-bit encryption system whose keys are controlled by the customer country.

5. As with the SINGARS family of radios, the AN/PRC-117 is a tactical radio providing ECCM jam-resistant secure communications for exchange of command, control, and targeting information within the THAAD system tactical radio network. ECCM capabilities are sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED and algorithms for these jam-resistant waveforms are unique to the customer country.

Unlike the SINCGARS radios, the AN/PRC-117 uses Type 1 encryption. When loaded with U.S. crypto keys, the system is then CLASSIFIED up to SECRET. Should a potential adversary come into possession of one of these radios, the customer country can quickly remotely rekey remaining radios, preventing potential adversaries from understanding received command, control, and targeting information.

6. The Defense Advanced Global Positioning System (GPS) Receiver (DAGR) is a handheld GPS location device with map background displaying the user's location. Unlike commercial grade GPS receivers capable of receiving Standard Positioning Signals (SPS) from GPS satellites, the DAGR is capable of receiving Precise Positioning Signals (PPS). PPS satellite signals provide significantly more accurate location data than do SPS signals. This capability within DAGRs is possible due to the Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM). The SAASM is an encrypted device permitting both receipt of PPS signals and the benefit of preventing potential adversaries from spoofing the system to display incorrect location information. The SAASM capability within the DAGR is sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED. The SAASM capabilities are sensitive due to the system's ability to access restricted PPS GPS satellite signals and to prevent spoofing. While sensitive, the ability of potential adversaries to exploit the system is limited.

7. The same SAASM capabilities resident in the DAGR are also resident in the THAAD GPS timing system. The THAAD system requires highly precise timing hacks in order accurately track and engage targets. The PPS signals generated by GPS satellites provide this precise timing information. The SAASM device resident in the timing system permits receipt of this precise PPS timing data. The SAASM is an encrypted device permitting both receipt of PPS signals and the benefit of preventing potential adversaries from spoofing the system to display incorrect data. The SAASM capability within the timing system is sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED.

8. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of specific hardware, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

9. A determination has been made that Saudi Arabia can provide substantially the same degree of protection for sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sustainment program is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

10. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

KEEP AMERICA'S REFUGES OPERATIONAL ACT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, in celebration of National Wildlife Refuge Week, Senator BARRASSO and I introduced legislation just prior to the recent recess to reauthorize the National Wildlife Refuge System's volunteer and partnerships program. I want to share with our colleagues some information about S. 1940, the Keep America's Ref-

uges Operational Act, and ask for their support.

The Keep America's Refuges Operational Act reauthorizes the volunteer and partnerships program, with no increase, at \$2 million per year. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will use this authorization of Federal funding to provide volunteer uniforms, training, equipment, and necessary travel. The bill also allows volunteer groups to use this modest funding for administrative expenses directly related to the program.

For example, these groups will now be able to use funding to complete administrative requirements of cooperative agreements with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Cooperative agreements enable volunteers to assist the agency in technical activities, such as bird banding, other wildlife tagging, and research.

Our National Wildlife Refuge System is an exceptional network of public lands and waters dedicated to fish and wildlife conservation. More than 40 million people visit our refuges each year to explore, fish, hunt, and view and study wildlife. This ecotourism industry strongly supports local economies.

Volunteers are critical to refuge operations, making up 20 percent of the refuge system's workforce. Volunteers assist with fish and wildlife surveys, restoring habitat, and supporting refuge office functions. Without volunteers and partner groups, refuges may have to cut back on public programs and reduce hours of operation.

In my home State of Delaware, we have two beautiful refuges: the Prime Hook National Wildlife Refuge and the Bombay Hook National Wildlife Refuge. The two refuges employ only 10 full time staff, and both refuges are highly dependent upon volunteers.

Each year, people come to our refuges to observe the federally threatened Red Knot shorebird, which stops along the Delaware Bay to refuel on horseshoe crab eggs along its migration journey. Volunteers make sure these visitors have memorable experiences.

When people can see these pristine habitats and the many species that call them home, they are inspired to be good stewards of our planet for the enjoyment and benefit of future generations.

I want to ensure that these opportunities abound, in Delaware and around the country. A small annual investment in the refuge system volunteer and partnerships program goes a long way. Every \$1 appropriated to coordinate these volunteers translates to \$10 worth of volunteer services.

These appropriations also help cut government costs. In fiscal year 2016, 40,000 volunteers donated 1.4 million hours, with donated time equaling that of 649 full-time employees.

I want to thank Senator BARRASSO for cosponsoring this commonsense legislation. I look forward to working with him and our colleagues in the House to pass the Keep America's Refuges Operational Act and enact it into law.

Thank you.

CONFIRMATION OF AJIT PAI

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I do not believe Chairman Pai should have been confirmed to serve a full 5-year term as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, FCC. Since assuming the leadership role at the Commission, Chairman Pai has systematically advanced policies that advance corporate interests at the expense of American consumers.

Chairman Pai's decision to open an NPRM that will eventually reverse the 2015 open internet order is an egregious example of his misplaced priorities. In 2016, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the open internet order was a lawful exercise of the Commission's regulatory authority. Broadband service providers must provide fair and equal access to all users, regardless of socioeconomic status. Over 18 million Americans submitted comments urging the Commission to maintain regulations that impose transparency and prevent ISPs from throttling or discriminating against certain data. Numerous polls have shown that Americans, across the political spectrum, overwhelmingly support regulations that would prevent broadband companies from discriminating against certain data.

Chairman Pai claims that the 2015 order caused a decrease in broadband investment, but the evidence suggests otherwise. I wrote to Chairman Pai about the evidence that he frequently cites to support his allegations of depressed investment—evidence, which I believe, is incomplete and inconclusive. As technology develops and consumers become even more dependent upon internet access, it is imperative that the FCC ensures that the internet is not divided between the have and the have-nots.

I was also disappointed by Chairman Pai's support for Congress's actions to repeal the Federal Communications Commission's broadband privacy rules. These rules are especially important in light of recent data breaches. Every website we visit and every link we click leaves an unintended trail that tells a story about our lives. ISPs can collect information about our location, children, sensitive information, family status, financial information, Social Security Numbers, web browsing history, and even the content of communications. ISPs sell this highly sensitive and highly personal data to the highest bidder without consumer's consent or knowledge. The Commission's

rules empowered consumers and gave them tools to protect their privacy though transparency, choice, and data security. In supporting the rule's repeal, Chairman Pai demonstrated that he does not believe that Americans should have control over their data.

The rise of the internet of things, telehealth, and smart agriculture means that American consumers need an FCC that is on watch and committed to protecting their interests. I hope that Chairman Pai will reverse course and will stop putting the interests of big corporations ahead of the interests of American consumers.

REMEMBERING THOMAS F. BURKHART AND VETERANS OF THE WAR IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, this week my constituent Caroline Burkhart of Baltimore, MD, is on a historic trip to Japan of remembrance and reconciliation. A guest of the Japanese Government, she will follow the journey of her father, Thomas F. Burkhart, who was a prisoner of war of imperial Japan 75 years ago. Her trip will include a visit to the site of the camp in which her father was held as a POW.

At the start of WWII, Lieutenant Burkhart served in the Philippines with the Headquarters Company of the 45th Infantry, Philippine Scouts, an elite U.S. Army unit composed of American officers and Filipino enlisted men. After Japan's December 8, 1941, invasion of the Philippines, his battalion helped defend the withdrawal of American forces on Luzon to the Bataan Peninsula. Barely a month after being promoted to first lieutenant, on January 24, 1942, Lieutenant Burkhart earned a Silver Star for "Gallantry in Action" at the Battle of Abucay Hacienda, January 15 to 25, 1942, which maintained the first battle position on Bataan.

Sick with malaria, Lieutenant Burkhart was in the open-air general hospital No. 1 near the tip of Bataan when Major General Edward King surrendered the peninsula to Japanese forces on April 9, 1942. Soon thereafter, the patients were taken by truck, boxcar, and foot up to Camp O'Donnell, an overcrowded, makeshift POW camp. In early June, the Japanese, fearing the deaths of the prisoners from the horrific conditions in the camp, began to release their Filipino POWs and transfer the others to a new facility at Cabanatuan. It is estimated that 1,550 Americans and 22,000 Filipinos died at Camp O'Donnell, the overwhelming majority within the first 8 weeks.

On November 6, 1942, Lieutenant Burkhart was among 1,500 prisoners packed into the coal bunker of the unmarked "hell ship" *Nagato Maru* to Japan. It took three torturous weeks for the ship to make its way from the

tropics to the cold of Northeast Asia. Lieutenant Burkhart, nearly blind from malnutrition, was used as a slave laborer for the construction company Toshima Group—today's Tobishima Corporation. He was soon moved to the Hiroshima No. 1-B Zentsuji POW Camp on the island of Shikoku. The enlisted men at Zentsuji were slave stevedores for Nippon Express Co.—Nippon Tsuun—at Sakaide Rail Yards and the Port of Takamatsu. As an officer, Lieutenant Burkhart worked in the camp garden. On June 23, 1945, he and 334 officers were transferred to POW Camp 11-B Rokuroshi, deep in the Japanese Alps. Food was scarce, conditions were overcrowded, and winter clothes were unavailable, leading many to fear that they would not survive the harsh winter. Lieutenant Burkhart was liberated from this camp in early September.

Lieutenant Burkhart remained in the Army and had a distinguished career with the quartermaster corps, retiring in 1957 as a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve. Throughout his life, he was plagued by health problems most likely caused by the illnesses and hardships of being a POW. In 1972, at age 57, he passed away and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Thomas Burkhart's daughter Caroline has honored his memory by working tirelessly to preserve the history of the POW experience and to teach its lessons of American perseverance and grit. Ms. Burkhart is an active member of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor Memorial Society. In this year, the 75th anniversary of the fall of the Philippines, we appreciate the effort by Japan to reach out to Ms. Burkhart and the American POWs in the spirit of reconciliation and healing.

I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Caroline Burkhart a safe and meaningful journey and in expressing our gratitude and appreciation to Thomas F. Burkhart and all veterans of the war in the Pacific for their heroic service and sacrifice.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE JAMES WRIGHT

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor George James Wright, a resident of Laurel, MT, and a veteran of the Second World War.

George, I would like to thank you and your family on behalf of Montana and the United States of America for your service to our Nation in times of war.

George was born on June 14, 1923, in Hinsdale, MT.

Like many Montanans from Valley County, he made a living off the land farming and ranching. He worked hard alongside his older brother, where he remembers driving the tractor and looking up into the big blue Montana sky.

Also, like many Montanans, he did not back down from answering the call

to serve his Nation when we needed him most.

In 1943, George enlisted in the Army, making him the first in his family to serve in the military.

He spent over 2 years fighting in the jungles and on the beaches of the Philippines and New Guinea as a proud member of the 32nd Infantry Division.

He braved the mud. He braved the rain. He braved the bugs, and he braved the bullets.

He saw the unimaginable, as Japanese kamikaze pilots slammed their airplanes into American ships.

He did the unbelievable, driving Army bulldozers into the unknown, making sure our soldiers got the supplies and food they desperately needed.

He served our Nation with bravery, courage, and dignity, working his way up to the rank of T5.

After America's victory, George came home, and returned to those same Montana fields and skies.

After seeing the war's destruction firsthand, he knew that the world needed to be rebuilt, and he knew he was the person for the job. He took what he learned on the battlefield and spent his next years doing construction work.

He married the love of his life, Vivian, who we remember today, and they had two children Roland and Sharon.

At the time, he did not receive the recognition that he was due for his service to our Nation, but we are here today to make that right.

Now, a proud father, grandfather of two, and great-grandfather of seven, he will get that long overdue acknowledgement.

I have the proud honor of presenting him with the following: Bronze Star Medal with one Bronze Service Star, Good Conduct Medal—Army, American Campaign Medal with three Bronze Service Stars, World War II Victory Medal, Philippine Liberation Ribbon with one Bronze Service Star, and Honorable Service Lapel Pin—WWII.

George, you are a Montana farmer through and through, whether feeding Americans at home or soldiers in the field.

I am proud to call myself a farmer, if only because it means I have something in common with a man like George Wright.

George, you have spent your life providing for Montanans at home and protecting Americans overseas.

These medals serve as a small token of our Nation's appreciation for your service and your sacrifice. You are an American hero and one of Montana's best. Thank you for your service.

TRIBUTE TO GERALD ROBERT ZELMER

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Gerald Robert Zelman, a veteran of the Vietnam war.

Gerald, I would like to thank you, on behalf of the State of Montana, and the

United States of America, for your service to this Nation.

Gerald, known by his friends and family as Gerry, was born in Bismarck, ND, on June 25, 1947.

He married the love of his life, Dora Jean or D.J., on October 12, 1968, in Worden, MT, at the height of the Vietnam conflict.

Two months later, Gerry was off to war.

He attended boot camp in Fort Lewis, WA, and then moved on to advanced infantryman training in Fort Eustis, VA.

He deployed soon thereafter, serving proudly with the 101st Airborne Division out of Camp Eagle.

Gerry served as a helicopter crew chief, ensuring that pilots and crews were safe as they flew aerial missions. His skills on the battlefield ensured that rotary-wing aircraft were fine-tuned and ready to take off for their missions.

Gerry is a fixer and a problem solver.

In Vietnam, he fixed helicopters and kept our birds in the air, covering our soldiers on the ground.

When he returned from war, he worked as a maintenance foreman at Montana Sulphur and Chemical.

It is his skills on the battlefield, his bravery and courage, and his service to our Nation that earned him these commendations decades ago. It is my honor to finally deliver them today.

As a father to Carrie and Cody and grandfather to two grandchildren Sienna and Aden, he will get that long overdue acknowledgement.

I have the proud honor of presenting you, Gerry, with the Bronze Star Medal for your meritorious service in connection with ground operations against a hostile force.

I am also presenting you with copies of your previous awards: Army Commendation Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal with Silver Service Star attachment, Expert Badge with Auto Rifle Bar, and sharpshooter badge with rifle bar.

Gerry, these medals are but a small token of our Nation's appreciation for your service and your sacrifice. You are an American hero, and Montana is proud to call you one of our own.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, in support of National Forest Products Week and in my role as a cochair of the Senate Paper and Packaging Caucus, I would like to recognize the almost 20,000 hard-working men and women employed by the forest products industry in the great State of Arkansas.

Arkansas is home to over 90 wood products, paper, and packaging manufacturing facilities that make over \$8 billion in products annually and contribute over \$1.2 billion to the State

and local economies through wages and compensation.

The forest products industry plays a valuable role in the life of every American, every day. From paper and packaging to wood products, tissue, and other personal care items, paper and wood products are at the heart of modern life and a modern economy. In total, the industry employs about 900,000 Americans nationwide and manufactures over \$280 billion in products every year. That is nearly 4 percent of the current U.S. manufacturing GDP.

In addition to cochairing the Paper and Packaging Caucus, I am also a co-chair of the Senate Recycling Caucus. In this dual capacity, I have seen the success the forest products industry has had in pairing economic growth with respect for the environment. Be it through the use of carbon-neutral biomass energy or the successful implementation of voluntary recycling programs that now reach 96 percent of Americans, the forest products industry is leading by example.

Last year, I had the opportunity to see firsthand how the forest industry contributes to the economy of my State. Congressman BRUCE WESTERMAN and I visited timber-rich south Arkansas on our "Seed to Sawmill" tour. We learned about proper forest management and the positive environmental impacts achieved through conservation efforts. We also visited a seedling nursery, working private forests, state-of-the-art processing facilities, and the U.S. Forest Service's Experimental Forest in Crossett.

It is clear that the forest products industry contributes a great deal to Arkansas and to the U.S. economy overall. That is why it is important for us to highlight how forest products improve our lives, help grow our economy, and promote healthy environmental practices.

I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating National Forest Products Week and reflect on the many ways this recyclable and renewable resource impacts our daily lives for the better. Thank you for the opportunity to recognize the hard-working professionals of the forest products industry in the great State of Arkansas.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING COMPREHENSIVE JUVENILE SERVICES, INC.

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize an organization that is committed to redirecting the lives of youth and their families in western Arkansas. Comprehensive Juvenile Services, Inc., of Fort Smith, AR, helps youth who experience difficulty within their families, have problems in school, or face other challenges that result in them being at risk

of or referred to the juvenile justice system. Comprehensive Juvenile Services is celebrating 40 years of incredible, invaluable service to the community, and I want to congratulate them on this milestone.

Incorporated in 1976, Comprehensive Juvenile Services is a private, non-profit community-based youth services agency. It serves 1,000 youth each year in Sebastian, Crawford, Franklin, Logan, Scott, Polk, and Montgomery Counties. CJS is supported by and receives guidance from community leaders as it seeks to help children and youth who are susceptible to delinquency or have encountered legal problems and need positive influences to help get back on track toward a happy and successful adolescence.

CJS provides support to these children and their families in a variety of ways. It employs caseworkers to assess a youth's individual problems and develop case plans, provides aftercare to those in custody of the Department of Youth Services, offers one-on-one mentoring opportunities, operates an emergency shelter for at-risk youth, and features other programs including treatment for major behavioral problems, mental health assessments, and therapy and parenting classes.

The commitment that CJS has demonstrated for youth in western Arkansas is inspiring. The men and women of the agency put their hearts and souls into helping children and teens improve their situations and strive for better outcomes at home, at school, and in life generally. In one of many success stories, a former client named Sherry went through a difficult adoption where she experienced major conflict with her adopted family. Through the help of Community Juvenile Services, Sherry completed a program at the Girls Shelter of Fort Smith and is now a Department of Child and Family Services caseworker herself, advocating for children and helping to make a difference in their lives the same way that CJS did in hers.

I am so proud of the work that Comprehensive Juvenile Services has done over the past 40 years. They truly are changing lives, one child at a time. I want to congratulate everyone involved with CJS on a job well done, and I look forward to hearing many more success stories in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO RONALD K. LORENTZEN

• Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Mr. Ronald K. Lorentzen, a dedicated public servant who has spent his career advocating for American workers and businesses. Mr. Lorentzen retired on June 30, 2017, after more than three decades of government service.

Born in the blue-collar town of Ash-
tabula, OH—a great hometown, as my

wife Connie can attest—Mr. Lorentzen's roots are evident in his life's work. Too often, especially in trade policy, representatives and policymakers fail to live up to the promises they have made to working families, but not Mr. Lorentzen. He never forgot where he came from, and he never forgot the workers who are too often left behind by our trade policy.

In his roles at the International Trade Administration, he has been a leader in our government's efforts to combat unfair trade practices and hold countries that cheat the rules accountable. He served as lead negotiator for the U.S. and chairman of the Steel Committee at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, where he worked to address steel overcapacity within the U.S. Market. While we know we have a lot more work to do to create a truly level playing field for our steel industry, his work helped shape a more fair international steel market for American companies.

In addition, Mr. Lorentzen led U.S. delegations before the North American Steel Trade Committee, NASTC. He helped ensure the NASTC fulfilled its mission as a forum for NAFTA steel countries to build consensus and develop united positions on areas of common concern. A firm grasp of the facts and diplomatic skill made him a strong and effective advocate for U.S. manufacturers.

Through his many roles in government, Mr. Lorentzen has served this country and its working families. He has stood up for workers in my State, and his efforts have helped save jobs. When we enforce our trade policies and hold accountable those who cheat the international trade system, we are ensuring our workers and businesses have access to a level playing field. Mr. Lorentzen has been a leader in that fight.

Mr. Lorentzen will be remembered for his compassion, work ethic, and integrity. I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in thanking him for his service and wishing him all the best on his retirement.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ASHER'S CHOCOLATES

● Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and honor Chester Asher Candy Co., Inc., "Asher's Chocolates," as it celebrates the 125th anniversary of its founding in Pennsylvania.

In 1892, Chester A. Asher founded Asher's Chocolates in the city of Philadelphia, near Independence Hall. A farm boy from Scotland, who had previously lived in Canada, Chester had a "passion for chocolates" and a "knack for getting to the heart of a sugar craving." In 1899, he moved the company to the historical area of Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia. Chester worked

tirelessly to perfect his candies and chocolates and was constantly searching for innovative ways to please his customers.

Following World War II, Chester's four sons took over the business, and they subsequently passed the company on to their sons in their retirement. After their father's passing in 1968, the third generation of Ashers, brothers John "Jack" and Bob Asher, assumed leadership of the company. Asher's Chocolates quickly grew from the brothers producing each piece of candy individually with just two candy-making machines to building a warehouse and being regarded throughout the East Coast as a well-known candy company. While both of the third-generation brothers were vital to the company's increasing success, it was Jack who became lovingly referred to as, "the Candy Man."

Jack was very engaged in hands-on management of the company. When he wasn't on the ground overseeing production, Jack served as a volunteer firefighter with the Wissahickon and Flourtown fire companies. Jack also became a prominent member of the community by serving on the boards of the First Presbyterian Church in Germantown and the historic Cliveden, where he sponsored the Battle of Germantown reenactment for 40 years. Jack's proactive involvement and dedication to the community did not go unrecognized. In 1988, the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce awarded Jack the Small Business Person of the Year award, and in 2006, he was inducted into the National Confectionary Sales Association's Candy Hall of Fame. Though it is with great sadness that Jack Asher passed away in September of 2017, his legacy will undoubtedly continue through the life of Asher's Chocolates.

While over a century has passed since its founding, Asher's Chocolates still remains family owned. Currently, Jeff, a fourth-generation Asher, serves as the CEO of Asher's Chocolates and believes it is his family's "stubborn, common commitment to providing excellent chocolate at an affordable price" that has allowed Asher's Chocolates to remain in business for so long. Today Asher's Chocolates has expanded its business, selling over 3.3 million pounds of candy each year, employing over 100 people, and supplying delicious treats on a national and worldwide level to Canada, Mexico, Japan, China, South America, and Europe.

As Asher's Chocolates has reached global success, I am honored it calls Pennsylvania home. Founded by a Scottish man who emigrated from Canada and was devoted to operating a family-run business, Asher's Chocolates is rich in both diversity and tradition. While their impact is great and long-standing, Asher's Chocolates hasn't lost sight of what is important:

family and "one of life's sweetest pleasures . . . [is] a simple box of chocolate." Asher's Chocolates serves as a symbol of success, history, and family, and I commend the Asher family and the company's employees on the 125th anniversary of its founding.●

TRIBUTE TO CHANCE BROWN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Chance Brown, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Chance is a graduate of Douglas High School in Box Elder, SD, and a recent graduate of Colorado State University in Fort Collins, CO, having earned degrees in sociology, political science, and business administration. He is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Chance Brown for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DAN KNUTSON

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Dan Knutson, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Dan is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD, and a recent graduate of Augustana University, having earned a degree in psychology. He is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Dan Knutson for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 11,

2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1617. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 77 North in Sarita, Texas, as the "Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint".

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 12, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 190. An act to provide for consideration of the extension under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of nonapplication of No-Load Mode energy efficiency standards to certain security or life safety alarms or surveillance systems, and for other purposes.

S. 920. An act to establish a National Clinical Care Commission.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 585. An act to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for the Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 294. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the "Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building".

H.R. 378. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 452. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 1858. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office".

H.R. 2105. An act to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to disseminate guidance to help reduce small business cybersecurity risks, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2196. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients.

H.R. 2229. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2254. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the "Janet Capello Post Office Building".

H.R. 2302. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the "Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 2464. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office".

H.R. 2763. An act to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2989. An act to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission.

H.R. 3031. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for flexibility in making withdrawals from a Thrift Savings Plan account, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3243. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 2266.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1616) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2266) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the following Members be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. THORNBERRY, WILSON of South

Carolina, LOBIONDO, BISHOP of Utah, TURNER, ROGERS of Alabama, FRANKS of Arizona, SHUSTER, CONAWAY, LAMBORN, WITTMAN, COFFMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, COOK, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. KNIGHT, BACON, SMITH of Washington, BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. LANGEVIN, LARSEN of Washington, COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. GABBARD.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 11 of rule X: Messrs. NUNES, STEWART, and SCHIFF.

From the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of section 1262 of the House bill, and section 4 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. JOHNSON of Ohio, BERGMAN, and YARMUTH.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 221, 551, 555, and 3509 of the House bill, and sections 236, 551-53, 3116, 5508, and 6001 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. FOXX, Messrs. BYRNE, and SCOTT of Virginia.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 313, 314, 601, 723, 727, 729, 732, 3118, and 3122 of the House bill, and sections 601, 701, 725, 732, 1089A, 1625, and 3114 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALDEN, BARTON, and PALLONE.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 862 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BARR, WILLIAMS, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of sections 864, 1032, 1039, 1040, 1058, 1201, 1203-05, 1211, 1222, 1223, 1231, 1232, 1234, 1243, 1246, 1247, 1265, 1270A, 1272, 1276, 1278, 1280, 1301, 1302, 1521, 1522, 1687, 2841, and 3117 of the House bill, and sections 111, 861, 867, 1011, 1203-05, 1212, 1213, 1231-33, 1241-45, 1250, 1261-63, 1270B, 1270C, 1282, 1283, 1301, 1302, 1531, and 1651 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, DONOVAN, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 515, 1062, 1063, 1067, 1080, 1695, 2843, and 3510 of the House bill, and sections 520A, 529, 1035, 1081, 1083, 1217, 1264, and 14013 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLATTE, ISSA, and CONYERS.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 601, 1062, 1265, 2827, 2828, 2831, 2832, 2844, 2863, subtitle F of title XXVIII, and section 2863 of the House bill, and sections 311, 338, 601, 1263, 1264, 2850, and 12801 of the Senate amendment, and

modifications committed to conference: Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 323, 501, 801, 803, 859–860A, 873, and 1101–09 of the House bill, and sections 218, 544, 557, 801, 812, 821, 822, 829, 852, 902, 931, 934, 938, 1045, 1093, 1094, 1101, 1102, 1104–06, 1111–13, 2821, 2822, 6005, 6012, 10804, 11023–25, and 11603 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MEADOWS, ROSS, and LYNCH.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of section 223 of the House bill and sections 897, 898, 1662–64, and 6002 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SMITH of Texas, LUCAS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of sections 801, 860B, 867, 1701–04, 1711–13, 1721–23, 1731–37, and 1741 of the House bill, and sections 854, 862, 897, 898, 899C, 10801, and 10802 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CHABOT, KELLY of Mississippi, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 122, 311, 546, 601, 1082, 1617, 1695, 3501, 3502, 3505, and 3507–10 of the House bill, and sections 331, 601, 1048, 6002, 13501, 13502, 13508, 13513, 13607, and 14013 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri, HUNTER, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

From the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of section 572, 573, 576, 578, 1077, 2841 of the House bill, and sections 731, 1084, 1088, 1264, 11001, 11008, and 14004 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, BILIRAKIS, and WALZ.

From the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration of section 701 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. NEAL.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 294. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the “Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 378. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 452. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Mis-

souri, as the “Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1858. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the “Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2105. An act to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to disseminate guidance to help reduce small business cybersecurity risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2196. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2229. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2254. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the “Janet Capello Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2302. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the “Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2464. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the “John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2763. An act to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following concurrent resolution was read, and placed on the calendar:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 6, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 178. An act to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 652. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3012. A communication from the Acting Director of Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Water and Waste Loans and Grants” ((RIN0572-AC36) (7 CFR Part 1780)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3013. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fluoxastrobin; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL-9966-09-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3014. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Oxathiapiprolin; Pesticide Tolerance” (FRL-9966-68-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3015. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fluazifop-P-Butyl; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL-9966-67-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3016. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Importation of Fresh Persimmons From New Zealand Into the United States” (RIN0579-AE26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3017. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pecans Grown in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas; Establishment of Assessment Rates” (Docket No. AMS-SC-17-0027) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3018. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's 2017 compensation program adjustments; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3019. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3020. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on

the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Frederick S. Rudesheim, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3021. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Failure of Contractors, Participating under the DoD Test Program for a Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan, to Meet Their Negotiated Goals"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3022. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Assessment of the Recommendations of the National Commission on the Future of the Army"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3023. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting a report relative to the Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3024. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Certain Entities from the Entity List; and Revisions of Entries on the Entity List" (RIN0694-AH41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3025. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wassenaar Arrangement 2016 Plenary Agreements Implementation" (RIN0694-AH35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3026. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include the Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222" (RIN0694-AH38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3027. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3028. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3029. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3030. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to credit availability for small businesses; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3031. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3032. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Negotiated Noncompetitive Agreements for the Use of Sand, Gravel, and/or Shell Resources on the Outer Continental Shelf" (RIN1010-AD90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 3, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3033. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fleet Alternative Fuel Vehicle Acquisition Report for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3034. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Refrigerant Management Regulations for Small Cans of Motor Vehicle Refrigerant" ((RIN2060-AT43) (FRL No. 9968-68-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3035. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter: Revision of Federal Implementation Plan Requirements for Texas" ((RIN2060-AT16) (FRL No. 9968-46-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3036. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Iowa Air Quality Implementation Plans; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)" (FRL No. 9968-66-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3037. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)" (FRL No. 9968-62-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3038. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9968-64-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3039. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9968-63-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3040. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Enhanced Monitoring; California" (FRL No. 9968-38-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3041. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs" (FRL No. 9968-34-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3042. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to Ozone Offset Requirements in Davis and Salt Lake Counties" (FRL No. 9968-74-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3043. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9968-51-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3044. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 2011 Base Year Inventory for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Baltimore Maryland Nonattainment area" (FRL No. 9968-54-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3045. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Final Rule To List the Maui Dolphin as Endangered and the South Island Hector’s Dolphin as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act” (RIN0648-XE686) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3046. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Technical Correction for Tonkin Snub-Nosed Monkey” (RIN1018-BC64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3047. A communication from the S.A.T. Manager, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for the Iiwi (*Drepanis coccinea*)” (RIN1018-BB54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3048. A communication from the S.A.T. Manager, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Sonoyta Mud Turtle” (RIN1018-AZ02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3049. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief of the Unified Listing Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Pearl Darter” (RIN1018-BB55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3050. A communication from the Acting Manager of the Species Assessment Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Guadalupe Fescue; Designation of Critical Habitat for Guadalupe Fescue” (RIN1018-BA74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3051. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Service Provider Licenses” (NUREG-1556, Volume 18, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3052. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pilot Program for Section 355 PLR procedures” (Rev. Proc. 2017-52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3053. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the

Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Updated Static Mortality Tables for Defined Benefit Pension Plans for 2018” (Notice 2017-60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3054. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Physical Presence of Certain Individuals in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or the United States Virgin Islands Under Section 937(a) Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria” (Notice 2017-56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3055. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Procedures for Obtaining Approval to Use Plan-Specific Substitute Mortality Tables” (Rev. Proc. 2017-55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3056. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Mortality Tables for Determining Present Value under Defined Benefit Pension Plans” (RIN1545-BM71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3057. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Financial Resources, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3058. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Financial Resources, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3059. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Children and Families, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3060. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Children and Families, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3061. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Planning and Evaluation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3062. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Planning and Evaluation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3063. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Planning and Evaluation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3064. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Legislation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3065. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Legislation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3066. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Evaluation of the Graduate Nurse Education Demonstration Project: Report to Congress”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3067. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Medicare Payments for Clinical Diagnostic Laboratory Tests in 2016: Year 3 of Baseline Data”; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 5, 2017, the following reports of committees were submitted on October 13, 2017:

By Mr. ENZI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 25. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 21. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law (Rept. No. 115-169).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 886. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish an Acquisition Review Board in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-170).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1208. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may elect to have the United States Postal Service use the Hold for Pickup service or the Signature Confirmation service in delivering the document, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-171).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1584. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to reauthorize the Judicial Conference of the United States to redact sensitive information contained in financial disclosure reports of judicial officers and employees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-172).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 211. A resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 245. A resolution calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes.

S. 1959. A bill to designate certain Federal land in the State of California as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1960. A bill to repeal the amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1961. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to temporarily reauthorize certain pilot programs under the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1962. A bill to provide relief to community banks, to promote access to capital for community banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1963. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to include certain pension as administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1964. A bill to encourage kinship guardianship placements and support payment rate equity for such placements, to improve oversight of State child welfare programs funded under the Social Security Act, to strengthen national data on child fatalities from maltreatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 292. A resolution condemning the brutal and senseless attack at a country music festival in Las Vegas, Nevada, honoring the memory of the victims of the deadly shooting, offering condolences to, and expressing support for, the families and friends of the victims and all of the individuals who were affected by the attack, and applauding the dedication and bravery of law enforcement officers, firefighters, paramedics, emergency medical technicians, medical professionals, hotel security and staff, and community members in responding to the attack; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. Con. Res. 26. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of the American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) Chair of Honor; considered and agreed to.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

On October 13, 2017, under the authority of the order of the Senate of October 5, 2017, the following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ENZI:

S. Con. Res. 25. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; from the Committee on the Budget; placed on the calendar.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require Internet-based, real-time responses to requests to verify taxpayer income for legitimate business purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. Res. 291. A resolution affirming the historical connection of the Jewish people to the ancient and sacred city of Jerusalem and condemning efforts at the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to deny Judaism's millennia-old historical, religious, and cultural ties to Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 58

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 58, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 652

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

S. 872

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1064, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for meals.

S. 1113

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1453

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1453, a bill to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to designate certain substance use disorder treatment facilities as eligible for National Health Service Corps service.

S. 1498

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from New York

(Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1498, a bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive American women's history museum, and for other purposes.

S. 1568

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1568, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of President John F. Kennedy.

S. 1595

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1595, a bill to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater support to students with dependents, and for other purposes.

S. 1691

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1691, a bill to provide minimal cybersecurity operational standards for Internet-connected devices purchased by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1753

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1753, a bill to amend the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to provide a temporary license for loan originators transitioning between employers, and for other purposes.

S. 1783

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1783, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to implement a process under which individuals who are 16 years of age may apply to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public election activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1806

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1806, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, and for other purposes.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1823, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, *supra*.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1829, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1842, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1911

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1911, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1922

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1922, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 278

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 278, a resolution expressing condolences to the victims of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria, commending the resiliency of the people of Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands, and expressing gratitude to other neighboring States willing to stand by the people of the affected areas during the relief and recovery efforts.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 25—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2019 THROUGH 2027

Mr. ENZI from the Committee on the Budget; submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. CON. RES. 25

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable health care for all.
Sec. 3002. Revenue-neutral reserve fund to reform the American tax system.
Sec. 3003. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.
Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extending the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 3005. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen American families.

Sec. 3006. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote innovative educational and nutritional models and systems for American students.

Sec. 3007. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the American banking system.

Sec. 3008. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American agriculture, energy, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.

Sec. 3009. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore American military power.

Sec. 3010. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and service members.

Sec. 3011. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for public lands and the environment.

Sec. 3012. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to secure the American border.

Sec. 3013. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote economic growth, the private sector, and to enhance job creation.

Sec. 3014. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation modifying statutory budgetary controls.

Sec. 3015. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the taxpayer bailout of pension plans.

Sec. 3016. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs.

Sec. 3017. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare and repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

Sec. 3018. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to affordable child and dependent care.

Sec. 3019. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to worker training programs.

Sec. 3020. Reserve fund for legislation to provide disaster funds for relief and recovery efforts to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 4101. Point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate.

Sec. 4102. Point of order against certain changes in mandatory programs.

Sec. 4103. Point of order against provisions that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.

Sec. 4104. Point of order against designation of funds for overseas contingency operations.

Sec. 4105. Point of order against reconciliation amendments with unknown budgetary effects.

Sec. 4106. Pay-As-You-Go point of order in the Senate.

Sec. 4107. Honest accounting: cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.

Sec. 4108. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.

Sec. 4109. Adjustment for wildfire suppression funding in the Senate.

Sec. 4110. Adjustment for improved oversight of spending.

Sec. 4111. Repeal of certain limitations.

Sec. 4112. Emergency legislation.

Sec. 4113. Enforcement filing in the Senate.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 4201. Oversight of Government performance.

Sec. 4202. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 4203. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 4204. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.

Sec. 4205. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.

Sec. 4206. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,490,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,613,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$2,755,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$2,883,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,015,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,162,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,306,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,463,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,654,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,825,184,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: −\$167,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −\$169,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −\$166,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −\$165,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −\$166,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: −\$167,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: −\$169,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: −\$172,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: −\$146,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: −\$145,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,136,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,220,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,319,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,344,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,501,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,563,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,607,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,753,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,851,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,942,710,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,131,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,233,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,310,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,370,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,486,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,532,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,561,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,710,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,810,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,903,041,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$640,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$619,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$555,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$486,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$470,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$370,227,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$254,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$246,851,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$155,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$77,857,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,278,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$22,063,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,760,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,396,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$23,992,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$24,508,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$24,953,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$25,375,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$25,777,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$25,999,469,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,595,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$16,281,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$16,933,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,553,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,188,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$18,765,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$19,269,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$19,809,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$20,307,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$20,780,452,000,000.

SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$557,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$569,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$570,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$568,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$584,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$574,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$598,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$584,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$613,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$601,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$629,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$611,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$644,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$621,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$660,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$641,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$678,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$658,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$695,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$675,108,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$45,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,045,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,511,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,676,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,191,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,167,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$37,773,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,597,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, —\$762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,442,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$43,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$47,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$48,326,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,898,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,540,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,135,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,354,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,638,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,112,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,542,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$4,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,554,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$2,364,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$2,715,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, —\$3,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$14,163,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, —\$4,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$16,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, —\$4,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$17,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, —\$6,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$19,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, —\$6,816,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, —\$19,990,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$89,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$90,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$84,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$74,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$73,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$77,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$78,001,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,281,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,932,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$90,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$99,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$100,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$98,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$101,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$101,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$102,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$102,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$102,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$102,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$103,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$103,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$104,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$104,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$105,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$106,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$107,433,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$546,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$558,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$560,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$563,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$578,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$570,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$574,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$575,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$586,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$583,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$601,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$599,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$605,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$603,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$617,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$614,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$633,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$630,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$652,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$653,552,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$586,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$585,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$643,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$643,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$687,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$686,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$734,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$734,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$819,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$819,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$833,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$833,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$845,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$845,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$934,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$934,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,002,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,002,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,066,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,066,321,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$491,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$477,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$490,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$479,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$493,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$482,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$494,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$485,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$497,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$494,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$506,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$499,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$515,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$502,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$531,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$520,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$544,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$538,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$557,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$548,723,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,683,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$49,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$49,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$52,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$52,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$56,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$56,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,757,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$74,173,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$176,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$177,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$191,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$189,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$198,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$196,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$205,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$202,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$221,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$219,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$219,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$216,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$216,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$214,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$234,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$232,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$242,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$240,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$251,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$248,884,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,488,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,657,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$73,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,382,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,889,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,642,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,973,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,608,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,382,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$388,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$388,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$441,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$441,158,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$497,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$497,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$546,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$546,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$589,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$589,086,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$630,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$630,179,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$664,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$691,250,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$691,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$716,494,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$716,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$736,146,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$736,146,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, —\$68,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$51,055,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, —\$133,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$96,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, —\$145,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$130,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, —\$176,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$166,918,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, —\$218,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$209,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, —\$247,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$238,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, —\$276,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$266,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, —\$307,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$297,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, —\$366,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$356,035,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, —\$415,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$404,286,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, —\$95,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$95,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, —\$93,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$93,401,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, —\$95,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$95,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, —\$98,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$98,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, —\$101,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$101,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, —\$102,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$102,309,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, —\$111,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$111,119,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, —\$124,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$124,766,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, —\$128,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$128,332,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, —\$141,303,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$141,303,000,000.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,676,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,675,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,684,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$8,901,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$3,053,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$873,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$903,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$932,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$962,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$996,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$1,031,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$1,068,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$1,106,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,146,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$1,188,060,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$849,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$909,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$972,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$1,040,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$1,111,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$1,188,081,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$1,266,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$1,349,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,437,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$1,530,362,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$5,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$5,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,888,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,426,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$7,194,000,000.

SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$281,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$281,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$322,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$368,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$379,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than November 13, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing or replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3002. REVENUE-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include—

(1) tax relief for middle-income working Americans;

(2) lowering taxes on families with children; or

(3) incentivizing companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation is revenue neutral and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3003. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

(d) EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENDING THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3005. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) addressing the opioid and substance abuse crisis;

(2) protecting and assisting victims of domestic abuse;

(3) foster care, child care, marriage, and fatherhood programs;

(4) making it easier to save for retirement;

(5) reforming the American public housing system;

(6) the Community Development Block Grant Program; or

(7) extending expiring health care provisions,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3006. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL AND NUTRITIONAL MODELS AND SYSTEMS FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);

(2) ensuring State flexibility in education;

(3) enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs;

(4) the consolidation and streamlining of overlapping early learning and child care programs;

(5) educational programs for individuals with disabilities; or

(6) child nutrition programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3007. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the American banking system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3008. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Farm Bill;
- (2) American energy policies;
- (3) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;
- (4) North American energy development;
- (5) infrastructure, transportation, and water development;
- (6) the Federal Aviation Administration;
- (7) the National Flood Insurance Program;
- (8) State mineral royalty revenues; or
- (9) soda ash royalties,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3009. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE AMERICAN MILITARY POWER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) improving military readiness, including deferred Facilities Sustainment Restoration and Modernization;
 - (2) military technological superiority;
 - (3) structural defense reforms; or
 - (4) strengthening cybersecurity efforts,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and service members by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3011. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);
 - (2) forest health and wildfire prevention and control;
 - (3) resources for wildland firefighting for the Forest Service and Department of Interior;
 - (4) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or
 - (5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3012. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE THE AMERICAN BORDER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) securing the border of the United States;
 - (2) ending human trafficking; or
 - (3) stopping the transportation of narcotics into the United States,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3013. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND TO ENHANCE JOB CREATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) reducing costs to businesses and individuals stemming from Federal regulations;

(2) increasing commerce and economic growth; or

(3) enhancing job creation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3014. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION MODIFYING STATUTORY BUDGETARY CONTROLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying statutory budget controls, which may include adjustments to the discretionary spending limits and changes to the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for the Financial Accounting Standards Board, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and other similar entities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE TAXPAYER BAILOUT OF PENSION PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prevention of taxpayer bailout of pension plans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3016. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING WORK REQUIREMENTS IN ALL MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3017. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICARE AND REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the

pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), which may include repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under section 1899A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3018. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFFORDABLE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making the cost of child and dependent care more affordable and useful for American families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3019. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to worker training programs, such as training programs that target workers that need advanced skills to progress in their current profession or apprenticeship or certificate programs that provide retraining for a new industry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3020. RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE DISASTER FUNDS FOR RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS TO AREAS DEVASTATED BY HURRICANES AND FLOODING IN 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing disaster funds for relief and recovery to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 4101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution,

motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2019.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

SEC. 4102. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “CHIMP” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not re-

sult in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that includes a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(e) SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3103 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall be applied and administered as if section 3103(e) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, had not been enacted.

SEC. 4103. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term “CHIMP” has the meaning given such term in section 4102(a); and

(2) the term “Crime Victims Fund” means the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101).

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution making full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision containing a CHIMP affecting the Crime Victims Fund that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all CHIMPs affecting the Crime Victims Fund in relation to fiscal year 2018 to be more than \$11,224,000,000, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of

the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(3) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to paragraph (1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(4) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this subsection may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(5) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this subsection, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) **REVIEW OF PROCEDURES REGARDING CHIMPS.**—The Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall review existing budget enforcement procedures regarding CHIMPS included in appropriations legislation. These committees of jurisdiction should consult with other relevant committees of jurisdiction and other interested parties to review such procedures, including for Crime Victims Fund spending, and include any agreed upon recommendations in subsequent concurrent resolutions on the budget.

SEC. 4104. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that designates funds for fiscal year 2018 for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate

shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) **SUSPENSION OF POINT OF ORDER.**—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

SEC. 4105. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION AMENDMENTS WITH UNKNOWN BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to or motion on a bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits a written statement for the Congressional Record indicating that the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, is unable to determine the effect the amendment or motion would have on budget authority, outlays, direct spending, entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, or surpluses.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SEC. 4106. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) **APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any of—

- (A) the period of the current fiscal year;
- (B) the period of the budget year;
- (C) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year; or
- (D) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(3) **DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.**—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(4) **EXCLUSION.**—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legisla-

tion” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on November 5, 1990.

(5) **BASELINE.**—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) **PRIOR SURPLUS.**—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4107. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for major legislation considered in the Senate shall, to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty considered in the Senate—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(i) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 4108. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.

If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 4109. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING IN THE SENATE.

If a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) to provide for wildfire suppression funding, which may in-

clude criteria for making such an adjustment, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this concurrent resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 4110. ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF SPENDING.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—If a measure becomes law that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may decrease the allocation to the committee of the Senate with jurisdiction of the direct spending by an amount equal to the amount of the decrease in direct spending.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays shall be determined on the basis of estimates submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.

Sections 3205 and 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, are repealed.

SEC. 4112. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.**—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) **EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.**—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of this resolution, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between

the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) **DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) **CRITERIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) **UNFORESEEN.**—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4113. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE SENATE.

If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2018, 2018 through 2022, and 2018 through 2027 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advanced appropriations that would have been identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 4201. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General's list of unimplemented recommendations and on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 4202. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

SEC. 4203. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 4204. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

SEC. 4205. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2017 to 2027.

SEC. 4206. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 291—AFFIRMING THE HISTORICAL CONNECTION OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE TO THE ANCIENT AND SACRED CITY OF JERUSALEM AND CONDEMNING EFFORTS AT THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO) TO DENY JUDAISM'S MILLENNIA-OLD HISTORICAL, RELIGIOUS, AND CULTURAL TIES TO JERUSALEM

Mr. CRUZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 291

Whereas for over 3,000 years, Jerusalem has played a central role in the history and identity of the Jewish people;

Whereas Jerusalem is the location of the holiest site for the Jewish people, the Temple Mount, as well as the Western Wall, where Jews from across the world come to pray;

Whereas Jerusalem has been a Christian pilgrimage site for over 2,000 years, and holds

considerable religious significance for Christians;

Whereas Jerusalem is home to the third holiest site in Islam, and holds considerable religious significance for Muslims;

Whereas Jerusalem serves as a cultural and religious inspiration to billions of people around the world;

Whereas the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has passed a series of anti-Israel resolutions in recent years regarding Jerusalem, both at the Committee level and by the Executive Board—a governing body of UNESCO;

Whereas these biased resolutions are attempts to erase or minimize the Jewish as well as Christian historical and religious ties to Jerusalem, and unjustly single out our close ally Israel with false accusations and criticism;

Whereas numerous archaeological excavations, such as those taking place in the City of David, Israel's most archaeologically excavated site, have uncovered a myriad of antiquities which scientifically reaffirm Jerusalem's historical significance to Judaism as well as Christianity;

Whereas the City of David is the archaeological site of ancient Jerusalem, and is believed to be the very site recorded in the Bible upon which King David established the capital of ancient Israel;

Whereas since 1867, there have been archaeological excavations at the site of the City of David, including international delegations of archaeologists from the United States, England, France, and Germany;

Whereas these excavations have unearthed antiquities from over 10 different civilizations, including Canaanite, Israelite, Roman, Byzantine, and Persian;

Whereas the current excavations of the City of David are carried out under the auspices of the Israel Antiquities Authority, and are held to the highest scientific standards;

Whereas among the most significant archaeological discoveries unearthed from the City of David include the Siloam Inscription (8th century B.C.E.), which recounts the preparations made by King Hezekiah of Judah for the impending Assyrian siege against Jerusalem, consistent with the Biblical account from 2 Kings; clay seal impressions/bullae (6th century B.C.E.) bearing the names of two Judean Government officials who are mentioned in the very same verse in the Bible, Jeremiah 38:1; the Pool of Siloam (1st century B.C.E.), which served during the Second Temple period as a ritual bath for the hundreds of thousands of Jewish pilgrims ascending annually to the Temple, which stood atop the Temple Mount; and the Second Temple Pilgrimage Road (1st century C.E.), which began at the Pool of Siloam and served as the main thoroughfare of Second Temple period Jerusalem that carried hundreds of thousands of people on their annual pilgrimages to the Temple;

Whereas the Pilgrimage Road located within the City of David, which stretches 600 meters from the Pool of Siloam to the footsteps of the Western Wall, will be open to visitors upon completion of the excavation; and

Whereas these discoveries affirm the undeniable truth that the City of David, the Western Wall, and the Temple Mount are inextricably linked together—physically, historically, and symbolically—as the bedrock of the connection between the Jewish people and Jerusalem, and have been for millennia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and affirms the historical connection of the Jewish people to the ancient and sacred city of Jerusalem;

(2) recognizes and affirms that the archaeological discoveries from the City of David, the site of ancient Jerusalem, present undeniable scientific evidence of the millennia-old connection of Jerusalem to the Jewish people, and, by extension, to Christianity;

(3) commends the Government of Israel for protecting the freedoms of all faiths in Jerusalem including Jews, Christians, and Muslims, ensuring their access to holy sites so that they may worship freely;

(4) condemns any past, present, or future efforts at UNESCO to delegitimize Israel through attempts to rewrite and deny the history of Jerusalem; and

(5) encourages the United States to continue working with allies to prevent UNESCO from passing biased and unjust anti-Israel resolutions in the future.

SENATE RESOLUTION 292—CONDEMNING THE BRUTAL AND SENSELESS ATTACK AT A COUNTRY MUSIC FESTIVAL IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE DEADLY SHOOTING, OFFERING CONDOLENCES TO, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR, THE FAMILIES AND FRIENDS OF THE VICTIMS AND ALL OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE AFFECTED BY THE ATTACK, AND APPLAUDING THE DEDICATION AND BRAVERY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, FIREFIGHTERS, PARAMEDICS, EMERGENCY MEDICAL TECHNICIANS, MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS, HOTEL SECURITY AND STAFF, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS IN RESPONDING TO THE ATTACK

Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs.

SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 292

Whereas, in the late hours of Sunday, October 1, 2017, a 64-year-old man from Mesquite, Nevada, killed 58 individuals and wounded more than 500 innocent individuals in a horrific attack at the Route 91 Harvest festival in Las Vegas, Nevada, with more than 22,000 individuals in attendance;

Whereas President Donald Trump called the attack an act of pure evil and said that unity cannot be shattered by evil and that the bonds between the people of the United States cannot be broken by violence;

Whereas the attack is the deadliest mass shooting in the modern history of the United States;

Whereas the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and other law enforcement professionals within the city of Las Vegas and Clark County, Nevada, including emergency response teams from Henderson and North Las Vegas, the Nevada Department of Public Safety, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, military service members and veterans, ambulatory services, and other emergency and health care professionals responded to the attack bravely, admirably, and in a coordinated manner, saving many lives;

Whereas doctors, nurses, paramedics, and other medical professionals worked around the clock under harrowing circumstances to provide life-saving care for hundreds of victims;

Whereas, during the attack, countless civilians selflessly assisted victims and, following the attack—

(1) hundreds of individuals stood in long lines to donate blood for those who were injured in the attack; and

(2) the people of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the United States expressed overwhelming financial, physical, and emotional support for the victims and the families of the victims;

Whereas local organizations, businesses, and caregivers came together with Federal, State, and local government agencies to support the victims and help the community heal; and

Whereas Nevada has a vibrant and renowned tourism economy that will continue to thrive, attracting and welcoming millions of visitors from across the United States and internationally, and emergency management officials will diligently dedicate local and Federal resources to boost public safety and security in Las Vegas, Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the horrific attack at the Route 91 Harvest festival in Las Vegas, Nevada, on October 1, 2017, in which 58 innocent individuals were killed and more than 500 innocent individuals were injured;

(2) honors the memory of the victims killed in the attack and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims;

(3) expresses hope for a full and speedy recovery by, and pledges continued support for, those who were injured in the attack;

(4) offers compassion to those who attended the event, but were not physically injured, and are dealing with symptoms of post-traumatic stress or seeking grief counseling;

(5) recognizes the spirit and resilience of the Las Vegas and Nevada communities; and

(6) applauds the dedication and bravery of local, State, and Federal law enforcement and counterterrorism officials and emergency medical and health care professionals for their coordinated efforts in responding to the attack, securing the community, and providing treatment.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR THE UNVEILING OF THE AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION (POW/MIA) CHAIR OF HONOR

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 26

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR UNVEILING OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION (POW/MIA) CHAIR OF HONOR.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on November 8, 2017, to unveil the American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) Chair of Honor.

(b) **PREPARATIONS.**—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1111. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 25, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1112. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 705, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

SA 1113. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 705, *supra*.

SA 1114. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 695, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system

and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

SA 1115. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 695, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1111. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 25, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 83, line 17, strike “Sections 3205 and” and insert “Section”.

On page 83, line 19, strike “are” and insert “is”.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4114. PROHIBITION ON AGREEING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION WITHOUT A SCORE IN THE SENATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to vote on the adoption of a covered amendment to a bill or resolution that requires an estimate under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653), unless an estimate described in such section 402 for the covered amendment was made publicly available on the website of the Congressional Budget Office not later than 28 hours before the time the vote commences.

(b) **COVERED AMENDMENT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered amendment” means an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1112. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 705, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Child Protection Improvements Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.

The National Child Protection Act of 1993 (34 U.S.C. 40101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3 (34 U.S.C. 40102)—

(A) by striking “provider” each place it appears and inserting “covered individual”;

(B) by striking “provider’s” each place it appears and inserting “covered individual’s”;

(C) by amending subsection (a)(3) to read as follows:

“(3)(A) The Attorney General shall establish a program, in accordance with this section, to provide qualified entities located in States that do not have in effect procedures described in paragraph (1), or qualified entities located in States that do not prohibit the use of the program established under this paragraph, with access to national criminal history background checks on, and criminal history reviews of, covered individuals.

“(B) A qualified entity described in subparagraph (A) may submit to the appropriate designated entity a request for a national criminal history background check on, and a criminal history review of, a covered individual. Qualified entities making a request under this paragraph shall comply with the guidelines set forth in subsection (b), and with any additional applicable procedures set forth by the Attorney General or by the State in which the entity is located.”;

(D) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking “unsupervised”;

(ii) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) that the State, or in a State that does not have in effect procedures described in subsection (a)(1), the designated entity, ensures that—

“(i) each covered individual who is the subject of a background check under subsection (a) is entitled to obtain a copy of any background check report;

“(ii) each covered individual who is the subject of a background check under subsection (a) is provided a process by which the covered individual may appeal the results of the background check to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in the background report of the covered individual; and

“(iii)(I) each covered individual described in clause (ii) is given notice of the opportunity to appeal;

“(II) each covered individual described in clause (ii) will receive instructions on how to complete the appeals process if the covered individual wishes to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in the background report of the covered individual; and

“(III) the appeals process is completed in a timely manner for each covered individual described in clause (ii); and

“(B) the State, or in a State that does not have in effect procedures described in subsection (a)(1), the designated entity, may allow for a review process—

“(i) through which the State or designated entity, as the case may be, may determine that a covered individual who is the subject of a background check under subsection (a) is disqualified for a crime specified in subsection (f)(2)(C); and

“(ii) which shall be consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.)”;

(iii) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “authorized agency” the following: “or designated entity, as applicable,”; and

(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting after “authorized agency” the following: “or designated entity, as applicable,”;

(E) in subsection (d), by inserting after “officer or employee thereof,” the following: “, nor shall any designated entity nor any officer or employee thereof,”;

(F) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) **FEES.**—

“(1) **STATE PROGRAM.**—In the case of a background check conducted pursuant to a

State requirement adopted after December 20, 1993, conducted with fingerprints on a covered individual, the fees collected by authorized State agencies and the Federal Bureau of Investigation may not exceed the actual cost of the background check conducted with fingerprints.

“(2) **FEDERAL PROGRAM.**—In the case of a national criminal history background check and criminal history review conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the fees collected by a designated entity shall be set at a level that will ensure the recovery of the full costs of providing all such services. The designated entity shall remit the appropriate portion of such fee to the Attorney General, which amount is in accordance with the amount published in the Federal Register to be collected for the provision of a criminal history background check by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(3) **ENSURING FEES DO NOT DISCOURAGE VOLUNTEERS.**—A fee system under this subsection shall be established in a manner that ensures that fees to qualified entities for background checks do not discourage volunteers from participating in programs to care for children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities. A fee charged to a qualified entity that is not organized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may not be less than the total sum of the costs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the designated entity.”; and

(G) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) **NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK.**—Upon a designated entity receiving notice of a request submitted by a qualified entity pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the designated entity shall forward the request to the Attorney General, who shall, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, complete a fingerprint-based check of the national criminal history background check system, and provide the information received in response to such national criminal history background check to the appropriate designated entity. The designated entity may, upon request from a qualified entity, complete a check of a State criminal history database.

“(2) **CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW.**—

“(A) **DESIGNATED ENTITIES.**—The Attorney General shall designate, and enter into an agreement with, one or more entities to make determinations described in paragraph (2). The Attorney General may not designate and enter into an agreement with a Federal agency under this subparagraph.

“(B) **DETERMINATIONS.**—A designated entity shall, upon the receipt of the information described in paragraph (1), make a determination of fitness described in subsection (b)(4), using the criteria described in subparagraph (C).

“(C) **CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW CRITERIA.**—A covered individual may be determined to be unfit under subsection (b)(4) if the covered individual—

“(i) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under this section;

“(ii) knowingly makes a materially false statement in connection with a criminal background check under this section;

“(iii) is registered, or is required to be registered, on a State sex offender registry or repository or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh

Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (34 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.);

“(iv) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

“(I) murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

“(II) child abuse or neglect;

“(III) a crime against children, including child pornography;

“(IV) spousal abuse;

“(V) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

“(VI) kidnapping;

“(VII) arson;

“(VIII) physical assault or battery; or

“(IX) a drug-related offense committed during the preceding 5 years;

“(v) has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor committed as an adult against a child, including—

“(I) child abuse;

“(II) child endangerment;

“(III) sexual assault; or

“(V) of a misdemeanor involving child pornography; or

“(vi) in the case of a covered individual who has, seeks to have, or may have access to the elderly or individuals with disabilities, has been convicted of any criminal offense relating to the abuse, exploitation, or neglect (as those terms are defined in section 2011 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397j)) of an elder or an individual with disabilities.”; and

(2) in section 5 (34 U.S.C. 40104)—

(A) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

“(9) the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual—

“(A) who has, seeks to have, or may have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, served by a qualified entity; and

“(B) who—

“(i) is employed by or volunteers with, or seeks to be employed by or volunteer with, a qualified entity; or

“(ii) owns or operates, or seeks to own or operate, a qualified entity;”;

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) the term ‘designated entity’ means an entity designated by the Attorney General under section 3(f)(2)(A).”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be fully implemented by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1113. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 705, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or

individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.”.

SA 1114. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 695, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Child Protection Improvements Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.

The National Child Protection Act of 1993 (34 U.S.C. 40101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3 (34 U.S.C. 40102)—

(A) by striking “provider” each place it appears and inserting “covered individual”;

(B) by striking “provider’s” each place it appears and inserting “covered individual’s”;

(C) by amending subsection (a)(3) to read as follows:

“(3)(A) The Attorney General shall establish a program, in accordance with this section, to provide qualified entities located in States that do not have in effect procedures described in paragraph (1), or qualified entities located in States that do not prohibit the use of the program established under this paragraph, with access to national criminal history background checks on, and criminal history reviews of, covered individuals.

“(B) A qualified entity described in subparagraph (A) may submit to the appropriate designated entity a request for a national criminal history background check on, and a criminal history review of, a covered individual. Qualified entities making a request under this paragraph shall comply with the guidelines set forth in subsection (b), and with any additional applicable procedures set forth by the Attorney General or by the State in which the entity is located.”;

(D) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking “unsupervised”; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) that the State, or in a State that does not have in effect procedures described in subsection (a)(1), the designated entity, ensures that—

“(i) each covered individual who is the subject of a background check under subsection (a) is entitled to obtain a copy of any background check report;

“(ii) each covered individual who is the subject of a background check under subsection (a) is provided a process by which the covered individual may appeal the results of the background check to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in the background report of the covered individual; and

“(iii)(I) each covered individual described in clause (ii) is given notice of the opportunity to appeal;

“(II) each covered individual described in clause (ii) will receive instructions on how to complete the appeals process if the covered individual wishes to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information con-

tained in the background report of the covered individual; and

“(III) the appeals process is completed in a timely manner for each covered individual described in clause (ii); and

“(B) the State, or in a State that does not have in effect procedures described in subsection (a)(1), the designated entity, may allow for a review process—

“(i) through which the State or designated entity, as the case may be, may determine that a covered individual who is the subject of a background check under subsection (a) is disqualified for a crime specified in subsection (f)(2)(C); and

“(ii) which shall be consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.);”;

(iii) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “authorized agency” the following: “or designated entity, as applicable;”;

(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting after “authorized agency” the following: “or designated entity, as applicable;”;

(E) in subsection (d), by inserting after “officer or employee thereof,” the following: “, nor shall any designated entity nor any officer or employee thereof.”;

(F) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) FEES.—

“(1) STATE PROGRAM.—In the case of a background check conducted pursuant to a State requirement adopted after December 20, 1993, conducted with fingerprints on a covered individual, the fees collected by authorized State agencies and the Federal Bureau of Investigation may not exceed the actual cost of the background check conducted with fingerprints.

“(2) FEDERAL PROGRAM.—In the case of a national criminal history background check and criminal history review conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the fees collected by a designated entity shall be set at a level that will ensure the recovery of the full costs of providing all such services. The designated entity shall remit the appropriate portion of such fee to the Attorney General, which amount is in accordance with the amount published in the Federal Register to be collected for the provision of a criminal history background check by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(3) ENSURING FEES DO NOT DISCOURAGE VOLUNTEERS.—A fee system under this subsection shall be established in a manner that ensures that fees to qualified entities for background checks do not discourage volunteers from participating in programs to care for children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities. A fee charged to a qualified entity that is not organized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may not be less than the total sum of the costs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the designated entity.”; and

(G) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.—

“(1) NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK.—Upon a designated entity receiving notice of a request submitted by a qualified entity pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the designated entity shall forward the request to the Attorney General, who shall, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, complete a fingerprint-based check of the national criminal history background check system, and provide the information received in response to such national criminal history

background check to the appropriate designated entity. The designated entity may, upon request from a qualified entity, complete a check of a State criminal history database.

“(2) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW.—

“(A) DESIGNATED ENTITIES.—The Attorney General shall designate, and enter into an agreement with, one or more entities to make determinations described in paragraph (2). The Attorney General may not designate and enter into an agreement with a Federal agency under this subparagraph.

“(B) DETERMINATIONS.—A designated entity shall, upon the receipt of the information described in paragraph (1), make a determination of fitness described in subsection (b)(4), using the criteria described in subparagraph (C).

“(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW CRITERIA.—A covered individual may be determined to be unfit under subsection (b)(4) if the covered individual—

“(i) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under this section;

“(ii) knowingly makes a materially false statement in connection with a criminal background check under this section;

“(iii) is registered, or is required to be registered, on a State sex offender registry or repository or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (34 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.);

“(iv) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

“(I) murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

“(II) child abuse or neglect;

“(III) a crime against children, including child pornography;

“(IV) spousal abuse;

“(V) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

“(VI) kidnapping;

“(VII) arson;

“(VIII) physical assault or battery; or

“(IX) a drug-related offense committed during the preceding 5 years;

“(v) has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor committed as an adult against a child, including—

“(I) child abuse;

“(II) child endangerment;

“(III) sexual assault; or

“(IV) of a misdemeanor involving child pornography; or

“(vi) in the case of a covered individual who has, seeks to have, or may have access to the elderly or individuals with disabilities, has been convicted of any criminal offense relating to the abuse, exploitation, or neglect (as those terms are defined in section 2011 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397j)) of an elder or an individual with disabilities.”; and

(2) in section 5 (34 U.S.C. 40104)—

(A) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

“(9) the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual—

“(A) who has, seeks to have, or may have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, served by a qualified entity; and

“(B) who—

“(i) is employed by or volunteers with, or seeks to be employed by or volunteer with, a qualified entity; or

“(ii) owns or operates, or seeks to own or operate, a qualified entity;”;

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) the term ‘designated entity’ means an entity designated by the Attorney General under section 3(f)(2)(A).”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be fully implemented by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1115. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 695, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.”.

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2017 third quarter Mass Mailing report is Wednesday, October 25, 2017. An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable pdf document. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states “none.”

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically or delivered to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records is open from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224-0322.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: Laura O’Conner of Utah.

RECOGNIZING THE 11 AFRICAN-AMERICAN SOLDIERS OF THE 333RD FIELD ARTILLERY BATTALION WHO WERE MASSACRED IN WERETH, BELGIUM, DURING THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of

S. Res. 99 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 99) recognizing the 11 African-American soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion who were massacred in Wereth, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge in December 1944.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 99) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 27, 2017, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

CONDEMNING THE BRUTAL AND SENSELESS ATTACK AT A COUNTRY MUSIC FESTIVAL IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 292, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 292) condemning the brutal and senseless attack at a country music festival in Las Vegas, Nevada, honoring the memory of the victims of the deadly shooting, offering condolences to, and expressing support for, the families and friends of the victims and all of the individuals who were affected by the attack, and applauding the dedication and bravery of law enforcement officers, firefighters, paramedics, emergency medical technicians, medical professionals, hotel security and staff, and community members in responding to the attack.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 292) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 26, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of the American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) Chair of Honor.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 218, S. 705.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 705) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

S. 705

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Protection Improvements Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.

The National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3 (42 U.S.C. 5119a)—

(A) by striking "provider" each place it appears and inserting "covered individual";

(B) by striking "provider's" each place it appears and inserting "covered individual's";

(C) by amending subsection (a)(3) to read as follows:

"(3)(A) The Attorney General shall establish a program, in accordance with this section, to provide qualified entities located in States that do not have in effect procedures described in paragraph (1), or qualified entities located in States that do not prohibit the use of the program established under this paragraph, with access to national criminal history background checks on, and criminal history reviews of, covered individuals.

"(B) A qualified entity described in subparagraph (A) may submit to the appropriate designated entity a request for a national criminal history background check on, and a criminal history review of, a covered individual. Qualified entities making a request under this paragraph shall comply with the guidelines set forth in subsection (b), and with any additional applicable procedures set forth by the Attorney General or by the State in which the entity is located.";

(D) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking "unsupervised";

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(II) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking "that each covered individual who is the subject of a background check" and inserting "(A) that each covered individual who is the subject of a background check conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(1)"; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) that each covered individual who is the subject of a national criminal history background check and criminal history review conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(3) is entitled to challenge the accuracy and completeness of any information in the criminal history record of the individual by contacting the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the procedure set forth in section 16.34 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.";

(iii) in paragraph (3), insert after "authorized agency" the following: "or designated entity, as applicable,"; and

(iv) in paragraph (4), insert after "authorized agency" the following: "or designated entity, as applicable,";

(E) in subsection (d), insert after "officer or employee thereof," the following: "nor shall any designated entity nor any officer or employee thereof,";

(F) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) FEES.—

"(1) STATE PROGRAM.—In the case of a background check conducted pursuant to a State requirement adopted after December 20, 1993, conducted with fingerprints on a covered individual, the fees collected by authorized State agencies and the Federal Bureau of Investigation [may not exceed eighteen dollars, respectively, or the actual cost, whichever is less, of the background check conducted with] *may not exceed the actual cost of the background check conducted with fingerprints.*

"(2) FEDERAL PROGRAM.—In the case of a national criminal history background check and criminal history review conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the fees collected by a designated entity shall be set at a level that will ensure the recovery of the full costs of

providing all such services. The designated entity shall remit the appropriate portion of such fee to the Attorney General, which amount is in accordance with the amount published in the Federal Register to be collected for the provision of a criminal history background check by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(3) ENSURING FEES DO NOT DISCOURAGE VOLUNTEERS.—A fee system under this subsection shall be established in a manner that ensures that fees to qualified entities for background checks do not discourage volunteers from participating in programs to care for children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities. *A fee charged to a qualified entity that is not organized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may not be less than the total sum of the costs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the designated entity.*"; and

(G) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

"(f) NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.—

"(1) NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK.—Upon a designated entity receiving notice of a request submitted by a qualified entity pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the designated entity shall forward the request to the Attorney General, who shall, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, complete a fingerprint-based check of the national criminal history background check system, and provide the information received in response to such national criminal history background check to the appropriate designated entity. The designated entity may, upon request from a qualified entity, complete a check of a State criminal history database.

"(2) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW.—

"(A) DESIGNATED ENTITIES.—The Attorney General shall designate, and enter into an agreement with, one or more entities to make determinations described in paragraph (2). The Attorney General may not designate and enter into an agreement with a Federal agency under this subparagraph.

"(B) DETERMINATIONS.—A designated entity shall, upon the receipt of the information described in paragraph (1), make a determination of fitness described in subsection (b)(4), using the criteria described in subparagraph (C).

"(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW CRITERIA.—The Attorney General shall, by rule, establish the criteria for use by designated entities in making a determination of fitness described in subsection (b)(4). Such criteria shall be based on the criteria established pursuant to section 108(a)(3)(G)(i) of the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 5119a note)."; and

(2) in section 5 (42 U.S.C. 5119c)—

(A) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

"(9) the term 'covered individual' means an individual—

"(A) who has, seeks to have, or may have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, served by a qualified entity; and

"(B) who—

"(i) is employed by or volunteers with, or seeks to be employed by or volunteer with, a qualified entity; or

"(ii) owns or operates, or seeks to own or operate, a qualified entity.";

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking "and" at the end;

(C) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) the term ‘designated entity’ means an entity designated by the Attorney General under section 3(f)(2)(A).”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be fully implemented by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be withdrawn, the Hatch substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, the title amendment be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1112) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill (S. 705), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The amendment (No. 1113) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.”.

CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 695 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Hatch substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, the title amendment

be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1114) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 695), as amended, was passed.

The amendment (No. 1115) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.”.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, October 17; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Trachtenberg nomination under the previous order; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:44 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

KIRSTJEN NIELSEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE JOHN F. KELLY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ALEX A. BEEHLER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE KATHERINE HAMMACK.

JAMES E. MCPHERSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, VICE ALISSA M. STARZAK.

JOHN C. ROOD, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY, VICE CHRISTINE E. WORMUTH.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BARRY LEE MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE, VICE KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN, RESIGNED.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HANNIBAL WARE, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE PEGGY E. GUSTAFSON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

KATHLEEN HARTNETT WHITE, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, VICE NANCY HELEN SUTLEY.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

GAIL S. ENNIS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, VICE PATRICK P. O'CARROLL, JR., RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STEPHEN AKARD, OF INDIANA, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE ARNOLD A. CHACON, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BROCK D. BIERMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE THOMAS O. MELIA.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

YLEEM D. S. POBLETE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (VERIFICATION AND COMPLIANCE), VICE FRANK A. ROSE.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

PRESTON RUTLEDGE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE PHYLIS CORINNE BORZI, RESIGNED.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

JOHN EDWARD DUPUY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, VICE PATRICK E. MCFARLAND, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

JAMES C. HO, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE CAROLYN D. RANDALL, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

JON J. RYCHALSKI, OF MONTANA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE HELEN TIERNEY, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 8036 AND 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DOROTHY A. HOGG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. PAUL D. NELSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID D. THOMPSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ANTHONY J. COTTON

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. RALPH L. SCHWADER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. DONALD B. ABSHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD E. ANGLE
COL. MILFORD H. BEAGLE, JR.
COL. SEAN C. BERNABE
COL. MARIA A. BLANK
COL. JAMES P. BIENLIEN
COL. BRIAN R. BISACRE
COL. WILLIAM M. BORUFF
COL. RICHARD R. COFFMAN
COL. CHARLES D. COSTANZA
COL. JOY L. CURRIERA
COL. JOHNNY K. DAVIS
COL. ROBERT B. DAVIS
COL. THOMAS R. DREW
COL. MICHAEL R. EASTMAN
COL. BRIAN S. EIFLER
COL. CHRISTOPHER L. EUBANK
COL. OMUSO D. GEORGE
COL. WILLIAM J. HARTMAN
COL. DARIEN P. HELMLINGER
COL. DAVID M. HODNE
COL. JONATHAN E. HOWERTON
COL. HEIDI J. HOYLE
COL. THOMAS L. JAMES
COL. CHRISTOPHER C. LANEVE
COL. OTTO K. LILLER
COL. VINCENT F. MALONE II
COL. CHARLES R. MILLER
COL. JAMES S. MOORE, JR.
COL. MICHAEL T. MORRISSEY
COL. ANTONIO V. MUNERA
COL. FREDERICK M. O'DONNELL
COL. PAUL E. OWEN
COL. WALTER T. RUGEN
COL. MICHELLE A. SCHMIDT
COL. MARK T. SIMERLY
COL. MICHAEL E. SLOANE
COL. DOUGLAS F. STITT
COL. WILLIAM D. TAYLOR
COL. WILLIAM L. THIGPEN
COL. THOMAS J. TICKNER
COL. MATTHEW J. VANWAGENEN
COL. DARREN L. WERNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. DIRON J. CRUZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY J. HILTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. KEITH Y. TAMASHIRO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SCOTT D. BERRIER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ERIC P. WENDT

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. CHRISTOPHER W. GRADY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. BRUCE H. LINDSEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHAEL E. BOYLE

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be major*JAMES A. FANT
DUSTIN D. HARLIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ERIK M. MUDRINICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

SCOTT M. ABBOTT
JACQUELYN M. AMEDURI
AMANDA J. ANDERSON
SPENCER M. ANDRUS
ALICE RUTH C. ARMAS
CHASTIE R. ASHWORTH
MARY A. BARNARD
APRIL C. BARR
MAVIS J. BEAN
SUFUN BEARD
WALTER A. BEELAND III
MATHEW E. BEEMAN
JASON F. BLAIR
HEATHER J. BLAKE
DONA R. BRADY
JESSICA M. BROOKS
SHEILA A. BROWN
TIMOTHY A. BRUNSON
LINDSEY M. CANTRELL
BETHANY A. CASPER
PAUL DANIEL CHARLES
ERMITA N. CHARLESBERRETTE
ADRIANNA L. CLARK
JENNER A. COOPER
KRISTINA M. COUGHLIN
FELECIA G. CRADDIETH
JASON S. CROSS
SHAE E. D. Y. DAVIS
NOELLE P. DERUYTER
DONNA L. DOUGLAS
NINA M. DUMAS
CHRISTOPHER SEAN DUNCAN
KATRINA M. DYKE
SHARON L. ELEBY
SUSAN A. FON
CHELSIE DAWN FOWLER
JORDAN J. FRIED
JARRETT E. GALLARDO
AYANNA H. GLENN
SONYA S. GOLDING
MARIO E. GONZALEZ
KARA N. GRANROTH
EMMYLOISA F. GREENHILL
JONATHAN D. HARE
ANGELA D. HARP
CYNTHIA L. HARRIS
KOLT T. HARRIS
MARY JANE P. HARRIS
JOSEPH W. HARVEY
HALEY M. HENDRIX
BRANDON G. HESTWOOD
BENJAMIN R. HOLLEY
PETRA HOLLOWAY
LISIS M. HUDSON
CLAUDIA E. HUNTER
AMY L. JACOBSON
MARIA C. JEAN
NINA M. JOHNSON
ADA A. JUNTUNEN
MELINDA C. KHUFU
HYUN J. KIM
MELISSA R. KING
STEFANIE J. KNOX
DOUGLAS A. KOOYMAN
NATALIE A. KORONA
SHAWN C. LAWSON
MARK B. LENTS
ELIZABETH K. LEWIS
KATHERINE LINDSTROM
SARA J. LLOYD
JULIE C. LOMBRANA
SARAH E. MARKS
PARIDA C. R. MATA
ERICA N. MCGAHA
HAI PHUONG T. MCMANNON
ANDREW C. MEIDLINGER
CANDICE L. MEISTER
PAUL J. MERRILL
MARK S. METZLER
MICHAEL J. MILLAR
LAURA A. MILLNER
MARC A. MILLER
VANESSA J. MOFFETT
TANYA P. MOONEYHAM
HEIDI J. MOSHER
HEATHER S. MULLIN
SONYA R. MUZYKA
SAMANTHA J. NELSON
LYNN T. NGUYEN
CHRISTINA M. NIGRO
ALISIA JOANN ORTIZ

MARISOL M. PACHECO
CHRISTOPHER M. PARKER
WAYNE A. PERNELL
KYLE N. PERRY
ANGELA K. PHILLIPS
ELIZABETH R. PHILLIPS
SHANNON D. PIERCE
DAVID P. PITTS
MARK J. POMERLEAU
KIMBERLY ANN POOLE
JOHN W. POWELL
KRISHA A. PRENTICE
KRISTOFFER A. PRICE
TIFFANY J. PROCHASKA
HEATHER A. QUIGG
MICHELLE M. RENEAU
RACHEL DANELLE RHODES
CATHY A. RILEY
JESSICA L. ROBERTS
JASON D. ROSS
KERRIE A. SANDERS
JESSICA N. SANDS
CHRISTOPHER A. SCHAEFER
STACEY J. SCHRINER
JESSICA M. SCIRICA
RONALD W. SEARS, JR.
ANDREW R. SEVERNS
JONATHAN SHIN
DANIELLE L. SHUBERT
MICHELLE AULETTA SIMPSON
CHARISMA C. SINGH
MICHAEL P. STACPOOLE
THOMAS K. STALLWORTH
DESMOND A. TAYLOR
JENNIFER L. TERREBONNE
JOHN J. THOMPSON
DANIEL C. THURLOW
KEVIN J. THYNES
BRAD S. TIEFEL
DIEGO L. TORRES
MALICK B. TRAORE
SHARLOTT URIARTE
CHRISTINA VALLES
KASINDRA M. VAN METER
PETER B. VARNEY
JONATHAN PAUL VIRNIG
CATHERINE A. VOLKMER
MICHAEL A. VOLKMER
CAROL D. WALKER
LATASHA M. WESTFALL
JOSHUA V. WILLIAMS
SAMUEL R. WILLIAMS
LAWRENCE J. WILSON
NAOMI L. WINTERHELD
BART D. WINTERS
SARAH M. WORKMAN
MANDIE LOU YATES
JUNE J. YI
ERIC M. YOUNG
SHENIKA A. ZAREBSKI
KRISTINA M. ZUCCARELLI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be colonel

DAVID S. LYLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GEORGE B. INABINET

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

BENJAMIN A. BARBEAU
EDWARD W. BROWN
RAHMAN R. FUNN
ANDREW P. GOERKE
JEREMIAH M. HARVEY
WALTER L. HELMICK
KIRKLIN J. KUDRNA
MARSHALL T. MCGURK
MATTHEW R. MORGAN
JASON L. OLIVET
MATTHEW P. REFF
MATTHEW A. RILEY
BLAIR D. TIGHE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

GARRETT K. ANDERSON
JOSEPH A. LEPPERT
ROGER D. PLASTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JOSHUA A. AKERS

MATTHEW R. ANDERSON
PARVEZ BAIG
GAMAL A. BAKER
RISHARD M. BANKS
JARED D. BEAM
TYSON T. BECK
AUTUMN L. BECKER
DANIEL D. BECKER
WILLIAM J. BELKNAP
BONNIE R. BOUDREAUX
NATHAN B. BUCKNER
NATALIE A. CAMPBELL
MARISOL CARBONELL
JACOB J. J. CHAE
ALBERT W. CHENG
JAI I. CHO
ROSS K. COOK
MAURO CORREA, JR.
CLAYTON T. CRAIG
JONATHAN L. CZEREPAK
CATHERINE M. DAHL
TIMOTHY J. DIXON
DAVID T. ENSLEY
MATTHEW V. EUSTERMAN
JOSEPH FERGUSON
PATRICK R. FERGUSON
MICHAEL D. GILLINS
PAUL M. GOFORTH
JOHN M. GOODMAN
MAJD S. HADDAD
ALIREZA HAMIDZADEH
STEVEN E. HANDEL
JEREMY J. HANLON
JAROM HANSEN
SEUNG H. HONG
JOSHUA G. HYATT
BRANDON H. JONES
PAUL C. KEARNEY
JONATHAN D. LANE
TIFFANY R. LEWIS
ERICK J. LUND
JONATHAN A. MASON
CORI M. MCCLATCHEY
HILLARY J. MCCORMACK
JAMES B. MCLAUGHLIN
PARTH MEWAR
GEORGE P. MITROGOGOS
NAVIA T. NGUYEN
CHRISTOPHER T. NORMAN
MITCHELL J. L. OLIVER
JUSTIN E. OLSEN
KONY PARK
JAMES L. PARKER
FARZAN L. POURANFAR
APRIL M. POWERS
JARRED L. PRICE
JOSHUA D. PRUDEN
SHANNON L. REA
ADRIENNE R. REMBERT
JOSHUA L. ROCKWOOD
SHAKASHA L. SCRUGGSWILLIAMS
ISAAC C. SEBOURN
MICHAEL D. SEGALL
JILLIAN D. SEGLEM
SCHUYLER B. SESSIONS
CHAO H. SHEN
DAVID H. SMITH
BRENT A. TALBOT
JESSE A. THIETTEN
DARIN F. TINER
JOSEPH C. VANDERBOSCH
JOSHUA R. WALDRON
ASHLEY M. WEBB
THOMAS M. WELNAK
LUCINDA J. YOUNG
D013005

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624
AND 3064:

To be major

JONATHAN L. ABBOTT
MELANIE J. ACEVEDOVALLE
MOSTAFA M. AHMED
AARON K. ANDERSEN
HARRY T. AUBIN
DANIEL W. BAILEY
MICHELLE L. BAILEY
WAYNE T. BAILEY
STEPHEN E. BARBERA
ADAM M. BARELSKI
JASON T. BARTER
HILLERY S. BAVANI
JESS W. BELLING
RAFIK BENABDA
MICHAEL D. BERES
HUGH F. BIGG
GEORGE E. BLACK IV
BARTON L. BLACKORBY
JOHN F. BONNES
ZACHARY C. BOOMS
CYRUS C. BOWERS
ALAINA M. BRELIN
MATTHEW E. BRICE
KEVIN M. BRODERICK
ROBERT O. BROUGHTON
STEVEN E. BROWN
SEAN C. BRUGMAN
MATTHEW E. BRYANT
RYAN V. B. BURKHART
MICHAEL M. BURSEY

DAVID C. BURY
ROBERTO CANDELARIASANTIAGO
EBONEE B. CARTER
RUDOLPH A. CARTIER III
CHRISTOPHER L. CASE, JR.
MICHAEL T. CAVENDER
ASHLEY D. CESAR
PHILIP J. CHANDLER
EDWARD T. CHANG
MICHAEL S. CHEUNG
SANDY K. CLAYTON
MICHAEL S. CLEMENS
BRANDON M. COLE
CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER
NICHOLAS P. COSENTINO
AARON L. CRAIG
KATHRYN A. CRANE
DOMINIQUE S. CROSBY
AMBER R. CROWDER
THOMAS M. CROWELL II
TYLER A. DAILEY
MATTHEW R. DAVIS
RICHARD D. DETHERIDGE
DANIEL R. DIBLASI
CALEB G. DICKISON
JOHN J. DIGIOVANNI
TIMOTHY B. DINH
JEREMY W. DOCEKAL
EDWARD A. DOLOMISIEWICZ
PATRICIA M. DOMINGUEZ
ANGELA M. DUNN
JOHN C. DUNN
CECILY E. DUPREE
JOSHUA D. DWORKIN
BRYANT S. EDWARDS
JONATHAN C. ELLEMENT
JABON L. ELLIS
SCOTT P. ENDICOTT
MARTIN O. EVANS II
PHILIP G. EYE
NINA L. FAKHORI
WILLIAM G. V. FARKAS
THORAN G. FARNSWORTH
KRISTIN C. FIALA
EAMON L. FILAN
TIMOTHY FLYNN
AUSTIN T. FOLLEY
DEREK C. FORSTHOEFEL
BRIAN E. FOSTER
JAMES N. FOSTER
STEPHEN L. FOSTYK
IAN W. FOWLER
BRENTON R. FRANKLIN
THOMAS C. FRAWLEY
AMIE E. FREEMAN
MATTHEW A. FREEMAN
BENJAMIN S. FRIDAY
AMANDA J. GACCETTA
BLAKE R. GALLER
ANTONIO M. GARCIA
JOSHUA K. GARDNER
IAN S. GEIS
CANDACE P. GILES
BLAIR S. GLASGO
TIMOTHY A. GOTHAM
ALISON M. GRAJKOWSKI
BROOKE L. GRAY
JULIA GREENE
LUCAS L. GROVES
LINDSAY K. GRUBISH
ANNE M. GUNN
ANTHONY J. HACKETT
SCOTT B. HAHN
NEIL R. HALONEN
GREGORY J. HAMILTON
WILLIAM E. HARNER
JAMES R. HARTLINE
BRANDON D. HECHT
EMILY M. HECKENDORN
KENNETH A. HEIDA, JR.
ROBERT K. HEININGER
CAMELLIA L. HERNANDEZ
ANNELIES T. HICKERSON
ANDREW W. HILL
CALEB D. HIXSON
JEFFREY D. HOFFMANN
PAUL J. HOFFMANN
DOUGLAS R. HOGBOOM
STEVEN R. HOLE
SARAH M. HOLMEN
MATTHEW D. HOLTkamp
CAITLIN M. HOWARD
RICHARD K. HURLEY, JR.
JACK N. HUTTER
ANNA H. ISFORT
NATHAN K. JANSEN
JOHN B. JENNETTE
KARSTEN G. JENNINGS
CHRISTINE A. JOHNSON
ELISE H. JOHNSON
KAROLINE R. JOHNSON
PETER C. JOHNSON
ELLEN C. JONES
DANIEL M. KAPLAN
AARON S. KARMES
MALGORZATA E. KASPERSKA
STEFAN G. KAZACOS
MARION C. KEHN
BRENDAN S. KELLEY
MATTHEW H. KEMM
SHEILA M. KEMPER
GARRY J. KENNEBREW

ERIC P. KINSMAN
JOHN W. KIRCHER
KEVIN R. KNIERY
EHAB A. KOMSAN
JEANNE A. G. KRICK
ANDREW R. KUHLE
DANE K. KURATSU
JAMES M. KYLE
NICHOLAS D. LANCASTER
PAUL J. LANIER
HEATHER A. LAYHER
JOSHUA A. LAYHER
DOUGLAS Y. C. LEE
LESLIE M. LEMANEK
KATHERINE M. LEONARD
MUOY I. LIM
ADRIANNA N. LONG
TRACY V. LOVE
QUAN M. LUONG
ALEXANDER D. MALLOY
JOHANNA G. H. MAROWSKIE
ERIC J. MARPLE
DAVID W. MARTELL
JENNIFER H. MASEL
JACOB MATHEW, JR.
KIMBERLEY A. MAXWELL
DANIEL R. MAY
IAN C. MAY
PATRICIA S. MCADAMS
JOHN G. MCCARTHY
JASON C. MCCARTT
BENJAMIN J. MCCOLLUM
IAN S. MCDUGALL
MEGHAN J. MCHENRY
CHRISTINA J. MCKINNIS
TYLER S. MCMILLAN
ALLEN A. MEHR
AYESHA M. MEJIA
LINDA Y. MEYERS
ALEX S. MILLER
ELIZABETH A. MILLER
KEITH D. MOFFITT
AMINA MOGHUL
GORDON MOK
MARIO A. MORALES
ROBERT L. MORRIS
MATTHEW W. MORRISSEY
KATHRYN B. MUIR
MELISSA A. MYERS
JASON J. NAM
ZACHARY S. NEUBERT
JELAUN K. NEWSOME
MATTHEW P. NILAN
FAITH A. D. NIMER
MARY A. NOEL
CHRISTOPHER O. OCHIENG
JORDAN T. OCHSNER
ANDREW W. OSTEN
RICHARD S. OTTO
ERIKA A. OVERBEEKWAGER
DAVID T. PADRO
HEMANT PAL
RYAN M. PAOLINO
GRACE E. PARK
MELANIE V. PARM
BRANDON M. PENIX
KRISTOPHER M. PETERS
KEITH E. PETERSEN
BRYAN M. PETTI
CHRISTOPHER K. T. PHAM
NGAC N. PHAN
PHUNG D. PHAN
JONATHAN E. PICKETT
SARAH B. PLACEK
TESS H. POLLINGER
BRIAN C. POMERANTZ
HEATHER S. POMERANTZ
ROBERT A. POWELL
TYLER A. POWELL
ZACHARY A. PRATHER
RYAN L. PRENTICE
VICTORIA M. PRENTICE
RICHARD L. PURCELL
NATASHA J. PYZOCHE
REBECCA J. RADCLIFFE
FRANK J. RAGUKONIS, JR.
JONATHAN H. RASMUSSEN
JOHN M. RAWLINGS
NEPHI A. REDD
MATTHEW S. REECE
JASON L. REED
BRADY W. REESE
ERIKA S. REESE
CHRISTINA P. REMMERT
SHANNON F. RENFROW
AARON D. ROBERTS
BENJAMIN C. ROBERTS
AMANDA L. RODRIGUEZ
MANUEL RODRIGUEZ IV
FABIAN J. ROHENA
ANNA N. ROMAGNOLI
CESAR J. ROSA
ASHLEY A. ROSELLE
JASON E. ROSTEDT
ERIC J. ROYSTON
WILLIAM D. RUMBAUGH
EAN R. SABERSKI
ADRIAN M. SALAZAR
CAROLYN A. SALTER
JOHN S. SAUR
KURT E. SCHAPIRA
WAYNE C. SCHMIDT, JR.

DAVID P. SCHMITT
ALICIA N. SCRIBNER
KAYE E. SEDARSKY
FRANCIS A. SEILER
NEEL J. SHAH
BRIAN J. SHIOZAWA
JUSTIN R. SHIRLEY
DOROTHY SHUM
SAMUEL N. SIGOLOFF
JENNA L. SILAKOSKI
NICOLE M. SILVA
NICHOLAS C. SILVESTER
BRIAN D. SINDELAR
MAXWELL R. SIRKIN
DEL R. SLONEKER
BRETT L. SMITH
LAPORTIA J. SMITH
STEPHANIE S. SMITH
ZACHARY D. SMITH
CHARLES P. SMOOT
SARAH B. SNYDER
KYLE SOKOL
CHRISTOPHER C. SQUIRES
STEPHEN K. STACEY
GREGORY J. STEVENS
JAYNE R. STEVENS
JAMES A. STEWART
RODGER S. STITT
GEORGE W. STONE
ADAM G. STREET
SCOTT SULLIVAN
VICTORIA F. SULLIVAN
RICHARD C. SWEDARSKY
MICHAEL C. SWIFT
MICHAEL S. SWITZER
CHRISTOPHER M. TARNEY
DAVID J. TENNENT
CONNIE L. THOMAS
RICHARD L. THOMAS
DAVID P. TILLMAN
THOMAS A. TOKARZ
ANTHONY M. TOLISANO
THOMAS H. TONKIN
DANIEL J. TSENG
ERIC K. TURNER
REBECCA E. VAREBROOK
TREASACH C. VARGAS
CHRISTOPHER F. VAUGHNS
KARLA M. VEGACOLON
JENNIFER L. VIERA
JAYME A. VOGT
ALANA M. WADE
BRIAN S. WALLIN
LOREN E. WALWYN'TROSS
LIN C. WANG
AUBRI M. WATERS
SEBASTIAN K. WELSH
PAUL J. WETSTEIN
BRADY W. WHITMER
LUKE M. WICKE
MEREDITH C. WILLS
KELLY E. WILSON
SARA M. WILSON
JONATHAN T. WINGATE
KIN Y. WONG
BRIAN C. YBARBO
STEVEN H. YOO
DAVID H. YUN
JASON M. ZACK
KATHERINE M. ZAMPERINI
BOVEY Z. ZHU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JANETTA R. BLACKMORE
GAIL A. DREITZLER
MICHAEL E. FRANCO
DAVID L. HAMILTON
ROBERT S. HEATH
JEFFREY E. OLIVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

STEVEN A. BATY
JOHN C. BEACH
DWAYNE C. BECHTOL
MICHAEL R. BONHAGE
AMMON W. BROWN
CLAYTON D. CHILCOAT
ANNE E. HESSINGER
ALISA R. WILMA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

WESLEY J. ANDERSON
SANDRA J. BARR
JODY L. DUGAI
MARC A. FRY
RONALD S. GESAMAN
SEAN P. HARBERT
IRMA T. HARTMAN

DAVID HERNANDEZ
ROBERT A. HOLCEK
JOSEPH A. HULSE
PAUL M. JOHNSON
STEVEN A. KNAPP
FRANK LEE
VINCENT L. LETO
HENGMO Y. MCCALL
BETHANY L. MCCORMICK
GENERA D. MILLER
KEITH C. PALM
VINA A. RAJSKI
KATHLEEN G. SPANGLER
LANCE C. TAYLOR
DANIEL B. THOMPSON
CORNELIUS R. TYLER
TANYA L. WAHLBERG
HOPE M. WILLIAMSONYOUNCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

GINA E. ADAM
THOMAS J. ANTON
JANELLE A. ARNETTE
JAMES R. AUUIL
JON E. BAKER
MICHAEL F. BELENKY
BRIAN J. BENDER
JOSEPH A. BOWMAN
DANIEL D. BRIDON
KENT A. BROUSSARD
EDWARD L. BRYAN, JR.
JOSE E. CAPOAPONTE
KRISTEN L. CASTO
CHRISTOPHER M. CHRISTON
WALTER G. S. CUMMINGS
ROSS A. DAVIDSON
JACOB J. DLUGOSZ
RYAN R. ECKMEIER
BRIAN P. EVANS
SHAWN R. GELZAINES
DOUGLAS R. GRAY
ANDREW HAGEMASTER
KEVIN C. HAMILTON
JILL J. HENDERSON
BERNITA HIGHTOWER
STACY A. HOLMAN
MATTHEW D. KONOPA
JOSELITO C. LIM
DOUGLAS K. LOMSHEK
HUGH A. MCLEAN, JR.
MICHAEL S. MENDENHALL
JEFFREY J. NEIGH
JEANNE A. NORWOOD
MICHAEL T. PEACOCK
STEVEN J. RICHTER
JASON R. SEPANIC
SHANNON N. SHAW
STEVEN E. SHIPLEY
ROBERT B. SIDELL
KEVIN S. SMITH
BRIAN C. SPANGLER
REBECCA J. TERRY
MATTHEW W. VOYLES
NORMAN C. WATERS
JOHN D. A. YEAW
DAVID R. ZINNANTE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DAVID J. H. CHANG
FRED I. DIXON
RICHARD J. FONVI
DANIEL A. HOLLAND
CHRISTOPHER W. LOWE
JOHN M. PERRINE
BENJAMIN A. RING
STEVE M. SMITH
BRADY L. STOUT
IAN J. TARASEVITSCH
MICHAEL R. TAYLOR, JR.
MATTHEW J. YANDURA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SAMUEL A. REDDING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

SATIVIA M. FRANKLIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MAURICE O. BARNETT
AARON C. BARTA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JENNIFER A. MAHONEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

YON T. CHUNG
MICHAEL B. PAYNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CATHLEEN A. LABATE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

GRANT R. BARGE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL W. CHUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

REBECCA J. COOPER
MATTHEW L. DANIELS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

CHEMITRA M. CLAY
JOHN C. HUBBARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CHARLES K. BERGMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ROBERT S. PATTON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JASON P. AFFOLDER
KEVIN J. AGEN
KATHY L. ALLISON
MICHAEL C. ANDERSON
WYETH S. ANDERSON
CHRISTIAN C. AYERS
KEVIN M. BAIRD
LESLIE A. BARNETT
DANIEL A. BARTLETT
JULIA BELL
CORY N. BERG
MATTHEW R. BOWLER
JOHN R. BRETTTHORST
KATHY M. BROWN
JOHN T. BRYAN
TODD E. BUHR
ANDREW T. CARTER
JOSEPH M. COLACICCO
JOHN S. COMBS
JOHN M. COOPER
MALCOLM S. CORNISH V
JOSEPH M. DAVIS
JAMES DEBOER
ANTHONY R. DEKEYZER
DARYL G. DEVERAWADEN
DAVID S. DINKELMAN
PATRICK A. DISNEY
STEPHEN P. DONDERO
STEPHEN D. DORRIS
MARY O. DRAYTON
SARA E. DUDLEY
REBECCA L. EGGERS
CHRISTINE V. ENRIQUEZ
STEVEN A. ERICKSON
STEPHEN A. FABIANO
DONALD A. FAGNAN
CHARLES A. FISHER, JR.
MICHAEL S. FLEMING
JOEL D. FRANKLIN
JERRY E. GAUSSOIN
KERRY L. GEORGE
GREGORY K. GIBBONS
JOSEPH W. GREENLEE
JOHN W. HANKINS
DANIEL J. HEAPE
COREY P. HEMINGWAY
MARTIN J. HENDRIX III

ERIK E. HILBERG
DAVID T. HILLS
YOLANDA M. HINES
KRISTA M. HOFFMAN
HERMAN L. JOHNSON, JR.
HUMBERTO I. JONES
GBENGA B. KAFFO
SCOTT B. KINDBERG
CLETIS R. KING, JR.
KEITH R. KRUELSKI
CURT E. KUETEMEYER
CALVIN J. LANE
ERIC D. LARSEN
DONALD T. LOGSDON
JEFFERY P. LUCAS
FREDRIC R. MADDOX
LANDIS C. MADDOX
YOLANDA B. MADDOX
WHEELER R. MANNING
JEANETTE A. MARTIN
JOHN T. MASTERNAK
BRIAN D. MATTHEWS
JOHN W. MCDONALD
ROBERT L. MCDONALD, JR.
REBECCA B. MCELWAIN
MONDREY O. MCLAURIN
ROBERTO J. MERCADOROMERO
MICHAEL F. MINAUDO
TODD D. MITCHELL
FRANK A. MOORE
DARYL R. MORSE
JOHN M. MOTSZKO
KIMBERLY D. NASH
CHRISTOPHER D. NOE
BRIAN S. OLSON
LUIS A. PARILLI
MICHAEL A. PATRICK
TERRIE L. PETERKIN
REGINA PISTONE
STEVEN E. PUTTHOFF
JARED A. REID
HATTIE L. RICHARDSON
MICHAEL E. RIVERA
CHRISTOPHER J. RUGA
ROBERT W. RUGG
EARL B. SCHONBERG, JR.
STEVEN P. SCHULTZ
ROBERT L. SKETCH
JAMES M. STEPHENS
JOE J. SUDDITH, JR.
MICHAEL G. SUMMERS
JACK S. TAYLOR
SHANE M. UPTON
STEWART J. VANBUREN
MARK W. VANDERSTEEN
WILLIAM R. VENABLE
JOSHUA S. VOGEL
MARVIN L. WALKER
ANTHONY T. WALTERS
DAVID A. WARE
WALLACE E. WEAKLEY, JR.
ROBERT M. WILLIAMS
GREGORY R. WORLEY
WILLIAM B. WYLES
GUY YELVERTON III
TIMOTHY R. ZETTERWALL
D013695
D012837
D012388

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ANDRE B. ABADIE
WILLIAM T. ADAMS
MATTHEW A. ANDERSON
JOEL R. ARELLANO
ROBERT C. ARMSTRONG
RICHARD R. BALESTRI
JOHN M. BARRY, JR.
ARCHIE L. BATES III
JOSEPH D. BECKER
AMOS R. BENNETT
DUSTIN D. BISHOP
CRAIG J. BONDRA
STEPHANIE L. BOUNDS
DAN R. BRUE II
REGINALD E. BRYANT
WILLIAM W. BURCH
ANDRE L. BURKS
JOHN R. BUSSOLARI
TERENCE A. CALIGUIRE
GILBERT M. CARDONA
GWYN A. CARVER
ELIZABETH A. CASELY
ROBERTO R. CASTILLO
JOHN C. CHECCO
DERRICK W. CHENG
GABRIEL A. CHINCHILLA
JAMES B. COGBILL
FAREN R. COLE
DANIELLE D. CORKE
ROBERT E. CROFT
PATRICK E. CURRY
MATTHEW F. DABKOWSKI
TIMOTHY G. DALTON
KEVIN K. DAMON
AIMEE S. DEJARNETTE
JASON W. DICKERMAN
ALAN H. DINERMAN
ALYSSA G. DREW

SKYE D. DUNCAN
PAUL F. EVANGELISTA
EDWARD R. EVANS III
MICHAEL J. FEELEY
MATTHEW J. FOULK
JOHN F. FRAVEL III
ERNEST A. FREUND
JOHN A. FRICK
CANDICE E. FROST
JOSEPH A. FUNDERBURKE
ROBERT A. GLECKLER
ADELAIDO GODINEZ III
RICHARD S. GRAMMER
EUGENE J. GREGORY
JASON D. HALLOCK
JAMES M. HALLORAN
SANG D. HAN
REGINALD M. HARRIS
PAUL R. HAVERSTICK, JR.
JOSH W. HELMS
JASON L. HESTER
KAREN E. HOBART
WILLIAM W. HORN V
CHARLES E. HORNICK, JR.
TREVOR W. HOUGH
BLUE HUBER
CHRISTOPHER G. HURLBURT
CHRISTOPHER A. INGELS
HEATHER A. JACKSON
JAMES E. JENKINS II
JEREMIAH J. JETTE
CHRISTOPHER G. JOHNSON
GARRETT P. JONES
DEXTER A. JORDAN
CHRISTOPHER E. KEESHAN
RAYMOND A. KIMBALL
DAVID C. KNAPP
GARY R. KRAMLICH II
KRISTOFER S. LABOWSKI
NORMAN S. LAWRENCE
BRYAN C. LECLERC
WILLIAM R. LEGGETT III
JASON S. LIGGETT
JEFFERY L. LONG
BRYAN M. LOVE
H C. LYLE
KEVIN M. MACNEIL
LAWRENCE D. MARTIN
CARLOS I. MARTINEZ
BRIAN J. MARZAN
WILLIAM C. MCDOWELL
JOHN W. MEEK
ROBERT E. MEINE
GLENN O. MELLOR
JOHN C. MICHAUD
BENJAMIN D. MILLER
HAROLD S. MONTOYA
LAWRENCE A. MULLANY
DELTON NIX, JR.
BRIAN C. NORTH
BUCKLEY E. ODAY III
ERIC R. OLSON
MATTHEW N. OLSON
OSVALDO ORTIZ
CHRISTOPHER E. OXENDINE
TYLER J. OXLEY
ANDREW F. PEKALA
DWIGHT E. PHILLIPS, JR.
JESSE A. PHILLIPS
SEAN R. PIRONE
MICHAEL J. PONCHAK
COREY S. PRESSLEY
TAGE J. RAINSFORD
CHRISTOPHER C. RANKIN
DAVID J. RAPONE
JAMES S. RAWLINSON
WALTER E. RICHTER
RYAN K. ROSEBERRY
GREGORY S. ROSS
DANIEL W. RUECKING
DARCY R. SAINTAMANT
ADAM R. SANDERSON
ANTHONY SCHEVALIER
CHAD C. SCHOOLS
MICHAEL A. SHEKLETON
MATTHEW J. SKAGGS
LAWRENCE E. SKELLY III
CRAIG C. SMITH
DIRK H. SMITH, JR.
JENNIFER J. SMITTHEYS
JAMES L. SNYDER
KHOT SOUIMANPHANH
SEAN F. STINCHON
ERIC N. STROM
JOHN D. SUGGS, JR.
MICHEAL C. SWINSON
ERIC S. TOLLEFSON
ALLEN D. WALKER
KRISTA L. WATTS
CATHERINE T. WILKINSON
DAVID M. WILLIAMS, JR.
SAMUEL J. WILLMON
STEVEN M. WINKLEMAN
ROBYN D. WOOD
GEOFFREY W. WRIGHT
MATTHEW M. ZAIS
JUAN C. ZAVALA
DANIEL M. ZERBY
G001052
G010302
G010463
D011646

G001060

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WINFIELD A. ADKINS
CHRISTOPHER S. ALFEIRI
BRANDON C. ANDERSON
WILLIAM C. ASHMORE
BRYAN L. BABICH
TIMOTHY M. BAER
MARK C. BAILEY
MICHAEL J. BAIM
EDWARD J. BALLANCO
DANIEL T. BARD
JOHN M. BAREFIELD
SHAWN M. BARNES
JEREMY A. BARTEL
GARY W. BEARD, JR.
ERIC D. BEATY
ANTHONY J. BEHRENS
JEFFREY S. BERGMANN
MICHAEL R. BINETTI
JAMES B. BIRD
W. M. BOCHAT
ROBERT G. BORN
BRADLEY L. BOYD
JOHN B. BROOM
TERRY A. BUTCHER
TOMMY L. CARDONE, JR.
BRADLEY M. CARR
SHANE D. CELEEN
JONATHAN M. CHUNG
TERRY L. CLARK
GLEN E. CLUBB
ADAM M. COBB
MICHAEL W. COBB
MATTHEW D. COBURN
JAMES M. COLLINS
JASON W. CONDREY
JORGE O. CORDEIRO
JACK D. CRABTREE III
CHRISTOPHER W. CRARY
PATRICK J. DAGON
CHRISTOPHER R. DANBECK
ANTHONY E. DANIELS
PATRICK S. DAULTON
LINN K. DESAULNIERS
DAVID P. DIAMOND
TIMOTHY E. DRUELL
BRADFORD T. DUPLESSIS
JAMES T. ELDRIDGE IV
JOSEPH M. EVERS
STUART L. FARRIS
GRANT S. FAWCETT
DAVID E. FIELDER, JR.
JOHN A. FIVIAN
ALRIC L. FRANCIS
KENNETH J. FREY
ROGELIO J. GARCIA
WHITNEY B. GARDNER
LARRY V. GEDDINGS, JR.
HISE O. GIBSON
JOSEPH C. GOETTZ II
KEVIN R. GOLINGHORST
SCOTT D. GOULD
CHAD D. GOYETTE
MATTHEW R. GRAGG
PHILIP E. GRAHAM
ETHAN L. HALL
JAMES J. HANDURA
WILLIAM C. HANNAN, JR.
KEVIN F. HANRAHAN
MICHAEL G. HARRIS
JAMES A. HAYES
REBECCA D. HAZELETT
GLENN A. HENKE
BART G. HENSLEY
JOHN J. HERRMAN
ADAM W. HILBURGH
TREVOR W. HILL
ROBERT A. HILLIARD
DERIC J. HOLBROOK
SCOTT L. HOLLAND, JR.
EDWARD C. HUDSON III
MARK E. HUHTANEN
BRYAN W. HUNT
STUART M. JAMES
KARL D. JANSEN
JEREMY E. JELLY
BARTON L. JOHNKE
JASON E. KERR
PHILLIP J. KINIERY III
SETH A. KNAZOVICH
SCOTT P. KNIGHT, JR.
SIDNEY A. KNOX
MICHAEL J. KOVACEVIC
GLENN E. KOZELKA
PAUL T. KRATTIGER
JOHNATHON M. KUPKA
CHRISTOPHER S. LANDERS
JACOB J. LARKOWICH
STEPHEN H. LEE
FRANCISCO J. LEIJA
MARK S. LENT
PHILIP V. LENZ
VYLIUS M. LESKYS
APISIT LEWIS
JOHN D. LITCHFIELD
BRYAN L. LOGAN
LUIS O. LOMAS

BENJAMIN R. LUPER
TIMOTHY J. MACDONALD
JOSEPH J. MALIZIA, JR.
MICHAEL C. MANNER
DANIEL K. MARK
DAMIEN E. MASON
CHARLES L. MATALLANA
LEE C. MATTHEWS
DAVID N. MAYO, JR.
RYAN E. MCCORMACK
MATTHEW Y. MCCULLEY
JOHN F. MCDANIEL
JAMES T. MCGAHEY
EDWARD MEYERS
ZACHARY L. MILLER
NATHAN A. MINAMI
ANDREW J. MORGAN
BRYAN A. MORGAN
JUSTIN T. MUFALLI
TIMOTHY R. MUNGIE
STEPHEN F. MURPHY
JON P. MYERS
SCOTT A. MYERS
ALEXIS A. NEAL
ROSS F. NELSON
DON A. NESTOR, JR.
JOEL D. NEWSOM
ERIC M. NOE
CHRISTOPHER M. NYLAND
JAMES M. O'BRIEN II
RYAN P. O'CONNOR
MARK A. OLSEN
RALPH W. OVERLAND
JEFFREY O. PAINE
JAMES G. PANGELINAN
DUANE M. PATIN
TIMOTHY P. PAYMENT
FELIX A. PEREZ
JACOB A. PETERSON
CARL A. POPPE
SCOTT S. PRESTON
RALPH W. RADKA
BRIAN R. RAUEN
JAMES G. RIELY
WILLIAM A. RODGERS
RAFAEL A. RODRIGUEZ
KEVIN C. SAATKAMP
AMADO SANCHEZ IV
JOHN W. SANNES
ANDREW O. SASLAV
TODD A. SCHMIDT
MICHAEL D. SCHOENFELDT
JENNIFER L. SCHULKE
JOHN G. SCHWEMMER, JR.
DAVID S. SENTELL
SCOTT A. SHAW
JONATHAN A. SHINE
ANDREW J. SHORT
APRIL D. SKOU
KENNETH D. SLOVER
JASON E. SMITH
MICHAEL T. SQUIRES
CHRISTOPHER M. STALLINGS
JENNESS F. STEELE
PATRICK T. STICH
MARK W. STOUFFER
STEVEN L. TABAT
JASON C. TALIAFERRO
BRANDON S. TEAGUE
FREDERICK J. TOTI
MICHAEL F. TREMBLAY
JASON B. TUSSEY
TRENT D. UPTON
TIMOTHY R. VAIL
JAMES P. VELESKY
JONATHAN M. VELISHKA
GEORGE WALTER
ANDREW J. WATSON
CHRISTOPHER M. WEATHERS
CHRISTOPHER B. WELLS
JOHN T. WHELAHAN, JR.
CHRISTINE M. WHITMER
GEOFFREY A. WHITTENBERG
JASON T. WILLIAMS
JEREMY R. WILLINGHAM
THOMAS G. WILSON, JR.
MICHAEL L. WISER
DAVID C. WOODRUFF, JR.
JOSEPH W. WORTHAM II
RYAN L. WORTHAN
LEO J. WYSZYNSKI
D011853
D001730
D005484
D012357
D004201
D001087
D011368
D013960

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624
AND 3064:

To be colonel

DEVRY C. ANDERSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

SUZANNE T. ALFORD
LUIS E. AYBAR
DOMINIC M. BENNETT
ROBERT L. BOND, JR.
MICHAEL C. BORJA
CHARIS M. BRACY
JENNIFER K. BRIDGES
AMY D. BRUCE
WILLIAM J. BULLEN III
TIMOTHY R. CAMERON
CHRISTOPHER M. CASEY
GRANT J. CASSINGHAM
GREGORY A. CHASSE
JULIE E. CHRISTIE
JOSEPH J. CROWLEY
GODFREY CUNNINGHAM, JR.
SANDRA M. DEERING
SARA M. DIMMICK
WILLIAM J. ELLIOTT
JOSHUA A. EVIRS
CHRISTOPHER M. FERRANTE
NEAL J. FERRY
BRIGID C. FIELDS
STEPHEN A. FLOYD
JOHN G. GIBSON III
DECLAN B. GLYNN
JAMES C. GOUGER
MATTHEW D. GRAHAM
KYLE S. GREEN
MARK P. GRISSOM, JR.
NICHOLAS P. R. GRITZ
CASSIE L. HAMBLIN
KURT W. HANSEN
DARCY A. HERBERICK
NATHANIEL B. HODGES
MATTHEW T. HOLDEN
VANESSA K. JANSEN
ADAM J. KEECH
IAN S. KELLEY
EDWARD R. KELLUM
JEANANNE B. KIM
JEFFREY W. LAUPOLA
CLIFFORD T. LOOS
CHRISTOPHER R. LOPER
JABE LOPEZ
DAVID S. MADISON
AMY M. MANCL
JENNIFER M. MANGARAN
EDDIE L. MARTIN
MATTHEW M. MCKENZIE
TYSON B. MEADORS
JOHN E. D. MEYER
KATRINA C. MOFFETT
TODD P. MOULTON
WESTON P. MURRAY
MICHAEL F. NATARO
ANDREW L. ORCHARD
LESLIE C. PAISLEY
JEREMY D. PARSON
JACOB E. PIKE
DAVID L. PROSSER
KEVIN J. PUDAS
JASON T. RETTINGER
SAMANTHA F. SCARBOROUGH
JOSEPH G. STAINS
AARON R. STOMSKI
ANTONIO R. SWAIN
DAVID I. TANG
ANDY M. THAXTON
DAVID M. TRUESDELL
CALEB S. TUCKER
WILLIAM R. WALSH
BRIAN K. WEHLE
JAMIE N. WHITMAN
TIMOTHY L. WIES
ERIC R. WRIGHT
DAVID A. YANCEY
LAURA C. YOON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ROY A. ADUNA
QUENTIN ALBEA
PAUL M. ALLEN
CHRISTOPHER L. AMBROSI
ALDEN Y. ARGANTE
BLAIR W. ASHBY
RICHARD F. BAIER
ADAM M. BARONI
MARVIN E. BARTHOLOMEW
MICHAEL P. BAUTISTA
COREY A. BELL
CORY S. BENFIELD
BEAU J. BLANCHARD
KURT A. BOGART
CHARLES E. BONAFILIA
CHRISTOPHER W. BRANDT
JOEL B. BROVERO
JOSHUA W. BUNTE
MICHAEL J. CARR
BRANDON D. CARVER
JAIME CASTRO
JAVIER CASTROMARTINEZ
ROQUE E. CHASE
JAMES B. CLARK
KEITH A. CLARK
ROBERT J. COATS
JEROD L. COLE

DARRELL L. COOK
RALPH S. COOK
MICHAEL S. COOKE
WILLIAM J. CORRIGAN, JR.
PRAXEDES COTRINA
MATTHEW W. CRANDALL
KEVIN A. CURTIS
RAHSAN A. DEEVERS
MITCHEL M. DESHOTEL II
ALEXEY DIAZ
BRENT C. DUNAGAN
ALAN R. DUNLAP
ALOYSIUS V. ELZIE
CHRISTOPHER EMMETT
AMY N. EVANS
SCOTT D. EVANS
ROGER J. EYROLLES
GREGORIO V. FAMILIA
ROSS E. FARROW
MALVIN L. FIKES
ROBERT A. FILES, JR.
MICHAEL J. E. FISK
MIGUEL FLORES, JR.
MICHAEL R. FOUGHT
DOMINIC R. FRANK
MARK J. GACKOWSKI
LAWRENCE J. GAZAFY
DAMON C. GILBERT
JOHN J. GNIK
WILLIAM B. GODWIN, JR.
DAVID M. GREEN
CHAD W. HAACK
TENNILLE M. HAIRSTON
JERROD S. HALL
EVELYN J. HANDLEY
DOUGLAS E. HAWK
CATHERINE L. HAYNES
QUINCY P. HEBERT
DARRELL R. HEIDE
JOSHUA M. HEMMING
LINDA C. HILTON
GREGORY E. HITT
STEVEN HOFFEN
AARON E. HOLDREN
STEVEN L. HOOD
CHRISTOPHER M. HUDSON
GARY L. HUDSON
JAMISON R. HUNTER
KEVIN W. IRONS
MICHAEL C. JARRIEL
JOHN M. JERNIGAN
MYRON C. JOHNSON
CARLTON JONES
RONALD D. JONES, JR.
VINCENT A. JUNOR
MICHAEL A. KALMAN
STANLEY F. KEMPINGER, JR.
SHANNON J. KEUSS
PATRICK J. KEY
KERRY L. KING
CHRISTOPHER A. KISER
SHAWN L. KLINE
JEFFREY T. KNIGHT
ROB E. R. KOERNKE
VICTOR S. KOUW
WINSTON B. LANGHAM
JAMES C. LEASURE III
MICHAEL D. LEMMONS
ROBERT J. LILLY
MARLON D. LOVE
CRAIG W. LYNES
DAVID S. MACMELVILLE
THOMAS A. MADERA
CHRISTOPHER G. MARLEY
LUCAS J. MARTINEZMENDIETA
STEWART C. MATHEWS
KEVIN T. MATSON
ROBERT L. MCCALLISTER
JAMES R. MCCARTY II
SEAN R. MCDONNELL
CHRISTOPHER R. MCHENRY
MATTHEW T. MCMAHON
MATTHEW D. METZ
LISA D. MILLIGAN
SHANNON N. MORRIS
DUANE L. MOTLEY
TODD A. MOUSEL
CRAIG L. MUELLER
JAMES J. MUELLER
GREGORY L. MULL
SCOTT A. MYTHEN
MARK D. NAGORNIUK
JEREMIAH J. NELSON
LEONARDO A. NICASIO
ELOY D. NUNEZ
LEE D. O'CONNOR
SEAN R. OWENS
SHAUN M. PAGE
KENNETH B. J. PAYNE
CHAD E. PELLETIER
RYAN J. PLATT
GARY P. PLUTTA
DAMIEN M. PORTER
BRIAN R. PURVIS
DAVID M. RACKLEY
MARK A. REDDY
MICHAEL G. REILLY, JR.
BRADLEY W. REMPFER
BRENT E. RICKER
DAVID R. RINEHART
DAVID W. ROACH
CHRISTOPHER P. ROCHE

ROMEO G. SALAZAR
RICARDO SANCHEZ
JOEY SANDERS
SUZANNE E. SCHRUMP
CHRISTOPHER W. SHEPHERD
JAMES C. SIMPSON
CHRISTOPHER R. SMITH
RODERICK B. SMITH
REGGIE L. SMOOT
CHRISTOPHER J. STEFENACK
JOHNNY L. STEVENSON, JR.
KYLE P. STROBECK
PIO STROLIGO
JOHN R. SULLIVAN
MICHAEL A. SWORD
WILLIAM O. TEMPLET, JR.
DANIEL J. TOPPER
JACOB A. UPTEGROVE
VICTOR R. VASQUEZGARCIA
MICHAEL A. VAUGHAN
CARLOS A. VEASLEY
PETER H. WARD
YVETTE M. WASHINGTON
EDWARD E. WEEKLEY, JR.
LARRON D. WHITE
MICHAEL S. WHITEHEAD
DAVID N. WILCOX
ANTONIO WILLIAMS
MARK S. WILLIAMS
THOMAS H. WILLIAMS, JR.
JOHN P. WOJCIC
FRED WOOD
JAMES W. WORLEY II
COREY K. WRIGHT
KIRTLEY N. YEISER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES
NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

CALVIN LOPER
KELVIN B. MCGHEE

To be lieutenant commander

KEVIN J. ALTEMARA
MARIAN D. HILL
STEVEN A. SHEPSKI
BILLY W. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MAUREEN M. DERKS
KRISTA B. KALICK
JEFFERY J. RIGGS, JR.
JEFFREY P. SHARP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DANIEL T. BARNES
CHRISTIANE A. BENZING
JAMES K. BROWN
DAVID P. BUNDY
STEVEN S. CHOI
NICHOLAS S. HAMILTON
CHELSEA M. HASSETT
SEAN J. JIN
KIMBERLY R. LAHNALA
TONY T. G. LE
JOHN T. MONEY
JEREMIAH A. STIEFEL
JACQUELYN O. VERMILLOHERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

SHAMIRE E. BRANCH
KELLY L. BYRNE
JASON M. DAWSON
JACK C. DOUGHERTY
STEPHAN D. GALLAGHER
RINO M. GUERRERO
CHRISTOPHER R. MACHADO
MICHAEL A. MARTIN
JESSICA A. ORR
NICHOLAS S. PATRIA
THAI Q. PHUNG
MATTHEW C. REFFITT
TYONNA N. RESPCIO
JUSTIN P. VANES
KA XIONG
ALANNA B. YOUNGBLOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DAVID L. AGUILAR
MICHELLE E. J. AKINS
JODI M. D. BIERMANN
KATY T. BOCK
KENNETH P. BOND
LEAH P. CARTER
JASON D. DOAN
CHARICKI J. EVANS

LAUREN P. GARCIA
RUBEN J. GARCIA
TIMOTHY L. HENDERSON
ANTHONY M. HRUBY
MICHAEL G. MANASKIE
WILLIAM V. MAUGERI III
BENJAMIN E. ONEILL
RYAN C. ROELING
WILLIAM C. SOUDER III
DANIEL J. WALKER
DAVID K. ZIVNUSKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

REBECCA L. ANDERSON
JOHN M. BEAVER
AARON R. BURDT
DAVID A. CROCHET
JEREMY P. DORSCHNER
DAVID T. DOYLE
MICHAEL W. FLOYD
KEVIN W. JACK
GREGORY R. JONES
DEVON B. KIBBONS
WESLEY C. LASSITER
JESSICA B. MAHONEY
GLORIA V. MCCRAY
CLINTON E. NEWMAN
THEODORE R. PERSON
CHRISTOPHER J. RICARD
LAWRENCE L. SCHUMAN, JR.
JASON P. SHAW
TOOCHIKWU O. UDEINYA
KENNETH R. VANHOOK, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ARTHUR D. ANDERSON III
JILLIAN E. BAHLMAN
MICHAEL A. BINGHAM
SHANNON R. BUCKLEY
BRIAN T. CURRAN
NICHOLAS A. DADDS
JUDE C. EZEIDKE
JOSE M. FERNANDEZ
DAVID L. FERRIS
KARL R. HENKE
THEMBA D. HINKE
RACHEL S. JELSMIA
PUYAN A. KHESHTI
MICHELLE M. KINGSLAND
BRAD W. KINNAMON
JOSEPH W. LEAVITT
PATRICK A. LIVESAY
ARTHIEMARR M. MANGOSING
ASHLEY R. MAXSON
JASON Q. MCCCLINTIC
TANYA W. MCKNIGHT
MICHAEL S. MERZ
KYLE M. MILLER
JUSTIN R. PARKER
NICOLE R. RAMOS
STEAMBOAT B. ROCK
ROBERT L. ROSS
JACOB E. RUSSELL
TARA J. SALADIN
BRIAN M. SCHAUS
OLUYEMISI H. SERIKI
WILLIAM D. SWAN
EMILY C. WARD
JOHN E. WEAVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JOSHUA D. ALBRIGHT
KEVIN D. ARMENDARIZ
THOMAS A. BAILLIE
MANUEL BENITEZ
MARK S. COLLINS
BEVERLY A. S. CRAWFORD
JONATHAN A. CULBERT
LEONARD A. DEPRISCO
LAUREN E. FLEMING
LACY A. FORD
JAMIE A. FUJIMOTO
TIMOTHY D. GALLEGOS
JASON N. GERONTES
BRANDON J. GILSTRAP
BENJAMIN T. HARPER
TRAVIS D. HOWARD
SENECA R. JOHNS
CARL M. JOHNSON
JASON G. JOO
HYUN S. KIM
JACOB E. KUEHL
RALPH L. LAFFEY
SEAN M. LARUE
REX G. LLOREN
JEFFREY P. MACY II
NICHELE R. MAGEE
RICHARD L. MARKKRAY
JAMES A. MCDOWELL
TYRELL L. MITCHELL
DERRICK V. MOORE

KEVIN C. MOTT
RICHARD M. PINTO
JESUS RINCON, JR.
CHRISTOPHER P. ROGERS
JASON W. SABATER
ANTHONY M. SANTOS, JR.
PHILIP R. SAULNIER
NOADIAH K. SIKINGER
LISA L. SNOH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

JOE F. MORALES II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JESSICA B. ANDERSON
ELIZABETH J. DOUGHERTY
JASON S. FISCHER
DAVID M. GARDNER
TIMOTHY P. GORMAN
MICHAEL A. HATFIELD
JOSEPH W. HONTZ
MIRANDA V. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MARCO A. ACOSTA
BRIAN E. ACTON
THOMAS M. ADAMS
WILLIAM M. ADAMS
RYAN M. AGTE
JHON ALCIDE
DENIS P. ALFORD
BRIAN M. ALLEN
GARRETT N. ALLEN
SEAN O. ALLEN
STANLEY E. ALLEN, JR.
BENJAMIN C. ALMOND
FRANCISCO A. ALONSO
WHITNEY M. ALVARADO
LUIS B. ALVAREZ
MONICA N. AMAGNA
MICHAEL W. AMECHE
DEREK J. ANASTASIADIS
JEREMIAH K. ANDERSON
DOUGLAS R. ANDRADE
CHRISTOPHER N. ANDREWS
DAVID M. ANDREWS
MAXIMO A. ANGELES
BRADEN W. APPERSON
RYAN P. APPLEMAN
PAUL A. ARCHER
GUILLERMO M. ARGUELLO
GERALD E. ARMSTRONG
BRAMWELL B. ARNOLD III
DANIEL R. ARSENAULT
JOSE A. AYALA
CHRISTOPHER M. BABCOCK
JONATHAN S. BACH
MICHAEL R. BAKER
DUSTIN I. BALDWIN
JAMES S. BALL
BRETT M. BALLARD
PATRICK N. BANTA, JR.
ANDRE L. BARBER
CARL W. BARLOW III
TODD M. BARRIGER
TAYLOR C. BARROW
JON B. BAUMAN, JR.
JEREMIAH B. BAUTISTA
CARLTON T. BAYES
MARK A. BEALE
TRAVIS F. BEAN
VANCE R. BEATTY
MATTHEW E. T. BECK
JACOB T. BECKELHYMER
WILLIAM E. BECKER III
STEVEN C. BEDNASH
SHANE R. BEENER
RONALD G. BELANY, JR.
JOSHUA M. BERGEN
SARAH J. BERGMAN
SEAN K. BERGSTROM
ROBERT H. BERKSTRESSER
ERIKA BETANCOURT
WILLIAM G. BICKEL
MATHEW J. BIRD
BRIAN T. BITTNER
JAMES J. BLACK
CHARLES R. BLACKWELL
SAMUEL H. BLAIR
RYAN D. BLANKENSHIP
PETER R. BLEDAY
GREGORY S. BLOK
WILLIAM R. BOGDANOWICZ
ERIC W. BOKHOVEN
CHRISTOPHER J. BONGARD
TIMOTHY D. BONHAM
CLARENCE R. BOSWELL
PATRICK J. BOUCHOUX
PATRICK R. BOURQUE
WILLIAM A. BOWEN III
ADAM M. BOYD

JON N. BOYER
MICHAEL D. BOYLE
TAYLOR B. BRASHEAR
CHRISTOPHER J. BRASS
SCOTT A. BRAZELTON
PAUL D. BRAZIER
PAUL A. BRIDGERS
JAMES E. BRIDGEN
PATRICK W. BRINKMAN
JAMES B. BRODTMANN
JOSHUA K. BROWN
THOMAS N. BROWN
ANDREW D. BROYLES
DERRICK R. BRUCE
LOWELL E. BRUHN
SAMUEL BRYANT
JEFFREY S. BUCK
FREDERICK T. BUCKLEY
JEFFREY C. BUENAVENTURA
DANIEL E. BURKE, JR.
DAVID M. BURKETT
JEFFREY L. BURKHOLDER
WILLIAM R. BURKLAND
JAMISON K. BURKS
MATTHEW A. BURMESTER
JOHN A. BURNS
JASON M. BURROUGHS
ALEXANDER T. BUSCHOR
JOHNATHON S. BUSS
AARON B. BUTLER
BRETT A. BUTTERFIELD
MATTHEW D. BYINGTON
DANIEL K. BYRNE
NATHANIEL C. CALCAMUGGIO
JAMES P. CALLAHAN
WILSON M. CALLES
DAVID M. CAMP
ALEXANDER J. F. CAMPBELL
SYLVESTER CAMPOS III
JOHN T. CANNY II
MATTHEW J. CAPALDO
JEREMY M. CAPPALO
ASHLEY H. CARLINE
CAMERON A. CARLSON
JARED L. CARLSON
JASON A. CARRIER
WILLIAM M. CARSON
GREGORY W. CARTER
MICHAEL W. CARTER
JOHNATHON A. CASEY
ANDREW W. CASSITY
SEAN C. CASTLE
TOMAS G. CAVERO
PATRICK M. CERONE
THOMAS P. CHAMBERAS II
IAN CHAMBERLIN
NICHOLAS A. CHAMBERS
PIA M. CHAPMAN
MIGUEL D. CHARLES
NICHOLAS S. CHARNAS
JEN C. CHEN
MATTHEW R. CHESNEY
ANDREW J. CHESS
JONMICHAEL CHOMBEAU
SARAH R. CHOMBEAU
WILLIAM T. CICHILLO, JR.
JOEL M. CINCOTTA
STEPHEN L. CLAGETT
JACOB Z. CLARK
ROBERT D. CLARKSON
COLIN M. CLEARY
NICHOLAS J. CLENDENNING
MILTON D. COCHRAN
ANDREW C. COE
TIMOTHY J. COENNEN
JUSTIN A. COHEE
JAMES C. COLEMAN
JOHN W. COLEMAN III
KEENAN L. COLEMAN
DEIRDRE E. COLLINS
JOSE L. COLON
JOHN A. COLVIN
PAUL J. COLWELL
LETA M. COMER
ANDREW W. CONNER
ARLEN M. CONNOLLY
CHRISTOPHER J. CONWAY
DAVID A. COOK
EVAN J. COOK
LEE E. COOK
RUSSELL J. COOK
JEFFREY A. CORNIELLE
BRADLEY G. CORREA
KYLE A. CORRY
DAVID S. CRAIG
DUSTIN K. CRAWFORD
CHARLES J. CRAWLEY III
JAMES B. CREMEAN
JOSEPH A. CRESTO
ARLENE V. CREWS
RYAN D. CULBERTSON
DEWARD L. CUMMINGS
RODRIGO L. CUNHA
CAITLIN E. CUNNINGHAM
RYAN P. CUNZ
CHRISTOPHER H. CURD
EDWARD P. CURLEY
SCOTT M. CURTIN
JOHN D. DAMON
PETER G. DANIELS
PAUL M. DANOS
RICHARD J. DAPRATO

PAUL J. DAUFFENBACH
JAMES D. DAVEY
NATHAN C. DAVEY
TYLER M. DAVIES
BRIAN J. DAVIS
DANIEL E. DAVIS
GRAIG C. DAVIS
DANIEL R. DECKER
MALLORY W. DECKER
STEPHEN J. DEFAZIO
RICHARD R. DELK
ROBERT J. H. DENNIS
ERIK A. DENTE
RENATO A. DEPAOLIS
ALBAN DERVISHI
NATHAN H. DESSO
TIMOTHY J. DEVALL
RYAN E. DIBELLO
TIMOTHY J. DIDJURGIS
ANDREW J. DIERKS
ANDREW J. DIETZEL
ERIK S. DILL
CALVIN W. DILLARD
CHASE H. DILLARD
GERARD T. DIMONE II
AMANDA R. DIRICKSON
ROGER A. DMOCHOWSKI
IVAN G. DOBREV
CHRISTOPHER R. DOLAN
FRANCIS K. DORE
RYAN T. DOYLE
MARTA D. DREW
RICHARD T. DUGAN
GABRIEL P. DURAN
KYLE E. DURRANT
RYAN J. EASTON
NICHOLAS K. EDMISTON
ASHLEY E. ELLISON
SCOTT G. ELWELL
BENJAMIN A. ELZNER
STEPHEN M. EMERSON
NICOLEMARIE K. A. ENGLAND
TIMOTHY D. ERICKSON
WILLIAM C. ERVIN
RICHARD W. ESCAMILLA, JR.
DAVID J. ESHELMAN
LUIS E. ESTRADA
ROBERT D. ESTRELLA
GREGORY D. EWING
ERIC T. FAIRCLOTH
ADAM M. FAIRES
MATTHEW E. FAULKENBERRY
WILLIAM M. FAVIA
BRADLEY P. FEIGE
JOSHUA D. FEINBERG
SHANNON C. FEITZ
SCOTT N. FELTER
NATHANIEL C. FETTING
JAMESON J. FINCHER
JASON A. FITE
PATRICK J. FLEENOR, JR.
ELY J. FLETCHER
ANDREW C. FLORO
DANIEL E. FOOSE
PETER C. FORBES
TRAVER J. FORDHAM
ALLAN J. FORTIER
CHRISTOPHER N. FOSS
MATTHEW S. FOSTER
BRIGITTE M. FOX
SASHA R. FRANKHOUSER
JOHN N. FRANKLIN, JR.
STEVEN FRESSE
THOMAS J. FREY
TY T. FRITZ
KYLE J. FULLERTON
LAUREN M. FUSELIER
PATRICK F. GAHAN
JUSTIN A. GALLREIN
CHRISTOPHER T. GANS
LESLIE A. GARCIA
MICHAEL G. GARCIA
OMAR A. GARCIA
MATTHEW R. GARCIBRAGIEL
ERIK D. GARDNER
DREW D. GASTON
CHRISTOPHER A. GAVIERES
EMILY E. GEDDES
JASON R. GEDDES
JACOB M. GERLACH
MELVIN L. GIDDIN
WILLIAM W. GIFFORD
DANIEL J. GIFT
IAN E. GILL
JOSEPH T. GILLIGAN
RHETT N. GILMAN
NATHAN A. GINGERY
LAUREN A. GIRARD
JOSHUA A. GLASS
SEAN F. GLASS
MARK A. GLASSER
MICHAEL R. GLAVAN
BRIAN P. GLEASON
MICHAEL E. GLYNN
RYAN M. GODSHALK
JOHN T. GOFF
WILLIAM J. GOLDEN
ANTHONY J. GOLEMI
ERIC W. GORDEN
ROBERT A. GORDON
CARL M. GOVERNALE
STEPHEN N. GRABER

TOMAS A. GRADO
KEITH R. GRAEBNER
MARTELLEY S. GRAHAM
BRENDAN E. GREELEY
NATHAN F. GREEN
CARLEIGH R. GREGORY
TYLER L. GRELL
EDWARD J. GREWAY, JR.
GARY W. GRIMES II
LUKE D. GRISWOLD
CORY D. GRIZZLE
JEFFREY H. GRUETZMACHER
RYAN M. GRUNDT
ANTHONY M. GRUSICH
MATTHEW J. GUIDO
KEVIN X. GULDNER
DALAN M. HAAS
ALLAN C. HALE
CHARLES R. HALL
KYLE D. HANFORD
SEAN W. HANLEY
BRIAN M. HANSON
DAVID M. HANSON
ALYSHA D. HARAN
WILLIAM G. HARDIN, JR.
ROBERT A. HARRELL
ANTHONY M. HARRIS
BENJAMIN T. HARRIS
BETHANY A. HARRISON
ROGER A. HART
JOHN J. HARTSOG
ROBERT H. HARTZELL III
WILLIAM B. HARVEY IV
CODY C. HASTINGS
EZRA T. HATCH
KYLE T. HAUBOLD
KRISTOFER D. HAWBAKER
EMILE H. HAWKINS, JR.
DANIEL R. HAWTHORNE
JOHN T. HAYASHI
JOHN J. HAYES III
MICHAEL S. HAZLEBECK
DONALD R. HEAD
MATTHEW J. HEASTER
MATTHEW L. HEAVRIN
COLLIN R. HEDGES
MATTHEW G. HEIDT
ANDER S. HEILES
CHRISTOPHER C. HELLER
BRANDON B. HEMPLER
KEVIN F. HENDERSON
RANDALL E. I. HENDRICKS
DUSTIN G. HENZE
TIMOTHY G. HERMAN
RONALD A. HERRERA
CONNOR M. HERRON
JENNIFER L. HESLING
JOHN D. HESLING
RICHARD W. HESS
ANDREW C. HILL
JASON E. HIPPI
CHRISTOPHER M. HIRONAGA
KATHERINE V. HIRSCH
BRIAN D. HOCK
DANIEL C. HODGES
ANDREW J. HOFFMAN
COE R. HOFFMAN
MICHAEL T. HOPHEINS
JAKE W. HOLLAND
MICHAEL J. HOLLAND
ERIC P. HOLLER
NICHOLAS L. HOLMAN
ANDERS C. HOLMSTROM
DANIEL J. HOOGE
DANIEL J. HORGAN
KEVIN P. HOWARD
NIKOLAI J. HOWE
MASON J. HOYT
JOSHUA D. HRICIK
DONIVAN W. HUDGINS
KRISTOFER C. HUFF
STEPHEN P. HUFFMAN
CLAYTON E. HUNT
STEVEN HYDE
CARLOS M. IGUINA
JOHN D. INMAN
KEVIN M. ISAAK
CHRISTOPHER R. JACK
ADAM H. JACKSON
BRETT D. JAKOVICH
RACHEL R. JARVIS
RYAN P. JAUREGUI
JUSTIN L. JAYNES
AARON JEFFERSON III
CHRISTOPHER R. JENKINS
CHRISTOPHER A. JESSEL
DEVAN W. JEWELL
CHARLES E. JOHNSON
CRAIG D. JOHNSON
DEREK M. JOHNSON
GEOFFREY B. JOHNSON
JAMES B. JOHNSON
JAY B. JOHNSON
KYLE A. JOHNSON
COLIN A. JOHNSONGIAMMALVO
ADAM M. JONES
ANTONIO T. JONES
BRIAN J. JONES
CHRISTOPHER E. JORDAN
JOHN B. JUDY
NATHAN R. JUMP
KENNETH E. KAPP

MATTHEW S. H. KASAOKA
 JOSHUA W. KASH
 JESSE R. KASPER
 JAMES M. KAUFMAN
 JOHN F. KAVANAGH
 PETER J. KEANEY
 SEAN P. KEARNEY
 JEFFREY W. KEE
 MATTHEW J. KEELEY
 ALFRED L. KELLER, JR.
 KRISTOPHER J. KELLOGG
 JUSTIN M. KELLY
 SCOTT M. KENNICOTT
 ANDREW J. KIEFHABER
 THOMAS J. KILCLINE III
 IAN G. KILPATRICK
 JOHN R. KIMMEL
 JOSEPH J. KIMOCK, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER M. KINGERY
 JEFFREY R. KINGSLAND
 SHANE D. KITTERMAN
 SCOTT C. KNUTTON
 ANTHONY N. KOCHANSKI
 KEVIN J. KOENIG
 JAMESROBERT C. KOFFI
 RICHARD A. KOPP, JR.
 HUNTER S. KORBELIK
 ERIK C. KOWALSKI
 DAMON W. KROES
 BRENDAN A. KRUSE
 CHRISTOPHER W. KUHPITTERS
 MARK D. KUMMER
 RICHARD S. KUSS
 ANDREW D. KWON
 ZACHARY O. LAMB
 STACEY R. LANCASTER
 ERIC L. LARDIZABAL
 JOHN D. LARNERD III
 PETER A. LARSEN
 STEWART P. LATWIN
 ANDREW J. LAVIN
 ANTHONY R. LAVOPA
 JEREMY D. LEAZER
 JAMES P. LEE
 NATHAN J. LEE
 WALTER A. LEE
 MATTHEW B. LEES
 DEAN J. LEGIDAKES, JR.
 SAMUEL G. LEHNER
 FRANKLIN LEMENE
 WILLIAM K. LENNON
 ANDREW M. LEONE
 ADAM J. LETIZIO
 KASEY B. LEWIS
 KRISTOPHER R. LEWIS
 LINZY LEWIS III
 NATHAN M. LICHON
 CHRISTOPHER A. LINDAHL
 GREGORY D. LINDERMAN
 MICHAEL J. LINDSEY
 JOSHUA E. LISTER
 NICOLE L. LOBECKER
 DUSTIN A. LOCKERMAN
 BENJAMIN B. LONG
 CATHERINE S. LONG
 WILLIAM P. LOONEY
 LISA J. LOWERY
 ROBERT G. LOWERY III
 TROY E. LOYD
 JOSHUA LUDWIG
 DAVID P. LUECK
 LEVI T. LUNDELL
 DIRK R. LUNDGREN
 KEVIN J. LUTZ
 JOHN P. LYLES
 REED H. MACKENZIE
 BENJAMIN S. MACNEIL
 GREGORY T. MAHER
 DANIEL M. MAINE
 MEAGAN B. MAKARENKO
 NATHAN L. MALNATI
 JEFFREY K. MANDEL
 THOMAS C. MANEMEIT
 MIA E. MARBELLA
 SETH J. MARCUSA
 DANIEL L. MARION
 TIMOTHY D. MARKLEY
 HUNTER A. MARNER
 TYLER V. MARSHBURN
 CHAD T. MARTIN
 JOHN P. MARTIN
 SCOTT J. MARTIN
 FRANCISCO D. MARTINEZ
 LUIS G. MARTINEZ
 SERGIO A. MARTINEZ
 STEPHEN C. MATTINGLY
 AARON K. MAUK
 BRIAN D. MAXFIELD
 JAMES M. MAXWELL
 ROBERT E. MAYER
 RYAN W. MCBRIDE
 VINCENT M. MCCALL
 RICHARD E. MCCLAIN III
 MARK L. MCCLURE
 GAVIN C. MCCORRY
 RYAN D. MCFEELY
 THOMAS P. MCGEE, JR.
 CASEY E. MCHENRY
 DOUGLAS K. MCKENZIE
 JAMES T. MCCLAUGHLIN
 MICHAEL J. I. MCCLAUGHLIN
 CONNOR T. MCMURRAY

AMANDA K. MCNALLY
 RONALD A. MCNEAL III
 RYAN D. MCNULTY
 FRANK K. MCQUIDDY
 JAMES L. MCQUINIFF
 DAVID D. MEADOWS
 JOHN D. MEDWID
 BYRON C. MEEK
 JOSHUA D. MEEK
 RICHARD F. MEHLMANN
 JAVIER O. MEJIA
 MICHAEL A. MELENDEZ
 DAVID J. MENDONSA
 IAN B. MENELEY
 CARLY G. MEYER
 DAWN A. MEYER
 ANDREW B. MILBURN
 ROBERT E. MILCHESKY
 ANDREW J. MILLER
 CHARLES A. MILLER
 JAMES B. MILLER
 NICHOLAS G. MILLER
 RYAN Q. MILLER
 RYAN W. MILLER
 THOMAS E. MILLER
 BENJAMIN J. MILLS
 COURTNEY N. MILLS
 MATTHEW K. MILLS
 STEPHEN J. MINDEK
 CHRISTOPHER B. MINICK
 JASON J. MIYOSHI
 ROBERT J. MOLINARO
 CHRISTOPHER B. MONTAGUE
 MARK MONTARULI
 BRANDON L. MOODY
 GARRETT M. MOORE
 GARRETT T. MOORE
 JUSTIN P. MOORE
 ANTHONY J. MORANA
 NICOLAS S. MORENO
 BRIAN A. MORGAN
 MATTHEW K. MORGAN
 MARK A. MORGART
 COLIN J. MORRISSEY
 BENNETT C. MORTON
 JOSHUA A. MOULZOLF
 KYLE A. MOYER
 MICHAEL A. MULLEE
 BENJAMIN M. MULLOY
 NICHOLAS E. MUNN
 GAROLD I. MUNSON
 MICHAEL R. MURKERSON
 MARK J. MURPHY
 ANDREW S. MYERS
 SARA A. NASH
 GEORGE L. NAUGHTON
 ANTHONY M. NEBEL
 ERIK C. NEIDLINGER
 CHARLES J. NELSON
 WILLIAM J. NEMECEK
 CRAIG P. NESGOOD
 DANIEL G. NESMITH
 ELIZABETH A. NEWBOLD
 DAVID P. NICOLAS
 CLAYTON A. NIEKRAS
 ERIC R. NIESSNER
 CHRISTOPHER J. NISCH
 JACOB A. NORGGAARD
 AMANDA D. NORTON
 SEAN R. NORTON
 ROBERT M. NOTARI
 KENT W. NYGREN
 KYLE J. OBENOUR
 MICHELLE E. OBENOUR
 MATTHEW J. OBERLANDER
 PRESTON J. OCHOA
 SHANNON M. OLDHAM
 MATTHEW S. OLOUGHLIN
 JOHN D. OLSEN
 DANIEL T. OLSON
 TYLER C. OLVEY
 SCHUYLER P. ONDERDONK
 DANIEL J. ONEILL
 JOHN R. ONEILL
 JUAN OQUENDO III
 BRADLEY T. OTREMBIA
 JONATHAN S. OVREN
 CAREY J. OWENS
 DANIEL W. OWENS
 JASON T. OWENS
 DAVID M. PACKNICK
 DAVID S. PAGAN
 ERIC C. PAGE
 MIRCEA C. PAMFIL
 JASON D. PARADIS
 JAMES J. PARKER
 MITCHELL G. PARMENTIER
 JULIAN P. PASCUZZI
 JOHN R. PATRICK
 MATTHEW S. PAUL
 CHAD G. PEARCE
 ROBERT W. PEDERSEN
 JOSHUA A. PEEPLES
 MATTHEW C. PELONZI
 NATHAN M. PENKA
 NICHOLAS J. PERANTEAU
 MARC A. A. PEREZ
 LANE S. PERKINS
 LARRY J. PERSON
 JAMES P. PETERSEN
 BENJAMIN M. PETRISIN
 TREVOR S. PHILLIPSLEVINE

ELANA S. PHIPPS
 MATTHEW W. PILLOW
 JACOB D. PITCHFORD
 NATHAN S. PITTSCH
 THOMAS J. PLACEK, JR.
 MCKENZIE S. PLANK
 ANDREW L. POLLACK
 TIMOTHY D. PONSHOCK
 EUGENE B. PONTES
 MEGHAN E. POOLE
 DANIEL L. POPE
 JUSTIN R. PORTER
 SHAUN A. POSEY
 CHRISTOPHER T. POST
 RICHARD J. POUDRIER
 THOMAS E. POWERS III
 JOSHUA T. PRESS
 MATTHEW C. PRICE
 JOSHUA R. PRITT
 MISTY R. PROBST
 BROOK A. PRUDDEN
 STEPHEN C. PRUGH
 MICHAEL F. QUAGLINO
 MATTHEW J. QUINTERO
 ANDREW T. RADCLIFFE
 CHRISTOPHER W. RAKOSKI
 NATHAN A. RAO
 RAY E. RATLIFF
 JOSHUA D. RAYMOND
 PAUL M. REALI
 TERRA A. REBER
 MIGUEL E. RECALDE
 MATHEW B. RECHKEMMER
 RONNY C. RECTOR
 JOHN D. REED
 ERIC T. REGNIER
 PAUL R. REYES
 JOSEPH E. RICE
 WILLIAM A. RICHARDSON
 BRIAN G. RIGEZ
 PHILLIP A. RIOS
 CLAYTON T. RIVES
 BRETT P. ROBBLEE, JR.
 DANIEL J. ROBERTSON
 GORDON L. ROBERTSON
 JOHN F. ROBIE
 MARGARET K. ROBIE
 DEREK S. J. ROCHA
 DAVID A. RODES
 BRANDON S. RODGERS
 CARLOS M. ROE
 SHAUN P. ROESSNER
 JASON L. ROGERS
 MICHAEL S. ROGERS
 ERIC J. ROHAN
 BRANDON L. ROHDE
 TOBIN J. ROLLENHAGEN
 CHRISTOPHER A. ROMNEK
 JESSICA N. ROSA
 JENNA R. ROSE
 MICHAEL A. ROSE
 MICHAEL V. ROSELLI
 KATHRYN E. ROSENBERG
 DAVID J. ROSENFELDER
 AMANDA J. ROSS
 JASON D. ROSS
 RYAN A. ROSS
 ELAN J. S. ROTKLEIN
 DANIEL J. RUSSELL
 BRIAN J. RUTLEDGE
 JEFFREY M. RYAN
 SAMUEL C. RYKACZEWSKI
 JEFFREY M. SACHINSKI
 DONALD G. SAFFORD
 RYAN J. SALCIDO
 MICHAEL A. SALVEMINI
 EMILY A. SALVIA
 COSMAS SAMARITIS
 JOSE SANCHEZ, JR.
 BENJAMIN L. SANDERS
 LINDSEY C. SANTIAGO
 OMAR C. SANUSI
 ALEXANDER M. SAYERS
 VICTOR C. SCHAEFER
 MICHAEL R. SCHELCHER
 JONATHAN M. SCHEMEL
 BRITTANY L. SCHENKEL
 ADAM C. SCHMIDT
 CHRISTOPHER L. SCHMITT
 SHANE M. SCHNETTLER
 KARL A. SCHROEDER
 CLINTON T. SCHUHART
 HUNTER A. SCOTT
 ANDREW R. SEBASTIANO
 JOSEPH V. SEIDA
 THOMAS P. SELAND
 RYAN S. SELIGMAN
 MARTIN SETIAWAN
 CHRISTIAN N. SEYMOUR
 BLAKE J. SHAFFER
 MATTHEW D. SHARRA
 KATHERINE Y. SHEPHERD
 LESTER L. SHEWMAKE III
 ADAM M. SHIELDS
 JARED R. SHULLICK
 ZACHARY J. SIPES
 STEPHEN J. SKAHEN, JR.
 BARRETT R. SLEEPER
 PETER G. SLYE
 DAVID M. SMALL
 AIMEE J. SMITH
 MICHAEL J. SMITH

REBECCA M. SMITH
 REED R. SMITH, JR.
 REID A. SMITH
 RODERICK L. SMITH
 TIMOTHY S. SMITH
 ERIC D. SMITLEY
 KENNETH S. SNELL
 KAILEY M. SNYDER
 ARWYN B. SOUTH
 WILLIAM C. SPEARS
 ROBERT W. SPENCE
 MICHAEL D. SPRANGER
 CHRISTOPHER G. SPRING
 COURTNEY R. STALTER
 JOHN W. STAMANT II
 KEVIN M. STEADELE
 MICHAEL J. STEARNS
 JAMES P. STEBBINS
 ALEXIS F. STEELE
 JESSE N. STEELE
 TODD J. STEINBRENNER
 DAVID M. STEPPE
 CARL H. STEWART, JR.
 KATIE A. STEWART
 PATRICK R. STEWART
 SIAN E. STIMPERT
 ERIC A. STINSON
 JOSHUA J. STOCKDALE
 MATTHEW G. STOLPINSKI
 DANIELLE M. STONE
 PATRICK R. STONE
 SANJAY S. STONE
 ANDREW C. STONER
 BENJAMIN A. STOROZUM
 PARKER H. STRATTON
 TYLER H. STRUZINSKI
 JORDAN J. STUTZMAN
 TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN
 ERIK B. SUNDAY
 DEREK A. SUTTON
 JASON T. TUTTON
 JACQUES A. SUYDERHOUD
 JEFFREY R. SWAIM
 TODD R. TALSTEIN
 ROBERT M. TANKSLEY
 RACHEL E. TARBOX
 LEIGH R. TATE
 HELEN G. TAUTOLO
 DAVID K. TAVEEL
 EARVIN M. TAYLOR
 BRENDAN M. TEAGUE
 MICHAEL E. TEM
 ZACHARY B. J. TEMPLIN
 ANDREW R. TENBUSCH
 BRADFORD J. TESDALL
 JUDSON J. C. THOMAS
 TRAVIS B. THOMAS
 WILLIAM H. THOMAS
 ANDREW R. THOMPSON
 CHRISMAN L. THOMPSON
 MARK J. THOMPSON
 PAUL J. TORTORA
 SEAN M. TOTH
 SHAWN M. TOTH
 BRENDAN T. TOWER
 IAN R. TOWNSEND
 JOHN M. TOZER
 JAYSON V. TREMBATH
 MEREDITH E. TREZISE
 JERRY B. TUCK
 ALAN N. TUCKER, JR.
 REBECCA K. TUCKER
 ROBERT F. TUMMINELLO
 DANIEL J. TURNER
 MATTHEW K. TURNER
 SARAH J. TURNER
 ADAM R. TURPIN
 NICHOLAS A. TUUK
 SEAN A. VALDEZ
 CHRISTOPHER B. VANALLEN
 WILLIAM J. VANDECASLE II
 JEFFREY E. VANDENENGEL
 RYAN D. VANLOO
 GAVIN T. VEEDER
 CASEY L. VERONIE
 JACOB K. VETTER

THOMAS C. VIGER
 NICHOLAS F. VILARDI
 JOHN W. VINE
 GERALD E. VINEYARD
 JUSTIN D. VITALIS
 TOBLER T. VOGHT
 CHRISTOPHER J. WADDELL
 SCOTT C. WAGNER
 JOSEPH K. WAIDELICH
 MARK F. WAITE
 JAMES C. WALK
 DAMIEN L. WALL
 JONATHAN P. WANDERSEE
 MATTHEW D. WARSHAW
 JUSTIN P. WASKEY
 NICHOLAS J. WATTSFERNANDEZ
 JOSEPH R. WAURIO
 ANDRE A. WEBB
 JARED S. WEBSTER
 KRISTOPHER R. WEIBLE
 AUSTIN G. WEINY
 JACOB M. WEINZATL
 BRIAN M. WELCH
 BENJAMIN P. WHATLEY
 NATHAN D. WHITE
 JACOB R. WHITEHILL
 NATHANIEL R. WHITEMAN
 MICHAEL L. WIEDERHOLT
 ANDREW R. WIGGINTON
 JAMES J. WIGHTMAN
 DARIN M. WILCKEN
 ERIC J. WILCKENS
 TERRENCE D. WILKENING
 DAVID P. WILLIAMS
 JASON M. WILLIAMS
 JODI M. WILLIAMS
 ROBERT S. WILLIAMS
 ALYSSA J. WILSON
 BRIAN D. WILSON
 WILLIAM C. WILSON
 ROBERT R. WINFIELD
 TIMOTHY M. WINTERS
 KAREN J. WOOD
 BRETT M. WOODARD
 JAMES C. WOODSIDE
 JOHN C. WOODSIDE
 CAROLYN A. WORK
 RYAN J. WORRELL
 CRAIG J. WRIGHT
 DANIEL C. YATES
 CHARLES W. YEARGIN
 FREDRICK R. YONKMAN
 KRISTOFER L. YOST
 MICHAEL P. YOST
 JORDAN D. YOUNG
 JAMES T. YOUNTS
 MICHAEL J. ZECCA
 MATTHEW V. ZELINSKAS
 ARTHUR L. ZEPF
 ROBERT F. ZIERDEN
 DANIEL P. ZIMMER
 KYLE J. ZINK
 KEITH E. ZUMAR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

WILLIAM J. ROY, JR.

To be lieutenant commander

RAQUEL T. BUSER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

GREGORY F. ALLEN
 MILES G. ALVAREZ
 LAURA G. ANDERSON
 LINDSAY K. BARNES
 KENNETH G. BAUGESS
 ERIK J. BOOHER
 RYAN P. BRECKENRIDGE

KELLY L. CARMACK
 SAMUEL K. CHUNG
 BRANDON F. CLARE
 PETER J. CRIMMINS, JR.
 MIGUEL CUEVA, JR.
 RYAN P. DEGHELDER
 JOSHUA E. DOMAGALSKI
 LIAM J. DORNEY
 AMANDA M. ECKERT
 PATRICK J. EMERY
 SCOTT E. FINLEY
 JOSHUA L. FISHER
 TIMOTHY S. FOLEY
 TEBIN H. T. GLEBUS
 MILTON L. GRAY
 NICOLE W. HAHN
 MICHAEL C. HAMMOND
 COLLEEN P. HANDBURY
 ERIC R. HAYDEN
 NATHANIEL J. HAYES
 ANDREW S. JACKSON
 MICHAEL S. JENKS
 JAMIE L. JOHNSON
 DAVID JUSTAMANTE
 WILLIAM R. KATZ
 ERIK S. KNEBEL
 JASON R. KNUDSON
 ROBIN S. LAFRANCE
 BRYAN J. MARTIN
 REID A. MASON
 LEAH K. MCDUFFIE
 RYAN P. MCGEOUGH
 TRAVIS C. MILLER
 MEAGHAN K. MURRAY
 JEREMY J. NERIUS
 MELISSA L. OCASIO
 MARY A. OSHLO
 STEPHEN H. PINERO
 JOHN C. PRESSLEY, JR.
 PEYTON T. PRICE
 NATHAN J. RICHARDSON
 DYLAN H. RICHMOND
 JEN G. SCHUMACHER
 LINDSAY M. SHEPHEARD
 FRANK T. SISTO, JR.
 ERIC C. SMITH
 JOHN E. SMITH III
 GREGORY A. SUDDERTH
 MATTHEW R. TIMMERMAN
 HILLARY A. TOKARCZYK
 ROBERT U. TUOHY IV
 JENNIFER C. TURNER
 LESLIE E. WARD
 PAUL M. WARD
 JORDAN T. WEINSHANK
 MARK A. WESS
 CLINTON M. WOODS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JOHN J. STRAUB

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 16, 2017:

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

HENRY KERNER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE SPECIAL COUNSEL, OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL, FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CALLISTA L. GINGRICH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE HOLY SEE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE SCALISE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 551, and YEA on Roll Call No. 552.

HONORING BLAIRE BARTLETT

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank my outgoing Deputy Chief of Staff, Blaire Bartlett.

Raised in the small town of Westerville, Ohio, Blaire Marie Bartlett grew up with a desire for enriching the lives of others. After graduating from Westerville North High School, Blaire enrolled in Spring Hill College on a golf scholarship where she later obtained a B.A. in Hispanic Studies and a B.S. in International Studies. Subsequently, former Congressman Jim Walsh hired Blaire as his Executive Assistant. After working in various offices, both on- and off-Hill, Blaire joined my staff in 2015 within weeks of my swearing-in.

I have seen first-hand just how vital an asset Blaire Bartlett is. She is the glue that holds an office together. She brings strength, intelligence, poise, and humor to a job in which those qualities are in high demand, but low supply. Her incredible work ethic has made my office function better than a well-oiled machine. Furthermore, Blaire's selfless passion for animal welfare and human rights is refreshing to see in a town where many think only of themselves.

Mr. Speaker, after spending almost 12 years working in Congress, Blaire is ready for a new chapter in her life. I will miss having her and her dog, Monkey, in my office each day. Nonetheless, I am profoundly grateful for everything she has done for me, my staff, and the citizens of New York's 11th Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING STAFF SERGEANT RICHARD B. HUNTER ON RECEIVING THE AIR FORCE CROSS

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to pay tribute to Staff Sergeant Richard B.

Hunter upon being awarded the Air Force Cross, the second highest military decoration that may be awarded to a member of the United States Air Force.

While deployed as a combat controller in November 2016, Staff Sergeant Hunter heroically and without regard for his personal safety, maximized effects on the battlefield by integrating air assets, employing precision fires, and protecting the wounded with his own body, saving the lives of his teammates.

As friendly forces entered the village, they were ambushed by heavy machine gun fire from insurgents. Staff Sergeant Hunter immediately identified the enemy locations and directed multiple "danger-close" strikes so close the team was blasted by dirt.

While under enemy fire, Staff Sergeant Hunter shielded the wounded with his body and provided suppressing fire with his rifle. Simultaneously, he coordinated close air support missions, deconflicted airspace, and maximized fire support from the overhead gunships.

While attempting to maneuver out of the kill zone, Staff Sergeant Hunter continued to accurately direct "danger-close" engagements on the massing enemy forces. Due to the smoke being so thick the team couldn't see, Sergeant Hunter used the overhead aircraft to direct them through the village.

At great risk to his life, Staff Sergeant Hunter acted to protect and recover his wounded teammates. While under heavy fire, he was able to direct air strikes via a radio in one hand, and use the other to drag the wounded to safety.

Staff Sergeant Hunter controlled 31 "danger-close" missions resulting in an estimated 27 enemies eliminated and 3 vehicles destroyed, with the closest precision strike 9 feet away.

The courage shown by this dedicated Special Tactics Combat Controller is a true testament of his character. Staff Sergeant Hunter has displayed selfless commitment to service and sacrifice.

The exceptional skill that Staff Sergeant Hunter demonstrated resulted in 57 total lives saved. Through his extraordinary heroism, superb airmanship, and aggressiveness in the face of the enemy, Staff Sergeant Hunter reflected the highest credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

The entire Northwest Florida community is immensely proud of our District's tradition of military service and support for all those who bravely serve our Nation.

On behalf of the United States Congress, it is a true honor to recognize Staff Sergeant Richard B. Hunter upon this most notable distinction.

He is truly a remarkable man, and I thank him for his selfless service to his country.

KEITH SWERDFEGER TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Keith Swerdfeger of Pueblo, Colorado, who has been honored with the Lifetime Business Achievement Award from the Colorado State University—Pueblo.

Keith Swerdfeger was born and raised in Pueblo, Colorado, and has had a lifelong passion to start a business and make a contribution to his hometown. In 1968, Keith realized his dream of becoming a business owner, opening Swerdfeger Construction, Inc. with his wife Sharon. This was the beginning of a very successful business venture. Today, Swerdfeger Construction, Inc. is a vital part of Pueblo's economy as well as in southern Colorado and six other states, employing up to 500 people. Keith readily gives all of the credit to his employees for his company's success, while continuing to strive to create more jobs and opportunities.

Keith is passionate about investing in the Pueblo community and firmly believes that part of his company's success has come as the result of the work he, his family and employees have done to give back. Keith has been very active with the Pueblo Economic Development Corporation, Pueblo County United Way, the Colorado Contractors, the Distribution Contractor Association, the Greater Pueblo Chamber of Commerce and other civic and industry associations. Keith represented Colorado House of Representatives District 47 from 2011 to 2013 where he served on the Economic and Business Development Committee, the Finance Committee and the Local Government Committee. He was a strong advocate for his District and the community of Pueblo and worked diligently to bring jobs and economic opportunities to the people of southern Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, Keith Swerdfeger has been a long-time business leader and tireless civic volunteer for his hometown of Pueblo, Colorado. I'm fortunate to consider him a dear friend. When we tell younger generations of Puebloans that the keys to a successful life are dedication and a strong work ethic, we can point to Keith as an example. Pueblo is grateful to have Keith Swerdfeger as one of its sons.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING THE SHAVERTOWN
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT
MEDAL OF VALOR RECIPIENTS

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I honor the first responders of the Shavertown Volunteer Fire Department, who are being presented with Medals of Valor for their selfless acts to rescue lilou Warmouth earlier this year during a terrible house fire.

On the night of July 4, 2017, the Shavertown Volunteer Fire Department received reports of a massive fire consuming two homes in the nearby Dallas Borough. After arriving at the scene, the firefighters discovered that Mrs. Warmouth was trapped in one of the burning buildings.

Firefighter Keith Rinehimer found Mrs. Warmouth, selflessly running into the flames to save her. During the rescue, his face mask malfunctioned, forcing him to inhale smoke, but he continued to push on. As he helped carry Mrs. Warmouth through the fire, he was forced to remove his gloves to help carry her, receiving severe burns on both hands.

Firefighter Ted Sherrill helped Keith Rinehimer move Mrs. Warmouth from the bedroom, through smoke and flames, to the kitchen where they were met by Assistant Chief Erik Sowga, Captain David Rinehimer, and firefighter John Berti. Together, they decided to exit the building through the front door, in order to get Mrs. Warmouth life-saving medical attention as quickly as possible, despite the fact that it was consumed by fire with temperatures reaching 800 degrees.

Mrs. Warmouth was taken to the Geisinger Trauma Center immediately for treatment, while Keith Rinehimer was treated for burns on both hands, as well as smoke inhalation, and all other first responders on scene were treated for heat exhaustion. Thankfully, Mrs. Warmouth has made a full recovery and all members of the Shavertown Volunteer Fire Department have already returned to serving their communities.

Assistant Chief Erik Sowga, Captain David Rinehimer, and firefighters Keith Rinehimer, Ted Sherrill, and John Berti all went above and beyond the call of duty that Independence Day. Their selfless and courageous acts saved the life of Mrs. Warmouth, and for that they are more than deserving of the Medals of Valor they are being presented with.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring these true American heroes of the Shavertown Volunteer Fire Department.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST.
PETER'S BOYS HIGH SCHOOL

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize St. Peter's Boys High School on the 100th anniversary of its founding.

While founded in 1917, St. Peter's Boys High School can trace its roots back to 1839 when the parish was originally dedicated. Operated by the Christian Brothers of St. John Baptist de La Salle, St. Peter's has a proud history of providing boys in the community with a quality education. After the Christian Brothers were temporarily recalled due to the First World War, local clergy ran the school until 1930. In 1943, St. Peter's officially moved to its location on Clinton Avenue where it has been educating Staten Island's youth ever since.

St. Peter's Boys High School is an unwavering commitment to turning students into intelligent, mature young men. Moreover, under the guidance of John Fodera for the past 50 years, St. Peter's has had an outstanding impact in the Staten Island community. The school's dedication to instilling proper morals, ethics, and civic responsibilities is nothing short of commendable. Furthermore, St. Peter's top priority to helping every student achieve his fullest potential proves what a blessing the school has been to Staten Island.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate St. Peter's Boys High School on its 100th anniversary. Its long success in education has benefited not just students, but parents and faculty as well.

HONORING RHINE VFW POST NO.
2729 ON ITS 85TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rhine VFW Post No. 2729, which will celebrate 85 years of service to veterans and the community at the end of this month.

On October 29, 1932, a group of 21 World War I veterans led by Leo Spychalski, Frank Chalupa, Joseph Sagan, and John Kwasny founded Rhine VFW Post No. 2729. Following World War II the post's membership grew to over 100 members, which led them to their current home at 5858 West Archer Avenue in Chicago.

Over the years, members of the Rhine Post have served the local community with just as much honor and dedication as when they served the nation in the Armed Forces. The Post has long been a cornerstone of the Southwest Side of Chicago. They have organized everything from an annual Memorial Day Parade to distributing American flags to local schools. Additionally, the Post has trained rifle and drill teams, organized visits to veterans in local hospitals, and engaged in area school programs such as the Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program.

Members of the Rhine Post continue to take pride in helping those in need through community service. The Post is an active partner of the VFW National Home for Children which houses the children and spouses of deployed military members at no cost.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the honorable military and community service of the members of Rhine VFW Post No. 2729. Their sacrifices for our com-

munity and our nation are a shining example of the American values that we should all embrace.

RECOGNIZING MR. PERVIS SPANN

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Pervis Spann who was inducted into the Chicago Blues Hall of Fame on Sunday, October 15, 2017.

Born in Itta Bena, Mississippi, Mr. Spann spent his teenage years caring for his ailing mother after she suffered a stroke. Eventually, he and his family moved to Battle Creek, Michigan in 1949. His time there was short-lived as he soon left to work in Gary, Indiana, and served his country with by serving in the Korean War, before returning to live in Chicago where he worked in a steel mill, drove a taxi, and repaired television sets.

Like many young men of the era, Mr. Spann used his G.I. Bill benefits to advance his education when he attended the Midwestern Broadcasting School, which led to his work on WOPA radio in 1959. Only a year later, he organized his first concert featuring B.B. King and Junior Parker and three years later, when Leonard and Phil Chess launched WVON, Mr. Spann hosted a regular late night blues slot and became known as the "all-night blues man." His most famous act of the era was when he hosted an 87-hour "sleepless sit-in" to raise money for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

During the 1960s, Mr. Spann managed the careers of leading artists including B.B. King, Bobby Bland, Junior Parker, Albert King, Little Milton, and, as he recalls, had a role in discovering the Jackson 5 and Chaka Khan.

In 1975, after WVON was sold and changed frequency, Mr. Spann, in partnership with Vernon Jarrett and Wesley South, bought the license to the original frequency and launched a new station, WXOL, which featured an all-blues format and many of the same voices from the old WVON. Later, in 1983, WXOL was able to reclaim the old call letters and resumed operation as WVON.

Today, Mr. Spann, with his daughter, Melody Spann Cooper at the helm of WVON (which I must note is located in my district), continues his career promoting the blues as the cohost of the popular cable TV program "Blues and More."

Needless to say, Mr. Pervis Spann has accomplished much in his lifetime and has helped craft the blues so many of us know and love today.

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't take a moment to note a few of Mr. Spann's well-known words of wisdom. As he said it, "If you don't love the blues, you got a hole in your soul." As a lover of blues, myself, I can confirm the veracity of his words.

So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all of my constituents in the 1st Congressional District of Illinois, I would like to once again extend my sincerest congratulations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the week of October 10 to October 13, 2017, I remained in my district in California to assist with relief efforts for catastrophic wildfires that displaced hundreds of my constituents. As a result, I was absent for Roll Call votes 558 through 568.

Had I been present for Roll Call vote 558, on suspension of the rules and passage of H.R. 1858, I would have voted yes.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 559, on suspension of the rules and passage of H.R. 2464, I would have voted yes.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 560, on ordering the previous question of H. Res. 562, I would have voted no.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 561, on agreeing to H. Res. 562, I would have voted no.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 562, on suspension of the rules and passage of H.R. 452, I would have voted yes.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 563, on suspension of the rules and passage of H.R. 3243, I would have voted yes.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 564, on instructing conferees on H.R. 2810, I would have voted yes.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 565, on closing portions of the conference on H.R. 2810, I would have voted yes.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 566, on suspension of the rules and agreement to H. Res. 569, I would have voted yes.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 567, to recommit with instructions S. 585, I would have voted yes.

And had I been present for Roll Call vote 568, on passage of S. 585, I would have voted yes.

COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF PEACE ACTION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Peace Action, the nation's largest grassroots peace network, on its 60th Anniversary.

Founded as 'SANE' in November 1957 in New York City by Lenore Marshall and Norman Cousins and others in response to the nuclear arms race, the organization was renamed Peace Action in 1993.

Among the organization's most notable members and supporters in its long and illustrious history are former chaplain of Yale University and pastor of New York City's Riverside Church, William Sloane Coffin; Marlon Brando, Henry Fonda, Marilyn Monroe, Arthur Miller, Harry Belafonte, Ossie Davis; Martin Buber, Pablo Casals, Bertrand Russell and Albert Schweitzer.

For 60 years, Peace Action has worked for an environment where all are free from violence, war, and the proliferation of nuclear, biological, chemical, and other weapons of mass destruction.

A core principle underlying the work of Peace Action is that longstanding global conflicts require long-term solutions and that U.S. foreign policy has a lasting effect on the world.

That is why Peace Action advocates on behalf of American foreign policy that supports peace, human rights, and democracy and organizes against pre-emptive wars and bellicose militarism.

Every day Peace Action chapters and affiliates in states across the country are working every day to promote a new U.S. foreign policy is based on peaceful cooperation, diplomatic engagement, and collective action to confront the greatest common threats to humankind—war, famine, disease.

Peace Action understands that war cannot be the appropriate response to every international or domestic conflict is not a suitable response to conflict and is committed to working toward the day that every person on earth can live in a world without war or threat of nuclear annihilation.

That is what Peace Action and its legions of peace warriors have done for the past 60 years and it is the work they are committed to today and will be committed to until the job is done.

Happy birthday Peace Action, and I thank them for their tireless and unceasing efforts in pursuit of a more peaceful world.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF COLOSSIAN BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 150th anniversary of Colossian Baptist Church in Newport News, Virginia.

Colossian Baptist Church was established in 1867 on Mulberry Island, Virginia. Reverend Henry Harris and Reverend Walter Williams worked together to organize the church along with other members of the First Baptist Church in Hampton and locals from the Island. The group began to meet together with the hope that they could build a congregation born out of community and anchored in faith. These early services were held in a barn on Mulberry Island's Follies Farm, led by Reverend Williams.

Reverend Williams served as the church's pastor for its first five years. Following his service, he was succeeded by Reverend Thomas Poole in 1872 and Reverend Thomas Wright in 1887.

The congregation of Colossian Baptist Church continued worship in the Follies Farm Barn until it burned down in a fire. Reverend Aaron Wyatt, elected as pastor in 1894, oversaw the church's transition into their new building.

The church was then rebuilt in 1915 following a devastating windstorm, but the con-

gregation soon needed to move again. In response to the outbreak of World War I, the United States Army bought and repurposed the Colossian Baptist Church property. That area is currently the United States Army Transportation Center at Fort Eustis, Virginia. Following their displacement, the church moved to Newport News, and has remained there ever since.

Reverend Irvin D. Melvin was named the first full-time pastor of Colossian Baptist Church in 1989, and the church has only grown stronger since that time through the expansion of their music, fellowship, and youth programs.

Reverend Peter A. Evans became the church's third full-time pastor in 1999. Under his leadership, the church broke ground on a new edifice in 2005, and construction was successfully completed in 2006.

Over the years, Colossian Baptist Church has continued to grow as it expands its outreach to the community. The church works with Greenwood Elementary School in a partnership dedicated to mentoring young men. Since 2014, the church has overseen the "Christmas House" program during December, which serves the local community by providing an avenue for the needy to access clothing, food, and more free of charge.

Over the last 150 years, Colossian Baptist Church has been served by many dedicated men of faith—Rev. Henry Harris, Rev. Walter Williams, Rev. Thomas Poole, Rev. Thomas Wright, Rev. Aaron Wyatt, Rev. Frank Ashby, Rev. David D. Harris, Rev. Thomas Ash, Rev. Andrew D. Holmes, Rev. Frank Rylander, Rev. William Cheeseman, Rev. Elick Edlow, Rev. James M. Lee, Rev. Irvin D. Melvin, Rev. Steven W. Banks, Rev. Lloyd Williams, Sr., and Rev. Peter A. Evans.

Mr. Speaker, as Colossian Baptist Church of Newport News, Virginia celebrates this historic milestone, its congregation can rejoice in 150 years of successful discipleship and service to the Hampton Roads community. I would like to congratulate Reverend Peter A. Evans and all of the members of the church's congregation. I hope that their next 150 years proves to be as rewarding and fruitful as the first.

RECOGNIZING THE ANNUAL SURRENDER DAY IN SCHUYLERVILLE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Annual Surrender Day in Schuylerville, New York, a day that commemorates the surrender of British General John Burgoyne to the colonial army following the Battle of Saratoga.

The Battle at Saratoga, fought in October 1777, marked a crucial win for the Americans that is considered the turning point leading to victory in the Revolutionary War. After a failed campaign through the Adirondack region of New York, General Burgoyne found his army surrounded by American forces and retreated to Saratoga where he surrendered his entire

army to American General Horatio Gates. The surrender at Saratoga not only bolstered American morale in the north, but also served as a deciding factor in bringing active French support to the American cause.

The residents of the Saratoga region celebrate this historic day with a reenactment of the famous battle, music from local students and musicians, and other Revolutionary War related festivities. We are proud that the 21st District of New York can commemorate this important event in American history.

HONORING 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. ELIZABETH OF HUNGARY CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Hungarian Caucus, I rise today with great pleasure and enthusiasm to congratulate St. Elizabeth of Hungary Catholic Church in Cleveland on their 125th anniversary. St. Elizabeth is North America's oldest Hungarian Church.

The history of this notable congregation begins in 1892, where a small wood-framed church on the corner of Buckeye Road and East 90th Street in Cleveland held mass for the faithful.

On June 4, 1893, the cornerstone of the first St. Elizabeth's Catholic Church was laid, providing seating for up to 800 Hungarian immigrants at a single mass. Ten years later, the church was too small to accommodate the thousands of Roman Catholic Hungarian immigrants who settled in this area. In 1907, the Pastor of the church began to petition the Bishop of Cleveland for permission to raise money to build a new church which could accommodate more parishioners. Construction of the new church begun in 1918 and was completed in 1922.

In addition to the completion of the church structure that still stands today, the community built a parish hall that became a community center for the neighborhood's Hungarians, a true social and religious meeting center of "Little Hungary" on Buckeye Road.

St. Elizabeth's was designed by Cleveland architect Emile Uhlrich and is an example of Italian-influenced Baroque Revival architecture. It was partly modelled after the church of Sant' Agnese in Agone in Rome.

St. Elizabeth's Church was listed on the National Register of Historic Places, qualifying both because of its place in Cleveland's history and because of its historically significant architecture.

The congregation of St. Elizabeth's weathered many changes throughout the decades, but remained true to its mission and to its dedication to Hungarian heritage.

St. Elizabeth's Church is a magnificent example of all that a spiritual home should be for the past 125 years. Our hope is that St. Elizabeth of Hungary Catholic Church's congregation continues to grow and prosper through the years.

Gratulalok.

HONORING STAN BETZ

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 2017

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor one of my constituents, Mr. Stan Betz, for his immense dedication serving the community of Santa Ana.

Mr. Betz, who passed away on September 28, 2017 and whose life we will always remember was a well-known custom car builder and an Anaheim High School Hall of Famer who recently celebrated his 90th birthday. Mr. Betz grew up on an orange ranch on Lemon Street in Anaheim and was a member of the Anaheim High School Class of 1946. From an early age, Mr. Betz became interested in cars and they remained his passion throughout his entire life. His uncle, Dick Kraft, one of the original Hot Rodders who came up with many innovations during his career, was a great source of inspiration and encouragement for Mr. Betz. And his legendary skills as a master car builder and painter made him famous in the automotive world.

Moreover, Mr. Betz's shop was a popular local meeting spot for all car enthusiasts and aficionados in the 1950's. His commitment and passion with automobiles and his work in the industry creating masterpieces continued throughout the decades. When business slowed down, Mr. Betz added paint products to his establishment, and his shop soon gained the reputation for being the best place to find a precise paint color.

Mr. Betz fully embodied the value of community service in all aspects of his life. He was not only a pioneer in the automotive industry but also a skilled businessman. As an avid community advocate, he made valuable contributions to the local community, such as stopping by Anaheim High School to interact with students. Mr. Betz combined his passion for cars with his passion to uplift the community, and kept them both firmly rooted as a part of his life.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Betz is an example of the value found in community engagement. I am honored to recognize Mr. Betz for doing his part in bridging the gap, and thank him for the positive impact he has made on the Santa Ana and Orange County community.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily

Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 17, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary, Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and David G. Zatezalo, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, all of the Department of Labor, Janet Dhillon, of Pennsylvania, and Daniel M. Gade, of North Dakota, both to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Carlos G. Muniz, of Florida, to be General Counsel, Department of Education, Peter B. Robb, of Vermont, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and Gerald W. Fauth, of Virginia, Kyle Fortson, of the District of Columbia, and Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, each to be a Member of the National Mediation Board.

SD-430

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Michael Dourson, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, and William L. Wehrum, of Delaware, Matthew Z. Leopold, of Florida, and David Ross, of Wisconsin, each to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, Paul Trombino III, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, and Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jeff Tien Han Pon, of Virginia, to be Director, and Michael Rigas, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director, both of the Office of Personnel Management, and Emily Webster Murphy, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice.

SH-216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Thomas L. Carter, of South Carolina, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization, Jennifer Gillian Newstead, of New York, to be Legal Adviser, and Manisha Singh, of Florida, to be an Assistant

Secretary (Economic and Business Affairs), all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management

To hold hearings to examine Federal support for research.

SD-342

OCTOBER 19

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the roles and responsibilities for defending the Nation from cyber attack; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine how healthy choices can improve health outcomes and reduce costs.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Stephanos Bibas, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Allison H. Eid, of Colorado, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Annemarie Carney Axon, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Michael Lawrence Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Thomas Alvin Farr, to be

United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina, William M. Ray II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Liles Clifton Burke, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Walter David Counts III, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Michael Joseph Juneau, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, Karen Gren Scholer, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Tilman Eugene Self III, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, and John C. Demers, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Scott C. Blader, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin, Mark A. Klaassen, to be United States Attorney for the District of Wyoming, William C. Lamar, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi, John R. Lausch, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, and J. Douglas Overbey, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee, all of the Department of Justice.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine modernizing the Food for Peace program.

SD-419

OCTOBER 25

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing naval forces and the Navy's current and planned capabilities to meet those threats.

SVC-217

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 1870, to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, S. 1953, to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and S. 1942, to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians.

SD-628

OCTOBER 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine advanced cyber technologies that could be used to help protect electric grids and other energy infrastructure from cyberattacks.

SD-366

SENATE—Tuesday, October 17, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the fountain of all wisdom and power, we are grateful that You still rule in Heaven. May our lawmakers continue to remember that Your purposes will prevail and that Your justice cannot be thwarted. Answer the prayers of our Senators as they daily seek Your wisdom, guidance, and protection. Lord, sustain them with Your unfailing love, rescuing them from the destructive forces that go contrary to Your will. Instruct our legislators even in the night seasons so that Your will may be done on Earth even as it is done in Heaven. Do for them exceedingly, abundantly above all that they can ask or imagine according to Your power working in and through them.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

WORK BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate, as I said yesterday, has a full schedule of work before it this fall. It is what the President, Vice President, and I discussed at our working lunch at the White House yesterday.

This week, the Senate is advancing one of the most important items on our agenda with consideration of the comprehensive budget for fiscal year 2018. It is a good budget that reflects the hard work of Chairman ENZI and the Budget Committee. It will help rein in Federal spending. It will help our country achieve balance. It will also help our economy grow.

One of the ways this budget will do so is by providing legislative tools to advance tax reform. After a lost decade of missed economic opportunities,

America's middle class deserves an economy that reaches for its full potential again, and tax reform is the single most important thing we can do today to get there.

It is not hard to see why. Our current Tax Code is archaic, arduous, and often just plain bizarre. It holds our economy back. It can hold workers' wages down. It actually incentivizes companies to shift jobs and profits overseas. It makes it easier for the wealthy and well-connected to game the system. Yet it is almost impossible for anyone else to understand it.

A constituent from Harrodsburg, KY, wrote to my office exasperated about the unfair Tax Code. This is what she said: "I am writing today to express my complete and total disgust for the complex, completely unfair, and completely messed up tax system in this country." This constituent, who has worked for nearly three decades as a CPA and has helped countless Kentuckians navigate the system, described some of the hardships faced by her clients and then continued by saying that "the honest, hardworking folks can't get ahead, the cheaters don't get caught and the rich just keep getting richer."

That was my constituent from Harrodsburg, KY, summing up today's Tax Code. Her story underlines the systemic problems of our Tax Code, and it is often our Nation's workers—including those in Kentucky—who continue to bear the burden.

Recently, the Kentucky State treasurer wrote an op-ed calling on Congress to provide much needed relief from our Tax Code. "We need tax reform," she wrote, "to increase Kentucky's economic growth and for greater middle-class prosperity throughout the Commonwealth."

I agree. So does President Trump, his team, and our colleagues here in Congress. We are all in agreement that delivering relief to working families should be at the heart of our plan, and that is what we continue to work toward in developing tax reform.

For families and individuals in Kentucky and across the Nation, we think taxes should be lower, simpler, and fairer. Our plan calls for doubling the standard deduction and significantly increasing the child tax credit. We will eliminate loopholes that are primarily used by the wealthy while protecting incentives that benefit the middle class.

Our plan also reforms the Tax Code to provide relief to our Nation's small businesses and to make it easier to keep jobs here in America. In an in-

creasingly competitive global economy, we are working to put American workers on a level playing field.

Above all, our goal is this. We want to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more money into the pockets of the middle class in Kentucky and across our country.

This sounds like a place where we should all be able to agree—Republicans and Democrats alike. In fact, our friends on the other side of the aisle have often supported the idea of tax reform and bringing jobs back to America. I hope they will again in the course of this important effort. I hope they will not fall into blind partisanship and reject any collaboration simply because they don't like the President.

Instead, they can work with us in a serious way on an overhaul of the Tax Code that can truly help the people of Kentucky, help the people of their States, and help Americans all across the land.

I look forward to continuing to work with colleagues in Congress and the administration to pass a responsible budget and to deliver tax reform for the American workers and families, who deserve an economy that reaches its true potential once again.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. First, Mr. President, a brief word on healthcare. Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY continue to negotiate a bipartisan package of legislation to stabilize our healthcare markets and lower premiums, a process that began over the summer. From what I have heard, they are down to a few final issues and are hopefully close to an agreement that can be taken back to both of our caucuses. Congress ought to show, through the work started by Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY way back in July, that Congress can work in a bipartisan way on healthcare, and we have no intention of

going along with President Trump's reckless sabotage of the Nation's healthcare law.

Last week, President Trump showed that he is willing to take a wrecking ball to our Nation's healthcare for the sake of politics without any regard to the people it would hurt: veterans, senior citizens, kids, and folks struggling to afford insurance. President Trump was so angry they couldn't repeal and replace, he instead said: I am going to wreck the system. The problem is, it hurts millions of innocent people all for pique and politics. He has shown he is willing to put at risk the healthcare of millions of Americans. President Trump's decision to end the cost-sharing program was an act of impulsive malice with no benefit and no end.

This seems to be his MO. He throws red meat to his rightwing base, whether it is on healthcare, immigration, Iran, or disaster aid. Then he says to Congress: You fix it up. That is not the way to lead. That is following. That is an act that exhibits no strength—no strength.

We want our President to be a strong leader. Every American does, regardless of ideology, but when the President plays so many political games that are not just harmless but that hurt people and then says to Congress to clean it up, blaming Congress for the mess he created, it doesn't work, it is not fair, it is not right, and it is the reason that, except for his base, President Trump's numbers keep sliding. They are flat now, and they are down below 40 percent. No President has had such low numbers. By the way, it is not helping the Republican Party. Numbers today show a record difference between whether people prefer Democrats or Republicans, so I would urge him to stop these harmful, almost malicious shenanigans and let us all work together for the good of our country.

On healthcare, we in Congress should continue to shore up the healthcare markets and lower premiums in a bipartisan way. We ought to reject the path of President Trump's sabotage and destruction and instead view a path of consensus and compromise. That is the way it has to go. No side wins everything they want. That is not how the Founding Fathers set up this country, otherwise we would be a dictatorship or a country without checks and balances. We ought to work together to improve our healthcare system, to lower costs for people, and to ensure that more people have access to health coverage. We Democrats have been pushing that for several months now.

I salute Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY for understanding that. They have been in careful negotiations that represent the best first step forward on healthcare. I hope we hear more from them on the status of negotiations. I hope they can come to an agreement

that includes curtailing the sabotage I spoke of that the President is doing. I hope Leader MCCONNELL and I can support this bill together, and then maybe even the House might pass it. The President has said, I think—we don't know, it changes from day to day—but I think the most recent pronouncement is that he might sign it.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the GOP tax plan, as soon as today, we will vote on the motion to proceed to the GOP budget resolution, which includes instructions to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion, slash Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion, and sets up, unfortunately for everybody, the same destructive, partisan process on taxes that the GOP used for healthcare called reconciliation. It says: We don't need you. We are just going to rush it through with our votes. It didn't work on healthcare. It is not going to work on this either.

Tax reform—if it is real reform—or even just tax cuts are very complicated. If you don't have the center coming together, everyone can pick it apart, and they are setting themselves up to do just that.

Although the Republican tax plan is little more than principles at the moment—and we have talked a lot about these principles of the Republican plan—it is so far away from what the American people want because of the process they have decided to use. When you don't want Democrats and use just Republicans, the people of the hard right—a minority in the Republican Party probably—can push the debate so far over because they say: We are not voting for this unless you do it our way. So we have a bill that really is so out of touch and harmful to all but the wealthiest Americans that it is hard to believe the Republicans are putting it forward with a straight face.

It is going to be the first time, my friends, that Republicans in Congress will vote to increase our Nation's deficit by \$1.5 trillion, which is spelled out as clear as day in the budget. I hope, given this dramatic increase in the deficit, all of the Republican deficit hawks are out of their nests for this one.

For the sake of ideological consistency, the same folks who decried debt and deficit under President Obama ought to denounce them under President Trump, but we haven't heard much of a peep from a whole lot of Republicans on this side with a few notable, brave, and leaderlike exceptions.

Here is what Representative WALKER, a conservative Member of the House, said, lamenting what was going on:

[The deficit is] a great talking point when you have an administration that is Democrat-led. It's a little different now that Republicans have both houses and the adminis-

tration. There's been less talk about it this year with a Republican-led administration than there has been the last seven or eight years.

Representative WALKER is exactly accurate.

The Republican leader on May 16 told Bloomberg TV that tax reform “will have to be revenue neutral.” These are his words. That is a principle he has advanced for years.

We are not hearing much from Republicans about deficits now. Yet, I repeat, this budget instructs the committees to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. It will be difficult for many of my Republican friends to say that they care about deficits and still vote for this budget.

The GOP budget resolution will also be the first time that my Republican colleagues vote to slash Medicare. The budget spells out over \$400 billion in Medicare cuts, as well as over \$1 trillion in Medicaid cuts—even more than the healthcare bill, and probably the No. 1 reason for its demise was that huge slash to Medicaid.

So it is going to be difficult for my Republican friends and this Republican Party to say that they want to protect Medicare and Medicaid and still vote for this budget. Unfortunately, this will not be the first time Republicans vote to advance a major piece of legislation—changes to our Tax Code—through a hyperpartisan process known as reconciliation. Reconciliation, as has just been documented in an article—I believe it was in *Politico*, but in one of our leading publications—was never intended for this type of purpose.

With this vote, though, Republicans are saying from the very outset that they don't really want Democratic input on this bill because they are setting up a process in which they don't really need Democratic votes. It is honestly a shame. And just as the partisan reconciliation process portended failure for the Republican healthcare bill, it is likely to portend failure here as well.

It is difficult to pass major legislation in the Senate, as it should be. That is what the Founding Fathers intended. That is the true conservatism of our government: checks and balances, no rush. It is even more difficult if you work only with the votes of one party. As I said, that allows a small few, usually on the hard right, to dictate what is in this bill.

My guess is that the vast majority of people here didn't want to vote for Medicare and Medicaid cuts, but because they couldn't get enough votes in the House to pass the budget without putting that in, because maybe 30 or 40 Members there insisted on it, it is in there. It is not going to serve you well. If anyone thinks it doesn't have real effect, look at the PAYGO rules. This is not just the budget. PAYGO, after this budget passes, would insist on slashes

in Medicare, 4 percent. That is the law; that is not a rule.

I hope that our colleagues will vote down this bill, and then I promise you, just as we are doing on healthcare, we can come together in a bipartisan way. That doesn't mean you get everything you like. It probably means more of the tax cuts go to the middle class and fewer to the wealthy, but there are lots of people on our side of the aisle who want to see small business get a tax cut, who want to see money from overseas come here and be used for jobs, and who want to see a middle-class tax break. We could come up with a bipartisan bill that would make, for the first time in a long time, this body shine.

The Republican Congress, at least at the moment on the path it is on, has abandoned the grand tradition of bipartisanship, working together, which has made this Chamber great through the decades and centuries.

When Republicans need Democratic votes, they come to us. The President and the leader have said: Come vote with us. Make it bipartisan. That is not what bipartisanship is. You don't craft a bill just within your party and then say: Voting with us is bipartisan. Bipartisanship means you sit down together and you come out with a proposal that a majority of both parties can support. They are not doing that.

Republicans will spend the entire first year of this Congress trying to pass their major agendas through reconciliation or similar vehicles, first with CRAs, then healthcare, now taxes. The majority leader himself said in a speech, "Restoring the Senate," in 2014 that "when the Senate is allowed to work the way it was designed to, it arrives at a result acceptable to people all along the political spectrum." But if it's an "assembly line for one party's partisan legislative agenda," it creates "instability and strife" rather than "good, stable law."

The American people want to see us work together. We may not always succeed. It may not be easy, but we can try.

As I said—and I would say this to my colleagues—there are areas in which we can agree on taxes: Lower middle-class taxes; don't raise them. Give some relief to small business. Try to bring the money from overseas and put it into infrastructure and job creation. We can work together, but not in this process and not with this awful bill, which favors the wealthy dramatically, raises taxes on the middle class, hurts the deficit—increases the deficit dramatically—and is a partisan process. I hope my Republican friends keep that in mind when they vote today. If you vote this down, I promise you that we will come together in a bipartisan way and work for something that actually could pass, instead of what happened with healthcare. Try it. Try it. Reconciliation—working with one party—failed

miserably for you on healthcare, and now we are coming together. Let's not repeat the same mistake on taxes.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY NOMINATION

Finally, Mr. President, I just heard that the nomination of Representative MARINO to lead the Office of National Drug Control Policy has been withdrawn. That is the right decision. The fact that he was nominated in the first place is evidence that the Trump administration talks the talk but refuses to walk the walk. The bottom line is that this Congressman supported President Trump but is the wrong person for the job, and I am glad they saw it and withdrew.

I want to salute two of my colleagues who were way out in front on this: Senator MANCHIN, whose State has been ravaged by opioids, and Senator MCCASKILL, who has similar problems, particularly in rural areas, but all over. Senator MCCASKILL has legislation that I think would correct the kinds of ills we have seen in Representative MARINO's proposals, and I hope that in a bipartisan way we can support them.

The opioid crisis demands that the next drug czar be solely focused on getting communities across the country the help they desperately need, and we hope the administration nominates someone who fits that bill so we can pass that nominee quickly and in a bipartisan way.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Joel Trachtenberg, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent all remaining time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Trachtenberg nomination?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 218 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hassan	Reed
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cardin	Heller	Rubio
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Casey	Inhofe	Schumer
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Kaine	Shaheen
Coons	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corker	King	Strange
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Murphy	Young
Feinstein	Murray	
Fischer	Nelson	

NAYS—17

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Sanders
Booker	Harris	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Leahy	Warren
Durbin	Markey	Wyden
Franken	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Menendez
Isakson	Shelby

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

[Rollcall Vote No. 219 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying H.R. 2810.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2810) entitled “An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes,” and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators MCCAIN, INHOFE, WICKER, FISCHER, COTTON, ROUNDS, ERNST, TILLIS, SULLIVAN, PERDUE, CRUZ, GRAHAM, SASSE, STRANGE, REED, NELSON, MCCASKILL, SHAHEEN, GILLIBRAND, BLUMENTHAL, DONNELLY, HIRONO, KAINE, KING, HEINRICH, WARREN, and PETERS.

Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the motion, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H. Con. Res. 71.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Strange
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Menendez	Shelby

The motion was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2018

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the Joint Economic Committee debate be reserved to occur from 4:30 p.m. until 5:45 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the Senate's consideration of H. Con. Res. 71, the majority and Democratic managers of the concurrent resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desks, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal digital assistant devices and tablet devices. I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the staff be per-

mitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with the amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function, and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates for Federal revenues, the amount by which the Federal revenues should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt, and debt held by the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, earlier this month, the Senate Budget Committee took an important first step toward tax reform by approving a fiscal year 2018 budget resolution focused on growing America's economy through tax policies that put more money in the hands of hard-working Americans.

This week, we take the next step as the Senate begins debating the budget blueprint to pursue long-overdue tax relief for families and job creators that will jump-start economic growth. It is crucial that Congress approve this fiscal framework in order to eliminate the dated and stifling tax policies that are holding back American investment and productivity.

As Budget Committee chairman, I am proud that Congress and the President are tackling these important issues. After 8 years of stagnant growth, it is clear our Nation needs a simpler, fairer, and more transparent tax system that will leave more dollars in the pockets of hard-working families.

The last time Congress was able to accomplish large-scale tax reform was in 1986. Just think how much has changed in the country and world in those 31 years, including our Tax Code. America's tax laws are incredibly complicated and work to slow our economy and hurt American families. Incredibly, our current tax system actually benefits foreign-based companies while harming U.S.-headquartered companies and employers. We continually ask why jobs are leaving this country. A big reason is the hostile tax landscape.

The Senate budget aims to help reverse this trend by setting the stage for pro-growth tax reform that will lower taxes on American families and on job creators by a net \$1.5 trillion over 10 years. By keeping more money in the pockets of hard-working taxpayers, these reforms—if done right—will boost investment, wages, and productivity here at home.

Pro-growth tax reform should reward hard work, savings, and encourage investment. It should broaden the tax base while lowering the marginal tax rates, streamline our tax laws, and limit government distortion of market-based decisions. Our tax policy should provide for a globally competitive corporate tax rate and an international

tax system that does not penalize U.S. companies.

It is no secret that tax policies influence the everyday dollars-and-cents decisions of individuals and small businesses. They help drive such decisions as to whether to work an additional hour or invest in an additional unit of capital. This is why economic experts note that potential economic growth should always be considered when talking about tax cuts. In fact, the Joint Committee on Taxation states “tax policy can directly influence the level of labor supply, physical capital, human capital, and technology in an economy by changing the after-tax returns to certain economic activities or changing the cost of pursuing such activities.”

Pro-growth reform that removes government distortions of the marketplace would also allow for resources to be reallocated from what produces the best tax outcome to what is the best economic use. This efficiency will lead to increased investment, growth of businesses, and higher economic output or gross domestic product, GDP. In fact, increasing GDP from private sector growth can provide additional dollars to the Treasury. Let me repeat that. Better tax policy will boost the value of everything we produce, and this will mean more revenue for the Federal Government.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, an increase in productivity of one-tenth of 1 percentage point could increase revenue into the Treasury by \$273 billion over a 10-year period. A return to our historic average growth would decrease projected spending deficits by over \$2 trillion in the 10-year window—more than enough to pay for the decrease in revenues assumed under static scoring conventions that don’t account for economic growth. That is what we have to operate under.

In addition to the Senate Budget’s key role in reforming the Tax Code, it is also a serious fiscal plan. If Congress and the administration can adhere to this blueprint, we will be taking steps to get our fiscal house in order with a combination of restrained spending, reduced tax burdens, and a growing economy.

The Senate Budget Committee has put together a responsible budget that provides a path to creating a more effective, efficient, and accountable government for hard-working taxpayers. To accomplish this goal, the budget proposes \$5.1 trillion in savings over the next 10 years, while investing in a strong national defense, providing for the care of our most vulnerable citizens, and not touching Social Security.

From the start, this budget was focused on achieving on-budget balance by the end of the 10-year budget window. By 2026, the resolution—with ensuing economic growth from tax reform and an improved regulatory land-

scape—will generate a \$79 billion on-budget surplus. This surplus would rise to \$197 billion by 2027.

In addition to the fiscal reforms proposed by this resolution, it also continues efforts to respond to concerns about the broken budget process. This budget promotes curtailing budget gimmicks, increasing honesty and accuracy by government scorekeepers, and ending the “spend now, pay later” mentality of Washington.

It is also important to note the thorough and robust committee process that produced this Senate budget resolution. More than 150 amendments from both sides were filed, and 29 were voted on during our daylong markup process. This budget reflects bipartisan input and includes five amendments that were accepted from Democratic members of the committee.

The next step for tax reform will build on the Budget Committee’s open and transparent committee process. Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL and Senate Finance Committee Chairman ORRIN HATCH have promised that tax reform legislation will also move through the committee process. In other words, any speculation people have heard about where the tax is, is not right because it has a process to go through. This will provide Finance Committee members the opportunity to offer amendments before the full Senate considers the legislation. So we will consider it in committee and then on the floor. Once the bill moves to the Senate floor, every Member will be able to offer amendments before voting on the measure.

This budget serves as a framework to expand economic opportunity for each and every American. It reflects our belief in the American entrepreneurial spirit and that by allowing American families and small businesses to keep more of their hard-earned dollars, they will innovate and invest money in ways that will grow our economy. We believe our Nation’s best days—and those of its citizens—are ahead of us.

The time to act is now. If we don’t change course, our Nation will continue to experience the sluggish economic growth of the last decade. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support America’s hard-working families and employers and help put our Nation on a better course. Approving this budget focused on pro-growth tax reform does just that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to complete my remarks before the Senate recesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I know that budgets are not particularly sexy

and exciting discussions. A lot of people wonder about a trillion here and a hundred billion there and what it all means. It means a lot. What it means is that if this horrific Republican budget is implemented, it will mean an enormous amount of pain for tens of millions of working-class, middle-class, and lower income people in this country. That is what this budget means.

After failing to pass a so-called healthcare bill that would throw up to 32 million Americans off of the health insurance they currently have—a bill that was widely opposed by the American people—Donald Trump and the Republican leadership are back again. While I totally disagree with what they are trying to do, I do appreciate their temerity. They are not giving up in terms of trying to protect the interests of the billionaire class against the vast majority of the American people.

The Republicans are now pushing one of the most destructive and unfair budget and tax proposals in the modern history of the United States—a plan that would do incalculable harm to tens of millions of working families, our children, the sick, the elderly, and the poor. The Republican budget we are debating on the floor of the Senate this week is the Robin Hood principle in reverse. Robin Hood took from the rich and gave to the poor. What this budget does is take from working people, the middle class, the elderly, and the poor to give massive tax breaks to people who are already living in incredible opulence.

Donald Trump and the Republican leadership claim that their plan would provide a “big league” tax cut for the middle class. Nothing could be further from the truth.

According to the Tax Policy Center, by the end of this decade, nearly 80 percent—underline 80 percent—of the tax benefits of the Republican plan would go to the top 1 percent. Even more incredibly, the top one-tenth of 1 percent would receive some 40 percent of the tax breaks over a 10-year period. A tax proposal which gives 80 percent of the benefits to the top 1 percent and 40 percent of the benefits to the top one-tenth of 1 percent is not a tax proposal benefiting the middle-class or working families of this country; it is a tax proposal designed to benefit the wealthiest people and the campaign contributors of the billionaire class.

This budget cuts Medicaid by more than \$1 trillion over a 10-year period. That is kind of strange. The United States of America is the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee healthcare to all people. What the American people want, in my view, is to join the rest of the world and understand that healthcare is a right, that we should not have 28 million people without any health insurance and even more underinsured with high deductibles and high copayments. Yet

what this budget does, unbelievably, is throw 15 million people off of the health insurance they have with a trillion-dollar cut in Medicaid.

I would hope that my friend the chairman of the Budget Committee might at some point during this long debate tell us what happens to somebody today who is struggling with cancer, with heart disease, with diabetes, with a life-threatening illness, who suddenly loses the Medicaid health insurance they have. What happens to that person? I would hope that some of my Republican friends would tell the American people what happens, because study after study tells us what will happen, and that is that thousands of people will lose their lives. They will die because they will no longer have access to the health insurance they had.

Further, this budget does what Republicans have not yet attempted to do during the past year in their so-called healthcare legislation, and that is to make a \$473 billion cut to Medicare. So it is not only a trillion-dollar cut to Medicaid, it is also a \$473 billion cut to Medicare.

Interestingly enough, I think many Americans will recall that during his campaign for President, Donald Trump told the American people that he would not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. He said that over and over again. On April 18, 2015—this is just one quote of many—Mr. Trump said:

Every Republican wants to do a big number on Social Security, they want to do it on Medicare, they want to do it on Medicaid. And we can't do that. And it's not fair to the people that have been paying in for years and now all of a sudden they want to be cut.

That is Donald Trump running for President.

Well, I would say to President Trump: That is what you told the American people during your campaign, and now I hope you will tell your Republican friends right here in the Senate that they should respect the campaign promises you ran on and that if they pass a budget that cuts Medicare or Medicaid, you will veto that legislation.

I hope the President has the integrity to do that. I don't think he will, but I hope he does that.

Poll after poll tells us that the overwhelming majority of the American people do not want Congress to cut Medicare or Medicaid. In fact, I think in this country today, if you ask people what their deepest concerns are, they are concerned about jobs, and they are concerned about income. I think even more so they are concerned about the healthcare they have, how much it costs, and whether they are going to have it tomorrow.

Poll after poll tells us that the American people do not want Congress to cut Medicare—which, by the way, is the most popular health insurance pro-

gram in this country—and they don't want to see Medicaid cut either because they know, among other things, that about two-thirds of nursing home dollars come from Medicaid. So if you have a mom or a dad dealing with Alzheimer's or some other terrible illness in a nursing home and massive cuts to Medicaid are made, what is going to happen to your parent who is in a nursing home? People know that. They do not want to cut Medicare and Medicaid.

A recent Pew Foundation poll finds that 85 percent of Republicans and 94 percent of Democrats want to either maintain or increase funding for Medicare.

Sixty percent of Americans oppose slashing Medicaid, according to a recent Quinnipiac poll.

A recent Wall Street Journal and NBC poll finds that only 12 percent of the American people believe the wealthy should receive a tax cut, while 62 percent believe the wealthiest people in our country should pay more in taxes.

You have the American people saying: Don't cut Medicare. Don't cut Medicaid. Don't give tax breaks to billionaires. In fact, ask them to pay more in taxes. That, by and large, is where the American people are coming from, whether Democrats, Republicans, or Independents.

Then the question arises: Why is the Republican leadership bringing forward a budget that does the exact opposite of what the American people want? The answer to that question, I am sorry to say, is not complicated. It has everything to do with a corrupt campaign finance system that allows billionaires and the wealthiest people in this country to exert their influence over the political process. Increasingly, it is not the ordinary American middle-class worker the Congress listens to, but it is wealthy campaign contributors. Today, we have a corrupt campaign finance system that enables multi-billionaires, along with some of the most powerful CEOs in America, to contribute many hundreds of millions of dollars to the political process.

Many of us believe that the concept of democracy is one person, one vote. You get a vote, and I get a vote. Sometimes you win; sometimes you lose. The majority wins. That is what we teach the children in the fifth grade and sixth grade: One person, one vote, majority wins.

Unfortunately, as a result of the disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision, the American campaign finance system has been totally corrupted. We now have a situation where billionaire families can spend unlimited sums of money to help elect candidates who protect their interests, and not only can they spend that money, that is exactly what they are doing.

There was a very interesting article in the Boston Globe just the other day,

October 14. This is what the article says. The headline is: "The Koch brothers (and their friends) want President Trump's tax cut. Very badly."

This is what the article says—but first, I should say a word about the Koch brothers. Not everyone knows who they are. The Koch brothers are the second wealthiest family in America. They are struggling to catch up to the Waltons. They are not quite there. They are worth only \$90 billion. They are struggling, but they are getting by, I am happy to tell you. With that \$90 billion, what they are doing, along with a few of their friends, is spending hundreds of millions of dollars every campaign cycle to elect people, in this case Republicans, who support their agenda. This is what the article says:

The message from the billionaire-led Koch network of donors to President Trump and the Republican Congress it helped to shape couldn't be more clear: Pass a tax overhaul, or else.

As the donors mixed and mingled for a policy summit at the St. Regis hotel in midtown Manhattan last week, just a block south from Trump Tower, it came up again. And again. And again.

"It's the most significant federal effort we've ever taken on," said Tim Phillips, president of Americans for Prosperity, a Koch-aligned group with offices in 36 States. "The stakes for the Republicans, I've never seen them this high."

Many in the Koch network, a vast group of libertarian-leaning nonprofits and advocacy and political organizations, described the upcoming legislative push for a tax overhaul as an inflection point in modern political history, a do-or-die moment that would define whether their efforts over the years will pay off or not. The network leaders plan to dedicate much of their two-year \$400 million politics and policy budget to the effort—though they wouldn't give an exact number.

That is \$400 million in the next two years to pass this piece of legislation. This comes from a family, the Koch brothers, who are pretty upfront about what they believe. They do not want to cut Social Security or Medicare and Medicaid. They will take that, but that is really not their goal. They want to eliminate Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and virtually every other Federal program that provides help to the working families of this country.

By the way, just in passing, if the estate tax, which is part of the Republican budget, is repealed, we might want to mention that the Koch brothers' family would see a benefit of some \$30 billion. If your family is going to get a \$30 billion benefit, then putting a few hundred million dollars into seeing that legislation passed is not a difficult idea.

This budget makes clear who the Republicans in Congress are listening to, and it is not the middle class or the working families who do not want to see Medicare cut or Medicaid cut and who certainly do not want to see a \$1.9 trillion tax break for the top 1 percent. I am afraid that my Republican colleagues are listening to their top campaign contributors who have told the

Republican Party, in no uncertain terms, that if they do not get their tax cuts, they will stop providing the Republicans with hundreds of millions of dollars in campaign contributions. How sad is that?

Think about the incredibly brave Americans who have fought for democracy over the years. Some of them never return from the battlefields where they have fought for an American democracy that makes us a country where people rule. Abraham Lincoln reminded us that we are a “government of the people, by the people, for the people,” not a government of the billionaires, by the billionaires, and for the billionaires.

Let's be clear about something else. The entire economic theory that Senate Republicans and President Trump have embraced with this budget is called trickle-down economics. That is what it is. You give tax breaks to billionaires and large corporations, and the benefits trickle down. They improve the economy. This whole theory is a fraud, and when applied, it has been an abysmal failure.

Since Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush slashed taxes on the wealthy and deregulated Wall Street, trillions of dollars in wealth have been redistributed from the middle class and working families to a handful of millionaires and billionaires. Today, we have more wealth and income inequality than at any time since the 1920s. Today, the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. This budget would make a bad situation even worse by widening that gap with its trillions in cuts to social programs and gifts to the top 1 percent.

The Republican budget we are debating today would make horrific cuts to the needs of working families. Let me give you a few examples. This budget would give the wealthiest family in America, the Walton family of Walmart, a tax cut of up to \$52 billion. Does anyone in their right mind think that the wealthiest family in this country needs a tax break of up to \$52 billion? They do that by repealing the estate tax.

At the same time, however, if you are a low-income senior citizen—and we have too many of them in the State of Vermont—trying to figure out how to keep warm in a cold winter, you and 700,000 other senior citizens and families might not be able to keep your home warm in the winter because of a cut of about \$4 billion to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

This budget says that if you are the second wealthiest family in America, the Koch brothers, your family will see a tax break of up to \$33 billion. But if you are a working class kid right now in high school in Vermont or in Texas or in Wyoming and you are scratching your head as to how you can afford to

go to college and, in your computations, you are looking at what a Pell grant might mean to you, this budget would cut over \$100 billion in Pell grants and other financial assistance programs.

This budget gives members of the Trump family a tax cut of up to \$4 billion. But if you are a low-income, pregnant woman, you and over a million other new moms, babies, and toddlers may not be able to get the nutrition you need, thanks to a \$6.5 billion cut to the Women, Infants, and Children Program, the so-called WIC Program.

At a time when millions of working-class families all across this country are paying 40 percent or 50 percent or more for the housing they need, this budget eliminates housing assistance for more than a million families due to a cut of about \$37 billion to the Section 8 rental assistance program and other housing programs.

At a time when the cost of childcare has skyrocketed, which is a very serious problem in my State, the Republican budget eliminates Head Start services for 25,000 children each and every year by cutting this program by some \$3 billion.

In total, the Republican budget would cut more than \$5 trillion from education, healthcare, affordable housing, childcare, transportation, and other programs that working people desperately need over the next decade.

What is alarming is that despite this incredible giveaway for the billionaire class, the Koch brothers and their network say that it is not enough. They want more. Let us be very clear that their eventual goal—not today, not tomorrow, but their eventual goal is to see that programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are completely eliminated.

Let me conclude by saying that this budget is not a budget for the people of Texas. It is not a budget for the people of Vermont or the people of Wyoming or the people of the United States of America. This is a budget for the billionaire class, which today is already doing phenomenally well. This is a budget for campaign contributors whose greed has no end, who provide millions of dollars to candidates who represent their interests.

This is a budget that must be opposed by the American people. I urge the American people to tell their Members of the Senate to vote no on this budget.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:42 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOEVEN).

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2018—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 1116

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1116.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI] proposes an amendment numbered 1116.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss the Republican tax reform plan and what impact it will have on the fiscal health of our Nation but especially the impact it will have on working families across the United States and in my home State of Illinois.

I have represented Illinois in Congress both as a House Member and as a Senator for a number of years. I am proud to say that during my career, I have not shied away from tackling big issues.

Maybe one of the toughest assignments I have ever had was in 2010, when President Obama created the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform. It was known as the Simpson-Bowles Commission. I was one of 18 Republicans and Democrats given the responsibility of trying to find a way to balance America's budget and reform our country's largest spending programs and our Tax Code.

This was no small task, but it was an important one. We spent month after month in bipartisan meetings working at it. Nearly a year after the Commission was created, we were asked to vote on the final report.

Simpson-Bowles was not a perfect plan, but I decided to vote in favor of the report, and I knew it would be controversial, but I believed then, as I do now, that there is only one honest way

to reduce debt: cut spending, raise revenues, do not ignore the Tax Code. Bowles-Simpson did just that. It raised revenue by eliminating a lot of the exclusions and deductions and efforts of the Tax Code to reward certain companies and special interests, and it cut spending for both defense and non-defense. To say nothing of the months-long bipartisan process—a far cry from the current reconciliation that we have been going through this year on the healthcare issue—there simply is no comparison between the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction plan and what the Republicans want to bring to the floor of the U.S. Senate and House this year in the name of tax reform.

Simpson-Bowles was about balancing our budget responsibly. It raised nearly \$88 billion in revenue over the first decade, and unlike the Republican tax plan, it boosted the standard deduction and still retained the personal exemptions families claim on their taxes. It protected middle-income families from backdoor cuts, and—and I underline this—it ensured that the wealthy in America paid their fair share of taxes.

If there is one thing I can never understand, it is why the Republicans, in the name of budget deficits or in the name of tax reform, always end up in the same place—always cutting taxes on the wealthiest people in America. Where in the world is that coming from? I have met a lot of wealthy people in the course of my life; not one of them, with a straight face, has said to me: Senator, I desperately need a tax cut. They don't. Yet that is the fall-back default position on every Republican plan.

Importantly, the Simpson-Bowles plan provided details of the hard choices necessary to reach our goal. There is simply no comparison between that comprehensive, bipartisan plan to balance the budget and the highly fiscally irresponsible Republican tax reform plan before us now that will literally add \$2.4 trillion to the national debt.

How many times have Members on the Republican side of the aisle come to the floor to pose for holy pictures and to preach to us about the deficit? Now that they are in the majority and they have a President of their party, what is the first thing they do? They propose adding \$2.4 trillion to the national debt.

Where are my colleagues across the aisle who have been the first to speak out and admonish the Democrats about their failure to recognize the Federal debt? Where is my colleague the majority leader of the Senate who was so quick to rail on the “alarming level” of our national debt during the Obama years? He is silent now.

Even the most stalwart of self-proclaimed fiscal hawks on the right are falling in line behind this phony plan, which would allow for \$1.5 trillion in

unpaid-for tax cuts—clinging on to economic growth projections no responsible economist would dream of using. They used to call this economic theory of cutting taxes on the rich and economic growth the Laffer curve. I have never heard a better named description of an economic theory. It is a laugher. And this Laffer curve inspired the Governor of Kansas to bring that State to near fiscal ruin, trying to apply that great theory and watching his State crumble in the process.

History has proven that tax cuts simply do not yield economic growth. The economic growth promises of the Bush tax cuts turned out to be completely false. Those tax cuts for the wealthy ballooned our deficits and our debt and contributed to a scandalous rise in income inequality in the United States of America.

Tax cuts don't pay for themselves, and I know my Republican colleagues know that.

When Republicans' rosy estimates of economic growth do, in fact, fail and the deficit is sky-rocketing, the Republican budget spells out exactly how they plan to pay for the tax cuts on the backs of hard-working Americans. Listen to this. To pay for the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America, the Republican tax reform plan—now, get this—uses \$1 trillion in cuts from Medicaid and more than \$470 billion in cuts from Medicare.

Think about it. Health insurance for the elderly in America will take a \$470 billion cut under the Republican tax reform plan—for what? To give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country—go figure—and then \$1 trillion in cuts in Medicaid.

What is Medicaid for? Isn't it just health insurance for the poor? Well, in some respects, that is a good general description, but it is so much more. The Medicaid Program, which the Republicans return to time and time again to cut, is critically important for parts of America. Half of the children born in the State of Illinois are taken care of by Medicaid. Their mothers are taken care of before the baby is delivered and after. Plus, it is the No. 1 source of health insurance for the disabled across America. They want to cut \$1 trillion out of it. I haven't even gotten close to the most expensive part of Medicaid. Two-thirds of seniors in America in nursing homes count on Medicaid to pay for their medical bills.

The Republicans want to cut \$1 trillion out of Medicaid to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America. What is going to happen to those folks in nursing homes? What is going to happen to the disabled who count on Medicaid? What is going to happen to those mothers and their babies? That is a legitimate question to ask.

Make no mistake, the real answer for who pays for these cuts doesn't involve fake economics; it involves real families across America.

Let's look at the plan for what it is. While claiming to fix our broken Tax Code, this Republican tax reform plan would instead provide nothing short of a windfall for the wealthiest in our country and stick hard-working families in Illinois and across the country with the bill.

Under the Republican plan, no less than 80 percent of the benefits go to the top 1 percent of wealthiest Americans. Eighty percent of the benefits go to the wealthiest people in this country. That is more than three-quarters of all tax breaks going to people who make more than \$730,000 a year. Is that why Members of the Senate were elected—to take care of people making more than \$730,000 a year? Not in my State.

What about the middle-income Americans this plan is supposed to help? The Republican plan would raise taxes on nearly one-third of Americans who make between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year. One-third of them will pay higher taxes. That is not tax relief for working families. In fact, the Republican plan would eliminate the State and local tax deduction—a deduction used by one-third of all taxpayers to reduce their tax bill. That has been part of our Tax Code from the beginning, and here is the theory: We believe, in the current Federal Tax Code, you shouldn't pay a tax on a tax. It is basic. If you are paying \$1,000 in property taxes where you live right now, should you be taxed on that \$1,000? Under the current Tax Code, no. You are able to deduct State and local taxes. The Republicans eliminate that deduction. If they have their way, families with homes, families who pay sales taxes will pay a Federal tax on the State and local taxes they pay. This deduction currently allows families who pay State and local income or sales taxes to deduct those taxes from their Federal income tax. In other words, this deduction prevents families from double taxation—once by the Federal Government and again by the State. Yet the Republicans eliminate this deduction.

In Illinois, we rank fifth in the Nation for people who are helped by the State and local tax deduction. The taxpayers I represent will be hit especially hard. Nearly 2 million Illinoisans—roughly a third of the taxpayers of my State—claimed more than \$24 billion in State and local tax deductions in 2015. If Republicans have their way, almost 2 million people in Illinois would be double-taxed on an average \$12,500 of earnings. That is just plain wrong.

Republicans would have you believe that State and local tax deduction only helps the wealthy, but most people who take this deduction make less than \$200,000 a year.

Even families who do not claim the State and local deduction will see their taxes increase under the Republicans'

so-called tax reform plan. The Republican plan eliminates the personal exemption worth \$4,050 a person. A family of four making \$50,000 a year in my State will pay \$887 more under this part of the Republican tax reform plan. Getting hit by losing the State and local tax deduction and then turning around and losing a personal exemption, a family of four in Illinois making \$50,000 will pay \$887 more a year, just on that provision, in Federal taxes.

What are the Republicans raising taxes on my middle class for? They are raising taxes on middle-income families to provide massive tax cuts for corporations to the tune of \$2.6 trillion over the first 10 years, and—Mr. and Mrs. America, sleep well tonight—we are going to take care of that with economic growth. Here is the reality: Corporate profits are soaring in America. Today, corporate profits in the United States of America as a share of gross domestic product are at record highs; corporate taxes paid to the Federal Government as a share of GDP, record lows. What is the Republican approach to those two facts? To cut more corporate taxes.

Wouldn't it be good to have someone come to the floor and say: Instead of just looking at corporate taxes, why don't we look at corporate employees? How are they doing? We know how they are doing. They are falling behind. They are more productive than ever. The corporations are more profitable than ever. Yet the disparity in income in America gets worse. We have the best workers in the world—no apologies. They do great work. They don't get paid enough. The answer on the Republican side is to give the corporations more tax breaks. I say the answer should be something else.

Why don't we address the fact that CEOs in America make 271 times the average wage of their employees? Two hundred seventy-one? Come on. If they are going to head up these corporations, of course they are entitled to be paid more—their profitability, their entrepreneurial spirit, their talent, and all the rest—but 271 times? American workers are still waiting for their pay raise, and they won't get it with this Republican tax reform plan.

While American workers and their families continue to wait for their turn, the Republicans seemed determined to provide tax cuts to corporations and the wealthy rather than make the Tax Code work for working families. This has to stop. It is time we look at tax reform and economic growth in terms of the family room, not the boardroom.

The very successful Warren Buffett said:

My friends and I have been coddled long enough by a billionaire-friendly Congress. It's time for our government to get serious about shared sacrifice.

Thank you, Warren Buffett. I agree.

If Republicans want to get serious about fixing the faulty incentives in our Tax Code and provide working families some relief, it is time they stop clinging to the Laffer curve and this failed trickle-down policy that giving a tax break to the wealthiest person in America can only help the poorest person in America.

I know these are difficult and complex issues. It is no secret in Washington how difficult tax reform can be. But these are issues that deserve robust, bipartisan debate. Now is not the time to abandon any semblance of fiscal responsibility and rush through this deficit-exploding plan that has no prayer of paying for itself with growth.

I hope my Republican colleagues will look beyond the boardroom and seize this opportunity to reward and incentivize businesses to make real investments in the United States and its workers. Look at this Tax Code. If you own a big business in my State of Illinois and want to move your business out of Illinois—to Mexico or China or you name it—we are going to give you a helping hand. Our Tax Code says that the cost of the moving expenses are deductible. You don't have to pay taxes on those; we are going to give you a break to move your business. What are we thinking?

For goodness' sake, why don't we have what Senator SHERROD BROWN and I are submitting as an amendment—a patriot employers tax break, a patriot corporation tax break. You keep your business in Illinois. You keep your business in Ohio. When your workforce grows, it is American workers who get the jobs, and the wages you pay for 90 percent of them have to be at least \$15 an hour. You have to provide health insurance and a basic retirement plan that is fair. Give a veterans preference, please, to the men and women who served our country. And then we will give you a tax break. We won't give it to the company that is ready to move overseas; we will give it to the company that is ready to invest in the United States and U.S. workers. I think that is a tax policy most Americans would say makes sense. Why aren't we talking about that kind of approach instead of finding a way to give a tax break to the wealthiest?

American workers and families are watching this debate, and they are still waiting for a better deal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will vote on a budget resolution for fiscal year 2018. While there are many elements to this particular resolution, most of this Chamber's and the public's attention are on the reconciliation instructions related to tax reform.

Before I go too far, I first want to thank Chairman ENZI and all of our colleagues on the Budget Committee for their work on this resolution. Chairman ENZI has been a critical player in the ongoing effort to reform our broken Tax Code, and his work to craft this budget resolution and move it out of committee has been critical to this effort.

For the next step, he is going to need help passing the resolution here on the floor. I think we will get there.

Specifically, this budget resolution contains a \$1.5 trillion reconciliation instruction for tax reform. That is a good number, putting meaningful tax reform within reach.

As the debate over the budget and the instruction moves forward, I think it is critical that everyone understand what tax reform will do for our country and, perhaps more importantly, what will happen if we fail.

Tax reform has been the chief focus of the Senate Finance Committee for years now. In the 6½ years that I have been the lead Republican on the committee, we have had about 70 hearings focused on the Tax Code. In the vast majority of those hearings, we have heard both Democrats and Republicans acknowledge the inefficiency of our current tax system, with very few members having spent their time and energy defending the status quo, which is not at all surprising.

Our current tax system imposes undue burdens on middle-class families. Our current tax system is obscenely complex, riddled with credits, exemptions, and deductions, many of which were designed to benefit special interests. Our current tax system's complicated rate structure makes it difficult for families to plan and, for some workers, creates a disincentive to work for additional earnings. Our current tax system subjects American businesses and job creators to the highest tax rates in the industrialized world. Our current tax system creates incentives for businesses to move headquarters and operations offshore, eroding our Nation's tax base. And our current system has forced companies to keep trillions of dollars offshore, preventing further investment and growth here at home.

Reform of this broken system is long overdue. The last major overhaul to our Tax Code was more than three decades ago. Even if the Tax Code hadn't changed dramatically since that time, the economy of 1986 was dramatically different from the one we have today. Of course, the code has undergone a

number of piecemeal changes since the 1986 reform, but that approach has left us with a system that simply does not work.

Fundamental change is what our tax system needs—change that takes the entire system into account and change that will create a tax code that, at the very least, looks as though it was designed on purpose. That is what we aim to provide once the Senate and the House have passed a consensus budget resolution.

On the Finance Committee, we are working to craft legislation pursuant to the guideposts in the unified framework released last month. Our bill, based on the uniform tax reform framework, will give much needed relief to millions of low- to middle-income families. It will level the playing field for Americans and for American job creators and promote more investment in the United States.

In the end, all of this will mean bigger paychecks for American workers, a more vibrant U.S. economy, and more American jobs. But without this budget resolution, we are unlikely to get there.

Don't get me wrong, I would like to produce a tax reform product that could get 60 votes. I have spent years asking my Democratic colleagues to meaningfully engage in this effort. To be sure, there have been Democrats who have been willing to put themselves out there on tax reform in recent years, including the former Finance Committee chairman, Max Baucus, and our current ranking member, Senator WYDEN. But they have generally been the exception.

When President Obama was in office, many Democrats typically talked about tax reform only in the context of raising revenues to fuel additional spending, which isn't tax reform at all. It is simply raising taxes.

Under President Trump, the focus, at least among many in the Democratic leadership, seems to be about preventing passage of anything that could be viewed as a win for the President and Republicans in Congress. Perhaps I am wrong about that—and I hope I am—but when we are talking about tax reform these days, most of the talk from my friends on the other side of the aisle has been about unreasonable and unprecedented process demands.

That is unfortunate. There are a number of areas of tax reform where Democrats and Republicans are largely in agreement. Those areas include middle-class tax relief, bringing down the corporate rates, and fixing our international tax system to make American companies more competitive.

Given these shared concerns, I am still hopeful that some of our Democratic colleagues will join us in this effort. I remain willing to work with any Member of the Senate who wants to engage in this effort in good faith.

Historically speaking, tax bills that pass through the budget reconciliation process tend to have support from both parties. In fact, when Republicans have held the White House and Congress, purely partisan tax reconciliation bills have not been enacted. That being the case, I think the unified framework envisions a tax reform approach that both parties can and should support.

Long story short, I haven't given up on producing a bipartisan tax reform package. But, once again, we need to pass this budget resolution if we are going to move the ball forward. That being the case, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution before us this week and to work with us as we develop tax reform legislation that will help middle-class families and job creators throughout the country.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the first step to achieving our goal of overhauling our antiquated and uncompetitive Tax Code is passing a fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and we have made the first step in that journey earlier today. No one should be confused about this. A vote for the budget is a vote for tax reform. In converse, a vote against the budget is a vote against tax reform.

I don't know anybody in America who thinks that our Tax Code is a paragon of simplicity, efficiency, and virtue. To the contrary, I think most Americans realize that our Tax Code is simply too complex and that our Tax Code punishes taxpayers here at home by keeping overseas money earned overseas, rather than being brought back home and being invested in jobs and wages in America.

The budget resolution will steer our Nation into a safer and sounder fiscal course through a combination of restraining spending, reducing tax burdens, and strengthening our economy. Strengthening our economy really needs to be the focus, like a laser, that we have on what we are all about here—trying to get the economy to grow again faster.

We know that since the great recession of 2008, our economy has experienced anemic economic growth. Last quarter we saw that our economy, instead of growing at the annual rate of about 1.8 percent, grew at 3.1 percent. Why is that important? Well, when the economy grows faster, that means that people are finding more work to do and they are paying their taxes to the Treasury. That eases the financial bur-

dens of the U.S. Government while allowing people to keep more of what they earn in their pockets.

Here are some of the goals that we are attempting to accomplish by the 10-year budget resolution. First of all, we want to try to restrain Federal spending, parts of which go up at the rate of 5.5 percent or more a year and is about 70 percent of what the government spends. I know most people focus on the 30 percent that Congress appropriates, but, really, that is not the biggest part of the problem. That 30 percent includes about \$600-plus billion for defense spending alone. But the 70 percent of the money that is spent on auto pilot through mandatory spending programs grows at the rate of about 5.5 percent per year. That is the reason why we are seeing huge annual deficits and unsustainable debt. So restraining spending is an important goal of our budget.

Reducing nondefense discretionary spending is also important. Part of having a budget is establishing our priorities. That is what we do in our household budgets. That is what we do in our individual budget. That is what countries need to do in their budgets. We need to determine what our No. 1 priority is.

Well, I happen to believe that the safety and security of the American people is our No. 1 priority. That is why I believe defense spending is so important. While there are other things we would like to do, just like there are other things we would like to be able to buy as an individual or as a household, sometimes you simply can't afford it, recognizing the priorities that are important to you and to your family. Defense spending is the No. 1 priority of the Federal Government. Nobody else can do that. We can't do it as individuals. We can't do it as States. That is why it needs to be our national priority.

This budget also provides for the maximum level of defense funding allowed under the law, while allowing for an adjustment if an agreement on revised funding levels is reached. It provides a glidepath to an on-budget surplus, leaving aside Social Security entirely.

Most importantly, the budget will provide Congress with the roadmap forward in the goal of being able to pass tax reform and ultimately allowing middle-class Americans to keep more of their hard-earned pay.

Helping working families is one of the most important benefits of tax reform, but it is not the only benefit. Equally important is enhancing our Nation's competitiveness in a global economy and achieving growth for our job creators.

We have a self-inflicted wound caused by our Tax Code when competing with other countries around the world. We have the highest corporate tax rate in

the world. Why is that important? Why should we care what corporations pay in taxes? Because that influences how much money is paid to shareholders. It influences how much money can be paid in wages to people employed by businesses. What we have seen frankly is a negative incentive for companies to move their businesses overseas.

About a week or so ago I remember reading an article—I think it was in the *Wall Street Journal*—that said IBM now has more employees in India than it has in the United States. I am sure that is caused by a number of circumstances—perhaps access to the workforce, perhaps the markets that are available to the company—but I have to believe that at least some of that is caused by our Tax Code. It is cheaper, more efficient, and more cost effective to develop those jobs and that business overseas than it is here at home. Why in the world would we want to sustain that status quo? That is one of the things we are trying to do in our tax reform—enhancing our competitiveness and achieving growth for our job creators right here in America.

It used to be that reducing the business tax was a bipartisan effort. In 2011, when President Obama was President of the United States, he gave a speech to a joint session of Congress where he called it a national priority, recognizing that having the highest corporate rate in the world moved business overseas and it hurt workers here in America.

The Democratic leader, our friend and colleague from New York, has previously advocated reducing that corporate tax rate because he recognizes the benefits to workers and working families right here in America. So, occasionally, we have to remind them, when they come out and say harsh and frankly untrue things about what we are trying to do, that they used to be for the very same things that we are now advocating for today.

There are other significant pieces, too, such as those that affect the people in my State and those who work in the energy sector. It is no secret that Texas leads the Nation in energy production. I know people think that it is only about oil and gas, but we are actually the No. 1 electricity producer from wind energy in the country. So we believe, literally, in an “all of the above” policy when it comes to energy.

We know that some parts of the energy sector, particularly those refiners in the oil and gas sector, spent the past month and a half trying to recover from Hurricane Harvey, and at least 25 refineries were closed temporarily because of the storm. Why should you or I care about refineries that were closed because of the storm? Because all you had to do after Hurricane Harvey hit Texas was to look at the price you pay for gasoline. It has skyrocketed because of the closed refineries. It actu-

ally benefits the entire Nation and consumers when energy prices are low.

Operations have now resumed in some areas and, thankfully, some of those higher prices at the pump have dropped, but the hurricane underscored the need to ensure our energy sector's ongoing dynamism and vitality. That is where tax reform can help as well.

One component of our proposal is a territorial tax system. Companies such as Apple, IBM, ConocoPhillips, and ExxonMobil all have headquarters in the United States, and they have earned money overseas. One has to wonder: Why in the world wouldn't they want to bring that back to the United States and invest it in businesses and paychecks here in America? That is because under our current tax structure, they have to pay taxes on the money they earn overseas, but if they want to bring it back to the United States, they have to pay taxes again up to a 35-percent corporate tax rate on the same money. So they make the rational decision and keep the money overseas. They build their businesses there and hire more workers abroad and not here at home. Why in the world would we want to maintain that sort of self-destructive status quo?

A new territorial tax system is going to be an important part of tax reform, and it is not to help big businesses. It is to help workers who are looking for work or people who are working who have had stagnant wages and are looking for a little extra in their paycheck each month. That is why it is so important.

In addition, we plan to help decrease the cost of investing in things like new plants and equipment in America. Things like expensing rather than depreciating over many years investment in new equipment and new businesses are really important to encourage those businesses to modernize their plants and, again, to hire more workers.

Tax reform represents an opportunity to cement America's position as the world's largest energy producer, as well, rather than one of those regulatory exercises that, unfortunately, happens far too often and ends up increasing the cost of creating jobs in the energy sector. I will continue to be an advocate for the countless number of Texans whose livelihoods depend on this sector of our economy while it continues to face challenges on a multitude of fronts.

Getting back to my point about the price of gasoline, if we drive a car, we are all paying for gasoline. It just makes sense to do what we can to help that price get lower, and we all benefit. One of those ways we can do that is through regulatory reform and the second is through tax reform.

NAFTA

Mr. President, I mentioned Hurricane Harvey earlier, but that is not the only

challenge. Another potential challenge, I should mention, is NAFTA. This is the North American Free Trade Agreement, which is a 20-year-old trade agreement that includes Canada, Mexico, and the United States. This is a topic I will have a chance to speak about further at the Hoover Institution this afternoon.

As most of us know, the NAFTA negotiations are ongoing. President Trump has said—at least his administration, Ambassador Lighthizer, and the Commerce Secretary have said that their attitude toward renegotiating NAFTA is first to do no harm. I really appreciate that because NAFTA has been an important part of our trading relationships with Mexico and Canada, and it supports about 14 million jobs in commerce between our 3 countries in North America.

Since the administration announced its intent to revisit NAFTA, I think it is important to revisit the critical role that NAFTA has played in all North American energy markets, including electricity, renewables, oil, and natural gas. As I wrote in a letter to Ambassador Lighthizer this summer, each market is highly integrated with and remains dependent on vital energy infrastructure and trade crossings that border the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Free trade and the free-trade agreements, such as NAFTA, allow the United States to maximize the benefits of being the world's largest energy producer. If you have been paying attention, you know that our energy industry has undergone dramatic changes over the past two decades. I remember when we were worried about having to import liquefied natural gas from places around the world to our own shores before the natural gas revolution took place here in America, thanks to improvements in technology and drilling techniques.

Now we have such cheap and plentiful natural gas that we can export that gas around the world. It is just not an economic boom. It is a way for us to provide alternative energy resources to some of our friends and allies around the world, particularly in Europe, where Mr. Putin uses energy as a weapon, threatening to shut off energy supplies if countries in his neighborhood don't cooperate.

So opening Mexico's energy market has positioned U.S. companies to meet Mexico's needs for technical expertise and capital. As my friends south of the border reminded me, they said the Eagle Ford shale, which is one of the most plentiful sources of natural gas in the world, doesn't stop at the Rio Grande. So as we provide additional technical expertise and capital to Mexico, we can expect for them to experience the sort of energy renaissance we ourselves have experienced in the United States.

During the NAFTA negotiations, we should seek to promote North American energy security by maintaining and protecting rules that reduce or eliminate barriers to U.S. investment in Mexico and Canada. Opportunities like this are why NAFTA could benefit from an update rather than a repeal.

Former Secretary of State George Shultz reminded us yesterday in the *New York Times* that NAFTA has helped a wide range of U.S. manufacturing industries like auto, electronics, and aerospace become more competitive relative to their foreign competitors. Secretary Shultz also pointed out how that increased competitiveness is fostered. It has resulted mainly from the development throughout the last 24 years of strong vertical supply chains that take advantage of economies of scale. Thanks to NAFTA, economic production can take place wherever in North America it is most efficient.

Let's remember all of this as negotiations continue. Let's seek to preserve all of the good we have inherited from NAFTA and update all that is outdated in NAFTA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1974 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, followed by the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, later this week, Senator MURRAY and I, with other Senators, will introduce bipartisan legislation to give States additional flexibility to create more choices of health insurance policies in the individual market and to extend cost-sharing reduction subsidies during 2018 and 2019. These subsidies pay for copays and deductibles for millions of low-income Americans who buy health insurance on the Affordable Care Act exchanges. Our goal is to stabilize and then lower the cost of premiums and to enable all Americans to have access to health insurance.

Our legislation will be based on the four hearings and other meetings that

the Senate's Health, Education, Labor, and Pension Committee held last month. I am chairman of that committee, and Senator MURRAY is the ranking Democratic member. These hearings and meetings were bipartisan. They were lengthy. They were remarkable in this sense: They engaged nearly 60 Senators from both political parties in extensive discussions. We not only had the four hearings, which involved the 23 members of our HELP Committee, but we invited any other Senator who wished to come to a committee meeting ahead of time to meet the Governors and the State insurance commissioners and others who were testifying, and 37 did. So we have had extensive participation by 60 Members of the U.S. Senate through four hearings and a variety of committee meetings in the process that developed this legislative proposal that Senator MURRAY and I have agreed upon.

According to witnesses at our hearings, according to the Congressional Budget Office and Congress's Joint Tax Committee, without these cost-sharing payment reductions, premiums will rise, the Federal debt will increase to pay for the higher subsidies by \$194 billion over 10 years, and up to 16 million Americans may find themselves living in counties where no company sells insurance in the individual market.

Imagine yourself as a 45-year-old songwriter in Tennessee who loses her job, has three kids, goes to the individual market, and finds that she can't buy health insurance; no company is offering it because we did not act. Those are the consequences we are talking about.

Witnesses also testified that one way to lower costs for consumers is to give States more flexibility than the Affordable Care Act now allows to design health insurance plans that give consumers more choices.

We have purposefully limited our proposal to two themes: first, 2 years of temporary cost-sharing payments and, second, amendments that would give States meaningful flexibility in using the section 1332 innovation waiver, which is already a part of the Affordable Care Act.

The problem with the waiver is that while it was designed to give States the opportunity for innovation, it has been very restrictive. It limited the number of opportunities States could use. It would be like saying to someone: You can drive anywhere you want to in the United States as long as you end up in New York or in Nashville or in Birmingham, AL. Our goal is still to protect patients but to give States more flexibility in offering more choices.

There are, of course, many other good and useful ideas that would improve Federal laws regulating health insurance. There are many on the Republican side, and there are many on the Democratic side. There are prob-

ably even ideas that both of us would agree on, but Congress has been stuck for 7 years in a partisan stalemate over the Affordable Care Act. Most of that stalemate is about the individual insurance market.

Most people get their insurance from the government, Medicare, or Medicaid. Most of the rest of the people get their insurance from their employer on the job; that is 50 or 60 percent of Americans. Only 6 percent of Americans get their insurance in the so-called individual market. It is about 350,000 people in Tennessee. Every single one of them is very important, and every single one of them is terrified by the skyrocketing premiums in that market and by the possibility that they might not be able to buy insurance at all in that market if we don't act.

We concluded that the best course would be to take this limited, bipartisan first step, which would avoid the chaos that could occur during 2018 and 2019 if premiums continue to skyrocket and millions of Americans find themselves without a way to purchase health insurance. Once we complete this limited first step, then we can take the second and the third steps.

I want to undersell this proposal rather than oversell it. It has significant advantages in terms of cost-sharing reductions, which make it more likely that premiums will stabilize in 2018 and actually go down in 2019. It has significant advantages in changing the law so that States will have more flexibility in offering choices, which is another way to lower costs, but it is only a limited first step.

Senator MURRAY and I hope that by the end of the week we can present Senate leadership—Senator McCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER—with the support of a significant number of Republican and Democratic Senators. We then hope the Senate will pass the legislation, the House will agree to it, and the President will sign it.

During the last several days, I have had encouraging discussions with President Trump, who called me on two different occasions, encouraging me to work with Senator MURRAY to come to a bipartisan agreement. I am grateful to him for that encouragement, and I am grateful to her for her patience and for working on this so diligently for such a long period of time. I see she has just come to the floor.

I think one other thing Senator MURRAY and I can agree on is that we hope our next legislative assignment is easier than this one. I think we both also agree that the sooner we act, the better, so Americans will have the benefit of lower premium costs and the peace of mind of knowing that they will be able to buy insurance for themselves and their families.

I would like to say through the Chair to Senator MURRAY that I asked for 10

minutes to speak, and then I asked for 10 minutes for her to follow me. I am about finished, and when I am through, then she has the floor, according to my request.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief summary of the agreement that Senator MURRAY and I have.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWER PREMIUMS, MORE STATE FLEXIBILITY,
ZERO SCORE, AVOID CHAOS IN 2018, 2019

Make Section 1332 State Innovation Waivers Work

Amend law to provide meaningful flexibility for health plan designs

- Example: Iowa waiver
- Example: higher co-pay opioids, lower co-pay statins
- Example: Medicaid savings for Sec. 1332 costs (NH)
- Repeal 2015 Regulation and Guidance “Alaska for All” (Maine, Minnesota)
- State-based program to cover very sick
- 20% premium decrease for everyone
- NO new federal spending; savings help pay for the fund

Streamline approval process

- Governors apply for waiver
- Federal waiver approval time in half
- Fast-track approval for emergency situations
- Fast-track approval for “me too” waivers
- Waivers can last longer (6 years)
- Harder for future administrations to cancel waiver
- Model waivers help states get approved faster

New Copper Plan: Catastrophic Insurance All Ages

Interstate Health Insurance Compacts: Texas Public Policy

Redirect Existing User Fee Funding to States for Consumer Outreach

2 Years Funding Cost Sharing Reduction Subsidies (Zero score), No Double Dipping by Insurance Companies

Chaos Without Cost Sharing (CBO, JCT, CMS):

- 20% average premium increases in 2018
- \$194 billion new federal debt over ten years
- 50% counties with one insurer today—would get worse
- Up to 16 million Americans with zero insurance options on exchanges
- Four-lane highway to single payer solution

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have said repeatedly over the last several weeks that while it is important that the two of us, as the chairman and the ranking member of the HELP Committee, come to an agreement, that is not nearly enough because our real job was and is to see if we can find, among a significant number of Republicans and a significant number of Democratic Senators, a consensus that will cause this to be enacted, will cause the Senate to pass it and the House to pass it and the President to sign it. In my opinion, we wouldn't have come to an agreement ourselves unless we thought that was likely.

I will not go into the specific provisions that are in this, except to briefly summarize them. The first group of them makes the section 1332 innovation waivers work by giving more flexibility. In New Hampshire, for example, the State would like to use Medicaid savings to help pay for the cost of its Affordable Care Act waiver, and this would allow that. In Maine, for example, the State has applied for a waiver. The waiver has been approved, but the use of the funding has not been approved. This would allow that. Alaska, Oklahoma, Iowa, for example, all have waivers in line that they would like to submit to give a greater variety of choices in their States and hopefully lower premium costs, but it is too restrictive under the current conditions.

About the only sort of waiver that the current Director of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services can approve is the Alaska-type waiver, which is a good idea. Alaska created a reinsurance fund, which helped the very sick Alaskans, immediately lowered premiums 20 percent for all other Alaskans, and then used the savings from the lower subsidies as a result of the lower premiums to pay for 85 percent of the cost of the fund. Minnesota has tried a similar thing. Maine did that on its own a few years ago. We have streamlined the approval process for those waivers, so that can be done more easily.

I would emphasize that a number of these, while they are limited proposals, could not be done in a budget reconciliation process. They had have to be done with 60 votes.

The proposal also includes what we call a new copper plan, catastrophic insurance for all ages. We still keep the patient protections; that is, preexisting conditions, et cetera. We still keep the essential health benefits, but we allow someone who is healthy and young, for example, to pay a higher deductible and a lower premium if that is what they choose to do. We direct the Department of Health and Human Services to go ahead and write regulations to encourage interstate health insurance compacts. We compromised on the outreach funding and agreed that we will spend about twice as much as or more than President Trump wanted to expend, but we will do most of that by grants to the States. And of course we agree on 2 years of funding for the cost payments.

Finally, I would say that if we do not do this, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Joint Tax Committee, and CMS, premiums next year will increase 20 percent, there will be a \$194 billion increase in the Federal debt over 10 years, and up to 16 million Americans might find themselves unable to buy insurance through the individual market. In my view, this agreement avoids chaos, and I don't know a Democrat or a Republican who benefits from chaos.

I thank President Trump for his encouragement to me and to Senator MURRAY to try to succeed on this. I thank Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, for creating an environment in which we could get to this point. I thank the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL—despite his focus on tax reform—for allowing us to work together and try to do this. I especially thank Senator MURRAY, who, whenever she sets about to get a result, I have found, she usually gets one. I could not have a better partner to work with on difficult issues in the Senate. In fact, the one thing we probably most agree on, we found the most difficult to solve; that is, in 2018, we want to make sure that the cost-sharing payments go to the benefit of consumers, not the insurance companies. I want that. Senator MURRAY wants that. The President wants that. My Republican colleagues want that. And I know Democrats want it. We believe we have strong language in our proposed agreement to do that, but we are going to make sure that it is the strongest possible language.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I look forward to working with Senator MURRAY over the next few days to see if we can find a consensus among Republicans and Democrats to present to the Senate leadership. I hope that we can then pass it, the House will pass it, and the President will sign it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to thank Chairman ALEXANDER for his tremendous work on this. I am very grateful for his leadership in supporting a bipartisan discussion under regular order in the HELP Committee and his determination to see it to this point and beyond.

I remember very clearly back in July when it was clear that the so-called skinny repeal didn't have the votes to pass. We talked right then and there about getting to work on ways to stabilize the healthcare market and protect patients and families from premium spikes as a result of the uncertainty this administration caused. We were able to engage nearly half the Senate in our hearings and conversations on the HELP Committee, and we found that there was a lot more that we agreed on than we disagreed on when it came to strengthening healthcare and controlling costs in the near term.

Since then, actions by this administration have made our work more urgent. So I am very glad Democrats and Republicans agreed to work together to address this, and I am extremely pleased that, with the input of Members on both sides of the aisle, as well as Governors and patients and advocates, we were able to reach an agreement that I hope will set the

healthcare discussion in Congress on a very different path than the one we have all seen for the last 7 years.

This agreement provides certainty on the reduction of out-of-pocket payments for the next 2 years. It will address attempts by this administration to keep people from getting enrolled in the care they need. It takes a number of very strong, bipartisan steps to offer States more flexibility to innovate in the way the Affordable Care Act intended, without undermining the essential health benefits, such as maternity care and mental health coverage, or burdening people who have pre-existing conditions.

This is an agreement I am proud to support, not only because of the important steps to strengthen our healthcare system but because of the message it sends about the best way to get things done in this Congress. The way to deliver results, as Chairman ALEXANDER says, for patients and families is to work under regular order, to find common ground rather than retreating to partisan corners, and to hear from our experts and our families and our Members on both sides of the aisle rather than reciting talking points to each other. We know that is true because just a month ago, the idea of an agreement between Republicans and Democrats on healthcare seemed impossible at best, if not improbable. Thanks to the strong, bipartisan work of Chairman ALEXANDER and many of our Members, we have been able to bridge the divide.

I strongly believe that patients and families in every State across our country will be stronger if we can get this agreement signed into law. I urge my colleagues to not only support it but to continue working together because there is no question we have work to do.

I thank Chairman ALEXANDER and all the Republicans and Democrats who have been so engaged in this effort, and I echo the comments of Senator ALEXANDER about what is in the bill. I won't repeat them. I agree with his last comments that we both want to make sure the payments go to consumers. We are working on that language, and I wish to assure our colleagues that is our joint intent as we get this language finalized and put into place.

I thank the Presiding Officer for this short amount of time during a busy day on the floor. I again thank Chairman ALEXANDER, and I remain committed to him to get this done in the right way for the people of this country.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this deeply flawed budget that is terrible for America and particularly harmful to working families.

The Republican plan that we face today is a budget-busting first step toward issuing massive tax breaks to special interests and to wealthy individuals. This proposed budget fails to improve economic growth or to drive up wages. It should look awfully familiar to all of us because it is a retread of the failed trickle-down economics which exploded budget deficits in the 1980s and squandered the budget surplus we had briefly in the early 2000s. That trickle-down theory ruined our budget and failed to grow the economy then, and we cannot afford to relive those failed policies now.

Our Nation faces significant economic challenges today that need to be addressed directly. Wages have barely improved in the past 20 years; the costs of education, childcare, and other essential living expenses continue to climb.

Job creation is slowing. From February through September of this year, the economy added the lowest number of jobs in 7 years. Wages are also falling this year. Since the Trump administration took over, 39 States and the District of Columbia have seen workers' wages decline, after adjusting for inflation. Nearly 4 in 10 rural families don't have access to high-speed internet and the opportunities it affords.

We all know many of the communities we represent, in both rural and urban areas, still have not fully recovered from the great recession. Yet this budget only makes life harder for working families by cutting vital programs and critical services that invest directly in those communities. The Republican budget ignores our current reality and makes it tougher for American families to afford a college education or access quality healthcare coverage. As we saw through last week's executive actions, the Trump administration remains singularly focused on taking away healthcare from 20 million Americans and sabotaging the system for those left. This proposed budget would take us deeper down that destructive path.

The Republican 2018 budget cuts more than \$5 trillion over the next decade in healthcare, education, transportation, medical research, and other critical investments. It slashes Medicaid by \$1 trillion and Medicare by more than \$470 billion. When they are done, these budget-busting tax giveaways will leave other Federal efforts with a gaping \$660 billion hole, bringing our domestic Federal investments as a share of our Nation's GDP to the lowest levels since the Hoover administration.

If you are at home listening, all of that sounds pretty unbelievable. Wash-

ington Republicans wouldn't really jeopardize our Nation's healthcare, our educational system, our rural communities, and bust the budget all at the same time, right? Unfortunately, all of that is true when we look at the details of this failing budget. Again, this is all based on a brazen theory that led to the failed and harmful tax policies of the past.

The real question we should be asking now is, How do we improve our communities, grow our economy, and drive up wages for hard-working families? That is what I am focused on when I look at the budget.

Republicans believe step one should be to take funds out of Medicare, out of education, out of infrastructure, and pull healthcare away from the working poor. Then step two of their plan is to give all that money to wealthy political interests under the ruse that regular people, someday, will be better off because America's elite investing class will have done something spectacular with the money we just sucked out of our communities.

It is truly amazing that this idea continues to resurface because the promise of wild economic growth and trickle-down benefits has failed to materialize time and time again. What we have found is, working families, rural communities, and others who are robbed to finance this type of plan are the ones who suffer, all to put money into other people's pockets.

Who exactly loses in this budget? For starters, senior citizens, who will see Medicare cut \$470 billion, to be exact. Let me say that again. This Republican budget cuts Medicare to the tune of nearly half a trillion dollars.

Children, working families, and people in need of opioid treatment will be pounded by Medicaid cuts of more than \$1 trillion. Medicaid cuts will lead to millions losing their coverage. They will unravel the progress we have made fighting the opioid epidemic, jeopardize mental health coverage, and force many rural hospitals to close.

The hit will be especially hard in rural areas, where more than 12 percent of rural hospital revenue comes from Medicaid. In New Mexico, Medicaid actually accounts for more than 20 percent of hospital revenue in rural areas.

For seniors, the Medicare and Medicaid cuts together will have devastating consequences. Let's look at one example, Alzheimer's disease. Medicare and Medicaid together pay for nearly 70 percent of care for those 65 and older with Alzheimer's. These deep cuts will force families to make a terrible choice between working and caring for their family members. Already, 15 percent of caregivers to someone with Alzheimer's have left their jobs or retired early in the past year due to their caregiving responsibilities. Cutting Medicare and Medicaid, when

Alzheimer's costs are getting higher and no cure is in sight, will saddle individuals and their families with massive costs and hardship.

The devastation this budget will create does not stop there. More than 8 million students will see their Pell grants cut by one-third. That is right. Republicans want to cut investments in education so they can give special interests a tax break. These are Americans who are striving for a college degree, who just want a fair shot at opportunity without being crushed by debt. Pell grants are the primary form of financial aid for so many students, giving them access to an education that might otherwise be out of reach.

This chart pretty much sums up what I have been saying about the priorities reflected in this budget: tax cuts over investments in things like Medicare, Medicaid, education. The picture is pretty clear. They are taking direct investments away from our people and our communities and instead giving those dollars away as part of a convoluted plan that leaves the wealthy better off.

What is more amazing about this plan is that Republicans have changed budget rules to allow them to add \$1.5 trillion to the debt while doing it. For many years, the Conrad rule in the Senate specifically prohibited reconciliation legislation from increasing the deficit in the first 10 years. It was what reconciliation bills were designed to do—reduce the deficit. Then, Republicans repealed that rule in 2015 and threw any illusion of fiscal responsibility out the window.

Remember when Republicans believed in fiscal responsibility and balanced budgets? Under President Trump, Republicans barely give these values lip service—and this year's budget goes even further than before to reject fiscal reason. It removes a Senate requirement for the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—to issue a cost estimate a day ahead of votes on the Senate floor, the so-called 28-hour rule. Why? Because they want to hide how fiscally irresponsible these votes are from their constituents and the American people.

Finally, the Republican budget assumes far faster growth than the CBO could possibly justify under even the rosiest assumptions. This backward math says that their budget magically delivers \$1.24 trillion in deficit reduction. According to the Tax Policy Center, the Republican tax plan will reduce revenues by \$2.4 trillion over the first 10 years and another \$3.2 trillion over the next 10 years. The actual cost far exceeds the Republican estimates.

Where do all the tax cuts go? Most of them go to wealthy folks who are doing just fine without them. We don't need to be doling out tax breaks to wealthy trust-funders when families in Las Cruces, Gallup, and Santa Rosa are

struggling to make ends meet, don't have high-speed internet, and haven't gotten a raise in years, in some cases.

Under this Republican plan, the top 0.1 percent will receive a tax cut of more than \$700,000 a year. It would take a typical household in my State nearly 15 years—15 years of work and earning—just to match the giveaway being provided to a single wealthy investor under this budget. That is not just wrong, it is downright sickening.

Part of this massive benefit to the rich comes from the creation of a special rate for passthrough income of 25 percent. This plan is designed to help large law firms and hedge funds that, in my mind, don't need a special tax break to further enrich themselves. Millions of working families will actually face higher taxes as a result. Under the Republican tax plan, nearly 8 million working households will actually see an average tax hike of \$794. Now, \$800 may not seem like a lot if you are working on Wall Street, but \$800 is a lot for people working hard on relatively modest incomes in New Mexico.

Unfortunately, as I said earlier, we have seen this movie before. We don't need another bad sequel.

This Republican plan delivers higher deficits and fewer community investments. Tax cuts in 1981 and the early 2000s led to less revenue as a share of GDP and higher deficits. The national debt nearly tripled under President Reagan and nearly doubled under President George W. Bush.

We have also seen the dangers of reckless tax cuts for the wealthy at the State level. In Kansas, Republicans slashed individual rates by more than 20 percent and abolished taxes on pass-through income. Sound familiar? Since the tax cuts were enacted in 2012, the State's revenue plummeted, and Kansas has buckled under an economy that has trailed the United States in job, wage, and economic growth.

A recent study found that for tax cuts to pay for themselves, the economy would have to grow \$5 to \$6 for every single dollar of cuts. Yet the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation found that tax cuts generate nowhere near that amount. According to them, each dollar of tax cuts would lead to only 4 cents to, at best, \$1.25 in new economic activity.

The evidence is clear. Large tax cuts for special interests and for the rich simply don't pay for themselves. As we have seen, time and time again, trickle down only works in fake, so-called think tank models, not in real life.

Rather than rely on disproven theories, we should be investing in what we know actually works in increasing wages and accelerating economic growth. Expanding the earned-income tax credit, for example, has proven to be effective at increasing the living standards of working families. It effec-

tively raises their wages. Let's strengthen and make fully refundable the child tax credit.

Instead of slashing infrastructure spending, as this budget does, we should be investing to prepare our Nation to compete. Investing in infrastructure is proven to create good-paying jobs and stimulate our overall economy. President Trump talked about infrastructure investment incessantly on the campaign trail. Where is that rhetoric today? Where is that commitment today? Sending kids to high-quality pre-K is shown to improve both theirs and, for that matter, their parents' economic outcomes.

We need to invest in clean energy because it is cheaper, because it is good for the economy, and because all of our future livelihoods depend on addressing climate change. The renewable energy sector is a place where jobs are growing rapidly in New Mexico—and not just in urban metro areas but especially in rural communities.

We need to invest in Federal research and development that has led to the internet, to the GPS, to the laser, and to lifesaving medical breakthroughs. We must ensure that startups can access the capital they need to launch and grow their businesses, whether they are in rural New Mexico or downtown Detroit. We need to close the digital divide so that every person in America, regardless of ZIP Code, has access to high-speed internet that connects people and communities to financial and educational opportunities.

Democrats have a plan to grow the economy, to increase wages, and to improve the lives of folks who work on Main Streets across this country. Our plan connects people with the opportunities that will exist tomorrow.

The Republican plan is very different. It is written by the lobbyists on K Street, with much of the benefit flowing to the investment bankers on Wall Street. Regrettably, Republicans are pursuing the same partisan process with the budget and with tax reform that failed when they tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The cost of Republican chaos and backward thinking is growing by the day, and this budget will continue that process. We need bipartisan, pragmatic solutions to the challenges that our country faces.

To all of my colleagues, we are asking simply to do what we know works. Let's work across the aisle through regular order to get things done for our constituents.

Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. ENZI, for allowing me, as the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, some time on the Senate floor to discuss the budget.

Our budget process is important, and it has long been in a period of neglect. It needs reform. That is what I am here to talk about today. There are so many areas that are affected by our budgeting process or, at least, that should be. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of any aspect of the Federal Government that couldn't be or shouldn't be addressed through the budgeting process.

When we look at the budget process, it is important for us to focus, to one degree or another, on the Budget Act of 1974. This is an old law. Forty-three years in statute has not exactly improved it. It hasn't matured into something better. In other words, rather than a piece of art that has appreciated in value over time, this is something more akin to the 8-track tape player that you might have purchased in 1974 to go inside your Ford Pinto, which would explode upon impact. This is something that didn't really improve in the 43 years since it was passed, especially not the way we have followed it or, better said, the way we have utterly failed to follow it.

One of the best ways to describe the budgeting process, prescribed by the Budget Act of 1974, is that it is non-binding. It is less legislation than it is legislative fiction. It is aspirational in the sense that it aims for what could be and what should be, except no one actually aspires to it. In Congress, we don't get to the aspiration, basically, ever. It is reminiscent almost of the immortal words of St. Augustine. When he was undergoing his transition to Christianity, he famously said: "Lord, grant me chastity . . . but not yet"—always wanting to restrain oneself later and not now, even though the need for restraint, the need for reform is present now, is calling out for reform right now. That is why it is important to remember that what comes next is important, and next is now. We are discussing the budget this week, and it is important that we focus on these issues right now.

We do have a system that has to be kept carefully in balance. That balance depends on Congress keeping the national interest front and center. It depends on Congress being willing to restrain itself and follow the dictates of our constitutional structure. We have failed on these scores.

Congress collectively, actively, almost defiantly avoids the very type of accountability built into our constitutional structure—the type of accountability called for by article I of the Constitution. Article I, the very first clause of the first section of the first article of the Constitution, makes clear that if you are going to make policy within the Federal Government, if you are going to establish norms that will be enforceable as generally applicable laws within our Federal Government, you have to go through Congress.

"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." Article I, section 1 tells us that.

Article I, section 7 tells us that in order to make a law in our Federal system, you first have to pass something through the House of Representatives and the Senate, and then you have to submit it to the White House. You cannot make law without going through that process. That process is also worked in for a budgeting process.

The way the Budget Act of 1974 is supposed to work, the way our budget process is supposed to operate is that we will pass a series of laws appropriating money in various aspects of the Federal Government. We have a budget that gets passed first, which is an aspirational statement not submitted to the President. It is a resolution passed jointly by both Houses of Congress that sets budgeting priorities. Then, following from those priorities, there are supposed to be 13 separate appropriations bills that spend money, that allocate the scarce resources of the Federal Government, understanding that they are finite to each of the major areas of government spending.

There will be one bill, for example, that funds National Defense. There is another bill that will fund our Justice Department or Federal court system. There is another bill that will fund, for example, our national parks, and so on and so forth. When you follow that formula, you avoid the kind of circumstance in which we push all spending decisions into one legislative package, setting up a potential for disaster.

A common analogy that I sometimes use to describe this is, imagine if you live in an outlying area, in an area where there is only one grocery store for 100, maybe 200 miles around. Upon moving there, suppose, on your way home from work, you receive a phone call from your significant other telling you to stop by the store: Don't come home without bread, milk, and eggs. You don't need everything else. Just get bread, milk, and eggs.

You go to the grocery store. You get your shopping cart, and you put in your bread, milk, and eggs. You get to the checkout counter. You put out your bread, milk, and eggs.

The cashier says to you: Excuse me, there is a problem. You can't buy just bread, milk, and eggs. This is a special kind of store where you can't buy bread, milk, and eggs unless you also buy a bucket of nails, one-half ton of iron ore, a Barry Manilow album, and a book about cowboy poetry. In fact, for that matter, this is the kind of store where you have to buy one of every item in order to buy anything else. That is kind of what it is like every time we pass a spending bill lately because, even though the Budget Act of

1974 contemplates 12 or 13 separate appropriations bills, each addressing one discreet aspect of the Federal Government's spending, we end up, more often than not—in fact, basically every single time for the last 6 of ½ years I have been serving here, and even longer than that, we end up passing either a continuing resolution, which basically is a reset button saying that we will continue to spend next year at the same rate we have been spending this year, subject to these minor exceptions or, alternatively, we might pass an omnibus spending bill, which can be 1,000, maybe 2,000 pages long, sometimes longer, and identify all the areas in which we will be spending but put into one unified bill.

The problem with these bills, the way we have tended to do continuing resolutions and omnibus spending bills, is that we tend to consider and pass them under a compacted time agreement in the final hours or minutes before a cliff. By "cliff," I mean an arbitrary deadline, after which a spending measure already in place will expire. So if there is a spending bill that expires on September 30 of a particular year, it is not uncommon for us to address a spending bill on September 30, sometimes late in the day on September 30 or in the days leading up to it.

It is not uncommon for Members of Congress to be told at that moment: You have two choices. You can either pass this as is and have everything funded more or less as it has been or you can shut down the government.

Nobody really wants to cause a government shutdown. Certainly, nobody wants to be accused of shutting down the government.

Most Members tend to vote for it, and then the American people continue to get what they have been getting. They continue to operate a Federal Government that spends about \$4 trillion a year, with little or no control, even by the people's own elected Representatives in Congress, whose job it is to do these things over their own government. This is wrong.

We shouldn't be governing this way. Yet there is a touch of irony in this in that we govern this way, I think, at least in part, because of a fear of public outcry against the process or criticism about the process in which we might engage. Yet, as we undertake this process, which undercuts that process altogether and sidesteps it, as we have avoided that studiously in order to avoid criticism, we have seen Congress's approval rating plummet. In fact, if you look at most opinion polls these days, it puts our approval rating as an institution right around 10 percent. The last time I checked, in the United States of America, that makes us less popular than Fidel Castro. It makes us only slightly more popular than the influenza virus, which is rapidly gaining on us.

If what we are wanting to do is avoid criticism, then the last thing we ought to do is continue to do what we have been doing, which is to consolidate all spending decisions into one legislative package to be addressed at the end of the fiscal year, telling Members they have to either vote for it or be blamed for a government shutdown. That is wrong. That shuts out the American people, and it makes their government unaccountable to them.

In the process, we avoid reforming a lot of programs that need reforming. Among other things, we avoid reforming entitlement spending. It is important when we think about entitlement spending and how it needs to be reformed to remember the immortal words of President John F. Kennedy, who said that "to govern is to choose." But today, to budget is not to choose or to choose in advance not to choose, to avoid choosing altogether.

We are \$20 trillion in debt, and we choose to ignore that. Twenty trillion dollars is an enormous amount of money, as is the interest we pay on that sum every single year, which is about \$250 billion a year—an enormous sum of money in and of itself. But that isn't the scary part. The scary part is that \$250 billion, which is what we spend every year on interest on our national debt, is roughly the same interest payment we had about 20 years ago. I believe our national debt was one-sixth or one-seventh of its current size. The only reason it is even that low is because our Treasury yield rates—the interest rate at which the U.S. Government pays its creditors—is at an all-time historical low.

Laws of mathematics are such that what goes down must inevitably come back up. As soon as it does come back up, even if it comes up only to its historical average and doesn't rebound above that average, in a short period of time, within a few years after that, we will find ourselves going from about \$250 billion a year in interest on debt to about \$1 trillion a year in interest on debt, leaving ourselves with the uncomfortable, darned-near impossible prospect of having to cover a \$750 billion shortfall—this on top of our existing sprawling national deficit—without any clear means of doing so.

Congress, in many cases, fears reform, but reform remains necessary to make programs structurally reliable and fiscally sustainable. In other words, we are fearing the wrong thing. A lot of people in my home State of Utah fear snakes, understandably. We have rattlesnakes in parts of Utah. Rattlesnakes can do a lot of damage to you if they bite you. You don't want to mess with a rattlesnake. But sometimes we fear the wrong things, at least in the sense of, in addition to a lot of rattlesnakes, we also have a lot of deer. They should actually fear deer more than rattlesnakes. More people

die in the United States every year as a result of deer causing automotive accidents than they do from rattlesnake bites altogether. Sometimes we fear the wrong things.

We fear making reform. But reform is not what we should fear; we should fear the consequences of failure to do that.

In some ways, the central unifying problem isn't just about the debt or dysfunction but the distrust. Congress has squandered the trust of the American people, and we as an institution have a responsibility to work hard to win back that trust. The only way to win back that trust is through real reform. We have to put the national interest ahead of our own interests, our own political interests and the special interests that are constantly moving here in Washington, DC. That work can begin with this very budget. It should begin with this budget. Budgets provide us with an opportunity to discuss our priorities. Those priorities always need to be all about reform.

This budget is far from perfect, but in understanding that it is not perfect, it is a vehicle to begin the real process of reform. Nowhere is this more important than with tax reform, and this will set in motion those events that can culminate in real, genuine, and much needed tax reform.

There are a couple of odd quirks within our Federal Tax Code. First of all, its sheer length and complexity are a problem. Arthur Brooks from the American Enterprise Institute said that complexity is itself a subsidy—a subsidy that disproportionately benefits the well connected, the wealthy, the well educated, the specialists who handle the complexity and profit from it. One hundred years ago, our Tax Code was only a few hundred pages long. Today, our Tax Code, depending on what you count, can fairly be described as much closer to 100,000 pages than to a few hundred.

Among the many problems we can find in the Tax Code is the marriage tax penalty, which many Americans are familiar with, whereby a hard-working American couple might pay higher taxes only because of the fact that they happen to be married. This is wrong, and it needs to be fixed.

There is a related point—a related flaw—that is much less well known than the Tax Code marriage penalty, and that is the Tax Code parent penalty. Let me explain what that is. Imagine two couples—couple A and couple B. Imagine that couple A and couple B are identical in every respect but one. In other words, they both have the same income, they both have the same pattern of charitable contributions, mortgage interest, State and local taxes, and so forth. Everything that affects their taxes is the same except one thing: Couple A has three children and couple B chooses to remain childless. Because of the way our Tax

Code interacts and intersects with our senior entitlement programs—namely, Social Security and Medicare—we end up penalizing parents, creating this parent tax penalty. Let me explain that a little bit.

Let's call couple A—the couple with three children—Jack and Julie. According to very modest assessments made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Jack and Julie, with their three children, will incur costs of about \$700,000 as they raise their children. These are the costs of raising children. I believe it is a little faulty—there are a number of things it doesn't include—but it is an estimate produced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Jack and Julie, our hypothetical couple A, will spend \$700,000 raising their three children to maturity. It doesn't take into account the non-economic costs associated with parenting or the myriad benefits that go along with that—but \$700,000. That is the amount they will put into raising these three children. That cost doesn't benefit just Jack and Julie, it doesn't benefit just their three children—no, the way our system works, the way Social Security and Medicare work, it also goes to stabilize, to shore-up entitlement benefits for tomorrow's retirees, because Social Security and Medicare operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. Today's retiree benefits are paid by today's workers. Today's workers will be tomorrow's retirees. Today's children will be tomorrow's workers and will be paying the retirement benefits of today's workers, tomorrow's retirees.

Let's look at couple A, back to Jack and Julie. Jack and Julie operate solely with Julie's income. Jack is a stay-at-home father. Meanwhile, Julie has a good job that pays \$75,000 a year. As you look at this chart, it shows how the pay stubs Julie receives twice a month might look.

I would imagine many Americans look at this the same way I do. People approach their pay stubs with a degree of trepidation. It is almost easier not to look at it when you see all the things the government does to your paycheck each time it goes through.

Jack and Julie look at Julie's pay stub when it comes out twice a month, and they see a few things, including the fact that, in addition to the \$205 that is withheld from her Federal income tax twice a month, she also sees \$41.84 withheld for Medicare, \$178 withheld for Social Security, and \$144 withheld for State income tax.

So when we look at Julie's pay stub, we see that what Julie is paying into Social Security and Medicare is roughly the same as what we will see from couple B, who chooses to remain childless. Couple B has every right not to have children. We don't want to penalize anybody regarding their decision on whether to have children. But the point here is that the investment Jack

and Julie are making into the Social Security system comes twice—first as they pay their taxes, including their Social Security and Medicare taxes—and with Social Security taxes, by the way, that is also going to play a role in determining the Social Security benefits for which Jack and Julie will one day be eligible when they retire. Yet the Tax Code doesn't adequately take into account the \$700,000 they are investing into their own children and that those children will make it possible for couple B to receive their Social Security and Medicare benefits when they retire. That is why we need to fix the parent tax penalty.

The parent tax penalty consists of this unique interaction between our tax system and our senior entitlement programs and doesn't take into account the intense investment in financial terms that America's moms and dads make in their children.

By increasing the child tax credit, we could offset this penalty. One of the proposals out there would involve raising it to, say, \$2,000 per child. I think that would be great. I could even go higher than that, but \$2,000 wouldn't cover the whole problem, it wouldn't undo the whole penalty, but it would go a long way toward offsetting that. I would welcome that. That would be a good development. There are people just like Jack and Julie Jones all over this country who would benefit from that, and the American people as a whole would benefit from it. Social Security and Medicare would be more stable and made more sustainable by this change.

The next step we need to make with tax reform involves making the Tax Code more pro-worker. A lot of people criticize the Tax Code for the fact that it has the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world at 35 percent. I believe that the best reform we could achieve would be substantial. There are a lot of people who are talking about reducing the corporate tax rate to maybe 15 percent or 20 percent. I hope we can get to something like that, and that would be a great first step. What I would really like to do is to bring that down not to 25 percent or 20 percent or 15 percent, I would like to see it brought down to zero. Let me explain why I believe that.

A corporation consists of and is animated by two things: capital and labor, investors and workers. Investors and workers join together and form partnerships to make profits. Both of them pay a share of the corporate tax. In the United States, forces of globalization have benefited from this arrangement between workers and investors. The forces of globalization have benefited the investor class more than the workers. In this new global economic environment, we need to think about how to increase the returns to workers.

Globalization has helped the investors, and policy now needs to go out of

its way to help the workers. One way to do that would be to eliminate the corporate tax altogether and tax investment income the same way we do regular income. That would shift the worker share of business tax to business owners. This would immediately do two things: It would give a raise to American workers, who really need it, and it would turn the United States into an irresistible magnet for foreign investment in the United States of America. In one stroke, the most profitable, favorable tax strategy in the global economy would be creating American jobs.

The current code gives preferential treatment to U.S. investors sending their money overseas. While this is their right to do, this is not something we should be incentivizing and pushing them into, which is exactly what the status quo does. Reform would give preferential treatment to international investors coming here, which is, after all, what we want. Let's level the national playing field between the working class and the investor class, while tilting the global playing field toward the United States rather than pushing it outward, away from our great country.

If these tax reforms could be set in motion through this budget or at least set in motion indirectly if not directly, the Tax Code would finally start working again for American families and finally start benefiting hard-working American mothers and fathers.

Another issue that we struggle with significantly in the Federal Government involves Federal regulations. This, too, is something we could start to address through the budgeting process. Our Federal regulatory system is economically damaging. This is something that strangles small business. It inherently—by its very nature, it inures disproportionately to the benefit of large, established, incumbent businesses, those that can afford an army of lawyers, accountants, lobbyists, and compliance specialists, that benefit from a heavy system of regulation, which is often made heavier still at the urging of the largest, wealthiest, most established companies because these Federal regulations provide a natural restriction on entry, a natural barrier that disincentivizes and in some ways disables would-be competitors from joining and entering into the marketplace. One thing we know about competition is that it brings down costs and it raises quality, and that is a good thing.

Federal regulations also create a sort of constitutional distrust. They themselves represent a harsh deviation from the natural constitutional order. I mentioned a few minutes ago the provisions of article I. Article I, section 1, and article I, section 7 require that Federal laws be passed by Congress. Federal regulations get around that.

Sometimes Congress chooses voluntarily to delegate to someone else the task that we, by operation of the Constitution, are supposed to perform and not to delegate to someone else. This administrative action makes things easier on occasion for Congress, but that is a bug, not a feature. The Constitution never was intended to make life easier for Members of Congress.

Let me explain how this happens and how it shows up here. It happens sometimes with good intentions. Congress wants to approach a particular issue, solve a particular problem without necessarily having to go into the difficult, painstaking, line-drawing process that inevitably is brought into question anytime we are trying to solve a problem through lawmaking. In other words, Congress will identify a problem and pass a law that says, for instance: We shall have a good law in area X, and we hereby delegate to agency Y the power to make and enforce rules carrying the force of generally applicable Federal law that will carry out the objectives we have outlined in our legislation.

In other words—let's get to something more approximating a real example. Congress, for instance, passes a law that says: We shall have clean air. We hereby delegate to the EPA the power to decide what clean air is, what pollution is, what acceptable limits on pollution might be, and what penalties will befall polluters. And then those same regulators, those same people at that same agency who made all the rules defining pollution and defining acceptable limits for pollution, prescribing penalties, they are the same people who also enforce them. You have the lawmakers who are also the law enforcers, and none of them are subject to an election.

Now, I don't mean to disparage the character or the capabilities of any of the fine people who work at the EPA or any of our other Federal bureaucracies. For the most part, these are well-intentioned, hard-working, well-educated, and highly specialized public figures or government employees, we might say, but there is a difference.

People in Congress are not magically empowered with any gifts for coming up with good legislation any more than any other American is, but there is a difference. We are elected, and we are subject to the people at regular intervals. You can fire your U.S. Senator every 6 years, you can fire your Representative every 2 years. You cannot fire a government bureaucrat. As Ronald Reagan said, the closest thing we see to eternal life on this Earth is a new government program. The closest thing you can find to a lifelong career is in government, in many government bureaucracies.

What this has produced is a profound proliferation of Federal law. We have been able to make more things Federal, and we have been able to make

more Federal laws as a result of the fact that Congress now delegates away far more of its legislative power than it actually exercises. Let me explain what I mean.

I keep in my office two sets of documents. I welcome any of you to come by. In my office, we serve Jell-O every Wednesday at 3:30. For reasons I don't entirely understand, Utah consumes more Jell-O than any other State in the Union on a per capita basis. The Utah Legislature has actually designated Jell-O as Utah's official State snack. Now, I will be clear that these are not Jell-O shots. They are not tainted with alcohol or anything like that, but we serve Jell-O every Wednesday at 3:30. You are all invited to join us any time you would like. If the Senate is in session and if it is Wednesday at 3:30, it is time for Jell-O.

When you come by my office for Jell-O Wednesday, you will see two stacks of documents that I have represented in this graph. One stack of documents is a few inches tall, it is about 3,000 pages long, and it consists of the laws passed by Congress last year. The other stack is 13 feet tall, it is about 96,000 pages long, and it consists of last year's Federal Register.

For those of you who are fortunate enough not to know what the Federal Register is—and I really do envy you—it is the annual index, the compilation of Federal regulations. First is their release for public notice and comment, and then later is their finalized Federal Register.

These are laws. These are not just rules exclusively deciding what time the lights will go on and off at the Commerce Department or what times the gates will be staffed at this or that Embassy. No. Many of these are regulations that impose affirmative obligations on the American people, sometimes with criminal penalties, often with substantial civil penalties attached to them, and yet they are not passed by anyone who is elected. In many cases, they are not even written by people who are accountable to anyone who is, in turn, elected. This is a problem.

During 2016, Congress enacted 214 laws; whereas, the agencies issued 3,853 rules. Those are 18 rules that were put in place by Federal agencies for every 1 law that was enacted by Congress. This is not without consequence. This is not just an abstract constitutional violation.

This costs the American people a lot of money, and it costs them money in a way that is kind of invisible. You have the Tax Code. You have your pay stub. I showed you that chart earlier from Julie's pay stub showing how much the government takes out of each paycheck. That is visible. That is tangible. That is something she can see each week. There is another bite that gets taken out of each and every one of

her paychecks that is invisible, and that bite is taken out by these Federal regulations, meaning everything that Jack and Julie, everything that every one of you, everything that every American purchases, every good or every service is made more expensive by these Federal regulations. In fact, it is fair to say really that the costs of compliance with these Federal regulations are passed on disproportionately to America's poor and middle class who pay for those regulations through higher prices on goods and services, diminished wages, unemployment, and underemployment, and it is not insignificant.

Twenty years ago, when I first started studying this problem, I was shocked to learn that this backdoor, invisible, highly regressive form of tax—that is the cost of compliance with Federal regulations—stood at \$300 billion a year. That was astounding to me, stunning. Today that number stands at about \$2 trillion a year. In 20 years, we have seen the cost of complying with Federal regulations multiply nearly sevenfold. That is troubling.

If the cost of complying with U.S. Federal regulations were a country, if it were the GDP, the \$2 trillion in compliance costs, that is roughly the same as the gross domestic product of India and Italy. The cost of complying with Federal regulations is slightly less than the GDP of India and slightly more than the GDP of Italy. That is sad, that is stunning, that is a constitutional problem, and it is a public policy problem. The 2016 Federal Register contains 95,894 pages—the highest level in its history and 19 percent higher than the previous year of 2015, which contained 80,260 pages.

In the absence of trust, we need an abundance of transparency, and that is what constitutional lawmaking is all about. We need to restore that constitutional order by passing reforms like the REINS Act, which would require congressional assent before major rules are put into place. It would require Congress to affirmatively enact a regulation into law before an economically significant regulation could take effect.

There are some other areas where we need transparency—in higher education and healthcare. These things appear to have little in common at the outset, and yet, in many ways, they have a lot in common in that they are two areas where there has been a lot of Federal involvement where there probably shouldn't be and where that Federal involvement has made things more opaque and less transparent and resulted in higher costs.

In higher education, I highlighted the need in the last Congress for reforms through my introduction of the Higher Education Reform and Opportunity Act, which would have opened up the

accreditation process. Currently, the higher education system in America has been commandeered by the iron triangle, consisting of the U.S. Department of Education, Federal accreditation bodies, and institutions of higher education in this country. Unless you are part of that iron triangle, you can't really break into the higher education market because you can't get Federal higher education assistance.

As a result, things like apprenticeships, distance learning, massive open online courses—or MOOCs, as they are sometimes described—suffer. They get left out. The upshot is, if we reformed this area, we would have more opportunities to get postsecondary skills and training, we would lower the cost of higher education, we would save money for both borrowers and taxpayers alike, and we would have more people able to pursue their chosen vocation.

With healthcare, as in higher education, Federal influence is driving up prices while outcomes are flatlined. In 2009, Congress doubled down on what wasn't working when they passed ObamaCare. The results were instability, lost coverage, new plans, higher premiums, and higher deductibles at the same time.

Meanwhile, you had a whole lot of concentration of market power in a few companies. The top 10 health insurance companies in 2008—the year President Obama was elected President—had combined profits of about \$8 billion a year. Last year, that number skyrocketed to \$15 billion a year. The difference was ObamaCare.

ObamaCare made it easier for those companies to see their profits skyrocket, but they did so on the backs of America's poor and middle class. With ObamaCare, we also had the unsustainable expansion of Medicaid, a failed program we should be trying to rescue people from, not trap them in. We need to repeal and replace ObamaCare.

As we look toward reform, a guiding principle should always be restoring the constitutional principal of federalism or some might call it localism or the principle of subsidiarity. The idea is that you should govern locally, as locally as possible. There is a reason for this. The Constitution requires it, but it is also the case that we all benefit when we follow that constitutional system. It allows more Americans to get more of the kind of government they want and less of the kind of government they don't want. Bad things happen when we ignore federalism, as we have over the last 80 years and increasingly so over the last decade. There are some examples of that.

One involves transportation. Our Interstate Highway System was created by the Federal Government in the 1950s under the leadership of President Eisenhower. He acknowledged that for national security and interstate commerce reasons, it would be a good idea

to have an interstate highway system. So we proposed—and Congress passed into law—a gasoline tax that would fund the establishment, the creation of an interstate highway system. The idea was always to hand that interstate highway system back over to the States after the project was completed, which it has been now since the 1980s. Yet we are still collecting a Federal gasoline tax—18.4 cents per gallon, to be precise. Yet that 18.4 cents per gallon still doesn't ever seem to be sufficient, even though the Interstate Highway System has been completed since the 1980s and even though, stunningly, you could maintain the existing Interstate Highway System for about 4 cents per gallon. So where is the rest of it going? Well, it is going to purely local projects: surface roads, bike paths, all sorts of other things, many of which might well be worthy but aren't necessarily Federal in nature.

Another example involves public land. A lot of people were surprised to learn this—especially people from the East—but the Federal Government owns and controls about 30 percent of the land in the United States. A lot of people in the East aren't aware of this because, in every State east of Colorado, the Federal Government owns less than 15 percent of the land. In no State west of Colorado does the Federal Government own less than 15 percent and, in many States like my own, that number is much larger. In fact, in my State, the State of Utah, the Federal Government owns 67 percent of the land.

Let's set aside the question, for a minute, of why the Federal Government needs to own that much land at all and why it needs to own 30 percent of the landmass in the United States. If it is going to own that much, why does it disproportionately own so much land in States like mine, especially when that harms people in States like mine?

You see, in Utah—this map shows Federal land. Anyplace you see white, that is non-Federal land. If you see any of these colors represented here, that is one type of Federal land ownership or another. Where you see color on this chart, that is where the Federal land is owned and controlled by the Federal Government and the local taxing authorities can't tax it. As a result, people have to go to the Federal Government for a "Mother May I" in order to even cross the property or utilize the property for some legitimate business or personal need, and the local taxing authorities can't tax it. This harms westerners disproportionately, and it is wrong. We need reform in this area.

We also need to get the Federal Government out of the business of thinking it needs to own this much land and into the business of thinking, if it is going to own that much, then it needs to allow taxing authorities to collect at least a rough equivalent of property tax.

Also, in the area of primary and secondary education, because public education is so important, the Federal Government needs to stay out of the K-12 education arena. In other words, what is taught in the K-12 classroom needs to be decisions made by teachers in consultation with parents, principals, local school officials and, in some cases, State officials, not from Washington, DC. That is not an appropriate decision to make from Washington, DC, unless you are talking about educational experiences perhaps in the District of Columbia or a U.S. territory or on a military base or something like that.

The Federal Government should have no role in K-12 public education. That is not our job. We have to remember the text of the 10th Amendment echoing the structure of the original Constitution: that powers not granted to Congress and not prohibited to the States are reserved to the States respectively or the people. That has to mean something. In order for it to mean something, there has to be some limit to what powers are, in fact, granted to the Federal Government.

Over the last 80 years, we gradually drifted away from this idea. We concluded that every problem in society is a government problem and that every government problem is a Federal problem. That is wrong. That has harmed the American people.

We need to restore federalism, localism, and subsidiary. This will free the people of the tyranny they feel as the result of a lost election. At any given moment in America, there are people who are disappointed about the last election, especially so with House elections, Senate elections, and the occupant of the White House. At any given moment, the people who feel as if they are not well represented in Washington—either at the U.S. Capitol or at the White House or both—can be counted in the tens, if not hundreds of millions. We will end this tyranny if we return a lot of that power.

In other words, let's say someone living in Connecticut might not quite be on the bandwagon of "make America great again." If they don't want to make America great again, they can want to make Connecticut great again. In other words, federalism allows more people in America to get more of the kind of government they want and less of the kind of government they don't want. It allows more people to have more of a say because local governments, while not perfect, are more responsive to their local constituencies. It better protects both the minorities and majorities. It lowers the temperature of our national politics. One of the reasons national politics have become so contentious is because everything has been centered in Washington, DC. There is no reason it has to be that way. In fact, the Constitution says it should never be that way.

Finally, with regard to federalism, there are a few things that only the Federal Government can do. Those things include national defense, establishing a uniform system of weights and measures, coming up with a uniform system of laws governing immigration and naturalization and a uniform system of laws governing interstate and foreign trade or commerce. Those things that can be done only by Congress must be done well. When we are so busy doing the things we are not supposed to do, we fail to do those things that only we can do. That is yet another reason to restore federalism.

Then, whatever is left over, whatever remains, whatever we can't bring back, needs to be fixed. It needs to be made to work. Whatever we don't return to the States can be made more effective and more efficient, and we should do that.

The 1974 Budget Act, as I explained at the outset of my address today, is outdated. We have to reform it. The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation use formulas that are opaque and unknown, that are effectively a black box. This is wrong, and we have to get rid of those.

That is one of the reasons I introduced the CBO Show Your Work Act, so they can't just tell us anymore: You can't know why we reached the conclusions we reached that have stunning implications for law and public policy.

From budget, to taxing, to spending policy and policymaking, the constant theme is inertia. One could argue that the consistent theme is nostalgia. We are stuck in that era of the Ford Pinto and the eight-track cassette player. Americans are being held back, not only by outdated policies but by a process that is out of date too.

We met the challenges of the 20th century with policies that met the moment, but we have to be constantly updating, constantly overseeing and tweaking and improving. Government may well move at the pace of a turtle, but it can move, nonetheless, and move it must because the only way to get to next is to focus on now.

In our increasingly personalized, customizable society and economy, government's obsession with centralization is making these things worse, not better. We need to govern locally and not nationally in every single instance. We need to empower individuals and local communities.

In Washington, we have to embrace accountability, especially the kind of accountability prescribed by the Constitution. We can do better, but we have to first recognize the need to do so.

The budget is indicative of all the problems we face in Washington. It is also indicative of Congress's authority and its ability to create solutions. We can do this. We can. We must. And together, we will.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise to speak about the budget. I find many points of agreement with my colleague from Utah.

Just to sort of jump into it, normally we wouldn't be having this budget discussion in the fall. The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 suggests that the President would give us a budget in February, that we would pass a budget by April, and that budget would then set top-line numbers that would be given to the committees, that would then write their authorizing bills with those budgetary numbers. Then it would be handed over, and the appropriators would ultimately fashion appropriations bills that were responsive to the budget and the authorizing bills. We are into a new fiscal year, and the many of the authorizing committees have already done their jobs.

I am on the Armed Services Committee. Probably the biggest piece of legislation we do every year is the NDAA. We have already written it without having a budget. We didn't have a budget top-line number this year. We have gone ahead and written the bill, and the appropriators are already working.

I think what everybody on this floor understands is that this really isn't a budget debate; it is an effort to set up a set of instructions around which to do tax reform via budget reconciliation. In my view, this budgetary document fails as a budget, and it also fails as a good-faith beginning to a tax reform discussion.

I want to talk about each of these: why this document fails as a budget—I voted against it in committee, and I am going to vote against it on the floor—and why it fails as an effort to initiate the necessary process for reforming the Tax Code for the first time since 1986.

If you look at this document, the budget that is on the floor has a whole set of priorities that are either wrong or completely unrealistic. As an example, the budget proposes over \$5 trillion in spending cuts, \$470-plus billion cut to Medicare, and an over \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid. That would not only be a bad idea, but it is completely unrealistic and unlikely to occur. These cuts are not going to happen, and so it is just artificial.

Second, the budget does not address the primary budgetary reality—a dangerous reality we are living under—of sequestration and budget caps. It continues to gut domestic discretionary programs, to the tune of over \$600 billion over the decade.

Finally, just a particular item that I think is very important: The budget proposes a fast track, a 50-vote process, to open up drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That is really

not a budgetary matter; it is shoehorned into the budget because we like to assume we are going to get a big chunk of revenue by drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. But this is a fundamental matter of environmental policy that shouldn't be squirreled away in a tiny detail on the budget.

I opposed drilling in the National Arctic Wildlife Refuge when it was last on the floor in the mid-2000s. We were dealing with high oil prices and overreliance on Middle Eastern oil. The energy situation has completely changed. We are moving to low- and no-carbon energy sources, and oil prices are significantly lower. We are not relying on Middle Eastern oil. I would also argue that the cost-benefit calculation now makes drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge a particularly poor idea. I went to the Refuge two summers ago and saw the environmental damage that would be caused by drilling there, and I opposed it.

So the budget—from the unrealistic expense cuts to Medicaid and Medicare that would really hurt people, to other cuts—is unrealistic. The fact that it was being done after the authorizers and appropriators were generally done with their work demonstrates that the budget isn't that serious. What this is really about is coming up with an instruction to begin the process of tax reform.

Tax reform done through the reconciliation process is a bad idea for at least two reasons. First, it begins as completely partisan. If you are going to do tax reform for the first time since 1986, you ought to try to get the best ideas of both parties. But that is not what is done with reconciliation. When you say “We are going to do it through reconciliation,” you are saying “We, the majority, have 52 votes. All we need is 50 plus a tiebreaker. We are not going to listen to Democrats. We are not going to meaningfully entertain the ideas you have. We are going to do it on our own.”

I would venture to say that the same outcome as was achieved with the effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act via reconciliation is going to be the end result here. Trying to do something this important all on your own, without meaningfully including the public and the minority, almost destines it for failure.

The second reason it is a bad idea to do tax reform via reconciliation is this: Matters in reconciliation are temporary, not permanent.

I went to the Chamber of Commerce in Northern Virginia with Senator WARNER a couple of weeks back. We talked about tax reform. We talked about the fact that it was needed to grow the economy, that it hadn't been done for a long time. But what my business leaders want is tax reform that is permanent. They don't want a

tax reform bill where the provisions expire, and because of the rules of reconciliation, that is what happens. So to do tax reform via reconciliation is a mistake.

But let's go further and look at the tax reform ideas that have been discussed by the administration and others that we will likely embark upon if this budget passes. The budget sets up a mechanism for partisan and temporary tax cuts that would increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. The first page of the GOP's own budget talks about the challenges of deficits:

“Continual overspending and its resulting deficits will expand the Federal debt. During the next 10 years, debt held by the public is slated to rise from 77 percent of GDP (\$15 trillion) to 91 percent of GDP (\$26 trillion).”

Why would we propose to increase the debt by \$1.5 trillion in a partisan, temporary tax reconciliation bill? If folks—especially the GOP—are so focused on the deficit and debt, and we should be, why are we including a mechanism in this instruction to raise the debt by \$1.5 trillion? I think, again, the answer is that this is not a serious proposal, and it is only the vehicle for partisan and temporary tax cuts.

The initial analyses I have seen of this tax proposal suggests a couple of things. First, the tax benefits would overwhelmingly be for folks at the top, the wealthiest, the folks who least need a break in taxes. To give an example, the Republican proposal calls for the elimination of the estate tax. That would cost more than \$270 billion over 10 years. The estate tax has high thresholds already. It affects an extremely limited number of Virginians and a limited number of folks in virtually every State. Giving up \$270 billion to get rid of the estate tax is enough to provide every child from a low- or moderate-income family with access to free preschool. That is about 7 million kids. You would still have enough money left over to take every student off Head Start waiting lists. Which would you rather do—cut the estate tax \$270 billion for a few families or provide access to free preschool to every low- and moderate-income kid in this country and take every child on a Head Start waiting list off the list?

Second, the proposal has some gimmicks and special quirks that I think need to be brought to attention. I hope we will bring it to attention on the floor. Here is an example: The budget that is before us repeals a rule that is currently in place that requires the CBO to issue scores on legislation coming out of reconciliation at least 28 hours in advance of a vote. Now, 28 hours isn't that long, but at least it is enough time for a Senator and staff to read a bill and understand the consequences of the bill before voting. This Republican budget repeals the transparency rule that forces the CBO to issue a score. I have an amendment

to not repeal the rule but to restore it and make it stronger. There should be a CBO score to let every Senator and especially the public know what we are voting on with respect to these matters.

I will conclude and say this: Tax reform is important. Let's not sugarcoat this. We are not really debating a budget on the floor. If we were really going to debate a budget, we would have done it last spring. This is all about setting the stage for tax reform. We haven't done it for a long time. It is important. We should promote tax reform that makes the Tax Code simpler and fair and that focuses on middle-class working families and makes it easier to start businesses and grow them. We shouldn't be doing tax reform that is partisan, that is temporary, that increases the deficit, and that produces the overwhelming benefit of a tax reform package to those at the top of the income scale who don't need it.

It is my hope that we will have that debate in earnest on the floor of the Senate. I would love to join my colleagues in a good-faith effort to reform the Tax Code. Reconciliation and this particular proposal is not the way to do that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I read from my remarks, I would like to make the point that I get the impression that what some Members of the other political party—but more often editorials and think tanks—believe and want the public to believe is that there is actually a tax bill produced by the tax-writing committees of the Congress, something that is very definitive in what it does to the tax policy. I want to make clear that there is no such document. All we have so far is what is called a framework agreed to by the leaders of the two tax-writing committees and the Treasury Department and the leaders of the House and the Senate. You cannot draw conclusions about who is going to pay what taxes just from the framework.

I will get into real detail on this, but the other thing I would like to make clear is the fact that there are a lot of people drawing conclusions about who is going to get tax benefits and who is going to be hurt as a result of all this information that is out there, from which no one can draw conclusions because there isn't any bill before the Congress at this point. There will be in a matter of weeks.

The budget that we are debating this week paves the way for fundamental

tax reform. For more than a decade, both sides of the aisle have talked about the need for tax reform that provides tax simplification, tax fairness, and gives us the ability to increase our economic competitiveness so that we can grow the economy.

Under President George W. Bush, we had a bipartisan tax reform panel. Under President Obama, we had the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Commission. We have had individual Members also authoring tax plans, including a bipartisan bill authored by Finance Committee Ranking Member WYDEN, the Senator from Oregon, and former Senator Coats, then representing the State of Indiana.

In addition to these high-profile plans that have been out there over the years, the Senate Finance Committee has also had countless tax reform hearings over this extended period. The committee also held a series of bipartisan options papers discussions under then-Chairman Baucus. Additionally, under Chairman HATCH, we had bipartisan tax reform working groups. All of this work over the years has laid the foundation and informed the unified framework released by the Big 6. That is the framework I previously referred to.

The influence of these prior discussions and proposals on the Big 6 framework is evident. In other words, all of that work that has gone on over the years in different environs is bearing fruit now in getting a consensus of what we ought to do in a broad way of moving forward on tax simplification, tax reform, and tax cuts.

The framework is nothing but a framework and will be filled in with details by the tax-writing committees. It is at that point that any think tank, any Member of the other political party, any Member of our political party, any college professors, any economists anywhere can make some sound judgments as to the extent to which certain people benefit or don't benefit from the legislation before us.

I think they ought to take into consideration that you have to think about the country as a whole, which hasn't grown by more than 1.6 percent in each of the 8 years of the previous administration. If you are going to have jobs created, you have to grow at about twice that amount, at 3 percent or more. That is some of the thinking behind this budget that is before the Senate right now and the thinking behind the tax reform measures that will follow our adoption of the budget.

I will be repeating myself to some extent here, but for illustration, I have a chart here comparing the Big 6 framework, the Wyden-Coats bill, and the Simpson-Bowles plan to which I have already referred. You can see here the main point about putting these three plans together is to show similarity. All proposals would consolidate the

current tax brackets down to three. That is one point the chart makes.

Two plans provide for a top rate of 35 percent, while one provides for a top rate of 28 percent. Yet the Big 6 framework, the framework that will evolve into a piece of legislation called tax simplification, tax reform, and tax cuts, is being criticized for having a 35-percent top rate that somehow is a giveaway to the wealthy, whereas you can see from this chart that plans that have been bipartisan in the past have had the 35-percent top rate or less. Of course, the 35-percent tax rate that is said to be a giveaway to the wealthy is not even the one that proposes a lower 28-percent rate. The 28-percent rate is reserved for the Simpson-Bowles plan. That Simpson-Bowles group was put together by none other than a Democratic President.

Let me ask: Were Democratic members of the Simpson-Bowles Commission, which voted for that plan, voting to give huge tax cuts to the wealthy? Do our Democratic colleagues expect us to believe that a 35-percent top rate is a sensible bipartisan compromise when offered by Democrats but a giveaway to the rich once it is associated with this administration or with Republican Members of Congress?

Well, another thing is the same: All three plans would repeal the alternative minimum tax. This is very surprising. From listening to my Democratic colleagues, I thought repealing the alternative minimum tax was some nefarious plot to benefit President Trump, but that just doesn't square with the reality and what has gone on in the Congress over the last decade and a half with regard to tax reform. Repealing the alternative minimum tax has had strong bipartisan support.

While serving as either chairman or the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator Baucus and I introduced bipartisan, stand-alone legislation to repeal the alternative minimum tax. We did that across several Congresses. Of course, we were not successful. I hope this Congress will be successful in doing that.

Our legislation eliminating the alternative minimum tax garnered bipartisan support from across the political spectrum. The current ranking member of the Finance Committee and the current minority leader of the entire U.S. Senate even joined Senator Baucus and me at that time in these efforts as cosponsors of that legislation.

At the time, a few years ago, the current ranking member even went so far as to say that "the alternative minimum tax should be Congress' number-one priority for tax reform." I agree with what the current ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee said a few years ago, which I just quoted. The alternative minimum tax repeal should be a top priority, and it seems as though it is going to be a top priority this year because the alternative

minimum tax adds needless complexity to the Tax Code and often hits middle-income taxpayers rather than the wealthy, as originally intended.

Let me give a history of the alternative minimum tax. I think it was passed in 1969. Studies of wealthy people showed that about 150 people who were very wealthy paid no income tax, and there was a feeling that everyone ought to pay some tax. The alternative minimum tax was set up to hit those 150 and some other people, but it wasn't ever indexed. Now it hits millions of middle-income taxpayers. To help those middle-income taxpayers who should have never been hit by the alternative minimum tax—that is the rationale for doing away with it.

We even have the Internal Revenue Service's Taxpayer Advocate Service repeatedly calling for the repeal of the alternative minimum tax, noting that it "does not achieve its original goal" and "stealthily increases marginal rates for middle-income taxpayers."

I want to move now to the corporate tax part of the framework. I am back at the chart now. Similarity between these plans exists for reform of corporate taxes. For instance, each one of these three plans seeks to significantly lower our corporate tax rate.

The Wyden-Coats bill calls for an 11-percent reduction in the corporate rate, bringing that rate down from 35 to 24 percent. The Big 6 framework aims for 20 percent as the highest corporate tax rate. Yet, according to the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the corporate rate reduction in the Big 6 framework is "a massive corporate tax cut that overwhelmingly benefits shareholders."

The last time I checked, the distribution of the benefit from a corporate rate reduction is the same no matter what party or what President proposed it. This chart shows that similarity between the bipartisan plans and the Big 6 framework. I don't think the Senate Finance Committee ranking member proposed a 24-percent corporate rate when that Wyden-Coats plan was developed because he wanted to provide a massive benefit to the shareholders he now talks about. I also know for certain that isn't why the Big 6 framework aims for 20 percent.

The truth is, there has been a really big, growing, bipartisan consensus that our corporate tax rate is out of step with other major trading partners. Now, at 35 percent—and it has been at 35 percent for decades—our corporate tax rate is the highest among developed countries. While we have been at 35 percent, our major trading partners have been lowering their rates. On average, their rates are more than 10 percent lower than ours, so averaging maybe about 24 percent.

Now, that obviously has a great impact on jobs in America because it puts American companies at a competitive

disadvantage globally, costing American jobs. It has also strained our corporate tax system to its breaking point as we have battled corporate inversions and foreign takeovers. Now, how much in the last several years have we heard Members of this body complaining about foreign takeovers and inversions to skip the country, to save taxes? Well, that is one of the reasons for reducing the corporate tax rate so that doesn't happen.

Moreover, a growing body of economic literature is showing that a significant portion of the corporate tax does indeed fall on workers in the form of lower wages. The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation as well as the Congressional Budget Office assumes 25 percent of corporate tax falls on workers. So if you reduce the corporate tax rate, according to congressional researchers here who work for us, one would assume that workers are going to get 25 percent of that benefit to their wages. We even have other studies—many—finding that workers could bear more than 70 percent of the burden of a high corporate tax rate.

While the exact burden borne by workers may be debated, the economic research is very clear. A corporate rate reduction means a significant wage increase for workers. In fact, the Council of Economic Advisers very conservatively estimates that workers could see their wages increase by more than \$4,000 due to lowering the corporate rate to 20 percent.

In reality, there is very little in this tax framework that has not had bipartisan support in the past or is not well within the mainstream of bipartisan proposals before us. Once again, that statement I just made is the purpose of this chart, to show that this bipartisan agreement and what we have before the Congress coming up—the Big 6 framework—have so many likenesses in it that there is absolutely no rationale for the partisanship we are having in the news media and on the Senate floor talking about this framework. This is why the accusations that the Big 6 tax framework is nothing more than a giveaway to the rich—why that statement we hear so often is so dumbfounding.

I want to move on to another issue about whether these are tax cuts for the rich, and I want to show how one of the proposals before the Congress will help the rich. More perplexing is that those who are screaming "tax cuts for the rich" and saying it the loudest have also been the most ardent supporters of maintaining one of the largest loopholes for the wealthy; namely, the State and local tax deduction.

I know the minority leader was on the floor last week, I think, citing IRS statistics to claim that the deduction was really a middle-class benefit, but the minority leader told only part of that story. I would like to look at some

estimates by the liberal Tax Policy Center that my Democratic colleagues like to cite so often. According to the Tax Policy Center, 90 percent of the tax increase from eliminating the deduction would fall on taxpayers with incomes exceeding \$100,000, and 40 percent of the total would be paid just by taxpayers with incomes exceeding \$500,000 a year.

Think of it this way. Those with incomes exceeding \$500,000 make up less than 1 percent of all tax filers, yet receive 40 percent of the deduction benefit of claiming the State and local tax deduction.

I would like to illustrate it a better way. I have a chart based on IRS data that looks at the benefit of the deduction by adjusted gross income. Prior to going to the chart, I think it is important to point out that only about 30 percent of the taxpayers even itemize and have the State and local tax deduction available to them because you have to itemize to get that. This chart is going to focus on that 30 percent.

The first group I have highlighted on this chart are taxpayers with incomes below \$50,000. As we can see on the chart, only about 12 percent of the tax filers in this group claim the deduction. In other words, 88 percent of the taxpayers in this category receive no benefit from the State and local tax deduction. That 12 percent does get a fairly nice benefit from it. They are deducting an average of a little over \$3,000 in State taxes for a State benefit of just under \$500, assuming they are in today's 15 percent bracket.

From further down the chart, we can see that the benefits afforded to low- to middle-income taxpayers are very much dwarfed by the benefits afforded to the wealthy or, as some of my Democratic colleagues might have become accustomed to referring to them, the millionaires and billionaires. Where only 12 percent of taxpayers with incomes under \$50,000 have any benefit from the State and local tax deduction, over 90 percent of filers with incomes exceeding \$500,000 claim the deduction. Tax filers in the \$500,000 to \$1 million range are, on average, deducting more in State and local taxes—\$53,000—than the incomes of the taxpayers in the first group.

If we assume taxpayers in this second group are, under the current law, in the 39.6-percent tax bracket, that translates into a tax benefit of nearly \$21,000. For those with incomes exceeding \$1 million, there is an average tax benefit of about \$100,000.

So if you are truly interested in eliminating tax loopholes for the rich, look no further than the elimination of the State and local tax deduction. This elimination provides an opportunity to better target more tax relief where we want to target it—to the middle class—making up for any benefit the middle class may lose from deductions and

then some. In other words, the income tax would remain much more progressive.

The Big 6 framework provides the tools to do a middle-income tax reduction, including nearly doubling the standard deduction, reducing the current 15-percent rate to 12 percent, and significantly increasing the child tax credit. The framework also grants significant leeway to the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee to explore additional options to ensuring middle-income tax relief.

In addition to being a benefit that overwhelmingly goes to the wealthy, the State and local tax deduction also has the effect of disproportionately benefiting States with high State and local taxes. Essentially, the deduction allows wealthy individuals in high-tax States to then offload some of their State and local tax burdens onto taxpayers in other States.

This new chart lists the top 10 States that benefit the most from the State and local tax deduction. The States are listed, and we can see the extent to which they benefit from it. We see we have New York at the top, a little lower is California, and a little bit below that is Massachusetts. It would seem to me that our Democratic colleagues like to talk a big game about eliminating loopholes for the wealthy, but when it comes down to actually doing it, they are more interested in holding on to a tax subsidy that favors the tax-and-spend policies of overwhelmingly blue States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the obscenity that will be the attempt by the Republicans to insert into the budget bill an ability for the big oil companies of our country to be able to drill for oil in this sacred, pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

I first wish to thank Senator CANTWELL from the State of Washington, our great Democratic leader on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, for her leadership not just on this issue but on so many other issues in the energy and environment area that we are having to confront during this era of Donald Trump.

Let me just tell my colleagues that the Republican budget is ultimately all about massive handouts to the 1-percent richest people in our country and to huge corporations, while doing almost nothing for working and middle-class Americans in our country. In this bill, the Republicans will slash Medicaid and Medicare while at the same time blowing a \$1.5 trillion hole in the deficit to finance tax cuts for the superrich. But if that weren't bad enough, tucked inside of the Republican budget is a poison pill, one more

massive corporate handout—a giveaway of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska to Big Oil.

Senate Republicans have included instructions for the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution that would open the door for drilling in one of America's greatest natural resources. This GOP budget sets the stage for Republicans to ram drilling in the crown jewel of America's National Wildlife Refuge System through the Senate's using only a 50-vote threshold. This is nothing more than a Big Oil polar payout. This cold-hearted Republican budgetary scam only underscores the backward priorities of President Trump and congressional Republicans.

As our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico look desperately for relief from the devastation of Hurricane Maria, there has been no refuge in the Trump administration. When tens of millions of Americans wanted to be sure that their healthcare would be protected, there was no refuge in the Republican Party. But the instant billionaires and oil companies look for a tax cut, a refuge suddenly appears. That is when the Republicans can find a refuge. Unfortunately, it is the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

But the Republican plan to offset \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts for the super-wealthy will only result in \$1 billion being able to be raised from allowing the oil companies to drill in this pristine refuge. That plan neither makes any sense nor will it actually bring in any cents sufficient to pay for this huge tax break and the deficit they are creating.

Maybe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think there is a different exchange rate above the Arctic Circle, but down here those numbers don't even come close to adding up. This is exactly the kind of polarizing politics we need to get away from—giveaways to Big Oil and billionaires at the expense of the American people and our planet.

There is a long, bipartisan history of fighting to protect the Arctic Refuge for future generations. It was Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower who began this bipartisan legacy by setting aside the core of the Arctic Refuge in 1960. It was further protected by President Kennedy and Senator TOM UDALL's father, Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Then, Representative Mo Udall succeeded in doubling the size of the Refuge, protecting even more of this untrammeled wilderness. Protecting this special place has always been an issue that rose above party lines, and it should continue to do so.

In 2015 the Interior Department recommended that Congress designate this area as wilderness and not open it to drilling. In making that wilderness recommendation, the Department of

the Interior concluded that the "Arctic Refuge exemplifies the idea of wilderness—to leave some remnants of this nation's natural heritage intact, wild, and free of the human intent to control, alter, or manipulate the natural order."

The Coastal Plain is the biological heart of the Refuge. The Fish and Wildlife Service has called it the "center for wildlife activity" in the Refuge. It supports more than 250 species, including caribou, polar bears, and migratory birds, but that is exactly where this Republican legislation would allow Big Oil to drill, forever despoiling this ecosystem.

Two years ago, we lifted the four-decades-old ban on exporting American crude oil. As a result of that giveaway to the big oil industry, we are now exporting more U.S. crude oil—nearly 1 million barrels a day—than we could ever produce from drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

We have a fracking revolution taking place in our country right now. We hear it over and over from President Trump. We hear it from the Republicans: There is a fracking revolution. We are on our way to energy independence. We should lift the ban on exporting oil out of the United States. We should start selling it around the world to the highest bidder. We have so much oil that we can afford to send it out of our own country. Don't worry about it; there is no problem with exporting American oil.

As a matter of fact, what the Trump administration also says is this: Don't worry about the fuel economy standards in America. We are going to start to review them so we can lower—lower—the goals for our country for making the vehicles that we drive in our country more efficient.

Where do we put the oil in our country? We put 70 percent into gasoline tanks. We don't have to be a detective to figure out what happens if, instead of having our cars continue to get more and more efficient in terms of reducing the amount of oil that we need, we have our standards get lower and lower, and, as a result, we need to consume more oil.

What does the Trump administration say? They say they are going to review the fuel economy standards. They are going to take a "we can't do it" stand. They are going to take an "it's too hard to improve the economy standards" stand. That is what they said for four decades: It is too hard.

But during the Obama administration they were able to put on the books a standard that moves America to 54.5 miles per gallon by the year 2025 in the United States of America—54.5 miles per gallon. That is where the plug-in hybrid revolution comes from. That is where the all-electric vehicle revolution comes from. That is where Elon Musk comes from. That is where all of

these statements coming from the Chinese, the Indians, Volvo, and others come from. It is this movement toward plug-in hybrids and all-electric vehicles, reducing the amount of oil that we consume,—not just here in the United States, but around the globe.

What does the Trump administration say? We can't do it. It is too hard. We are going to review those standards. So they are saying: We don't have the technological capability to accomplish something that avoids the necessity of having to drill in a pristine wildlife refuge—to put a gasoline station on top of something that should be preserved for generations to come. They are saying: We can't improve the fuel economy standards. We are going to export 1 million barrels of oil a day. Guess what. We are going to go up into the Arctic Refuge in order to find the oil so that the gas guzzlers can stay on the road and so we can export oil to China. We are going to allow, finally, for the Big Oil cartel—which is now taking over the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, and the EPA—the ability to be able to despoil one of the last untrammelled, perfect, pristine areas in our country.

That is just fundamentally wrong, and we are going to have a vote on it on the floor of the Senate during this budget debate. To raise \$1 billion total as they run up a deficit of \$1.5 trillion, they despoil this sacred part of our country. It is immoral. It is wrong. It says that the Trump administration is handing over the keys of our government to the big oil companies. It is saying: No matter how many hurricanes hit our country, no matter how warm the water is off the coast of our country, they are going to remain in climate change denial—that it is really not a problem. Therefore, you don't have to increase the fuel economy standards. You don't have to reduce the fossil fuels going into the atmosphere. You don't have to worry. Climate change—ignore it. Fuel economy standards—we are not going to do it. What is the one thing we will do? For the oil industry, we are going to allow them to drill in the pristine Arctic wilderness. It is immoral—fundamentally immoral.

For 60 years, going back to Eisenhower, we figured out how to protect it. But now, at the height of a fracking revolution, with millions of new barrels of oil; at the height of an incredible plug-in hybrid and all-electric vehicle revolution, as we are reducing the amount of oil we are consuming in our country; at the height of storms that are assaulting every part of our Nation with an intensity we have never seen in our history, the President says: I am going to ignore all of those issues and just focus upon what Big Oil wants.

This is going to be a monumental debate we will have on the floor of the Senate this week. I am looking forward

to that debate because I think the American people are going to want to know who has voted which way on this critical environmental issue—the environment issue, in my opinion—which will be taken on the floor of the Senate this week and will be led by our great leader on energy and environment issues, Senator MARIA CANTWELL, from the State of Washington. She has been a clear, consistent, insistent voice on these issues.

I think this week we are going to have the kind of historic debate the American people will want us to have on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak against the budget resolution's containment of language that might direct our colleagues in the future to open up drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for his leadership on this issue and for being on the Senate floor tonight to talk about how important it is that we continue to maintain this Wildlife Refuge as it exists.

Our public lands have been under assault from this administration. It comes in all forms. It certainly comes in the form of trying to use the Antiquities Act in reverse and, basically, to say: You can open up public lands for drilling.

This really caused a controversy in Utah with the Bears Ears National Monument. There are Tribes, sportsmen, fishermen, and hunters who value the public lands in this national monument and who don't want to see it turned over to companies or individuals who want to mine or drill for oil and gas to the detriment of the monument resources. Now the budget resolution will allow for a “for sale” sign on some of our public lands to give a tax break to millionaires.

It is not that this is the only issue. As I said, there is the notion that the administration is taking our public lands and trying to turn them over to be developed, the notion that they are giving land to coal companies so they can harvest coal off of Federal lands and then not charging them a royalty rate which is compensatory and fair to the American public. We tried to fix that. Obviously, this Secretary of the Interior is trying to roll that back and give coal companies a sweetheart deal.

Now we have an EPA Administrator who, basically, has had a mining company CEO walk into his office and say: By the way, we want to develop a mine at the headwaters of Bristol Bay in Alaska, home of the largest salmon run and probably responsible for 50 percent of sockeye salmon around the world. Immediately after the mining executive left the EPA Administrator's office, the EPA Administrator sent out a

letter saying: Let's toss aside Clean Water Act safeguards to protect Bristol Bay, move forward on this idea of allowing the mine application to proceed.

So much for due process, so much for preserving what has taken the American public more than a hundred years to put together so that the public can recreate on public lands—so, yes, hunting, fishing, Native American, and recreational communities are all upset.

What is the latest play? Let's stick in the budget resolution language providing for the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development—something that has been so precious to the United States of America—basically a Serengeti for wildlife, an intact arctic ecosystem that doesn't exist in other places in the United States. Yet people are trying what I call a sneak attack, just like they did 12 years ago, just as people tried to open up the Arctic refuge for development before and on its own merits couldn't get it enacted into law. They put it in the Defense appropriation bill, thinking that there is no way people could vote against money for the troops—that is how we can get the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge open for mineral development.

But it didn't work then, and it is not going to work now. The American people are not for legislative sneak attacks, backdoor ways to move legislation that could never pass on its own merits. I know the President wants to get a big budget package together, get healthcare in there, throw in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge drilling, hope that people can't vote no, and move forward. I would say, if this is such a wonderful idea, let it stand on its own merits.

This area, as we can see, is a very pristine part of the United States. And now some people are saying: Oh, well, we could do some sort of drilling. Why do you want to have drilling in a pristine wildlife refuge? When people say: Oh, well, there are refuges that have had drilling—if that was prior to it being declared a refuge, yes, but this is a pristine area that we decided to set aside. Why? Because, as I mentioned, it is a Serengeti, it is an arctic Serengeti of caribou and other wildlife, over 200 different species of birds that come to the area, to say nothing about the population of polar bears in the region. Why do we want to destroy this? It is not that we are somehow thinking that we are going to get oil reserves out of it for our Nation. In fact, the issue is really, with the price of oil and the oil export market that has now been created, oil produced here is going on to the larger world market. So why is it that we think this is going to help us in the United States?

People are trying to use a budget process to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion to pay for tax cuts for wealthy

people. They are willing to degrade the environment as a way to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. I don't agree to it. I don't think the American people agree to it. They know that this iconic wildlife refuge has been attacked many times. They know that every time, someone has had to come up with some backdoor way of trying to get the refuge opened. I think my colleagues should understand and take note that these have all failed. They failed in the past because this idea is not the brightest, most brilliant idea in America. It is not the thing that is going to turn the U.S. economy around. It is not the thing that is going to help us get tax reform. It is not an idea that is even going to help us with the bipartisan effort to move forward on an energy package. If you think about it, we passed an energy bill out of here last Congress with 85 votes. If this was something that could be done in that package, it would have been done in that package.

I know that we are going to have more oil and gas exploration in Alaska. I know there is going to be more exploration in many parts of the Arctic. There is going to be a rush of Arctic nations to look at oil drilling off of our coast and in the Arctic Circle. The United States should get ready and participate in those discussions. I am first in line to say that we need a fleet of icebreakers to be prepared and be ready for the advent and the change in the Arctic. There will be many discussions about where responsible drilling should take place. I guarantee you, even if you opened up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, it would not stop this debate about more drilling in Alaska.

Let's remember that we set aside this pristine area for a very specific purpose: to keep the uniqueness that has existed in this part of the world—just a very small piece of it. Continue to have the debate in other parts of Alaska and in the Arctic about what the development of oil resources are going to be.

I encourage my colleagues not to fall prey to another backdoor attempt at trying to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Don't fall for a cynical bill where somehow somebody is going to try to cram everything in it and say: You can't vote against it because it has too many things for your State. Let's do the work that it takes to do bipartisan work—work together, agree on the things that we can agree on, and move forward. I guarantee you, our energy policy will be better in America for doing that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). If no one yields time, then time will be charged equally.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on October 18, 2017, that it be in

order to call up the following amendments; that the time until 3 p.m. be for debate on the amendments, equally divided between the managers or their designees; and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Hatch amendment No. 1144 and Sanders amendment No. 1119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, Senators should be prepared for additional amendment votes to occur during the series at 3 p.m.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 218, on the confirmation of David Joel Trachtenberg to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 219, on the motion to proceed to H. Con. Res. 71. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.●

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-16, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Kuwait for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$29 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-16

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Kuwait.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$27 million.

Other \$2 million.

Total \$29 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Two hundred eighteen (218) M1A1 Abrams Tank Hulls with 120mm cannons.

Two hundred eighteen (218) AGT-1500 (M1 Tank Series) Engines.

Non-MDE: Also includes transportation and other logistics support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (USA).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: KU-B-JAT, KU-B-UKO, KU-B-UKN, KU-B-ULB, KU-B-ULX, KU-B-UMK.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 16, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Kuwait—M1A1 Abrams Tanks

The Government of Kuwait has requested a possible sale of two hundred eighteen (218) M1A1 Abrams tank hulls with 120mm cannons and two hundred eighteen (218) AGT-1500 (M1 Tank Series) engines in support of its M1A2 tank recapitalization. Also included are transportation and other logistics support. The estimated cost is \$29 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country. Kuwait plays a large role in U.S. efforts to advance stability in the Middle East, providing basing, access, and transit for U.S. forces in the region.

This potential sale is associated with Congressional Notification 16-66 which was notified to Congress on December 12, 2016, regarding recapitalization of 218 Kuwait M1A2 tanks. Subsequent to the notification, Kuwait requested 218 M1A1 tank hulls from U.S. inventory be provided and upgraded vice using Kuwait's current fleet of tanks due to its interest in maintaining operational readiness. Kuwait will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The M1A1 tank hulls will come from U.S. inventory. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Kuwait.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-16

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. 120mm Gun. The gun is composed of a 120mm smoothbore gun (cannon) manufactured at Watervliet Arsenal; "long rod" Armor-piercing fin-stabilized discarding-sabot (APFSDS) warheads; and combustible cartridge case ammunition. There may be a need to procure/produce new gun cannon tubes from Watervliet Arsenal. New cannons inducted at Anniston Army Depot would be inspected according to established criteria and shipped to Lima Army Tank Plant for the tank upgrade process. The highest level of information that could be disclosed through the sale of this end-item is UNCLASSIFIED.

2. AGT-1500 Gas Turbine Propulsion System. The use of a gas turbine propulsion system in the M1A2 is a unique application of armored vehicle power pack technology. The hardware is composed of the AGT-1500 engine and transmission and is not classified. Manufacturing processes associated with the production of turbine blades, recuperator, bearings and shafts, and hydrostatic pump and motor are proprietary and therefore commercially competition sensitive. The highest level of information that could be disclosed through the sale of this end-item is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Kuwait.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-54, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Greece for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$2.404 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-54

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Greece.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$918 billion.
Other \$1.486 billion.
Total \$2.404 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consider-

ation for Purchase: The Government of Greece has requested the possible sale of items and services to support the upgrade of up to one hundred twenty-three (123) F-16 aircraft to Block V configuration.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred twenty-five (125) APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radars (includes 2 spares).

One hundred twenty-three (123) Modular Mission Computers (MMCs).

One hundred twenty-three (123) LINK-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution System Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS-JTRS) with TACAN and EHSL.

One hundred twenty-three (123) LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI)-Inertial Navigation System (INS).

One hundred twenty-three (123) Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS).

One hundred twenty-three (123) Improved Programmable Display Generators (IPDGs).

Non-MDE: Included in the possible sale are up to one hundred twenty-three (123) APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT); one (1) Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS); one (1) F-16V Simulator; upgrade to two (2) existing simulators; one (1) Avionics Level Test Station; Secure Communications, cryptographic equipment and navigation equipment; upgrade and integration of the Advanced Self-Protection Integrated Suite (ASPI) I to ASPI II on twenty-six (26) F-16s; Ground Support System, systems integration and test; spares and repair parts, support and test equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistical, and technical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (SNY Amendment 6).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: GR-D-SBD, \$1.3B, 7 Dec 1992; GR-D-SNX, \$2B, 9 Mar 2000; GR-D-SNY, \$1.9B, 13 Dec 2005.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 16, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of Greece—Upgrade of F-16 Aircraft to an F-16 Block V Configuration

The Government of Greece has requested a possible purchase of an upgrade of its existing F-16 fleet to an F-16 Block V configuration which includes up to one hundred twenty-five (125) APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radars (includes two (2) spares); one hundred twenty-three (123) Modular Mission Computers (MMCs); one hundred twenty-three (123) LINK-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution System Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS-JTRS) with TACAN and EHSL; one hundred twenty-three (123) LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI)-Inertial Navigation System (INS); one hundred twenty-three (123) Improved Programmable Display Generators (IPDGs). Also included in the proposed sale are up to one hundred twenty-three (123) APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT); one (1) Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS); one (1) F-16V Simulator; upgrade to two (2) existing simulators; one (1) Avionics Level Test Station; Secure Communications, cryptographic equipment and

navigation equipment; upgrade and integration of the Advanced Self-Protection Integrated Suite (ASPI) I to ASPI II on twenty-six (26) F-16s; Ground Support System, systems integration and test; spares and repair parts, support and test equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistical, and technical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$2.404 billion.

This proposed sale will contribute to U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally which is an important partner for political stability and economic progress in Europe. The upgrade of F-16 aircraft to an F-16 Block V configuration will bolster the Hellenic Air Force's ability to support NATO and remain interoperable with the U.S. and the NATO alliance. It will also help Greece sustain operations in the future, thereby reducing the threat the alliance's enemies pose to the U.S. and the alliance.

The proposed sale will improve Greece's capability to meet current and future security threats. Greece will use this capability as a deterrent to regional threats, strengthen its homeland defense, and execute counter-terrorism operations.

Greece currently employs a mix of F-16s in Block 30, Block 50, Block 52+, and Block 52+ Advanced configurations. Therefore, Greece will have no difficulty absorbing the upgrade of these aircraft from an operation and support standpoint.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin of Fort Worth, TX. There are currently no known offsets. However, Greece typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between Greece and the contractor.

The proposed sale will require the assignment of approximately 3-5 additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Greece.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-54

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The proposed sale for upgrade of Greece's F-16s to Block V will involve the release of sensitive and/or classified (up to SECRET) elements to Greece, including hardware, accessories, components, and associated software. The F-16 Block V aircraft system is UNCLASSIFIED, except as noted below. The aircraft utilizes the F-16 airframe and features advanced avionics and systems including the AN/APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radar, Modular Mission Computers (MMCs); LINK-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution System Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS-JTRS); Advanced Self-Protection Integrated Suite (ASPI) II ship-sets; LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI)-Inertial Navigation System (INS); Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS II); Improved Programmable Display Generators (IPDGs); APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or

Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT); and Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS).

2. Additional sensitive areas include operating manuals and maintenance technical orders containing performance information, operating and test procedures, and other information related to support operations and repair. The hardware, software, and data identified are classified (up to SECRET) to protect vulnerabilities, design, and performance parameters and other similar critical information.

3. The AN/APG-83 is an Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar upgrade for the F-16. It includes higher processor power, higher transmission power, more sensitive receiver electronics, and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR), which creates higher-resolution ground maps from a greater distance than existing mechanically scanned array radars (e.g., APG-68). The upgrade features an increase in detection range of air targets, increases in processing speed and memory, as well as significant improvements in all modes. The highest classification of the radar is SECRET.

4. The Modular Mission Computer (MMC) is the central aircraft computer of the F-16. It serves as the hub for all aircraft subsystems and avionics data transfer. The hardware and software are classified SECRET.

5. The Multifunctional Informational Distribution System-Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS-JTRS) is classified CONFIDENTIAL. The MIDS-JTRS is a secure data and voice communication network using Link-16 architecture. The system provides enhanced situational awareness, positive identification of participants within the network, secure fighter-to-fighter connectivity, secure voice capability, and ARN-118 TACAN functionality. It provides three major functions: Air Control, Wide Area Surveillance, and Fighter-to-Fighter. The MIDS-JTRS can be used to transfer data in Air-to-Air, Air-to-Surface, and Air-to-Ground scenarios. The MIDS terminal hardware, publications, performance specifications, operational capability, parameters, vulnerabilities to countermeasures, and software documentation are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The classified information to be provided consists of that which is necessary for the operation, maintenance, and repair (through intermediate level) of the data link terminal, installed systems, and related software.

6. The Advanced Self-Protection Integrated Suite II (ASPII) is an enhanced version of the original ASPII I integrated Electronic Warfare (EW) system, which provides passive radar warning, wide spectrum Radio Frequency (RF) jamming, and control and management of the entire EW system. It is an externally mounted EW pod. The suite includes an ALQ-187 EW System, ALR-93 Radar Warning Receiver, and ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser System. Greece has upgraded ASPII I to II on all but a remaining twenty-six jets. The commercially developed system software and hardware are UNCLASSIFIED. The system is classified SECRET when loaded with a U.S. derived EW database.

7. The Embedded Global Positioning System (EGI)—Inertial Navigation System (INS)/LN-260 is a sensor that combines Global Positioning System (GPS) and inertial sensor inputs to provide accurate location information for navigation and targeting. The EGI-INS/LN-260 is UNCLASSIFIED. The GPS cryptovariable keys needed for highest GPS accuracy are classified up to SECRET.

8. The Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS) is a modified HGU-55/P helmet

that incorporates a visor-projected Heads-Up Display (HUD) to cue weapons and aircraft sensors to air and ground targets. In close combat, a pilot must currently align the aircraft to shoot at a target. JHMCS allows the pilot to simply look at a target to shoot. This system projects visual targeting and aircraft performance information on the back of the helmet's visor, enabling the pilot to monitor this information without interrupting his field of view through the cockpit canopy. The system uses a magnetic transmitter unit fixed to the pilot's seat and a magnetic field probe mounted on the helmet to define helmet pointing positioning. A Helmet Vehicle Interface (HVI) interacts with the aircraft system bus to provide signal generation for the helmet display. This provides significant improvement for close combat targeting and engagement. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED; technical data and documents are classified up to SECRET.

9. The Improved Programmable Display Generator (IPDG) and color multifunction displays utilize ruggedized commercial liquid crystal display technology that is designed to withstand the harsh environment found in modern fighter cockpits. The display generator is the fifth generation graphics processor for the F-16. Through the use of state-of-the-art microprocessors and graphics engines, it provides orders of magnitude increases in throughput, memory, and graphics capabilities. The hardware and software are UNCLASSIFIED.

10. The AN/APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT) is a system capable of transmitting and interrogating Mode V. It is UNCLASSIFIED unless/until Mode IV and/or Mode V operational evaluator parameters are loaded into the equipment. Elements of the IFF system classified up to SECRET include software object code, operating characteristics, parameters, and technical data. Mode IV and Mode V anti-jam performance specifications/data, software source code, algorithms, and tempest plans or reports will not be offered, released, discussed, or demonstrated.

11. The Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) is a multi-platform PC based mission planning system. JMPS hardware is UNCLASSIFIED and the software is classified up to SECRET.

12. Software, hardware, and other data/information, which is classified or sensitive, is reviewed prior to release to protect system vulnerabilities, design data, and performance parameters. Some end-item hardware, software, and other data identified above are classified at the CONFIDENTIAL and SECRET level. Potential compromise of these systems is controlled through management of the basic software programs of highly sensitive systems and software-controlled weapon systems on a case-by-case basis.

13. If a technologically advanced adversary obtains knowledge of the specific hardware and software source code in this proposed sale, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

14. Greece is both willing and able to protect U.S. classified military information. Greek physical and document security standards are equivalent to U.S. standards. Greece has signed a General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA) with the United States and is in negotiations with CENTCOM on the Communications Inter-

operability and Security Memorandum of Agreement (CISMOA). The Government of Greece has demonstrated its willingness and capability to protect sensitive military technology and information released to its military in the past.

15. A determination has been made that the Greece can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

16. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Greece.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREATER DANBURY NAACP

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Greater Danbury NAACP as they celebrate 60 years of outstanding advocacy and support for equal rights and an end to race-based discrimination in Connecticut and the Nation.

Founded in 1957, the Danbury NAACP serves as a branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP. By focusing on the Danbury, CT, area, this branch helps connect people in the region with the national NAACP mission. As part of the oldest civil rights organization in America, the Greater Danbury NAACP has had a valuable role in the progress we have made toward a society free from discrimination and respectful of individual civil rights. This year's theme, "Steadfast & Immovable," exemplifies the branch's continuous dedication to leading the fight to ensure every person in our great Nation will truly enjoy equal rights under the law.

The organization continues its rich history of collaboration with other civil rights groups. Recently, alongside other organizations and individuals, the Greater Danbury NAACP participated in an International Workers' Day event to emphasize the need for better treatment of immigrants. The branch's president, Glenda Armstrong, spoke at the event, emphasizing how, even with its founding centered on the inequality facing African Americans, the NAACP's goal of racial equality encompasses everyone in America.

One of the national organization's key objectives, mirrored in the work of the Greater Danbury branch, is to use democratic processes to put an end to racial discrimination. In March, the Danbury NAACP expressed its support—along with its parent association—for the NO HATE Act. I introduced this act with Congressman BEYER to counter the rising number of hate crimes in America. The NO HATE Act will encourage more thorough reports on hate crimes by law enforcement, grant victims of these crimes the

right to sue in civil court, and establish hotlines run by the State to make sure hate crimes were reported. These key measures align with the NAACP's vision of equality.

Since its formation, the Greater Danbury NAACP continuously strives to eliminate racial discrimination and achieve social, political, economic, and educational equality for the people of Danbury, CT, and the Nation. I applaud their tireless work and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Greater Danbury NAACP on 60 years of dedication and advocacy on behalf of Connecticut residents.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF A.T. STILL UNIVERSITY-KIRKSVILLE COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 125th anniversary of A.T. Still University's Kirksville College of Osteopathic Medicine, KCOM. KCOM was established in 1892 as the first osteopathic medical school in the world and continues to be recognized for its success as a multidisciplinary healthcare educator.

KCOM was founded by Dr. Andrew Taylor Still, whose novel methods of treating patients gave birth to the field of osteopathy. The school's first class included 21 students, five of whom were women. The school and medical practice quickly became a success, providing more than 30,000 osteopathic treatments in 1895.

According to the American Osteopathic Association, osteopathic medicine is one of the fastest growing specialties in U.S. healthcare. In fact, the number of doctors of osteopathic medicine has increased 276 percent since 1986. Importantly, more than half of all active doctors of osteopathic practice in primary care specialties, and many of these choose to practice in community-based settings. Students trained by KCOM are uniquely situated to impact communities lacking medical resources, whether they be rural or urban.

The focus of the KCOM administration and faculty on community outreach and underserved populations is to be commended. They partner with community health centers around the State to provide services to the most vulnerable individuals and instill a spirit of service in their students. Unique programs such as these that further education and support community health are of great benefit to the people of Missouri and serve as an example to others.

Today KCOM continues to make strides in whole person healthcare and works to be a leader in health professions education. I extend my sincere thanks for all they do. Congratulations to A.T. Still University president Craig M. Phelps, A.T. Still University-

Kirksville College of Osteopathic Medicine dean Margaret Wilson, faculty, and all former and current students on this important occasion.●

REMEMBERING ROBERT BRADSHAW

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to remember former Reno police chief Robert Bradshaw, who recently passed away at the age of 79.

Mr. Bradshaw served as chief of the Reno Police Department from 1981 to 1991. Before that, he was an assistant chief for the San Jose Police Department. After working in Reno, Bradshaw served with the Nevada Highway Patrol and later became chief of the Concord Police Department in California.

Mr. Bradshaw strongly believed in the role community plays when it came to reducing and preventing crimes in Reno. The Reno Police Department said he was widely regarded as an expert in community-oriented policing and is credited with bringing that philosophy to the force.

In fact, the police department's current motto of "Your Police, Our Community" has been attributed to him.

One of Reno's longest serving chiefs, Bradshaw was a mentor to countless officers and had a large impact on the city. During his tenure, Bradshaw developed specialized units and created neighborhood advisory groups. He also started the community satisfaction survey in 1987, which still continues three decades later.

As Nevada's senior Senator, I know firsthand that Mr. Bradshaw's tireless efforts while chief made Reno a safer place. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and loved ones as they mourn his loss.●

REMEMBERING PATRICK FLANAGAN

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to remember my friend, Second Judicial District Court Chief Judge Patrick Flanagan, who recently passed away in Reno at the age of 64. My deepest sympathy goes out to his family and loved ones.

All of Washoe County and Nevada's legal community will miss Chief Judge Flanagan, who only a year and a half ago was unanimously elected by the Second Judicial District Court to serve as chief judge. He was one of Nevada's finest, and his loss cannot be understated.

Before being elected to the bench, Chief Judge Flanagan served as an attorney and an assistant Federal public defender for the District of Nevada and worked in the appellate division of the Washoe County Public Defender's Office as a chief appellate deputy. In 2006, he was elected to serve as the Second Judicial District Court judge in Department 7 and was reelected in 2014.

Chief Judge Flanagan played a large role in the Reno community, as he regularly spoke to students, opened his courtroom for observation, and engaged students in public outreach initiatives, including the court's first annual student Flag Day poem contest.

His colleagues remember him as a personable, caring, and effective jurist who repeatedly inserted jokes or random facts about Irish history in his emails.

He served as the president of the State Bar of Nevada, the Washoe County Bar Association, and the Nevada Chapter of the Federal Bar Association.

Chief Judge Flanagan completed his undergraduate degree from Duquesne University and received his juris doctorate from California Western School of Law.

As Nevada's senior Senator, I know Chief Judge Flanagan's legacy will live on in the court. Lynne and my family pray for Chief Judge Flanagan's wife, their two children, grandchild, and entire extended family as they mourn his passing.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3068. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0163—2017-0170); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3069. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Human Subjects" (16 CFR Part 1028) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3070. A communication from the Deputy Director, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation" (RIN0906-AA11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3071. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Head Start Program" (RIN0970-AC63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3072. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation

of Assets in Single Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022 and 29 CFR Part 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3073. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Preparedness and Response, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3074. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Aging and Administrator of the Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3075. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Aging and Administrator of the Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3076. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3077. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on mining activities as required by the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3078. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3079. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, General Services Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3080. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Adminis-

trator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3081. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator for Protection and National Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3082. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the vacancy in the position of Special Counsel, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3083. A communication from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's annual submission regarding agency compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and revised Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-123; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3084. A communication from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Endowment's fiscal year 2017 Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act submission of its commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3085. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Significant Improvements Needed in DCRA Management of Vacant and Blighted Property Program"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3086. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tolfenpyrad; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL-9967-72-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3087. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tall oil fatty acids; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL-9965-58-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3088. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Florpyrauxifen-benzyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL-9963-66-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3089. A communication from the Commanding General, Army Military District of Washington, Department of Defense, trans-

mitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Military Helicopter Noise; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3090. A communication from the Executive Secretary, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Description of Office, Procedures, and Public Information" ((12 CFR Part 1101) (Docket No. FFIEC-2017-0003)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3091. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Oskaloosa, IA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0296)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3092. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guide Concerning Fuel Economy Advertising for New Automobiles" (16 CFR Part 259) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3093. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9969-10-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3094. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Regional Haze Plan and Prong 4 (Visibility) for the 2012 PM2.5, 2010 NO2, 2010 SO2 and 2008 Ozone NAAQS" (FRL No. 9969-21-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3095. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Miscellaneous Source Specific Revisions for Jefferson County" (FRL No. 9969-19-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3096. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Implementation Plan; Iowa; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; Amendment to the Administrative Consent Order, Grain Processing Corporation, Muscatine, Iowa" (FRL No. 9969-14-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3097. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 3" (FRL No. 9969-46-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3098. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of South Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9969-23-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3099. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Ambient Ozone Monitoring Requirements" (FRL No. 9969-18-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3100. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon; Permitting and General Rule Revisions" (FRL No. 9968-98-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3101. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation; State of Utah; Salt Lake County and Utah County Nonattainment Area Coarse Particulate Matter State Implementation Plan Revisions to Control Measures for Point Sources" (FRL No. 9969-01-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3102. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9969-12-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3103. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills," (RIN2060-AS46) (FRL No. 9969-06-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in

the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3104. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Nutritional Yeast Manufacturing Residual Risk and Technology Review" (FRL No. 9969-08-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3105. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extended Due Date under Notice 2017-10 for Participants Affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, or Maria" (Notice 2017-58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3106. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3107. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3108. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Institute for Children's Health Quality, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Sickle Cell Disease Treatment Demonstration Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3109. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2017-1102); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3110. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Health, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3111. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Health, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3112. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Exec-

utive Office of the President, transmitting a report relative to assistance for communities affected by hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, and by wildfires; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3113. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3114. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3115. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Hart-Scott-Rodino Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-113. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the Governor of New Jersey to join the United States Climate Alliance and take a leadership role in protecting the citizens of New Jersey and the United States, the environment, and the planet from the devastating effects of climate change, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION No. 264

Whereas, The Paris Climate Accord, also known as the "Paris Agreement, which was agreed to by nearly every country in the world, is the first global pact aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions in order to avert the worst effects of climate change; and

Whereas, The Paris Agreement, unlike previous pacts, requires every country to take action to lower greenhouse gas emissions rather than differentiating between developed and developing countries, and

Whereas, Although scientists have estimated that at best, the agreement will only cut greenhouse gas emissions by half of what is necessary to avoid an increase in atmospheric temperatures enough to prevent a cascade of devastating consequences, the agreement represents a turning point for the world and will cause fundamental shifts in global financial and energy markets; and

Whereas, The Paris Agreement sent a powerful signal that the world is committed to a low carbon future; and

Whereas, The climate change caused by rising global temperatures will likely: increase the frequency, severity, and duration of heat waves, creating a greater risk for heat-related illnesses and deaths, especially among the elderly, very young, disabled, and poor; increase the intensity of hurricanes creating stronger peak winds and increased rainfall, increase the risk of flooding within

storm-affected areas and increase the risk of drought in areas located outside storm tracks; and continue to decrease the size of polar ice sheets and land-based glaciers, causing sea levels to rise and contribute to enhanced coastal erosion, coastal flooding, and the loss of coastal wetlands, and

Whereas, Under the Paris Agreement, every participating country agreed to submit an individual plan to tackle its greenhouse gas emissions and to report regularly on its emissions and progress made in implementing and achieving its nationally determined contributions; and

Whereas, President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement will assuredly weaken global efforts to avoid drastic climate change; and

Whereas, The Trump administration has already communicated its intention to dismantle domestic plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as protections to reduce gas emissions from the methane gas emissions from oil and gas production and the plan to reduce emissions from power plants; and

Whereas, In response to President Trump's announcement of his intention to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, the Governors of California, New York, and Washington have announced the formation of the United States Climate Alliance, a coalition to convene states committed to upholding the Paris Agreement and to taking aggressive action to address climate change; and

Whereas, Together California, New York, and Washington represent about 68 million people, or one-fifth of the country's population, and account for nearly 10 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions in the country, and

Whereas, In addition, 85 mayors, 82 presidents and chancellors of universities, and the leaders of over 100 businesses have pledged to continue to meet the United States' greenhouse gas emissions targets despite the President's decision to withdraw the United States from the agreement; and

Whereas, The United States Climate Alliance will act as a forum to sustain and strengthen existing climate programs, promote the sharing of information and best practices, and develop and implement new programs to reduce carbon emissions; and

Whereas, The United States Climate Alliance is committed to upholding the Paris Agreement and reducing greenhouse gas emissions in order to avoid the disastrous repercussions of unchecked climate change for the United States and the planet; Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges the Governor of New Jersey to join the United States Climate Alliance and take a leadership role in protecting the citizens of New Jersey and the United States, the environment, and the planet from the devastating effects of climate change.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the Governor of New Jersey, the Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, the President and Vice-President of the United States, and every member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-114. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to continue

the state and federal partnership managing the Medicaid program in New Jersey and in the nation; to the Committee on Finance.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 198

Whereas, The Council of State Governments (CSG) is the nation's only organization serving all three branches of state government, CSG is a region-based forum that fosters the exchange of insights and ideas to help state officials shape public policy. This offers unparalleled regional, national and international opportunities to network, develop leaders, collaborate and create problem-solving partnerships; and

Whereas, New Jersey is a part of the CSG's Eastern Regional Conference, which is comprised of New Jersey and 10 other member states from Maine to Maryland, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and five eastern Canadian Provinces; and

Whereas, The CSG's Eastern Regional Conference has adopted a resolution urging the federal Executive and Legislative branches of government to maintain the integrity of the strong state and federal partnership that has been the hallmark of the federal Medicaid program since its inception more than fifty years ago; and

Whereas, As a member of CSG's Eastern Regional Conference, New Jersey strongly supports the continued partnership of the State and the federal government in managing the Medicaid program in New Jersey; and

Whereas, The Medicaid program was enacted as Title XIX of the Social Security Act in 1965 by President Lyndon Johnson to provide medical assistance to individuals whose incomes and resources were insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services; and

Whereas, Federal laws and policies establish a broad framework for the Medicaid program and states are provided flexibility within that framework to design state Medicaid programs which best meet the unique needs of each state to provide all necessary medical services without individual state or national spending caps; and

Whereas, New Jersey has designed a Medicaid program that is a unique support system tailored to the needs of New Jersey residents; and

Whereas, The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, commonly known as the Affordable Care Act, allowed states to opt to expand income eligibility for Medicaid to 138 percent of the federal poverty level and provided states a federal match for expenditures to cover 100 percent of the state Medicaid costs for this new cohort through calendar year 2016, after which the match will gradually decrease to 90 percent of these costs in calendar year 2020; and

Whereas, New Jersey chose to provide this expanded Medicaid coverage to its citizens starting in January 2014 and more than 500,000 New Jersey residents have received health insurance coverage through this new expanded eligibility; and

Whereas, In total, over 1.7 million New Jersey residents, or 20 percent of the State's population, receive their health insurance coverage and gain access to vital health related services through the Medicaid program; and

Whereas, New Jersey's total Medicaid budget equals \$17 billion in combined State and federal dollars; and

Whereas, In addition to providing access to health insurance for individuals, the Medicaid program provides critical financial resources for health care providers and institutions who care for the underserved, sup-

porting the region's health care infrastructure through the Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) program; and

Whereas, New Jersey institutions anticipate receiving over \$500 million in Medicaid DSH payments in 2016 to support the provision of services to the underserved and develop the region's health care infrastructure; and

Whereas, Like its partner states throughout the eastern region, New Jersey has benefited from the State and federal partnership which manages the Medicaid program; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. New Jersey, as one of the partner states in the CSG Eastern Regional Conference, strongly supports the continuation of the state and federal partnership managing the Medicaid program in New Jersey and in the nation.

2. The Legislature urges the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the state and federal partnership managing the Medicaid program to ensure the continuation of the provision of health care services to needy New Jersey residents.

3. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to each member of Congress representing the State of New Jersey, the Commissioner of Health and Human Services, the Chief Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and the President of the United States.

POM-115. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey condemning the President of the United States's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Climate Accord; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 263

An Assembly Resolution condemning President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Climate Accord.

Whereas, The Paris Climate Accord, also known as the "Paris Agreement," is a landmark international agreement reached in 2015 between 195 countries aimed at reducing carbon emissions, slowing rising global temperatures, and helping countries deal with the effects of climate change; and

Whereas, The Paris Agreement ended the strict differentiation between developed and developing countries that characterized earlier efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and replaced it with a common framework that commits all participating countries to put forward their best efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

Whereas, The agreement reaffirmed the goal of limiting global temperature increase well below 2 degrees Celsius, while urging further efforts to limit the increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius; and

Whereas, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has concluded that the rising global temperature is very likely due to a corresponding increase in the levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere produced by human activity and is causing, Earth's climate to change; and

Whereas, The climate change caused by rising global temperatures will likely: increase the frequency, severity, and duration of heat waves, creating a greater risk for heat-related illnesses and deaths, specially among the elderly, very young, disabled, and poor; increase the intensity of hurricanes creating stronger peak winds and increased

rainfall, increase the risk of flooding within storm-affected areas and increase the risk of drought in areas located outside storm tracks; and continue to decrease the size of polar ice sheets and land-based glaciers, causing sea levels to rise and contribute to enhanced coastal erosion, coastal flooding, and the loss of coastal wetlands; and

Whereas, Under the Paris Agreement, every participating country agreed to submit an individual plan to tackle its greenhouse gas emissions and to report regularly on its emissions and progress made in implementing and achieving its nationally determined contributions; and

Whereas, President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from this landmark agreement will seriously weaken global efforts to avoid drastic climate change; and

Whereas, Given the devastating effects of raising global temperatures, it is critical that this country remain in the Paris Climate Accord in order to globally reduce carbon emissions, slow rising global temperatures, and help countries deal with the effects of climate change; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House condemns President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Climate Accord.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice-President of the United States, every member of Congress elected from this State, the Governor of New Jersey, and the Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.

POM-116. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado concerning ensuring access to reproductive health care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 17-1005

Whereas, Colorado has always been committed to a quality health care system and to creating policies that meet the health needs of women and families, including affordable reproductive health services; and

Whereas, Colorado was the first state to allow safe, legal abortion on a bipartisan basis in 1967; and

Whereas, The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has stated that "[s]afe, legal abortion is a necessary component of women's health care", and health providers and associations affirm that good access to reproductive health care deeply and positively impacts women's lives and futures; and

Whereas, Reproductive health care is both safe and common. More than 90% of women have used contraception, about three in ten women will have an abortion in her lifetime, and more than half of women will have a child at some point in their lives.

Whereas, People may disagree with the decision to seek an abortion, but it is a decision that each person should make for themselves with the counsel of their health providers, their families, and their faiths; and

Whereas, Rates of maternal mortality are decreasing around the world, but increasing in the United States for women of color who face an alarming and disparate rate of pregnancy complications and maternal mortality; and

Whereas, Restrictions on the availability of reproductive health care and limits on health coverage, such as policies denying insurance coverage for reproductive health

services, have a disparate impact on low-income women and women of color and their families; and

Whereas, Obstacles to obtaining the best method of contraception for each person's unique health and life circumstances remain a barrier to many; and

Whereas, Low-income women and women of color face a higher rate of unintended pregnancy, so ensuring access to contraception is a critical part of helping to address health disparities in marginalized communities; and

Whereas, An inability or difficulty to conceive is not only emotionally difficult for people looking to start a family but can be prohibitively expensive, so we must do more to help people seeking to build their families, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity; and

Whereas, There is a continued need to address inequities in health care access and ensure culturally and linguistically appropriate training of health providers; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-first General Assembly of the State of Colorado: That we, the members of the Colorado House of Representatives, find that:

(1) Colorado continues to be a state where all individuals' health remains a top priority, and Coloradans resist attempts to undermine the right to access reproductive health care;

(2) Access to comprehensive and affordable reproductive health care is critical to ensure that people have the information and services to prevent unintended pregnancies, the support to have healthy pregnancies and become parents when they are ready, and the ability to raise their children in a safe and healthy environment and to be able to care for their families with dignity;

(3) State, county, and city health departments shall promote policies to ensure access to a full range of reproductive health care, including abortion, and eliminate disparities that prevent low-income women and women of color from seeking safe, high-quality care;

(4) Both public and private health insurance should cover the full range of reproductive health care, including abortion;

(5) Facilities and professionals providing reproductive health services shall not be subjected to regulations that do not have a medical benefit and that are more burdensome than those imposed on other facilities or health care professionals that provide medically comparable procedures. Provision of services should be based on the best medical practices as developed by medical experts and supported by medical evidence.

(6) All qualified health care professionals shall be able to provide the full range of reproductive health care, including abortion, and have access to appropriate medical training. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to President Donald J. Trump; Vice President Mike Pence; Paul Ryan, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; Orrin Hatch, President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate; Governor John W. Hickenlooper; Dr. Larry Wolk, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment; and the members of Colorado's Congressional Delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 825. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-173).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1116. A bill to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities (Rept. No. 115-174).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

S. 1285. A bill to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands (Rept. No. 115-175).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 832. A bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1965. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and traditional mammoth ivory products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 1966. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to modify the regional conservation partnership program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional exemptions to the individual mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1968. A bill to direct the National Science Foundation to award grants to encourage young girls to participate in computer science and other STEM activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1969. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to create a program to provide funding for organizations that support startup businesses in formation and early growth stages by providing entrepreneurs with resources and services to produce viable businesses,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. Kaine, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1970. A bill to establish a public health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1971. A bill to provide air carriers with access to information about applicants to be pilots from the National Driver Register, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1972. A bill to improve the monitoring and reporting of propane stocks and days of supply by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration with regard to propane export volumes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1973. A bill to provide for Federal research grant reform; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1974. A bill to require transparency in the tax code by requiring federally funded tax credits to be disclosed in the USASpending.gov website; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1975. A bill to designate additions to the Rich Hole Wilderness and the Rough Mountain Wilderness of the George Washington National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1976. A bill to allow all individuals purchasing health insurance in the individual market the option to purchase a lower premium copper plan; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Con. Res. 27. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; to the Committee on the Budget.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 200

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to prohibit the

conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 640

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 640, a bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 835

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 835, a bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics.

S. 876

At the request of Ms. HETTKAMP, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 876, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs.

S. 937

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 937, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 978

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in pre-kindergarten through higher education.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1022

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1022, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to support such centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1042

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1042, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude Segal Americorps Education Awards and related awards from income.

S. 1110

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1110, a

bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes.

S. 1135

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the Federal Pell Grant duration limits of borrowers who attend an institution of higher education that closes or commits fraud or other misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1151

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1224

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1224, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a Community Resilience Grant Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1403

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to establish the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps to place youth and veterans in national service positions to conserve, restore, and enhance the great outdoors of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1480

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1480, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of

the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a home infusion therapy services temporary transitional payment under the Medicare program.

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, *supra*.

S. 1754

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1754, a bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1782

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1782, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1787

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1787, a bill to reauthorize the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1823, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to

other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1829, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program.

S. 1857

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1857, a bill to establish a compliance deadline of May 15, 2023, for Step 2 emissions standards for new residential wood heaters, new residential hydronic heaters, and forced-air furnaces.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1893, a bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes.

S. 1899

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1899, a bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. 1901

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1901, a bill to require global economic and political pressure to support diplomatic denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, including through the imposition of sanctions with respect to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and any enablers of the activities of that Government, and to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes.

S. 1960

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1960, a bill to repeal the amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 75, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the largest organization of food and nutrition professionals in the world.

S. RES. 250

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 250, a resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy.

S. RES. 285

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 285, a resolution honoring the life and achievements of Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1974. A bill to require transparency in the tax code by requiring federally funded tax credits to be disclosed in the USASpending.gov website; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the much needed topic of tax reform. The high rates and complicated nature of the current Tax Code are burdening individual taxpayers and making businesses less competitive in the global market. That simply has to change. It has been more than 30 years since we have passed major tax reform, and we are well past time.

Unfortunately, I recently learned of a serious threat to reforming the Tax Code called alpacas. Now, what do these cute, mild-mannered pets have to do with Federal tax policy? Earlier this

year, I issued an oversight report entitled "Tax Rackets: Outlandish Loopholes to Lower Tax Liabilities." That report demonstrated how clever accounting allows nearly anything imaginable to become a writeoff, including alpacas.

To illustrate the point, the report outlined how local and Federal tax bills can be sheared by claiming exotic pets—these exotic pets—as livestock and turning backyards into barnyards. That is when the fur really started to fly.

Alpaca owners associations that once brazenly touted this tax fleece as a key selling point for the animals now feigned outrage at the suggestion. The association tried to pull the wool over the eyes of taxpayers by retaining a professional PR consultant. They launched a media campaign, inundating my office and others with phone calls, social media messages, and letters with photos of alpacas.

Through slick reporting and aggressive lobbying, tax-subsidized alpaca ownership was somehow presented as a bulwark of small business and a flourishing middle class. If this mere mention of a tax break costing \$10 million annually and enjoyed by relatively few taxpayers elicited such an outmeasured and aggressive response, imagine the backlash we will face when we are attempting to actually eliminate tax preferences benefiting powerful corporations and special interests to the tune of billions of dollars.

There are over 200 loopholes buried throughout the Tax Code that collectively cost \$123 trillion annually. Again, there are over 200 loopholes buried throughout the Tax Code that collectively cost \$1.23 trillion annually. This exceeds the total amount spent annually by the Federal Government for all discretionary programs, which includes defense, education, transportation, foreign aid, and protecting the environment.

These exemptions increase the bill for the average taxpayer. They also make the Tax Code so complicated that most individuals have to hire a tax professional or buy software to help complete their tax returns.

At more than 74,000 pages in length, no one—not even those in Washington who write the laws or enforce them—truly understands Federal tax law. Special interests are taking advantage of this confusion by hiring armies of accountants and Washington lobbyists to dodge taxes and cash in on the complexity of the code. For example, developers are claiming—these are a lot of homebuilders are claiming \$8 billion in tax credits every year supposedly to construct low-income housing, but with fewer homes being built and no basic accountability requirements, it is nearly impossible to track how this money is being spent.

The Government Accountability Office, the GAO, which is investigating,

said the "IRS and no one else in the federal government really has an idea of what is going on."

The same is true with hundreds of other tax loopholes. A luxury yacht can qualify as a second home and can be eligible for a mortgage interest deduction. Alaskan ship captains can expense costs for whaling as charitable contributions, even though no money goes to charity and whaling is typically illegal otherwise. High rollers can itemize the cost of gambling trips, including entertainment. Even the cost of losing lottery tickets can be deducted, a kind of scratch-off writeoff.

Only the IRS knows who is taking advantage of these loopholes, and the agency often cannot verify whether those claiming the tax giveaways are eligible. In order to achieve meaningful tax reform that makes the code simpler and fairer, we have to be able to first evaluate who is benefiting from these loopholes, for what purpose, and for what price.

That is why I am introducing the Tax Expenditures Accountability Act, which will publicly disclose the names of the corporate and special interests receiving tax credits and the costs of these tax credits. This bill requires the Department of Treasury to disclose the special interest receiving tax credits just as all other Federal expenditures are currently disclosed on the public website USASpending.gov. Sunlight is obviously the best disinfectant, and I look forward to exposing many of these loopholes, eliminating them, and returning the savings to individual taxpayers in the form of lower taxes.

As the alpaca lobby demonstrated, riding herd on tax breaks will cause every special interest benefiting from the code's complexity and unfairness to cry foul. Washington's powerful special interests will mobilize and threaten to derail tax reform. Many would rather protect these loopholes than allow taxpayers to keep more of their own paycheck.

Coming up short on reform is not an option. We have to do it this year. Individuals and businesses are suffering under a broken, antiquated tax code that is in dire need of fixing. We can't be deterred in efforts to achieve real reform that reduces the tax bill for everyone.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1975. A bill to designate additions to the Rich Hole Wilderness and the Rough Mountain Wilderness of the George Washington National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, this bill authorizes additions to two existing wilderness areas within the George Washington National Forest in Virginia; the Rich Hole and Rough Mountain Wilderness Areas. It's a relatively

simple bill, and it provides only a small window into the volume of work done by Virginians to manage a vast swath of Federal land in this region collaboratively and responsibly.

America's Federal lands are some of our most precious assets. We may hike or bike them; derive energy, minerals, or goods from them; or sometimes just leave them to nature. There is a long history of conflict among stakeholders who disagree on which Federal lands are best suited to which purposes.

Many years ago, forest users with different views and interests formed the George Washington National Forest Stakeholder Collaborative. Through hard work and consensus, the Collaborative agreed upon a number of recommendations for forest management and protection. Everyone got some of what they wanted and gave some ground. Preservation advocates consented to timber harvest and other active forest restoration and management in certain areas. The forest products industry consented to wilderness and lightly-managed areas elsewhere. The U.S. Forest Service's 2014 revised GW Forest Management Plan reflected many of these agreements.

Subsequently, the Forest Service convened the Lower Cowpasture Restoration and Management Project, bringing more stakeholders to the table, earlier in the process, to negotiate out how to manage this particular part of the Forest, located in the lower portion of the Cowpasture River watershed, in ways that work for everyone. Within this process, further compromises were made to achieve a mutually satisfactory project that could gather broad support. All members of the Stakeholder Collaborative now support the wilderness additions identified in this bill.

I am proud to partner on this with my colleague Senator MARK WARNER, and we are following in the path blazed by Senator John Warner and Representative Rick Boucher, who were instrumental in passing the original Virginia Wilderness Act in 1984.

Taking care of our Nation's outdoor resources is good for our economy and good for our environment. Land disputes may sometimes be difficult, but the example of the GW Forest Stakeholder Collaborative proves they don't have to be. When everyone comes to the table and invests the necessary time, we can find common ground. I hope this will be a lesson for us in other tough policy challenges, and I encourage the Senate to support this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2019 THROUGH 2027

Mr. PAUL submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:
S. CON. RES. 27

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable health care for all.
Sec. 3002. Revenue-neutral reserve fund to reform the American tax system.
Sec. 3003. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.
Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extending the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
Sec. 3005. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen American families.
Sec. 3006. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote innovative educational and nutritional models and systems for American students.
Sec. 3007. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the American banking system.
Sec. 3008. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American agriculture, energy, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.
Sec. 3009. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore American military power.
Sec. 3010. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and service members.
Sec. 3011. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for public lands and the environment.

Sec. 3012. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to secure the American border.
Sec. 3013. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote economic growth, the private sector, and to enhance job creation.
Sec. 3014. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation modifying statutory budgetary controls.
Sec. 3015. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the taxpayer bailout of pension plans.
Sec. 3016. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs.
Sec. 3017. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare and repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board.
Sec. 3018. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to affordable child and dependent care.
Sec. 3019. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to worker training programs.
Sec. 3020. Reserve fund for legislation to provide disaster funds for relief and recovery efforts to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 4101. Point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate.
Sec. 4102. Point of order against certain changes in mandatory programs.
Sec. 4103. Point of order against provisions that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.
Sec. 4104. Point of order against designation of funds for overseas contingency operations.
Sec. 4105. Point of order against reconciliation amendments with unknown budgetary effects.
Sec. 4106. Pay-As-You-Go point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 4107. Honest accounting: cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.
Sec. 4108. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.
Sec. 4109. Adjustment for wildfire suppression funding in the Senate.
Sec. 4110. Adjustment for improved oversight of spending.
Sec. 4111. Repeal of certain limitations.
Sec. 4112. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 4113. Enforcement filing in the Senate.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 4201. Oversight of Government performance.
Sec. 4202. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 4203. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 4204. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 4205. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.
Sec. 4206. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,490,936,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,613,683,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,755,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,883,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,015,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,162,063,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,306,948,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,463,269,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,654,829,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,825,184,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: –\$167,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: –\$169,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: –\$166,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: –\$165,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: –\$166,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: –\$167,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: –\$169,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: –\$172,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: –\$146,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: –\$145,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,093,721,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,220,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,319,687,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,344,861,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,501,231,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,563,762,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,607,752,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,753,919,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,851,463,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,942,710,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,095,740,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,266,669,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,310,493,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,370,283,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,486,230,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,532,290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,561,834,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,710,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,810,435,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,903,041,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$605,492,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$612,986,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$554,338,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$486,902,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$470,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$370,227,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$254,886,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$246,851,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$155,606,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$77,857,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,243,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$22,056,913,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,759,903,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$23,396,024,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,992,408,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,508,029,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,953,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$25,375,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$25,777,513,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$25,999,469,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,560,034,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$16,274,565,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,932,521,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$17,553,196,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$18,188,386,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,765,097,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$19,269,019,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,809,369,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$20,307,841,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$20,780,452,000,000.

SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$557,253,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$569,287,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,316,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$568,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$584,504,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$574,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,730,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$584,706,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$613,707,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$601,894,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$629,014,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$611,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$644,732,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$621,649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$660,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$641,891,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$678,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$658,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$695,076,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$675,108,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,978,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,114,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,042,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,702,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,161,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,045,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,222,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,511,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,394,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,467,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,676,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,565,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,238,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,191,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,637,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,401,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,165,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,940,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,167,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,617,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,773,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,464,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,597,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, –\$762,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,737,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,615,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,363,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,069,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,090,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,106,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,238,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,442,000,000.

(5) **Natural Resources and Environment (300):**

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,489,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,533,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,022,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,716,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,511,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,280,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,326,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,063,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,564,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,898,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,372,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,284,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,540,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,743,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,135,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,894,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,354,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,311,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,638,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,881,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,112,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,173,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,280,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,542,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,379,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$4,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,554,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,997,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,359,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$2,364,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,393,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$2,715,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, —\$3,254,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$14,163,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, —\$4,648,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$16,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, —\$4,817,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$17,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, —\$6,228,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$19,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, —\$6,816,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$19,990,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$89,125,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$92,875,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$90,538,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$92,393,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$84,687,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$93,064,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,062,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$81,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$71,003,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,791,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$71,930,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$74,521,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$73,370,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$76,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,843,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$76,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,345,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$76,895,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$77,831,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$78,001,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,018,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,281,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,435,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,518,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,690,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,867,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,778,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,061,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,041,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,347,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,669,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,985,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,353,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,304,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,932,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$90,224,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$99,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$100,086,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$98,799,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$101,018,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$101,064,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$102,034,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$102,218,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$102,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$103,178,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$102,725,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$103,653,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$103,012,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$103,960,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$103,798,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$104,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$104,942,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$105,921,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$106,473,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$107,433,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$546,598,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$558,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$560,622,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$563,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$578,838,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$570,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$574,616,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$575,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$586,530,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$583,769,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$601,742,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$599,099,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$605,811,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$603,443,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$617,220,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$614,728,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$633,890,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$630,824,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$652,230,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$653,552,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$586,239,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$585,962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$643,592,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$643,374,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$687,119,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$686,926,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$734,446,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$734,241,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$819,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$819,073,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$833,885,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$833,669,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$845,578,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$845,355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$934,429,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$934,186,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,002,522,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,002,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,066,566,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,066,321,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$491,978,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$477,537,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$490,106,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$479,627,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$493,118,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$482,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A)

(A) New budget authority, \$557,641,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$548,723,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,683,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,683,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,182,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,182,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,460,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,460,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,915,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,734,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,953,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,424,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,424,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,757,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,757,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,173,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,173,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,446,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$177,393,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,376,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$189,441,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$198,336,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$196,338,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$205,001,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$202,930,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$219,320,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$219,424,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$216,903,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$216,519,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$214,343,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$234,741,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$232,535,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$242,559,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$240,210,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$251,142,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$248,884,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,038,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,504,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,523,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,866,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,272,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,069,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,488,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,657,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,232,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,432,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,865,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,093,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,382,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,675,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,889,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,518,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,642,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,989,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,649,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,311,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,973,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,972,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,608,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,485,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,830,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,052,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,610,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,827,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,382,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$388,767,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$388,767,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$441,158,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$441,158,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$497,893,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$497,893,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$546,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$546,206,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$589,086,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$589,086,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$630,179,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$630,179,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$664,060,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$691,250,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$691,250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$716,494,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$716,494,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$736,146,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$736,146,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$111,576,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,576,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$133,357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$133,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$145,919,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$131,518,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,695,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$176,695,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$218,460,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$218,460,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$247,892,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$247,892,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$276,275,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$276,275,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$307,701,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$307,701,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$366,270,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$366,270,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$415,402,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$415,402,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,229,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,401,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,401,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,479,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,479,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$98,956,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,956,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,293,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$101,293,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$102,309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$111,119,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,119,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,766,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$124,766,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$128,332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$128,332,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$141,303,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$141,303,000,000.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,591,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$3,053,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$946,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$873,312,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$903,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$932,055,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$962,698,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$996,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,031,653,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,068,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,106,862,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,146,803,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,188,060,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$849,609,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$909,109,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$972,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,040,108,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,111,446,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,188,081,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,266,786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,349,334,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,437,032,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,530,362,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,553,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,584,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,716,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,888,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,062,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,029,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,426,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,581,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,779,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,024,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,194,000,000.

SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$281,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$290,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$301,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$311,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$322,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$333,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$344,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$343,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$356,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$369,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$368,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$380,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$379,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than November 13, 2017, the committees named in subsections

(a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing or replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3002. REVENUE-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include—

(1) tax relief for middle-income working Americans;

(2) lowering taxes on families with children; or

(3) incentivizing companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation is revenue neutral and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3003. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENDING THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3005. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) addressing the opioid and substance abuse crisis;
- (2) protecting and assisting victims of domestic abuse;
- (3) foster care, child care, marriage, and fatherhood programs;
- (4) making it easier to save for retirement;
- (5) reforming the American public housing system;
- (6) the Community Development Block Grant Program; or
- (7) extending expiring health care provisions,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3006. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL AND NUTRITIONAL MODELS AND SYSTEMS FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);
- (2) ensuring State flexibility in education;
- (3) enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs;
- (4) the consolidation and streamlining of overlapping early learning and child care programs;
- (5) educational programs for individuals with disabilities; or
- (6) child nutrition programs,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3007. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the American banking system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3008. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Farm Bill;
- (2) American energy policies;
- (3) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;
- (4) North American energy development;
- (5) infrastructure, transportation, and water development;
- (6) the Federal Aviation Administration;
- (7) the National Flood Insurance Program;
- (8) State mineral royalty revenues; or
- (9) soda ash royalties,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3009. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE AMERICAN MILITARY POWER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) improving military readiness, including deferred Facilities Sustainment Restoration and Modernization;
 - (2) military technological superiority;
 - (3) structural defense reforms; or
 - (4) strengthening cybersecurity efforts,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and service

members by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3011. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);
- (2) forest health and wildfire prevention and control;
- (3) resources for wildland firefighting for the Forest Service and Department of Interior;
- (4) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or
- (5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3012. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE THE AMERICAN BORDER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) securing the border of the United States;
- (2) ending human trafficking; or
- (3) stopping the transportation of narcotics into the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3013. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND TO ENHANCE JOB CREATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) reducing costs to businesses and individuals stemming from Federal regulations;
- (2) increasing commerce and economic growth; or
- (3) enhancing job creation,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3014. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION MODIFYING STATUTORY BUDGETARY CONTROLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying statutory budget controls, which may include adjustments to the discretionary spending limits and changes to the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for the Financial Accounting Standards Board, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and other similar entities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE TAXPAYER BAILOUT OF PENSION PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prevention of taxpayer bailout of pension plans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3016. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING WORK REQUIREMENTS IN ALL MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3017. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICARE AND REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), which may include repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under section 1899A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legisla-

tion would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3018. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFFORDABLE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making the cost of child and dependent care more affordable and useful for American families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3019. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to worker training programs, such as training programs that target workers that need advanced skills to progress in their current profession or apprenticeship or certificate programs that provide retraining for a new industry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3020. RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE DISASTER FUNDS FOR RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS TO AREAS DEVASTATED BY HURRICANES AND FLOODING IN 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing disaster funds for relief and recovery to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 4101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution

making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2019.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

SEC. 4102. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “CHIMP” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment

between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that includes a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(e) SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3103 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall be applied and administered as if section 3103(e) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, had not been enacted.

SEC. 4103. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

- (1) the term “CHIMP” has the meaning given such term in section 4102(a); and
- (2) the term “Crime Victims Fund” means the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101).

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution making full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision containing a CHIMP affecting the Crime Victims Fund that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all CHIMPs affecting the Crime Victims Fund in relation to fiscal year 2018 to be more than \$11,224,000,000, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(3) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to paragraph (1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House

amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(4) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this subsection may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(5) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this subsection, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) REVIEW OF PROCEDURES REGARDING CHIMPS.—The Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall review existing budget enforcement procedures regarding CHIMPs included in appropriations legislation. These committees of jurisdiction should consult with other relevant committees of jurisdiction and other interested parties to review such procedures, including for Crime Victims Fund spending, and include any agreed upon recommendations in subsequent concurrent resolutions on the budget.

SEC. 4104. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that designates funds for fiscal year 2018 for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in

which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) SUSPENSION OF POINT OF ORDER.—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

SEC. 4105. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION AMENDMENTS WITH UNKNOWN BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to or motion on a bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits a written statement for the Congressional Record indicating that the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, is unable to determine the effect the amendment or motion would have on budget authority, outlays, direct spending, entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, or surpluses.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SEC. 4106. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any of—

- (A) the period of the current fiscal year;
- (B) the period of the budget year;
- (C) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year; or
- (D) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(3) DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

- (A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or
- (B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on November 5, 1990.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) **PRIOR SURPLUS.**—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4107. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for major legislation considered in the Senate shall, to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty considered in the Senate—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(i) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 4108. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.

If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 4109. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING IN THE SENATE.

If a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) to provide for wildfire suppression funding, which may include criteria for making such an adjustment, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this concurrent resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 4110. ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF SPENDING.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—If a measure becomes law that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may decrease the allocation to the committee of the Senate with jurisdiction of the direct spending by an amount equal to the amount of the decrease in direct spending.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays shall be determined on the basis of estimates submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.

Sections 3205 and 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, are repealed.

SEC. 4112. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.**—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) **EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.**—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of this resolution, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made

by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) **DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) **CRITERIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) **UNFORESEEN.**—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) **INAPPLICABILITY.**—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4113. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE SENATE.

If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the

Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2018, 2018 through 2022, and 2018 through 2027 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advanced appropriations that would have been identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 4201. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General's list of unimplemented recommendations and on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 4202. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

SEC. 4203. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spend-

ing, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 4204. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

SEC. 4205. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2017 to 2027.

SEC. 4206. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1116. Mr. ENZI proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

SA 1117. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1118. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1119. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1120. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1121. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1122. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1123. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1124. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1125. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1126. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1127. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1128. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1129. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1130. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1131. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1132. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1133. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1134. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1135. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1136. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1137. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1138. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1139. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. Kaine, Mr. COONS, Mr. KING, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr.

WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1140. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1141. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1142. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1143. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1144. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1145. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1146. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1147. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1148. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1116. Mr. ENZI proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable health care for all.
Sec. 3002. Revenue-neutral reserve fund to reform the American tax system.
Sec. 3003. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.
Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extending the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
Sec. 3005. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen American families.
Sec. 3006. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote innovative educational and nutritional models and systems for American students.
Sec. 3007. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the American banking system.
Sec. 3008. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American agriculture, energy, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.
Sec. 3009. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore American military power.
Sec. 3010. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and service members.
Sec. 3011. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for public lands and the environment.
Sec. 3012. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to secure the American border.
Sec. 3013. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote economic growth, the private sector, and to enhance job creation.
Sec. 3014. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation modifying statutory budgetary controls.
Sec. 3015. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the taxpayer bailout of pension plans.
Sec. 3016. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs.
Sec. 3017. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare and repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board.
Sec. 3018. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to affordable child and dependent care.
Sec. 3019. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to worker training programs.
Sec. 3020. Reserve fund for legislation to provide disaster funds for relief and recovery efforts to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 4101. Point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate.

- Sec. 4102. Point of order against certain changes in mandatory programs.
- Sec. 4103. Point of order against provisions that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.
- Sec. 4104. Point of order against designation of funds for overseas contingency operations.
- Sec. 4105. Point of order against reconciliation amendments with unknown budgetary effects.
- Sec. 4106. Pay-As-You-Go point of order in the Senate.
- Sec. 4107. Honest accounting: cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.
- Sec. 4108. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.
- Sec. 4109. Adjustment for wildfire suppression funding in the Senate.
- Sec. 4110. Adjustment for improved oversight of spending.
- Sec. 4111. Repeal of certain limitations.
- Sec. 4112. Emergency legislation.
- Sec. 4113. Enforcement filing in the Senate.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

- Sec. 4201. Oversight of Government performance.
- Sec. 4202. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
- Sec. 4203. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
- Sec. 4204. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
- Sec. 4205. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.
- Sec. 4206. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,490,936,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,613,683,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,755,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,883,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,015,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,162,063,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,306,948,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,463,269,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,654,829,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,825,184,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: –\$167,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: –\$169,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: –\$166,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: –\$165,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: –\$166,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: –\$167,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: –\$169,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: –\$172,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: –\$146,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: –\$145,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,136,721,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,220,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,319,687,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,344,861,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,501,231,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,563,762,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,607,752,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,753,919,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,851,463,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,942,710,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,131,688,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,233,119,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,310,579,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,370,283,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,486,230,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,532,290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,561,834,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,710,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,810,435,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,903,041,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$640,752,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$619,436,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$555,198,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$486,902,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$470,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$370,227,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$254,886,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$246,851,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$155,606,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$77,857,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,278,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$22,063,363,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,760,763,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$23,396,024,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,992,408,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,508,029,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,953,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$25,375,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$25,777,513,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$25,999,469,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,595,294,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$16,281,015,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,933,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$17,553,196,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$18,188,386,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,765,097,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$19,269,019,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,809,369,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$20,307,841,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$20,780,452,000,000.

SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$557,253,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$569,287,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,316,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$568,721,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$584,504,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$574,347,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,730,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$584,706,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$613,707,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$601,894,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$629,014,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$611,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,732,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$621,649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$660,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$641,891,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$678,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$658,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$695,076,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$675,108,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,978,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,114,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,042,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,702,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,161,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,045,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,222,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,511,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,394,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,467,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,676,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,565,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,238,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,191,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,637,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,401,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,165,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,940,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,167,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,617,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,773,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,464,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,597,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, –\$762,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,737,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$3,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,442,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$45,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$45,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$47,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$47,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$49,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$48,326,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,542,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$5,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$6,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,990,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$89,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$90,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$84,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$74,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$73,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$77,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$78,001,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,281,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,932,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$90,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$99,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$100,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$98,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$101,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$101,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$102,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$102,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$102,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$102,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$103,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$103,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$104,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$104,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$105,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$106,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$107,433,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$546,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$558,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$560,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$563,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$578,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$570,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$574,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$575,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$586,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$583,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$601,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$599,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$605,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$603,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$617,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$614,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$633,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$630,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$652,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$653,552,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$586,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$585,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$643,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$643,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$687,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$686,926,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$734,446,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$734,241,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$819,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$819,073,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$833,885,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$833,669,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$845,578,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$845,355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$934,429,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$934,186,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,002,522,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,002,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,066,566,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,066,321,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$491,978,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$477,537,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$490,106,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$479,627,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$493,118,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$482,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$494,706,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$485,536,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$497,021,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$494,507,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$506,711,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$499,405,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$515,692,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$502,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$531,668,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$520,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$544,483,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$538,620,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$557,641,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$548,723,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$39,683,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,683,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,182,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,182,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,460,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$49,460,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$52,915,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$56,734,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$60,953,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$60,953,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,424,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$65,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$69,757,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$74,173,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$74,173,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$176,446,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$177,393,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$191,376,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$189,441,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$198,336,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$196,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$205,001,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$202,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$221,481,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$219,320,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$219,424,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$216,903,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$216,519,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$214,343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$234,741,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$232,535,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$242,559,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$240,210,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$251,142,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$248,884,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,038,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,244,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$64,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,377,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,866,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$67,069,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,488,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$68,813,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,657,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$70,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$72,432,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$71,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$74,233,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$73,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$76,093,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$75,382,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,675,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,889,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,518,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,642,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,989,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,649,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,311,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,973,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,972,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,608,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$28,485,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,255,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$28,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$30,052,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$30,827,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,382,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$388,767,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$388,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$441,158,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$441,158,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$497,893,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$497,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$546,206,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$546,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$589,086,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$589,086,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$630,179,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$630,179,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$664,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$691,250,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$691,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$716,494,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$716,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$736,146,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$736,146,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$68,576,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$51,055,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$133,357,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$96,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$145,919,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$130,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$176,695,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$166,918,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$218,460,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$209,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$247,892,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$238,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$276,275,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$266,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$307,701,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$297,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$366,270,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$356,035,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$415,402,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$404,286,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$95,229,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$95,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, —\$93,401,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$93,401,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$95,479,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$95,479,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$98,956,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$98,956,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$101,293,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$101,293,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$102,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$102,309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$111,119,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$111,119,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$124,766,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$124,766,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$128,332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$128,332,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$141,303,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$141,303,000,000.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,676,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,675,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,684,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,901,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,053,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$946,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$873,312,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$903,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$932,055,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$962,698,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$996,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,031,653,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,068,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,106,862,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,146,803,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,188,060,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$849,609,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$909,109,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$972,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,040,108,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,111,446,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,188,081,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,266,786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,349,334,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,437,032,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,530,362,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,553,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,584,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,716,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,888,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,062,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,029,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,426,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,581,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,779,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,024,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,194,000,000.

SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$281,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$290,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$301,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$311,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$322,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$333,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$344,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$343,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$356,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$369,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$368,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$380,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$379,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than November 13, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing or replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3002. REVENUE-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include—

(1) tax relief for middle-income working Americans;

(2) lowering taxes on families with children; or

(3) incentivizing companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation is revenue neutral and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3003. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(b) **DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.**—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) **EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.**—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENDING THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3005. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) addressing the opioid and substance abuse crisis;

(2) protecting and assisting victims of domestic abuse;

(3) foster care, child care, marriage, and fatherhood programs;

(4) making it easier to save for retirement;

(5) reforming the American public housing system;

(6) the Community Development Block Grant Program; or

(7) extending expiring health care provisions,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3006. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL AND NUTRITIONAL MODELS AND SYSTEMS FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);

(2) ensuring State flexibility in education;

(3) enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs;

(4) the consolidation and streamlining of overlapping early learning and child care programs;

(5) educational programs for individuals with disabilities; or

(6) child nutrition programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3007. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the American banking system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3008. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) the Farm Bill;

(2) American energy policies;

(3) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;

(4) North American energy development;

(5) infrastructure, transportation, and water development;

(6) the Federal Aviation Administration;

(7) the National Flood Insurance Program;

(8) State mineral royalty revenues; or

(9) soda ash royalties,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3009. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE AMERICAN MILITARY POWER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) improving military readiness, including deferred Facilities Sustainment Restoration and Modernization;

(2) military technological superiority;

(3) structural defense reforms; or

(4) strengthening cybersecurity efforts,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and service members by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3011. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(2) forest health and wildfire prevention and control;

(3) resources for wildland firefighting for the Forest Service and Department of Interior;

(4) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or

(5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3012. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE THE AMERICAN BORDER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) securing the border of the United States;

(2) ending human trafficking; or

(3) stopping the transportation of narcotics into the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3013. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND TO ENHANCE JOB CREATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) reducing costs to businesses and individuals stemming from Federal regulations;

(2) increasing commerce and economic growth; or

(3) enhancing job creation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3014. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION MODIFYING STATUTORY BUDGETARY CONTROLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying statutory budget controls, which may include adjustments to the discretionary spending limits and changes to the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for the Financial Accounting Standards Board, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and other similar entities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE TAXPAYER BAILOUT OF PENSION PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prevention of taxpayer bailout of pension plans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3016. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING WORK REQUIREMENTS IN ALL MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3017. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICARE AND REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), which may include repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under section 1899A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3018. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFFORDABLE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making the cost of child and dependent care more affordable and useful for American families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3019. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to worker training programs, such as training programs that target workers that need advanced skills to progress in their current profession or ap-

prenticeship or certificate programs that provide retraining for a new industry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3020. RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE DISASTER FUNDS FOR RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS TO AREAS DEVASTATED BY HURRICANES AND FLOODING IN 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing disaster funds for relief and recovery to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement****SEC. 4101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2019.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a

point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

SEC. 4102. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “CHIMP” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that includes a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—In the Senate, subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(e) **SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3103 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall be applied and administered as if section 3103(e) of S. Con. Res. 11

(114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, had not been enacted.

SEC. 4103. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section—

(1) the term “CHIMP” has the meaning given such term in section 4102(a); and

(2) the term “Crime Victims Fund” means the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101).

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution making full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision containing a CHIMP affecting the Crime Victims Fund that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all CHIMPs affecting the Crime Victims Fund in relation to fiscal year 2018 to be more than \$11,224,000,000, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(3) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to paragraph (1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(4) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this subsection may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(5) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this subsection, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) **REVIEW OF PROCEDURES REGARDING CHIMPS.**—The Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall review existing budget enforcement procedures regarding CHIMPs included in appropriations legislation. These committees of jurisdiction should consult with other relevant committees of jurisdiction and other interested parties to review such procedures, including for Crime Victims Fund spending,

and include any agreed upon recommendations in subsequent concurrent resolutions on the budget.

SEC. 4104. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that designates funds for fiscal year 2018 for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) **SUSPENSION OF POINT OF ORDER.**—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

SEC. 4105. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION AMENDMENTS WITH UNKNOWN BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to or motion on a bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits a written statement for the Congressional Record indicating that the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, is unable to determine the effect the amendment or motion would have on budget authority, outlays, direct spending, entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, or surpluses.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of

the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SEC. 4106. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any of—

(A) the period of the current fiscal year;

(B) the period of the budget year;

(C) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year; or

(D) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(3) DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on November 5, 1990.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and

sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) REPEAL.—In the Senate, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4107. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.—During the 115th Congress, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for major legislation considered in the Senate shall, to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS.—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAJOR LEGISLATION.—The term “major legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty considered in the Senate—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(i) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) TIMING SHIFTS.—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct

spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 4108. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 4109. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING IN THE SENATE.

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) to provide for wildfire suppression funding, which may include criteria for making such an adjustment, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this concurrent resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 4110. ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF SPENDING.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a measure becomes law that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may decrease the allocation to the committee of the Senate with jurisdiction of the direct spending by an amount equal to the amount of the decrease in direct spending and may revise the aggregates and other appropriate levels in this resolution and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger in the amounts necessary to accommodate the decrease in direct spending.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays shall be determined on the basis of estimates submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.

Sections 3205 and 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, are repealed.

SEC. 4112. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays,

and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of this resolution, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this sec-

tion, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4113. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE SENATE.

If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2018, 2018 through 2022, and 2018 through 2027 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advanced appropriations that would have been identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 4201. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General's list of unimplemented recommendations and on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these over-

sight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 4202. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the Senate, for purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 4203. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 4204. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

SEC. 4205. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2017 to 2027.

SEC. 4206. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SA 1117. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REPEAL TAX INCENTIVES FOR RETIREMENT SAVINGS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would repeal Federal tax incentives for retirement savings.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1118. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 83, line 13, strike “Sections 3205 and” and insert “Section”.

On page 83, line 15, strike “are” and insert “is”.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4114. PROHIBITION ON AGREEING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION WITHOUT A SCORE IN THE SENATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to vote on the adoption of a covered amendment to a bill or resolution that requires an estimate under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653), unless an estimate described in such section 402 for the covered amendment was made publicly available on the website of the Congressional Budget Office not later than 28 hours before the time the vote commences.

(b) **COVERED AMENDMENT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered amendment” means an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1119. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 4, line 12 decrease the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 24, line 19, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 24, line 20, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 24, line 23, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 25, line 2, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 25, line 3 increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 25, line 6, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 25, line 11, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 25, line 15, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 25, line 19, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 25, line 23, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

SA 1120. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY LEGISLATION THAT PROVIDES A TAX CUT FOR THE TOP 1 PERCENT OF THE WEALTHIEST INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that provides a tax cut to the top 1 percent of individuals.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members

of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1121. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 ____ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT WITH TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY WITHOUT ALSO REPEALING THE DEBT CEILING.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the Federal deficit by lowering taxes on the wealthiest taxpayers without also repealing the debt ceiling.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1122. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN AND PREGNANT WOMEN UNDER MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving oral health care for children and pregnant women under Medicaid by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1123. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional

budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 ____ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION REDUCING ACCESS TO, OR AFFORDABILITY OF, ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would pay for tax breaks for the wealthy by reducing access to, or affordability of, oral health care for children provided through Medicaid.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1124. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 ____ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING ACCESS TO OR AFFORDABILITY OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR MINORITY AND DISENFRANCHISED POPULATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce access to or affordability of health care services for minority and disenfranchised populations of the United States, including American Indians and Alaskan Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, by cutting Medicaid and Medicare to offset tax breaks for the wealthy.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(1) reduce access to or affordability of healthcare services for minority and disenfranchised populations of the United States

SA 1125. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional

budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 ____ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE THE MEDICARE PROGRAM OR TURN IT INTO A VOUCHER SYSTEM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would privatize the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or turn the program into a voucher system.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1126. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 ____ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY BEFORE PROVIDING FULL HURRICANE RECOVERY FUNDING.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that lowers taxes for the wealthiest Americans without ensuring that full recovery funding is provided to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other areas affected by recent hurricanes.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1127. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING INCENTIVES FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES TO HAVE AND MAINTAIN AN ADVANCE CARE PLAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting incentives for Medicare beneficiaries to have and maintain an advance care plan by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1128. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING ACCESSIBILITY TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION FOR LOW-INCOME STUDENTS AND PROMOTING HIGHER GRADUATION RATES AT ALL 4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting accessibility to postsecondary education for low-income students and promoting higher graduation rates at all 4-year institutions of higher education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1129. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. SENSE OF THE SENATE OPPOSING THE HARMFUL CUTS TO THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate opposes the harmful cuts to the Medicare program under this resolution.

SA 1130. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE USE OF COLLEGE SAVINGS ACCOUNTS WHILE STUDENTS ARE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SECONDARY SCHOOL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the use of college savings accounts while students are in elementary school and secondary school, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1131. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR THE DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO RESPOND TO NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient resources for the diplomacy and development professionals at the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to respond to national security threats by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1132. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CUTS TO MEDICAID OR MEDICARE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cut Medicaid, Medicare, or both to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1133. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT ELIMINATES OR DECREASES THE VALUE OF THE NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT OR THE LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate, decrease the value of, or decrease the available amount of new markets tax credits or low-income housing credits.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1134. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR FUNDING TO IMPROVE VOTER REGISTRATION AND THE VOTING EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient funding to improve voter registration and the voting experience in Federal elections by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1135. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF ACCESS TO THE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES OF SMALL EMPLOYERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the expansion of access to the income tax credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1136. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, MARITAL STATUS, MILITARY OR VETERAN STATUS, RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, HANDICAP, FAMILIAL STATUS, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN IN HOUSING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting efforts to eliminate discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity, source of in-

come, marital status, military or veteran status, race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin in housing by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1137. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT CHANGES TO VOTING LAWS AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL DO NOT DISPROPORTIONATELY BURDEN THE RIGHT OF RACIAL AND LANGUAGE MINORITIES TO VOTE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that changes to voting laws at the State and local level do not disproportionately burden the right of racial and language minorities to vote, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1138. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 50, line 8, strike “, and” and all that follows through “ledger,” on line 9.

Beginning on page 50, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 51, line 3.

SA 1139. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mr. KING, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT OR REDUCE A SURPLUS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill, resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, motion, or conference report pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 641) that would cause or increase a deficit or reduce a surplus in either of the following periods:

(1) The period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year.

(2) The period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of deficit increases and reductions in a surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SA 1140. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPEALING THE ENSURING PATIENT ACCESS AND EFFECTIVE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2016 TO ENSURE THAT THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION HAS THE TOOLS NEEDED TO COMBAT THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to restoring the ability of the Drug Enforcement Administration to enforce our Nation's laws and help stop the opioid epidemic, which may include repealing the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1141. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr.

ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT RAISES TAXES ON MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES BY ELIMINATING OR LIMITING THE STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the State and Local Tax Deduction.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1142. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX REFORM BILL THAT DOES NOT EXPAND AND IMPROVE THE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that provides for changes to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 without expanding and improving the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit by increasing the size of the credit, increasing the maximum of expenses eligible for the credit, and making the credit refundable.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1143. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING TAX COMPLEXITY FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing tax complexity for small businesses by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1144. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING MEDICAID AND MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), which may include strengthening and improving Medicaid for the most vulnerable populations, and extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1145. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NUCLEAR WASTE CLEANUP.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference

reports relating to Federal investments in the Office of Environmental Management of the Department of Energy, which may include measures to meet the Federal Government's legacy responsibilities for cleanup of liquid radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel and nuclear materials, transuranic and mixed or low-level waste, or contaminated soil and water, and which may also include measures to deactivate, decontaminate, and decommission excess facilities at 16 sites created by the Manhattan Project or Cold War programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1146. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include lowering taxes on families with children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1147. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ENDING MEDICARE AS WE KNOW IT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that eliminates the guaranteed health insurance benefits for seniors and people with disabilities under the Medicare program, increases costs for seniors and people with disabilities by establishing a Medicare voucher or premium support plan that provides limited payments to Medicare beneficiaries to purchase health care in the private health insurance market, or weakens the traditional Medicare program by diverting the healthiest enrollees into private

plans and undermining traditional Medicare's ability to control costs while offering access to a broad range of providers, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 1148. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 60, line 8, after "provided that" insert "any increase in the amount of the limit for the revised security category is accompanied by a commensurate increase in the amount for the revised nonsecurity category, and provided that".

On page 82, line 2, after "ure" insert " , provided that any increase in the amount of the limit for the revised security category is accompanied by a commensurate increase in the amount for the revised nonsecurity category".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Consumer Data Security and the Credit Bureaus."

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 to conduct a hearing entitled "The Cost of Prescription Drugs: How the Drug Delivery System Affects What Patients Pay, Part II".

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Gregory G. Katsas, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Jeffrey Uhlman Beaverstock, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama, Emily Coody Marks, and Brett Joseph Talley, both to be a United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, and Holly Lou Teeter, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-216 to hold a hearing entitled "Open Hearing on the Nomination of Christopher Sharpley to be the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members from my staff and from Senator SANDERS' staff be given all-access floor passes for consideration of the budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 71: Eric Ueland, Paul Vinovich, Landon Stropko, Tom Bork, Mike Jones, Joshua Smith, Alexander Beaton, and Jill Harrelson; and that the following staff members be given floor privileges for the remainder of the debate on the measure: Natalie Rico, Catherine Konieczny, Jake Whitaker, and Max Pfeiffer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2017

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 18; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H. Con. Res. 71.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:04 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 18, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 17, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DAVID JOEL TRACHTENBERG, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 18, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, today we praise You with our whole heart. You continue to exceed our expectations with Your bountiful blessings and tender mercies.

Inspire our lawmakers to remember Your generosity to them and this land we love. In these days of stress and strain, continue to be the shepherd who will guide them to Your desired destination.

Lord, thank You for forgiving our sins, healing our sickness, filling our lives with good things, and surrounding us with Your love. Continue to be a celestial parent to our Nation and world, sustaining us all with Your tender compassion and mighty power. God of mercy and grace, transform our dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it goes without saying that the Obama years were not easy for America's middle class. Many of the men and women we represent felt forgotten over the last decade. They found themselves stuck in a stumbling economy without the opportunity to get ahead, looking on as paychecks stagnated, jobs moved overseas, and government spent far beyond its means while middle-class belts tightened.

In my State and in so many more around the country, these are the problems that faced many families and communities over the last 10 years, and they are the concerns at the heart of the comprehensive budget that the Senate just voted to proceed to yesterday. This budget is a serious plan to put our country on a more responsible fiscal path and also to set us on a course for a more fulsome economy that lifts up the middle class.

On the fiscal side, it provides a path to balance with serious reductions to the growth of Federal spending, complying fully with previous spending caps while also providing a way to increase defense resources in the event that a bipartisan agreement on those caps can be reached.

On the economic side, it clears the way for committees to continue their critical work to spur steady economic growth while providing legislative tools to advance tax reform—the single most important action we can take today to help our economy reach its full potential.

As we all know, our archaic Tax Code is a significant roadblock standing in the way of America's economic future. It holds back families and small businesses. It makes it harder for those who are not well-connected elites to succeed. It even incentivizes companies to send jobs and investments overseas. That is really, clearly wrong.

In today's increasingly competitive global economy, we cannot afford a tax code that forces American workers to compete against foreign competitors with one hand tied behind their backs, as our current code does. We need to act.

Under Chairman HATCH's leadership, the Finance Committee has made progress developing commonsense tax reform goals. With further instructions from this budget, the committee will be able to complete its work and report legislation that promotes economic growth, helps keep more money in the pockets of hard-working men and women, and closes special interest loopholes while preserving core middle-class incentives.

Our tax reform goals center on a few things: bringing more jobs and investments to our country and then keeping them here, making the Tax Code fairer so it doesn't benefit just wealthy elites, and lowering rates so hard-working families are able to keep more of their paychecks.

The main goal is this: We want to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more money in the pockets of hard-working men and women throughout our country. These are goals shared by the President, by his team, and by Senate colleagues. They are certainly shared by our Republican colleagues. I would think they would be shared by all of us, on both sides of the aisle, and our Democratic friends did share them until just recently. I hope they will continue to support these commonsense goals rather than just blindly oppose this effort to fight corporate offshoring and to eliminate loopholes for the wealthy, simply because they don't like the current occupant of the White House.

There is no need for our Democratic friends to continue inventing reasons to oppose tax reform or to make more claims designed to distort reality. I hope they will decide to change course and work together in a serious way to accomplish what should be bipartisan goals—goals they once vocally supported, seemingly until President Trump came along.

Let's deliver relief to American workers and families with an economy that reaches for its true potential once more, and the next step to get there is to pass the comprehensive budget before us with its tools to move our country forward.

I wish, once again, to thank Chairman ENZI and the members of the Senate Budget Committee for their fine work on this budget.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2018

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H. Con. Res. 71, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

Pending:

Enzi amendment No. 1116, in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 3 p.m. will be equally divided between the managers or their designees.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, this week the Senate is debating a fiscal year 2018 budget resolution focused on growing America's economy through tax policies that put more money in the hands of hard-working Americans. Tax reform is long overdue and is needed to jump start our Nation's economic growth. It is crucial that Congress approve this fiscal framework in order to eliminate the dated and stifling tax policies that are holding back not only investment and productivity but American families. It is time for more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks.

The tax reform framework recently announced by the President and congressional leaders represents the beginning of a process aimed at boosting America's economic growth and putting more money in the pockets of everyday Americans. That tax framework has to be defined by the Finance Committee. This sets up a process so that can be done as easily as possible.

It is crucial that we allow U.S. companies—large and small, especially small—to better compete both at home and overseas, which will make the United States more attractive for investment and to do business. This will improve our competitiveness, it will help keep good paying jobs here at home, and it will bring back jobs that have been lost.

Lowering taxes on small businesses will also help unleash the ingenuity of America's job creators. We are the most ingenious and most inventive in the world.

Unfortunately, as many hard-working families personally understand, our economy has experienced 8 years of stagnant growth. This economic downturn and slow growth has resulted in a lost decade that has cost the Nation millions of jobs.

Family income is not rising as fast as it should, which has real consequences for our future. When family incomes fail to grow, it becomes difficult for parents to pay for their children's education and for their own needs. Sluggish family income growth also means less money for retirement or healthcare and makes it harder to save for a downpayment on a house.

It is no surprise that incomes are stuck, given America's overall economic stagnation over the past decade.

Without wage growth, American families find it difficult to improve their standard of living. We must do better for these hard-working American families, and this budget resolution will help put our Nation on a better fiscal track with a combination of restrained spending, reduced tax burdens, and a growing economy.

The budget puts in motion a process to cut taxes for American families and job creators by \$1.5 trillion over 10 years. In addition to keeping more money in the pockets of hard-working families, tax reform done right will spur investment and reinvigorate productivity here at home.

America's tax system is incredibly complicated. This budget will provide Congress with the opportunity to make more Tax Code simplifications and make it fairer for all Americans. We especially want to make sure families, small businesses, and workers are not penalized for their success.

Simplifying the Tax Code is an important part of tax reform efforts. America's current code is made up of more than 4 million words. That is seven times the length of Leo Tolstoy's "War and Peace," and it is more than two times the combined length of the complete works of William Shakespeare and the King James Bible.

The National Taxpayers Union recently released some figures that calculate the burden of tax compliance for families and small businesses. The National Taxpayers Union learned that the total annual time burden of tax compliance is more than 6 billion hours. Let me repeat that. The total time burden for tax compliance is more than 6 billion hours. That is a lot of family time. That costs families and small businesses nearly \$34 billion a year on tax software and other out-of-pocket expenses, as well as—this is the important part—\$229 billion in time and labor to comply with the Tax Code. The Tax Code's combined burden of \$263 billion is more than the gross domestic product of 154 nations.

To understand just how complex and outdated the U.S. Tax Code has become, it is important to put it in the historical context of how it has grown over the years. In 1913, the 1040 Income Tax Form consisted of three pages, with one page of instructions. More than 100 years later, that same form now consists of 2 pages, with 106 pages of basic instructions and, depending on taxpayer circumstances, 13 separate schedules, each with numerous pages of instructions. In fact, there are more than 70,000 pages of instructions in total. This is why, every tax season, Americans are forced to wade through an ever-changing labyrinth of forms and regulations when they file their returns.

Each year, hard-working families navigate a minefield of tax definitions and tax tests in order to fully reap the

benefits of tax credits. Is it any wonder that many who are eligible may not even claim these credits because of this complex web of tax forms? For example, there are many definitions of "child" in the Tax Code, meaning a family with children may qualify for some child benefits but not others and may fail to receive the full benefits they deserve.

To promote fair treatment, our budget is focused on providing the tools needed to simplify the Tax Code. Let me repeat that. These are the tools that are needed to simplify the Tax Code. The Finance Committee still has to plug in details and eliminations and a final version, and that would allow Americans to keep more of what they earn. That is another part of the process, but this part of the process is necessary in order to make sure we get to that part of the process. Hard-working families deserve an economy that provides higher wages and more and better jobs. Pro-growth tax reform can boost small businesses, and it can free Americans to make their own decisions about how to spend their hard-earned money.

I want to repeat some of those numbers. I am an accountant. Usually, numbers put people to sleep, but I think these are ones people will understand.

The National Taxpayers Union did some figuring on the burden of tax compliance by families and small businesses. This National Taxpayers Union learned that the total annual time burden of tax compliance is more than 6 billion hours, which costs families and small businesses nearly \$34 billion a year on tax software and other out-of-pocket expenses as well as—and this is the important part—\$229 billion in time and labor to comply with the Tax Code. The Tax Code's combined burden of \$263 billion is more than the gross domestic product of 154 countries.

We need to take action. We need to pass this budget so the process can be simplified and expedited, and we can get to that yet this year so people, when they are filing their taxes next year, can take advantage of what is being done here. I think we will have bipartisan support in making these important changes. The process is set up so there can be that bipartisan support since it goes through the Finance Committee, and we have been promised there will be a markup, which will allow everybody to make amendments to the Tax Code and the tax bill. Then it will come to the floor, where everybody will have a chance to make amendments to the bill.

This sets the budget and sets up the opportunity to have some tax reform this year so people can take advantage of it next year. I ask my colleagues to support this budget and work with us on getting tax reform that will make a difference for all hard-working Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I want to explain why I took us out of the quorum call. If I leave us in a quorum call, all time will be charged to my side. If I take us out of a quorum call, even though no one is here to speak, it will get divided equally. That is fair, and that is what we are trying to do.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If no one yields time, the time will be divided equally.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday the chairman and the ranking member of the HELP Committee came to a bipartisan agreement on a package to stabilize our healthcare law and to lower premiums. It was the product of months of difficult negotiations. Like all good negotiations, both sides gave some and both sides got some. The product is something that neither side is completely happy with but that both sides can move forward with. That is what a good, fair compromise looks like. It took work, and, at a time when bipartisanship is desperately sought after, this was not even just a flicker but a nice flame of bipartisanship burning brightly.

Then, a few minutes ago, President Trump tweeted: I am supportive of LAMAR as a person, and also of the process, but I can never support bailing out insurance companies who have made a fortune with ObamaCare.

There are many reasons to be vehemently strongly upset about this tweet and how wrong it is. First, frankly, the President doesn't know what he is talking about in the compromise.

It doesn't bail out insurance companies. It helps people who are sick and who need healthcare. It keeps their premiums low. It allows them to go to a doctor or get a medicine that they need.

Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY made sure that, in the provisions they were writing, the money would not go to the insurance companies but rather would go to millions of Americans who need help because they couldn't afford healthcare on their own.

The President ought to know what he is talking about when he tweets about bills because on this one, he had no understanding of what it is about. This

helps millions of people. This keeps premiums down. This allows Americans—working class, middle class, many of whom are in rural areas in red States—it allows them to go to the doctor, go to the hospital, get medicine. Nothing bothers Americans more than when they can't get healthcare they desperately need for themselves or a loved one.

So, first, the President ought to know what the bill is about before he tweets. Clearly from this tweet, he doesn't.

Second, this President keeps zigging and zagging, so it is impossible to govern. Two Thursdays ago, the President called me in the gym and said: Let's work on a bipartisan solution on healthcare. It was his initiation. He first talked about, let's repeal and replace; I told him that is off the table. But I then said that Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY are working on a compromise—and I outlined the basic compromise they were coming up with, that each side got something—and the President suggested that he call Senator ALEXANDER and I call Senator MURRAY and encourage them. I called Senator MURRAY; he called Senator ALEXANDER. And he called Senator ALEXANDER, from what Senator ALEXANDER told me, several times to encourage him.

Yesterday, he called the Murray-Alexander deal a "very good solution." Now, this morning, he says he can't support it. He can't support bailing out insurance companies that have made a fortune with ObamaCare. He is wrong on the facts, as I mentioned, doesn't know what the bill is. We should have a President who actually knows the facts of bills he talks about.

Second, he is totally inconsistent. He is for it one day, against it the next day.

Mr. President, you cannot govern a country, you cannot keep America great if you don't know what is in the bills and don't have a consistent policy about them.

But he keeps zigging and zagging. Our only hope is that maybe tomorrow he will be for this again.

Finally, a word in general: We all know there are extremes in America. The hard right has a lot of power here. If every time the hard right says "jump," the President says "how high," his Presidency will be a failure. Yet that is what has happened repeatedly.

The hard right doesn't represent America on healthcare. Eighty percent of the people did not like the TrumpCare bill that the hard right supported—80 percent. The majority of Americans, by a substantial margin, want to see ObamaCare strengthened, not repealed. The hard right doesn't; they want to get rid of it.

If the President simply is responding to them, it is not leadership. He did the

same thing on DACA. Leader PELOSI and I met with him. It was clear what we sought—approval of the Dream Act. He agreed, provided there was border security, explicitly no wall. The next day, the rightwing attacked him. Laura Ingraham or one of those radio commentators said he should be impeached. I think Breitbart News called him Amnesty Trump. And he totally reversed himself.

That is not leadership, Mr. President. That is blatant fear.

We all understand political forces. They push us all around. When you are President, you have an obligation to lead. And this Presidency has been so unsuccessful in accomplishing things—he can blame MITCH MCCONNELL, which the President has done, or the Republicans in the Senate. He can blame the Democrats. But really the reason that we are not getting anything done and his Presidency has been so bare of accomplishment is that this President is embracing a hard-right, extreme position that is very far away from what Americans want. His Presidency will continue to fail, continue to be a failure, if he continues to do that.

So I would say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, going back to the agreement, the agreement is fair, and it is down the middle. As I said, each side gave. Let's move forward. Let's get a large percentage, a large number of Democrats and Republicans to sponsor this legislation. Let Leader MCCONNELL have the good sense and the courage to put it on the floor. I would bet my bottom dollar it will pass. Let Speaker RYAN do the same, and we will have shown that we can get something done in a bipartisan way.

LAMAR ALEXANDER is not obstructing. PATTY MURRAY is not obstructing. The President is obstructing at the moment. We should overcome that obstruction and work together. That is what the American people want.

I hope the President rethinks his position. He has rethought it several times already. I hope he actually reads and learns what is in the bill. And I hope we can get this done—not for any party's sake or any individual's sake but for the American people's sake, the millions and millions of Americans who can't afford high premiums, who desperately need healthcare and medicine, and who are praying for us to do something to help them.

Mr. President, on the budget, yesterday the Republican majority voted to start debate on a budget resolution that would increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion—so much for the deficit hawks. It would slash Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion—so much for the many people who don't want to cut it, who promised not to cut it, including the President. It blows a huge hole in the deficit—as I said, deficit hawks. Finally, it favors the very wealthy.

My friend here was once head of the Club for Growth. I salute him. He

states his position. He believes tax cuts on the very wealthy and on big corporations will create jobs. We can have that debate. It is called trickle-down economics. But he is honest about it.

Some of the others—our Secretary of the Treasury, our advisers to the President, many in this Chamber—are saying this is a middle-class tax cut. When 80 percent of the benefits go to the top 1 percent, when we remove the estate tax, which doesn't apply to anyone whose estate is less than close to \$11 million, it is a tax cut for the wealthy. Some people believe that is a good way to exercise policy. The American people don't. But let's debate it that way.

Our Republican colleagues, just like on healthcare, are ashamed of this bill. They can't debate it on what they really believe, and so they put up these chimeras. They sort of make it up: Oh, no, we won't have a deficit; there will be huge growth. I think the Secretary of the Treasury said that it will decrease the deficit by a trillion dollars. That was laughable. Oh, it will go to the middle class, not the wealthy. When they lower the top rate, raise the bottom rate, get rid of the estate tax, and allow passthroughs which will mainly go to very wealthy individuals to reduce their tax rate to 15 percent—that is in the outline.

So today we begin the process of shining light on this awful proposal, of telling the truth. That is what the amendment process will be today.

Today we are going to vote on a Democratic amendment to strike the trillion dollars of cuts in Medicaid. If our colleagues don't want to cut Medicaid, they should vote for this. If our colleagues are OK with a trillion dollars of cuts in Medicaid, let them vote against the amendment, but believe me, the American people will know exactly how each Member of this Chamber feels when it comes to dramatically cutting Medicaid.

We will also propose an amendment to strike the cuts to Medicare. Now, in the healthcare bill, in one of the reiterations, we debated cutting Medicaid. We haven't debated cutting Medicare, but now we will. Some \$473 billion of cuts are in the exact budget our Republican colleagues wish us to vote for. And it will shine a light on what really is in this bill, not what is said.

How many of you on the Republican side have mentioned that this bill cuts Medicare and Medicaid, this budget proposal? Are you going to start mentioning it today, or are you going to try to hide it? Because it does. By the way, the idea that this doesn't count because it is just in a budget that we can ignore is belied by the fact that there is statutory pay-go—statutory, not rules—and it says that Medicare is cut 4 percent if there is a deficit in terms of tax cuts. OK? Are you going to cut Medicare 4 percent? We don't want to do that. We hope you don't. But this

budget would require that under the pay-go rules, and that is law.

So we are going to have amendments. Do you want to cut Medicaid or not? Yes or no. Do you want to cut Medicare or not? Yes or no. Do you want to vote for a \$1.5 trillion deficit or not? Yes or no. And do you want 80 percent of the tax cuts to go to the top 1 percent, to the very wealthy, while middle-class taxes are raised for many people? Yes or no.

Today begins the process of truth. Today begins the process that shines light on all of the misrepresentations by Secretary Mnuchin and Gary Cohn and by the President himself, who says he is just going to cut taxes on the middle class, not on the wealthy.

This process will be going on for a while. There is going to be a very bright light shining on our Republican colleagues in the House and Senate. It is going to take them a while to come up with a bill. It is not easy writing a massive tax bill. And all the while, while they are writing it—and certainly once it comes out—that bright line of truth will produce, in my judgment, the same result we had on healthcare. The more the American people see, the less they will like it.

A CBS poll on Sunday said that 58 percent of the American people believe that the Trump bill is tax cuts for the wealthy; only 19 percent believe it is for the middle class. That number is going to get worse, my colleagues, just as the healthcare thing got worse. The American people turned against you as we Democrats shined a bright light on what it really did.

You cannot govern from the hard right. As wealthy as they are, as much as they threaten you with primaries, it is not going to work. We still have a foundation of democracy. There is still a foundation of honor and truth. And when honor and truth and sunlight hit this bill, it will crumble.

Now, I say to some of my colleagues that we want to work with you on a good tax reform bill, one that is revenue neutral, one that doesn't favor the wealthy. We believe small businesses should get tax breaks. We believe money from overseas should come back and be used to create jobs. There are lots of things we can do on common ground without blowing a hole in the deficit, without cutting Medicare and Medicaid, without favoring the rich. Defeat this bill, we will work with you, just as we have on healthcare. We said: If you defeat that bill, we will try to come up with a bipartisan compromise, and we have—one that the President is flip-flopping on, zigzagging on, saying yes one day and no the next. But we have come up with a compromise, and the same thing can happen on taxes.

Today is a beginning turning point in the tax debate, the day that what is really in this Republican bill will come to light, and the American people, as they learn about it, will not like it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to say some words about our Budget resolution, which I hope we will be passing this week, and how important it is that we do, in fact, pass this. I want to clarify a few issues because the tax reform legislation continues to be a work in progress, and many elements have been mischaracterized, while others have been made up out of the clear blue sky.

Let me start with the budget resolution and start by thanking Chairman ENZI for the very hard work he has done and the very great work he has done in bringing together the Republican conference around a budget resolution that I think is very likely to pass.

Let's be candid about what this is about. The budget resolution is about giving us the tools to pass tax reform later this year. That is what this budget resolution is about. It is a misnomer, really, when you think about it. The most important substantive item in the budget resolution, by far, is the procedural tools it will give us to pass tax reform with a simple majority vote in the Senate, so that a minority of the body is not able to block tax reform by filibuster. That is what this is about. That is what we are endeavoring to accomplish here.

Why is it important? The main reason it is so important is because for so long we—our entire country—have been laboring with such feeble economic growth. For the last 60 years, prior to the Obama administration, annual economic growth in America was 3.4 percent. During the entire 8-year administration of President Obama, we never once had a single year where we reached even 3 percent. The Congressional Budget Office believes that we are now locked into the indefinite future of sub-2 percent economic growth, and that is what we just have to accept. We have to settle for the fact that we are no longer a booming economy. We are not capable of being a booming economy.

There are a lot of problems with this. I think it is completely unacceptable to believe that, somehow, because a calendar year turned on a page or because Obama was elected President some years ago, it is not possible for America to have the robust economic growth that used to be ordinary. It is not true that we are somehow consigned to feeble growth, and it matters if our economy is growing at 2 percent. It takes 36 years to double the standard of living for the average family. If we just managed to get the growth to 3 percent, and that is less than the historical average, then we can double our standard of living in just over 20 years.

It is a big difference in the standard of living of the people who I represent. That is what this is about.

If we get this budget resolution passed this week, the tax reform that many of us are working very hard on has two big goals, certainly for me. I have had many discussions with my colleagues on the Finance Committee and outside the Finance Committee, and I think these goals are widely shared.

The first is that it absolutely has to provide tax relief for hard-working Americans—middle income, lower income, people of modest means, many of whom live paycheck to paycheck. There has to be a direct tax benefit for those Pennsylvanians, those Arkansans, and those people all across America.

How are we going to do that? It is very clear. There is no question. There will be a reduction in the tax rates that are applied to income for hard-working Americans. There is going to be an increase in the standard deduction that they can take, which means a bigger chunk of their income that doesn't get taxed at all. That is absolutely going to be a feature of this tax reform. We are going to increase the child tax credit, so that people who have the cost of raising a family with kids are going to get a credit toward that cost.

The combined effect of these things are absolutely going to lower the tax rates for hard-working Americans, for lower income and middle-income families. If it didn't accomplish that, it wouldn't even get out of the Finance Committee, much less pass a vote on this floor. That is No. 1. There are still dials to be turned and rates to be set—exactly where the various brackets begin and end. These details are still a work in progress, but that goal is going to be achieved. That is item No. 1.

But the other item is really important too, and that is the process by which all of these very same families get an indirect pay raise. They get a pay raise. It will happen over time, and it will happen in different ways. That happens by creating incentives to maximize economic growth and to get away from this sub-2 percent, barely growing economy we have been tolerating and to get back to something closer to what is normal for America—an economy that is growing at least 3 percent.

What happens if we have stronger economic growth? I mentioned before that we increase the standard of living much more quickly. People get to see their kids have a better life and a better standard of living than they had. They can see that trend is going to continue. It happens because new businesses start to get launched again. It happens because existing businesses expand. Both new businesses and expanding businesses hire more workers.

When you hire more workers, especially at a time when most economists think we are at something close to what they consider full employment, it puts direct, immediate, and upward pressure on wages, which is what we have been waiting for.

So not only will a working family discover they owe less money to Uncle Sam, but they are very likely to quickly be in a position where they are getting a pay raise because their employer has to pay them more to keep them because we are going to create more demand for workers. How do we do that? One of the ways we are going to do that, I hope—and this is, again, a work in progress; it is underway—is that we ought to make our business tax regime, our big business Tax Code competitive. Anyone who looks at this honestly knows that our Tax Code is not competitive today. American workers and businesses lose out to competition from overseas because other countries have much more competitive tax codes. It is entirely possible, and I think you could make the case, that the American Tax Code is the worst in the world. It is that bad, and when it is that bad, that means our workers and our businesses are much less able to compete. So we are going to try to fix that. That means lowering the rate on income tax for our businesses to something that is comparable to what the rest of the world pays, rather than the extremely high outlier rate that we have today.

It also means that we ought to allow our businesses to expense capital when they put it to work. What does that mean? That means that when a company says we are going to buy a new piece of equipment, a new piece of machinery, a new vehicle, or a new backhoe—whatever it might be—you allow the company to recognize that expense when the expense occurs for tax purposes. That might just seems like common sense. Why wouldn't you do that? We don't do that today. For a large category of new equipment that businesses go out and purchase, even though they have to buy it in the year in which they put it into service and they have to come up with the cash, they don't get to reduce their income accordingly, except over many years. What that means is that it makes it effectively more expensive to buy that equipment. They have to pay tax on money they don't have. That means they buy less equipment.

What difference does this make? It makes a lot of difference. Again, there is a direct effect and an indirect effect. A direct effect is that by allowing businesses to fully expense the capital they put to work, we are going to encourage them to buy more items. That means more work, more production for the kind of machinery and equipment that these businesses are likely to buy. But it gets better than that because when

businesses deploy that capital—when they buy a new piece of equipment, a new piece of machinery, when they upgrade their software, or whatever they are doing with this capital expenditure—they are making their workforce more productive. They are making their employees able to produce more in a given hour in a given day, and when workers are more productive, that is when a business can afford to pay them more, and in fact, has to pay them more. That is where pay raises come from. They come from productivity growth. Productivity growth comes when capital gets put to work. We are going to encourage more of that, and that is going to result in higher wages and higher income for the people we all represent.

The third point I want to make about this tax reform is that it is very important that we fix a broken part of our code that deals with overseas subsidiaries of American firms and foreign firms that operate in the United States. That part of our Tax Code is a disaster. We have all read about the corporate inversions, for instance, where an American-based company seeks to be acquired by a foreign company for the sole purpose of lowering its tax burden. That happens. It happens because our Tax Code drives it.

We have all heard about the \$2 to \$3 trillion of profits that American companies have earned in overseas subsidiaries. They will not bring the money home because if they were to do so, they would have to pay another huge tax on top of what they already paid in the jurisdiction of whatever country their subsidiary operates in. Why would we tolerate a system like that? We have an opportunity to fix that. If we fix that, then huge sums of money will come flooding back into the United States. That is going to get invested here. That is going to mean more businesses, new expansion, and more hiring. That is going to be tremendously constructive for our economy, and, going forward, we will eliminate this perverse incentive to have multinational companies headquartered anywhere but in the United States, which is the case today.

In short, this is our opportunity to begin to achieve the growth we have been waiting for. Ever since the great recession, we have not had the kind of economic growth that used to be normal for America. A completely archaic, terribly unfair, ridiculously complicated Tax Code is part of the reason why.

You might ask: How did we used to have such strong growth with this Tax Code? The fact is that most of the rest of the world has been about the business of improving their tax code while we have not. This is our moment and our opportunity to begin to catch up. We can do it in a big way, as long as we pass this budget and give ourselves the tools to do so.

This budget resolution creates the opportunity to do tax reform. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have criticized the fact that we are setting up a process and using the budget resolution so that the subsequent tax reform can be passed with a simple majority vote in the Senate. They have criticized that. They suggested, in varying degrees, that somehow that leaves them out of the process. Let me be very clear. That is categorically untrue. As to the tax reform bill, we are working on the ideas for this now, and when we actually get to drafting the specifics, it is going to happen in the Finance Committee in the Senate. It is going to happen in the Ways and Means Committee in the House. It is going to be public. The documents are going to be disclosed before the markups begin, and it is going to be open to amendments.

My Democratic colleagues on the Finance Committee are going to be able to offer whatever amendments they like. They can work with us on shaping this, and I hope they will join us in voting for it. It is much better if we could end up passing this with a big bipartisan vote. A tax bill that absolutely does lower the direct tax burden on lower income and middle-income families and encourages more economic growth ought to be something that could be broadly supported. They will have every opportunity to weigh in. They will have every opportunity to amend it. There is nothing about this procedure that in any way excludes Democratic participation.

What it does do, though, is that it says that we will not be held hostage by a minority that wishes to thwart this. If we can persuade at least 50 Senators and a Vice President who is so inclined in the Chair, we will have the ability to pass tax reform. I think it would be malpractice for us not to create the opportunity to do tax reform with a simple majority since we have that vehicle available to us. I believe we are going to pass it today.

Another point I would like to address is the discussion that somehow we are going to blow a hole in the deficit with this. It couldn't be further from the truth, in my view. The budget resolution allows the Finance Committee to report back a tax reform package that will, by a very particular and very precisely defined process, be deemed to forego \$1.5 trillion in Federal revenue over the next 10 years. But when you start to unpack that, you realize that, in all likelihood, if we do this tax reform right, we are going to reduce the size of the deficit over this 10-year period. We are not going to increase it.

Why do I say that? First of all, the \$1.5 trillion in foregone revenue contemplated by the budget resolution is very misleading because it pretends that the current policy we have of a number of temporary tax relief meas-

ures is going to go away. It pretends we are not going to continue those or extend them. In all likelihood, Congress routinely extends them. They will probably be extended. That is worth about \$500 billion of that \$1.5 trillion. What we are really talking about is \$1 trillion of less revenue over the next 10 years. You have to keep in mind, that is on a base of about \$43 trillion. It is something on the order of recalling 2.5 percent of projected Federal revenue.

I think the question to ask is, How much extra economic growth will it take to fully offset \$1 trillion worth of forgone revenue? Well, that math is pretty easy because the joint tax plan and the Congressional Budget Office have quantified this many times. The answer is something like approximately four-tenths of 1 percent. Four-tenths of 1 percent of extra economic growth, in response to the tremendously pro-growth incentives that we want to put into this Tax Code, will fully offset that.

The Congressional Budget Office is projecting, on average, for the next 10 years, our economy is going to continue at this feeble 1.9 percent—1.9 percent is their number. If getting these reforms right, if lowering the tax burden on working families, if allowing business to expand, making our international and business Tax Codes competitive, if we do that right, I have absolutely no doubt we can generate much more than an additional four-tenths of 1 percent of growth.

When we get the specifics, we will have an opportunity and we will have many analyses that we will be able to look at to address this question of just how much economic growth we will have. In my view, it is extremely likely that we will significantly surpass this very modest hurdle of four-tenths of 1 percent of growth.

Finally, the minority leader made reference to this being a big tax cut for the wealthy. I will remind my colleagues, we can have differences of opinions. We can have a debate here, and we will, but let's remember, this tax reform bill is not written yet.

The two big goals I mentioned I think are universally shared on our side of the aisle, tax relief for middle-income working families and pro-growth policies. We haven't written the details yet. We haven't established exactly what the brackets will be, exactly what the rates will be, where they will kick in, how the passthrough rates apply. There are a lot of important details that are going to be worked out in committee, which is exactly what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle insisted we should be doing, and that is what we should be doing. It also means, since that product is not yet finished, it is not possible for anyone to pull out a number and say X percent of this bill is going to go to this category of people. That is

not knowable because the bill is not finished yet.

I am thrilled about this opportunity that we are going to create this week to pass the tax reform later this year that will allow us to achieve the growth we have been waiting for, and that means allowing my constituents, Pennsylvanians, and people all across America to achieve the standard of living they deserve, that they are working hard to achieve, and that they will be able to enjoy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and as always he was articulate and thoughtful and made a strong case.

I would like to speak to the issue we are going to be addressing over the next few days, the next few weeks, and probably the next few months, not necessarily to be unalterably opposed but to talk about how we can get where we all want to be, which is lower taxes, higher growth, and a stronger U.S. economy.

I think it is important to emphasize at the beginning, just so we all know, what we are talking about the next couple days isn't the budget. As the Senator from Pennsylvania noted, it is really a vehicle for a massive tax cut.

My problem with the tax cut is not necessarily that we are going to have one, but the question is, How is it structured? Who gets the benefits? How to pay for it?

As the Senator pointed out, we still don't know what the plan is. We have an outline; we have principles; we have bullet points; we have lists, but we don't have a plan. Therefore, it is difficult to analyze.

We do have some particulars that have been released. You don't need to be an economist to understand that if the rate for the lowest taxpayers is being increased and the rate for the highest taxpayers is being decreased, that the overall effect will be loaded toward those at the upper income level.

The only analysis we have from the tax policy foundation, an outside non-partisan group, is that under the plan, as it has been described by the White House and by Members of Congress, about 80 percent of the benefits of this proposal go to the top 1 percent of wage earners in this country. Eighty percent of the benefits go to the top 1 percent.

It may be that as the details of the plan are more well known and more thoroughly described, we will find it is slightly different than that. One of the things that really bothers me about this budget resolution we are going to be voting on is, it explicitly waives a longtime budget rule that before you can vote on issues such as this, there must be a Congressional Budget Office

score 28 hours prior to the vote. It waives that provision. That is not a good sign. That doesn't reassure me that we are going to have a clear idea of what we are voting on.

When you combine the cuts proposed to Medicare and Medicaid, which go into paying for these massive tax cuts, it looks to me like the biggest losers in this whole process will be seniors.

When you look at what we know about the structure of the tax cuts and the fact that there is a one-half trillion-dollar cut in Medicare projected over 10 years and a \$1.5 trillion cut in Medicaid, seniors are going to take the most serious hit. Why do I say that? Well, we all know Medicare specifically applies to seniors, so that is pretty easy. If you are cutting Medicare, you are hitting seniors.

Secondly, though, what a lot of people don't realize about Medicaid is that 70 percent of the nursing home beds in America are paid for by Medicaid. By definition, who is in those beds? Seniors. When you cut Medicare and Medicaid, you are going to be impacting seniors.

The provisions of the tax plan, as we know it—and I keep emphasizing “as we know it” because we are voting on something today to clear the path for a major tax cut, and we don't know what it is, but it appears it will impact seniors disproportionately.

I want to touch on a couple of other points. One is the argument that the cuts to Medicaid and Medicare aren't really cuts; they are just reductions in growth. Well, that argument applies if you are talking about the NASA budget, for example. If the NASA budget is projected to grow 5 percent a year, and we cut it to 4 percent a year, that is a reduction in growth; that we are going to do one less trip into space or whatever the policy outcome of that cut is.

Medicare and Medicaid are different, however. They have to pay costs in the real world as they come up when necessary. The increased growth that is projected in those two programs is based upon two unalterable facts. One is demographics.

We are getting older, and that means more work, more demands on the medical system. It also is based on medical inflation, which everyone knows in recent years has proven to be higher than the ordinary rate of inflation. This is the best projection we have, but if you project that the current level of medical costs today, 8 years from now or 10 years from now are going to cost what they cost today, plus medical inflation, plus the impact of demographics, people getting older, that is a real cost. If you cut that, fewer people are going to get services. Rural hospitals will close. There will be undeniable impacts on both the economy of our rural regions of the country and real people.

This argument that cuts to Medicare and Medicaid are just a cut in growth—

it is not really a cut—is just not true. That may be true in some areas, but it is not true here because these are real costs that are going to be incurred. If the costs go up and fewer dollars are there to meet them, somebody is going to get hurt. These are real cuts to real people.

The other thing I want to touch on is the deficit and debt. I have to say, I am sort of puzzled by this whole process because as I have been here over the past 5 years and as I have lived my life over the past 25 years, the majority party in the Senate has been focused on the debt and on the deficit and the dangers of the debt to our country, to our economy, and how bad it was that we were mortgaging our children's future, and all of a sudden it is no big deal. All of a sudden it is OK to knowingly, consciously, deliberately talk about a \$1.5 trillion increase in the debt over the next 10 years. That assumes, by the way, that the cuts to Medicare and Medicaid take place and that other cuts that are in the budget, exemptions and deductions, take place. It could be that the effect on the debt and the deficit will be much greater.

I remember 2 or 3 years ago, when we were in a recession and people were trying to get jobs and we had millions of people unemployed, there was a motion to extend unemployment benefits for 6 months. I can't remember the cost. I think it was \$5 or \$6 billion. Oh, no, point of order. We can't do that. It will increase the deficit. We are talking about \$1.5 trillion that we know of, but that is OK. That is OK.

I think we need to understand this. What this really is, if we pass unfunded tax cuts, they aren't really tax cuts. They are simply a deferral of the tax from us to our kids. We don't have to pay the tax, but the money to be spent is still going to be spent, so the hole gets deeper. We borrow that money, and our kids and our grandchildren are going to have to pay it back with interest. That is called shift and shaft. That is not a tax cut. We are just shifting the tax and shafting our kids. It is as if on your deathbed you call your children over and say: I have some final words for you. The kid leans over, and you say: Here is my credit card bill. I had a wonderful trip to Acapulco. I hope you don't mind paying for it. That is what we are doing. We are indulging ourselves and stealing from the next generation because we are not willing to pay the costs of the programs we all support and think are important.

I think there is another fact that needs to be realized. As we build up this deficit and debt, eventually the bill is going to come due, and because we have used up all of our resources, the only place to go to cut them is going to be Social Security and Medicare because the discretionary budget is essentially going to be all gone.

It is really simple to make the interest rate calculation. We now owe \$20 trillion. Seventy-seven percent of our annual GDP we owe. The interest rate calculation is simple: 1 percent, \$200 billion a year.

I think it is more a question of when than if. When interest rates return to a more normal level of 5 percent, that is \$1 trillion a year in interest, just interest. That happens to be very close to the entire discretionary budget of the U.S. Government—\$1.1 trillion—this year, defense and nondefense. We will be paying almost as much in interest as the entire discretionary budget. How are we going to manage that situation? The only way it can be managed is to start talking about Social Security and Medicare.

So this is a long-distance, slow-motion diminution of the value of those programs that are so important to so many Americans, particularly senior Americans.

The final point I wish to touch on relates to the Senator from Pennsylvania basically predicting: Don't worry, these tax cuts will pay for themselves. I have been hearing that all my adult life; I have never seen it work. It didn't work in the middle of the last decade during the Bush tax cuts. All those tax cuts were going to pay for themselves: Don't worry, the stimulus of economic growth will be such that there will be more income, more revenues, and we will, in fact, as the Senator said, reduce the deficit.

The problem is there is no evidence that it has ever worked in the history of mankind. The best economic research I have seen says that maybe the economic growth will offset about 20 percent of the cost of the tax cuts, but 80 percent is going to go straight to the debt. So to make the assumption that somehow this is all going to pay for itself, I believe, is irresponsible.

I have a modest suggestion for those who are making that argument. Will my colleagues accept a friendly amendment which says that if the growth does not occur, then the taxes—or certain taxes—are automatically retriggered in order to fill the gap? If my colleagues are right, that will never need to happen, but if you are not right, that will protect our kids. I think that is a reasonable solution. I don't think it is going to happen. Why? Because it hasn't happened. It hasn't happened in Kansas. It hasn't happened here. I have never seen it happen.

I have looked at the economic research and, as near as I can tell, there is no data that indicates an automatic correlation between tax cuts and economic growth. I suspect there are tax cuts that can stimulate economic growth; it depends on where they are and what they are. But there is no evidence that is the case regarding tax cuts in general.

So those of our membership who believe this rosy scenario—the temptress,

rosy scenario—is going to occur, fine. But if it doesn't, let's put language in the whole tax program which says that insofar as the growth does not occur as projected, the deficit will be maintained at no worse than current levels by automatically triggering tax increases to fill the gap. Then we are being honest. Then we are being honest to the next generation.

I believe there are important areas where tax cuts are necessary in order to make us more competitive, in order to help to grow our economy. However, I don't think what I have heard so far is the answer, and there are many problems with what has been described. I am willing to hold my fire and see what the Finance Committee comes up with and see whether, as the Senator from Pennsylvania said, it will be an open and bipartisan process, with amendments. If that is the case, we, I think, could come up with, on a bipartisan basis, a reasonable tax change—tax cuts, tax reform—that will strengthen our economy without adding to the deficit and without requiring massive cuts to programs such as Medicaid and Medicare that are so important to millions of Americans. It can be done right.

In 1986, it was done right. That was true tax reform. That was the last time we did tax reform. And I think it is very interesting that over the last several months, the language that describes what we are about to do has migrated from “tax reform” to “tax cuts.” Tax reform means you change the Tax Code, get rid of the inefficiencies, simplify it, take away some exemptions and deductions, lower rates, but we end up revenue neutral and we have a stronger economic base from which to proceed. Tax cuts simply add to the deficit or are based upon unrealistic and, indeed, cruel cuts to people in the future.

I think we have an opportunity to do this right. I think there is more consensus here than perhaps people realize on the question of doing tax reform in a way that will benefit the entire country. I don't think the Members on this side of the aisle are categorically opposed to tax cuts under any circumstances.

When I was the Governor of Maine, we cut taxes—I can't remember, 10 or 15 times—overall by about 15 percent. We cut the income tax. We cut the sales tax. We cut the property tax. So it can be done. That was done on a bipartisan basis with a legislature that went back and forth between Republican and Democratic control. They had this sort of strange Independent Governor, but we made it work. It can be done, and it can be done on a bipartisan basis.

It certainly looks as though this is about to be railroaded. It is about to be shoved down our throats without adequate analysis and without fully under-

standing it. I deeply hope that is not the case. I hope we learned something from healthcare, that we can do good things when we work together. When we don't, it rarely ends well.

So I understand that the votes are probably there to pass this budget, but the real question will come: What happens next? What does the plan look like? How responsible is it? What kind of assumptions is it based on? What kind of analysis do the Joint Taxation Committee and the Congressional Budget Office provide us on a non-partisan basis as to what it will really do? Then we can have a real debate. Then we can talk about what is best for America. I think, between the group of us who work here and down the hall, we can find a good solution. But if the solution is thrust upon us, if it is ill-conceived, if it is skewed toward the wealthy, if it balances the budget on the backs of seniors, on Medicare, and Medicaid recipients, if it is based upon unrealistic assumptions about growth, then we are going to harm our country, not help it.

Eventually, if we keep going down the road we are traveling in terms of the national debt, the piper will have to be paid. It may not have to be paid by our generation, but it is going to have to be paid by these young people and by their peers all across America. I don't think that is right. That is not the legacy I came here to leave to my children and grandchildren.

Thank you, Mr. President. I look forward to working with my colleagues to find a path forward that is responsible and responsive to the needs of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Mississippi.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I will be brief, but I want to point out a matter of real concern, and it should be a matter of concern to all Americans.

When new Presidents are elected, they have always been given the opportunity to put their team in place in short order. Regrettably, this has not been allowed to happen for this new President in this Congress. Here are the facts.

Now 9 months in office, President Trump has had only 182 of his nominees confirmed. That is an unacceptable, unprecedented 39 percent. It is a grossly low statistic by historical standards.

At this point in President Obama's administration, 65 percent of his nominees had been confirmed. At this point in George W. Bush's administration, 53 percent had been confirmed. Under Bill Clinton, 76 percent had been confirmed. And under President George H.W. Bush, 70 percent had been confirmed. Yet, because of delaying tactics by our colleagues across the aisle, this President, who needs a team in place, as does every President, has only 39 percent of his nominees in office.

This has been done through an abuse of the process by our friends across the aisle—a distortion of the rules requiring cloture on noncontroversial nominees, requiring well-qualified nominees to be subjected to a 30-hour debating period for a motion to proceed and another 30-hour debating period, typically where there is only silence on the floor of the Senate, for the actual confirmation.

This is inconvenient to the administration, but it is injurious to the American people. With more than 1,000 executive positions needing confirmation, we need these people in place. The American people need these people in place. These vacancies need to be filled to work for the American people, to provide hurricane relief, for instance. There are people who would have been part of the administration working on that, had we not had these delaying tactics. People in critical national security positions, people who are fighting against ISIS, are waiting for confirmation, and people who would be a key part of the counterterrorism efforts have been waiting for months to get to work.

We had a spate of this in July, and I was one of several Senators who called on the leadership to just keep us in session in August to take care of some of these nominations. We demonstrated, by the action of the majority leader, that by canceling part of the August break, we could break logjams. As of the end of July, we had confirmed only 56 Trump nominees. By keeping us in session for one extra week and shortening our work period back home, we confirmed 76 nominees in one week, as opposed to 56 the previous 6 months of this year. We can do that again.

I would simply say to the Presiding Officer and to my colleagues on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle: I am among those calling on the majority leader to once again adopt an aggressive schedule that includes working all night, that includes working weekends, that includes canceling some breaks. We need, once again, to break this logjam.

The American people spoke in November and, through our democratic process, they elected Donald Trump as President of the United States. He deserves the same consideration from minority Members of the current Senate that previous Presidents, Democrat and Republican, got from minority Members of the Senate.

Let's free the process up. Let's eliminate the distortion of the rules. Let's have a more aggressive schedule, and let's once again break this logjam.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, our Nation was founded on a principle encapsulated in the first three and most important words of our Constitution:

"We the People." Our Founders wanted to have a nation that didn't work for the benefit of the powerful and the privileged, but for decisions of the people, by the people, and for the people, as President Lincoln so eloquently described our Nation. He did not describe a nation by and for the powerful, not a nation by and for the privileged, but by and for the people.

Tomorrow, a bill is coming to the floor that couldn't be more of a "by and for the powerful" bill than we have seen on the floor of the Senate before. It is a bill completely contrary to the fundamental values embedded in our Constitution.

This bill is a budget bill, and at its heart, it says: We are going to do \$5 trillion of tax cuts almost completely for the richest Americans, and we are going to do so by gutting programs that make America work for working Americans.

The President said: When it comes to tax reform, I want to help the middle class; I am not going to do anything for the rich and powerful.

Then why, I ask you, is this bill coming to the floor of the Senate completely for the rich and powerful?

President Trump, come before the American people and explain how you can make a promise that you are going to do tax reform for the middle class and then put a bill on the floor of the Senate that is all about benefits—raiding the National Treasury—for the rich and powerful. How do you explain this complete opposite?

What a complete pretense we have, to say this bill is about helping American workers when it is all about the rich and powerful.

The Republican budget plan not only has \$5-plus trillion, virtually all in tax giveaways, a raid on the National Treasury for the rich and powerful, but it proceeds to cut healthcare for older Americans, a cut of \$1 trillion in Medicaid for working Americans. There will be a lot of damage done to ordinary Americans who just want peace of mind that when their loved one gets sick, when their loved one gets injured, they will get the care they need. Is peace of mind too much to ask of our national healthcare system? Are my colleagues so callous, so out of touch, so cruel that they want to fund tax cuts for the richest Americans by destroying healthcare and diminishing healthcare for our seniors?

It is not just our seniors, it is our citizens on Medicaid. In Oregon, it is the Oregon Health Plan. It serves the poorest among us, many of them working part-time jobs that have no healthcare plan, many of them working shifts that are determined at the last second. Some of the most stressful jobs in America are at the very bottom, some of the most stressful work schedules are at the very bottom, and we are going to cut not just \$1 trillion from

Medicaid but half a trillion from Medicare. Wow.

Let's look at the other programs that would be devastated by this Republican budget in order to fund that \$5 trillion in tax cuts, almost all for the wealthiest Americans.

The Senate Budget Committee Democratic staff said that if those cuts in the Republican budget are extended evenly, distributed reductions, it would have the following impact: It would eliminate housing assistance for more than 1 million families. It would eliminate heating assistance for nearly 700,000 seniors on fixed incomes. It would eliminate nutrition assistance by more than \$100 billion—a 33-percent cut. In other words, to translate that, there would be a lot more hunger in an already hungry America. It would slash Pell grant funding by more than \$100 million, eliminate Head Start services for 25,000 children in an average year, cut mandatory transportation funding by \$200 billion, cut funding for the National Institutes of Health by \$37 billion—all to give a massive tax giveaway to the richest Americans.

If the President is proceeding to say that this is a plan for the middle class, then we would expect virtually all the benefit to go to the middle class, but what do we actually have? Four out of five dollars of benefits go to the top 1 percent, and 40 percent of that goes to the top one-tenth of 1 percent. Why should there be one single penny going to the very richest Americans in a nation in which we should be striving for a foundation for every family to thrive?

We know that to thrive, our children have to have food to eat, we need to have healthcare programs that create peace of mind, and we need to make sure our seniors have a strong foundation in their retirement, but instead we see all those programs—including the opportunity for college and Pell grants—being raided for this massive giveaway to the top 1 percent.

President Trump, come before the American people and explain how it is possible that you can claim you are doing a plan for middle-class America, and you are sending virtually the entire benefit to the top 1 percent of Americans.

This budget resolution's associated tax plan is one of the most egregious examples of rigging the system of America for the powerful and privileged rather than a government of, by, and for the people.

I am here today to stand up and say: Not one penny to the top 1 percent. If you want a fair plan for America, it would be not one penny to the top 1 percent. If you want a plan that strengthens the middle class, there would be not one penny to the top 1 percent. Not one penny for billionaires while we gut Medicare and Medicaid. Not one penny for billionaires when

middle-class families' taxes will go up under this plan. Not one penny for our billionaires while we destroy programs, safety nets, and opportunities for education, from Head Start to Pell grants to attend college.

We could do a great deal of good to invest in America. We could invest in transportation. We have an incredible number of bridges and roads that need repairs. We can put an incredible number of people to work building middle-class jobs and middle-class incomes through building infrastructure instead of a giveaway of the National Treasury to the top 1 percent. By investing more than \$1 trillion, we can create millions of good-paying American jobs.

There are more than 56,000 bridges in America. One out of eleven is structurally deficient. Engineers estimate that we could easily spend \$123 billion on repairing bridges and \$420 billion modernizing highways and that we would get a return back to our economy, with lower vehicle maintenance, decreased delays, lower fuel consumption, improved safety, lower long-term maintenance costs, lower emissions—all benefits of investing in transportation, in addition to the fact that it will strengthen our economy.

We can think about the investment we need to make in our water infrastructure, the water supply systems and certainly wastewater treatment—a problem in virtually every town across America. What about all those lead pipes that need to be replaced? Two thousand years ago, the Romans were poisoned by their own water because they lined their aqueducts with lead, and here we are, 20 centuries later, poisoning our citizens with lead pipes. Why aren't we spending money to take care of that problem? It is not just a problem in Flint; it is a problem in hundreds of cities across this country.

If we want America to thrive, why not invest in rural broadband? Why not create high-speed broadband in every rural town and village across this Nation, which would strengthen that economy, which would give people the ability to build their businesses in smalltown, rural America, instead of spending trillions of dollars in tax giveaways to the very richest Americans?

How about an investment in our students—not decreasing Pell grants but strengthening Pell grants to make it possible for more people to attend college without ending up with a debt the size of a home mortgage? It is a real possibility to create debt-free college in our public universities. Why don't we do that? That will strengthen the foundation for every family to thrive.

Good jobs, good education, good infrastructure, not a theft from the American Treasury of \$4 trillion to \$5 trillion for the very richest Americans—that is what is being proposed here. Has there ever been a train robbery as audacious as this theft of the

National Treasury for the richest Americans? Has there ever been a bank robbery as audacious and outrageous as this theft of the American Treasury for the richest 1 percent of Americans?

Here on the floor, we should be wrestling with how to create a foundation for every family in America to thrive, not considering a bill that wipes out healthcare, wipes out Pell grants, does damage to every conceivable thing that would make this Nation stronger in order to give the billionaires more zeroes in their bank accounts.

This bill is destructive, it is shameful, and it is contrary to the very principle of our Constitution of government of, by, and for the people. This bill is government of, by, and for the 1 percent. It must not stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am very happy the Senate is engaged in this debate on tax policy. It actually is long overdue. It has been some 30-odd years since this country has undertaken a massive reform of our Tax Code.

It is interesting. If we go back and think what life was like back in 1986, it was just a different planet, a different world, different economics. So, at a minimum, our code needs to be modernized. Everybody who has run for office—certainly every candidate for President from both parties for over two decades now—has run on the promise of tax reform and the need for it. So this is a very important debate.

What we are debating now on the budget, so people who are watching at home understand—you and I at home think of a family budget as a plan on what you are going to spend money on, and that is what the Federal budget is. It is kind of an outline, a framework of how and the parameters under which the government would spend its money. Then you have to actually go out and spend it through a separate process called appropriations. So this budget creates a framework for how we are going to spend money in the year to come, and then it is going to be used as a vehicle to pass tax reform, which is obviously the way and the system under which we generate revenue for the government to pay for the things we need to pay for. That is the first debate. But obviously the debate on the budget has led us to this debate on tax reform, because that is the primary purpose this year it is being used as a vehicle for.

Why does that matter? There are a lot of speeches going on already about tax reform and how bad the bill is and how this is a giveaway for this group of people or that group of people. That is hard to do since there is still not a bill, and the reason there is not a bill is that it is going to be worked through the normal process of the Senate.

That was the criticism, for example, from my friends on the other side and

many outside of this building in the press. The criticism was, you put together a healthcare plan, and you didn't even go through committee, no one had any input, and there were no public hearings. That is what they are going to do with tax reform, and that is what is going to produce a bill.

The only thing that has been put out is called a framework, and the framework basically says: These are some of the ideas we have. This is our starting point that we want to operate from. But we are going to go through the committee process, there are going to be votes, there is going to be an opportunity to weigh in and make differences, and from that, we intend to produce a tax bill.

So they can criticize the framework, I suppose, but to basically go out and start trying to convince people that there is a tax bill that will do this versus that when it is just not true and when you have a seat here in the Senate and potentially on the committee where you can actually weigh in about the specifics of what is going to be in the bill and what is not, I think it is unfair and disingenuous. In any event, that is kind of the way things go nowadays. So I look forward to that debate.

The second thing that has been an interesting development is hearing people talk about how horrible this is going to be, that this is going to add to the debt, and then all of a sudden a bunch of people who have never had any problem spending as much money as they possibly could out of the Federal Treasury are suddenly becoming deficit hawks.

Here is what is so interesting. If we were to turn around and say: Forget about tax reform. We are going to take \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years and we are going to use it for debt spending. We are going to borrow \$1.5 trillion and use it to fund all these things the government is going to do—for example, one of our colleagues here has offered a plan to provide healthcare for everyone in America, paid for by the Federal Government. That would cost tens of trillions of dollars. Over a dozen Members of the Senate have signed on to it as a plan. There is no plan to pay for it. It is not \$1.5 trillion over 10 years; it is like tens of trillions of dollars over the next number of years. So there is a lot of concern there. It kind of boils down to we are prepared to borrow money and spend it so long as the government gets to spend it, but if this is money we are going to take and give to you to spend, then that is a real problem, and that is irresponsible. That is the framework.

The second point I would make on the debt is, I believe the debt is a significant threat to the future of the United States. The problem is, we can't tax our way out of it, and we can't simply grow our way out of it. We have to

do a combination of things. The first is, we have to grow our economy. The second thing we have to do is bring some constraint to future spending—not slash Medicare, not get rid of Social Security.

My mother is on Social Security and Medicare. This may surprise many people watching, but there are a significant number of people in my home State of Florida on Social Security and on Medicare. As I said, my mother is one of them. I am an enormous supporter of these programs. I also look at those programs and I look at the number of people going into them and how long they are going to live, and the math tells you these programs are going to have some big problems in the years to come, which threatens not just to take them down but threatens to trigger a debt crisis in America.

We have to deal with the spending side and create a more disciplined way of spending in the future years to bring some certainty, but we also have to grow the economy. In essence, if you take a stagnant economy, no cuts in the world are going to get you there. You can't simply cut your way there, and you can't simply tax your way there. The only solution to our debt problem—and it happens to be good for America all around—is the combination of discipline in future spending combined with rapid, robust, and sustained economic growth.

As much as anything else, this effort of tax reform is, among other things, an effort to generate sustained economic growth and to do so in a unique period in the history of the world. This is not 1986. Our economy is not the only show in town anymore. There are now dozens of developed economies around the world that are following our example from the eighties—reduce taxes, reduce regulations, and, frankly, make investments in infrastructure and the like—and today they are no longer recipients of our aid. They are no longer nations looking to work with the United States to get a little bit closer to the way we are. They are full-blown competitors in the global economy.

Every 4 years—every 2 years, actually, once in the winter and the next 2 years in the summer, we send our best athletes in different events to the Olympics to compete. In our economy, it is the Olympics every single day. What makes it even more complicated is, sometimes our team isn't just made up of Americans. Our team is partnered with the Japanese team to create a company or the Mexican team to create a manufacturing chain. So that complicates it further.

The fundamental thing to understand is, America today is in a competition—by the way, a competition that doesn't have to be one where they lose and we win or we lose and they win but a competition nonetheless. Every day, businesses, investors, people with ideas are

making a decision: Where do I want to do this activity? Where do I want to create this new job? Where do I want to create this new company? Where do I want to innovate this new idea? Where do I want to hire people to do all of this? Do I want to do it in America or do I want to do it somewhere else?

We are not performing well in that competition. It is not just because of taxes. We have infrastructure problems that we have to confront. We have a higher education system that is not built for the 21st century. We are not teaching people, in sufficient numbers, the skills they need for some of the best jobs in the world. I have no problem with a 4-year degree from a liberal arts college. That should always be an option on the menu. We need a lot of plumbers, pipefitters, electricians, and welders. These are important jobs as well. In fact, oftentimes, they pay a lot more than a 4-year degree in political science will ever pay you. We need to do a better job of training those people in those fields as well.

We need to have an immigration system that is pro-American but a pro-American economy that allows us to compete for the best talent in the world. If you think about it, I don't see anybody complaining that their team just signed a guy who can throw 98-mile-an-hour fastballs, but he is from the Dominican Republic. If in sports we go out and find the best people, we should be able to do that in our economy as well. You can do that without hurting the American worker.

We also have to have a tax code that is competitive. It cannot be substantially more complicated and expensive to start a business or operate one in America than it is somewhere else because if we do that, we will lose. That, as much as anything else in this global economy, is hurting the American people.

You talk about putting America first. I think it is about allowing America to compete. I am not asking for an unfair advantage over other countries. We are just asking for a fair chance to compete because I believe the American people who have been given the chance to compete can outthink, outinnovate, and outwork anybody in the world, and our Tax Code is a key part of it.

The goal here is, when you hear a lot of this talk about businesses getting this or that deduction, we want to make America an attractive place to invest. We don't want people taking that money and investing all of it in another country. We want them to invest it here, invest it here to allow a company to grow and hire more people. We want companies to decide that this is the place where we want to hire. This is the place where we want to innovate. We have to have a tax code that reflects that.

We have to understand that the vast majority of American businesses don't

pay taxes the way the big companies do. They pay the small businesses through passthroughs. A lot of them—you know them because I know them—are not sophisticated operations. They are successful, but they don't have an army of lawyers to deal with a complicated tax code and accountants who know every trick in the book. To them, the Tax Code hurts them, especially since they are paying on their personal rates.

That is why the personal side is related to the business side. These are things we need to deal with so we can be competitive, so we can have more taxpayers—not more taxes, more taxpayers. More people making more money not just improves their quality of life, it generates more revenue to pay for the bridges, the roads, and the national security of the United States of America. So tax reform, as much as anything else, is the growth side of this endeavor, and it is not the only thing we need to do, but it is an important thing we need to do if we are going to let America compete and win in the 21st century global economy.

There is another dynamic of the 21st century that is different from 1986. From that, I rely heavily on my own personal experience, not just today but growing up. In 1986, I was in ninth grade. My mom worked at Kmart, and my father was a bartender in Miami. We owned a home. We didn't have everything we wanted, but we had everything we needed. They were able to sustain a family and allow us to go to school—public school—go on to college and do those sorts of things on the salary of a bartender and a stock clerk at Kmart.

I don't need to tell anybody here that there isn't a community in the country at this point, in the 21st century, where my parents could achieve the standard of living they had in 1986, for two reasons: everything costs more, and those jobs either don't exist anymore or have not kept pace with the cost of living.

Since the year 2000, up until today, my wife Jeanette and I have been raising four children in the 21st century. I enter it by telling you that while we certainly have been blessed to have more resources available to us than the vast majority of people who will be impacted by what we are about to do here, we certainly have enough people in our lives and certainly have had periods in our lives where we understand some of the challenges facing people today. Here is the bottom line. Raising children in the 21st century is more expensive than raising children at any point in the history of this country. The reason is, there are more things to pay for. I know people may tell you that Wi-Fi and access to the internet is a luxury. I am sorry, you can't do homework in the 21st century with your kids if you don't have access to the internet, and that costs money.

Not only do you have to have access to the internet, you have to have access to it on a mobile device. Those mobile devices cost money. Those data plans cost money. If you are paying for a data plan, you know how much they cost. It is not just about watching movies on Netflix or talking to your friends on Snapchat, you literally cannot do homework in many of the schools in the country in the 21st century unless you have access to it. That is why I personally have witnessed people at McDonald's at 6:30 in the evening because they have free Wi-Fi, and the single mom or single dad is there helping their kids with homework.

The cost of everything keeps going up, the cost of clothing, of food, of everything. You look at our Tax Code, and it has not kept pace with it. Let me give you an example. Accounting for inflation, from 1960 to 2015, which is when the latest numbers were available, the average cost per child of raising that child, in a middle-income family, went up by over \$11,000. It is over \$11,000 more expensive, accounting for inflation.

Here is a stunning figure. Again, this is different in different communities, but, by and large, for middle-income families—and by that we mean a firefighter and a teacher who are raising a child—they are going to spend approximately \$230,000 to raise that child in the 21st century from 0 to 18. By the way, my oldest is now 17½. I have been told by plenty of my colleagues that it doesn't end at 18. In many cases, it begins to accelerate in some form or fashion—but, nevertheless, \$230,000.

Let me tell you something else. That does not even include college. That doesn't even include going to college, which is another thing we are going through right now, which, by the way, is completely and totally out of control in terms of what they are charging. It is more than that. There are people out there spending \$10 or \$15,000 on SAT prep courses. For the life of me, I don't understand how these schools can expect someone who comes from a single-parent home in a poor neighborhood to keep pace with people who are having these sorts of resources available to them, but that is another topic for another day. That is a cost that is involved in all of this.

How about childcare? In 38 out of 50 States, childcare is more expensive than college. Think about it. Let's say you take home \$900 a week, and childcare is \$250 or \$350 a week. That is one-third of your paycheck just for childcare. These expenses are reducing the ability of families to afford to have children and to raise them. These costs keep going up.

One of the things we have offered as a partial solution—it is not going to solve every problem—is to increase the child tax credit and to do so in a way that actually helps people. What it

would do is it would reduce families' tax bills on a per-child basis, increasing the flexibility that family has at a time, for example, when childcare costs have risen more than ever before and are already higher than they have ever been. We have to understand, the family is the most important unit in all of society. It is the most important institution in society. It is the first government. It is the first school. It is the core institution that underlies everything else we do as a nation. There is no more important job than any of us will ever do than the job of a parent.

If you think about our Tax Code, it says: If you invest money in a piece of equipment or a business, the Tax Code will help you with that, but if you invest it in the future of an American taxpayer, if you invest it in someone whom we are going to need to build the sort of economy and future we want for our Nation, the Tax Code does not really take it into account. That makes no sense to me.

I have two charts to outline how important this tax credit is to tax reform. Again, I am operating off the framework because there is no bill out yet, but based on the framework, the amount of tax relief a working- or middle-class family will get almost entirely depends—almost entirely—on what we do with a child tax credit.

Here is the first chart. This chart shows the average tax cut for American families if the child tax credit is doubled from its current size—not just doubled, but we make it refundable against payroll tax liability, which is the tax every American pays. For Social Security and Medicare, it is the first chunk that comes off your paycheck. No matter how little you make, everyone pays it. If we make the child tax credit double, and we apply it toward your liability on payroll tax, this chart—which is what I propose, and it is what Senator LEE and I have been working on, what Ivanka Trump has been advocating and we have been working with her office on—shows you what the impact of that would be. That is the blue line. You can see from the blue line that the chart begins with some cut, depending on how much money you make, and it begins to drop as the amount of—obviously, the more money you make, the larger the credit will be up to its limit because you can't get a credit if you are not making any money at all, even if it applies to payroll tax. You start to see that it also grows with the number of children because it is per child. It doesn't just phase off at two children. That is the blue chart.

What is the red chart? The red chart is if we do nothing or basically just do a gimmicky thing about it. Then you start to see that without the child tax credit being made refundable and without the child tax credit applying toward the payroll refundable, and with-

out the tax credit being per child and sufficiently increased, this framework would be a tax increase. People would actually pay more, and the more children you have, the bigger your tax increase will be.

Suffice it to say, we have to do it. This red line cannot be what we wind up at. I don't think that is the intent of the people who drew up the framework, but that is where we wind up if we don't do it. I pulled that chart out to show you how important it is that we do it as part of this framework. It has to happen. It has to. It will not pass without it. It is the right thing to do. This is a pro-job, pro-family initiative. I actually think it is pro-growth. It is hard for economists to measure it that way, but it would be.

There are a lot of people who can't start a business because they can't afford to leave the security of a certain type of employment. The tax credit frees that up for them to be able to do it.

Let me get to the second chart. This shows you basically the same dynamic but now based on how much people are making, what kind of jobs they do. We arbitrarily picked out some of the jobs where many of us know people who are in these fields: a home health aide, a retail person working sales at Macy's, an office clerk—we all see office clerks every day—a truckdriver, an individual with a vocation to be a nurse, firefighters. Obviously, I have three firefighters in my own family. Again, of the \$1,500 child tax credit, only the first \$1,000 was refundable, and you start to see that red line here and how pathetic it is for these folks in these professions. It does not really do much.

Now look at the blue line. That is what we want to get to, which shows an at least \$2,000 child tax credit being applied to their payroll taxes. Now you start to see the figures get better here. You start to see the home health aide getting about \$1,000 in relief, the retail salesperson getting a little bit under \$1,000, the truckdriver and the office clerk getting down to \$1,400, the nurse getting down to about \$1,200, the firefighter getting down to about \$1,200.

A lot of people will tell you that \$1,200 or \$1,400 is not going to change the world, but it will help. I didn't say this was the solution to every problem. Another solution is to get these salaries up higher. That is the other part of it. Another solution is to get the cost of some of these things lower, like get a grip on the cost of obtaining college credits. Another solution is to provide more childcare options for people. Yet there is no way that this does not help. It helps. It helps the people whom we need to help, and it helps us get closer to the goal that we all have for this Nation, which is being a place of equal opportunity. We pride ourselves on equal opportunity, but I am telling you that we are lacking equal opportunity

if, of two children who grow up in two different homes, one has access to quality pre-K education, then to quality schooling, and then to the right support for that schooling, and one does not. It starts by the time you are a junior and senior. It hurts you. It absolutely hurts you in your way forward in life.

This is not the solution to all of our problems—that would be misleading—but it is a big step in that direction. It would show in tax policy that we are supporting the most important institution in society, which is the family, and the most important function that any of us will ever have, which is being a parent. We are investing in America's future.

The children being raised—the two, three, four children—do you know who those are? Those are the people who are going to fund Social Security and Medicare when I retire and when many of you retire. Those are the people who are going to be starting the businesses. Those are the people who are going to be the backbone of our economy not in 50 years but in the next 10, 15, 20 years. This is the future of America—literally and figuratively the future of our Nation—in which we would be investing. We would be allowing their parents to make that investment on their behalf, who are the right people to be making the investment.

This has to be a part of whatever else happens. I think this has strong bipartisan support, and I know the White House supports it. I am optimistic that it will happen. The only thing that would keep it from happening is if tax reform itself goes down, but this has to happen. There is no choice but to do it. We have to, and it is the right thing to do.

I am pleased that we have come this far on it, and I look forward to the work in getting it achieved, but it cannot just be a gimmick, it cannot just be that we increase the child tax credit by a little bit. If we do not do it right and sufficiently and structure it in an appropriate way, we will be raising taxes on working families. That cannot happen. I know no one here wants to see that happen.

We will have a lot of debate about everything else, but this is the one that I hope will have strong bipartisan support as we move forward on tax reform, and I am excited to be able to work on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to start by making it very clear that this is not the way our budget process should work. In fact, to even call this a budget process gives it more credit than it deserves. With Republicans in control of the White House and both Chambers of Congress, the budget process has now descended into chaos and

dysfunction. I talked about this in the Budget Committee, but I am going to keep talking about it because it is important.

First of all, look at the date. We are debating a budget for fiscal year 2018 months too late and more than 2 weeks into the fiscal year for which we are supposed to be budgeting.

Secondly and far more importantly, we are not really here to talk about a budget. We are not really here to have a debate about our values and our priorities or where we should be directing our limited national resources. We are not here to talk about what or whom we should be investing in as a nation. We are certainly not really here to try to come together around a shared vision for where our country can head next year or 5 years from now or even 10 years from now. Yet Democrats do want to have this conversation. We believe this is a critical debate to have, and we would love to spend time on this floor debating a budget that opens up that conversation and puts us on a path toward working together to actually get that done.

We all know why we are really here. It is that Republican leaders want to start another fast-track, partisan process to jam legislation through Congress and do everything possible not to have to work with Democrats. For what? It is to give more tax breaks to the rich, to raise taxes on the middle class, to circumvent any debate about a major environmental decision that would be unwise and potentially catastrophic, and to blast a hole in our budget that will increase the deficit, blow up the debt, and put Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education investments, healthcare, and so many more priorities at risk.

All of this is not just shameful and wrong—it is not going to work. We all have seen what has happened in the last few months. The Republicans have spent months trying to jam TrumpCare through Congress, and they have refused to work with Democrats. So here we are now, months later, with Democrats and Republicans finally working together to improve healthcare after there being months of delay.

I say this to my Republican colleagues: Let's skip this first part. Let's skip this partisanship and dysfunction and acrimony and bitterness, and let's move, right now, to the bipartisan work and negotiations that we all know our constituents actually want and expect. I know it will not be easy, but I am confident that we can get it done.

All we are asking is that President Trump keep the promises he made on the campaign trail to put workers and the middle class first. It should not be that difficult, and the choice could not be clearer. Should we give President Trump and his Cabinet of millionaires and billionaires more tax breaks, or

should we cut taxes for the mom or dad who is working two jobs or struggling to pay his mortgage or help his kid go to college? Should we preserve and protect Medicare and Medicaid, or should we allow those critical programs to be cut to give tax breaks to the rich? That is really the crux of this debate.

Democrats believe that workers and the middle class should get tax breaks, and from everything we are seeing about this Republican plan and everything we are seeing in this budget today, Republicans do not agree. I am hoping we can move away from this partisan process and really get to work for the people we represent, and I am hoping we can return to a budget process that will allow a true debate about our values and our priorities as a nation.

We should be here talking about the path to another bipartisan budget deal that will restore the investments in domestic and defense priorities. We should be having conversations about ways to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid, not to cut them. We should be talking a lot about how we tackle our deficit and debt challenges fairly and responsibly.

On that point, I note that I find it especially interesting that so many Republicans have spent years pretending to care about the deficit when it has come to making cuts to middle-class priorities, but the minute that it has come to handing tax breaks to the rich, all of that has gone out the window. One Republican even admitted to the *New York Times* that deficit concerns are nothing more than a "great talking point" when Democrats are in charge. With a budget that would add trillions of dollars to the debt—a budget that is on the floor today—we will see where people actually stand on that issue.

Finally, we should be talking about ways to help our workers. We should be talking about ways to grow our economy from the middle out, like making sure we have access to high-quality childcare and pre-K for every working family, making college more affordable, and investing in retirement security for our workers and our families. We should be talking about how we are going to support our veterans, protect women's health and rights, and make healthcare more affordable and accessible. There is a lot we should be talking about in this budget. Those are the conversations we should be having. Those are the people in whom we should be investing.

I am going to be doing everything I can in this so-called budget debate to keep the focus on the people for whom I came here to fight. I am going to stand with Democrats and families across the country to fight back against Republican attempts to jam a massive, partisan tax break for the rich through Congress and force working families and the middle class to pay the price.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the budget resolution for fiscal year 2018.

Let me say that consideration of this budget resolution seems surreal, not only because of the timing—coming, as it does, 3 weeks into the fiscal year—but also because of the real challenges the United States faces today.

We have important work to do. At this moment, three States and two U.S. territories are struggling to recover after experiencing significant natural disasters. The resources we are providing are simply not sufficient.

In addition, sadly and tragically, Las Vegas just experienced the worst mass shooting in American history, breaking the record that was set only last year in the tragic mass shooting in Orlando, but there is no serious bipartisan and comprehensive effort to address gun violence.

After President Trump's reckless efforts to sabotage the Affordable Care Act, Congress needs to act to stabilize private insurance exchanges. I think that we were all pleased, as I was, to see Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY take strong steps to do that over the last few days. It appears, however, that they are once again being undermined by the President.

Next week, the President is officially going to declare the opioid crisis as a national emergency, which is what we all have recognized over several years, but declarations mean nothing without there being the resources to help. This is an emergency, and we need to provide those resources now, but given this budget resolution before us, those resources will not be available.

States are already taking steps to reduce healthcare coverage for kids under the Children's Health Insurance Program and services through community health centers because we have not been able to act in time to reauthorize these critical initiatives.

We face international crises in Iran, Iraq, and North Korea, which are inflamed, unfortunately, every time the President tweets or comments about these issues.

Before December 8, the President and Congress need to come to an agreement to provide relief from sequester funding caps for defense and non-defense priorities.

The President and Congress need to act immediately to undo the crisis that has been created by the President's Executive order on DACA, which will put thousands of Dreamers at risk of deportation and have an adverse impact on our economy.

This budget addresses none of these challenges. In fact, it so weights tax cuts to the rich and deficits that we will not have the resources with which to deal with any one of these issues. Instead, a week after the President took

steps that will cause millions to lose their private health insurance, this budget will pave the way for trillions of dollars in cuts to healthcare offered under Medicare and Medicaid.

Last week, the President basically tried to strangle the Affordable Care Act. Now the goal is to undo Medicare and Medicaid, and that is astounding. The real goal behind that is not just to undo these critical programs for every American; the real goal is to provide trillions more in tax cuts that will overwhelmingly benefit the wealthiest.

The majority will say that the budget only lays out a broad fiscal plan and that none of the details have been set, but we have seen this play before. It starts with tax cuts for all, but it will end with nothing short of a historic transfer of wealth from low- and middle-income Americans to those who are prospering the most in this country. It starts with the promise of a balanced budget, but it will end with greater deficits. It will start this time when, after a long and difficult recovery from the economic crash of the Bush administration, the economy is finally moving forward with stock market highs, low employment, and low interest rates.

Nothing about our current economic situation demands massive, deficit-busting tax cuts, particularly to the wealthiest Americans. Indeed, it is instructive to look back to the 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts. These tax plans were also paid for with trillions of dollars of debt because the Nation was newly at war. These plans also overwhelmingly favored the top 1 percent of Americans. We were told then that the tax benefits would trickle down to the working class and pay for themselves. I opposed these tax plans because I didn't believe that would occur, and, in fact, it didn't occur. Despite the substantial benefits for those at the top, overall economic growth from 2001 to 2007 was weaker than average. Median household income fell 2.7 percent while prices and poverty continued to rise. With weak regulation and oversight, this fiscal policy ushered us into the great recession. Now the GOP is poised to do the same thing yet again.

Just for contrast, in the early 1990s, under President Clinton, Democrats took tough votes to raise revenue and rein in spending. Despite predictions to the contrary, the economy took off in one of the biggest economic booms in history, and at the same time we turned budget deficits into the first surplus in a generation.

There are lessons in that experience. There are no shortcuts to restoring fiscal order. Tax cuts do not pay for themselves, and you can't balance the budget while cutting revenue. So how does the majority promise to turn straw into gold this time? By pairing \$5.8 trillion in cuts from basic services, including Medicare and Medicaid, with

massive deficits and rosy revenue assumptions. With these in place, the GOP says that it can balance the budget and cut taxes by \$1.5 trillion. Never mind the fact that the Republican tax cuts to the wealthy will likely cost more than \$1.5 trillion, and never mind that this budget assumes absurd cuts to nondefense programs and leaves spending for defense at sequester levels, which we all recognize are inadequate. But even if the numbers are phony and built on loose, unrealistic assumptions, won't most Americans be getting a substantial tax windfall under this plan? Sadly, no.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center's analysis of the available information on the GOP tax plan, about 80 percent of the tax cuts will go to the top 1 percent, increasing their after-tax income by about 9 percent. Nearly half of that money will go to the top one-tenth of 1 percent. Meanwhile, the bottom 80 percent of American wage earners will get only 13 percent of the tax cuts, and many hard-working families with children could actually see their taxes go up.

Based on the Tax Policy Center's analysis, most Rhode Islanders who get a tax cut will receive only \$190 or less out of this deal. That is less than the cost of a week's worth of groceries for a family of four. Yet most Rhode Islanders and most Americans stand to lose much, much more due to the inevitable cuts in investments like Medicaid, Pell grants, Title I, health research, and public infrastructure. Most middle-class families in my State depend on programs like these. To send their children to school, they need Pell grants; to make sure that their elderly mother or father is well cared for, they need the assistance of Medicaid for nursing homes. So that \$190 tax cut will be nothing compared to the losses they will incur in the cost of college for their children, the cost of healthcare for their parents who are just struggling to get by.

On the other hand, people on the top end of the bracket will get a tax cut large enough to buy a new Mercedes. If the recent past is any indication, they will pocket that money, invest it, or send it overseas. That money doesn't trickle down, and working Americans at the losing end of the tax bill will not see it in their paychecks.

The American people deserve a better deal than this budget resolution offers. I know President Trump and the leadership on the other side of the aisle are desperate for a legislative win. They have spent an entire year trying to ram through the partisan TrumpCare healthcare bill that would upend our entire healthcare system, kick over 30 million Americans off of their insurance, and make massive cuts to Medicaid, harming our most vulnerable citizens, including seniors, children, and people with disabilities. The proc-

ess, the tactics, and the product alienated even Members of their own party and Americans across the political spectrum.

After having failed with TrumpCare and with all of the other challenges we face, the majority leadership has set in this budget blueprint a deadline of November 13 for committees to produce tax cut legislation. All the other business we need to do must wait until we cut taxes for the wealthy.

I know there is room for compromise and that there are Members of good will on both sides who are actively working to address many of the real challenges I mentioned earlier, but tax cuts for the rich shouldn't be on our to-do list, let alone at the top of the list, as it is today.

One of the things we should be standing up for is our men and women in uniform by providing the revenue we need to support them. But when it comes to providing that revenue, this resolution takes a knee and gives revenue away to millionaires and billionaires.

This is a truly rigged process. Its only purpose is to fast-track tax cuts for the rich and cut funding to healthcare and other key initiatives that most Americans count on. For that reason, I will oppose this budget resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Wyoming.

ENERGY REGULATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last week, the Trump administration took a very important step, the step to end the war on coal and the war on American energy. The Environmental Protection Agency has said that it has begun the formal process to roll back the Obama administration's so-called Clean Power Plan. This plan was a cornerstone of the Democratic efforts to destroy the reliable forms of energy that the American public continues to use today.

My goal is to make energy as clean as we can as fast as we can without raising costs on American families. The Trump administration wants exactly the same thing. The steps it announced last week will help provide greater energy security, more jobs, and a stronger economy. This is exactly what President Trump promised he would do. It is exactly what the American people voted for last November.

Americans said that they were tired of Washington's out-of-control regulators. President Trump took action right away. He issued an Executive order in March, telling his administration to go back and review some of President Obama's worst energy regulations. One of those was the Clean Power Plan, which tried to regulate powerplants in a way that wasn't even allowed under the Clean Air Act.

President Trump's Executive order was the first step in correcting this bureaucratic overreach. Last week's announcement by the Environmental Protection Agency was the next step. With this move, the Agency is saying that Washington will no longer trample on the law. It tells the rest of Washington that there are limits. So I applaud President Trump and Scott Pruitt, the Administrator of the EPA.

The Agency was created because America needed to do a better job of making sure we had clean air, clean land, and clean water. There is a right way to do this job. For a long time, the Agency did its job well. We can strike and need to strike the right balance. We need to do that again so we can protect our environment while allowing our economy to grow. We can have reasonable regulations that protect Americans while also respecting the law.

My home State of Wyoming is one of the most pristine, beautiful places in the world, and it is one of the most energy-rich places in the world. Wyoming has struck this balance successfully, and so have many other States. We are addressing threats to our environment through the cooperation of States, towns, Indian Tribes, and Washington.

The Environmental Protection Agency did not get the balance right with its Clean Power Plan. It overstepped its bounds to fulfill a political agenda. In 2008, when Barack Obama was running for President, he said that under his policies, "If somebody wants to build a coal-fired power plant, they can." But he went on to say, "It's just that it will bankrupt them."

Bankrupt them. Once he got into office, he did everything he could to keep that promise and to bankrupt as many coal companies as possible. The Obama administration pushed out unnecessary, unlawful regulations on coal producers, powerplants, and their customers.

Look at the difference between the two Presidents. President Obama promised to bankrupt American energy producers, and then he misused his power in order to do it. President Trump promised to promote American energy security and economic growth, and he is following the law to do that.

The law never gave the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to write its Clean Power Plan. The Agency went ahead and did it anyway. That is why States sued the Federal Government to block this destructive bureaucratic overreach. States knew—people knew that the Environmental Protection Agency had written a dangerous regulation that would shut down American powerplants and would raise energy costs for American families. Their rule would have thrown thousands of people out of work in Wyoming and in other States. It would have led to as much as \$33 billion in compliance costs in the year 2030. That

is what the Agency estimated—\$33 billion in compliance costs.

Last year, the Supreme Court decided that this rule could do so much damage that the Court stopped President Obama in his tracks. Last week, the Agency recognized that there is a better way. It is going through the process to set aside the old rule and take a fresh look at what it could or should do legally. It said that any regulation of these powerplants is going to be done the way every new regulation should be done. That means listening to the people who have the most at stake, like the States and communities affected by these regulations. It is especially true in places like Wyoming, where there are already partnerships in place that could accomplish many of the goals of the new rules. It means that Washington should consider the costs as well as the benefits of regulation, and it should use reasonable estimates about both the costs and the benefits.

In 2015, the Supreme Court criticized the Obama administration for another rule that made this same mistake. The Court said that it is not "rational, never mind appropriate, to impose billions of dollars in economic costs in return for a few dollars in health or environmental benefits."

If Washington is going to write regulations the way they should be done, this means acting rationally, and it means following the law.

The Clean Air Act didn't give the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to write its so-called Clean Power Plan. That should have stopped the regulators right there and then. It should not have been a sign for regulators to interpret the law in a brandnew way that Congress never intended. That is what the Obama administration did anyway.

If Washington does regulations right, that means doing them in a way that provides clarity, not confusion, not more questions. It means doing what is best for America, not just what is the preference of the people writing the regulations.

We are blessed in this country with enormous natural resources. Our goal should be to use these resources responsibly, in ways that protect our environment and help to make our economy grow. We need a strong economy. That is what the American people are looking for.

Over the 8 years of the Obama administration, the leaders of the EPA created broad and legally questionable new regulations. They declared a war on coal, and a war on American energy. Under the Trump administration, the war is over, and America is back on the right track.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, we are now debating the budget resolution for fiscal year 2018. The main reason this budget resolution is before us is to allow for floor consideration of tax reform. So I want to talk a little bit about what I hope will be our guiding principles on the way we would proceed on tax reform, because tax reform is needed in this country.

Our Tax Code is overly complex. There are significant problems, particularly as we harmonize with the international community. There are things we need to do in our Tax Code to make it a fairer tax code, to make it a simpler tax code, to raise the revenues we need to make sure we don't have deficits.

There are things we need to do. I hope that we will have three guiding principles, and I will talk about these three and how the budget resolution that came out of committee would violate each of these principles and why I cannot support it as it has been presented by the committee.

First, we should have an open process on tax reform. The last time we did comprehensive tax reform, in 1986, it took well over a year for us to be able to complete the work. We had numerous committee hearings. We had a lot of public input because, when you change the Tax Code, it has lots of different effects, some of which are not apparent. There are a lot of tradeoffs, and we need to do this in an open manner.

It is also important that we have a bipartisan product because we want the Tax Code to remain intact so people can plan. We don't want to see a Tax Code pass in one Congress only to be radically changed in the next Congress. That only happens when you have a bipartisan agreement where Democrats and Republicans are working together in order to bring about a consensus change in our Tax Code. It doesn't work if it becomes a partisan process.

The budget resolution that has been presented on the floor by the Budget Committee fails on this first guiding principle. It is not a process that will lead to a bipartisan result. It is one that is a partisan process. Reconciliation, by definition, becomes a partisan process when a budget resolution is passed along party-line votes.

Secondly, under reconciliation and the rules of the Senate, you cannot enact permanent tax changes because it would create deficits outside of the budget window. For that reason, if we want permanency in our Tax Code, let's use regular order, where we bring the bills up in our committees, we bring them to the floor, we offer amendments without restriction, and, at the end of the day, we can pass permanent changes to our Tax Code that are in the best interest of the taxpayers of this country. Once again, on

the first principle of an open, fair process, the budget resolution presented by the committee fails.

The second principle, which I would argue that all of us should agree upon, is that we don't want to finance the tax changes through debt, that it would be wrong for us to do debt financing of tax relief because that only adds to our national debt and deficit. It affects our economic growth. It really presents, I think, a moral issue: Do we really want our children and grandchildren to pay for what we spend today? The budget resolution presented by the committee fails on this second guiding principle.

By its own instructions, it allows for a \$1.5 trillion increase in the national debt by the tax changes that are presented. There is no pretense here. It says that we will allow for a \$1.5 trillion increase in the deficit.

To make matters worse, there is a provision that was put in the budget resolution that allows the budget chairman to bring the bill to the floor without getting the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Taxation Committee score. In other words, we will be allowed to vote on a bill that may increase the deficit well beyond \$1.5 trillion without having the objective scoring by those who are responsible to let us know what impact it has on the deficit. Instead, we will get a partisan evaluation by the chairman of the committee rather than one that is produced by the professionals who are charged with reviewing what we do.

Now, to make matters even more problematic on the deficit, the guiding principle we have here on what the committees are looking at is what was presented by the so-called Big 6; that is, the Republican fiscal leadership of the Senate, the Republican fiscal leadership of the House, along with the fiscal advisers to the President. They have come in with an outline that doesn't add up to \$1.5 trillion. It adds up to a much greater deficit number than \$1.5 trillion. So we are starting with deficits well in excess of \$1.5 trillion with a process where we may be asked to vote without knowing the impact on the deficit, but we do know it will add to the deficit. That fails the test that we all felt that we shouldn't be taking action on the floor on tax reform to increase the deficit.

The third guiding principle should be that we want to be fair. We want to be fair to the taxpayers of this country. The truth is that middle-income taxpayers are already overburdened. We know that. We know that it is tough. It is tough to make ends meet. So we certainly don't want to pass a tax bill that will increase the burdens to middle-income taxpayers. I would think that we all would agree on that particular point. When you look at the budget resolution that has been presented by the committee, it fails on that test.

It eliminates the estate tax—hundreds of billions of dollars of costs fi-

nanced by middle-income taxpayers to the 0.2 percent of the wealthiest individuals in this country. It fails in eliminating the alternative minimum tax, which is a way that we, at least, capture a minimum tax from very, very high-income taxpayers. That is eliminated both on the individual side and on the corporate side. There are tax cuts, breaks, and reduction of rates for the wealthiest taxpayers in this country. How is that all offset? Well, some of it is not offset, but to the extent that we know that it is offset, the budget resolution would allow for cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Let me repeat that. We are going to cut Medicare by almost \$500 billion in order to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country and we call that a fair tax bill? We are going to cut the Medicaid Program by a trillion dollars? We just went through that debate on the floor of the Senate on the changes in the healthcare system where we had significant cuts to the Medicaid system, and we saw the public reaction and rightly so because, when you cut Medicaid, you are cutting the lifeline from many families in this country—hard-working families who may have a child who was born with a difficult medical condition but they know they at least have the protection under our system. Those are the families who are at risk. Why are we doing it? To give tax cuts to 0.2 percent of Americans by eliminating the estate tax? The budget resolution that has come out of the Budget Committee fails on the third test of fairness. So whether it is failing on process or increasing the deficit or not being fair to middle-income families, this budget resolution should be rejected.

Now, I saw where, as to the Big 6—I referred to them before—we have their outline. It is a broad outline. I acknowledge that. It is heavy on promises on tax cuts, and it is very light on how they are going to finance it. So some of us can start filling in the blanks as to who are going to be targets for losing important provisions in our Tax Code, but in a couple of cases, we don't have to guess because the outline specifically calls for it. One is the loss of deduction on the State and local taxes that we pay. To me, this is a direct attack on federalism. It is the same taxpayer who pays State and local taxes who pays Federal taxes, and now we are going to tell those taxpayers that they are going to have to pay taxes on taxes. That makes absolutely no sense. It is a direct attack on federalism. The work that our States and local governments do to provide services to taxpayers in this country should have the exact same respect as what we do at the Federal level of government.

We can only surmise that this might not be the last attack on federalism, that there could well be an attack on

the way State and local governments finance their capital programs because that has been on lists before and there are big gaps as to how they are going to even reach a \$1.5 trillion deficit target. That would concern us because State and local governments have already been hit by restrictions at the national level as to how they can borrow money.

Another area that we don't really have to guess about is the impact it is going to have on the real estate market. We know that the trigger to the 2009 recession started in the housing markets. Yet in this proposal that is likely to be done, if you eliminate State and local taxes, you are eliminating the deductibility of the property taxes. If you eliminate the deductibility of property taxes, you are affecting the value of homes here in America. The largest, single asset for many families could be very well jeopardized.

Then there is talk—the outline says we are going to take a look at all of the standard deductions; it doesn't give a lot of protection out there—of whether we will be looking at mortgage interest deductions and compromising that. Will these deductions be as valuable as they are under the current Tax Code? That is one of the reasons I said a process is important because, if you reduce the value of a deduction, you reduce its worth and you reduce the value of real estate.

I have been working for many years to improve retirement security. I am very proud to have worked with Senator PORTMAN on these issues. We have done a lot of good things to make it easier for people to save for their retirement. Yet we don't know exactly how the proposal under this budget resolution will affect retirement security, but we do know that there have been discussions about the "Rothization" of a 401(k). What does that mean? It means that today if you contribute to a 401(k) plan, you don't have to pay current taxes on your contributions. You pay the taxes when you take your money out after retirement. If "Rothization" is mandated, it would mean that you would no longer have the ability to defer taxes on the contributions you make, as you can today on a 401(k). If that is mandated, it will affect people's ability to save for their retirement and very much affect retirement security in this country. Here is the rub. It doesn't raise any revenue. It is just the timing of revenue. By collecting the revenue today, we lose it tomorrow. It actually builds in a larger deficit in the out years. It is actually contrary to good budgeting from the point of view of preserving us from going further into debt.

We don't know if that is going to come out of the committee, but it certainly could come out of the committee in order to meet the instructions that have been recommended by the Budget Committee.

I could use the same arguments about how we could jeopardize the new market tax credits, which are very important for economic development; the historic tax credits, on which I have worked with many Members here and which affect economic growth; the work opportunity tax credit, which affects hiring people who have challenges in the workforce; and the low-income housing tax credit, which gives us affordable housing. All of those tax credits could lose value or could be eliminated under the outline we have before us.

So I hope we adopt some amendments. I hope we take a different course, but there will be amendments, I hope, that will be offered to eliminate the use of reconciliation for a tax plan so we can truly have a bipartisan tax bill that can stand the test of time—that we demand that we have the scoring before we vote on it so we know what we are doing, that we will not deficit-finance tax changes, and that we don't jeopardize the State and local tax deduction or the mortgage interest deduction or the retirement security savings that we have today or the various tax credits. I hope we will all clarify that together. I hope that we can get some of that done during the amendment process.

Let me make this clear. There is a better way. There is a better way. Let's give up use of this partisan process and start from the beginning on a bipartisan process that recognizes that we need tax reform, we need to do this, but let's do this in a bipartisan manner, let's know what we are doing, let's be fair to middle-income taxpayers, and let's do it in a way that will not increase the size of the deficit and will stand the test of time and where we can give permanent reform to our Tax Code. That is what we should be doing, and I regret that we are heading down a path that will make that impossible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, I have had a little bit of time to listen to some of the speeches that have been given on the floor today, and I just want to talk about a few of those today.

My great colleague from Maryland, with whom I have enjoyed the privilege of serving on the Foreign Relations Committee, talked about an open process and at the same time talked about being able to offer amendments. The definition of an open process is being able to offer amendments and that is what we are going through. We are going through later this week some-

thing called a vote-arama, where we will be having amendments.

We talked about the permanent tax changes.

Mr. CARDIN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. GARDNER. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. CARDIN. Do you believe an open process is starting at maybe 2 o'clock tomorrow morning when no one is listening and that having 1 minute of time to debate an amendment is an open process?

Mr. GARDNER. If the Senator would like to work with us on fixing the budget process, I hope he will. I hope we can change the budget process. It is fundamentally broken. We haven't changed it since 1974, the year I was born—maybe a few years after that. We ought to change this process so it works for the American people. We ought to do something to make this process more effective.

We have heard people come and talk about Medicare and Medicaid. These are very critically important social safety nets for this country. People in my community, my parents, our families, and people we have lived with and known for our entire lives rely on Medicaid and Medicare, but there is this big myth out there that Washington has this ability to increase funds but yet rename it as a cut. You have a group of people in Washington, DC, who are trying that Washington, DC, Kabuki dance, where they say a decrease in the rate of increase is a cut. That is like saying that my son, who is 6 years old, is supposed to grow 4 inches next year, and the doctor says: Your son is going to grow 4 inches next year, based on the charts. If my son grows only 2 inches that year, did he shrink? No. He still grew. But in Washington, DC, they would say: No, he is shorter than he was. This is absurd.

Let's be honest with the American people. Medicare increases in funding. We are trying to be more responsible with the dollars we have because the United States is in debt, and the way we are going to fix that is to be responsible with the dollars we have and to grow our economy.

A couple of weeks ago, I saw a map of the United States. It showed distressed communities in this country. It showed that the haves have more and the have-nots have less. It is time we do something about that in this country. It is time we fix the fact there are counties in our country that are suffering. There are communities in our country that haven't seen a new net job for nearly two decades. We can do better than that.

It has been 30 years since Congress last passed major tax reform. It was 1986. I was 12 years old. For those who are wondering what the No. 1 movie was the last time we passed tax reform, it was "Top Gun." The one thing I wanted that same year, the last time

we did tax reform, was an Atari 7800. That is what I wanted the last time this body passed tax reform.

Fast forward to today, 30 years later. The last time we did tax reform was 30 years ago. We now live in a world of Wi-Fi, self-driving cars, and Smartphones, but we still have an Atari-era tax code. It is clunky. It is outdated. It is bloated to more pages than any of us would care to read. I wish I had come up with this, but I didn't. I will repeat it: The Tax Code is longer than the Bible, and unlike the Bible, there is no good news in it. It feeds the suspicion that you can game the Tax Code if you are wealthy. If you are average, you will be stuck with the bill.

We can do better. That is the opportunity we have now. We must seize it in a way that helps hard-working American families and businesses to create jobs on Main Street, to change this unfair system that we have.

When I go across the State of Colorado, throughout the four corners of our great State, there are people I meet who have been very successful. If you go to Denver, CO, right now, you will think the new State bird is the construction crane. Dozens of construction cranes are on the horizon, showing the success we have had in that State. If you go to Southeastern Colorado, Western Colorado, Northeastern Colorado, there are pockets of poverty that remain as strong as ever because we haven't been able to find the tools necessary to grow the economy the way we should. That is what this debate allows us to do—to grow this economy, to get this Nation firing on all cylinders again. It is the opportunity we have. We should seize it right now, passing this budget leading to tax reform, to make sure that we can grow American opportunity and innovation because too many people haven't had a meaningful pay increase for far too long. They know they spend too much time working through a tangled mess of rules just to file their taxes that are too high to begin with.

As a country, we spend 6 billion hours and \$263 billion each year just to jump through all the hoops and tangles and check the boxes of our Atari-era Tax Code. That is \$263 billion we are spending on a 1986-era tax code, just to check the boxes, to fill the forms, to pay the accountants, and to find the lawyers. That is the entire GDP of the nation of New Zealand. That \$263 billion is more than the GDP of New Zealand. We spend as much money preparing and filing our taxes in this country as the entire economic output of the nation of New Zealand.

American people need relief. It starts by reducing the number of brackets, simplifying the Tax Code, and reducing our rates. For many American families, this will leave them with more money in their pockets at the end of

the day. It also would cut that 6 billion hours that are spent working, trying to file taxes, and leave families with more time to do things that matter to them—not trying to fill out a tax form, but letting them be with their family, be at work, and invest the way they want to with their time and their money. It is just a start.

The end of the unfair death tax will bring relief to regular Americans. Let's start with the death tax. I have heard people criticize the death tax. It is unfair and at times cruel. That should be reason enough for this Congress to repeal it. We have a tax that causes families to have to confront breaking up businesses that have been in the family for generations or selling off the family farm just to keep what they have built and what they have already paid taxes on because somebody died. The government seems to think death is a taxable event.

When I visit with Colorado's farmers and ranchers, one of their biggest concerns—in fact, I met with a group of farmers this past week in Colorado who said that the repeal of the estate tax is more important to them than passing a new farm bill because it is affecting their way of life. These aren't billionaires whom we hear so many complaints about on the Senate floor and in the political op-eds and by the pundits on TV. These are families and ranchers whose families have been working for generations. They have dirt under their fingernails. These are people who have sacrificed for generations to build up land and capital, not liquid assets. That apparently makes them into billionaires, and it is bad enough that they ought to be penalized when they die.

If you are fortunate enough to have some incredible land in Colorado underneath your farm or ranch—maybe a homestead around Vail or Aspen. Are you going to be forced to break up that estate, forced to sell that land, that 36-acre parcel, so you can pay the estate tax when it was open space and we are able to conserve that open space and enjoy that great beauty? Washington, DC, is driving local development decisions, all because of the estate tax. It is suffocating our way of life in rural America, and it must end.

Reforming business taxes will bring tax relief to American families, hard-working families. The corporate tax rate is the highest in the world, and employees are paying the price for uncompetitive corporate tax rates. We have the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world. President Obama said that in his 2011 State of the Union Speech.

If you just look at what we can do by decreasing tax burdens on American businesses, we can actually increase the average American household income by between \$4,000 and \$9,000 a year. This is an average increase to

American households across the country. This isn't to the millionaires or billionaires. This is to hard-working American families who are just trying to get ahead in life. So this puts \$4,000, at a minimum, in their pockets as a result of lower tax rates. That is not just a one-time increase either. We are not talking about a one-time hit. It is not just for the top earners. The Tax Foundation says that workers across the income distribution will feel the effects year after year.

Go home and ask your constituents whether they would like to have more money in their own pockets or whether they would like to have that in the hands of Washington or Wall Street. Do you know what? I am pretty sure they are going to say: I can spend it better than any bureaucrat or Member of Congress ever could. If I keep it, I will make smart choices for my family. That is what we have to focus on.

The Council of Economic Advisers put out a report explaining how reducing the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 20 percent would result in the average American household income going up by \$4,000 to \$9,000. It is worth walking through what they said. Before 1990, when corporate profits went up by 1 percent, worker wages actually went up by more than 1 percent. Before 1990, profits went up by 1 percent and workers' wages went up by more than 1 percent. Since 1990, that relationship between corporate profits and workers has changed. Over the last 8 years, from 2008 to 2016, a 1-percent increase in corporate profits increased workers' wages only by 0.3 percent, a 0.7-percent decrease. Part of the reason for that is our uncompetitive corporate tax rates.

We will go to our numbers to illustrate what has happened. During the same time, from 1990 until this decade, foreign countries, foreign nations figured out that lowering the corporate tax rate leads to more money in their workers' pockets. While our tax rate has stayed stubbornly high, the high tax rates in other countries have plummeted. The United States has decided that we are going to keep the highest tax rates while other economically developed countries are dropping theirs, resulting in higher wages for their workers. Today, U.S. corporate tax rates are far higher than those of any other country I have talked about today.

Look at this. If you look at where the United States is right now, we are right here, top of the chart, 35 percent. That is the U.S. Federal tax rate, the 2017 average statutory corporate tax rate. Look at OECD countries: 10 percent lower than our statutory rate. Asia is at 20 percent, which is 15 percent lower than our statutory rate. Europe is at 18 percent, and some countries in Europe are going lower because they have realized that when they lower their taxes, they have done a bet-

ter job of attracting businesses, growing their economy, and creating more work.

It would be tempting for some to assume that taxing corporations skims some of the cream off the top. You will hear plenty of rhetoric about lowering corporate tax rates being a giveaway. Here is the sad truth. I hope the people take the time to learn this lesson. It is the employees that bear the burden of corporate taxes. Studies show that workers pay between 45 percent and 75 percent of corporate taxes in the form of lower wages. How do you fix that? Lowering the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 20 percent will alleviate that burden and result in higher income to that average American family, allowing them to keep as much as \$9,000—a kind of wage increase of \$9,000, an effective increase of \$9,000, as much as that each and every year. It is an average increase, according to the Council of Economic Advisers. Once those effects are fully felt, those effects are going to continue year after year across all income distributions.

We are going to another chart here. The family will be able to spend that \$4,000 to \$9,000 the way they want to. It could be the difference between having a rainy day fund and living paycheck to paycheck. It could be the downpayment on a new home or a route to a better education or a way they can do what they want to with their free time, if they have some or are able to get some because of innovations we are able to create and the jobs we are able to make better and wages people are able to see increased. It is about them putting more money into their families instead of their government.

None of that is going to happen, though, with this current Atari Tax Code. None of that is going to happen unless we can give families and businesses the relief they need. That is what we have the opportunity to do here today.

This week, when we approve the budget, we set the stage for the budget reform, the budget bill, to move forward on tax reform and tax relief, allowing the American people to keep more money in their own pockets. We can provide meaningful relief with a simpler code, less hassle, less squandering of money to avoid the unfair death tax, and more businesses hiring more workers and paying higher wages. That is why this budget is so important. That is why I hope it is approved this week and we set the stage for a brighter future in the coming months and years, as we fight for every chance for the American people to keep the dollars they work so hard to get.

Thank you.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up the following amendments and that the Senate vote in relation to the amendments following disposition of the

Sanders amendment No. 1119, Nelson No. 1150, Heller No. 1146, Sanders No. 1120, and Collins No. 1151; further, that there be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form, prior to all votes in the series at 3 p.m., with an exception of 10 minutes prior to the vote in relation to the Heller amendment, and that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I would like to begin by quoting David Stockman. David Stockman was the head of the Office of Management and Budget in the Reagan administration. He wrote a famous book after his tenure running the Office of Management and Budget. It is called "The Triumph of Politics: Why the Reagan Revolution Failed." Let me read you a quote from David Stockman's book. This is what he says:

The hard part of the supply-side tax cut is dropping the top rate—the rest of it is a secondary matter. . . . Then, the general argument was that, in order to make this palatable as a political matter, you had to bring down all of the brackets. But, I mean, [the plan] was always a Trojan horse to bring down the top rate.

I quote from David Stockman in his book "The Triumph of Politics." He wrote about how President Reagan sold massive, deficit-busting tax cuts for the wealthy by making knowingly erroneous arguments, by making faulty economic arguments.

As we stand here on the Senate floor today, debating the Trump budget of 2017, we focus on what Mark Twain once said: History does not repeat itself, but it does tend to rhyme.

This looks very much like what Reagan tried to pull off in the early 1980s, to no avail, and his book is very clear as to why they were unsuccessful. The Reagan-era promises of economic growth and budget surpluses turned out to be massive debt and deficits. There is some kind of nostalgia, political nostalgia, for a Reagan era that never existed and, instead, a painting of a past that just has to be replicated today. Let's look at what David Stockman said he did and why it turned out so unsuccessful for President Reagan. The Republicans are back again with a new budget, but they are using the same old bag of tricks and gimmicks from more than 30 years ago.

This is their plan, which is very simple, and it is identical: No. 1, claim unspecified funding cuts to many domestic programs many, many years in the future; No. 2, assume unrealistic growth from your policies that will magically balance the deficit; and finally, No. 3, use those questionable economic assumptions to provide massive tax breaks for the wealthy and big corporations in our country.

The budget we are debating today hits all of these points. It claims to

balance the deficit, while in reality it is a blatant attack on the middle class for the benefit of these super rich.

First, let's start with the budgetary trick: unspecified cuts to domestic programs. Back in the 1980s, David Stockman called these "magic asterisks," meaning that the Reagan administration would count the savings from these future cuts, but in reality, they would be someone else's problem to figure out at a later time.

Today, we are dealing with a budget containing more than \$1 trillion in completely unspecified and unallocated funding cuts over the next decade—the magic asterisks, programs to be cut but not specified. Please vote for this budget, but do not take any responsibility, my Republican colleagues, for actually telling the American people what programs are going to get cut—the magic asterisks.

Second, we have the same unrealistic economic growth assumptions that Stockman referred to in the 1980s as a rosy scenario. That is what he called it.

Today, we are being told that tax cuts for the wealthy will magically grow the economy to the tune of an additional \$1.2 trillion and will somehow pay for themselves. History taught us that tax cuts do not pay for themselves. It was not true under Reagan, and David Stockman, his budgetary expert, tells us this. It was not true under Bush, and it will certainly not be true under Donald Trump as well.

The Republicans forget recent history and continue to use these fairy tale economic assumptions for the same reasons they did in the 1980s. The tax cuts for the wealthy do not look completely irresponsible to the rest of the American people. Can we sell the American people once again on magic asterisks, on rosy scenarios, on unspecified cuts, on a budget that is balanced sometime in the future but is not the responsibility of these Members of the Republican conference at this time out on the floor of the Senate? Can we pull it off again? Can we fool the American people again? Can we hide our real agenda, which is to give a huge tax break to the wealthiest people in America?

In the same way that David Stockman called that the Trojan horse to get the tax break for the wealthy, so too have they built another budget as a Trojan horse to get the tax breaks without any of those specific cuts in programs that they know will be like touching political kryptonite. They are not going to lay out which programs are going to get cut at some point in the future.

That is why these tax cuts are irresponsible. The framework that Republican leadership has presented is devoid of details for what it will do to families. It doesn't specify what it will do for small businesses, and it is com-

pletely silent on how it will assist workers, who have been struggling for years to keep up with the rising costs of living.

What the Republican tax framework is crystal clear on is how it will benefit the wealthiest Americans and corporations. In fact, the tax framework released by the Republican leadership will send 80 percent of the benefits directly to the top 1 percent of the wealthiest individuals in this country—Ronald Reagan redux, David Stockman redux. And 80 percent of the benefits go to the upper 1 percentile. What did David Stockman say? "But, I mean, [the plan] was always a Trojan horse to bring down the top rate."

What we have now is a Republican Party genetically hard-wired in order to do the same thing that failed as an economic policy in the early 1980s. It was such a catastrophe and it was so bad that Republicans actually had to get together with Democrats in order to fix it after it went into effect.

This particular version of it will provide tax cuts for shareholders and CEOs. It allows the richest 1 percent of all Americans to concentrate wealth to an even greater degree than they already can, while many middle-class families will actually see their tax bill go up. They want to take away the State and local tax deduction. We are going to see millions of Americans with an actual tax increase. They are the middle class. There is almost nothing in this bill that helps the middle three quintiles. From 20 percent to 80 percent, there is almost nothing in this bill that helps them.

They know it, by the way. They know what they are doing. They know that 80 percent of this is going to the upper 1 percentile. They know almost nothing goes to the middle three quintiles, and they also know they are going to take away the tax break for State and local deductions from those people as well. It is not a tax plan. It is a tax scam.

Despite their talk about how these tax giveaways for the rich will pay for themselves, the Republican tax plan will create a \$2.4 trillion hole in the deficit. We know what Republicans and the Trump administration will do with those deficits. They will be used to go where the 1980s plan did not ultimately go, and that is to gut Medicare, to gut Medicaid, and to gut Social Security.

Let's give them credit. In this bill, at least on Medicare and Medicaid, they actually do talk about these specific cuts. They actually talk about it. There is a \$470 billion cut in Medicare. You can hear that, grandma or grandpa. They are going to cut Medicare by \$470 billion in this bill. I tell you one thing. Both grandma and grandpa may be old, but they are not stupid. They are not stupid. They know what you are doing. They are going to figure this out.

They want to cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion, as well, for those tax breaks for the upper 1-percenters. There is your plan. It is pretty simple to understand. Grandma and grandpa are going to understand it. The American people are going to understand it. It is all toward the Trojan horse to get the tax break for the upper 1 percentile.

The recent report from the Democratic staff of the Senate Budget Committee found that the budget would also slash \$5 trillion from critical programs like education and transportation. It is unspecified at this particular point in time because they know it would create a political nightmare for them. It would be "nitro hits glycerin" politically if they specify at this time where those cuts would come from.

Over the last 8 years, our friends on the other side of the aisle explained to us that the Federal deficits were the greatest threats facing our country. We couldn't invest in clean energy. We couldn't finance infrastructure. We couldn't do anything about healthcare or the people who need it in our country because of the threat to our national debt. Before that, we were famously told in the 2000s that deficits don't matter. Of course, that was after President Clinton's budgets in the 1990s put us on a path to a budget surplus.

Before that, David Stockman was convincing President Reagan that deficits were of no concern and should not get in the way of tax cuts for the wealthy. We have seen this movie before, and now, once again, it sounds like the present rhymes with the past.

We come back to the central erroneous premise of the Republican Party, which they continue to try to sell to the American people—that it is possible, simultaneously, to have massive tax breaks for the wealthiest 1 percent, to increase defense spending simultaneously and massively, and to balance the budget at the same time. It is not possible. The American people know it. They have seen it in the past. They are trying to run the same old movie past the American people, but it is all—in the immortal words of David Stockman—toward the goal of creating a Trojan horse to bring down the rates for the wealthiest people in America. That is the choice the American people are going to have to make.

This budget is a moral disgrace to be considered on the floor of the Congress—Medicare and Medicaid, a sacrifice for a tax break for the wealthiest people in our country. This is a shameful day in the history of this institution.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Madam President, for the recognition.

Madam President, today I wish to talk a little bit about something very

obscure that is buried in this budget bill, but it is something that is very, very important to me. First, before I talk about the specific policy issues, I just want to talk about a personal exploration I had. This is with regard to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and this special area up here called the 1002 area.

I had the opportunity in the 1980s to take a raft trip down across this Arctic Coastal Plain and down to the sea, and part of the reason was that many of the Alaska Senators at the time used to say: If you are going to make policy in Alaska, you ought to see that part of Alaska. So I took the opportunity to see it. I took a raft trip down a river called the Hula Hula River, which flows out of the Brooks Range, a large mountain range, into the Beaufort Sea.

I can say that from my personal experience, this is one of the wildest, most magnificent places on the Earth.

I would like to talk a little bit about the creatures and critters we saw there. We saw the beginning of the caribou migration, which occurs over in Canada to this area in Alaska, where they calf on the 1002 area. It is one of the biggest migrations in the world of a mammal species. We saw grizzly bears. One grizzly bear actually came into our camp, and we had to retreat and watch whatever it was going to do until it moved along. We saw musk oxen. We saw polar bears. We saw what a marvelous and incredible area this was and what a rich, rich ecosystem it was.

I was reminded of my Uncle Mo, Congressman Morris Udall, who was the author in 1980 of legislative protections for this area. He required congressional action to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and this 1002 area. He did that because he realized how significant and how magnificent it was.

One of the things we have to realize is what we are protecting here. People travel all over the world to go to the Serengeti and see the migration of the animals on the Serengeti plains. This same caribou migration is very much like the Serengeti. In fact, it is our Serengeti, when you have animals migrate from Canada all the way into Alaska and back. This is our Serengeti. It is a special place. It is a real treasure, and I don't have any doubt in my mind that we should save it.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge represents one of the world's wildest and more biodiverse places. Its Coastal Plain or the 1002 area is the biological heart of the refuge. There is no other place like it on the planet. Congress showed remarkable restraint and forethought when it put the Refuge under Federal protection, and I am proud my Uncle Mo Udall was instrumental in passing legislation that doubled the size of the Refuge. Under that law, only Congress can open up the 1002 area for drilling.

Today I rise in strong opposition to the Republican proposal to drill for oil in this remarkable place. I will fight their plan tooth and nail. The only reason they are doing this is to pay for tax cuts for big corporations and tax cuts for the richest Americans.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge's coastal plain is an environmental time machine. It is a rare place on this Earth, where almost everything has been preserved as it was over 10,000 years ago. Oil and gas development would change its delicate ecosystem forever. We could never get it back.

This Refuge is the largest Arctic conservation area on the globe. It is part of our national heritage. It is part of the world's heritage. That is why I compare it to the Serengeti, where people travel from all over the world to see that migration. The same thing is true here. It would be wrong to plunder this magnificent area for short-term gain, especially when that gain is speculative.

The 1002 area is home to 37 species of land mammals, 8 species of marine mammals, 42 fish species, and over 200 species of birds. Migratory birds fly in and out of this area from every State and every continent. The coastal plain in the Refuge is only 20 to 30 miles wide. No other equivalent slice of Alaska's North Slope is as biologically diverse.

Let me share a few examples of the wildlife that depend on this area. Here is a photograph of a caribou and its young during the spring calving time. The 1002 area hosts the largest and most concentrated herd of Porcupine caribou in the world: 197,000 caribou make the longest land migration of any animal—2,700 miles—to give birth there on the coastal plain in the 1002 area. Their numbers are strong now, but even a small change in reproductive rates could threaten the herd's existence.

Here is a picture of a polar bear. Nine hundred Beaufort Sea polar bears den on- and offshore in this area. The magnificent polar bear is threatened under the Endangered Species Act, and with climate change causing sea ice to melt rapidly, more bears are expected to den on shore.

Here is a photo of the musk oxen. About 250 musk oxen live there year-round. This impressive mammal survived the last ice age, but forcing them from their habitat now could threaten their survival.

People also depend on the Refuge. The Gwich'in have lived there for thousands of years. They call themselves people of the caribou because their culture and way of life are intertwined with the Porcupine caribou herd. Caribou represents about 80 percent of the Gwich'in people's diet. They use caribou skins for clothing, bedding, and shelter. They make fish hooks, skin scrapers, and other tools from Caribou bones.

Gwich'in are spiritually tied to the caribou as well. They have a saying: "Every caribou has a bit of the human heart in them; and every human has a bit of caribou heart." The Gwich'in people depend on the caribou for their material and spiritual survival. Oil development in caribou calving grounds would threaten their very future.

The Republicans' budget resolution instructs the Senate Energy Committee to identify at least \$1 billion in deficit savings over the next 10 years. The Republicans have their sights on the 1002 area to produce that \$10 billion. As I said, this estimate is highly speculative, but, for the sake of argument, let's assume the number of \$1 billion is correct. It still doesn't even scratch the surface of the \$1.5 trillion deficit the Republicans recklessly propose. It is not even one one-thousandth of the money the Republicans need to raise to pay for the megadeficit they will rack up to pay for a tax break for the superwealthy.

Opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is not necessary for U.S. energy independence. We are now an oil exporter, and oil prices are low. Low prices are forcing companies to stop drilling in areas that are much more accessible and less sensitive to development. Opening the Refuge now makes even less sense as more and more people are demanding fuel-efficient and electric cars.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one of the last truly wild places in America. The decision to protect the Refuge from drilling was done carefully and thoughtfully. The decision to undo that protection should be given the same care and thought.

We haven't held hearings. We haven't even been able to hear from and question experts. Directing the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to draft legislation to raise funds without a public process is premature. The American people will have to live with our decision. This rushed proposal shortchanges them and it shortchanges future generations.

There are few places left in the world where the Arctic coastal plains, foothills and mountains and the wildlife they support are wild and free. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one of those places. This unique, grand, and biologically rich place deserves full protection in perpetuity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to start by commending the Senator from New Mexico for his leadership on many issues but today for being on the floor to protect this vital, beautiful American treasure, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I thank the Senator.

I wish to speak about the budget as well. I hope everyone across the coun-

try will really pay attention to the debate we are having in the Senate over the next couple of days and over the coming weeks and months.

There is no doubt that when we look at the budget that is going to come to the floor of this Senate, it is stacked overwhelmingly in favor of the wealthiest Americans and powerful special interests, and the benefits that will go to the folks at the very top are paid for, in one way or another, by everyone and everything else.

I wish to be very clear. I think we need to reform our Tax Code. We need to simplify our Tax Code. We need to reduce the tax burden on middle-class families throughout the country. We should do that in a transparent, accountable, and bipartisan fashion, but make no mistake, unfortunately, what we have received so far from the Trump administration is something that has been cooked up behind closed doors, and the more we look at it, the worse it gets, from the perspective of making sure the American public is protected in this process. At the end of the day, it is just another warmed-over version of what we know of as trickle-down economics.

What is trickle-down economics? It is the idea that if you give big tax breaks to the top 1 percent—the folks at the very top of the income scale, including big corporations—that somehow the benefits of that tax cut are going to trickle down through the economy and lift everybody up. The problem is, we already have a real-world example of how that whole theory failed, how it ran aground. We saw that in 2001 and in 2002 when we cut taxes in the United States. What went up? What went soaring up were the incomes of the top 1 percent. The other thing that went up were our deficits and national debt. Everybody else was left behind. So, yes, the yachts went up, but all the other boats kind of ran aground.

If we look at this chart, we will see it has been part of a pattern over a long period of time, where the incomes of the top 1 percent—that is this red line—have risen steadily. They bounce up and down, usually with respect to some fluctuations in the financial markets, but right after the 2001-2002 tax cuts, we saw aftertax incomes of the top 1 percent shoot up. Did it really help the economy? It didn't help the economy overcome the financial crisis. So we saw some of those incomes come down during the financial crisis.

So when we look at the pattern, our tax policies and other policies have resulted in this huge and dramatic increase in the incomes of the top 1 percent, and everybody else has been kind of static. That is an average. Many of those American households are much worse off today than they were even 20 years ago, in terms of real income.

So a lot of people are on a treadmill, with millions falling behind. Why in

the world we would then adopt a tax plan that actually increases this inequity without improving the economy is just another windfall tax break to the top 1 percent.

Let's just take a look first at the estate tax. It is a great example of how this Republican bill—this Trump bill—is stacked overwhelmingly in favor of the very wealthiest in the United States of America. Our Republican colleagues like to call this a death tax. There are 2.6 million deaths in the United States every year. Only about 5,000 American households pay the estate tax. This isn't a death tax; this is a tax to prevent the growth of dynasties in America. Teddy Roosevelt would be crawling in his grave as a Republican to hear about this Republican proposal because he thought America should be a place where we don't have an aristocracy, we don't have oligarchy. We don't just let people sit around and pass on billions of dollars—sure, we can pass on millions, but billions and billions of dollars—because, over time, what happens is that growing wealth inequality in the United States, instead of making sure people can sort of make it on their own in the country, which is what we thought America was all about.

Just to illustrate the point, if you are a couple and you have an estate of lower than \$11 million—if your estate as a couple is below \$11 million—you don't pay a penny in Federal estate tax, not one penny. If you are an individual who has an estate below \$5.6 million, you don't pay a penny in estate taxes. That is why only 5,000 households—the very wealthiest households in the country—are the only ones that pay it. In fact, when we look at this chart, we can see these two little red dots out of all of these squares are the only households that are impacted.

So this Republican plan would give a \$240 billion tax cut over 10 years to these wealthiest households in the United States of America. One day, Donald Trump's estate will benefit mightily from this, according to Bloomberg, and I think that is a trusted source around here. Yet we are going to give that \$240 billion tax cut to the superwealthy and the rest of the country is going to have to pick up the bill.

So who is going to pay for that bill and how? Well, it really happens in two ways. One way is tens of millions of middle-class taxpayers are going to get socked by this tax plan. The other way is, under this bill, it green-lights deep cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, so we are going to see increased burdens on folks who are on Medicare—seniors.

I wish to talk for a minute about the increase in middle-class taxes under this Trump administration plan.

First, under their plan, taxpayers will no longer be able to deduct their property taxes and their State and

local taxes. We hear a lot from our Republican colleagues about double taxation when it comes to corporations. Yet their plan proposes a double taxation on tens of millions of middle-class taxpayers around the country. On that dollar, they pay their State and local taxes, and then they will be taxed on what they pay to their State and local governments and what they pay on property taxes. That is why this plan is opposed by the National Governors Association. It is why it is opposed by the United States Conference of Mayors.

If we look at IRS data, we will find that 40 percent of taxpayers making between \$50,000 and \$75,000 of annual income—just that small band—take the deduction for State and local taxes, and they are going to increase their taxes under this plan. That is almost 8 million Americans right there.

There is another provision in this Republican plan which says that the bigger your family is, the bigger the tax you are going to pay. If you have three, four, five kids, you are going to be paying more taxes than you are today because what they give with one hand on the standard deduction, they take away on the personal exemptions.

Low-income seniors are going to see their taxes go up because the bottom rate is increased from 10 percent to 12 percent, and the deductions many seniors get, especially if they are disabled, are eliminated. They are going to see their taxes go up.

Finally, I really hope Members will begin to focus on this. The National Association of Realtors hired PricewaterhouseCoopers to do an analysis of the Republican plan. This is from the National Association of Realtors: "Homeowners with adjusted gross incomes between \$50,000 and \$200,000 will see an average tax increase of \$815 a year." Because of the interaction of what you do with respect to the home mortgage deduction and the fact that it is not as big a benefit and the inability to deduct your local property taxes—and I want to read this very deliberately—"Home prices in the short run will fall by an overall average of 10.2 percent." Let me say that again: Home prices in the United States will fall by an average of 10.2 percent. That is by PricewaterhouseCoopers.

They may recover at some point, they say, but if you are a senior and you have all of your savings in your house and the value of your house drops by 10 percent, you are in a world of hurt, and that is what the National Association of Realtors tells us this bill will do.

That is on the tax side. That is not the only way seniors are going to be hit. Middle-income families are going to be hit on the tax side; their taxes are going to go up. But they will also be hit because, in order to pay for those estate tax breaks for the super-

wealthy—the 5,000 households in the country that each year benefit from that—this budget also green-lights cutting Medicare by \$473 billion, and it green-lights cutting Medicaid by over \$1 trillion. So not only does the middle-class take it through increased tax burdens—tens of millions of them—but folks on Medicare are going to see that program cut and a \$1 trillion cut in Medicaid.

We just went through a big debate here in the United States Senate, and a majority rejected the idea that we should cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion, especially in the middle of an opioid epidemic and all the other health challenges we face around the country. Yet that is what this Republican budget green-lights.

The bottom line is that they have big tax cuts for the superwealthy paid for by increasing the tax burden on tens of millions of middle-class Americans, paid for by cutting Medicare and Medicaid. Then, at the end of all of that, this budget is actually designed to increase the national debt by \$1.5 trillion. It is written right into this budget bill.

I served for many years on the House Budget Committee. I was the ranking Democrat. The chairman of that committee for many years was PAUL RYAN, now Speaker of the House. Every year, Congressman RYAN—now Speaker RYAN—would come up with what he called the "Path to Prosperity," a 59-page document, and it repeatedly referred to "the crushing burden of debt." It was mentioned 12 times in that one budget document.

I happen to believe that we need to be serious about reducing our long-term deficits and debt, and our Republican colleagues used to say they cared about that too. But this budget actually calls for a \$1.5 trillion increase in our national debt. What happened to the fiscal conservatives? What happened to the budget hawks on the other side of the aisle?

It turns out that when it comes to cutting Medicare and Medicaid, a lot of our Republican colleagues have been all in for that. But when it comes to tax cuts—tax cuts for the very wealthy—somehow deficits and debt don't matter anymore because this budget actually calls for a \$1.5 trillion increase in the national debt.

I really hope we will get to regular order. Let's have a full bipartisan discussion. The only time there has been successful tax reform is when it has been done in a bipartisan, transparent way. Yet what this bill is doing is setting up a vehicle to try and jam something through on a partisan basis, something that will help the most powerful and the most wealthy in this country at the expense of everyone else. Let's not go in that direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank Senator VAN HOLLEN for his very perceptive and comprehensive analysis of this budget proposal, which is designed to give huge tax breaks to people who don't need it and make terrible cuts to millions of families in this country who are struggling to keep their heads above water. I thank him very much for his remarks.

For the past 10 months, my Republican colleagues in the Senate have tried and failed to slash Medicaid by hundreds of billions of dollars. Even though the American people have stood up and said "Don't do it; Medicaid is just too important," they keep coming back and back and back.

What I want to tell the American people today is, despite the fact that we were able to prevent cuts to Medicaid in the so-called Republican healthcare proposals, they are back again in this budget proposition calling for a \$1 trillion cut in Medicaid over the next decade. Meanwhile, as Senator VAN HOLLEN just pointed out, these cuts are designed to provide a \$1.9 trillion tax break to the top 1 percent.

There may be some people who think it is a good idea to cut healthcare for working families and give tax breaks to billionaires. There may be some people, but I don't think there are a lot of people who think that makes any sense at all. So the amendment I am offering today, along with Senators CASEY and STABENOW—which I believe will be voted on at 3 p.m.—is very simple and straightforward. It would simply prevent the Republicans from cutting Medicaid by \$1 trillion, and it would be fully paid for by stopping the Republican effort to give the wealthiest people in America another tax break.

Plain and simple, this budget resolution is nothing more than a massive transfer of wealth from working families to the very rich, with huge tax breaks for billionaires and terrible cutbacks on programs that working families desperately need.

At a time when the middle class of this country continues to shrink, when families in the State of Vermont and all across this country are struggling to make ends meet, struggling to put food on the table, put gas in the car, pay their electric bill, pay their health insurance, maybe put away a few bucks to send their kids to college, it would be highly immoral and bad economic policy to take from these working families, to take from America's senior citizens, to give even more to the wealthiest people in this country—people, by the way, who are already doing phenomenally well.

At a time when 28 million Americans have no health insurance and millions more are underinsured with high deductibles and high copayments, at a time when so many of our people cannot afford the prescription drugs they desperately need, cutting Medicaid by

over \$1 trillion would throw at least 15 million Americans off of the health insurance they currently have.

It is beyond my comprehension how anyone with a conscience could support legislation that throws 15 million people off of the health insurance they have. Think for a moment about people who are struggling with cancer, struggling with heart disease, struggling with diabetes, struggling with life-threatening illnesses, and they have Medicaid. Medicaid is their lifeline to the healthcare they need.

I hope the Presiding Officer will get up here at some point and tell the American people what happens to those folks when they lose their Medicaid. Have you done any studies as to how many people will die? The truth is, there have been studies that have been done, and the answer is that thousands and thousands of people every single year will die if Medicaid is cut for 15 million people who lose their health insurance.

Let me say what happens when you cut Medicaid by over \$1 trillion nationwide over a 10-year period. What it means is that not only will thousands of our fellow Americans die, it also means that a child with a severe disability—perhaps with Down syndrome or some other serious problem—will no longer be able to get the healthcare they need to adequately function. An estimated 11 million children—or 15 percent of all kids in the United States—have special healthcare needs. They may have conditions such as cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, autism, or one of a host of other serious problems. They may have mental health needs, such as depression, anxiety, or complications from a premature birth. Today, Medicaid covers 5 million—or 44 percent—of these children, providing them with coverage so that many of them can live at home with their families.

In addition to standard healthcare services, Medicaid helps these children get special education at school, long-term care, personal assistance from nurses and attendants, and may cover technology that helps them thrive. Medicaid may also cover social workers to help parents of children with special health needs make sense of all the bureaucratic redtape and get the services they need for their kids.

Medicaid provides these children with quality care. Ninety-two percent of children enrolled in Medicaid have had a primary care visit in the past year, which is higher than families with private insurance. If Medicaid is cut by \$1 trillion over a 10-year period, children with special needs could be left to fend for themselves. What a terrible thing that is to do to families who are struggling today, to tell them that you are going to remove the support they get for their child who has a disability.

It is not just the children who will suffer if this bill is passed. It is our parents. It is the senior citizens of this country. What every person should know—and I fear many do not know—is that Medicaid now pays for over two-thirds of all nursing home care. Let's think about this for a moment. What happens if there is a \$1 trillion dollar cut over 10 years to Medicaid? What happens to our parents and our grandparents and people with disabilities in America who have their nursing home coverage paid for by Medicaid today?

I may be wrong, but I don't recall that there has been one hearing to hear from groups like the AARP, to hear from senior citizen groups, to hear from doctors, to hear from nurses, to hear from nursing homes as to what the implications are of a \$1 trillion cut in Medicaid and what it means to the families in this country who have loved ones in nursing homes. There may have been a hearing. I don't believe there has been. My Republican colleagues are going forward with this disastrous cut without even knowing what the implications are, not having heard from one expert about what this legislation would mean.

Tragically, all of us know that our country is in the midst of an opioid epidemic, which has hit my State of Vermont very hard, and it is hitting virtually the entire country. This is quite unbelievable, but each and every day, more than 90 people die in our country from an opioid overdose, nearly 4,000 people every day begin abusing prescription painkillers, and—it is almost unthinkable but true—almost 600 people start using heroin every single day. How horrible is that?

Today, Medicaid covers one out of every three Americans who are addicted to opioids. Opioid treatment is difficult. It is expensive. It is not always successful, but I dare say there is virtually not one State in the country—I know my State is trying hard, we do better than most—that can say they now have the treatment capabilities available for people who are hooked on opioids or on heroin.

If we cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion, there is no question—none whatsoever—that there will be a massive reduction in the kind of care available to people who have opioid or heroin addiction.

I find it hard to understand why my Republican colleagues would come up with legislation that would do so much harm to the working families of this country with a \$1 trillion cut in Medicaid—and some of my colleagues in a few moments will talk about a proposed \$470 billion cut to Medicare and what that would mean—all to give incredibly large tax breaks to billionaires like the Walton family, like the Koch brothers, like the Trump family. I would hope my Republican colleagues understand that what they are pro-

posing is way out of touch with where the American people are.

According to a recent Quinnipiac poll, 60 percent of Americans oppose cutting Medicaid. A recent Wall Street Journal/NBC poll finds that only 12 percent of the American people believe the wealthy should receive a tax cut. Twelve percent believe the wealthy should receive a tax cut, while 62 percent believe the wealthy should pay more in taxes. In other words, what this legislation does is exactly the opposite of what the American people want.

On the other hand, we must be honest about it and acknowledge that we have an extremely corrupt campaign finance system. As a result of Citizens United—that disastrous Supreme Court decision—our campaign finance system has become even worse than it used to be. You have an example of where the American people say overwhelmingly: Don't cut Medicaid. Don't cut Medicare. Don't give tax breaks to the rich. In fact, ask the wealthy to start paying their fair share of taxes. That is what the American people are saying in poll after poll.

There is another group—and we have to be honest about that—who do believe that billionaires should get more tax breaks, and there is a group that believes we should cut Medicare and Medicaid. Unfortunately, those are the people who make hundreds of millions of dollars in campaign contributions to the Republican Party. Those are people like the Koch brothers and a few of their billionaire friends—a small group of people, half a dozen, 10 people—who will contribute \$3 to \$400 million to elect candidates who represent the wealthy and the powerful, just in this 2-year election cycle—\$3 to \$400 million.

What this debate is about is not what the American people want. The American people are pretty clear about it. It is really about what the billionaire class wants. The billionaire class, despite the fact that their wealth has increased phenomenally, despite the fact that the top one-tenth of 1 percent now owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent, that is not good enough. The Koch brothers are only worth \$90 billion. How are you going to get by on \$90 billion? How do you take care of the kids? How do you put gas in the car? Only \$90 billion. They need more.

If this legislation goes through and if the estate tax is passed—and I know people think I am not telling the truth because it is so unbelievable that anyone would propose this, but I am telling the truth—the Walton family, the wealthiest family in America, worth well over \$100 billion, could get up to a \$50 billion tax break. The Koch brothers, the second wealthiest family, worth over \$90 billion, their family, their heirs will get over a \$30 billion

tax break. So from their perspective, putting a few hundred million dollars to help elect some Republicans is pocket change if your family is going to get a \$30 billion tax break.

Let me just say, the legislation brought forth is really quite preposterous. It is based on a trickle-down economic theory of giving tax breaks to billionaires and corporations and seeing all kinds of new jobs being created. It is a theory that is fraudulent, doesn't work, hasn't worked, but it is legislation—legislation we are dealing with here—that does work very well for the billionaire class of America.

I have the radical idea—I know it is a radical idea—that maybe, just maybe the U.S. Senate should pay attention to the needs of the middle class, the working class, and lower income people in this country, the vast majority people, and not just a handful of billionaires.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WARREN and Senator BENNET be added as cosponsors to my amendment to restore the \$1 trillion in cuts to Medicaid, amendment No. 1119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. With that, I yield the floor to my colleague from Pennsylvania Senator CASEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Vermont for his leadership on this amendment and his words today. I will have more to say about the amendment in a moment.

Mr. President, as Senator SANDERS mentioned, his amendment that we are working together on, amendment No. 1119, will do the following, and it is right in the text of the purpose section of the amendment, to provide additional resources to restore the \$1 trillion in cuts to Medicaid paid for by reducing the Republican tax breaks for the wealthy. That is the quick summary of what we are working on.

I think it is also important to put this amendment in the context of discussions we are having in the Senate and, I am sure, throughout the country; that is, the tax proposal put forth by the administration as well as the Republican leadership, the so-called unified tax proposal. This is a Republican proposal that comes before the country. I think it is essential to read both the tax proposal along with the budget we are debating on the floor together.

There are a lot of ways to describe what the tax proposal is all about. I will describe it very bluntly, in my own words. This tax proposal is, for sure, a giveaway to the wealthy. The superrich do quite well. Big corporations do very well. The middle class does not do well at all at the end of the day.

Why do I say that? Because there have been a number of analyses done of

the proposal. Even the proposal, as it stands now, will have more analyses done when the bill is actually introduced, but in terms of what is on paper now, you have, for example, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities stating that by the year 2027—at the end of the 10 years—80 percent of the tax cut goes to the top 1 percent.

There is another analysis that is even more pointed in terms of the year. You don't have to wait until 2027 to figure out what is happening to the top 1 percent. Here is what the Tax Policy Center says with regard to the tax benefit that accrues to the top 1 percent and also what would accrue to the top 0.1 percent. The top 1 percent is roughly those making above \$730,000. The top 0.1 percent, of course, is even higher. Here is what the Tax Policy Center said in September based upon the proposals so far. Table 2 in the report says the following: Starting in 2018—the assumption here is that the tax proposal as currently crafted would happen this year. If it were to pass this year, in 2018—the 2018 tax year—the top 1 percent would get a tax cut of \$146,470. That is the first year of the tax cut for the top 1 percent, \$146,000. How about the top 0.1 percent, a very small number of extraordinarily wealthy Americans? They get \$747,580—roughly, \$747,000 in a tax cut. That is just in year one. We could provide more examples year after year, but you get the picture that a lot of the tax cuts, if there are any, will be shifted to the top 1 percent and the 0.1 percent.

When they do that, when they have a proposal that points in that direction in terms of the tax bill, what happens in the budget bill that is related to that?

It is very simple. The budget bill will cut Medicaid, as Senator SANDERS referred to, by over \$1 trillion. The exact number is \$1.056 trillion over 10 years. Let's call it a \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid over 10 years. That is, basically, what it is. With regard to Medicare, the cut is \$473 billion in the budget. Now, the difference between the two bills—or the two proposals, really—is that the budget proposal is a bill. So we know the exact details there. The tax proposal has some specificity, and some areas are not as specific, but the benefits to the wealthy are rather specific.

The Republican plan is to use the proposed \$1.5 trillion in cuts to those two programs—when you add the \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid to the \$473 billion cut to Medicare—to pay for the \$1.5 trillion tax cut to corporations. I think it is obscene to cut those programs and then use those dollars for a corporate tax cut. Notice that nothing about that is connected to the middle class and that nothing about that is focused on folks who are trying to get into the middle class. It is really a corporate tax cut that is paid for by cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

I will limit my remarks today to Medicaid because that is what this amendment is about. This amendment seeks to restore at least the Medicaid cut of \$1 trillion. So that is what we are focused on.

What is Medicaid? There are a lot of ways to describe it, but Medicaid covers 40 percent of all of the children in the country. If you are in Medicaid and you have the opportunity to take your child to the doctor and get checkups and all of the benefits that you get from Medicaid, you get to benefit from what is called early periodic screening, diagnosis, and testing. So a child who might be from a low-income family—and is, in the case of Medicaid—not only gets coverage but benefits from the early screening, early diagnosis, and early testing. All of those benefits go to that child, and 40 percent of the Nation's children are covered by Medicaid.

The other number to know, which is rather startling, is that 60 percent of all of the children in the country who have disabilities are covered by Medicaid. Of course, that is not limited to children from families who have lower incomes. You could have a family who has a rather high income—a middle-class income or much higher than that—who might have healthcare through the family's employer, but if the child has a disability, especially a profound disability, the family relies on Medicaid. So that is the program that we are talking about.

We know, as well, that Medicaid covers half of all of the births in the country. There are millions of births every year that are covered by Medicaid.

How about nursing homes? Medicaid pays for nursing home care for our parents, our grandparents, and our family members. If that were not the case, on average, you would see something on the order of \$75,000 in terms of annual expenses, which would force countless middle-class families out of their homes and deplete their hard-earned savings. That would be a big expense if it were not for the benefit of having Medicaid in the context of one's long-term care in a nursing home.

In addition to paying for 45 percent of all of the births, the other 45 percent is that of school districts in the country that use Medicaid funds to pay for medical and therapy services for kids in school who are receiving special education. We could go on and on.

Let me make one other point.

I mentioned that 60 percent of children with disabilities are covered. The Medicaid Program also makes it possible for millions of people with disabilities, including adults, to live in their own homes—to have the dignity, even having a disability, of staying in their own homes. Medicaid also makes it possible for those with disabilities to get to work and to be an active part of the workforce. The program also helps

to fund schools to be able to provide the physical, occupational, and speech therapy services to students with disabilities. For all of these reasons and more, what we seek to do with this amendment is to restore the more than \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid.

We all have the opportunity in the Senate to receive letters from constituents—sometimes handwritten, sometimes typewritten, sometimes by way of email, or otherwise—who communicate to us about the issues of the day. One of the most compelling letters that I have ever received in the context of healthcare and, particularly, in the context of Medicaid is from Pam Simpson. She is from Southeastern Pennsylvania. Pam wrote to me and described in rather specific detail about the challenges her son, Rowan, faces as a child with autism spectrum disorder and what his life was like before Medicaid and what his life was like after Medicaid. I will not dwell on the “before.” I will focus on how his life has changed with Medicaid.

Pam tells me that in late January of 2016 she applied for medical assistance for her son Rowan. She goes on to write about the wraparound services that came from Medicaid after her son Rowan was enrolled, which included a behavioral specialist consultant and a therapeutic staff support worker to help her son Rowan. It reads that the behavioral specialist evaluated Rowan while he was at daycare and “put a treatment plan together to help guide the therapeutic support, who was then able to provide support to Rowan while he was at daycare. The wrap-around services have been a Godsend.” That is what we were told in the letter from Pam Simpson.

I will conclude because I know that we are short on time.

Pam Simpson described the before and after. Then, in the letter, she was pleading with me to make sure that I do not take any steps that will cut Medicaid. She wrote about the adverse impact on her family and, obviously, the adverse impact on her son Rowan, who is the recipient of Medicaid.

In addition to reminding me about his circumstances and hers, she concluded the letter in this way:

Please think of my 9 month old daughter, Luna, who smiles and laughs at her brother daily; she will have to care for Rowan later in her life after we are gone. Overall, we are desperately in need of Rowan's Medicaid assistance and would be devastated if we lost these benefits.

She is one mother from one family who is talking about the adverse impact of there being cuts to Medicaid. I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment to make sure that the \$1 trillion that has been taken away from the Medicaid Program is restored in this budget bill that we are debating today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I assure our colleague from Pennsylvania that nothing in this budget resolution will deprive any person of the benefits they receive under Medicaid—no one. This budget resolution will not do that to anyone in the country. I can promise him that.

It is ironic, though, to hear my colleagues talk about cuts in Medicaid when no one is proposing cuts in Medicaid—no one. All we are talking about is reducing the rate of increase in the growth of a very important and necessary entitlement program. Someday, when they grow up, these same children are going to have to pay back the money that we have borrowed in order to sustain these programs today. So we need to look at the whole picture here and learn and figure out how we can meet our current needs but also be responsible enough not to spend money today that our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay back tomorrow.

Mr. President, I have come to the floor to talk primarily about tax reform because that is going to be the task that we undertake following the passage of the budget resolution.

The President of the United States invited the members of the Senate Finance Committee over to the White House, and I have just returned from that meeting. It was a bipartisan meeting of the tax-writing committee in the Senate. That is what the Senate Finance Committee is. We heard during the discussions that the President's preference would be for this to be done on a bipartisan basis, and there was no one there present who said: We insist that this be done on a partisan basis. In other words, everybody there agreed with the President that it would be better for the country and that we would be able to come up with a better product—it would be durable, and it would be sustainable—if, in fact, we were able to do so on a bipartisan basis.

In taking that to heart, Chairman HATCH, who is the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has previously stated his intention to have an open amendment process in the Senate Finance Committee. Typically, what happens is that there is some base bill—sometimes referred to as the chairman's mark—that is the starting place for legislation in our committees. What we do is to come up with what we think represents the closest thing to a consensus of those who are interested, actually, in pro-growth tax reform and what that would look like, and then open it up to Democrats and Republicans alike to offer their amendments to change it. If they have a majority vote in the committee, it will pass and change the bill. If they have a vote and it loses, then the bill will stay as it is.

I am, frankly, a little bit surprised to hear from some of our colleagues that they actually want us to avoid the committee process and want us to come out here on the floor and come up with a bill that all 100 Senators can agree to. That is a terrible way to operate. It is, basically, a recipe for failure.

What we need to do is to return to what we call regular order around here. All that means is this: Let's go through the traditional process of legislating, moving bills through the committee, and letting everybody participate. Then the majority leader can bring a bill to the floor with there being the same opportunity to offer amendments and to have votes. If you get a majority vote, you win, and your amendment is adopted. If you lose the vote, then it is not, and it does not change the content of the bill.

I really wonder whether we ought to go back to that old cartoon that talks about how a bill becomes a law. I remember when I was growing up “I am just a bill on Capitol Hill” or however the lingo goes. Some people have seen that on the internet. Even some of the pages here, who are much younger than I am, are shaking their heads, indicating they recall that. That is how a bill becomes a law. Our colleagues across the aisle act like this is a revelation, that this is somehow unprecedented and is a terrible way to do business.

Consistent with what the President has requested and what we would like on a bipartisan basis, let's give that a try. That is what we talked about over at the White House, and I think we owe it to the American people. Honestly, I think that if we were able to come up with a bipartisan tax reform bill, the country would be astonished—it would be shocked—that we were actually working together in the best interest of the American people, rather than relying on the same old, tired talking points and being sort of ensconced in our own bunkers, lobbing shots across some demilitarized zone at each other, politically. I think the American people are tired of that. Frankly, some of us who have been here a while are frustrated by the lack of productivity and by resorting to those same old tired talking points, living in these bunkers and not getting as much done as we need to for the American people.

There is a good reason why large-scale changes in our Tax Code haven't been made since 1986, and that is because it is hard. It is hard to get a consensus on a bipartisan basis, but it is long overdue, and the American people are demanding it.

The first step in the process of passing pro-growth tax reform that will leave you with more of what you earn in your pocket and will actually raise the living standards of hard-working families is for us to pass a budget resolution this week to give the Congress

the tools we need to get the job done. Now, it may very well be—well, I can hope, anyway—that we won't need to resort to the technical tools we get from a budget resolution, the reconciliation instructions, and that we can actually do this on a bipartisan basis, but if we can't, then this budget resolution will provide a roadmap for tax reform and provide a pathway to get our Federal spending under control, not by cutting but by reducing the rate of growth in some of our programs.

I don't know anybody who believes that the current Tax Code is working. One of the flaws in our Tax Code is that it favors production overseas as opposed to buying and building in America. It keeps overseas trillions of dollars that could be brought back here and used productively growing businesses, creating jobs, and increasing wages. Keeping your corporate headquarters in Dallas or Denton instead of Delhi or Dubai shouldn't be a disadvantage, although that is what happens under our current Tax Code.

Of course, we know that for every provision in the Tax Code, there is some lobbyist, some entrenched special interest that is going to fight like the dickens to keep that provision in the Tax Code. We have already heard some of the lazy arguments and the scare-mongering that are always based on unjustifiable assumptions. In this case, there are some people who say: Well, if we let people actually keep more of what they earn, it won't change their behavior at all. They say: If we let businesses keep more of what a business earns, they won't invest it in their own business and create new jobs. I think that defies common sense, and it defies experience. That is why we see, on the business side, countries like Ireland, which used to have one of the highest tax rates in the world, or the United Kingdom, cutting their business tax rate—because they realize that brings businesses to their country, it creates jobs, and it helps grow the economy and make a lot of other important things possible.

Two recent studies illustrate why the naysayers are off base. One is by the White House Council of Economic Advisers and shows a clear linkage between corporate tax rates and real wages. It shows that reducing the corporate rate—this may not seem obvious on its face, but this study says that reducing the business rate for corporations from 35 percent to 20 percent will translate into a minimum of a \$4,000 increase in income for the average household. The second study comes from another expert at Boston University and concludes that lowering the corporate rate from 35 to 20 percent will mean a rise in income of \$3,500 per household.

This used to be a bipartisan acknowledgment. I remember that in 2011 President Obama gave a speech to a

joint session of Congress where he acknowledged that we needed to cut our business rates to bring that money back here onshore and to keep our businesses from moving to other countries.

I mentioned several times on the floor recently that I was shocked when I read an article a couple weekends ago that said that IBM—one of the largest corporations in the world—has more employees in India than it does in the United States. I am sure that is caused by a number of factors—access to a workforce, a well-trained workforce, the cost of doing business—but it has to be influenced by our highest tax rate in the world.

These authors say the new plan that has been proposed by Republicans will raise the growth of the economy between 3 percent and 5 percent and real wages between 4 percent and 7 percent. If you cut corporate rates from the highest in the world to 20 percent, it will raise the wages of workers from 4 percent to 7 percent. Both of these studies suggest that tax reform will benefit working Americans.

I have to tell you that the President made this point over and over again at the meeting we had this morning. He said: I am not interested in giving tax breaks to the wealthy. I want more middle-class, hard-working families to see the benefit of tax reform. He said: People who are wealthy are doing just fine. They don't need any help in the Tax Code.

But the people who do need help are hard-working families who are seeing stagnant wages or seeing their standard of living decrease because of their high tax rates. So who in good faith could stand in the way of this happening? Who would stop us from giving workers a raise?

Well, we are ready to hear all the preaching. I know it is coming, but that shouldn't deter us from doing our designated task. We shouldn't allow petty ignorance to go unchallenged, and the sort of deliberate class warfare that pits different taxpayers against each other—we should not tolerate that.

Let me conclude because I know other colleagues want to speak. The American people are anxious, and they are frustrated. They are upset with what they see happening in Washington—or I should say not happening in Washington. The reason is because they want us to realize the two points I just mentioned. They are waiting for us to get it and to base our fiscal policy on what is honest and true.

We can't ignore this issue any longer, and we will not—first by passing the budget resolution this week and then moving on a bipartisan basis through the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, to come up, hopefully, with a consensus tax reform plan that will get our econ-

omy growing again and allow hard-working American workers to keep more of what they earn and, in the process, help improve their standard of living.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, so often when you hear folks speak in Washington, it sounds as if we are only speaking to ourselves because most people around the country simply cannot understand what we are talking about when it comes to tax reform. We talk about repatriation and going from a global system to a territorial system and preventing inversions and the number of cohorts on the individual side and pass-throughs and corporate cuts. We talk about static scores versus dynamic scores. Too often, too many of us speak in a language that no one truly appreciates or understands.

From my perspective, tax reform is really about two very simple pillars. The first pillar is, how do we increase the take-home pay of the average person in this country, and how do we make sure the jobs of the future are created here in the good old U.S. of A?

Mr. President, I was privileged to grow up in a home with a strong, powerful, optimistic mother. She raised two boys on her own. I will tell you, when you think about the challenges of single moms today, I think about the one who raised me. I think back to the times when she was working 16 hours each day 3 days a week and 8 hours a day a couple days a week. She was a nurse's aide. She wasn't an LPN or an RN. She wasn't even a CNA. She was simply a nurse's aide, which means for several hours each day of her shift she changed bedpans, she rolled patients over.

So when I think about the average single mom, with a couple of kids in the household, whose average income today is less than \$36,000 a year, I think to myself, how are we going to make sure that single mother takes home more of her hard-earned money? Tax reform is the fastest way for us here in Washington to actually translate our activities to that household. See, if we take less out of her paycheck, she gets to take home more of her money.

Some have joked about the fact that I said hashtag "keep yo money." Why do I say that? Well, it is the way we speak at home. No. 1, and No. 2, it simplifies and crystallizes whom we are talking about. We are simply talking about single moms like mine. We are talking about folks who work hard every day, who are strapped, challenged, with very little margin in their schedules and even less in their paychecks.

The average American—I heard that somewhere around 50 percent of Americans do not have \$500 in their savings

account. When we are talking about tax reform, we are talking about increasing the margin for a family.

The second major pillar of tax reform is simply making sure that the jobs of the future are created here at home. Well, simple question: How do you do that? The answer is even simpler. When you look around the globe, you find very carefully and critically and simply that there are countries that have a tax rate on their business production of around 12.5 percent. The competition for countries like ours—say, the OECD, high-income countries; there are about 39 of them—the average tax rate is 22 percent. Our corporate tax rate is 35 percent. It doesn't take a genius to figure out that the difference between 35 and 22 is 13 percent, but more importantly, there are fewer jobs created here at home.

That is a problem we should solve. We solve that problem by making sure our corporate tax rate is competitive with our global competitors—common sense, some would suggest. I would suggest they are right. But not only that—whether you are on the left or the right, economists on both sides and our current President Trump and our former President Obama agreed on one thing—and we should all stop and celebrate when we have agreement on both sides—they both say that the corporate tax must come down because a part of who pays the price of the corporate tax are the workers. Some have said that 25 percent of the corporate taxes are paid by corporate workers, and others have said it is 80 percent.

Here is what we know: Our workers in this country take home less of their money because our corporate tax rate is too high. We can do something about that.

So when we talk about tax reform, when we talk about the importance of inversions being eliminated, satisfying the need to grow our economy, let's keep it simple. Let's talk about moms and dads like my single mom, income under \$36,000. Can we make sure she takes more of her money home so she can take care of her two kids? The answer is yes, and we should do that ASAP.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to follow the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and appreciate very much his remarks and how he does such a good job of really explaining why this tax relief is so very important.

I rise today to talk about the need for tax relief and how our Tax Code is now both outdated, very complex, and again, as my esteemed colleague from South Carolina said, it is past time to provide tax relief for our Nation's families, farmers, ranchers, and small businesses. That is what passing this legislation is all about—providing much

needed tax relief for our hard-working citizens. As I said, it is past time to modernize our outdated American Tax Code and bring it into the 21st century. We need to do so to ensure that American businesses can compete on the global stage; it is a global economy, and we must compete. And it is very much focused on our efforts to bring tax relief to middle-class families, who have been struggling to get ahead and stay ahead over the last decade.

As I said, the Senate this week is taking the first step—a very important step—toward enacting pro-growth tax reform by passing a budget resolution that provides the path toward improving our economic growth and putting more money back into the pockets of hard-working American people. Voting for this budget will enable us to move forward to enact that tax relief, again, not only for our families, but for farmers, ranchers, and small businesses across this country. Small business is the absolute backbone of our economy, and that is where the vast majority of jobs are created.

It is very important to understand and realize that this is not just about tax relief—making sure that, after taxes, hard-working Americans keep more of their money in their pocket, again, as so eloquently detailed by the Senator from South Carolina—but it is also about growing our economy. This is also pro-growth. This is about stimulating economic growth, meaning more jobs and, as the businesses that create those jobs invest the capital, create those jobs as they compete for labor, that also moves wages and income higher. So think about it. For that hard-working American, it is not only about reducing his or her tax burden, it is about increasing their wages and income. That is the rising tide that lifts all boats, so it is both. It is both about improving wages and income, as well as reducing the tax burden.

The recently released tax blueprint proposes sweeping tax reform, tax relief that will benefit working families and small businesses across the country while promoting job creation, economic growth, and global competitiveness.

This country was built on hard work by individuals and families who strive each and every day to make ends meet, provide for their loved ones, and plan for retirement, but this past decade has seen too many families struggling to get by. The current Tax Code is complex; it is riddled with loopholes. That not only does nothing to help our hard-working families keep more of their money, it makes it very difficult to even fill out their tax returns.

Tax relief will help individuals and families in my State of North Dakota and across the country to get ahead by generating new jobs through economic growth, as I said, while also lowering their overall tax burden so that they

keep more of their paycheck. For example, by doubling the standard deduction, we will eliminate taxes on the first \$12,000 earned by an individual and \$24,000 earned by a married couple, effectively establishing a 0-percent tax rate up to \$24,000. This means that the nearly 81 percent of North Dakotans who claim the standard deduction—again, my State—will see a significant increase in their take-home pay, and that is true across the country.

Our tax framework aims to generate greater opportunities for small business owners and farmers, helping them to become more competitive. Remember, we all compete in a global economy now, so how do we help our farmers, our ranchers, our small businesses become more competitive?

Small business represents nearly 96 percent of all employers in my State, and while we have fostered a business-friendly environment in North Dakota, the Federal Tax Code continues to place undue burdens on our small businesses that operate across North Dakota and across the other 49 States. That includes our farmers and ranchers, who can pay a marginal tax rate as high as almost 45 percent, which is nearly twice the rate of the rest of the industrialized world.

The tax framework follows an example that we have set, and the tax framework that we have proposed will restore economic opportunity and, as I said, enact a pro-growth tax code for our country.

Last week, I hosted tax reform sessions and roundtables across North Dakota to hear directly from our small businesses and also from ag leaders, our farm leaders, on their priorities. I want to talk about some of those priorities in agriculture for just a minute. Agriculture is No. 1 in North Dakota. We are a huge energy State, as well, but agriculture is and always will be No. 1 in our State. So when we talk about tax relief, we need to talk about tax relief for our farmers and our ranchers.

The right tax reform will help our farmers continue to provide the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world, which benefits every single American every single day. So that includes reducing the tax burden on these hard-working farmers and across the board for small businesses which, as I said, are the job creators in our economy, in our country. The biggest way we do that is to drop that rate for small business to 25 percent. That is a huge step forward. It not only makes our farms, ranches, and small businesses across the country more competitive, but it generates the economic growth that is so important for job creation and higher wages.

Another important issue is, in this framework, we eliminate the death tax or the estate tax. The death tax can result in double and sometimes triple

taxation of income. For example, an individual's wages are taxed when they are earned, and interest, dividends, and capital gains from saved wages are taxed again. The death tax hits those earnings again when an individual dies.

The average farmer today is 60 years old. The average farmer is 60 years old, and we continually see fewer and fewer young people able to get into the business of farming. With a tax code that disincentivizes passing down the family farm to the next generation, how do we expect to feed our Nation and, in fact, the world, which is exactly what we do?

The estate tax also stifles economic growth and reduces our Nation's competitiveness. A study by the Joint Economic Committee in 2012 found that the death tax had destroyed \$1.1 trillion in capital stock in the economy, and, of course, less capital investment means fewer jobs. Eliminating the death tax will encourage individuals to save, grow our economy, and, according to the Tax Foundation, will increase the capital investment reinvested back into our economy.

Additionally many of our producers, our farmers, and other small businesses do not have access to the equity they need to operate, so they rely heavily on debt financing to fund their businesses, and that is particularly true for new and beginning enterprises. Our Tax Code should incentivize our Nation's entrepreneurs to start their business or farm operation and allow them to grow and prosper. That is why it is a priority—certainly one of my priorities—that as we do tax reform, we maintain the ability of these businesses to deduct from their taxes the interest they pay on their debt in order to maintain a level playing field for small business.

Think about a family farmer out there. When family farmers need capital, it is very hard for them to go out and get equity. So they have to borrow that money in order to buy equipment and invest in their enterprises, and that is why the interest deduction for farmers is so very, very important. They don't have access to that equity capital; they have to borrow their money, which is a huge cost to their operation, and that is why the interest deduction for our farmers and for our ranchers is so very important.

Also, expensing is important for farmers and ranchers, and this is important for all small businesses. Being able to expense what they invest in their business makes a huge difference. Equipment, business supplies, and other capital expenditures can be very costly. For example, a new combine nowadays probably costs about one-half million dollars. For farmers to come up with one-half million dollars to buy a combine, which they obviously need, is hard to do unless they are able to expense that investment and deduct the interest on the debt that goes with it.

The tax framework we have proposed would allow businesses to immediately write off or expense the cost of new investment and business assets, effectively reinvesting in our Nation's businesses and helping to drive economic growth. It will allow businesses to increase investment and, again, increase job creation and wages. I would propose that we have full expensing for the first 5 years—that is great—but we should also on a long-term basis keep the section 179 expensing provision, which we have worked very hard to make permanent and which should be retained in this new Tax Code for the long-term, as we get beyond the first 5 years, as part of tax reform and tax relief that really works for our ag sector.

So these are some of the priorities we will be working on to include in our tax relief package to ensure that our farmers, our ranchers, and our ag industry continue to remain strong and really the leaders worldwide when it comes to, as I said, not only producing the highest quality but the lowest cost food supply in the world, which benefits every American every single day.

Tax reform is about getting the American economy going and growing, it is about creating jobs, and it is about creating jobs here at home, not overseas. It is about bringing that capital that is stranded overseas and repatriating it back to America and creating jobs in this country.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together. We need to pass this budget, and we need to pass tax reform for the hard-working people of North Dakota and for hard-working Americans across this great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be here on the floor of the U.S. Senate with my colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, who just talked a lot about some of the details but also some of the results of the tax reform that we are talking about. Also, I was very inspired to hear Senator SCOTT from South Carolina talk about how he believes—and I believe—that tax reform for someone like his mother, who was a nursing assistant raising two boys as a single mom, will have great impact on her. We all have a story to tell, and that is why I think this tax reform bill that we are talking about will be, can be, and should be very impactful for everyone across this great land.

My colleagues and I have talked a lot about this over the last several weeks because it really presents an incredible opportunity for us to make a difference for every American family, every American business, and individuals from all walks of life.

Just last week, when I was home in West Virginia, I had a small business roundtable. I hosted about seven or

eight owners of small businesses, and we sat down to talk about tax reform and what kinds of impacts this would have on them, their businesses, and the people they employ. It didn't take long because the first question I asked, right off the bat, was: What does tax reform mean to you? Well, they didn't say "Tax breaks for the wealthy" because that is not what they believe and that is not what I believe.

We had a woman who has a family-owned business. She employs six people as a highly technical, small manufacturer. She said that what tax relief means to her and her small business is that after she trains people—it takes a year and a half to train—a lot of them will leave and go to a bigger company because they are searching for a higher wage. She said: What I am going to be able to do is reward the good workers in my business and raise their wages so they will stay.

I almost closed my book and left. I said: Well, do I need to hear anything more? These are the impacts, I think, tax reform will have on small businesses.

I had another person there who employs 36 people in a communications company. What does tax reform mean to you? She said: Well, I have two locations. I have 36 people evenly split between the two locations. But in communications you really have to modernize your IT for graphics and be able to do the best communications and advertising you can do. That is expensive. It is really expensive. She said: What tax reform means to me is, I am going to be able to modernize my infrastructure, my IT, my software, and still keep the 36 people who work for me. And she said: I am looking next year to hire another six, and this gives me the certainty to be able to do that.

Well, I almost closed my book up and left then. What does that mean? That means more investments. Somebody is selling that software. Somebody is creating that software—hopefully, in this country—and somebody is going to be the beneficiary of that increased investment in a small business.

I heard about raising wages. I heard about what economic growth will do to a small business in a small State. I heard Senator HOEVEN say 96 percent of business in North Dakota is small business, and 95 percent of business in West Virginia is small business.

So these efforts will be about transforming our economy. For too long, we have been living with a stagnant economy, with too few opportunities, and with people feeling like they just can't get ahead. Rural America has really felt this, and many of the communities in my State and around the country have felt these effects of this stagnation, this lack of confidence, this feeling that you can't get ahead. You are not ready to spend the money.

No. 1, you don't have it because you are paying too high taxes. No. 2, you

don't want to spend it because you don't have the confidence that the economy is going to move. That is what this is about today. We have a chance to transform this and create opportunities, reform our Tax Code, and deliver pro-growth legislative solutions. We haven't done this for decades. It is way past time to make a real difference and make a system that is more transparent, a system that is simple.

Something I don't think we talk about enough is tax simplification. How welcome that would be to probably everybody seated in the Gallery here today, and millions across the country, when they look at the time and effort and money they spend to prepare a complicated tax return, when tax simplification would free them from a lot of that burden.

Most of all, we want a system that is fair and the kind of system that rewards hard-working families and puts more money in the pockets of those who earn it. You think, what would you do with it. I think everybody could come up with something they could do. They might want to save for retirement. They might want to go on vacation. They might need to do repairs for their home. They might want to buy a new pair of shoes for their child or a new car. There are all kinds of ways that people are holding back because they don't have the confidence. If they have that money in their pocket, then the confidence will be there in the future, and they are going to invest. They will invest in their lives, their families, their homes, their businesses.

Before we can move forward, we must pass this budget. This budget resolution before us today reins in Federal spending and provides new prospects for our businesses and our families. It paves the way for a tax code overhaul and creates a pathway to greater prosperity. I heard the Senator from Texas saying we would love to have a bipartisan tax reform measure in front of us. When we all see what the results of this are going to be, we should be able to join together, but we need this budget resolution to make sure that what we have talked about for more than several months and a year is going to come to fruition.

A vote for this budget is a vote to provide tax relief for hard-working, middle-income Americans. It is a vote to lower taxes on families with children. It is a vote to incentivize companies to invest domestically and create jobs in this country. That is what they tell us they want to do. I believe they know an investment in this country with their capital and their people is a much more solid investment for their company's future than any investment outside of this country.

It is very hard to think that any of my Senate colleagues, Republican or Democratic, would not want to support

these goals. So passing this resolution creates a once-in-a-generation opportunity to reform our Tax Code in a way that will move our economy forward. Our country will move forward.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the budget and to begin the process of delivering tax reform that will help so many people in my State of West Virginia and across this country. We cannot let this opportunity slip by. I am going to do my best to make sure it doesn't. Thank you.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1144, 1119, 1150, 1146, 1120, AND 1151 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I call up the following amendments en bloc and ask unanimous consent that they be reported by number and that the rollcall votes in relation to the amendments occur in the order listed: Hatch No. 1144, Sanders No. 1119, Nelson No. 1150, Heller No. 1146, Sanders No. 1120, and Collins No. 1151.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for others, proposes amendments numbered 1144, 1119, 1150, 1146, 1120, and 1151 en bloc to amendment No. 1116.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1144

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting Medicare and Medicaid)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING MEDICARE AND MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), which may include strengthening and improving Medicaid for the most vulnerable populations, and extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1119

(Purpose: To provide additional resources to restore the \$1,000,000,000 in cuts to Medicaid paid for by reducing the tax breaks for the wealthy)

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 4, line 12 decrease the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 24, line 19, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 24, line 20, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.
 On page 24, line 23, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.
 On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.
 On page 25, line 2, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.
 On page 25, line 3 increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.
 On page 25, line 6, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.
 On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.
 On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.
 On page 25, line 11, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.
 On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.
 On page 25, line 15, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.
 On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.
 On page 25, line 19, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.
 On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.
 On page 25, line 23, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 1150

(Purpose: To provide additional resources to restore the \$473,000,000,000 in cuts to Medicare paid for by closing special interest tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.
 On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.
 On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.
 On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.
 On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.
 On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.
 On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.
 On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.
 On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.
 On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.
 On page 4, line 12, decrease the amount by \$5,850,000,000.
 On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$12,300,000,000.
 On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by \$19,550,000,000.
 On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$27,900,000,000.
 On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$37,150,000,000.
 On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$47,600,000,000.
 On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by \$59,500,000,000.
 On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$71,850,000,000.
 On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$87,250,000,000.
 On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$103,950,000,000.
 On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.
 On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.
 On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.
 On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.
 On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.
 On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.
 On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.
 On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.
 On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.
 On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.
 On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.
 On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.
 On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.
 On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.
 On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.
 On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.
 On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.
 On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.
 On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.
 On page 26, line 2, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.
 On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.
 On page 26, line 6, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.
 On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.
 On page 26, line 10, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.
 On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.
 On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.
 On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.
 On page 26, line 18, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.
 On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.
 On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.
 On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.
 On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.
 On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.
 On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.
 On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.
 On page 27, line 10, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.
 On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.
 On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.
 On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 1146

(Purpose: To provide tax relief to American families with children to provide them with more money in their paychecks to make ends meet)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include lowering taxes on families with children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1120

(Purpose: To ensure that there are no tax cuts for the top 1 percent of Americans)

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 _____ POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY LEGISLATION THAT PROVIDES A TAX CUT FOR THE TOP 1 PERCENT OF THE WEALTHIEST INDIVIDUALS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that provides a tax cut to the top 1 percent of individuals.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 1151

(Purpose: To provide tax relief to small businesses and to include provisions to prevent upper-income taxpayers from sheltering income from taxation at the appropriate rate)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include the provision of tax relief for small businesses, along with provisions to prevent upper-income taxpayers from sheltering income from taxation at the appropriate rate, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, while Senator ENZI is on the floor, I want to thank him for his leadership in the Budget Committee and taking us through this very important vote today.

I want to talk a little bit in terms that maybe people can understand what is going on here and what will be going on over the next few days.

What we are doing right now is passing a budget. Our budget is no different than your household budget, when you sit down and you figure out, over some

period of time, how much money you have and how much money you need to spend, where maybe you need to spend more and maybe you need to spend less. That is all we are doing with this budget.

This budget is not the tax reform bill. That will come after we pass a budget, but if we don't pass this budget, there is no possible way we can actually pass tax reform. That is why I support this budget. That is why I will work to defeat any amendments that will prevent this budget from being passed. Then we can start having an honest discussion about what we need to do around tax reform.

I know the Senator from South Carolina did a great job, as he always does on the floor, talking about why he supports tax reform. He is somebody we should really listen to. He is somebody who came up through truly humble means. You have people come on this floor and they talk about how the people who are supporting tax reform are just doing this for the billionaires and the rich.

I would encourage you to go out to the internet and take a look at Senator SCOTT's story and tell me if that is somebody predisposed to helping the rich. He is here to help the little guy. He is here to get the economy going so people can get back to work. He is here to actually create opportunities for wages to go up. He is here to actually do what we have been promising for 20 years and haven't done—almost 30 years.

Over that span of time, America has lost traction as the greatest economy that has ever existed. This tax reform measure, after we pass the budget, is to really get to a point to where States like West Virginia—you heard Senator CAPITO talk about 95 percent of the jobs created in West Virginia are small businesses. How could anybody sincerely come to this floor and say Senator CAPITO is only supporting this for the wealthy corporations? They just don't exist in any large number in West Virginia.

In my State, 80 percent of the jobs that are created are small businesses as well. So how anybody could suggest that there are those of us coming to the floor just talking about tax breaks for the rich and for corporations really need to go back and look at our States. Look at who is struggling and whom we are here trying to help. We get to the tax reform bill after we pass the budget. That is why I am going to support the budget.

Now, to some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, the Founding Fathers did strive to create a more perfect Union, but they created an imperfect democratic process. This is the sausage factory we call democracy. It is not intended to be perfect, nor does it ever produce anything that is perfect legislation—something that is done and you never come back to it.

Those who come to this floor and say: Unless I can have that perfect, I am not willing to support the good, they really need to go back and rethink why they are here. We are here to start fulfilling promises. You don't do it by coming onto this floor and saying: I really want to do tax reform but only if it is my perfect solution. You start by making progress. Then you build on that progress. You start getting the economy to grow, and you use those resources to better fund the most challenged people we have in this Nation, use those resources to grow the economy and give younger people an opportunity to realize the American dream the way I did back in the 1980s.

That is why we have to pass this budget. That is why we have to set aside our personal preferences for something far better than probably will ever come out of this Chamber but something good that begins to fulfill the promises we made to the American people.

When we get past the budget, we are going to do something called vote-arama tomorrow. Vote-arama is an interesting process, mainly because it is a bunch of votes that don't mean anything. There are going to be people who come up here, and they will file a bill. It will go up or down. Even if it goes up, it doesn't have the force of law.

Tomorrow, if you are here, it is a lot like going to good theater. At the end of the day, the only thing that matters is the final vote, and that is the vote on the budget. That is something every single person in this Chamber should support. Then we need to move on to tax reform that has a meaningful, lasting impact for the poorest, most challenged people in this country. It is not about tax breaks for the rich. It is not about tax breaks for corporations. It is about small businesses in West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina or across this Nation that need help. It is about those employees that, if we do this right, will be making more money. They will have more money to pay their bills. It is about making a conscious decision about how much money we can spend on Medicaid and to be absolutely certain we can fulfill the promise to people challenged by it. It is about fulfilling the promise to people on Social Security and Medicare, to make sure those programs can fulfill the promises we made.

This isn't about absolute cuts to Medicaid. This is about how much it should grow every single year to be absolutely certain those programs are going to be there 10, 15, and 20 years from now. If you have an opportunity to sit up in the Gallery and pay attention to these words, go back and really fact check some of what is being said. Go back and look at the backgrounds of some of the Members on this side of the aisle who support tax reform. They grew up as the little guy. They grew up

in challenged situations. They represent States where the vast majority of the people in those States are, themselves, challenged. Anybody who can sincerely come down here and say this is about the rich, this is about the corporations, come spend time in North Carolina, South Carolina, West Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee, States across this Nation. I come from the Southeast, but they are the ones that come out of my mouth.

I worry about all those little businesses. I worry about all those challenged people. This budget lays the groundwork for us to actually put meaningful policy in place for the first time in about 30 years that is sincerely attempting to fulfill the promises the politicians make in this Chamber every single day.

I hope all of our Members will come down here and accept the fact that perfect doesn't happen, but some good can happen. Good begins by passing this budget, and it continues by passing tax reform that will help the most challenged among us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1120

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, some of our Republican colleagues said in the past days, the budget debate is all about getting the tax reform. The fact is, this is a fast lane to a partisan process for dealing with taxes. When it comes to the Republican plan, you get a lot of rhetoric and a lot of happy talk. You hear it is the biggest tax cut ever. You hear it is about the middle class.

Just this morning, the President tweeted the Democrats will only vote for tax increases, but that rhetoric is just out of touch with reality. For example, our 2015 bill, of which I was the lead Democratic sponsor, cut taxes \$650 billion. It went to the heart of the needs of young people in this country with the American opportunity tax credit, the earned-income tax credit, but it also helped farmers—farmers who are concerned about expensing the research and development credit for our innovators.

That is the kind of approach we ought to take that is bipartisan, that helps people in this country. Everybody has a chance to get ahead. The fact is, the Tax Code on the books is now a tale of two systems. There is a strict mandatory system for a cop or a nurse. Their taxes come right out of every paycheck. It is mandatory. There are no special Cayman Island deals for them.

Then there is another set of rules for the highfliers, the most fortunate. They can, with good lawyers and good accountants, decide what they want to pay and when they want to pay it. That is the rotting source of unfairness that is at the heart of the American Tax

Code. That is why so many hard-working Americans think they are getting a rotten deal every April 15. That is the brand of unfairness Ronald Reagan was interested in going after, but somehow we can't get that same kind of spirit from Republicans at this point on this tax bill.

The Trump tax cut doubles down on the rotten unfairness in the Tax Code. It is a multitrillion-dollar handout to those who are the most powerful, and it is very generous to those at the top of the top, which is why this amendment with Senator SANDERS is so important. The Trump tax plan, at this point, doesn't just fail to close the most egregious loopholes, but it enshrines them for good.

The amendment that Senator SANDERS and I are putting forward is pretty simple. It says that in this tax bill we are going to put the focus on the middle class. We are not just going to focus on people at the top. That is why the amendment creates a point of order against the plan that gives a tax handout to the top of the top of the income spectrum in our country.

If you are a middle-class family, according to what is offered now, the Republican plan giveth with one hand and taketh away with another. The standard deduction might be doubled, but you are going to lose personal exemptions, and if you come from a State with a significant State and local tax structure, you are going to find it very hard to get ahead.

That is what we want to change. We will not want a scheme that hides the true multitrillion-dollar cost of the tax giveaways to those at the top. We want relief to go to those at the middle.

I close by saying that the Sanders-Wyden amendment is based on a simple principle, and that is that we want to expand the winners' circle for working Americans—those without lobbyists, those without clout—to have a chance to get ahead. They have been left out of the economic winners' circle for too long. We want to put a focus on those people who have felt the panic of seeing the costs of rent, college, and medicine go up and up and up. Tax reform should be about helping them. That is what the Sanders-Wyden amendment proposes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 1144

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of my amendment No. 1144. This legislation is designed to do two things. It is important for us to consider this. First, it would protect Medicaid for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens, namely, low-income children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with disabilities. Those are important vulnerable citizens, as far as I am concerned. In addition, it would strengthen Medicare in order to help

protect health benefits for current and future beneficiaries. Make no mistake. Our Nation faces a growing entitlement crisis, and Medicare and Medicaid are at the heart of it.

Under ObamaCare, Medicaid enrollment has increased by about 28 percent due to the expansion of the program in 32 States.

Between 2014 and 2015 alone, expansion States received about \$79 billion in Federal funds. The problem is that even before ObamaCare, Medicaid was plagued by quality issues, and States' hands were tied whenever they tried to advance innovative solutions to improve patient care.

Of course, even before ObamaCare, Medicaid spending on both the Federal and State levels was growing at an astronomical rate. Contrary to popular myth, ObamaCare did not fix this. It made things worse.

As chairman of the committee with jurisdiction over Medicaid, I have been working with a number of my Republican colleagues as well as State officials, stakeholders, and the American public to find solutions that will improve the quality and ensure the longevity of the Medicaid Program. That work will continue into the future.

Medicare is a separate problem entirely. Everyone knows that when it comes to Medicare, we are on a collision course with fiscal economic catastrophe facing us.

Over the long term, Medicaid faces more than \$33 trillion—that is with a “t”—in unfunded liabilities according to the independent actuaries at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

In the nearer term, the Medicare trustees project that Medicare Part A, which deals with inpatient hospital payments, will be officially bankrupt in 2029, resulting in steep benefit cuts for seniors relying on the program.

Even a number of prominent Democrats who recently served as Medicare trustees have recommended swift legislative action to “minimize the impact on beneficiaries, providers, and taxpayers.”

To put it simply, we need to address the fiscal challenges facing these programs if we are going to preserve them for future generations.

Despite the claims of a number of my Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we can't even make a dent in these problems by focusing solely on the tax side of the equation.

I know many like to claim that every wrong would be righted and every problem would be solved if we simply raised taxes on rich people. Anyone who has spent more than 5 minutes looking at the fiscal condition of our Federal health programs will tell you that is preposterous. The money just simply isn't there. The Republican budget acknowledges this reality.

My colleagues have argued that the budget would cut Medicare spending,

but that isn't true. In fact, under the budget, Medicare spending would increase every year, though at a slightly slower rate, in order to introduce some level of fiscal sanity into the process.

All told, the budget would slow Medicare's rate of growth by about 1 percent compared to the CBO baseline.

Furthermore, the budget resolution does not propose any specific programmatic changes to either Medicare or Medicaid, even though my friends on the other side of the aisle like to argue otherwise.

Let me be clear on another point. Despite a number of claims to the contrary, the budget resolution does not rely on savings from Medicaid in order to provide tax relief.

My colleagues, the ranking member of the Budget Committee and the senior Senator from Florida, have proposed amendments to dramatically increase taxes to the tune of about \$1 trillion for Medicaid and half a trillion dollars for Medicare over the next decade in order to double and triple down on this particular set of problems, the failed policies that have made these programs unsustainable in the first place.

These are not serious proposals. They are poison pills designed only to give the other side a round of partisan talking points that are really ridiculous.

A vote for my amendment is a vote for a stronger, more fiscally sound safety net that preserves Medicaid for our most vulnerable citizens, keeps our promises to Medicare's current beneficiaries, and strengthens the program for those who will need it in the future.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment. It is a good amendment. It is the right thing to do. It makes us better prepared for the future. It seems to me that every one of us would be proud to vote for it and to solve these problems that the amendment will solve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes to speak, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, let me say that the people of Michigan and our country deserve a better deal than what is in this budget. There are a number of concerns I have, but I want to mention three big ones, and I am proud to join with colleagues on amendments that would address them in votes that will be coming up.

The first is the fact that this budget would take \$473 billion out of Medicare. I offered an amendment in committee to make sure that would include privatizing Medicare, but that was voted down. That is certainly something that could happen.

There is \$1 trillion in Medicaid cuts as well. In Michigan, three out of five

seniors in nursing homes are there with the help of Medicaid health insurance. This is children, families, and senior citizens. There will be an amendment offered that Senator NELSON, Senator SANDERS, and I offered to take out this cut from Medicare. There will be one offered for Medicaid, with Senator SANDERS, Senator CASEY, and me, to strike that.

Second, 80 percent of the tax cuts built into the assumptions of the budget go to the top 1 percent. What does that mean? Well, it is \$1.5 trillion that goes to folks making \$700,000 or more. That is at least a \$200,000 tax cut per person. We commonly call this trickle-down economics. So far it has never worked. People in my State are still waiting for it to trickle down.

We have an amendment, as well, to remove this provision and to put the tax cuts into the pockets of middle-class taxpayers.

Finally, this plan overall increases the deficit. Even though it cuts Medicare and Medicaid, it also increases and explodes the deficit by \$2.4 trillion. We also will be addressing that as well.

Overall, unfortunately, in terms of the big tax cuts, this budget proposal is paid for by our senior citizens and single parents who are affected and middle-class families. I urge a "no" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 1151

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about what the appropriate tax rate should be for large corporations. That is important because we want them to create jobs right here in America and not overseas.

Let us not forget the true engine of our economy, and that is our small businesses. We need to provide true tax relief to our small businesses, the job creators in our economy.

I rise to discuss my amendment, which is No. 1151, which would create a deficit neutral reserve fund to support small business tax relief while preventing wealthy taxpayers from sheltering income from taxation at the appropriate rate.

It would send the message that through tax reform, we can help our small businesses thrive and be the engine of job creation and economic growth in communities all across our great country.

Small businesses make an out-sized contribution to our economy. According to the Small Business Administration, small businesses employ nearly half of all workers and generate two out of three net new jobs each year. Nationwide, they generate nearly half of our private, nonfarm GDP and one-third of our Nation's export value.

The State of Maine is truly a small business State, with nearly 300,000 of our residents employed by our more than 141,000 small businesses. That is nearly 60 percent of our workforce.

Most small businesses are organized as so-called passthrough entities, which means that their profits are passed on to their owners and reported on individual income tax returns.

Under current law, this income is taxed at individual rates, which can reach nearly 40 percent at the Federal level and can be significantly higher than the corporate tax rates that large firms face.

Given the administrative costs and these high tax rates, small businesses are forced to devote more resources to compliance and tax payments and fewer resources to creating good jobs and investing in their local communities.

It is no wonder that a recent survey by the National Federation of Independent Business found that concerns about Federal taxes on small businesses ranked third on the list of the top 10 concerns.

With tax reform, we have the opportunity to fix this problem. Of course, we should aim to do so in a way that prevents people from abusing rates intended for small business passthrough income.

My amendment would allow for changes to Federal tax laws and to provide relief to small businesses, while not allowing wealthy individuals to shelter their income from taxation at the appropriate rate.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1144

Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote on amendment No. 1144, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority time is yielded back.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the amendment from the Senator from Utah speaks about "strengthening and improving" Medicaid and Medicare. We don't strengthen and improve Medicaid by cutting it by \$1 trillion, and we don't strengthen and improve Medicare by cutting it by \$469 billion. That is Orwellian language.

We should vote down this amendment and adopt the Sanders amendment which says: Let us give no tax breaks to billionaires while we cut Medicaid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Baldwin	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Franken	Peters
Bennet	Gardner	Portman
Blumenthal	Graham	Reed
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Brown	Hassan	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Cantwell	Heinrich	Rubio
Capito	Heitkamp	Sasse
Cardin	Heller	Schatz
Carper	Hoeven	Schumer
Casey	Inhofe	Scott
Cassidy	Isakson	Shaheen
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kaine	Stabenow
Coons	Kennedy	Strange
Corker	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Leahy	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McCaill	Udall
Daines	McCaskey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	Wyden
Ernst	Murray	Young
Feinstein	Nelson	

NAYS—9

Booker	Hirono	Merkley
Gillibrand	Lee	Sanders
Harris	Markey	Warren

NOT VOTING—2

Blunt
Menendez

The amendment (No. 1144) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following this first vote—the one we just finished—be 10 minutes in length, all of the rest of them. Actually, there is a request for 5 minutes in length. We doubt that we can do it in 10, but the unanimous consent request is for 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1119

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1119, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CANTWELL be added as a cosponsor to amendment No. 1119 and that Senator STABENOW be added as a cosponsor to amendment No. 1120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment says no to the cutting of \$1 trillion from Medicaid and forcing 15 million Americans off the health insurance they currently have, while at the same time providing a \$1.9 trillion tax break to the top 1 percent. This is not what the American people want; it is what the billionaire class wants. I make the radical suggestion that maybe we listen to ordinary Americans and not just wealthy campaign contributors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. This amendment would increase mandatory spending and taxes each by more than \$1 trillion. I understand my colleagues are concerned about Medicaid. I want to assure them that this budget is focused on preserving Medicaid for those who need it most, but in order to preserve Medicaid, we must also be honest about its fiscal trajectory. The status quo for Medicaid is simply unsustainable. Not only are Medicaid outcomes lackluster, the program is on a path toward bankrupting our States. The budget before us puts Medicaid on a more sustainable path.

Critics argue that this budget pays for tax relief through cuts to Medicaid. I want to clarify that. This budget does not rely on savings from Medicaid to achieve tax reform. In fact, the economic growth attributed to reforming the Tax Code will help improve Medicaid's fiscal health.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Coons	Hassan
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Donnelly	Heitkamp
Booker	Duckworth	Hirono
Brown	Durbin	Kaine
Cantwell	Feinstein	King
Cardin	Franken	Klobuchar
Carper	Gillibrand	Leahy
Casey	Harris	Manchin

Markey
McCaskill
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Peters

Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester

Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—51

Alexander
Barrasso
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Enzi
Ernst
Fischer

Flake
Gardner
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski

Paul
Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Shelby
Strange
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—2

Blunt
Menendez

The amendment (No. 1119) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1150

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1150, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before Medicare, one-half of senior citizens in this country did not have any healthcare, health insurance. Medicare changed that. So why in the world would we want to cut \$473 billion from Medicare? It does not make sense.

My amendment simply restores that cut and replaces it with eliminating a number of tax loopholes. It is a simple amendment. Save Medicare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. It sounds like something simple. It is aimed at ending the budget resolution. This budget does not cut Medicare, and it does not provide tax breaks for the wealthy. It does not protect special interest tax loopholes. Also, anything that we do here has to be completed in other committees in order to ever happen.

This budget does slow Medicare's projected annual rate of growth by approximately 1 percent in comparison to the CBO's baseline. The CBO estimates that Medicare's hospital insurance trust fund will become exhausted prior to the end of the budget window of 2025, at which point it will no longer be able to pay full benefits to seniors. This budget resolution protects Medicare by extending the life of the trust fund. It also establishes a path toward pro-growth tax reform, which will generate additional economic growth in Medicare.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markley	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Cochran	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Blunt
Menendez

The amendment (No. 1150) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1146

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1146, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for the Senator from Nevada, Mr. HELLER.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of Heller amendment No. 1146. Amendment No. 1146 provides tax relief for families with children. This week we are setting in motion one of my top legislative priorities in the Senate; that is, to bring tax relief to American families.

For decades, Nevadans have been waiting for an affordable and fair tax code that they can understand, and I

have long said that the Tax Code is too costly and too complex. We need to simplify our code in a way that creates jobs and allows Nevadans to keep more of their hard-earned tax dollars. With this budget, we are taking an enormous first step in providing meaningful relief to Nevadans and middle-class families across the Nation.

Under our leadership and thanks to the work of the chairman of the Budget Committee, we are finally in a place where we can provide real, meaningful tax relief for all of America. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I have been working with my colleagues to craft a tax bill that accomplishes three major goals. The first is to create more jobs; No. 2 is to increase wages; and, finally, No. 3 is to boost American competitiveness.

So the question is, What does tax reform mean to an average Nevadan who works hard and is trying to provide a better life for themselves and for their children? It means you can keep more of your hard-earned paycheck, and it will be easier for you to file your taxes, less paperwork, more money. Lower rates for businesses mean more jobs, they mean higher wages, and they mean growth in our communities, all of which will benefit you.

As the son of a school cook and an auto mechanic, I understand discipline and hard work—all of it—that goes into every dollar and every paycheck, and I am working to see that we have more of it in your back pocket. That is why my amendment is absolutely critical, because it delivers this desperately needed relief and lets the middle-class families keep more of their hard-earned paychecks, helping them make ends meet and invest in their families.

For too long, American families have been struggling with stagnant wages and incomes, as well as slow economic growth made worse by the policies of the Obama administration. In inflation-adjusted terms, nationwide median household incomes stayed below what it was in 2007 all the way up to 2015. Last year, it was only \$890 more than it was in 2007. In my home State of Nevada, the situation is even worse. Median household income still hasn't fully recovered and is \$7,000 lower today than it was in 2007.

Tax relief for families with children, through an enhanced child tax credit, for example, will help begin to address the financial insecurities facing American families and will help families confront the rising cost of raising children. Expansion of the child tax credit will help hard-working, middle-class families in many ways, allowing them to keep more of their hard-earned income to use for the needs of their families and for their children.

I urge everyone in this Chamber to support children, I urge them to support middle-class families, and I urge them to support my amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if we support children and we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth, we will vote against this budget resolution, but I have no problems with Senator HELLER's amendment.

What I do want to do is spend a moment on the amendment that will come up next, and that is that it would establish a 60-vote budget point of order to prevent the top 1 percent of Americans—people who are doing phenomenally well—from receiving any future tax cuts. It is not a radical idea to suggest that at a time of massive income and wealth inequality, when the people on top are doing unbelievably well, at a time when the middle class is shrinking, now is not the time to provide hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the very wealthiest families in this country.

Under the Republican proposal with the repeal of the estate tax, the Walton family—wealthiest family in America—would get up to a \$50 billion tax break. Does anybody think that is vaguely sane? The Koch brothers, who have enough money to spend hundreds of millions of dollars electing right-wing candidates, will get a \$30 billion tax break.

I think the American people have been very clear, in poll after poll, saying not only do they not want to give tax breaks to billionaires but they correctly believe the wealthiest people in this country should start paying their fair share of taxes.

Today the United States has more income and wealth inequality than at any time since the 1920s. Today the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. Twenty people in America own as much wealth as the bottom half of our country.

According to a recent study by the Federal Reserve, the top 1 percent now own 39 percent of the Nation's wealth while the bottom 60 percent own just 3 percent. Since the Wall Street crash a decade ago, 52 percent of all new income has gone to the top 1 percent. If there was ever a time in American history not to be cutting Medicaid and Medicare and giving huge tax breaks to the 1 percent, this is that moment.

I ask support for this amendment.

I think Senator WYDEN wanted to say a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, very briefly, I strongly support this amendment, colleagues.

The point of this is, this is an amendment that does what the President says he wants to do, which is not give relief to the people at the top, but the reality is, when you look at their pro-

posal, it really does drive much of the wealth in America to those at the very top.

The Sanders amendment is to ensure that people at the top of the top don't get relief. We get it to working families and the vulnerable. I urge colleagues to strongly support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Harris	Reed
Boozman	Hassan	Risch
Brown	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heinrich	Rounds
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sanders
Cardin	Hirono	Sasse
Carper	Hoeven	Schatz
Casey	Inhofe	Schumer
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corker	King	Strange
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Leahy	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCain	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	Young
Flake	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

Blunt Menendez

The amendment (No. 1146) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1120

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1120, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this is a very simple and straightforward amendment. It would establish a 60-vote budget point of order to prevent the top 1 percent of Americans, people who are doing phenomenally well, from receiving any future tax cuts.

At a time of massive income and wealth inequality in this country, when the very rich are becoming richer while most Americans are seeing a decline in their standard of living, this is not the time to give tax breaks to people who don't need them.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Sanders-Wyden amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues, this next vote will be the last roll call vote of the day. Senator COLLINS has graciously agreed to do a voice vote on her amendment.

On this amendment, though, I am going to urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. We should not prejudge the Finance Committee's consideration of tax reform but allow the bill to go through regular order, where it will be open to amendment.

This amendment is corrosive to the budget resolution privilege. It falls outside the scope of what is appropriate for inclusion.

Adoption of corrosive amendments could be fatal to the resolution's privilege, and loss of privilege could compromise our ability to pass tax reform and enforce the budget spending limits.

Further, this amendment is also non-germane. The Congressional Budget Act requires that amendments to a budget resolution be germane. It is a statutory requirement we can't ignore. So I raise a point of order against this amendment under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 305(b)(2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 305(b)(2) of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Reed
Blumenthal	Hassan	Sanders
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Udall
Coons	Manchin	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markley	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	
Franken	Nelson	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Strange
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	
Flake	Paul	

NOT VOTING—2

Blunt Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 52.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 1151

Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 1151, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about what the appropriate tax rate should be for large corporations—so-called C corps. That certainly is important because we want to make sure that those large businesses are creating jobs here in the United States and not overseas in order to take advantage of lower tax rates.

But let us not forget the importance of providing tax relief for our small businesses. It is our small businesses that create the majority of new jobs in this country and that are really the economic engines for so many of our communities.

Small businesses make an outsized contribution to our Nation's economy. According to the Small Business Administration, they employ nearly half of all workers and generate two out of three net new jobs each year. Nationwide, small businesses generate nearly half of our private nonfarm GDP and one-third of our Nation's export value. My State of Maine is truly a State of

small businesses. Sixty percent of our workforce—that is, nearly 300,000 of our residents—are employed by more than 141,000 small businesses.

I spoke at length earlier about the amendment, and I know that the chairman of the Budget Committee has a lot of work to do tonight. So I won't repeat the comments I made earlier. Let me just say that my amendment would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to support small business tax relief while preventing wealthy taxpayers from sheltering income from taxation at the appropriate rate. We want to have some guide rails. But it is important that we recognize that it is the small businesses of America that are the true job creators in so many of our communities.

I urge our colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. President, I request a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1151) was agreed to.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for his cooperation and support as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it is probably not surprising but, unfortunately, so far Democrats have shown little disposition to work with Republicans on tax reform legislation, despite the fact that parts of our plan, like lowering corporate tax rates and switching to a territorial tax system, have been supported by Democrats as well as Republicans.

One particular aspect of the Republican plan that Democrats have been taking aim at lately is our plan to repeal the death tax. They complain that it is not something to really worry about, since, they claim, relatively few estates actually have to pay the tax.

One of my Democratic colleagues released a report detailing some of the ways people try to avoid the death tax. From the tone of the press release and report, one would think that anyone trying to avoid the estate tax was a multibillionaire and a tax cheat—and greedy, to boot. But I can tell you, the actual situation is very different.

Of course there are wealthy individuals who try to reduce or eliminate their death tax liability. After all, who wants to be taxed a second or third time on money they have earned during their lifetime that they could be passing down to their children or grandchildren?

There are also a lot of small business owners and owners of family farms and ranches who have to spend tens of thousands of dollars a year trying to avoid the death tax in order to preserve

their family business for another generation. Many of the farmers and ranchers in my State know that without careful and costly planning, the Federal Government will come around after their death demanding a staggering 40 percent of their estate and that their children won't have the money to pay without risking the farm or ranch.

How does that work? Well, farming and ranching is a cash-poor business. Farmers and ranchers may own valuable land, but they are only earning cash on the crops they grow or the livestock they raise on that land. Thus, while their overall farm or ranch may have a substantial value, the amount of money they have coming in is relatively small and subject to the swings in the market from year to year.

Frequently, when farmers and ranchers die, the vast portion of their estate is made up of their land, while actual cash or liquid assets are a very small part of it. If they don't take measures to avoid having their family hit by the death tax, the family will have no choice but to sell off the land to pay the government, which means losing income-generating property or the family's farm or ranch overall.

Family-owned businesses across the country face the same situation, where the value of the estate is tied up in the business.

The threat of the death tax is a constant burden hanging over the heads of farmers and ranchers in my State who want nothing more than to be able to pass on the family farm or ranch to the next generation.

That brings me to a larger point—the need to simplify our current Tax Code, which is one of the five principles guiding Republicans' tax reform efforts.

Our Tax Code is long, and it is complicated. It is almost twice as long as it was in 1985 and nearly six times as long as it was in 1955. The instructions for the basic 1040 form alone are more than 100 pages long, and it is no surprise. The Tax Code is full of deductions, exemptions, and special rules, all of which amount to unnecessary complication and, too often, confusion.

Take education tax benefits, an area of concern for middle-class families. Currently, there are more than a dozen separate tax provisions relating to education, from the American opportunity tax credit to 529 savings accounts. Of course, these provisions come with approximately 100 pages of IRS instructions, special forms, and schedules, not to mention the professional tax preparer whom too many families have to hire to figure it all out.

Then there are small businesses, which have to navigate a bewildering mass of tax provisions and regulations but often don't have the money to hire the professional help they need. I think it is fair to say that a big reason some small businesses fail to get off the

ground is because they lack the resources that would enable them to deal with the Tax Code.

Then, of course, as I mentioned before, there is that other bane of small businesses and family farms and ranches; that is, again, the death tax. The death tax forces farmers and ranchers to invest a significant amount of time and money in complex estate plans, insurance, and expensive tax professionals so they can preserve their farm or ranch for their children.

According to a recent survey by Family Enterprise USA, of those indicating that they undertook estate-planning efforts, the average planning cost in 2016 was more than \$170,000, and that doesn't include the average cost of insurance to pay for the death tax, which was \$75,000 a year. Those are simply wasted resources that could be used to reinvest back into the business, create new jobs, and increase wages—all of which would help us achieve the kind of economic growth we have been lacking for the past 8 years.

Republicans don't think farmers and ranchers should have to spend tens of thousands of dollars a year to preserve their farm or ranch for their children. We don't think families should have to hire a tax preparer to file a basic income tax form. We don't think it should cost small businesses between \$15 billion and \$16 billion each year to comply with the Tax Code. We don't think you should have to be an accountant to figure out what tax deductions, exemptions, or credits you qualify for. We don't think the Tax Code should prevent Americans from starting a small business or expanding an existing business to provide more jobs or higher wages for their employees. So the comprehensive tax reform bill we are currently drafting will simplify the Tax Code. It will eliminate loopholes and special rules and dedicate those savings to easing the tax burden on hard-working families and small businesses. It will drastically ease the tax return process, with the hope of making it as easy for Americans to file their taxes as it is to fill out a postcard. It will eliminate the death tax so that family-owned businesses, farms, and ranches in my home State of South Dakota and around the country can focus their dollars on growing their businesses, not paying for tax professionals to preserve it.

Our bill will simplify and streamline tax benefits so that you don't need to hire a tax professional to figure out which education or home ownership or other tax benefits you qualify for. So it is disappointing that our Democratic colleagues are so hostile to the idea of working with Republicans that they are passing on the chance to join us to provide the American people with unprecedented relief from our antiquated and overgrown Tax Code.

The single most important thing we can do for Americans struggling with

stagnant wages and a dearth of opportunities is to pass comprehensive tax reform. By reforming our Tax Code, we can provide the American people with more and better paying jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks. Most importantly, we can do this for the long term.

I hope Democrats will rethink their opposition and join us as we work to provide the American people with the relief that they have been waiting for and that they deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAS VEGAS STRONG

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today still in shock, still in mourning over the events of October 1, when 58 people—some of them Nevadans, many of them visitors to our State—were brutally gunned down by a madman on the Las Vegas Strip.

In addition to those horrible deaths, almost 500 people were injured. Many of them face long roads to physical recovery and an even longer and more painful road to emotional recovery. I know I speak for all of my Senate colleagues in praying for them and wishing them the quickest recovery possible.

This madman's actions devastated our city, but I rise today to tell you that the sense of devastation is being replaced by a renewed sense of community, a renewed sense of family, of unity, of faith, and a renewed sense of strength. I have had the honor of experiencing it firsthand in the eyes and the voices of those who survived and those who chose to stay in harm's way to help each other when they could have fled to safety. I have heard and seen this renewed sense of community and strength in the faces of our first responders, none of whom have ever encountered anything as horrific as the carnage of October 1 but who plunged into danger to save lives. Because? Because that is what they do.

I had the privilege of meeting a Las Vegas police officer, Sergeant Jonathan Riddle, who was stationed a block from the shooting scene doing traffic work. When he first heard the popping noises, like most of the concertgoers, he thought it was fireworks, but the second volley told him otherwise, and his training kicked in. He grabbed his rifle and he sprinted toward the chaos. Keep in mind, this police officer knew, through his training, that heavy-caliber bullets were being fired and that his protective vest would not stop them. He also knew his rifle was useless because the shots were coming

from the Mandalay Bay, and he couldn't shoot at the hotel for fear of hitting an innocent bystander. So he was, for all intents and purposes, defenseless. He knew it, but he ran anyway. He ran toward the violence. He ran toward it with one purpose, to help in any way he could.

It is almost not fair to single him out because dozens of metro police officers did the same thing, and firefighters, paramedics, and ambulance drivers also. It was not just professional first responders who emerged as true heroes on October 1. Taylor Winston, a marine, was just trying to enjoy the concert that night, but when the bullets started raining down, he was driven by his training, his instincts, his compassion for his fellow human beings. He helped several people over a fence where they took cover, but he realized the danger wasn't over. Looking around, he spotted a pickup truck with a long bed. He borrowed the truck. I use the term "borrowed" loosely. He loaded the back of it with injured people and rushed them to the hospital, but he wasn't done. He made a return trip, loaded the pickup again with wounded individuals and got them to the hospital.

Jack Beaton's last act on Earth was one of sacrifice and heroism. He draped himself over his wife, protecting her from the deadly bullets. He told her he loved her, then was hit and died in her arms.

Jonathan Smith shouted warnings when he realized what was happening, but when some people were too stunned to move toward safety, Jonathan moved toward them, getting them out of the line of fire. That is when Jonathan himself was hit. He survived but will likely always have a bullet lodged in his neck. It is a painful reminder of his heroics, but I hope it will also remind him of the people he saved.

John, a cab driver, accelerated toward the screams and the chaos and shouted for a frightened group of girls to jump into his cab, and he drove them to safety. Then John turned around and drove back to the shooting scene and transported another group to safety. In all, John possibly saved 11 lives.

There was a woman at the concert, a respiratory therapist, who had her cell phone shattered by a bullet while the cell phone was still in her hand. Shards of hard plastic tore through her hand and embedded in her skin. What did she do? She pulled the shards out of her hand, bandaged herself up, and rushed to the hospital where she worked to try to help other people more badly injured.

At our local hospitals, doctors and nurses worked miracles around the clock. When operating rooms were not available, they treated the wounded in hallways. Surrounded by shouting, crying, chaos, and blood, they saved one

life after another after another. Their skill, their composure, their dedication to saving lives was stronger that night than the evil intentions of the madman with a rifle.

I was walking the hallway of one of our hospitals with the hospital's CEO when a woman rushed toward him, grabbed him by the arm, and through tears and sobs, thanked him for the work his staff had done. Her niece had been wounded, but she was heading home. She said she could never thank the hospital staff enough.

In the aftermath, the community banded together to provide every resource possible to the victims and their families. The Las Vegas Convention Center's South Hall was dedicated to family reunification and support services. Airlines answered the call to provide free flights to the families of victims. Hotels and casinos across Las Vegas offered free rooms. The American Red Cross partnered with the Mirage to host a blood drive. Millions of dollars have been raised by local businesses and people across the country to support the victims.

The employees of Mandalay Bay and other MGM resort properties were understandably stricken and horrified by the shooting, but they too asked how they could help. Instead of being frozen by their shock and grief, they mobilized—donating blood, offering help to the families of the victims, organizing memorials, and otherwise coming together as a team, motivated by compassion and selflessness and providing comfort and solace.

True leaders have emerged in the wake of this tragedy. My friend Sheriff Joe Lombardo, head of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, has been steadfast in this crisis. He will always be remembered as a rock-solid presence when our city most needed one.

Let me say this for the world to hear. Our great city will not cower in fear because of this horrible act. We will mourn, we will heal, we will comfort each other, and we will pray, but make no mistake about it, Las Vegas is open for business. Las Vegas will not simply go on, but we will thrive. So come to Las Vegas, and maybe come away with a greater appreciation of what our city, our people are all about. From the blood and the horror, the terror, the carnage of October 1, Las Vegas has risen.

We have never shied away from our image as a city of entertainment. Our hospitality defines us, but the world has now seen a side much more profound—something we have always seen—and that is a home, a family, a community of people who will stand by each other during the darkest moments, a community of people bound by faith who will stand in the face of danger to protect a neighbor, a friend, a family member, or someone they have never met.

Everyone around the world has heard of Las Vegas. The very name conjures images almost immediately. Its skyline cannot be mistaken for any other. Yet prior to October 1, almost no one knew the true Las Vegas, the Las Vegas we are seeing now, a city that responds to cowardly violence with love and compassion for each other, a city that responds to hatred with faith and strength. "Las Vegas Strong" is a slogan we are now seeing on billboards, marquees, and T-shirts, but behind that slogan is a true story of true strength. It is a story of a city growing, emerging, and becoming closer and more united.

A deranged man with a rifle brought death and carnage and terror to Las Vegas, but today Las Vegas stands stronger. Las Vegas stands unafraid. Las Vegas's true identity has been revealed, and it is one of compassion and one of heroism. It is my hope that we will honor the memory of those lost by holding on to the sense of unity and family that has emerged since October 1 and that we will, all of us, continue to be Las Vegas Strong.

May God bless the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and may God bless the United States of America.

I yield back.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, as the newest Senator from the Silver State, I am humbled to serve and represent my fellow Nevadans. We Nevadans are very proud of our State, its people, and the spirit of self-reliance and community that guides us every single day. We are proud of the vastness and beauty of our rural counties and the energy and diversity of our cities, such as Reno and my hometown, Las Vegas.

When I was preparing to deliver my maiden speech before this body, my intention was to honor the Silver State's history and people, as well as share the issues I had planned to fight for while I am here in Congress—issues that matter to hard-working Nevadans. That speech was meant to celebrate Nevada's founding and values, to declare the basic right of every individual to education and affordable healthcare, to remind my colleagues of the dignity of equality and the right to marry whomever you love. That speech was meant to proclaim the dignity of women and their right to make their own health choices, to defend the right of immigrants and Dreamers to live in our country without fear, and to call on this body to fight for American values, including diversity and inclusion. That speech was meant to demand that our country's leaders respect every American, regardless of the color of their skin or how they choose to worship.

Unfortunately, my maiden speech on the floor of this body will instead talk

about mass murder. Today I want to recognize the courage of heroes and first responders and honor the wounded and those murdered. I want to recognize the fundamental dignity of every American in this age of violence, racism, and ignorance, the dignity of Americans not to be slaughtered by other Americans just for walking outside and attending a conference.

With over 43 million visitors per year, Las Vegas prides itself on warmly welcoming people from all around the world to revel in what we have to offer. Hospitality, in every sense of the word, defines who we are. When travelers come to Las Vegas, they plan to enjoy themselves in the company of loved ones and friends and become a part of our Nevada family.

On October 1, a man attacked that family by smashing two windows in his 32nd floor hotel suite and unleashing a barrage of bullets onto 22,000 people attending the Route 91 Harvest music festival. In 10 minutes, 58 innocent people were massacred, and more than 500 people were injured.

At first, concertgoers confused the rapid gunfire for fireworks. The grim realization that repetitive bursts were not fireworks but bullets, came as those in the crowd began to collapse, one after another, and blood began to stain the ground. This was a concert on the Las Vegas Strip, but it looked more like a battlefield. These were innocent people.

The human cost of this atrocious act of terrorism is incalculable. Children lost parents. Parents lost children. Friends lost friends. Those who survived the ordeal must not only heal from physical wounds but cope with the mental scars that will haunt them forever.

I will never forget the stories I heard walking through our hospitals and meeting with our first responders and those recovering from their wounds. Entire emergency room and hallway floors were stained with blood. A recovery room in one of our hospitals was turned into a makeshift morgue. A victim's phone rang continuously with calls from her father, who would soon learn that she would never be coming home.

There is one life story cut short for each of the 58 people killed that night. We have come to learn their stories—stories of sacrifice, of courage, and of love.

A young man died after taking the bullets that would have ended his girlfriend's life. A security guard was killed on the job. As bullets ripped through the night sky and bodies began falling to the ground, he took responsibility for keeping the public safe by directing the panicked crowd. He made the ultimate sacrifice—protecting others.

With approximately 2 million residents, the Las Vegas area is not a

small town, but this tragedy has shown just how strong and connected our community is. It goes beyond Las Vegas. There are so many communities across this country that were injured by this tragedy in some way. Many of those killed and injured were visitors to Las Vegas. All Nevadans grieve for those dead and are doing what they can to help the survivors.

Mr. ROGERS has a timeless quote:

Look for the helpers. You will always find people who are helping.

As we embrace others and the families of those wounded and those murdered, we also recognize so many in the community who helped. Even in the middle of the attack, there were helpers who shielded strangers from bullets and helpers who led people out of the concert venue. There were helpers who plugged strangers' bullet wounds with their fingers.

There were helpers like Jonathan. Despite receiving a gunshot wound to the neck, Jonathan saved the lives of 30 people by leading them out of the venue and aiding them in taking cover. He did this even after losing sight of his own family.

Jonathan later said: "I decided I'm not going to leave anybody behind."

There were helpers like Taylor, an Iraq war veteran, who turned a parked utility van into an ambulance. After climbing a fence as he fled the gunfire, he came across the vehicle, and he knew what he had to do. Before first responders arrived, Taylor drove roughly 30 people to area hospitals.

There were other helpers, like Tami, also an Iraq war veteran, who stayed behind to help victims on the ground. Tami used her ER nursing experience to triage those who were immobile because of their injuries. Despite her best efforts, Tami couldn't save one young woman and had the heartbreaking task of telling a mother that her daughter was dead.

Tami said:

I'll never forget that girl's face. I had to tell the mom that her daughter had gone.

In the toughest of circumstances, the promptness, efficiency, and professionalism of Southern Nevada's first responders and medical community saved many lives and ensured that this tragedy did not escalate into a further loss of life.

Andrew, an ambulance dispatcher, calmly and purposefully directed his team despite it being his first day in his new role.

There were doctors across our valley who did not need a call to rush to our hospitals to help. There were nurses who stayed long past their shifts to help care for and comfort the wounded, and our police officers and firefighters ran toward the bullets to help. These first responders, doctors, and nurses knew some of the people they were helping.

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Clark County Fire De-

partment, American Medical Response, MedicWest Ambulance, Community Ambulance, University Medical Center, Sunrise Hospital and Medical Center, The Valley Health System, and Dignity Health deserve our deepest thanks for their valor and their unmatched bravery.

I also honor and thank the Red Cross and the Department of Veterans Affairs, which brought mobile units to our hospitals, and the volunteer mental health counselors who came from all over the country to help provide comfort and support. I will never forget their dedication as our community grappled with this senseless tragedy.

In the days that followed, our community's compassionate response showed the world who we are as Las Vegas. So many unnamed heroes in our community stood for hours in line to donate blood. They came to the family reunification center and gave food and water and clothing—whatever they could—to help families and those who were wounded. Artists and volunteers created beautiful memorials and prayerful spaces for honor and grief. Local businesses, as well as airlines like Allegiant and Southwest and medical providers like The Valley Health System, MedicWest, and American Medical Response, made sure that the families of the slain as well as the wounded were provided help, support, and relief from medical bills and travel costs. In less than a week, dedicated volunteers built a beautiful remembrance wall and planted a healing garden for all of us to express our grief, reflect, and to remember.

Our city also received an outpouring of support and solidarity from countless fellow Americans, State governments, and foreign embassies. I was personally touched by the outpouring of support from my colleagues in this Chamber, and I thank them for it.

The people of Las Vegas came together to heal and protect their community, but they cannot do it all on their own. It has been difficult for all of us to understand the events of the past 2 weeks, but one thing is clear: We cannot stand by and do nothing.

As a lifelong Las Vegas, I have never seen such a profound community response. In the midst of such horror, I am so proud of my community, and I continue to be amazed at the strength and spirit that will help move us forward. But they need our help. The time has come for the people in this room—all of us—to do our part to keep our communities safe.

Over the past few weeks, I have heard my colleagues saying things like "no law could have stopped that" or "you can't legislate away evil." While that may be true, we are not helpless. When something bad happens, we can always take steps to understand what happened and work together to find a way to stop a future tragedy. Listen, we

cannot stop every shooting, but we can do something to prevent these senseless mass murders.

Just over a year ago, 49 people were murdered at a nightclub in Orlando—then, the deadliest shooting in modern history. My hometown of Las Vegas has now broken that record with 58 men and women being murdered by 1 man with multiple guns that were rigged for combat. This is a horrific distinction to bear.

Will we stand by and wait for the next community to break that record?

In our communities every day, Americans make commonsense decisions to protect their health and safety. They lock their doors. They set their alarms. They go to their doctors for annual check-ups. They wear seatbelts. After the worst attack on American soil on September 11, 2001, we reshaped the way we protect our country and our way of life.

Now, in the wake of the worst mass shooting in modern American history, I am calling on my colleagues to work with me to take reasonable, concrete steps to reduce the likelihood of another senseless shooting massacre on American soil.

Do not get me wrong. The people of Las Vegas are grateful to have the thoughts and prayers of nearly every Member of Congress, but thoughts and prayers alone are not enough. Now it is time for action—meaningful action—to prevent mass murders.

Let me be very clear. This is not about taking away guns. I grew up in a family of gun owners and hunters. My father was a member of Ducks Unlimited. I have family members who are avid sportsmen, including an uncle who was a member of the Nevada Bighorns Unlimited. My husband is a retired Secret Service agent. We are proud gun owners. I believe that Americans have the right to own guns.

But with the right to own a gun comes a shared responsibility to ensure that weapons do not fall into the hands of dangerous people. The right to own a gun must be balanced by the right of every American to be able to go out in public without having the fear that he will be shot and killed at a church, in a movie theater, in a classroom, in a nightclub, on a baseball field, or at a concert. The right to own a gun is important, and equally important is the right not to be killed by someone who has no business owning a gun.

The Second Amendment calls for gun ownership in defense of the security of America, not to terrorize its citizens. Congress has the responsibility to keep weapons that are designed for our military out of the hands of mass murderers. When we took office, each of us swore an oath to protect and defend the U.S. Constitution. That means that we are sworn to protect the lives and liberty of the American people.

Are we keeping that promise?

If there are commonsense, reasonable, proven steps that we can take to keep innocent people from dying at the hands of mass murderers, why wouldn't we take them? Why wouldn't we pass legislation that the majority of Americans supports? Why wouldn't we ban the tools used to kill and injure almost 600 people in the space of 10 minutes?

Many place blame with the strength of organizations like the National Rifle Association and other allied interest groups. Yet a recent poll finds that 93 percent of voters in gun households support universal background checks. Count me as part of that 93 percent. Congress is not going to repeal the Second Amendment, but its Members need to find the courage to be honest that there is a problem.

I echo my colleague Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut, who gave his maiden speech on this very same topic in 2013, right after the horrific massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School. He said that he never expected to find himself talking about guns in his maiden speech, but the issue of gun violence found him. I am devastated to say that the issue of gun violence found me too. It found the city of Las Vegas along with finding everyone else in the State of Nevada. It has already found other Members of this body and their neighbors across the country.

Like Senator MURPHY, I am making it my mission to prevent another tragedy like this one from ever happening again. We should return to commonsense principles as we determine how to move forward.

One, guns should not be available to people who are mentally ill, have a history of violence, or are suspected terrorists.

Two, everyone who buys a firearm should undergo a background check—no exceptions for people who buy from online retailers, gun shows, or private dealers. We cannot enforce our laws if we are not running background checks to determine who is trying to buy a firearm.

Three, certain military-style accessories that are necessary for war zones simply do not need to be in our communities.

As Members of this body are aware, the mass shooting in my hometown was made all the more lethal because of what is referred to as a bump stock—a tool that is designed to turn a semiautomatic rifle into an even deadlier weapon in order to kill as many people as possible and rain gunfire down on 22,000 concertgoers. This Chamber should speak in a unified voice that these tools do not belong in our country. This has nothing to do with infringing on the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding gun owners. You do not need a bump stock to hunt unless you are hunting people. If we do nothing now, there will be more massacres. We will see more fathers with-

out daughters, more mothers without sons, and more sisters without brothers.

The time has come to ask ourselves: Who will really be at fault the next time something like this happens? Will it be the deranged killer who used a loophole to get his hands on a deadly weapon or the people who failed to close that loophole when they had the chance?

My colleagues are right in that we cannot legislate away mental illness, and we cannot legislate away evil, but we can legislate to prevent murder. We can take smart, sensible steps to keep Americans safe. We can work together with gun owners and citizens against gun violence to make Americans safer.

To my colleagues who are undecided, I invite you to come to the hospitals with me in Las Vegas. Hear from the people who came to Las Vegas for a night of fun and country music and who will have to live with emotional and physical scars for the rest of their lives.

Hear from Dana, who will never see her fiancé again. Hear from Lindsey, who will never see her sister again. Hear from Hannah's three children, who will never see their mother again.

I spent much of the last 2 weeks talking with families of those who were wounded or killed. That Monday night after the massacre, I remember hugging a mother and father who were looking for their 26-year-old daughter at the family reunification center. They had gone to all of the area hospitals with the hope that they might find their daughter alive. Their final hope that night, if you want to call it that, was waiting in the reunification center for the call from the coroner's office to see if their daughter's body had been identified.

It so easily could have been my family, frantically searching, waiting, and grieving in that center. My niece was at that concert.

The people of Las Vegas responded to the worst tragedy our city has ever seen with unprecedented bravery, selflessness, and compassion. We are Vegas Strong.

It is long past time for Congress to follow their example and the example of so many other communities in our country touched by this violence and, finally, to summon the strength to get something done and reduce gun violence in America.

Let's not ignore the lives of those murdered or those wounded. Let's actually come together and agree that we must do something to honor all of the daughters, mothers, sons, fathers, sisters, brothers, and friends we have already lost to senseless gun violence.

It is time for us to move beyond resolutions. We must now have a new resolve to protect the basic freedom and safety of all Americans.

Work with me. Reach out to my office so that we can find common

ground and finally offer the American people something more than just our thoughts and prayers. Let's get something done in honor of the loved ones who are still with us, the family members and friends we would do anything to protect, the people in our lives we could not bear to lose.

I ask my colleagues to work with me. Work with me to prevent this from ever happening again.

Mr. President, thank you for listening.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I want to recognize the articulate, thoughtful, and passionate comments that have just been delivered by the Senator from Nevada. She has already served so effectively on committees and effectively on legislation, and now she brings her voice here to this Senate Chamber, where, over the history of our country, so many important conversations and dialogues have taken place, wrestling with the challenges we have and looking for the path to build the future we desire. So I welcome her. Of course, she has been here for some time now, but I welcome her now, being a part of the dialogue in this Chamber, which is an honor and something that is granted to only a few people in our Nation to come and to voice the concerns of our fellow Americans, of our home State constituents, striving to persuade colleagues to join in the effort to make our Nation and this world a better place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I know we are in the middle of a discussion and certainly a debate right now about a budget resolution, and, obviously, I participated in discussions of how concerned I am about the priorities in the budget resolution. I think the people of Michigan and the country deserve a better deal.

But while we are doing that, the clock is ticking on some very, very important programs where we actually have bipartisan support in committee. I want to thank Chairman HATCH and the Finance Committee, working with me and working with our ranking member, Senator WYDEN, for moving forward last week on a 5-year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, or what we call CHIP. The problem is this. Even though we passed it with only one negative vote and we had a strong bipartisan vote coming to the floor, my concern is that we have gone on to tax cuts. We are going on to a bill that includes Medicaid cuts and Medicare cuts and other debates. Yet we have this bipartisan effort that needs to get done because the funding ended September 30. It has been 18 days and counting. We will be

counting these days because it has been 18 days since the Children's Health Insurance Program was stopped being funded.

I am very concerned about this. I assumed that once we had agreement, we would be able to move something very quickly. It is deeply concerning to me that we are now in a situation where it is 18 days. Tomorrow it will be 19 days, and then we go into the weekend, and yet we are not seeing the Children's Health Insurance Program funded.

There are 9 million children in our country. These are low-income working families who are not able to have the confidence of knowing that health insurance will be there for them. CHIP has been an extremely successful program. In Michigan we call it MICHild, and we have about 100,000 children who are able to get health services because of MICHild. This means moms and dads go to bed at night and don't have to say a little prayer—please, God, don't let the kids get sick—because they know they are going to be able to take them to the doctor.

This has traditionally been a bipartisan bill. As I have said, we have had great support on both sides of the aisle, but it is now out of committee, and we need to move it, and we need to make space on the calendar to be able to get this done.

We also have something else that ended on September 30, and that is funding for our community health centers. This is something else that has bipartisan support. I want to thank my friend Senator ROY BLUNT. He and I joined together. We have 70 Members of this body who have signed a letter to continue the funding for community health centers. The problem is, the funding ran out on September 30. The Federal funding ended on September 30. We are talking about 25 million families, children, 300,000 veterans, 7.5 million children all across the country. In many parts of rural Michigan, that is the primary way people are getting their healthcare, as well as in urban settings.

Again, we have an agreement. We have talked about, now that the children's health insurance bill is out of committee, having it on the floor and then having an amendment for health centers, moving that together, which is something we have done in the past. We have strong bipartisan support to do it, but it has been put to the side in favor of what is a very divisive process on a budget resolution and tax cuts and other issues.

So I am imploring the leadership in the Senate to focus on something on which we all agree—at least the majority of us agree, the overwhelming majority of us agree—and that is making sure the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers get funded as quickly as possible. This is something done through the

States, this is locally driven, it meets all the tests that people talk about, and both of these programs are extremely effective.

In 2016 alone, Michigan's community health centers diagnosed coronary heart disease in more than 21,000 people. There were 21,000 people who, if they hadn't gotten that diagnosis, probably would have ended up in the emergency room—if they had been able to get to an emergency room before something fatal happened. Because we have community health centers from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan to our urban areas, people were able to get the diagnosis and the help they needed. Nearly 34,000 Michigan residents learned that they had asthma and could treat that asthma, and children could get the treatment they need. Nearly 140,000 people were diagnosed with diabetes and could begin to manage that so it didn't become something incredibly serious and life-threatening.

Health centers play a very important role. If we aren't treating these kinds of things, they can be deadly if undiagnosed or untreated, so it is very important.

I am worried that there is not the sense of urgency there needs to be here to continue the Children's Health Insurance Program and the community health centers. I know that my Democratic colleagues feel that we are ready and willing to, at any moment, stop the debate on a divisive budget resolution, focus on something that has bipartisan leadership and bipartisan support, and let's get that done.

In Michigan, our 100,000 children who are able to see the doctor through MICHild get the medical care and dental and vision care that they need to be successful—to be successful in school, to be able to see the blackboard, to be able to read, to be able to hear, because they are getting the basic healthcare they need.

Children shouldn't have to strain to see the blackboard and get bad grades because they can't get a simple eye exam, and that is what MICHild helps make happen. Children shouldn't have to struggle to ignore a painful tooth because the family can't afford to see a dentist. We have heard of horrible situations where, because of abscesses, children have actually lost their lives. It is not necessary. This is something that is preventable, and we have a bipartisan program, the Children's Health Insurance Program, created with bipartisan leadership years ago, that can be continued and needs to be continued.

Mr. President, I understand the debate on the floor about the budget. I understand the debate on tax reform. I want to see tax reform that simplifies the code and puts money in the pockets of hard-working families and small businesses and creates jobs. I mean, that is what I want to see happen. I

also want to make sure, as we are debating right now how to do that and the differences in doing that—I would argue that what is in this budget bill does not do that, and I want to work on something that does.

We have the clock ticking on 9 million children and their families whose health insurance funding stopped 18 days ago and community health centers from small towns in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan to the city of Detroit whose health center funding stopped 18 days ago.

So I am going to keep counting. I hope I don't have to count too high before we can get this done because I know there is support here. I know there is support to do it, but it has to be a priority. There has to be a sense of urgency. Just like a parent who is up at 3 o'clock in the morning with a sick child has a sense of urgency about what they need to care for their child, we need to have that same sense of urgency here and do what I know we can do if we would just take the time, just take a few minutes to get it done.

Mr. President, I hope that will happen very soon. Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening to talk about amendment No. 1141, which would raise a point of order against any provision that would strike State and local tax deductions.

As we talk tonight about how our country moves forward economically and as we talk about what are the best ways to have tax fairness in America, I guarantee you, my constituents want to make sure they continue to be able to deduct their sales tax, their mortgage deductions, and there are important policies that other States have for tax deductions.

The State of Washington has been a leader—and I would match our State, as it relates to our tax code and efficiency, with just about any other State. For a long time, Washington and Oregon have had the most unique tax codes in the United States of America. Yet our economies have grown faster than the national average every year since World War II. So we are doing something right. So the fact that we don't have an income tax in Washington State and the fact that Washingtonians, for many years, have been able to deduct our sales tax from our Federal tax obligations for income is something we are not interested in losing. What we are interested in is a fair debate about our Tax Code, an open process, and important discussion points of order if anybody tries to strip from us these very important tools.

State and local tax deductions have been an important way in which our taxpayers make sure they are treated fairly. For us in Washington, as I said,

many of our citizens use these itemized deductions because of the fact that we don't have an income tax and we are able to deduct our sales tax from our Federal tax obligations. In fact, 30 percent of Washington resident taxpayers—1.1 million—itemize their taxes and claim an average State and local tax deduction of \$7,402. These deductions put an average of \$600 back into the pockets of Washingtonians each year. So any attempt by legislation to try to erode that—particularly at a time when we also get a deduction on our property taxes as well—is something critically important to our State.

If legislation continues to move forward that repeals these deductions—I know our colleagues think they are doing good work by trying to simplify the Tax Code. In fact, they are saying: We are going to increase the standard deduction as a way to simplify the Tax Code. But for my Washington residents—and, my guess is, for many other States that are in the same boat that don't have an income tax—you literally are going to penalize them and the efficiency of their tax code, which is so important.

For example, 40 percent of tax filers who make between \$50,000 and \$75,000 claim this deduction, and 53 percent of taxpayers who make between \$75,000 and \$100,000 claim this deduction. So when my colleagues talk about doubling the deduction from \$6,000 to \$12,000 or from \$12,000 to \$24,000 for families, I am sure they would like us to believe that somehow is going to make the residents of Washington State and our taxpayers whole. That is not the case. On average, Washingtonians in those brackets could actually end up paying more. Why? Well, first of all, we should realize that there are over 250,000 Washingtonians—that is the estimate—who make more, in a joint filing, than \$150,000. So right there, these Washingtonians would be in a situation where, under this tax proposal, they would be paying more than they are currently paying because they are not allowed to itemize and they are not allowed to deduct. I don't want to raise taxes on Washingtonians. In tight economic times, I don't want to see them continue to see these deductions eliminated and have their tax bills go up.

Washingtonians work very hard at trying to make and keep the efficiency. I know there are other States—such as Texas, Alaska, and Florida—that also don't have an income tax. I know those States are probably struggling with the same policies and want to make sure they are making the same kinds of efficiencies. What we don't want is the current Republican proposal to raise taxes on working families in Washington State. We want to make sure these families continue to see the deductions they have had in the past.

So how would this work exactly in Washington? Well, one of the things we

are concerned about is the impact on the housing market. Without the deduction for property—we do not want to see an increase in the price of housing and fewer people being able to afford home ownership because they are no longer able to take this deduction. That would be something of grave concern to Washington residents.

Also, we want to make sure that we continue to have these deductions for both singles and families of four, who would be impacted by this.

For example, an average individual taxpayer making between \$50,000 and \$100,000 has an average total deduction of about \$22,000. So this taxpayer would not benefit from increasing the standard deduction to \$12,000. The difference is that they now get \$22,000 in their itemized deductions, and under this proposal, they would only be able to deduct \$12,000 of that. Take a family who is making over \$100,000. As I said, we have 250,000 filers in our State who make between \$150,000 and \$200,000. This income bracket on average claims a deduction of \$30,000 from various State, local, mortgage interest, charitable contributions, and medical expenses. This family also would not benefit from increasing the standard deduction to \$24,000. As I said, they are already deducting about \$30,000.

Literally, we are raising taxes on thousands and I would say probably hundreds of thousands of Washington residents. That is why I am offering this amendment. I want us to have a point of order and true discussion about any policy that would raise taxes on my residents in Washington State. We have to have a tax discussion that is about a fair and open process, a continued dialogue about how to make sure that working families get a fair deal in a tax policy. But one policy that is jammed into a budget proposal and that then comes back to us for 51 votes, that literally eliminates our ability to itemize and deduct and gets rid of our sales deductions that we have fought so hard for, that we are so proud of as it relates to the individuality of how our State operates—we should not, with just 51 votes, cast a vote increasing the taxes on thousands and thousands of Washingtonians and, I would say, on many other States in our Nation.

I hope our colleagues will take a close look at this. I hope they will help us in trying to make a point. Let's not rush through a policy when we don't know what the impacts are. Let's get specific about what the impacts are and recognize that some of our States are the most ingenious as it relates to delivering great services at lower costs.

I know some of my colleagues would like to say: There are these big States in the East, and here is how they operate. Here is what they do in collecting various forms of revenue. Well, this Western State operates with a great

deal of efficiency. Our residents have come to expect these sales tax deductions and these mortgage deductions, and they want to keep them. They do not want to hear that there is a sleight of hand at the eleventh hour, not by a broad debate but a tactic that would jam them into a reconciliation bill because of instructions and thereby have these thousands of dollars of tax increases foisted on them.

I hope my colleagues will join me in this very important point of order that we will be offering in this amendment. Let's have this discussion in broad daylight and not penalize innovative States that have different tax codes but have grown faster than the national average and continue to do so. Let's make sure that we have tax fairness for all residents of our country.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for more than 30 years, we have seen political battles over the Arctic Refuge—with some wanting to open the area for oil and gas leasing and many others believing that this pristine and ecologically important area should be given the highest protections available under the law. This week the fate of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge is again being taken up by the Senate, this time as part of the budget process.

There is no question that this is a divisive issue, one that deserves to be debated in the Senate, not taken up as part of the budget process with little to no debate, but Republicans are insisting on ramming an attempt to open the Arctic Refuge to drilling through using a partisan process because they know they lack the bipartisan support needed to properly debate the issue.

The President's budget estimated that leasing in the Arctic Refuge will generate \$3.6 billion in revenues, but the President's budget estimates just don't add up. In order to meet that number, oil companies would need to bid an average of \$2,400 per acre on every single acre of the 1.5 million acre coastal plain, more than 10 times the average lease sale bid on Alaska's North Slope.

We know this number is significantly inflated. If we look at other lease sales between 2010 and 2015, the industry bid on less than 5 percent of the leases in Alaska's National Petroleum Reserve. On top of that, oil supplies are currently at historic highs, so high that we lifted a 40-year ban on oil exports last year, and gas prices remained at long-term lows.

Today the United States is the world's largest producer of oil and natural gas. We are importing less oil than we have at any point in almost three decades. In addition to the high oil supplies, industry has shown little interest in drilling in the Arctic Refuge. In September 2015, after spending approximately \$7 billion to drill and explore

the region, Shell gave up on drilling in the Arctic region's Chukchi Sea due to the poor results and the high costs. Energy analysts predict very little interest in drilling in the Refuge for the foreseeable future.

So before we move ahead with leasing this area for oil and mineral exploration, we need to take a careful look at what we would be losing. The Arctic Refuge is one of America's last pristine, untouched wilderness places, and I think we should preserve it for future generations.

The Refuge is home to more than 200 wildlife species, including polar bears, musk ox, and caribou. The porcupine caribou herd travels to the coastal plain each summer to give birth to their young. The Refuge is the most important land denning site for a significant population of polar bears. Birds from all 50 States and 6 continents migrate to the Refuge for nesting and staging. Alaskan Native people still rely on the wildlife for basic sustenance and as a basis of their cultures.

In 2003, I had the opportunity to travel to the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and see firsthand the pristine wilderness. While I was there, I also had an opportunity to view areas that had been drilled for oil and gas. As you looked to the west, you could see a stark difference in the State lands that had been drilled for oil and gas and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge that had not been drilled. It was easy to tell the two apart because the scars that were left on that State land that had been drilled were still there many years later. They didn't gingerly step in and drill and leave. They cut scars across that land that will be there forever.

There is no question that the impact drilling would have on the Arctic would be devastating and irreversible, and although oil and gas resources can be developed safely, we all know that leaks and spills happen. The resulting environmental damage can change the landscape forever.

The Arctic Refuge represents our Nation's finest example of intact, naturally functioning Arctic and subarctic ecosystems. Nowhere else in North America do we see such a broad spectrum of diverse habitats occurring within one area. We must protect it for future generations. We have a responsibility to protect this area for our children and grandchildren. Any attempt to move forward a budget reconciliation containing leases in the Arctic is a move in the wrong direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on October 19, it be in order to call up the following amendments; that the time until 11:45 a.m. be for debate on the amendments, equally divided between the managers or their designees; that at 11:45 a.m., the Sen-

ate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Wyden No. 1302, Capito No. 1393, and Cantwell No. 1141; further, that following the disposition of the Cantwell amendment, Senator WARNER's amendment No. 1138 be called up and the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided between the managers or their designees; and that at 2 p.m., the Senate vote in relation to the Warner amendment, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 220, on Hatch amendment No. 1144. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 221, on Sanders amendment No. 1119. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 222, on Nelson amendment No. 1150. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 223, on Heller amendment No. 1146. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 224, on Sanders amendment No. 1120. Had I been present, I would have voted yea. •

TRIBUTE TO HERSHEL "WOODY" WILLIAMS

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to celebrate the christening of the USNS *Hershel "Woody" Williams*, T-ESB 4. This expeditionary sea base ship, the second of its kind, is named in honor of Medal of Honor recipient and West Virginia icon, Chief Warrant Officer Hershel "Woody" Williams, retired.

Woody Williams was born on a dairy farm in 1923 in Quiet Dell, WV. He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and served as a demolition sergeant in the Battle of Iwo Jima with the 21st Marines, 3d Marine Division. As a result of Woody's valiant service, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor from President Truman on October 5,

1945. Today, at 94 years old, he is the last living Medal of Honor recipient from the Battle of Iwo Jima.

What sets Woody apart from so many others who also honorably served is that his brave service on the battlefield was bookended by compassionate service to members of our Armed Forces and their families. Before entering the Corps, Woody had the painstaking task of delivering Western Union telegrams to Gold Star West Virginia families who lost loved ones early in the war. After he served 20 years in the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserves, he spent 33 years as a veterans service representative in the Department of Veterans Affairs and is still serving on the Governor's military advisory board in the State of West Virginia. He is a fierce advocate for all veterans of all eras.

On January 14, 2016, during a ceremony in Charleston, WV, Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus announced that the expeditionary sea base ship 4 (T-ESB 4) would be named the USNS *Hershel "Woody" Williams*. On Saturday, October 21, Woody will be joined by his family, five of his fellow Medal of Honor recipients, fellow World War II veterans, and four of the five living USS Arizona survivors from Pearl Harbor for the joyous occasion of the christening. I look forward to the great honor of joining these heroes at the event in San Diego this weekend.

Perhaps in no other time in our recent history has it been more vital to remember and emulate the heroism, perseverance, and patriotism of those who belong to the Greatest Generation. Woody is the embodiment of the best of his generation. Through the christening of a ship that bears his name, we are both honoring his great service and lifting up a role model to inspire all West Virginians and Americans alike.

I would like to salute Chief Warrant Officer 4 Hershel "Woody" Williams. I also want to thank him for his great service to this great Nation and the great State of West Virginia, for showing us the power of patriotism, freedom, and family.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DON CARANO

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to memorialize Don Carano, one of northern Nevada's most influential figures, a great business leader, and a man I am privileged to have called a friend. Don recently passed away peacefully at the age of 85.

My sincerest condolences go out to his family, friends, and loved ones. All of northern Nevada mourns the loss of Mr. Carano, who helped make Reno a better place to live and work, not only for his employees, but for the entire community.

Throughout his life, Mr. Carano was a caring, giving man who charted his own path as an entrepreneur. Some of his businesses include Eldorado Resorts, Ferrari-Carano Vineyards and Winery, and the McDonald Carano law firm. Mr. Carano was also instrumental in the construction of the National Bowling Stadium and the Reno Events Center in downtown Reno.

Born in Reno, Mr. Carano went to Southside Elementary School, Billingshurst Junior High School, and Reno High School before earning his college degree and serving in the U.S. Army for 2 years as an officer. Thereafter, Mr. Carano completed law school at the University of San Francisco and began his law practice in Reno. In 1973, he opened the Eldorado Hotel Casino, the first major casino to open on Virginia Street north of the railroad tracks, which changed the profile of gaming in northern Nevada.

Mr. Carano's many contributions and honors include the International Gaming and Wagering Business Hall of Fame, Nevada Food and Beverage Directors Association Man of the Year awards, the American Lung Association Distinguished Community Service Award, Hotelier of the Year Award, "Knight in the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic" by the Consul General of Italy, University of San Francisco Law School's Alumnus of the Year, International Restaurant and Hospitality Rating Bureau's Lifetime Achievement Award, the WIBC Gladys M. Banker Friendship Award, and many more. Just this year, Mr. Carano was recognized as a "Distinguished Nevadan" by the University of Nevada, Reno.

As Nevada's senior Senator, I thank Mr. Carano and his family for their decades of work in helping make Reno the thriving, booming, biggest little city that it is today. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in memorializing Mr. Carano and the legacy he leaves behind. Lynne and my family give our deepest sympathies to his wife, Rhonda, his five children Gary, Gene, Glenn, Gregg, and Cindy, 11 grandchildren, and 6 great-grandchildren as they cope with this great loss. •

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN BICENTENNIAL

• Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the University of Michigan, one of the world's premier universities, which is celebrating its bicentennial this year.

Whether it is leading-edge manufacturing, lifesaving advances in medical science, or groundbreaking leaps in technology, the University of Michigan is a world leader in innovation and creativity. I can tell you that there is no group of students or alumni in America that is more passionate and committed than our Michigan fans.

Founded on August 26, 1817, in Detroit, the University of Michigan was the first public university in the Northwest Territory, moving to Ann Arbor in 1837. With 63,000 students on three campuses and more than 572,000 living graduates, including my son, the university has one of the largest alumni bodies in the world. They include artists, astronauts, athletes, entrepreneurs, humanitarians, business and government leaders, and Nobel Laureates in economics, medicine, and science.

The university is known for many firsts that make it among, as its fight song states, the "leaders and best." Michigan was the Nation's first university to build a chemical laboratory, open and operate its own hospital, and teach science-based medicine. In 1879, the university created the chair of the science and the art of teaching, the first permanent professorial chair at an American college or university devoted to teacher preparation. Michigan offered the Nation's first collegiate aeronautics classes in 1914. In 1949, it established the Institute of Social Research, now one of the oldest and largest academic survey organizations.

Michigan is one of the world's leading research universities, spending \$1.39 billion on research in 2016. It produces, on average, 400 new inventions each year and launches a new startup every 4 weeks. Faculty and graduates have played a leadership role in developing the polio vaccine, identifying the gene for cystic fibrosis, creating the worldwide computing backbone that led to the internet, protecting the Great Lakes, and exploring space. The groundbreaking research continues today as the university works on autonomous vehicles and is home to M-City, a one-of-a-kind urban test facility for vehicle deployment.

The university is known for the beauty of its natural surroundings and architecture, including some 16,000 trees and such landmarks as Angell Hall, Burton Memorial Tower, and Hill Auditorium, all designed by Albert Kahn. It is home to more than 20 libraries, several museums, art galleries and collections, and performing arts venues, including the Arthur Miller Theatre, named in honor of the playwright and U-M alumnus.

Michigan also is renowned for its athletic tradition, dating back to 1865. It boasts 56 national championships in 12 sports and three Heisman Trophy winners.

I am extremely proud to congratulate the University of Michigan for its 200 years of leadership in higher education and outstanding contributions to the State of Michigan, the Nation, and the world. "Go Blue!" •

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3116. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fenpicoxamid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9966-73-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3117. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Triflumezopyrim; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9966-73-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3118. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3119. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3120. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3121. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3122. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Student Loan Ombudsman; to the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3123. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Belt Parkway Bridge Construction, Gerritsen Inlet, Brooklyn, NY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0937)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3124. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Pacific Ocean, Kilauea Lava

Flow Ocean Entry on Southeast Side of Island of Hawaii, HI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0172)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3125. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Marine Events Held in the Coast Guard Sector Northern New England Captain of the Port Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0998)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3126. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Cumberland River, Nashville, TN" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0812)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3127. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Tennessee River, Chattanooga, TN" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0727)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3128. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Socastee, SC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0801)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3129. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Sector Key West COTP Zone Post Storm Recovery, Atlantic Ocean, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0939)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3130. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Blue Angels Air Show; St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0577)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3131. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors; Baltimore, MD" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0808)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3132. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Safety Zone, Delaware River; Dredging" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0947)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3133. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Camp Lejeune, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0792)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3134. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Roanoke River, Plymouth, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0886)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-117. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee applying to the United States Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the United States Constitution, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and members of the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 67

Whereas, Article V of the United States Constitution authorizes the calling of a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution upon the application of two-thirds of the several states; and

Whereas, the drafters of our Constitution empowered state legislators to be guardians of liberty against future abuses of power by the federal government; and

Whereas, the federal government has created a crushing national debt through improper and imprudent spending; and

Whereas, the federal government has invaded the legitimate roles of the states through the manipulative process of federal mandates, most of which are unfunded to a great extent; and

Whereas, the federal government has ceased to operate under a proper interpretation of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, it is the solemn duty of the states to protect the liberty of our people, particularly for future generations of Americans, by proposing amendments to the United States Constitution through a Convention of the States under Article V for the purpose of restraining these and related abuses of power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the One Hundred Ninth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, That this legislative body does hereby apply to Congress under the provisions of Article V of the United States Constitution for the calling of a convention of the states, limited to proposing amendments to the United

States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this application shall constitute a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the United States Constitution until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made applications on the same subject; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this application be transmitted to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Tennessee, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several states, requesting their cooperation.

POM-118 A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona formally applying to the United States Congress, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2010

Whereas, the founders of the Constitution of the United States empowered state legislators to be guardians of liberty against future abuses of power by the federal government; and

Whereas, the federal government has created a crushing national debt through improper and imprudent spending; and

Whereas, the federal government has invaded the legitimate role of the states through the manipulative process of federal mandates, most of which are unfunded to a great extent; and

Whereas, the federal government has ceased to live under a proper interpretation of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, it is the solemn duty of the states to protect the liberty of our people, particularly for the generations to come, and to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States through a convention of the states under Article V to place clear restraints on these and related abuses of power; Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring:

1. That, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, the Legislature of the State of Arizona formally applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government and limit the terms of office for federal officials and for members of Congress.

2. That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states have made application on the same subjects.

3. That this application is revoked, withdrawn, nullified and superseded, retroactive to the date of enactment, if the application

is used for the purpose of calling a convention or is used in support of conducting a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States for any purpose other than to impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government or limit the terms of office for federal officials and members of Congress.

4. That the Legislature of the State of Arizona may provide further instructions to its delegates and may recall its delegates at any time for a breach of duty or a violation of the instructions provided. The Arizona delegates are instructed to not support term limits for members of Congress that would limit their number of years in any given office to fewer than twelve years.

5. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona and the presiding officers of each house of the several state legislatures, requesting their cooperation.

POM-119. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona formally applying to the United States Congress, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution to require a balanced federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2013

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring:

1. That, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, the Legislature of the State of Arizona formally applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states only for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that, in the absence of a national emergency, the total of all federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenue for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints.

2. That this application is to be considered as covering the same subject matter as the currently outstanding balanced budget applications from Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah and West Virginia and shall be aggregated with those applications for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds of the states necessary to require the calling of a convention, but may not be aggregated with any applications on any other subjects.

3. That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states have made application on the same subject, and supersedes all previous applications by this Legislature on the same subject.

4. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, each Member of Congress from the

State of Arizona and the presiding officers of each house of the several state legislatures.

POM-120. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona formally applying to the United States Congress, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2010

Whereas, the founders of the Constitution of the United States empowered state legislators to be guardians of liberty against future abuses of power by the federal government; and

Whereas, the federal government has created a crushing national debt through improper and imprudent spending; and

Whereas, the federal government has invaded the legitimate role of the states through the manipulative process of federal mandates, most of which are unfunded to a great extent; and

Whereas, the federal government has ceased to live under a proper interpretation of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, it is the solemn duty of the states to protect the liberty of our people, particularly for the generations to come, and to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States through a convention of the states under Article V to place clear restraints on these and related abuses of power; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring:

1. That, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, the Legislature of the State of Arizona formally applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government and limit the terms of office for federal officials and for members of Congress.

2. That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states have made application on the same subjects.

3. That this application is revoked, withdrawn, nullified and superseded, retroactive to the date of enactment, if the application is used for the purpose of calling a convention or is used in support of conducting a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States for any purpose other than to impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government or limit the terms of office for federal officials and members of Congress.

4. That the Legislature of the State of Arizona may provide further instructions to its delegates and may recall its delegates at any time for a breach of duty or a violation of the instructions provided. The Arizona delegates are instructed to not support term limits for members of Congress that would limit their number of years in any given office to fewer than twelve years.

5. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Resolution to the President and Secretary of the

United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona and the presiding officers of each house of the several state legislatures, requesting their cooperation.

POM-121. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona formally applying to the United States Congress, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution to require a balanced federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2013

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring:

1. That, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, the Legislature of the State of Arizona formally applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states only for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that, in the absence of a national emergency, the total of all federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenue for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints.

2. That this application is to be considered as covering the same subject matter as the currently outstanding balanced budget applications from Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah and West Virginia and shall be aggregated with those applications for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds of the states necessary to require the calling of a convention, but may not be aggregated with any applications on any other subjects.

3. That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states have made application on the same subject, and supersedes all previous applications by this Legislature on the same subject.

4. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona and the presiding officers of each house of the several state legislatures.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Carlos G. Muniz, of Florida, to be General Counsel, Department of Education.

*Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor.

*Kyle Fortson, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2019.

*Janet Dhillon, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2022.

*Gerald W. Fauth, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2020.

*Daniel M. Gade, of North Dakota, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2021.

*Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

*David G. Zatezalo, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health.

*Peter B. Robb, of Vermont, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

*Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2018.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. NELSON, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the 7.5 percent threshold for the medical expense deduction for individuals age 65 or older; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1978. A bill to delay the annual fee on health insurance providers until 2020 and to make such fee tax-deductible; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1979. A bill to block the implementation of certain presidential actions that restrict individuals from certain countries from entering the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide credits for the production of renewable chemicals and investments in renewable chemical production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1981. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERDUE:

S. 1982. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to establish a national security

freeze standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1983. A bill to establish a process to review foreign investment to determine the economic effect of the investment on the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 293. A resolution commemorating the 150th anniversary of Morgan State University; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 194

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 194, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes.

S. 200

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to prohibit the conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress.

S. 236

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the issuance of exempt facility bonds for qualified carbon dioxide capture facilities.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain

rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1016, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, *supra*.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1361, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 1505

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1505, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories.

S. 1568

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1568, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of President John F. Kennedy.

S. 1595

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Mary-

land (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater support to students with dependents, and for other purposes.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens and United States Citizens.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1829, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program.

S. 1839

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1839, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the market access program and the foreign market development cooperator program.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1842, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1960

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1960, a bill to repeal the amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016.

S. 1970

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1970, a bill to establish a public health plan.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

AMENDMENT NO. 1119

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1119 proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1120

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1120 proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1133

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1133 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1135

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1135 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1138

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1138 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1141

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1141 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 293—COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 293

Whereas, on November 27, 2017, Morgan State University (referred to in this preamble as the "University"), located in Baltimore, Maryland, will celebrate the 150th anniversary of the first academic year of the University and Founders Day;

Whereas the University was envisioned by African-American pastors in the Washington Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and officially founded by white pastors in the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church;

Whereas the University was incorporated on November 27, 1867, as the Centenary Biblical Institute, in celebration of the centennial anniversary of Methodism in the United States;

Whereas the University was established with a modest budget of \$5,000 to train for the ministry males who were former slaves and freedmen;

Whereas the first classes of the University were held in the basement lecture hall of Sharp Street Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore on April 30, 1867, with a class of 9 students and 1 teacher;

Whereas the University admitted the first female students to the University during the 1874–75 academic year and amended the charter of the University to train students in teaching as well as in ministry;

Whereas, in 1886, the University established a branch named Princess Anne Academy on the eastern shore of Maryland;

Whereas, in 1890, the University was renamed Morgan College in honor of Lyttleton F. Morgan, a long-time board member who was a strong financial supporter of the institution, and was authorized to offer bachelor's degrees;

Whereas the first bachelor's degree from the University was awarded in 1895 to George W. F. McMechen, who went on to earn a law degree from Yale University and to distinguish himself as a citizen and civil rights lawyer in Baltimore, Maryland;

Whereas, in 1893, the University established the second branch of the University, named Virginia Collegiate and Industrial Institute, in Lynchburg, Virginia;

Whereas, becoming fully accredited in 1925, the University established a strong record in academics, sports, and the promotion of an appreciation for African-American history and culture;

Whereas the University moved to the present location of the University in northeast Baltimore, and, on the recommendation of the Commission on Higher Education of Negroes in Maryland, which was appointed by the State Legislature, was purchased by the State of Maryland and renamed Morgan State College, thereby becoming the second of only 2 public State-supported liberal arts colleges in Maryland;

Whereas the University featured a distinguished faculty, expanded the facilities, and developed an outstanding undergraduate curriculum that led the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, an accrediting

agency, to declare the undergraduate curriculum of the University a model liberal arts program;

Whereas the graduate program of the University was established in 1965 and the first master's degree from the University was awarded in 1967;

Whereas, in 1975, the University was granted university status by the Maryland General Assembly and was authorized to offer a doctoral degree;

Whereas, in 1983, the first doctoral degree from the University was awarded;

Whereas, in 2004, the choir of the University was declared "The Best College Choir in the United States" by Reader's Digest;

Whereas, in 2007, after a period of phenomenal growth and achievement in academic programs, research, external grants, and public service—an era that many call the Morgan Renaissance—the University was reclassified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education as a doctoral research university;

Whereas, since the 1950s, the University has established a record of winning more Fulbright Awards than any of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (referred to in this preamble as "HBCUs") in the United States;

Whereas, in 2016, the entire campus of the University was designated as a National Treasure by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, making the University the only institution in the United States to have earned that distinction;

Whereas, after 150 years as an institution, the University has grown—

(1) from a student body of a modest 7 students to nearly 8,000 students;

(2) from a faculty of 1 to nearly 400 full-time faculty members; and

(3) from a single-track curriculum in ministry to an institution now offering 48 degree programs at the bachelor's level, 10 at the post-baccalaureate certificate level, 34 at the master's degree level, and 16 at the doctoral level;

Whereas the University has awarded diplomas, certificates and degrees to more than 51,000 students;

Whereas the University currently ranks in the top tier of institutions locally and nationally in graduating African Americans at all degree levels, and in fields such as architecture, marketing, nursing, the health professions, communication and journalism, family and consumer sciences, civil engineering, electrical engineering, finance, and industrial engineering;

Whereas, during the 2017 calendar year, the University is celebrating the 150th anniversary of the founding of the University; and

Whereas, on September 28–30, 2017, the University hosted on the campus of the University the 8 other HBCUs that also are celebrating their 150th anniversaries, in a United HBCU-9 Sesquicentennial Celebration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) makes note of and celebrates the history, legacy and achievements of Morgan State University;

(2) applauds Morgan State University for the 150-year devotion to academic excellence and to providing educational opportunities to thousands of students in Maryland, the United States, and the world;

(3) commends Morgan State University for being named Maryland's Preeminent Public Urban Research University in 2017, and for the entire campus of Morgan State University being declared a National Treasure by the National Trust for Historic Preservation;

(4) recognizes the achievements of all of the administrators, professors, students, and staff members who have contributed to the success of Morgan State University; and

(5) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the president of Morgan State University; and

(B) the provost and vice president for academic affairs.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1149. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1150. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNETT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*.

SA 1151. Mr. ENZI (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*.

SA 1152. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1153. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1154. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1155. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1156. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1157. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1158. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1159. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1160. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 1207. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1303. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1390. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116

proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1391. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1392. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1393. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1394. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1395. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1396. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1397. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1398. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1149. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING OPIOID DIVERSION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing opioid diversion, which may include repealing the amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legis-

lation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1150. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, decrease the amount by \$5,850,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$12,300,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by \$19,550,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$27,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$37,150,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$47,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by \$59,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$71,850,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$87,250,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$103,950,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.

On page 26, line 2, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,850,000,000.

On page 26, line 6, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by \$12,300,000,000.

On page 26, line 10, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.

On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by \$19,550,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by \$27,900,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.

On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by \$37,150,000,000.

On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by \$47,600,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$59,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.

On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by \$71,850,000,000.

On page 27, line 10, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.

On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by \$87,250,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.

On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by \$103,950,000,000.

SA 1151. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference

reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include the provision of tax relief for small businesses, along with provisions to prevent upper-income taxpayers from sheltering income from taxation at the appropriate rate, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1152. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF BROADBAND IN RURAL AMERICA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding access to broadband in rural areas of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1153. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD NOT ADEQUATELY FUND WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year for Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that provides funding for the wildfire management account of the Forest Service if funding levels for that account are not equal to or greater than the 90 percent confidence interval estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture under section 502(h)(3) of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(h)(3)) of anticipated wildfire suppression costs for that fiscal year.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply if—

(1) the bill or joint resolution described in that subsection provides not less than 100 percent of the rolling 10-year average of wildfire obligations; and

(2) on or before the date on which the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution described in that subsection, the Senate has enacted a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority for wildfire disaster relief for the fiscal year referred to in that subsection in an amount not to exceed \$1,460,000,000.

SA 1154. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING HEALTH CARE FOR VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the administration by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracted health care networks and to improve the administration by the Department of Veterans Affairs of health care generally, which may include the management of claims, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1155. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING ADDICTION TO OPIOIDS BY IMPOSING STRICTER PRESCRIBING GUIDELINES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing addiction to opioids by imposing stricter prescribing guidelines, which may include a 7-day supply limit in certain circumstances, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1156. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING FOREST HEALTH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing timber production from Federal land and providing bridge funding to counties and other units of local government until timber production levels increase, decreasing forest hazardous fuel loads, improving stewardship contracting, or reforming the process of budgeting for wildfire suppression operations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1157. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE MAINTENANCE BACKLOG OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the maintenance, repair, or improvement of infrastructure in units of the National Park System by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1158. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR NATIVE AMERICAN CHILDREN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the funding of charter schools by the Bureau of Indian Education, distance learning programs, and school opportunity scholarships, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1159. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TERMINATING THE CATFISH INSPECTION PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to terminating the catfish inspection program of the Department of Agriculture and returning the role of catfish inspection to the Food and Drug Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1160. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT VETERANS HAVE THE ACCESS AND ABILITY TO CHOOSE THEIR HEALTH CARE BASED ON THE BEST POSSIBLE HEALTH CARE TREATMENT AVAILABLE TO THE VETERAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that veterans can access the best possible health care treatment, which may include improving the Veterans Choice Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1161. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT WOULD RAISE TAXES ON BUSINESSES THAT HIRE VETERANS, ACTIVE SERVICE MEMBERS, OR THE LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the work opportunity tax credit under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1162. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT REPEALS THE TAX EXCLUSION FOR INTEREST ON STATE AND LOCAL BONDS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals the tax exclusion for interest on state and local bonds under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling

of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1163. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT WOULD RAISE TAXES ON HOMEOWNERS BY ELIMINATING OR LIMITING THE MORTGAGE INTEREST DEDUCTION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the mortgage interest deduction under section 163 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1164. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRE-PREPARED TAX RETURNS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the Secretary of the Treasury to provide pre-prepared tax returns to as many taxpayers as possible, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1165. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX INCENTIVES TO ENCOURAGE THE CREATION OF RESIDENT-OWNED COOPERATIVES FOR MANUFACTURED HOME COMMUNITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to tax incentives, such as a 75 percent income tax credit for the owners of manufactured home communities, to encourage the sale of such communities to residents and the creation of resident-owned cooperatives, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1166. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A SINGLE PAYER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a single payer health care system, which may include a Medicare-for-all national health insurance program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1167. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVING THE BUDGET PROCESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills,

joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to significantly improving the budget process by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1168. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE RESPONSE TO ILLEGAL FENTANYL INTO THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the response by States to illicit fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, including the treatment of individuals harmed by fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, and the efforts of the United States Government to detect and interdict illicit fentanyl and other synthetic opioids being trafficked into the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1169. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE COSTS OF FINANCING FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the costs of financing for State and local government projects, including by repealing the tax exclusion for interest on State and local bonds.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall

be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1170. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE OUT-OF-POCKET COSTS OR REDUCE ACCESS TO TREATMENT, INCLUDING MEDICATION-ASSISTED TREATMENT, FOR AMERICANS SUFFERING FROM AN OPIOID USE DISORDER.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase out-of-pocket costs or reduce access to treatment, including medication-assisted treatment, for Americans suffering from an opioid use disorder.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1171. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD DECREASE ACCESS TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR RETIREMENT SYSTEM AND TO MEANINGFUL SAVINGS INCENTIVES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would decrease access to the private sector retirement system and to meaningful savings incentives.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1172. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the

concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE MEDICAID AND CHIP FISCAL RELIEF FOR TEXAS, FLORIDA, PUERTO RICO AND OTHER UNITED STATES TERRITORIES IMPACTED BY HURRICANE HARVEY, HURRICANE IRMA OR HURRICANE MARIA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing fiscal relief through the Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Programs for Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico and other United States territories impacted by Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, or Hurricane Maria, including by increasing both the Federal medical assistance percentage and the enhanced FMAP for fiscal year 2018 for such States and territories to 100 percent and by increasing the total amount certified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 1108 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308) for payments to Puerto Rico and the other territories under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) for fiscal year 2018, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1173. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 20, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 25, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, reduce the amount by \$45,000,000,000.

SA 1174. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX INCREASES ON LOW-INCOME AND MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that impose a tax increase on low-income or middle-class families, including through a reduction in refundable tax credits.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1175. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION DECREASING TAXES TO HOUSEHOLDS IN THE TOP 1 PERCENT OF INCOME.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report pursuant to section 2001 that provides any net tax cuts to households in the top 1 percent of income.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1176. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING AN EXHIBITION OR PARADE OF MILITARY FORCES AND HARDWARE FOR REVIEW BY THE PRESIDENT IN ORDER TO DEMONSTRATE MILITARY FORCE OUTSIDE OF AUTHORIZED MILITARY OPERATIONS OR ACTIVITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting an exhibition or parade of military forces and hardware for review by the President in order to demonstrate military force outside of authorized military operations or activities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1177. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT REPEALS INCENTIVES THAT PROMOTE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT IN ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals the low-income housing credit under section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the new markets tax credit under section 45D of such Code, or the historic tax credit program.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1178. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAKING THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM SIMPLER AND FAIRER FOR ALL AMERICANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include provisions to make the American tax system simpler and fairer for all Americans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1179. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR NATIVE AMERICAN CHILDREN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the funding of tribally-operated education savings accounts, charter schools, and distance learning programs by the Bureau of Indian Education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1180. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to eliminating deficit-neutral reserve funds by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1181. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS STAY SOLVENT BY INSTITUTING MUCH NEEDED REFORMS TO THE BENEFITS FORMULA AND THE FUNDING STREAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the Social Security trust funds established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) stay solvent by instituting much needed reforms to the Social Security benefits formulas and funding streams by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1182. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX RELIEF FOR HARD-WORKING MIDDLE-CLASS AMERICANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include reducing federal deductions, such as the state and local tax deduction for high-income individuals, to ensure relief for middle-income taxpayers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1183. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXTEND THE REFINED COAL TAX CREDIT FOR NEW AND EXISTING FACILITIES AND TO CREATE OPPORTUNITY FOR NOT-FOR-PROFIT ELECTRICITY GENERATORS TO MONETIZE THE TAX CREDIT DIRECTLY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the refined coal tax credit, which may include extending and monetizing the credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1184. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TAX RELIEF FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing tax relief for farmers and ranchers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1185. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING REGULATORY RELIEF FOR COMMUNITY BANKS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing regulatory relief for community banks by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1186. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING RURAL BROADBAND TO CLOSE THE DIGITAL DIVIDE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding rural broadband to close the digital divide by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1187. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING TAX-EXEMPT PRIVATE ACTIVITY BONDS AND CREATING INVESTMENT TAX CREDITS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to infrastructure financing, which may include expanding tax-exempt private activity bonds and creating investment tax credits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1188. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR MISSIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting programs related to the nuclear missions of the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1189. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3001 and insert the following:

SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT AND IMPROVE AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding affordable health care for all Americans, including by preserving and improving the Affordable Care Act, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1190. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3001.

SA 1191. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM INTEGRITY BY INCREASING TARGETED DENIAL REVIEWS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improvements to program integrity funding, including measures to accommodate the addition of target denial reviews by the Social Security Administration, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1192. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report relating to a reconciliation bill that would increase the deficit over the budget window.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1193. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 4111.

SA 1194. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike sections 2001 and 2002.

SA 1195. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX REFORM LEGISLATION THAT RELIES ON SCORES AND DISTRIBUTIONAL TABLES NOT PRODUCED FROM THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and uses scores or distribution tables not produced by the Joint Committee on Taxation or the Congressional Budget Office.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1196. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX REFORM LEGISLATION THAT VIOLATES THE MNUCHIN RULE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill,

joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and provides an absolute tax cut for tax returns in the top 1 percent of income.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1197. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE RELEASE OF TAX RETURNS OF THE PRESIDENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to public disclosure of the individual tax returns of the President, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1198. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX REFORM LEGISLATION THAT RAISES LESS REVENUE THAN CURRENT LAW.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and results in less revenue than current law over the budget window as scored by the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1199. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX REFORM LEGISLATION NOT CONSIDERED THROUGH REGULAR ORDER IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 without hearings and mark-ups in both the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1200. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX REFORM LEGISLATION THAT IS LESS PROGRESSIVE THAN CURRENT LAW.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and results in a tax code that is less progressive than current law.

(b) DETERMINATION OF WHETHER CODE IS LESS PROGRESSIVE.—For purposes of this section, a measure described in subsection (a) results in a tax code that is less progressive than current law if, after the measure takes effect—

(1) the percentage increase in after-tax income for tax returns in higher income groups, including the top 10 percent, top 5 percent, top 1 percent, and top 0.1 percent, is greater than the percentage increase in after-tax income for tax returns in lower income groups; or

(2) the percentage decrease in after-tax income for tax returns in higher income groups, including the top 10 percent, top 5 percent, top 1 percent, and top 0.1 percent, is less than the percentage decrease in after-tax income for tax returns in lower income groups.

The determinations made under paragraph (1) and (2) shall be based on distribution tables produced by the Joint Committee on Taxation.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1201. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE RELEASE OF TAX RETURNS OF THE PRESIDENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to public disclosure of the individual tax returns of the President, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1202. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TECHNOLOGY-NEUTRAL TAX CREDITS FOR CLEAN ENERGY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing long-term, technology-neutral tax incentives for clean energy, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1203. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX REFORM LEGISLATION THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE A COMPLETE REVENUE SCORE AND A DISTRIBUTION TABLE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and for which there is not a complete revenue score over the budget window and a table of the distributional effects produced by the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1204. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION BILLS THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill reported under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 641) that would increase the deficit during the period of the budget year and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1205. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX CUTS FOR WORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing per-child Federal tax relief, which may include amending the child tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1206. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRIORITIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS OF REGIONAL OR NATIONAL IMPORTANCE AND PROJECTS IN HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prioritizing Federal investments in the infrastructure of the United States on projects of regional or national significance and projects in high priority corridors on the National Highway System by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1207. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRIORITIZING PROGRAMS AND POLICIES THAT FACILITATE DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the

pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prioritizing programs and policies that facilitate domestic and international travel and tourism within the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1208. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING VETERAN SUICIDE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing veteran suicide, which may include improving mental health programs and outreach efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs, hiring more mental health care professionals for the Department, or ensuring quality and timely access to mental health care for all veterans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1209. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to grants combating terrorism, which may include consideration of the dependence on tourism as a factor in rating systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1210. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PAY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IF THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS ARE NOT COMPLETED IN A TIMELY MANNER.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) both Houses of Congress should approve a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills before October 1 of each fiscal year;

(2) if a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills are not approved by October 1 of each fiscal year, no funds should be appropriated or otherwise be made available from the Treasury of the United States for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period after October 1 that a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills are not completed; and

(3) no retroactive pay should be provided to any Member of Congress for any period for which pay is not made available as described in paragraph (2).

SA 1211. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3010 and insert the following:

SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) eligibility for both military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation (concurrent receipt);

(2) the reduction or elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and Veterans' Dependency and Indemnity Compensation;

(3) the improvement of disability benefits or the process of evaluating and adjudicating benefit claims for members of the Armed Forces or veterans;

(4) the infrastructure needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including constructing or leasing space, to include leases of major medical facilities, and maintenance of Department facilities;

(5) supporting the transition of members of the Armed Forces to the civilian workforce,

including by expanding or improving education, job training, and workforce development benefits, or other programs for members of the Armed Forces or veterans, which may include streamlining the process associated with Federal and State credentialing requirements;

(6) improving access to and reducing wait times for Department of Veterans Affairs health care, including through hiring medical providers, fully staffing emergency departments, and improving the quality of such care;

(7) reforming and improving authorities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide health care through non-Department facilities or providers and equally investing in improvements and expansions to the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system; or

(8) providing or improving specialty services, including mental health care, homeless services, gender specific health care, fertility treatment, and support for caregivers; by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1212. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$216,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,406,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$5,256,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$5,767,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,161,000,000.

On page 4 line 4, increase the amount by \$1,843,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,181,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$619,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$94,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$57,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, decrease the amount by \$216,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$3,406,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by \$5,256,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$5,767,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$3,161,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$1,843,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,181,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$619,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$94,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$57,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,200,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,200,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$7,200,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$216,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,406,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,256,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,767,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$3,161,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$1,843,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,181,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$619,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$94,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$57,000,000.

On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by \$7,200,000,000.

On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by \$216,000,000.

On page 31, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,200,000,000.

On page 31, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,406,000,000.

On page 31, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,200,000,000.

On page 31, line 11, increase the amount by \$5,256,000,000.

On page 31, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,767,000,000.

On page 31, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,161,000,000.

On page 31, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,843,000,000.

On page 32, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,181,000,000.

On page 32, line 7, increase the amount by \$619,000,000.

On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by \$94,000,000.

On page 32, line 15, increase the amount by \$57,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by \$21,600,000,000.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORM OF CARE IN NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FACILITIES OR PROVIDERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to reforming and improving authorities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide health care through non-Department facilities or providers and equally investing in improvements and expansions to the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1213. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional

budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS AT THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to the Indian Health Service, which may include providing for additional healthcare professionals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1214. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STUDYING THE TRAFFICKING OF OPIOIDS AT THE NORTHERN BORDER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to studying the trafficking of opioids at the Northern Border by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1215. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASES IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR THE REVISED SECURITY CATEGORY AND THE REVISED NONSECURITY CATEGORY BY EQUAL AMOUNTS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that increases the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)) for the revised security category and the revised nonsecurity category by equal amounts.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1216. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE FAIRNESS OF THE CALCULATIONS OF AGRICULTURE RISK COVERAGE COUNTY COVERAGE PAYMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the fairness of the calculations of agriculture risk coverage county coverage payments by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1217. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING THE CATEGORIES OF LIVESTOCK LOSSES COVERED BY THE EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK, HONEY BEES, AND FARM-RAISED FISH PROGRAM OF THE FARM SERVICE AGENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding the categories of livestock losses covered by the emergency assistance for livestock, honey bees, and farm-raised fish program of the Farm Service Agency to include the cost of transporting feed and livestock by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1218. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK, HONEY BEES, AND FARM-RAISED FISH PROGRAM OF THE FARM SERVICE AGENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for the emergency assistance for livestock, honey bees, and farm-raised fish program of the Farm Service Agency by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1219. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS OF THE FARM SERVICE AGENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the disaster assistance programs of the Farm Service Agency by the

amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1220. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 57, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

icit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1221. Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING PUBLIC AND INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANCE, HOUSING RELIEF, CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE REPAIRS, AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE, AND OTHER RECOVERY AID FUNDING FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES MAJOR DISASTER THAT BEGAN ON OCTOBER 8, 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring public and individual assistance, housing relief, critical infrastructure repairs, agricultural assistance, and other recovery aid funding for the victims of the California wildfires major disaster that began on October 8, 2017 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1222. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE HIGHEST TAX RATE TO OFFSET ANY INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT RESULTING FROM OTHER TAX LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an automatic increase in the highest tax rate under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in order to offset any changes to such Code which increase the deficit within 10 years of taking effect, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1223. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD MAKE THE TAX CODE LESS PROGRESSIVE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would make the income tax code under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 less progressive by decreasing the tax burden paid by the 1 percent of taxpayers with the highest income, as measured either on an absolute basis or as a percentage of the total tax burden.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1224. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD NOT BE THE BIGGEST MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUT IN HISTORY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment,

amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would not be the biggest middle class tax cut ever enacted in the United States, based on a distributional analysis and score by the Joint Committee on Taxation and measured either as a share of the gross domestic product or as a percentage of the total tax burden (determined by defining “middle class” as all income deciles above the lowest 20 percent and below the highest 10 percent).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1225. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE TAXES ON MORE THAN 10 PERCENT OF TAXPAYERS BELOW THE TOP DECILE OF INCOME.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase taxes on more than 10 percent of the taxpayers not in the highest decile of income.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1226. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD MAKE ANY CHANGES TO THE TAX CODE IF THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT RELEASED TAX RETURNS FOR THE PRECEDING 5 YEARS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would make any changes to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, unless the President has released tax returns for at

least the preceding 5 taxable years to demonstrate the effects of any such legislation on lowering the tax burden of taxpayers like the President.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1227. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LOWERING THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS IN THE UNITED STATES BY IMPORTING DRUGS FROM CANADA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to lowering the cost of prescription drugs in the United States by importing drugs from Canada, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1228. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. HASSAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RAISING TAXES ON TAXPAYERS WHOSE ANNUAL INCOME IS BELOW \$250,000.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that raises taxes on taxpayers whose annual income is below \$250,000.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling

of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1229. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CARBON CAPTURE, STORAGE, AND UTILIZATION TECHNOLOGY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to support for carbon capture, utilization, and storage technology and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, which may include expanding section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and establishing other incentives for implementation of carbon capture, storage, and utilization technology on carbon-emitting facilities and the development of additional carbon utilization technologies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1230. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION ISSUED ON SEPTEMBER 24, 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the implementation of the presidential proclamation issued on September 24, 2017, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1231. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING SIGNIFICANT REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE ABSENT SPECIFIC CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the Secretary of State shall not be permitted to undertake any significant reorganization of the Department of State that involves consolidation, streamlining, transfer, or elimination of bureaus, offices, or functions within the Department, absent specific authorization from Congress, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1232. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING TRANSPARENCY WITH REGARD TO WAIVERS TO THE BUY AMERICAN ACT, THE BERRY AMENDMENT, THE BUY AMERICA ACT, AND SECTION 2533B OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing transparency with regard to waivers to the Buy American Act (chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code), the Berry Amendment (section 2533a of title 10, United States Code), the Buy America Act (section 5323(j) of title 49, United States Code), and section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1233. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amend-

ment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT WOULD PRESERVE THE CARRIED INTEREST LOOPHOLE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that preserves the preferential tax treatment of carried interest income.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1234. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL ALLOWING COMPANIES THAT HAVE OUTSOURCED JOBS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO BENEFIT FROM ANY TAX BREAKS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that permits companies which have outsourced jobs to foreign countries to benefit from any tax breaks.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1235. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSERVATION OF PLUM ISLAND, NEW YORK.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the conservation of Plum Island, Town of Southold, New York, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1236. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE CONSERVATION AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LONG ISLAND SOUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the conservation and stewardship of the Long Island Sound by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1237. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 4012(b)(2) and insert the following:

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$8,500,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$0; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$0.

SA 1238. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DROUGHT RELIEF.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to drought relief by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1239. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal crop insurance by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1240. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to rural development by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1241. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to agricultural research by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1242. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOLDING MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ACCOUNTABLE FOR FAILING TO PASS A BALANCED BUDGET.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1243. Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING THE FRAMEWORK NECESSARY FOR INNOVATIVE FINANCING OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS TO FUND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing the framework necessary for innovative financing options for students to fund postsecondary education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1244. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, line 17, insert “, which may include improvements to career and technical education” before the semicolon.

SA 1245. Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring accountability for the Department of Education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1246. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING TAXPAYERS AND FEDERAL INVESTMENTS AND ENSURING HUMAN SAFETY FROM FORESEEABLE FLOOD DISASTERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to any steps necessary to ensure that Federal infrastructure investments are adequately protected from foreseeable flood disasters and are located or constructed in a manner to minimize avoidable taxpayer losses and unnecessary risk to human safety by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1247. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD DECREASE FUNDING FOR THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS OR ANY OF ITS PROGRAMS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would decrease funding for the Bureau of the Census or any of its programs.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1248. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investments in the National Railroad Passenger Corporation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1249. Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KING, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 83, strike lines 12 through 15, and insert the following:

SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.

Section 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

SEC. 4112. PROHIBITION ON AGREEING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION WITHOUT A SCORE IN THE SENATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to vote on the adoption of a covered amendment to a bill or resolution that requires an estimate under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653), unless an estimate described in such section 402 for the covered amendment was made publicly available on the website of the Congressional Budget Office not later than 28 hours before the time the vote commences.

(b) **COVERED AMENDMENT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered amendment” means an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1250. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TRAINING TO SUPPORT THE RECOGNITION AND REPORTING OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to training to support the recognition and reporting of human trafficking by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1251. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING RURAL CALL QUALITY AND COMPLETION RATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving rural telephone call quality and completion rates by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1252. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SPORTS-THEMED ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING FOR BEFORE- AND AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to developing best practices for sports-themed academic programming for before- and after-school programs and mak-

ing such programming available online in a user-friendly format, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1253. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING CHILD CARE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OR THE CREATION, RENOVATION, OR EXPANSION OF CHILD CARE FACILITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to providing grants on a competitive basis to States to support child care workforce development or the establishment, renovation, or expansion of child care facilities in child care deserts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1254. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING THE USE OF SAVINGS ACCOUNTS FOR EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding the use of education savings accounts to add workforce development training and credentialing programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1255. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PERMANENTLY ESTABLISHING MYRA ACCOUNTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to permanently establishing the MyRA savings account program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1256. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF BROADBAND, ENERGY, HOUSING, AND WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IN RURAL AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the effective development of broadband, energy, housing, and water infrastructure in rural areas of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1257. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION OUTREACH AND EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to developing a comprehensive career and technical education outreach and education grant program, including by educating students and parents at an early stage about obtaining real-world skills and experiences and addressing outdated perceptions about career and technical education and careers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1258. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO CREATE INCENTIVES FOR MANUFACTURING OPERATIONS TO LOCATE IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to creating incentives for manufacturing operations to locate in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1259. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING RURAL BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments

between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting rural broadband deployment by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1260. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ALLOWING VETERANS TO RECEIVE CARE FOR THEIR NEWBORNS FOR UP TO 14 DAYS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to allowing veterans to receive care for their newborns for up to 14 days by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1261. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE OUTDOOR ECONOMY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the outdoor economy, including the production of economic data to accurately measure the economic benefits of public land and outdoor space in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1262. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr.

ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EQUALIZING THE TREATMENT OF SERVICEMEMBERS' AND BUSINESS MILEAGE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to treating mileage traveled by members of the Armed Forces (including reserve components) in the same manner as other business travel for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including by equalizing the required distance for deductible travel, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1263. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DESIGNATING CERTAIN MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AS HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to designating certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs as health professional shortage areas, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1264. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PERMITTING CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE TO PARTICIPATE IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT TO MILITARY FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to permitting children of members of the National Guard and Reserve to participate in education programs that provide additional support to military families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1265. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING POSTAL SERVICES FOR AMERICA'S POSTAL CUSTOMERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting postal services for the people of the United States, which may include improving the financial stability and condition of the United States Postal Service, strengthening the service performance that postal customers experience, or prioritizing the needs of rural areas of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1266. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DOMESTIC AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the domestic agricultural economy, such as improving farm income, addressing agricultural market disaster, or expanding the use of value-added agricultural products, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1267. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. USE OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE BASELINE TO DETERMINE BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

In the Senate, for purposes of determining points of order established under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) or any concurrent resolution on the budget, any estimate of the levels of new budget authority, outlays, or direct spending, new entitlement authority, or revenues in a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, conference report, or amendment between the Houses shall be made using the baseline projection under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907).

SA 1268. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR TEMPORARY TAX PROVISIONS.

(a) CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.—During the 115th Congress, in the Senate, any covered cost estimate for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, motion, or conference report that creates or extends a temporary tax provision shall also include, for information purposes only, an estimate of the cost of the temporary tax provision, as if it were permanent.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered cost estimate” means an estimate provided—

(A) by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653);

(B) by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)); or

(C) at the request of the Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Finance or the Committee on the Budget of the Senate; and

(2) the term “temporary tax provision” means an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (or any other provision of tax law) which includes a date of termination or applies only to periods, transactions, or events before a specified date.

SA 1269. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS TO OBTAIN AUDITS WITH UNQUALIFIED OPINIONS OF STATEMENT OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the Department of Defense and the military departments to obtain audits with unqualified opinions of statement of budgetary resources by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1270. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. . LIMIT ON SENATE CONSIDERATION OF RECONCILIATION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution reported pursuant to section 2001, or an amendment to, conference report on, or amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, which does not dedicate future savings from such legislation in a manner which allocates 40 percent of such savings to the capitalization of a national infrastructure bank and 60 percent of such savings to reduction of the deficit.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling

of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1271. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING FUNDING FOR MEALS ON WHEELS OR OTHER NUTRITION SERVICES.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or reduces funding for nutrition services under part C of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030d–21 et seq.).

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1272. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING THE MANY BARRIERS FACED BY WOMEN BUSINESS OWNERS AND ENTREPRENEURS, INCLUDING PROMOTING THE WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing the many barriers faced by women business owners and entrepreneurs, including promoting the Women's Business Center program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1273. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional

budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports making changes to or providing for the reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund established under section 200302 of title 54, United States Code, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1274. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CAUSE A DECLINE IN THE REHABILITATION OF HISTORIC INCOME-PRODUCING PROPERTIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cause a decline in the rehabilitation of historic income-producing properties in the United States, including by repealing the rehabilitation tax credit.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1275. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE IMPACT OF EXTREME WEATHER AND NATURAL DISASTERS ON CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to initiatives to bolster the resilience of existing critical infrastructure systems and facilitate the development of new critical infrastructure systems, which may include energy infrastructure, telecommunications, drinking water and wastewater, transportation networks, shore and flood protection, food production, healthcare and long-term care facilities, schools, law enforcement agencies, and public buildings, in order to improve critical infrastructure resilience in the United States and reduce the long-term economic costs from impacts related to extreme weather events or natural disasters, such as heavy rains, hurricanes, flooding, storm surge, sea-level rise, extreme temperatures or temperature changes, wildfires, earthquakes, or tornadoes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1276. Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BURR, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONTINUED FUNDING FOR THE CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANT PROGRAM OF THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investment in the Capital Investment Grant program, which may include measures to build and improve subway, commuter rail, light rail, bus rapid transit, streetcar, or ferry projects to support strong, safe, and efficient public transportation systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1277. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2001, strike subsection (c) and insert the following:

(c) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(d) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(e) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(f) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) through (e) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SA 1278. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, line 6, strike “\$1,500,000,000,000” and insert “\$2,000,000,000,000”.

SA 1279. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT UNDER THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT MISSION AREA OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ON TRIBAL LAND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving broadband deployment under the rural development mis-

sion area of the Department of Agriculture on Tribal land by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1280. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HELPING PROVIDE INCREASED VOTING SECURITY FOR THE VOTING SYSTEMS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROTECT AGAINST INTRUSION, THEFT, MANIPULATION, AND DELETION OF VOTER REGISTRATION DATA, BALLOTS, OR VOTES CAST, AND TO PREVENT CYBER ATTACKS FROM MALICIOUS COMPUTER HACKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to securing State election systems from intrusion, theft, manipulation, and deletion of voter registration data, ballots, or votes cast, and to prevent cyber attacks from malicious computer hackers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1281. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 4207. PROHIBITION ON DETAINING, REMOVING, OR DEPORTING ALIENS ON WHOSE BEHALF PRIVATE RELIEF BILLS HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED.

No Federal funding or other Federal resources made available during fiscal year 2018 may be used to detain, remove, or deport any alien on whose behalf a private relief bill has been introduced by a member of Congress during the 115th Congress.

SA 1282. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congress-

sional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BRINGING ABOUT FAIRNESS TO THE TAXATION OF BUSINESS EARNINGS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include provisions to align the American tax system with our trading partners by bringing fairness to the taxation of American business income, which may include ensuring the owners of capital bear the full burden of the taxation of business income, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1283. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PERMANENT TAX RELIEF FOR MAJOR DISASTERS DECLARED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include permanent tax relief for major disasters declared by the Federal government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1284. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES IN THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the expansion of leasing in the outer Continental Shelf by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1285. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. SCORING RULE FOR AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM OFFSHORE DRILLING LEASES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, for purposes of determining points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) or any concurrent resolution on the budget, amounts received under any offshore drilling lease entered into or modified after the date on which this concurrent resolution is agreed to shall not count as revenue of the Federal Government, if the amounts are required to be distributed to States or units of local government.

SA 1286. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX RELIEF FOR HARD-WORKING MIDDLE-CLASS AMERICANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-as-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include tax relief for hard-working middle-class American taxpayers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1287. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. ENFORCEMENT OF ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND OTHER LEVELS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—During each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cause the amount of new budget authority, outlays, or deficits to be more than, or would cause the amount of revenues to be less than, the amount set forth under any allocation, aggregate, or other level established under this resolution.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1288. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE INFORMATION RELATING TO THE SOLVENCY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget for a fiscal year, or any amendment thereto, or any conference report thereon, which does not include the following information:

(1) The year in which the asset reserves of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund are projected to become depleted (as estimated by the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds).

(2) The year in which the asset reserves of the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are projected to become depleted (as estimated by the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds).

(3) For each of the years identified under paragraph (1) and (2), the projected amount (expressed as a percentage) by which benefits scheduled to be paid under the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund or the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, as applicable, shall be reduced as a result of the trust fund having insufficient assets to meet its obligations (as estimated by the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1289. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 83, line 20, insert “, by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn,” after “emergency requirement”.

SA 1290. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. DUPLICATION DETERMINATIONS BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered legislation” means a bill or resolution of a public character reported by any committee of the Senate.

(b) DUPLICATION DETERMINATIONS BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.—Any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) for covered legislation shall include an analysis that includes—

(1) a determination of whether the covered legislation creates any new Federal program, office, or initiative that would duplicate or overlap with any existing Federal entity with similar mission, purpose, goals, or activities; and

(2) a listing of all such instances of duplication or overlapping created by the covered legislation.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any covered legislation unless the committee reporting the covered legislation has posted on the public website of the committee the analysis described in subsection (b).

(2) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (1).

SA 1291. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4114. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING PROGRAMS THAT HAVE BEEN EXPIRED FOR MORE THAN 5 YEARS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that appropriates amounts for a program for which the authorizing authority has been expired for more than 5 fiscal years.

(2) POINT OF ORDER SUSTAINED.—If a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision described in paragraph (1), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a)(1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a)(1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 1292. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TREATMENT OF REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS LEVELS TO ACHIEVE SAVINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) H. Con. Res. 448 (96th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1981, gave authorizing committees reconciliation instructions which amounted to approximately two-thirds of the savings required under reconciliation.

(2) The language in H. Con. Res. 448 resulted in a debate about how reconciling discretionary spending programs could be in order given that authorizations of appropriations for programs did not actually change spending and the programs authorized would be funded through later annual appropriation. The staff of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and Marty Gold, counsel to the Majority Leader, advised that upon consultation with the Parliamentarian, the original instructions on discretionary spending would be out of order because of the phrase, “to modify programs”. This was seen as too broad and programs could be modified without resulting in changes to their future appropriations.

(3) To rectify this violation, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate reported S. Con. Res. 9 (97th Congress), revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983, to include reconciliation, which revised the language in the reconciliation instructions to change entitlement law and “to report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce appropriations levels so as to achieve savings”.

(4) This was understood to mean changes in authorization language of discretionary programs would be permissible under reconciliation procedures provided such changes in law would have the result in affecting a change in later outlays derived from future appropriations. Further it was understood that a change in authorization language that caused a change in later outlays was considered to be a change in outlays for the purpose of reconciliation.

(5) On April 2, 1981, the Senate voted 88 to 10 to approve S. Con. Res. 9 with the modified reconciliation language.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that committees reporting changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce appropriations levels so as to achieve savings shall be considered to be changes in outlays for the purpose of enforcing the prohibition on extraneous matters in reconciliation bills.

SA 1293. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 _____. VOTING THRESHOLD FOR POINTS OF ORDER.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered point of order” means a point of order—

(1) under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), the Balanced Budg-

et and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), or a concurrent resolution; and

(2) which, but for subsection (b), may be waived only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(b) VOTING THRESHOLD.—In the Senate—

(1) a covered point of order may be waived only by the affirmative vote of three-fourths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn; and

(2) an affirmative vote of three-fourths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a covered point of order.

SA 1294. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2001 and insert the following:

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$210,740,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$21,070,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$421,480,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(d) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$526,850,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(e) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that—

(1) reduce new budget authority by not less than \$1,095,840,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(2) increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(f) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$295,030,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(g) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$737,590,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(h) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less

than \$948,330,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(i) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$21,070,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(j) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) through (i) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SA 1295. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, line 6, strike “\$1,500,000,000,000” and insert “\$2,000,000,000,000”.

SA 1296. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2001 and insert the following:

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$4,800,000,000.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$480,000,000.

(c) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$9,660,000,000.

(d) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$12,070,000,000.

(e) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that—

(1) reduce new budget authority for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$25,100,000,000; and

(2) that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(f) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its

jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$6,760,000,000.

(g) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$16,900,000,000.

(h) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$21,720,000,000.

(i) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$480,000,000.

(j) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) through (i) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SA 1297. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.

Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.

Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable health care for all.

Sec. 3002. Revenue-neutral reserve fund to reform the American tax system.

Sec. 3003. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.

Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extending the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 3005. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen American families.

Sec. 3006. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote innovative educational and nutritional models and systems for American students.

Sec. 3007. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the American banking system.

Sec. 3008. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American agriculture, energy, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.

Sec. 3009. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore American military power.

Sec. 3010. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and service members.

Sec. 3011. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for public lands and the environment.

Sec. 3012. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to secure the American border.

Sec. 3013. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote economic growth, the private sector, and to enhance job creation.

Sec. 3014. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation modifying statutory budgetary controls.

Sec. 3015. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the taxpayer bailout of pension plans.

Sec. 3016. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs.

Sec. 3017. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare and repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

Sec. 3018. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to affordable child and dependent care.

Sec. 3019. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to worker training programs.

Sec. 3020. Reserve fund for legislation to provide disaster funds for relief and recovery efforts to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 4101. Point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate.

Sec. 4102. Point of order against certain changes in mandatory programs.

Sec. 4103. Point of order against provisions that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.

Sec. 4104. Point of order against designation of funds for overseas contingency operations.

Sec. 4105. Point of order against reconciliation amendments with unknown budgetary effects.

Sec. 4106. Pay-As-You-Go point of order in the Senate.

Sec. 4107. Honest accounting; cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.

Sec. 4108. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.

Sec. 4109. Adjustment for wildfire suppression funding in the Senate.

Sec. 4110. Adjustment for improved oversight of spending.

Sec. 4111. Repeal of certain limitations.

Sec. 4112. Emergency legislation.

Sec. 4113. Enforcement filing in the Senate.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

- Sec. 4201. Oversight of Government performance.
- Sec. 4202. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
- Sec. 4203. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
- Sec. 4204. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
- Sec. 4205. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.
- Sec. 4206. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses
SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,490,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,613,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$2,755,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$2,883,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,015,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,162,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,306,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,463,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,654,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,825,184,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: –\$167,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: –\$169,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: –\$166,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –\$165,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: –\$166,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: –\$167,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: –\$169,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: –\$172,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: –\$146,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: –\$145,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,093,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,220,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,319,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,444,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,501,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,563,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,607,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,753,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,851,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,942,710,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,095,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,266,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,310,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,370,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,486,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,532,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,561,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,710,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,810,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,903,041,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$605,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$612,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$554,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$486,902,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$470,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$370,227,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$254,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$246,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$155,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$77,857,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,243,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$22,056,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,759,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,396,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$23,992,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$24,508,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$24,953,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$25,375,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$25,777,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$25,999,469,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,560,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$16,274,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$16,932,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,553,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,188,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$18,765,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$19,269,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$19,809,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$20,307,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$20,780,452,000,000.

SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$557,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$569,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$570,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$568,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$584,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$574,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$598,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$584,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$613,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$601,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$629,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$611,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$644,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$621,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$660,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$641,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$678,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$658,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$695,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$675,108,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$45,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,161,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$45,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$47,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,676,000,000.
(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,427,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$37,773,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,597,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, –\$762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,442,000,000.

(5) **Natural Resources and Environment (300):**

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,533,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$42,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$45,022,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$45,716,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$45,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$47,575,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$48,511,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,280,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$48,326,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,063,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,564,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,898,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,372,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,284,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,540,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,743,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,135,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,894,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,354,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,311,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,638,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,881,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,112,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,173,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,280,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,542,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$9,379,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$4,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,090,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,554,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,997,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,359,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$2,364,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,393,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$2,715,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$3,254,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$14,163,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$4,648,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$16,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$4,817,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$17,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$6,228,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, — \$19,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$6,816,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, — \$19,990,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$89,125,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$92,875,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$90,538,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$92,393,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$84,687,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$93,064,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$40,062,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$81,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$71,003,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,791,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$71,930,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$74,521,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$73,370,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$76,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$74,843,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$76,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$76,345,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$76,895,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$77,831,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$78,001,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development

(450):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,018,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,281,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,435,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,518,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,690,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,867,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,778,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,061,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,041,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,347,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,669,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,985,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,353,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,304,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,932,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and

Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$90,224,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$99,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$100,086,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$98,799,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$101,018,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$101,064,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$102,034,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$102,218,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$102,700,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$103,178,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$102,725,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$103,653,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$103,012,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$103,960,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$103,798,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$104,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$104,942,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$105,921,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$106,473,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$107,433,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$546,598,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$558,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$560,622,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$563,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$578,838,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$570,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$574,616,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$575,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$586,530,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$583,769,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$601,742,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$599,099,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$605,811,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$603,443,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$617,220,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$614,728,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$633,890,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$630,824,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$652,230,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$653,552,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$586,239,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$585,962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$643,592,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$643,374,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$687,119,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$686,926,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$734,446,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$734,241,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$819,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$819,073,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$833,885,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$833,669,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$845,578,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$845,355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$934,429,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$934,186,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,002,522,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,002,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,066,566,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,066,321,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$491,978,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$477,537,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$490,106,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$479,627,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$493,118,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$482,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$494,706,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$485,536,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$497,021,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$494,507,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$506,711,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$499,405,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$515,692,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$502,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$531,668,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$520,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$544,483,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$538,620,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$557,641,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$548,723,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,683,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,683,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,182,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,182,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,460,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,460,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,915,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$52,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,734,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$56,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,953,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,953,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,424,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$65,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,757,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,173,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$74,173,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$176,446,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$177,393,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$191,376,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$189,441,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$198,336,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$196,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$205,001,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$202,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$221,481,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$219,320,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$219,424,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$216,903,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$216,519,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$214,343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$234,741,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$232,535,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$242,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$240,210,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$251,142,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$248,884,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,038,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,244,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$64,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,377,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$66,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,866,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,069,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,488,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,813,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,657,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$70,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,432,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$71,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,233,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$73,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,093,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$75,382,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,675,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,889,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,518,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,642,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,989,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,649,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,311,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,973,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,972,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,608,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,485,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,255,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,052,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,827,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,382,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$388,767,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$388,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$441,158,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$441,158,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$497,893,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$497,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$546,206,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$546,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$589,086,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$589,086,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$630,179,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$630,179,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$664,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$691,250,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$691,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$716,494,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$716,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$736,146,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$736,146,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$111,576,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$86,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$133,357,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$102,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$145,919,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$131,518,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$176,695,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$166,918,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$218,460,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$209,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$247,892,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$238,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$276,275,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$266,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$307,701,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$297,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$366,270,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$356,035,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$415,402,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$404,286,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$95,229,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$95,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$93,401,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$93,401,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$95,479,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$95,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$98,956,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$98,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$101,293,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$101,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$102,309,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$102,309,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$111,119,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$128,332,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$141,303,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$141,303,000,000.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,676,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,675,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,684,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,901,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,053,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$946,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$873,312,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$903,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$932,055,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$962,698,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$996,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,031,653,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,068,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,106,862,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,146,803,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,188,060,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$849,609,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$909,109,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$972,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,040,108,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,111,446,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,188,081,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,266,786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,349,334,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,437,032,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,530,362,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,553,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,584,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,716,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,888,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,062,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,029,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,426,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,581,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,779,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,024,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,194,000,000.

SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$281,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$290,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$301,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$311,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$322,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$333,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$344,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$343,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$356,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$369,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$368,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$380,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$379,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving

such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than November 13, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing or replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3002. REVENUE-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include—

(1) tax relief for middle-income working Americans;

(2) lowering taxes on families with children; or

(3) incentivizing companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation is revenue neutral and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3003. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees,

or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENDING THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3005. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) addressing the opioid and substance abuse crisis;
- (2) protecting and assisting victims of domestic abuse;
- (3) foster care, child care, marriage, and fatherhood programs;
- (4) making it easier to save for retirement;
- (5) reforming the American public housing system;
- (6) the Community Development Block Grant Program; or
- (7) extending expiring health care provisions,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3006. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL AND NUTRITIONAL MODELS AND SYSTEMS FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);

(2) ensuring State flexibility in education;

(3) enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs;

(4) the consolidation and streamlining of overlapping early learning and child care programs;

(5) educational programs for individuals with disabilities; or

(6) child nutrition programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3007. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the American banking system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3008. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Farm Bill;
- (2) American energy policies;
- (3) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;
- (4) North American energy development;
- (5) infrastructure, transportation, and water development;
- (6) the Federal Aviation Administration;
- (7) the National Flood Insurance Program;
- (8) State mineral royalty revenues; or
- (9) soda ash royalties,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3009. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE AMERICAN MILITARY POWER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) improving military readiness, including deferred Facilities Sustainment Restoration and Modernization;
 - (2) military technological superiority;
 - (3) structural defense reforms; or
 - (4) strengthening cybersecurity efforts,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legis-

lation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and service members by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3011. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);
- (2) forest health and wildfire prevention and control;
- (3) resources for wildland firefighting for the Forest Service and Department of Interior;
- (4) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or
- (5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3012. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE THE AMERICAN BORDER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) securing the border of the United States;
- (2) ending human trafficking; or
- (3) stopping the transportation of narcotics into the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3013. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND TO ENHANCE JOB CREATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills,

joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) reducing costs to businesses and individuals stemming from Federal regulations;

(2) increasing commerce and economic growth; or

(3) enhancing job creation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3014. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION MODIFYING STATUTORY BUDGETARY CONTROLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying statutory budget controls, which may include adjustments to the discretionary spending limits and changes to the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for the Financial Accounting Standards Board, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and other similar entities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE TAXPAYER BAILOUT OF PENSION PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prevention of taxpayer bailout of pension plans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3016. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING WORK REQUIREMENTS IN ALL MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3017. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICARE AND REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), which may include repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under section 1899A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3018. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFFORDABLE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making the cost of child and dependent care more affordable and useful for American families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3019. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to worker training programs, such as training programs that target workers that need advanced skills to progress in their current profession or apprenticeship or certificate programs that provide retraining for a new industry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 3020. RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE DISASTER FUNDS FOR RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS TO AREAS DEVASTATED BY HURRICANES AND FLOODING IN 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing disaster funds for relief and recovery to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 4101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2019.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

SEC. 4102. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “CHIMP” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in

effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that includes a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(e) SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3103 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall be applied and administered as if section 3103(e) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, had not been enacted.

SEC. 4103. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term “CHIMP” has the meaning given such term in section 4102(a); and

(2) the term “Crime Victims Fund” means the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101).

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution making full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision containing a CHIMP affecting the Crime Victims Fund that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all CHIMPs affecting the Crime Victims Fund in relation to fiscal year 2018 to be more than \$11,224,000,000, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the

measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(3) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to paragraph (1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(4) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this subsection may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(5) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this subsection, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) REVIEW OF PROCEDURES REGARDING CHIMPS.—The Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall review existing budget enforcement procedures regarding CHIMPs included in appropriations legislation. These committees of jurisdiction should consult with other relevant committees of jurisdiction and other interested parties to review such procedures, including for Crime Victims Fund spending, and include any agreed upon recommendations in subsequent concurrent resolutions on the budget.

SEC. 4104. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that designates funds for fiscal year 2018 for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a

point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) SUSPENSION OF POINT OF ORDER.—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

SEC. 4105. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION AMENDMENTS WITH UNKNOWN BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to or motion on a bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits a written statement for the Congressional Record indicating that the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, is unable to determine the effect the amendment or motion would have on budget authority, outlays, direct spending, entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, or surpluses.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SEC. 4106. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any of—

(A) the period of the current fiscal year;

(B) the period of the budget year;

(C) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year; or

(D) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(3) DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as

that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(4) **EXCLUSION.**—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on November 5, 1990.

(5) **BASELINE.**—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) **PRIOR SURPLUS.**—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4107. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for major legislation considered in the Senate shall, to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic

variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty considered in the Senate—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(i) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 4108. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.

If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 4109. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING IN THE SENATE.

If a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits

established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) to provide for wildfire suppression funding, which may include criteria for making such an adjustment, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this concurrent resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SEC. 4110. ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF SPENDING.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—If a measure becomes law that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may decrease the allocation to the committee of the Senate with jurisdiction of the direct spending by an amount equal to the amount of the decrease in direct spending.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays shall be determined on the basis of estimates submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.

Sections 3205 and 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, are repealed.

SEC. 4112. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.**—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) **EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.**—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of this resolution, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean

any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated

emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4113. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE SENATE.

If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2018, 2018 through 2022, and 2018 through 2027 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advanced appropriations that would have been identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 4201. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General's list of unimplemented recommendations and on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 4202. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

SEC. 4203. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 4204. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

SEC. 4205. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2017 to 2027.

SEC. 4206. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SA 1298. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 25, decrease the amount by \$43,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by \$35,948,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$33,550,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by \$86,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by \$35,260,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by \$6,450,000,000.

On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by \$860,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by \$35,260,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by \$6,450,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by \$860,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by \$35,260,000,000.

On page 7, line 4, decrease the amount by \$6,450,000,000.

On page 7, line 5, decrease the amount by \$860,000,000.

On page 37, line 19, decrease the amount by \$43,000,000,000.

On page 37, line 20, decrease the amount by \$35,260,000,000.

On page 37, line 24, decrease the amount by \$6,450,000,000.

On page 38, line 3, decrease the amount by \$860,000,000.

SA 1299. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that creates a duplicative program.

(2) POINT OF ORDER SUSTAINED.—If a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision described in paragraph (1), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a)(1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a)(1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 1300. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SAME DAY VOTER REGISTRATION AND VOTING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the need for same day voter registration, an online national voter registration form, election day voter registration address updates, and early or no-excuse absentee voting by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1301. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2001, strike subsection (b).

SA 1302. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2002, insert the following:

SEC. 2003. MODIFICATION TO RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS.

Section 2001(a) and 2002(a) are null and void.

SA 1303. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A NATIONAL DISASTER EMERGENCY VOTING BALLOT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to voting procedures in the event that a National disaster occurs during an election that prevents voters from accessing polls, including a Federal write-in absentee ballot for domestic use, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1304. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPEAL OF THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing relief from Obamacare taxes, which may include the requirement to individually purchase, or jointly provide, health insurance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1305. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 4102(b)(2) and insert the following:

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$8,500,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$0; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$0.

SA 1306. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO VETERAN HOMELESSNESS, SUICIDE PREVENTION, AND AGRICULTURAL TRAINING PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting and improving the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include addressing veteran homelessness, suicide prevention and awareness, and sustainable agricultural training for veterans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1307. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE ABILITY OF SMALL BUSINESSES TO USE VOLUNTEERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring the ability of small businesses to use volunteers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1308. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to industry-based coordination of career and technical education in institutions of higher education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1309. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE USE OF FEDERAL EMINENT DOMAIN FOR TRANSMISSION LINES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the use of Federal eminent domain for transmission lines by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1310. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING ACCESS TO BROADBAND IN RURAL AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring access to broadband in rural areas of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1311. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTMENT IN ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient investment in Alzheimer's disease research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1312. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 64, line 4, insert “, and relating to promoting policies to improve disaster preparedness for older Americans” after “2017”.

SA 1313. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 5, insert “, which may include support of opioid overdose and addiction prevention activities, evidence-based opioid addiction treatment activities, education and community-based activities aimed at addressing and reducing the opioid overdose and addiction epidemic, improved monitoring and prescribing practices, and enhanced research for alternatives to opioid pain medication” before the semicolon.

SA 1314. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING HEALTH CARE OPTIONS FOR VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding health care options for veterans, which may include authorizing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into provider agreements with non-Department extended care providers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1315. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEFUNDING THE ELECTION INTEGRITY COMMISSION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to defunding the Election Integrity Commission, which is looking into voter fraud in order to promote policies that suppress the vote, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1316. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE DATA COLLECTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the

pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the Department of Justice to incentivize States and local law enforcement agencies to collect data on use of force incidents between law enforcement officers and civilians by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1317. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND TO SUPPORT UNACCOMPANIED WOMAN IN INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for unaccompanied women to secure access to vital services, including water, sanitation facilities, food, and health care, in emergency situations, including humanitarian crises or natural disasters, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1318. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING COMMUTER RAILROADS WITH ADDITIONAL GRANT FUNDING TO IMPLEMENT POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL SYSTEMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing commuter railroads with additional grant funding to implement positive train control systems by

the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1319. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. COONS)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COMPREHENSIVE IMPROVEMENTS TO MEDICARE HOSPITAL WAGE-RELATED PAYMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to adjusting Medicare payments for hospitals, which may include adjustments to reflect area differences in wage levels, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1320. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 4207. LIMITATION.

Any plan for the reorganization of the Department State and the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this section as "USAID")—

(1) shall preserve the independence of USAID and its authority to directly oversee its mission to end extreme poverty and promote resilient, democratic societies, while advancing the security and prosperity of the United States; and

(2) may not involve the subordination of USAID to the Department of State or to any other Federal agency.

SA 1321. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING CHILDREN LIVING IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED HOUSING FROM EXPOSURE TO LEAD-BASED PAINT HAZARDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting children living in Federally assisted housing from exposure to lead-based paint hazards by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1322. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for grants for community-oriented policing by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1323. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR THE AFG AND SAFER GRANT PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing assistance to firefighters, which may including funding the Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) program and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Firefighters (SAFER) grant program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1324. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AVERTING THE MEDICAID FUNDING CLIFF IN PUERTO RICO AND ENSURING STABLE MEDICAID FUNDING FOR PUERTO RICO'S MEDICAID PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to averting the impending Medicaid funding cliff in Puerto Rico and ensuring stable Medicaid funding for Puerto Rico's Medicaid program for the foreseeable future by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1325. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR THE URBAN AREAS SECURITY INITIATIVE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments

between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing assistance for urban areas in preventing and responding to terrorist attacks, which may including funding the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1326. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING AN EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR FORGIVEN STUDENT LOANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to excluding forgiven student loans from income for tax purposes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1327. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING RELATING TO ASSISTANCE FOR TRADE PROMOTION FOR CUBA UNTIL THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION STANDARDS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide funding relating to assistance for trade promotion for Cuba until the Government of Cuba is in compliance with International Labour Organization standards.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1328. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION FUNDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN HAVANA, CUBA UNTIL THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA CEASES PROVIDING SANCTUARY TO TERRORISTS AND AMERICAN FUGITIVES.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide funding relating to establishing a United States Embassy in Havana, Cuba until the Government of Cuba ceases providing sanctuary to terrorists and American fugitives.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1329. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING WASTEFUL OIL SUBSIDIES AND REFUNDING THE SAVINGS TO MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ending wasteful oil subsidies and refunding the savings to middle class families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1330. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr.

REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. FRANKEN)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ELIMINATING OR REDUCING FEDERAL FUNDING TO STATES UNDER THE MEDICAID EXPANSION.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate or reduce funding to States available under law in effect on the date of the adoption of this section to provide comprehensive, affordable health care to low-income Americans by eliminating or reducing the availability of Federal financial assistance to States available under section 1905(y)(1) or 1905(z)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(y)(1), 1396d(z)(2)) or other means, unless the Director of the Congressional Budget Office certifies that the legislation would not—

(1) increase the number of uninsured Americans;

(2) decrease Medicaid enrollment in States that have opted to expand eligibility for medical assistance under that program for low-income, non-elderly individuals under the eligibility option established by the Affordable Care Act under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII));

(3) reduce the likelihood that any State that, as of the date of the adoption of this section, has not opted to expand Medicaid under the eligibility option established by the Affordable Care Act under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)) would opt to use that eligibility option to expand eligibility for medical assistance under that program for low-income, non-elderly individuals; or

(4) increase the State share of Medicaid spending under that eligibility option.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1331. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD RAISE TAXES ON HOMEOWNERS BY REPEALING OR LIMITING THE REAL ESTATE PROPERTY TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would raise taxes on homeowners by repealing or limiting the real estate property tax deduction.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1332. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD GIVE A TAX CUT TO COMPANIES THAT OFFSHORE AMERICAN JOBS OR USE OFFSHORE TAX LOOPHOLES.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cut taxes on any company that has offshored jobs or that has used offshore tax loopholes to avoid paying its fair share.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1333. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3015 and insert the following:

SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECURING EARNED PENSION BENEFITS WITH NO CUTS AND ENSURING SOLVENCY OF THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to securing earned pension benefits with no cuts and ensuring solvency of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1334. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING REDUCTION FOR THE GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would result in funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative being reduced below the amount authorized under section 118(c)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(c)(7)).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1335. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCTIONS IN HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that, according to the Con-

gressional Budget Office, would reduce the number of Americans with health insurance coverage, raise out-of-pocket costs, or reduce health insurance benefits.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1336. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CUTS TO MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate or decrease the amount, duration, or scope of benefits provided under Medicaid, which may include making Medicaid a block grant or establishing per capita caps.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1337. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CUTS TO SENIORS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1338. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr.

ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING TAXES FOR MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce taxes for the top 1 percent of income earners.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1339. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING TAXES ON SENIOR CITIZENS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase taxes on senior citizens.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1340. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD RESULT IN A NET REDUCTION IN DIRECT SPENDING FOR FARM BILL PROGRAMS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would result in a net reduction in direct spending over the period of

fiscal years 2019 through 2028 for Farm Bill programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate according to data of the most recent spring Budget and Economic Outlook Update published by the Congressional Budget Office.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1341. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING TAXES ON FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase taxes on families with children.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1342. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION PROVIDING FUNDING FOR THE ELECTION INTEGRITY COMMISSION.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that provides funding for the Election Integrity Commission unless the bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report also contains a provision requiring the Election Integrity Commission to investigate Russian interference in the 2016 election, including hacking or other cyber intrusion into State election systems.

(2) **POINT OF ORDER SUSTAINED.**—If a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision described in paragraph (1), and the

point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 1343. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE, QUALITY HEALTH INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding access to affordable, quality health insurance, including through policies such as increasing access under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the Medicare program, or the Medicaid program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1344. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H.

Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR A NET REDUCTION OF TAXES PAID BY PERSONS WITH INCOME OF MORE THAN \$1,000,000.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would allow for a net reduction of taxes paid by persons with income of more than \$1,000,000.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1345. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR A NET REDUCTION OF TAXES PAID BY PERSONS WITH INCOME OF MORE THAN \$1,000,000 AND WOULD ALLOW FOR AN INCREASE OF TAXES PAID BY INDIVIDUALS IN THE LOWEST TAX BRACKET.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would allow for a net reduction of taxes paid by persons with income of more than \$1,000,000 and would allow for an increase of taxes paid by individuals in the lowest tax bracket.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1346. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$79,950,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$84,350,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$88,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$93,150,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$97,550,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$101,950,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$106,350,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$110,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$115,150,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$119,550,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$79,950,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$84,350,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$88,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$93,150,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$97,550,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$101,950,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$106,350,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$110,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$115,150,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$119,550,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$79,950,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$84,350,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$88,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$93,150,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$97,550,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$101,950,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$106,350,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$110,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$115,150,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$119,550,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$79,950,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$84,350,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$88,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$93,150,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$97,550,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$101,950,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$106,350,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$110,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$115,150,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$119,550,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by \$39,975,000,000.

On page 19, line 12, increase the amount by \$39,975,000,000.

On page 19, line 15, increase the amount by \$42,175,000,000.

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by \$42,175,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by \$44,375,000,000.

On page 19, line 20, increase the amount by \$44,375,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by \$46,575,000,000.

On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by \$46,575,000,000.

On page 20, line 2, increase the amount by \$48,775,000,000.

On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by \$48,775,000,000.

On page 20, line 6, increase the amount by \$50,975,000,000.

On page 20, line 7, increase the amount by \$50,975,000,000.

On page 20, line 10, increase the amount by \$53,175,000,000.

On page 20, line 11, increase the amount by \$53,175,000,000.

On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by \$55,375,000,000.

On page 20, line 15, increase the amount by \$55,375,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by \$57,575,000,000.

On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by \$57,575,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$59,775,000,000.

On page 20, line 23, increase the amount by \$59,775,000,000.

On page 22, line 20, increase the amount by \$39,975,000,000.

On page 22, line 21, increase the amount by \$39,975,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by \$42,175,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by \$42,175,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, increase the amount by \$44,375,000,000.

On page 23, line 4, increase the amount by \$44,375,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, increase the amount by \$46,575,000,000.

On page 23, line 8, increase the amount by \$46,575,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, increase the amount by \$48,775,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, increase the amount by \$48,775,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by \$50,975,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by \$50,975,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by \$53,175,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by \$53,175,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by \$55,375,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by \$55,375,000,000.

On page 24, line 2, increase the amount by \$57,575,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by \$57,575,000,000.

On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by \$59,775,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by \$59,775,000,000.

SA 1347. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget

for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ASSISTING ROHINGYA VICTIMS OF THE BURMESE MILITARY'S ETHNIC CLEANSING CAMPAIGN AND SUPPORTING PEACE AND RECONCILIATION PROGRAMS IN RAKHINE STATE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to assisting victims of the Burmese military's ethnic cleansing campaign targeting Rohingya in Rakhine State, including refugees in Bangladesh, and supporting peace and reconciliation programs in Rakhine State, including support for humanitarian organizations, United Nations agencies, and nongovernmental organizations supporting the implementation of the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State or otherwise seeking to provide humanitarian assistance to victims of the Burmese military, including gender based violence, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1348. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCED AGENCY RESOURCES OR AUTHORITY FOR CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that reduces agency resources or authority for consumer financial protection.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1349. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST AN UNLEVEL PLAYING FIELD IN ENERGY.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide greater net benefits for fossil fuels than for renewable energy sources.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1350. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CREATING JOBS BY INVESTING IN THE NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE AND INCREASING REVENUE THROUGH CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to infrastructure, which may include investing \$1,000,000,000,000 in infrastructure while substantially increasing revenues to the Treasury by closing corporate tax loopholes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1351. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STREAMLINING AND IMPROVING INCOME-DRIVEN REPAYMENT PROGRAMS FOR FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to streamlining and improving income-driven repayment programs for Federal student loans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1352. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PAY FOR TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY BY REDUCING FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THE MEDICAID PROGRAM.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would pay for tax breaks for the wealthy by reducing Federal funding for the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1353. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RELATING TO ALLOWING THE COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF VISITOR LOG DATA FOR THE WHITE HOUSE AND OTHER LOCATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making Federal Government records available to the public, which may include allowing for the collection and publication of visitor log data for the White House and other locations at which the President regularly conducts official business, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1354. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADVANCING WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE INTO THE 21ST CENTURY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving women's health care services, which may include measures such as—

(1) expanding awareness regarding, and expanding access without cost-sharing to, the full range of preventive services for all women, such as contraception, breast cancer screenings, mammograms, domestic violence screenings and counseling, lactation support and counseling, screening for gestational diabetes, testing for and counseling on sexually transmitted infections, and well-women visits, as provided for under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148);

(2) supporting access to women's primary care by investing in nurse practitioners and other health care providers;

(3) improving maternal safety and quality of care;

(4) requiring coverage without cost-sharing of any over-the-counter oral contraception approved or regulated by the Food and Drug Administration, and ensuring that any retailer that stocks oral contraception for routine, daily use approved or regulated by the Food and Drug Administration for use without a prescription may not interfere with an individual's access to or purchase of such contraception; or

(5) providing compassionate assistance through medically-accurate information and services, including emergency contraception and forensic medical examinations for survivors of rape, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1355. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO POVERTY REDUCTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting policies seeking to improve the economic security of low-income individuals and families, including by lifting families out of poverty, increasing educational attainment, and addressing the needs of vulnerable children and parents concurrently, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1356. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING LIMITATIONS ON FARM SERVICE AGENCY DIRECT AND GUARANTEED OWNERSHIP AND OPERATING LOANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing limitations on Farm Service Agency direct and guaranteed ownership and operating loans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1357. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$91,284,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$100,317,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$110,504,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$130,943,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$135,734,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$55,044,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$82,034,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$98,068,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$117,125,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$127,516,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$49,078,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$18,412,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,389,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$2,172,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$91,284,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$55,044,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$100,317,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$82,034,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$110,504,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, increase the amount by \$98,068,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$130,943,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$117,125,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$135,734,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$127,516,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, increase the amount by \$49,078,000,000.

On page 8, line 21, increase the amount by \$18,412,000,000.

On page 8, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,389,000,000.

On page 9, line 4, increase the amount by \$2,172,000,000.

SA 1358. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EXPANSION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

It is the sense of the Senate that tax reform legislation that expands the Child Tax Credit should also increase the refundable portion of the Child Tax Credit.

SA 1359. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing per-child Federal tax relief, which may include amending the refundable portion of the Child Tax Credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1360. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 62, lines 19 and 20, strike “the cost of child” and all that follows through “and useful” and insert “the cost of raising children and taking care of dependents more affordable”.

SA 1361. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDITIONAL CHILD TAX CREDIT IN PUERTO RICO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to allowing otherwise eligible families in Puerto Rico with one child or two children to claim the additional child tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1362. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REDUCTION OF PAYROLL TAXES.

In the Senate, no point of order shall lie under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that reduces any taxes assessed pursuant to the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

SA 1363. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPOSING NEW SANCTIONS-IN-WAITING TO REQUIRE IRAN TO ALLOW THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY TO IMMEDIATELY INSPECT IRANIAN MILITARY SITES SUSPECTED OF HAVING NUCLEAR WEAPONS-RELATED ACTIVITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to imposing new sanctions-in-waiting to require Iran to allow the International Atomic Energy Agency to immediately inspect Iranian military sites suspected of having nuclear weapons-related activities, which may include amending the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1364. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPOSING NEW SANCTIONS-IN-WAITING TO DETER IRAN FROM ACQUIRING URANIUM ENRICHMENT CAPABILITIES THAT GIVE IT NUCLEAR BREAKOUT CAPABILITY OF LESS THAN ONE YEAR.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to imposing new sanctions-in-waiting to deter Iran from acquiring uranium enrichment capabilities that give it nuclear breakout capability of less than one year, which may include amending the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1365. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPOSING NEW SANCTIONS-IN-WAITING TO DETER IRAN FROM TESTING, MANUFACTURING, OR DEPLOYING AN INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE OR ANY OTHER NEW BALLISTIC OR CRUISE MISSILE CAPABILITIES THAT CAN THREATEN THE UNITED STATES OR ISRAEL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to imposing new sanctions-in-waiting to deter Iran from testing, manufacturing, or deploying an intercontinental ballistic missile or any other new ballistic or cruise missile capabilities that can threaten the United States or Israel, which may include amending the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1366. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPOSING NEW SANCTIONS TO DETER ANY NUCLEAR WEAPONS-RELATED COOPERATION BETWEEN IRAN AND NORTH KOREA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to imposing new sanctions to deter any nuclear weapons-related cooperation between Iran and North Korea, which may include amending the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1367. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring accountability for Federal agencies, which may include requiring Federal agencies to submit reports on outstanding Government Accountability Office and Inspector General recommendations in the annual budget justification submitted to Congress, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1368. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 56, line 23, insert “or relating to supporting additional efforts to increase access to health care for veterans in rural areas through telehealth and other programs that reduce the need for such veterans to travel long distances to a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs” after “members”.

SA 1369. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR ANY CORPORATION THAT TURNS A PROFIT AND HAS MORE THAN \$1,000,000,000 OF ANNUAL REVENUE TO PAY NO FEDERAL INCOME TAX.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would allow for any corporation that turns a profit and has more than \$1,000,000,000 of annual revenue to pay no Federal income tax.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1370. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A PERMANENT FUNDING STREAM FOR SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a permanent funding stream for the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment block grant program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1371. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVIDING A TAX CUT TO THE TOP 1 PERCENT OR CREATING A LOOP-HOLE FOR WEALTHY TAX DODGERS THROUGH LOWERING THE PASS-THROUGH TAX RATE.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report relating to a reconciliation bill that would—

(1) provide a tax cut on business income to individuals in the top 1 percent of income, or

(2) increase the incentive for workers to receive compensation from their current employer through a pass-through business rather than in the form of higher-taxed wages.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1372. Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE MEDICARE OR LIMIT FEDERAL FUNDING FOR MEDICAID.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) increase the eligibility age under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(2) privatize the Medicare program or turn the program into a voucher system; or

(3) decrease or cap Federal funding of State Medicaid programs under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), or alter such funding of such programs in such a manner that would decrease the amount of Federal funding available to States to elect to provide medical assistance to low-income, non-elderly individuals under the eligibility option established by the Affordable Care Act in section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)).

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of

the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1373. Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. UDALL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE AFFORDABLE AND HIGH-QUALITY CHILD CARE AND EARLY LEARNING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to improve child care and early learning programs, which may include such measures as—

(1) providing Federal assistance to limit the percent of income families pay toward the cost of child care;

(2) providing access to high-quality preschool for all low- and moderate-income children;

(3) investing in our Nation's child care and early learning workforce;

(4) increasing services and supports for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities to promote access to inclusive, high-quality child care settings; or

(5) providing adequate funding to ensure that Head Start programs can meet the extended duration requirements set forth in the Head Start performance standards described in section 641A(a) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9836a(a)) for 2016,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1374. Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BENNET, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PARITY AND PERMANENCY FOR INCREASED UTILIZATION OF ENERGY TAX POLICIES SUPPORTING THE TREATMENT OF ENERGY-RELATED PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIPS THAT PROMOTE CLEAN ENERGY IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing parity and permanency for energy finance mechanisms supporting the treatment of energy-related publicly traded partnerships that promote clean energy, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1375. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT INCLUDES DEFICIT-FINANCED TAX CUTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that includes tax cuts and would cause or increase a deficit or reduce a surplus.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1376. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE VALUE OF THE EARNED INCOME CREDIT AND THE CHILD TAX CREDIT FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the value of the earned income credit for workers that do not claim children on their tax returns, increasing the value of the child tax credit for the parents of young children, and indexing the child tax credit for inflation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1377. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 10, insert “by fully preserving the current pre-tax retirement savings incentives” after “retirement”.

SA 1378. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TAX BENEFITS TO PATRIOT EMPLOYERS THAT INVEST IN AMERICAN JOBS AND PROVIDE FAIR PAY AND BENEFITS TO WORKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to income taxes paid by businesses, which may include measures providing tax breaks for companies that have not moved overseas to avoid paying their fair share of taxes, have maintained or expanded their United States workforce, or have provided fair wages and quality health insurance, prepared workers for retirement, hired veterans and workers with disabilities, and provided paid family medical leave, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1379. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H.

Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY CONVENING AN ONGOING GOVERNMENT-WIDE EFFORT TO PROVIDE FORWARD-LOOKING CLIMATE INFORMATION TO STANDARDS ORGANIZATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in consultation with the United States Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) and Mitigation Framework Leadership Group (MitFLG), convening an ongoing government-wide effort to provide forward-looking climate information to standards organizations for their consideration in the development of design standards, building codes, and voluntary certifications by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1380. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING THE SUPPORT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, PRESERVATION, AND REHABILITATION AND FEDERAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that reduce the support of the Federal Government for affordable housing construction, preservation, and rehabilitation and Federal housing assistance programs.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1381. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr.

ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN FEDERAL RESILIENCE ACTIVITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to investing in Federal resilience activities, which may include the establishment of an investment strategy by the Mitigation Framework Leadership Group or recommendations submitted to Congress by such Group on how the Federal Government should prioritize future resilience investments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1382. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX PROPOSALS THAT DECREASE INCOME AND WEALTH INEQUALITY, RATHER THAN INCREASE INCOME AND WEALTH INEQUALITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to tax proposals that decrease income and wealth inequality, rather than increase income and wealth inequality, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1383. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STUDYING THE FAILURES OF THE KANSAS STATE GOVERNMENT'S RECENT TAX REFORM EFFORTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to studying the failures of the Kansas State government's recent tax reform efforts, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1384. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX PROPOSALS THAT INCENTIVIZE LONG-TERM ECONOMIC GROWTH OVER SHORT-TERM PROFIT-SEEKING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to tax proposals that incentivize long-term economic growth over short-term profit-seeking, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1385. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CUT TAXES FOR THE RICH WITHOUT GUARANTEEING AFFORDABLE COVERAGE, BENEFITS, AND ACCESS UNDER THE MEDICAID PROGRAM FOR KIDS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cut taxes for the rich without guaranteeing affordable coverage, benefits, and access for children under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) or the program under title XXI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1386. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OF THE SITTING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to eliminating the financial conflicts of interest of sitting Presidents and Vice Presidents by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1387. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING CREDIT REPORTING AGENCIES FROM SHARING THE PERSONAL AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION OF AN INDIVIDUAL WITHOUT THE EXPLICIT CONSENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting credit reporting agencies from sharing the personal and financial information of an individual without the explicit consent of the individual by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1388. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING TAX FILING AND TAXPAYER ACCESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that taxpayers have the option to access free, pre-filled tax returns and are able to securely access their own tax data by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1389. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WAGE SUBSIDIES AND WELFARE REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing State flexibility, innovation, and efficiency in operating anti-poverty programs and providing for a wage subsidy targeted at low-income individuals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1390. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST MEDICARE CUTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that cuts or privatizes Medicare by reducing benefits, increasing beneficiary costs, or turning the program into a private voucher.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1391. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE, WEATHERIZATION, OR ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to home energy assistance, weatherization, or energy efficiency programs such as the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.), or the State energy conservation programs under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1392. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for

fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SIMPLIFYING THE TAX CODE AND LEVELING THE PLAYING FIELD BY ELIMINATING ALL ENERGY TAX CREDITS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to simplifying the tax code and leveling the playing field by eliminating all energy tax credits by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1393. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX RELIEF FOR HARD-WORKING MIDDLE-CLASS AMERICANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include reducing federal deductions, such as the state and local tax deduction which disproportionately favors high-income individuals, to ensure relief for middle-income taxpayers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1394. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO OFFSETS FROM REVENUE LOSSES THAT MAY RESULT FROM TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to offsets for revenue losses that may result from tax reform, which may include a temporary surtax paid by Americans in the highest Federal income tax bracket, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1395. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC BY PROVIDING ACCESS TO PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT FUNDING FOR STRONG INTERDICTION EFFORTS, WITH A PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON RURAL COMMUNITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing the opioid epidemic by providing access to prevention programs and substance use disorder treatment and funding for strong interdiction efforts, with a particular emphasis on rural communities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1396. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING THE NATION'S INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening the Nation's inland waterways system, which may

include improving or replacing aging locks and dams, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1397. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX-RELATED LEGISLATION THAT DOES NOT ELIMINATE THE CARRIED INTEREST LOOPHOLE AND USE THE INCREASE IN REVENUE TO FUND CLEAN WATER AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and that does not eliminate the carried interest loophole and use the increase in revenue to fund the clean water state revolving fund, the safe drinking water state revolving fund, and the Department of Agriculture's rural development programs.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1398. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING INVESTMENTS IN CERTAIN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening investments in infrastructure projects that have significant impacts on the United States or a region or metropolitan area in the United States, including the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant program and the Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) grant program by the amounts provided in such

legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of William L. Wehrum, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, dated October 18, 2017.

I, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Michael Dourson, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency, dated October 18, 2017.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-430 to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary, Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and David G. Zatezalo, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, all of the Department of Labor, Janet Dhillon, of Pennsylvania, and Daniel M. Gade, of North Dakota, both to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Carlos G. Muniz, of Florida, to be General Counsel, Department of Education, Peter B. Robb, of Vermont, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and Gerald W. Fauth, of Virginia, Kyle Fortson, of the District of Columbia, and Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, each to be a Member of the National Mediation Board.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of

the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 2017, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Jeff Tien Han Pon, of Virginia, to be Director, and Michael Rigas, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director, both of the Office of Personnel Management, and Emily Webster Murphy, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SH-216 to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Federal Oversight and Emergency Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing entitled "Broken Beakers: Federal Support for Research."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Kassamira Carter-Howard, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Melanie Thornton, a congressional fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 115th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michelle Roza of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 293, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 293) commemorating the 150th anniversary of Morgan State University.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 293) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

FREDERICK DOUGLASS BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2989, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2989) to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise tonight to join my House colleagues, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and Congressman ANDY HARRIS, to celebrate the passage of H.R. 2989, a bill to create a commission to honor Frederick Douglass in 2018, in the bicentennial of his birth.

Frederick Douglass was enslaved at birth on the Eastern Shore of Maryland in 1818; yet he learned to read and write. He escaped from Maryland and moved to New York. In 1845, he published his first autobiography, "The Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: an American Slave."

He later escaped to Great Britain to avoid being returned to slavery. British Quakers paid for his freedom, which enabled him to return to United States, settling in Baltimore, MD, in 1847; yet he continued to be a strong abolitionist who campaigned against slavery and in favor of the right to vote throughout the east and midwest. In 1850, he oversaw the Underground Railroad in Rochester, NY.

Douglass made four trips back to the place of his birth in Talbot County, MD. He reconciled with Captain Thomas Auld, who had enslaved him in the past. He made a pilgrimage to Tappers Corner in search of his grandmother's cabin and his birthplace. Moreover, he

invested in the African-American community in Maryland through housing developments in his old neighborhood in Fells Point, now named Douglass Place, and at Highland Beach, a summer resort community outside of Annapolis.

Among his many accomplishments, he served as an adviser to President Lincoln. Moreover, he received several appointments in the District of Columbia: legislative council, U.S. Marshal, and recorder of deeds. He was subsequently appointed Ambassador to Haiti from 1889 to 1891.

Two hundred years after Douglass's birth provides an opportunity to reflect upon his legacy. He stated, "We have to do with the past only as we can make it useful to the present and the future." I look forward to working with my colleagues to commemorate his bicentennial by retracing his steps and promoting his guiding principles of freedom and justice for all.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2989) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2017

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 19; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H. Con. Res. 71 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:31 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 19, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 19, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of David J. Ryder, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Mint, Department of the Treasury, and Hester Maria Peirce, of Ohio, and Robert J. Jackson, Jr., of New York, both to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SD-538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs

and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, focusing on fisheries science.

SR-253

OCTOBER 25

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing naval forces and the Navy's current and planned capabilities to meet those threats.

SVC-217

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the commercial satellite industry.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine an original bill entitled, "the Wildfire Prevention and Mitigation Act of 2017".

SD-406

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the economic outlook.

TBA

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Jeff Tien Han Pon, of Virginia, to be Director, and Michael Rigas, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director, both of the Office of Personnel Management, and Emily Webster Murphy, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 1870, to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, S. 1953, to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and S. 1942, to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians.

SD-628

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine working and aging with disabilities from school to retirement.

SD-562

OCTOBER 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine advanced cyber technologies that could be used to help protect electric grids and other energy infrastructure from cyberattacks.

SD-366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine improving oversight of the regulatory process, focusing on lessons from state legislatures.

SD-342

NOVEMBER 1

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine building tribal economies, focusing on modernizing tax policies that work for Indian country.

SD-628

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 19, 2017

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISSA).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 19, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DARRELL E. ISSA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Gene Hemrick, St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Father, creator of all that is good, You have called our U.S. Congress to work in Your world and, by its cooperation, to develop and improve the condition of humankind.

Grant that it may always work together as a loving, devoted family, bringing out the best in our Nation.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 562, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is hereby approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 17, 2017, at 12:04 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 705.
That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 26.
Appointment:
Congressional Award Board.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 17, 2017, at 3:24 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to a Conference with the House of Representatives H.R. 2810.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REMOVAL OF CONFEREES AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection and pursuant to clause 11 of rule I, the Chair removes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) as a conferee on H.R. 2810 and appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) to fill the vacancy.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

MODIFICATION OF APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES FROM COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources on H.R. 2810 is modified by striking the first reference to section 2863.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 562, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, October 23, 2017, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 23, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2842. A letter from the Commanding Officer, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a response to the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, regarding a study on Military Helicopter Noise, pursuant to Public Law 114-328, Sec. 1073(d)(1); (130 Stat. 2415); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2843. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice to Congress of the anticipated use of Selected Reserve units that will be ordered to active duty, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304b(d); Public Law 112-81, Sec. 516(a)(1); (125 Stat. 1396); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2844. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2016-0207; FRL-9966-84] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2845. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 SO₂ and 2012 PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards; North Dakota [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0558; FRL-9969-00-Region 8] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2846. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Oklahoma: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revision [EPA-R06-UST-2017-0504; FRL-9968-29-Region 6] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2847. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze State and Federal Implementation Plans [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0092; FRL-9968-97-Region 9] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2848. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Interim Final Determination to Defer Sanctions; California; Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0204; FRL-9969-03-Region 9] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2849. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Nebraska Air Quality Implementation Plans; Adoption of a New Chapter under the Nebraska Administrative Code [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0386; FRL-9968-76-Region 7] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2850. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Nebraska's Air Quality Implementation Plan, Operating Permits Program, and 112(1) program; Revision to Nebraska Administrative Code [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0485; FRL-9968-78-Region 7] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2851. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0515; FRL-9968-80-Region 7] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2852. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0356; FRL-9968-82-Region 7] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2853. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0524; FRL-9968-35-Region 9] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2854. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; General Burning Rule Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2015-0617; FRL-9969-04-Region 8] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2855. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Revisions to Air Pollution Control Rules [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0019; FRL-9969-05-Region 8] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2856. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Prevention of Significant Deterioration Updates [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0360; FRL-9968-90-Region 4] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2857. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; South Carolina; Interstate Transport (Prongs 1 and 2) for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0045; FRL-9968-73-Region 4] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2858. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Interstate Transport [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0321; FRL-9968-72-Region 4] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2859. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Regional Haze Progress Report [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0634; FRL-9968-71-Region 4] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2860. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Florida; Permitting Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0105; FRL-9968-92-Region 4] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2861. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0415; FRL-9968-93-Region 4] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2862. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia declared in Executive

Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—71); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2863. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-143, "Voter Rolls Protection Temporary Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2864. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-142, "Fort Dupont Ice Arena Programming Temporary Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2865. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-141, "Unity Health Care, Inc. Certificate of Need Maximum Fee Establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2866. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Bureau for Economic Growth, Environment, and Education, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, USAID, transmitting four (4) notifications of a designation of acting officer, or change in previously submitted reported information, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2867. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting seven (7) notifications of action on nomination, nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2868. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two (2) notifications of a designation of acting officer, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2869. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of a vacancy and a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2870. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Competitive Sourcing Official, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's 2016 Inventory of Inherently Governmental Activities and of Commercial Activities with accompanying link, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2871. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Report on the Operation and Status of the Government Securities Investment Fund from March 16, 2017 to September 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 8438(h)(1); Public Law 99-335, Sec. 101(a) (as amended by Public Law 104-316, Sec. 103(i)); (110 Stat. 3829); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1488. A bill to retitle Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore as Indiana Dunes National Park, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1731. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to provide funds to States and Indian tribes for the purpose of promoting economic revitalization, diversification, and development in economically distressed communities through the reclamation and restoration of land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining carried out before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-351, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2521. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to include South Carolina as a part of the Virginia/Carolina peanut producing region for purposes of appointment to the Peanut Standards Board (Rept. 115-352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2941. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System land within Kisatchie National Forest in the State of Louisiana (Rept. 115-353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2410. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment (Rept. 115-354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3053. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-355, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3101. A bill to enhance cybersecurity information sharing and coordination at ports in the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-356, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2921. A bill to establish a vegetation management pilot program on National Forest System land to better protect utility infrastructure from passing wildfire, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-357, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3921. A bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-358, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3922. A bill to extend funding for certain public health programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment

(Rept. 115-359, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1731 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2921 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Natural Resources and Armed Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3053 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3101 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3922 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3921. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 23, 2017.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 4078. A bill to enhance transparency and accountability for online political advertisements by requiring those who purchase and publish such ads to disclose information about the advertisements to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4078. A bill to establish various programs to ease the burden on undereducated and financially deficient workers seeking to further their education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 4079. A bill to repeal Public Law 114-145 to ensure that the Drug Enforcement Administration has the authority to carry out needed enforcement actions for drug diversion control investigations and operations to combat the opioid epidemic; to the Com-

mittee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 4080. A bill to repeal Public Law 114-145; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 4081. A bill to ensure the privacy and security of sensitive personal information, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to provide notice of security breaches involving sensitive personal information, and to enhance law enforcement assistance and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 4082. A bill to repeal the rules issued by the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health and Human Services entitled "Religious Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" and "Moral Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 4083. A bill to establish and strengthen projects that defray the cost of related instruction associated with pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 4084. A bill to repeal the amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4085. A bill to require the Joint Committee on Taxation to provide a distributional analysis, and analysis of effects on after-tax wage income, of major tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 4086. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 4087. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct a study relating to ultrafine particles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 4088. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers for certain employee education and training expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 4089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to issue identity protection personal identification numbers with respect to identity theft-related tax fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. PETERSON):

H. Res. 574. A resolution congratulating the Minnesota Lynx women's basketball team on winning the 2017 Women's National Basketball Association championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BERA, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H. Res. 575. A resolution recognizing the religious and historical significance of the festival of Diwali; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

137. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 99, urging the President and Congress of the United States to recognize the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh, also known as Artsakh, to establish economic and cultural ties with the nation, and to support the peace and stability in South Caucasus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

138. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Resolution No. 59, to encourage the President and the Congress of the United States and the United States Office of Management and Budget to support plans to upgrade the Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and encourage the United States Army Corps of Engineers to take expeditious action in preparing an Economic Reevaluation Report; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 4078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 4080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 4082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes," and under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress has the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for the carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 4086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act is constitutionally authorized under and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, § 1

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 4089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Congress shall have Power* * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 296: Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 299: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 535: Mr. TONKO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 548: Mr. LANCE and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 619: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 632: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 721: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 785: Mr. STEWART, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 797: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 798: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 807: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 811: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 877: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 881: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 997: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1133: Mr. DUNN and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 1144: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1155: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1164: Mr. BUDD and Mr. HURD.

H.R. 1267: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1276: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1403: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1478: Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1566: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1587: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1606: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1659: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1676: Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 1697: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HURD, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1698: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1699: Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCHSHON, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1811: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1818: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1896: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1897: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1955: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2092: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2101: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2267: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2273: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 2321: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2366: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2401: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2501: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 2531: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2545: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2550: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2589: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 2690: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2790: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2862: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3010: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 3018: Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 3032: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. WALZ, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3034: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3227: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 3282: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 3316: Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 3320: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3329: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BACON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3347: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 3394: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 3497: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3635: Mr. RUSH and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3641: Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 3671: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3714: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 3776: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 3828: Ms. NORTON and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3832: Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 3865: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3875: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3876: Ms. HANABUSA and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 3897: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, Mr. COOK, Mr. GALLAGHER,

Mr. BARR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 3898: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. HECK, and Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 3923: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 4001: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 4012: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4022: Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4029: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 4052: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4057: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 4073: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 118: Mr. BUCK.

H. Res. 271: Mr. VALADAO.

H. Res. 282: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H. Res. 359: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. SOTO.

H. Res. 401: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. GAETZ.

SENATE—Thursday, October 19, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Savior, we thank You for the fellowship of Your Spirit and Your consolations of love. May our lawmakers remember that You are their rock and refuge. Lord, speak peace to their hearts in these turbulent times, guiding them along the path of Your wisdom. Reward their efforts with a joyful harvest, as they strive to build up and not tear down. Raise them above discord and division, helping them to work together to keep America strong.

We are grateful for the favor You have given this Nation and for surrounding us with the shield of Your compassion, mercy, and love. Strong Deliverer, accept our grateful praise.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate is taking the next critical step in passing the comprehensive, fiscally responsible budget before us. It is pretty obvious that this is a good budget, and that is true whether you are looking at it from a fiscal perspective or an economic one.

Take the fiscal side first. It reins in government spending. It protects Social Security. It complies fully with the previous spending caps, while also providing for an increase for defense resources if a bipartisan agreement can be reached. In short, it is a fiscally responsible budget that will help put the Federal Government on a path to balance.

On the economic side, this budget can help our country realize better and more sustained economic growth,

which is critical, given the last decade of missed opportunities for the middle class. One way this budget can help our economy is by providing legislative tools to advance tax reform.

As I have said many times before, tax reform represents the most important thing we can do today to get our economy reaching for its true potential. Tax reform is all about getting America going again and growing again. It aims to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more money in middle-class pockets, and it represents a once-in-a-generation opportunity to replace a failing tax bill that holds Americans back with one that works for them. Passing this budget is critical to getting tax reform done so we can strengthen our economy, after years of stagnation under the previous administration.

I know Members are eager to continue proposing amendments to this budget. We already adopted some good ideas yesterday. For instance, the Senate adopted an amendment offered by Senator HELLER to provide tax relief to American families with children so they can have more money to make ends meet.

We also adopted an amendment from Senator COLLINS to provide relief to small businesses, which have been responsible for the creation of about two-thirds of the net jobs in recent years. That is according to statistics from the Small Business Administration. Both of these amendments reinforce the goals of the tax reform framework developed by the President, his team, and the tax-writing committees in Congress.

Today we will consider more ideas from colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I want to thank, particularly, Chairman ENZI and the members of the Senate Budget Committee for their good work in getting us to this point. The budget they produced is important to our fiscal and our economic future. I look forward to passing it soon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2018

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H. Con. Res. 71, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
Pending:

Enzi amendment No. 1116, in the nature of a substitute.

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:45 a.m. will be equally divided between the managers or their designees.

The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1302 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1302 as provided for under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] proposes an amendment numbered 1302 to amendment No. 1116.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the reconciliation instructions relating to tax reform)

After section 2002, insert the following:

SEC. 2003. MODIFICATION TO RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS.

Section 2001(a) and 2002(a) are null and void.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, later this morning, the Senate will be voting on the amendment I am offering to strike what are known as reconciliation instructions from the budget proposal.

The reason I will be focused this morning on that is that it is absolutely key that we pass this amendment in order to get bipartisan tax reform. The fact is that reconciliation is an on-ramp to the most partisan process around, and the history of successful tax reform is in our working in a bipartisan way. For example, that is what the late President Reagan worked to do in 1986 with a whole host of Democrats, and they came up with a lot of very important, bold, progressive ideas. They chose to actually treat income from a wage in the same way as one would treat income from investments so as to send, in one fell swoop, a message that

working-class people would get a fair shake, that the tax law was not about the 1 percent back then but that it was about working-class people. The middle class drives 70 percent of the American economy. They were not talking about massive tax handouts to big corporations and the wealthy; they were talking about the fact that, in our country, economic success is built around a thriving middle class—a middle class that can buy homes and cars and educate kids and pay for essentials.

What troubles me so much about these reconciliation instructions that would allow for a \$1.5 trillion net tax cut is that it is just the opposite of the kind of approach that Ronald Reagan and the Democrats used in 1986. It is going to polarize us rather than bring us together.

I think that is particularly important right now, given the meeting that was held at the White House yesterday that I attended along with a number of Democratic colleagues on the Finance Committee, because at that meeting Democrats made it very clear to the President of the United States that we think that the Tax Code is broken, that it is a broken, dysfunctional mess. We described the letter we sent that lays out our principles that tax reform should focus not on the 1 percent but on the middle class and not savage Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, which are our essential retirement programs.

What was striking about the discussion was that the President said: I agree with you on all of those things. He said: Tax cuts should not go for people like me. I want help for the middle class, and I don't want to cut Medicare and Social Security. I made the point—I hope respectfully, Mr. President. I said: Unfortunately, there is a big gap between the administration's rhetoric on this and the reality of what is really on paper. That is why it is so important that we strike these reconciliation instructions and make it clear from the get-go that we are going to get tax reform right, that we are not just going to kind of utter these sort of sound bites and rhetorical plights and speeches, as the discussions go out from various administration officials, and we actually focus on what it is going to take to do bipartisan tax reform.

The President agreed with the principles that Democrats talked about yesterday. It is very different when you see it on paper, and I want to talk a little bit about what is actually on paper.

First, the Trump tax plan creates a massive new loophole, the Grand Canyon of all loopholes, by twisting and abusing what is known as tax passthroughs. It used to be that the tax passthrough was for a store or a restaurant or a garage. You see them all over Oregon. You see them all over America. Those are the people for

whom we ought to be working together to give a boost to. That is not what is on paper. What is on paper is very different, and it is very different than what the President said yesterday he wanted.

For example, on paper is a new loophole that would allow tax cheats to self-declare as passthroughs, rake in income, and pay a much lower rate. It is a tax change that is deeply slanted toward what I call the top of the top—not just the 1 percent but the top of the top. Eighty-eight percent of the benefits of this kind of passthrough rate cut would go to those at the very top, according to recent analyses, the top 1 percent and those even more affluent. It opens the door for tax cheats to dodge paying into Social Security and Medicare like every hard-working wage earner in America. This would leave a lot of those programs that are lifelines for working families a lot worse off than they are today and that, too, is something the President said he didn't want.

Next, apropos again of the most affluent the President said he didn't want to help, is the estate tax. Here, there is a proposal in the administration's plan to abolish the estate tax. Let's make sure everybody understands who is affected by that. The tax today touches estates worth more than \$11 million, \$5.5 million for a single individual—a tiny fraction of all the estates in the country. Eliminating the estate tax isn't a policy change that has anything to do with helping the middle class. It is entirely about helping the megawealthy—exactly the people the President told us yesterday he didn't want to help.

The Finance Committee Democratic staff put out a report last week that looked at some of the worst schemes and dodges that are used by the megawealthy to avoid paying estate tax. There is a cottage industry of crafty lawyers and accountants who have made careers out of gutting the estate tax by engineering billion-dollar tax shelters for the 1 percent. So the estate tax is already full of loopholes, but this administration isn't interested in closing them even after the Treasury Secretary, Mr. Mnuchin, admitted just the other day that it goes mostly to the people at the very top.

So there is a common thread in these proposals. There is a common thread in this debate that is driven by partisanship and reconciliation, which is why I want to strike those instructions. What is actually on paper—not what is said in the speeches or in sound bites and the like—is that the Republican plan doesn't close the most egregious loopholes. It enshrines them as permanent features in our tax law. That is contrary to what the President said he wanted to do, and it certainly isn't a tax recipe focused on the middle class.

One of the individuals who has been most out in front of the cameras sell-

ing the Trump tax plan to the public is the Treasury Secretary. A few weeks ago, the Secretary doubled down on the failed experiment that tax cuts pay for themselves. Forget the history that shows that isn't true. Secretary Mnuchin said the Trump tax cuts will not just pay for themselves, they will raise an additional trillion dollars in revenue on top of their own costs. The fact is, there is no magical growth fairy, no unicorns, no kind of growth fairies that are going to somehow spring to life if this tax cut plan becomes law, but Secretary Mnuchin, our Treasury Secretary, keeps going back to the unicorns, keeps going back to rainbow economics.

What is striking is, I asked the Republican economist—the economist chosen by our friend and distinguished chairman ORRIN HATCH—who came before the Finance Committee the other day about whether tax cuts pay for themselves, and the Republican economist chosen by the Republicans on the Finance Committee, those Republicans' economist acknowledged that tax cuts don't pay for themselves.

There have been some other whoppers about the Republican plan, at least what is again written down on paper. Secretary Mnuchin said it is very hard not to give tax cuts to the wealthy with tax cuts to the middle class. That is one stunner of a statement: It is very hard not to give tax cuts to the wealthy. In the same interview, he delivered what sounded like a real ultimatum; that if the Congress doesn't pass this plan so tilted to the megawealthy, oh, boy, it is going to be tough times on Wall Street. You have to appreciate the eye-popping honesty, but the ideas behind what the Treasury Secretary is talking about on tax reform pretty much leave your jaw on the floor. If that is where the administration has trained its focus, as far as tax reform is concerned, the middle class is in tough straits.

In my judgment, this is yet another reason the Senate should reject using reconciliation for taxes and support my amendment. The fact is, the Congress has never used reconciliation to write a comprehensive tax reform bill. There is a template for comprehensive tax reform that has been proven to work, and I have mentioned it already. It is the one initiated by President Reagan, a big group of Democrats, a culmination of years of bipartisan work. What we saw was real bipartisanship, which I define as not taking each other's bad ideas but taking each other's good ideas. The bill was considered under regular order, it was debated in the Finance Committee and on the Senate floor for months, and it was open to unlimited amendments and passed the Senate by a vote of 97 to 3. That is the kind of bipartisan process we would like to see.

Democrats have made it clear, and we made it clear again yesterday, that

we think the Tax Code is broken, that we have heard the President's comments about how he wants to help the middle class and not the wealthy, that he understands how strongly we feel about protecting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, but the fact is—and this is the heart of the challenge—there is a big gap right now between what the President says his priorities are and what is actually written down on paper. That is the challenge, and we are not going to be able to address that challenge, in my view, by signing up for more partisanship, for taking the most partisan route on tax reform.

What we ought to be doing is saying that we all agree the Tax Code is broken; we all understand the key is helping the middle class, not more hand-outs for the top of the top, the 1 percent; that we are sensitive to long-term costs because we don't want to pass those off to our children. Doing that is best going to be accomplished by saying that as we move now to the actual consideration of tax reform, we reject partisan approaches like reconciliation, and we come together. I know we can do it.

The fact is, what the President says when he speaks about this subject is in line with the principles in the Democrats' letter. What we have talked about doesn't even go as far as what President Reagan did in 1986. What is in the Democrats' letter tracks a bipartisan piece of legislation that several colleagues here have been part of, including one in the President's Cabinet now.

We can do bipartisan tax reform that is good for our country. We shouldn't make it a lot harder to accomplish that goal by including these partisan reconciliation instructions in the budget proposal. That is why I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to strip these reconciliation instructions when we vote on my amendment later in the morning.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to use leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, on healthcare, my two good friends Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY have constructed a good, fair, bipartisan agreement that gives us a way forward

on healthcare. It will offer stability in the markets, and it will help lower premiums.

We have seen President Trump's near-constant equivocation on the agreement. We shouldn't let it impede the progress of this very important bipartisan compromise. He is for the bill one day, against it the next. That is not uncommon; the President sometimes is for and against something in the same sentence. We can only hope he comes around again once he grasps what is in the bill.

The Alexander-Murray deal is not a bailout to the insurance companies at all; it is the opposite. We have taken pains to ensure that insurance companies do not reap any benefits from this program. That is what ALEXANDER and MURRAY have done. They have explicit provisions in the bill to ensure that the cost-sharing program does what it is intended to do: Lower premiums, deductibles, and out-of-pocket costs for Americans who can least afford it.

I was reading an article this morning where they interviewed a retired manufacturing worker in Pennsylvania who was upset by the President's decision. The man said:

It seems like he is trying to hurt the middle class. . . . He [President Trump] says he's going to make it better for everyone. How does a (premium) increase make it better?

That is the question the President should ask himself. Ending cost-sharing hurts people, not insurance companies. Restoring cost sharing will help people, not insurance companies. Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY have made sure of it. I have talked to them about their language. It is good language, well intended. Maybe we can make it better. If the President has a suggestion, we welcome it, but as it is, it is pretty strong.

Well-intentioned Members on both sides should continue to sign their names onto this bill. I believe it has significant support within my caucus, and if Leader MCCONNELL puts it on the floor of the Senate, I am pretty certain it would pass.

I urge my Republican colleagues to take a good, hard look at the bill and to cosponsor it. So many of my Republican friends have said: Why can't we be more bipartisan? This is a bipartisan agreement. It wasn't one party coming up with something and telling the other to be for it, as too often happens in this Chamber. It was done together by the chair of the HELP Committee and the ranking Democrat of the HELP Committee. It is truly bipartisan, and it is a good way for us to go forward and set a metaphor for future bipartisanship.

Mr. President, now on the budget, today the Senate will vote on more amendments to the GOP budget resolution, which increases deficits by \$1.5 trillion, slashes Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion, and sets up this awful,

partisan process—the same one our Republican friends used in healthcare.

The Democrats could have offered an unlimited number of amendments on the bill, but this bill is so bad that we didn't want to be all over the lot. We wanted to focus on a few issues where we know the American people are overwhelmingly with us, not with the language in the bill.

Here is some of what we are doing.

We are going to make our colleagues say that they want to vote to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. After 8 years of crowing about debts and deficits under a Democratic President, the Republican deficit hawks seem to have flown the coop. This budget is going to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Our amendment would say: No, it should be deficit neutral. We have heard that for the last 8 years. Whenever a spending program comes about, I know our side says that spending programs grow the economy; their side says that tax cuts grow the economy. But if there is going to be an actual deficit, we should vote for it. Put your convictions where your votes are.

We are also going to make our Republican colleagues vote on whether they want to raise taxes on the middle class. The President claims that his tax plan will cut taxes, but it actually will raise them on millions of hard-working families. Today our Republican colleagues will decide whether they want to support those tax increases or protect the middle class from paying more taxes.

We are going to make our Republican colleagues vote on their specific proposal to eliminate the State and local deduction. Nearly one-third of all taxpayers take the deduction—red States, blue States, everyone in between. As the chairman of the Finance Committee knows, 35 percent of Utahns take the State and local deduction. It goes right to the heart of the middle class and upper middle class, giving families tens of thousands of dollars in deductions so taxes are lower. The elimination of State and local deductibility is a sure sign that the Republican tax plan does not favor the middle class.

In fact, AP reported yesterday that, according to experts, the GOP tax plan may still allow corporations to claim State and local deductibility but not individuals. Did you hear that? Corporations can claim it, but individuals can't. Isn't that backward? It shouldn't be taken away from either one. What the GOP plan takes away from individuals and families, it makes sure remains for big corporations.

So today Democrats will ask our Republican friends to vote on our amendment, led by Senators CANTWELL and VAN HOLLEN, to protect State and local deductibility for middle-class families.

Senator CAPITO has an alternative amendment that is incredibly vague

and leaves the door open to eliminating State and local. It doesn't say it will, but it leaves it open. That is why a coalition of groups, including the National Governors Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and organizations representing firefighters, teachers, and sheriffs have just come out against Senator CAPITO's amendment.

Senator CANTWELL and VAN HOLLEN's amendment, by contrast, is crystal clear: no elimination of State and local. I hope my Republican friends won't vote to raise taxes on so many of their middle-class residents.

Mr. President, finally, every morning I hear my friends the majority leader and the chairman of the Finance Committee talk about the need for tax reform because the middle class is stuck in a rut and the economy isn't working the way it should for American families. I agree with that assessment. We need to do more to grow the economy, create jobs, raise wages, and put money in the pockets of average Americans, but when you hear the details of the plan they have to solve those problems, your head spins. Lower the tax rate on big corporations and the top 1 percent, repeal the estate tax, which goes only to estates of over \$5 million, and eliminate critical middle-class tax breaks like State and local deductibility. In what world does that deliver middle-class tax relief or solve the problems we are talking about?

It is the same game they played with healthcare: Complain about high premiums, deductibles, counties without enough insurers, and then each Republican bill exacerbates the problem.

The Republicans slide in their favorite solution—tax cuts for the rich—as the answer to every ill. If the economy is doing well, Republicans push tax cuts for the rich. If the economy is doing poorly, Republicans push for tax cuts for the rich. If our healthcare system needs to be improved, tax cuts for the rich. It is entirely divorced from the real problems in the economy and our society.

Our economy suffers from massive inequality, which is growing, with a concentration of wealth at the very apex of our country's elite. The rich are doing well in America. God bless them; I am glad they are. American corporations are recording record-high profits. Look at the stock market, which reflects that. God bless them too. We hope they do well. But looking at the GOP tax plan, the American people have to wonder, is now the time to tilt the scales even further in favor of big corporations and the very rich? I believe the American people will reject that approach soundly and roundly, and after the amendment votes today, the American people will have a much clearer picture of what the Republican budget and tax plan is about.

There is still a chance to turn back from this budget and the one-party leg-

islating that has stymied this Congress. I urge my colleagues on the Republican side to reject this budget. Come work with Democrats, and we can produce real, successful, bipartisan tax reform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I know the Presiding Officer and all of our colleagues and those watching today know that we have been focused on the budget resolution. It is a very important document for the country, for the Senate, and for the Congress. There are a lot of big issues that we are all focused on, but there is one I wish to talk about this morning that relates to the budget document. Actually, to be perfectly frank, it relates to a number of the speeches made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They have been coming down to the floor and talking about issues related to energy, which is really important for America, the environment, which is also very important to America, and—a little bit to my surprise, from all of these experts coming to the floor—Alaska, which is my State.

I am going to say a little bit more about what some of my colleagues have been talking about—my State. There seems to be a few experts on Alaska from States like Massachusetts and Oregon. I just want to put things in perspective from a Senator who is actually from the State and not these other Senators who, to be honest, don't know much about what they are talking about.

The one thing you are seeing is that it is for sure that you know there is kind of an issue in the debate on the floor when you see talking points that are just stale—talking points that, if you took a speech from 30 or 40 years ago, are the same talking points. They are stale talking points from the other side of the aisle that have been used for decades, that haven't been updated or that don't reflect what has really been happening in the country in terms of technological advances, environmental standards, and one of the most important things that has happened in America over the last decade, and that is the American energy renaissance—the American energy renaissance.

I know some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't even like to talk about it. They don't like to acknowledge it: As to energy, we don't produce that in America. Yes, we do. Yes, we do. We are doing it really, really well, and it is benefiting millions and millions and millions of Americans in every State in the country.

The budget resolution that we are debating has a provision in it that is really simple. I bet if you polled it with every American—Democrat, Repub-

lican, people watching on TV—it probably has a 90-percent approval.

There is a simple instruction in the budget resolution that says that Congress needs to look at ways to increase Federal revenues by increasing American energy production. What could be wrong with increasing American energy production?

That provision that we are actually debating right now should be very bipartisan. Who is against that? Who could be against that? Why is this so important? Why is the American energy renaissance so important?

Well, as the Presiding Officer knows, because his State is certainly involved in it, the energy renaissance that is happening in the United States right now is a win, win, win, win, win on almost every category you can imagine.

What do I mean by the energy renaissance? Right now in our great Nation with our resources, we are producing more oil, more natural gas, and more renewables than any other place in the world. That is really good for the country. That is the renaissance. That is really a revolution in energy production. It is something that you would think on the Senate floor should be completely bipartisan. Unfortunately, it isn't.

Let me talk a little bit about how this energy renaissance and what is in the budget resolution will produce more energy for America by Americans, which is good for the country. Let's count the ways. When I said win, win, win, win, I wasn't joking. The wins are all on the board.

First, there is energy security. For our Nation, it is lower cost energy. With the increase in natural gas, we are seeing the drop in the prices of natural gas for homes and manufacturers and increasing manufacturing. These are enormously important for our Nation.

There is economic growth and jobs. In the energy sector, these are good jobs. The Presiding Officer has a lot of these jobs in his State. I have a lot of these jobs in my State. These are really important jobs. When you look at the weak economic growth in the United States over the last 10 years, the one sector that is actually driving growth has been the energy sector.

How about the trade deficit? It is a big problem. Everybody has talked about it. The President is very focused on it. We are now starting to export oil and export natural gas. My State has been exporting natural gas for over four decades. That helps our trade deficit.

Then, when you look at the Federal budget deficit, energy is a huge positive impact on the Federal budget deficit. That is what the budget resolution asks Congress to do in terms of policy: Let's produce more energy so we can produce more revenue for the Federal Government. That is a good idea. Nobody should be opposed to that.

Mr. President, as you know, when we are the world's energy superpower, as we are, that really helps our national security. It really helps our foreign policy. A lot of Americans have been concerned for decades that we have troops in the Middle East, that we have troops in areas where energy is really important. Well, let's produce it here.

I was in a meeting last year at the Munich Security Conference with the great Senator from Arizona and many of my colleagues. It was bipartisan. Senator MCCAIN led that codel to the Munich Security Conference in Germany. We met with a very prominent Russian dissident who has been fighting and battling with Vladimir Putin. At the very end of the meeting, we asked a simple question: What more can we do in the United States to help somebody like you, who is battling against a dictator who doesn't have our interest at heart? Do you know what this very smart Russian official, a courageous man, said? He said: America needs to produce more energy. That is how you take down the leadership in the Kremlin—more energy.

This is national security.

Let me say one more thing that doesn't get talked about a lot. It is not just helpful in all of these areas. When the United States of America is producing energy, it helps the global environment. Some people say: Well, wait a minute. A lot of the colleagues on the other side of the aisle come to the floor and kind of insinuate that when our country produces energy, it actually hurts the environment. That is not the case. When the United States produces energy, it actually helps the global environment.

Why is that the case? Let me just pause for a minute because, like I said, a lot of my colleagues are coming to the floor and talking about Alaska, energy, and the environment. Again, it is not with a lot of knowledge. They are stale talking points, yes. They have been using them for 40 years. Literally, I think one of my colleagues has been in the Congress plus or minus 40 years and has been using the same talking points on this.

As somebody who came to the Senate previously from a job as attorney general and a commissioner of natural resources and energy in Alaska, I know a little bit about this topic. I can tell you two important points.

My colleagues talk a little bit about Alaska, the environment, and energy. First, Senator MURKOWSKI and I care a lot more about the environment, the wildlife, the pristine wilderness in our great, amazing State than any other Member in this body. I don't need Senators coming down from places like Massachusetts, Oregon, Washington, Vermont, and Rhode Island talking about Alaska's environment. OK? Thanks. I don't need it. I care way more than any of them. With all due

respect, I know a heck of a lot more about it than any of them.

I also know this. In my State—and, I believe, in most of the country, but particularly in Alaska—Democrats, Republicans, Alaskan Natives, and non-Natives certainly support the highest standards on the environment, but we also support responsible resource development. Here is the key issue: We know we can do both. You can protect the pristine, amazing Alaskan environment, and you can responsibly develop our resources.

Let's talk about how we do this. Let's talk about how this applies to Alaska and how this applies to the rest of the country in general.

As I mentioned, this is a really important point. We have the highest standards on developing our resources and our energy than anywhere in the world, and we have some of the most technologically advanced and sustainable ways to develop resources in the energy sector. That allows us to do what I just mentioned, which is to protect the environment and to develop our resources.

Here is a really important point that a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle miss. They come down here, and this is what they talk about—by the way, they were in alliance with the last administration: How do we shut down energy development? How do we make it harder? How do we delay it?

As I mentioned, I was attorney general and the DNR commissioner in Alaska for almost 6 years of the Obama administration. It was all about how to shut it down in Alaska, how to delay it in Alaska, and how to shut it down in America. This is not what the country wants. This is not what the country needs, and, certainly, it is one issue that is often overlooked. This doesn't help the global environment, as they claim. It doesn't. Why is that? Because when you chase away investment in places like Alaska, with the highest standards on the environment in the world, what does that do? That drives capital and that drives investment to places like Russia, Iran, and Brazil, whose standards are so much lower than ours.

Russians on the tundra in the Arctic don't care anything about their environment. In my State and in the rest of America, we do.

I don't need to remind people that Russia and Iran right now are certainly our adversaries. Yet the policies that some of my colleagues like to promote, and certainly the last administration promoted, are to drive away investment, drive away energy production in America, with the highest standards in the world, so the Russians and the Iranians can take the capital and produce energy. They do not have high standards on the environment, and they are our adversaries. It makes no sense—no sense.

So how do we do this in Alaska? What are the environmental standards that almost no other place in the world—maybe Norway, maybe, to some degree, Canada—uses? What is the technology that enables us to produce American energy, with American jobs, with the American people, with the highest standards in the world? Let me provide a few examples. First, what I want everybody here to be aware of is, do not believe these doomsday scenarios. Don't believe the misinformed commentary. When my Democratic colleagues come to the floor, with very little knowledge about what is really happening in this sector, don't believe it. When they come to the floor and talk about a State like mine—Alaska—about which they know next to nothing, don't believe it.

Let me give one infamous example. In the 1970s, we were debating in the Senate—and I think one of my colleagues was maybe here then, probably using the same talking points—the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, one of the greatest energy infrastructure projects in the history of the world: 800 miles, 16 billion barrels of oil; at one point, 2 million barrels a day, from Americans, in America.

The people who were against it came to the floor and said: Oh, no. The Central Arctic caribou herd is going to be decimated if you do this—these beautiful animals that we care so much about in Alaska. Those were the arguments right on this floor. So what happened to the Central Arctic caribou? Again, we care about these animals way more than anybody else does in this body. In 1975, we had about 5,000 caribou; today, 66,000. I don't think the herd was decimated. We haven't heard that from anybody because they don't know, but that is the kind of doomsday scenario we heard from people with no knowledge, and then, when it doesn't happen, we don't hear them on the Senate floor saying: Oh, we were wrong about that.

Let me talk just briefly about some of what we do to make sure we do this in the most responsible way in the world. First, in the energy business, one thing we do is we explore. Again, in Alaska we have the highest standards in the world. A lot of other places in the United States have these standards. In the Arctic, we have what is called no impact exploration. What does that mean? It means we literally do everything to make sure there is no impact on these great species like the polar bear. Again, we care a lot more about our animals than my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

What does no impact exploration mean? Well, we undertake exploration required by State standards—these are not Federal standards—where we essentially have what are called ice roads and ice pads. Let me show my colleagues what that means. We only

allow for exploration in the winter on the tundra. When an exploration crew comes out, they have to build an ice road—it is a road made of ice—over the tundra. This photograph is an example of an ice road. Then they do exploration on an ice pad. They have drills, and they do all this work on the ice, on the tundra. They have about 4 months to do it and then they are done and then they leave.

What does the tundra look like after that exploration on ice? Right here. This is just one capped exploration well. It is as though nobody was even there—literally zero impact. These are Alaska standards, the highest in the world. They are expensive, yes, but we do it because we care so much about the environment. That is the exploration phase.

How about the production phase? What has happened in the production phase? The innovations in technology, many of which have occurred in my State, have made it so the surface footprint—when we actually put together a production pad—has shrunk dramatically. When we look at this chart, we see Prudhoe Bay in the 1970s. The other developments in Alaska include Kuparuk, Alpine, and Liberty. What happens is, the surface footprint has shrunk dramatically to 11, 12 acres now. Yet the ability to horizontally drill extends the reach of these wells underneath the ground, where we can reach resources in an incredibly vast manner without impacting the environment at all.

If a rig was placed right here on the Capitol Building, in terms of horizontal drilling, it could extend out to Andrews Air Force Base in Southeast, Silver Spring, MD, to the north, and well into Fairfax County—miles and miles and miles. Yet the surface footprint—the impact on the environment—is minimal.

That is what we do. We don't hear about it from the other side of the aisle, but it is really important, as we debate these issues, that all Americans know this. More energy for the country is really positive.

In conclusion, tonight the budget resolution is not just going to be a vehicle for tax reform, but there is also, as I mentioned, going to be an instruction for increased revenues for the country for more American energy production. It is a simple instruction.

As I mentioned, this should be very noncontroversial. What could be wrong with more energy production, particularly in a State like mine, where the standards are the highest in the world, and the technology is the most advanced in the world. What could be controversial about more energy production? More energy production means more American jobs, more American economic growth, more American national security, more American energy security, decreased

Federal budgets and trade deficits, and a more sustainable global environment because no one in the world produces energy more responsibly than Americans, especially Alaskans.

Nevertheless, some of my Democratic colleagues will be putting forth an amendment that does just the opposite. Think about that, an amendment that says let's kill energy production, thereby undermining American job growth, good jobs, American economic growth, American national security and energy security, while increasing our budget and trade deficits and harming the global environment. That is a lose-lose-lose scenario to me, but that is what is at stake tonight.

Later this afternoon, when we debate that amendment—and I certainly ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject any attempts to not take advantage of this incredible opportunity in America—the American energy renaissance that we need to continue—and this afternoon we are going to have an opportunity to do that.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the President's action last week stepping away from certifying Iran's compliance with the nuclear deal that was negotiated between the U.S. allies and the nation of Iran.

National security is about military power, but there is more to it than that. America's strength also comes from the power to use diplomacy.

In October 1945, President Harry Truman, my favorite President, changed the seal of the Office of the President to have the eagle face the olive branches of diplomacy instead of the arrows of war, signifying that America would also prefer that we use diplomacy first. In modern times, our judgments to go to war rather than use diplomacy have been flawed. Under this administration, diplomacy, in my view, is under assault, and that is why I rise today.

We see a decimated State in the USAID budget. We see bellicose rhetoric from the President. We see efforts to undermine, publicly, American diplomats engaged in negotiations. We see the refusal to even nominate key State Department diplomatic appointees.

As of last week, the administration has not put forward a nominee for approximately 52 percent of high-level positions at the State Department that require approval by the Senate. Thirty-two countries do not yet have Ambassadors in place, and that includes no nomination from the White House for Ambassadors to key countries like South Korea, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar. No one has been nominated for Assistant Secretary for

Arms Control, for Assistant Secretary for International Security and Non-proliferation, for Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs, Assistant Secretary for South and Central Asian Affairs, or for East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

How serious can the administration be about nuclear threats with no Ambassador to South Korea or no ambassadorial nomination for the key State Department official around non-proliferation? And the President has repeatedly undercut his Secretary of State's diplomatic efforts with North Korea.

President Trump's most recent action—his recent attack on diplomacy—is the decision to decertify the Iran deal, and I think this could be the most dangerous yet. By stepping back from a diplomatic deal that the United States made with the global community that is clearly working, the President is publicly undercutting diplomatic negotiations, and he is setting us on a road where military options become increasingly more likely. I will state it bluntly. If you weaken diplomacy, you raise the risk of unnecessary war, and that is what this President is doing.

First, President Trump's refusal to make the Iran certification and his threat to abandon the nuclear deal with Iran recalls the disastrous U.S. entrance into the Iraq war in 2003, where intelligence was politicized, and the administration repeatedly made false claims to justify going to war—a war of choice—to overthrow Saddam Hussein.

The Bush administration insisted that regime change in Iraq was necessary, and it insisted on that because of the claim of Iraq's continuing productions of weapons of mass destruction.

In March of 2003, the IAEA came out and said there was no credible evidence that Iraq had a program of weapons of mass destruction and that there was no evidence they had revived the nuclear program they shelved in the 1990s, but the Bush administration would not accept that claim. It did not fit with the narrative they were selling to the American people about Saddam Hussein so they said the IAEA was wrong. They said we needed to initiate war—one that has proven so costly to Virginians and to Americans in treasure and in regional stability but especially in American lives—to prevent Iraq from obtaining weapons of mass destruction.

We went to war. It turned out the scientists and the technicians and the IAEA were right. Iraq didn't have a program of weapons of mass destruction. The politicians who tried to undermine the credibility of the international agencies were wrong. Of course, the consequences of that decision are significant. Ironically, you could claim—I believe there is strong

evidence—that decision in 2003 has today led to greater Iranian influence in Iraq and the region and a proliferation of extremist groups that didn't exist before.

We are now hearing the Trump administration make similar claims about Iran; that Iran will soon enough have a nuclear weapons program, that the IAEA cannot be trusted, that Iran supports al-Qaida, and from a Republican colleague: "The policy of the United States should be regime change in Iran," and from Secretary of State Tillerson, we need a "peaceful transition" of the Iranian Government.

We should stop to think, Is this really about the nuclear deal or is it about beginning a drumbeat from the administration to march the United States toward another preventable war in the Middle East?

Second, while threatening to unilaterally terminate the nuclear deal at any time, President Trump also wants to revisit the terms of the deal to address what he sees as its flaws.

This isn't new. Since the day the deal was announced, some critics have argued that we could get a better deal or push for an alternative. I wasn't then, nor am I now, interested in the world of hypotheticals. I am interested in the world of facts. The fact is, the deal is working, and it is dramatically better than the alternative for at least 15 years or possibly longer.

Additionally, if we want to renegotiate the deal, Iran will seek to do the same. If we take a step back from the deal, Iran will take a step back, and what will they ask for—that they get to now increase centrifuges or get some of their enriched uranium back? I don't want to give Iran one thing back from this deal, but if we step back from a deal that is working and say we want to renegotiate, they will, too, and I don't think we should tolerate that.

Most wars start because of miscalculations. The notion that we can renegotiate the deal just on our side and the other side wouldn't think of renegotiation is magical thinking. The U.S. entrance in World War I 100 years ago started with miscalculations—most nations do. A miscommunication, a misunderstanding, another step, another step, and you are at war. We should be very, very wary.

I and all of us are very willing to go after Iran on the nonnuclear front. It was just 2 months ago that we passed—I think unanimously; maybe there was one "no" vote in this body—a set of stiff sanctions against Iran, North Korea, and Russia. We have given the power to the President to impose more sanctions on Iran for bellicose behavior, for activities in other countries, for violations of human rights, and for violating U.N. Security Council resolutions on their missile program. The President should use the sanctions power we just gave him to go after

Iran's activities that violate international norms and make America less safe. But when the IAEA, our allies, the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State all say that with respect to the nuclear deal, Iran is complying, we should avoid stepping back on that deal, lest we suggest that the United States cannot be trusted in good faith to follow a deal.

Third, I worry about the timing of this effort to step away from the Iran deal with respect to the imminent threat. I hear concerns about the Iran deal and what Iran might be able to do in year 8 or year 10 or year 15. Let me tell you about something I am worrying about this month, and that is the North Korean nuclear program.

We have been in briefings, and we hear the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State say to us and say to the world: The United States will always push for a diplomatic solution. We are never out of diplomatic solutions.

But let's be candid. What are the chances of a diplomatic solution with North Korea that would end or dramatically limit their nuclear weapons ambitions? I don't think the chances are high. I would say they are 20 percent at best. They are not zero, but they are not high, either. But if there is any chance of a diplomatic negotiation and a diplomatic end to this program, don't we owe it to the American public and don't we owe it to our troops to seek to exhaust and explore it? Of course we do. Yet every time Secretary of State Tillerson talks about trying to have some diplomatic outcome to pressure the Chinese to use leverage against North Korea, the President pours cold water on him.

I would argue that stepping back from the Iran deal sends an unmistakable signal to North Korea if I am right, and there is even a small chance of a diplomatic resolution. But the message we send to North Korea is that the United States will back out of a nuclear deal even when it is being complied with. I think we drive the chances of a diplomatic resolution with North Korea down to zero, and we should not do that.

There is significant evidence that while Iran's nonnuclear behavior is worthy of additional sanctions and pressure, the deal on the nuclear program is working. Our closest European allies, U.S. intelligence services, the IAEA, the P5—when I visit Israel and speak to national security and intelligence leaders, such as Gadi Eisenkot, who is essentially the equivalent of the head of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, they say Iran is complying with the deal, and it is making the world safer in the near and medium term. Secretary Dunford and General Mattis have said the same thing.

The deal gives us more intelligence because we have inspections that we

didn't have before. We have more inspections, and we know more about their program. In the first paragraph of the deal, on the first page of the deal, Iran pledges to never purchase, acquire, or develop military weapons. That promise, which is in perpetuity, gives us a legal justification, if they ever break it, to take action, including military action, to punish them for violating what they have signed. Do we want to give Iran the ability to step back from that promise they have made by stepping back ourselves when the deal is working?

Finally, the deal gives us a coalition. Our partners around the world who have signed on to the deal, who have been witness to the Iranian pledge, who know that Iran will have to permanently comply with the additional protocol of inspections under the deal—if we move away from the deal and Iran moves away from the deal, could we count on the coalition partners being with us to try to put a deal back together when it is we alone among the partners who have walked away from the table? What coalition could we expect if we are the ones who walk away from the table, if we say we are not interested in diplomacy? Then, later, if we need to take military action against Iran after we walked away from a deal, could we expect a coalition to support us in that?

I would like to conclude in this way: I think the President's decision to step back from this diplomatic deal poses a real challenge for this Congress. The President has done some things I agree with. He has done a number of things I disagree with. He has done only one thing that scares me, and it is this. I think that, together with defunding the State Department and pouring cold water on diplomacy and not filling key posts, this leads us closer to an unnecessary war. When you reject diplomacy or weaken it, you run the risk of an unnecessary war.

I have had to cast two war votes in the Senate, both as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I have been a city councilman, a mayor, a Lieutenant Governor, and a Governor, and casting a war vote is different from any vote you ever have to cast—any vote you ever have to cast. I have a son in the military, and that makes that vote different from any vote I have cast in 23 years in public life. As a Member of Congress, I may have to cast other votes to go to war against other nations, whether against nonstate terrorist groups or against a nation like North Korea or even Iran if they break for nuclear weapons. If I have to cast that vote, if I have to contemplate putting Congress on record that we should go to war, I want to be able to look American troops in the face and say: I exhausted every diplomatic option before I cast this vote. I think that is an obligation we owe to

the public and to our troops. We have to exhaust diplomacy.

There may come a time when that eagle just cannot face the olive branches of diplomacy, but we have to insist on military strength to keep order in the world and protect Americans. But if we turn to those arrows of war, we should be able to look at our public and look at our troops and say we exhausted diplomacy.

Stepping away from a diplomatic deal that is working is exactly the wrong thing for us to do at this time. It is my hope that Congress will not dignify what the President is doing in this regard and that we will insist, yes, upon strict compliance and also insist upon sanctions against Iran for non-nuclear behavior. But let's not be a nation that refuses to keep its diplomatic commitments. The stakes are just too high.

Mr. President I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to support the effort to pass the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. I am on the Budget Committee, and I am pretty familiar with the document. It provides a pathway to balance. It actually has a \$197 billion surplus in 2027, and it allows for tax cuts.

To Republicans—and Democrats too; you are welcome to join—the only way we are ever going to meaningfully get a tax cut is to pass a budget reconciliation instruction. This budget allows us to cut taxes. I hope some Democrats will join us, but if they choose not to, we can do it with a simple majority. If we don't pass this budget, we can't cut taxes unless we get 60 votes. With our friends on the other side—I think it is going to be hard to get any Democrats for a meaningful tax cut. They are not bad people; they just see things differently. When they spend money, they think that is good. They don't worry about the deficit. When we cut taxes, the deficit is the most important thing. My belief is that not only will we not have a deficit, we will actually have a surplus because this budget does two things: It restrains spending by \$5.1 trillion over the next decade, and it actually creates a system for tax cuts to spur economic growth.

If we could grow the GDP number by just 1 percent, that would be trillions of dollars of revenue. To those who are interested in this, we have been growing at about 1.9 percent GDP per year over the last 8 years—right around 2, sometimes under, sometimes a bit over. The historical average since World War II has been 3.2. If we could get back to 3.2 percent GDP growth, there would be trillions of dollars coming in to the Treasury, and I believe we can.

President Trump is trying to deregulate America after 8 years of heavy regu-

lation, but he can only do so much through Executive order.

Senator SULLIVAN, the Presiding Officer, talked about the opportunities in Alaska. I have learned a lot about Alaska. There are 750,000 people living in a State twice the size of Texas. It is beautiful as it can be. Environmentally, you are very sensitive. That is one of the qualities of Alaska you want to preserve. God has blessed Alaska with a lot of natural resources, and it would be good for the people of Alaska and the United States as a whole.

Every liter of gas and barrel of oil we can extract from Alaska in an environmentally sound way is less to buy from people who hate our guts. We are going to be using oil and gas for a long time to come. I want to move to a lower carbon economy. I think that would be good for the environment and good for our economy. Alaska has been blessed with natural resources, and I think Senator SULLIVAN explained how sensitive they are in the extraction process. But it would be insane to take Alaska oil and gas off the table for America because in that area, Russia is all over the place, and, trust me, they don't care about the environment.

One thing this budget doesn't do is it doesn't change the Budget Control Act caps. There is one member of our caucus who claims that this budget is somehow fiscally irresponsible. It is not. It actually leads to a surplus.

There is nothing in this budget that allows for more defense spending. The overseas contingency operations account is money set aside for our military and State Department to deal with the wars we are fighting that are not part of the Budget Control Act. We have been doing that for years. So for anybody to suggest that this authorizes an explosion of spending on the defense side—you literally don't know what you are talking about. If you looked at the details of the budget, you would find that it cuts spending by \$5.1 trillion and actually has a \$197 billion surplus 10 years from now.

But I want to let the body know—and the Presiding Officer will be right in that fight—that I, along with Senator MCCAIN, President Trump, General Mattis, Senator SULLIVAN, Senator BLUNT, and many others, am going to do everything I can to give the military more resources to fight wars we can't afford to lose.

I look forward to this debate with some of my colleagues on the other side and a few on this side.

Really, is it smart to have the smallest Navy since 1950? Is it really smart to have an Army 1940s-size given what is going on in the world, having fighter squadrons grounded not because the enemy shot us down but because the Congress shot us down?

We are spending about 3.2 percent of GDP on defense. Historically, since World War II, it has been about 5. Tell

me how you justify spending that much less today given the world we have to deal with. Where is the peace dividend?

Since 2011, when sequestration was passed, the world has deteriorated. President Trump is promising to rebuild the military, give them the capability they need to keep the enemies at bay and not fight wars with one hand tied behind their back. So I will be working with Senator MCCAIN and many others to make sure that our military is replenished; that we do have a 350-ship Navy, not 278; that we have an Army consistent with the threats—about 520,000 versus 420,000.

The No. 1 job of the Congress and the Federal Government is to defend the Nation. That is a different debate. That is not part of the budget. The budget resolution doesn't change defense spending caps. Hopefully, we can do that later, working with our Democratic friends.

This is the last best chance we will have to cut taxes. If this budget resolution fails, the ability to cut taxes on President Trump's watch goes away.

To those of you on the Republican side who have been claiming that we need tax cuts and a simpler tax code, this is your chance. If we don't succeed now, we are going to fail for the entire term of President Trump. That will be the end of us as a party, because if you are a Republican and you don't want to simplify the Tax Code and cut taxes, what good are you to anybody?

Our friends on the other side have really invested in "the government." Somebody needs to be involved in American politics who would actually like to send more money to you and less money to the government in a responsible way.

So I hope we are going to cut the corporate tax rate to make us competitive. We are going to double the standard exemptions so working people will have more money in their pockets. We are going to clean up some of the deductions and exemptions for the few at the expense of the many. But we can only do that if we pass a budget resolution.

A final thought. From the Republican Party point of view, we have the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. We have nobody to blame in this exercise but ourselves. If you are a Republican and you are frustrated with the lack of progress, count me in. The President is a willing partner to help us repeal and replace ObamaCare and to get a healthy tax cut to grow an economy that is dying to grow. But we have to help ourselves.

If we can't muster the votes necessary to pass this budget resolution to cut your taxes, then everybody who supported us for all these years should feel let down, and we will have let you down. I hope that doesn't happen. I am confident it won't. But to those Republicans who believe that a "no" vote is

good for the future of conservatism and the future of the economic well-being of the country, I could not disagree with you more. You will never balance the budget by dealing with discretionary spending alone. We are at 2008 levels of discretionary spending. What balances the budget is entitlement reform. If you want to balance the budget, vote for Graham-Cassidy because it finally puts Medicaid on a sustainable path.

We have to deal with our entitlement problem, but that is not in this budget reconciliation instruction. This instruction allows us to cut taxes with a majority-only vote and gets to balance or a surplus in 2027.

From a Republican point of view, this is the most important vote we are going to cast in 2017. If we fail, that is the end of this party's ability to grow. All of those who worked hard to get us here are going to be disappointed, and they should be.

We are not going to disappoint you. We are going to pass this budget resolution. We are going to cut your taxes, and we are eventually going to rebuild and replace ObamaCare, which is failing, with a block grant that gets the money and power closer to where you live, in the hands of the people you can vote for. We are going to succeed.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, let me first agree with the point that the Senator from South Carolina just made about the importance of passing a tax bill this year. He made the point—and if he didn't, I will make it—that if we don't pass a tax bill this year or at least get most of the way there—I hope we get done with this tax process this year. If we don't get that done, I think we won't have another opportunity to pass a tax bill in the next 4 years.

On the other hand, if we do pass a tax bill this year, we will have the incentive to take a second look in 2019, maybe 2020, but probably in 2019. The point I am making is, we don't have to do everything that could possibly be done to improve the Tax Code this year to take an important step. But if we don't take that important step, my belief is we are likely not going to have the kind of tax relief that working families need in the next 4 years. So not only is the pressure on the Republican Senate, the Republican House, and a White House that wants to work with us to get this done, but the pressure should be on everyone who cares about hard-working families. And the pressure should be on everyone who wants to see tax relief for those families happen. We need to understand that it needs to happen now.

Fights that can't be won in the next few weeks can be won in this Presidential term but only if we take this step successfully right now. As the

Senator from South Carolina and others have pointed out, this is an important two-step process.

The first step is a budget that allows us to move forward so that we can do this under the budget rules and allow 51 Senators to pass a bill on tax reform. By the way, they don't have to be 51 Republicans. I suspect that is what will happen, but once we get to 51 Republicans, I would love to see Democrats join us. I would love to see them join us before that.

This is the kind of help that hard-working families need—families who, for 9 years, were stuck in a situation where their buying power wasn't increasing, their job opportunities weren't increasing. They generally were not seeing that better job out there that was largely available to those very same hard-working families in the past because we aren't as competitive as we need to be.

There ought to be a couple of things we focus on. One is, how do you create tax relief for working families right now so that, as soon as possible, they begin to see a check that has more take-home pay? The other way to increase take-home pay is to increase starting pay, to make those jobs better. That is where we need to be looking on the other end of the spectrum.

On the end that creates jobs, what do we need to do to make ourselves more competitive? What do we need to do to constantly have the kind of pressure on the working job market that allows people who are working hard for a living to have better opportunities than they would have otherwise because we are more competitive than we would be otherwise?

I think the entire focus of this discussion should be, what do we do that improves the opportunities and improves the future for hard-working families? You can do that with a tax cut right now, which we should do. You can do that with policies that make more sense as we try to compete with the people we compete with around the world.

You can't have the highest corporate tax in the entire world and assume you are going to be the most competitive country in the entire world. You can't have a tax system that is uniquely different as it relates to products you sell overseas and expect to be more competitive than the countries who don't have that unique system, which penalizes rather than encourages American products to be sold in other places.

The Senate will vote later today on a budget resolution that reduces Federal spending by \$5 trillion over 10 years, provides a stronger foundation for economic growth, and allows us to move forward in the first, necessary legislative step in the Senate so that we can then move immediately to tax policy. This is a budget that will allow us to reduce taxes by \$1.5 trillion over 10

years, a budget that would put more money in the pockets of hard-working families, a budget that would add some opportunity to that struggle where, for almost a decade now, things haven't seemed to be getting better or easier. They seemed to be getting more difficult because we were less competitive and there was less pressure to find the workforce to do the jobs that need to be done. And then this is a tax code that will make it simpler and fairer and more uniformly impactful on everyone who pays taxes.

Most people don't mind paying taxes on the income they have until they find out that their neighbor next door with the same income has figured out how not to pay taxes. There is a reason American families and American businesses can't get through April without a bottle of aspirin. There is a reason this Tax Code creates headache after headache.

There is one estimate that individuals and businesses complying with the complicated tax system we have costs \$267 billion a year. That is half of the defense budget. If people are spending half of the defense budget just to comply with the Tax Code, there has to be something wrong with that, and we can do better. I think the proposals we are talking about will do a better job.

Right now, the individual Tax Code has seven different brackets—seven rates—and you have to figure out how they apply to whatever income you have had. It has 100 different credits, deductions, exclusions, and other provisions that make it extremely difficult to know what you owe or when you are going to owe what you owe.

According to the American Action Forum, the IRS currently imposes 8.1 billion hours of paperwork on Americans, which amounts to about 54 hours per taxpayer who is paying taxes. It is more for some, less for some, but a week's worth of work—54 hours of work—for taxpayers who pay their taxes. Every taxpayer gives that week to the Federal Government.

We are streamlining the Tax Code, increasing the basic deduction that families can have. If they don't want to go through the complicated Tax Code—here is how many of us there are who live at our house. Here is the basic deduction we get for each of those people living at our house. Here is how much we subtract from the money we make. Here is how much we need to pay.

There is no reason that one of the compliance options can't be a postcard or a piece of paper. In fact, when the current income tax was imposed on the American people, the entire set of instructions were on one page—the entire set of instructions for everyone who had to fill out the income tax form—with the assurance that only the richest people would ever pay any income tax, so most Americans would never have had to read that instruction sheet at all.

Now most Americans find it almost impossible to read the 100 pages of instructions that just get them to the Tax Code itself. Streamlining the Tax Code, helping families keep more of their money, figuring out a way we can be more competitive so there is opportunity for better jobs in the future, all should be important priorities for this Congress.

Passing a budget today will allow us to take the first step, which then allows us to take the next step in tax relief that matters and makes sense to the American people. We will take that step today. We should take that step today.

We should then follow up as quickly as possible to win the fights that can be won this year so Americans can start next year understanding that their Tax Code is simpler, the Tax Code is fairer, and their opportunities are likely to be greater. But for hard-working families, their take-home pay will definitely be higher than it is today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats have 4 minutes remaining.

AMENDMENT NO. 1302

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, yesterday I was at a meeting with the President at the White House, along with several members from both sides of the Senate Finance Committee. I said to the President flatout that Democrats agree that the Tax Code is a broken, dysfunctional mess. Finance Democrats yesterday laid out to the President our principles for reform, focusing on the middle class—not 1 percent—and being fiscally responsible so that Congress doesn't turn around and look at gutting safety-net programs such as Medicare and Medicaid or Social Security.

I think it would be fair to say that a whole lot of ears in that room perked up when the President said: Hey, I am for those kinds of things. The President talked to us about wanting help for the middle class. He said that this is not supposed to be about people like him, and he said that he doesn't want to shred the safety net.

Unfortunately, as I have indicated, there are gaps as wide as Crater Lake among all of the administration's statements, the rhetoric about taxes, and the reality of what is actually written down on paper about its tax cut plan. The Republican plan—this administration's plan, which actually is written down on paper, doesn't resemble what the late President Reagan accomplished in partnership with Democrats in 1986. Back then, the two sides brought their best ideas forward and passed major tax reform built around the idea that America is strongest when the middle class is prospering.

What is on paper today is just an enormous gift to the top of the top—the most fortunate special interests.

I hope the Senate, in a few minutes, will vote for my amendment to strike the reconciliation instructions from the budget because budget reconciliation is exactly the kind of partisan process, at least for taxes—especially for taxes, given the importance of taxes in this particular budget—budget reconciliation is exactly the kind of approach that President Reagan rejected in 1986.

I hope my colleagues will support my amendment, striking the reconciliation instructions from the budget. Senate Democrats have outlined our principles for reform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, very quickly, the principles that the Senate Democrats have laid out in our letter are very much in line with what the President says he wants. Now what we have to do is to have a bipartisan process to advance it. You do not get that with reconciliation. I hope the Senate supports my amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote in the 11:45 a.m. vote series this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1302, offered by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I think I have made the case.

To my colleagues, what the American people have told us—and they certainly said this during this last work period—is that they understand that the big challenges in this country require bipartisan approaches. That is what President Reagan understood when he brought together Democrats and Republicans for comprehensive tax reform.

We need to pass this amendment to strike the reconciliation instructions from the budget because they send all of the wrong signals with respect to tax reform.

The American people understand what it takes to tackle big issues. They understand that tax reform should be about the middle class. It should not be about the 1 percent, and it should not

be about causing a huge, new sea of red ink.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to strike the reconciliation instructions from the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time in opposition?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, we have an opportunity today to give ourselves the tool to pass a tax reform bill that will absolutely mean tax relief for middle-income and working-class families and will promote the kind of economic growth that we have been waiting for, but to do it, we are going to have to defeat this amendment and pass the underlying budget.

What my friend from Oregon is suggesting is that we give a minority in the Senate the opportunity to defeat tax reform by filibuster. That is what would happen if we were to pass this amendment.

I have to disagree strongly with the notion that somehow this is not a bipartisan exercise. There is nothing about reconciliation that in any way discourages or prevents full Democratic participation. We are going to have a markup in the Senate Finance Committee, and there will be unlimited amendment opportunities. If we are able to report something out, then there will be unlimited amendment opportunities on the floor. There is nothing that we could do to stop it if we wanted to because those are the rules of reconciliation. Every Democrat in this body will have an unlimited opportunity to weigh in on this, to influence this, and to amend this, and it will be a fully bipartisan exercise.

I urge a “no” vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Cortez Masto	Heitkamp
Bennet	Donnelly	Hirono
Blumenthal	Duckworth	Kaine
Booker	Durbin	King
Brown	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Cantwell	Franken	Leahy
Cardin	Gillibrand	Manchin
Carper	Harris	Markley
Casey	Hassan	McCaskill
Coons	Heinrich	Merkley

Murphy	Schatz	Van Hollen
Murray	Schumer	Warner
Nelson	Shaheen	Warren
Peters	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Reed	Tester	Wyden
Sanders	Udall	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Menendez

The amendment (No. 1302) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1393 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1393, offered by the Senator from West Virginia, Mrs. CAPITO.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mrs. CAPITO] proposes an amendment numbered 1393 to amendment No. 1116.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To help provide tax relief to middle-class Americans by reducing deductibility, for Federal tax purposes, of federal deductions, such as the state and local tax deduction which disproportionately favors high-income individuals)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX RELIEF FOR HARD-WORKING MIDDLE-CLASS AMERICANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include reducing federal deductions, such as the state and local tax deduction which disproportionately favors high-income individuals, to ensure relief for middle-income taxpayers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Madam President.

I would like to speak, for my 1 minute, about this amendment, which prioritizes tax relief for the middle class over the State and local tax deduction, which disproportionately benefits the wealthy and high earners.

Only 1 percent of the State and local deduction benefits go to taxpayers who earn less than \$50,000 annually. Tax reform means higher wages, lower taxes for middle-class workers. To unlock these benefits, we must reduce expensive deductions that do little to benefit everyday Americans. Keeping the State and local tax deduction without modification would cost more than \$1 trillion over 10 years. That money would be better spent on relief for the middle class.

Middle-class workers will benefit from the enhanced 0-percent bracket, enhanced child tax credit, and lower rates that will be part of this reform. We cannot let an unwillingness to reduce deductions for the wealthy stand in the way of relief for the middle-class working folks of this great country.

I hope my colleagues will join me in prioritizing middle-class families by supporting this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I rise in strong opposition to the Capito amendment. More than half the taxpayers claiming the State and local deduction make less than \$100,000. These hard-working, middle-class folks are not going to appreciate Congress double-taxing them.

The fact is, the Capito amendment is Washington lingo that would produce a Republican tax plan that hits the middle class, yet again, with more taxes. Under Capito, you could again have one hand giveth and the other hand taketh away. You might have the Republicans say let's double the standard deduction, but then when those middle-class folks lose their deduction for State and local taxes and their personal exemptions, they are in a big hole.

Reject this amendment, reject sleight-of-hand tax policy and those approaches like this that hurt hard-working, middle-class families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Paul
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

Menendez

The amendment (No. 1393) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1141 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1141, offered by the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1141, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1141 to amendment No. 1116.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would raise taxes on middle class families by double-taxing income already taxed at the state or local level)

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT RAISES TAXES ON MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES BY ELIMINATING OR LIMITING THE STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the State and Local Tax Deduction.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate

only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, this amendment simply raises a point of order on any legislation that modifies or eliminates State and local tax deductions. I know there are many States that have tax deductions from their Federal obligations on property, but I am specifically talking about States like Washington, Wyoming, Nevada, South Dakota, Alaska, Florida, Texas, and Tennessee.

We have had the ability to itemize and deduct our sales tax from our Federal income tax. That has resulted in a savings to the taxpayers. Under the President's proposal of increasing the standard deduction, even for households between \$50,000 and \$70,000, if you repeal their ability to continue to itemize, even with the standard deduction, you are raising taxes on them. It will not be covered. The standard deduction is only \$12,000. For that bracket in my State, they are deducting up to \$23,000.

Please do not raise taxes on our constituents without a due process and a budget point of order that says that we are all going to be a part of this process and discussion before you take away a way for our citizens to save money.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, this amendment is corrosive to the budget resolution's privilege. So it falls outside the scope of what is appropriate for inclusion. Adoption of corrosive amendments could be fatal to the resolution's privilege, and loss of privilege could compromise our ability to pass tax reform and enforce the budget spending limits. Further, this amendment is also nongermane. The Congressional Budget Act requires that amendments to a budget resolution be germane, which is a statutory requirement we can't ignore. So I raise a point of order against this amendment under the Budget Act, section 305(b)(2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 305(b)(2) of that act for the purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markley	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 52.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, and that following my remarks, the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, a week ago Saturday night, I was having dinner with my wife. It was about 8:30 in the evening, and the telephone rang, my cell phone, sitting in my pocket. I pulled it out, and it was the White House operator. The President was calling. So I walked out of the restaurant, sat on a curb outside in the dark, and had about a 15-minute conversation with the President of the United States while my dinner got cold.

President Trump said: I am calling about the cost-sharing reduction payments. I have cut them off as of Octo-

ber 1. The court says they are illegal. I don't want insurance companies to be bailed out. I think I can get block grants to replace ObamaCare, but I don't want people to suffer in the meantime.

So he said to me: I think I might want to get a bipartisan interim deal, a short-term deal. I have called CHUCK SCHUMER and told him that.

The President put that out in a tweet that day.

So the President said to me: Why don't you negotiate with Senator MURRAY and try to get one; meaning a short-term, bipartisan deal.

I said: Well, what about the CSR payments?

He said: I can put them back, and you can use that as a negotiating tool to get a better deal with the Democrats.

I responded that I was already working on an agreement with Senator MURRAY.

He said: Finish it, and let me know.

He called me again last Saturday. We talked about it again, and we talked twice yesterday.

I reported to the President that we finished our negotiations and that we are here today to present to the Senate the agreement we recommend.

The bill has 22 sponsors, half Democratic and half Republican—very few bills come to the floor with that many cosponsors originally—and there are a number of others on the Republican side and I understand from Senator MURRAY a number on the Democratic side who support the idea.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the cosponsors I am about to read be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the agreement that Senator MURRAY and I would like to present to the Senate for its consideration and the President's consideration and the consideration of the House of Representatives be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The Republican Senators who are cosponsoring the Alexander-Murray proposal, in addition to me, are Senator ROUNDS, Senator GRAHAM, Senator MCCAIN, Senator CASSIDY, Senator COLLINS, Senator ERNST, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator BURR, and Senator CORKER. I thank them all for doing that. Senator MURRAY will talk about the equal number of Democratic cosponsors that we have.

We hope Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER, the President of the United States, and the House of Representatives will consider our proposal. This is a first step—improve it and pass it, sooner rather than later. Our purpose is to stabilize and then lower the cost of premiums in the individual insurance market for the years 2018 and 2019.

In plain English, most Americans get their insurance from the government

or on the job. About 6 percent of insured Americans, or 18 million Americans, go into the individual market to buy it. They are the ones we are worried about. They are the ones we are seeking to help. There are 350,000 such people in Tennessee—songwriters, farmers, small business women—they are the ones who are terrified by the prospect of skyrocketing premiums and even the possibility that they might not be able to buy insurance at all.

Our agreement tries to help in two ways. No. 1, it permanently amends the Affordable Care Act to give new flexibility for States to create insurance policies that have a larger variety and lower costs. No. 2, it continues the cost-sharing reduction payments during 2018 and 2019.

Now, first, about cost-sharing. Cost-sharing reduction payments are subsidies that pay for co-pays and deductibles for low-income Americans. That is what they are. Every Democrat wants them to continue, so do many Republicans, including every Republican in the majority in the House who voted for their repeal-and-replace bill this year because it continued the cost-sharing payments for two years.

Let me say that again. Every Republican in the House of Representatives who voted to repeal and replace ObamaCare this year voted for a provision that continued the cost-sharing payments for 2 years. Our bill does the same thing. The only difference is, we eliminate any question about whether paying them is legal.

Now, why would so many Republicans and so many Democrats support these payments for 2 years and why would the President of the United States be interested in them? It is because the Congressional Budget Office has told us that if we don't do it—if we let them expire—premiums in 2018 will go up an average of 20 percent. They are already set, in most cases. The Federal debt will increase by \$194 billion because of the extra cost of subsidies to pay the higher premiums, and up to 16 million Americans may live in counties where they are not able to buy any insurance in the individual market.

So unless the cost-sharing payments, which the President says are illegal—and I agree with him. The Federal Court in Washington, DC, has told him they are illegal, not properly authorized by Congress. Unless they are replaced by something else temporarily, there will be chaos in this country, and millions of Americans will be hurt.

The President says there should be no bailout of insurance companies—no bailout of insurance companies. I agree 100 percent and so does Senator MURRAY. She can speak for herself. I have said to the President in our telephone calls—as I mentioned, 4 of them in the last 10 days—that if there is a way to improve the language in our bill, we would like to do that. We have a page

and a half to make it clear that the benefits go to consumers, not insurance companies. That can always be improved.

Some conservatives object to the idea of paying them at all, but I would ask this: What is conservative about unaffordable premiums? What is conservative about \$194 billion of new Federal debt? What is conservative about creating chaos so millions can't buy insurance or at least failing to deal with the chaos that has been created? What is conservative about a four-lane highway that would be the chaos that leads to a single-payer solution for insurance in this country? Do we really think that if 50 counties in Tennessee or Iowa or Kansas or any State are in a situation where no one can buy insurance on the individual market, that government-sponsored insurance is not far behind? Of course it is. That is why Senator GRAHAM and Senator CASSIDY have cosponsored our bill, because our bill would have been part of the Senate Republican repeal-and-replace bills if budget rules had allowed it.

Senator GRAHAM and Senator CASSIDY know that if we repeal and replace ObamaCare in 1 year or 2 years or 3 years, it takes 2 or 3 years for it to take effect. We still need the cost-sharing payments for the interim, and you can't pass those in the Senate with 51 votes. It takes 60. Democrats are for it. The Republican House majority has voted for it. The sponsor of the Senate repeal-and-replace bills are cosponsors of this agreement. It sounds like something that might actually become law before the end of the year.

Second, flexibility. The biggest difference between the Senate Republicans and the Senate Democrats with regard to health insurance and the individual market is whether Washington should write more of the rules or States should write more of the rules. Our position has been that States should write more of the rules. We have had about 50 votes—maybe more—and we have lost them all. We have made thousands of speeches, and we have lost them all. In the last 7 years, we haven't moved an inch toward our objectives of giving States more flexibility in creating insurance policies in the individual market. This agreement does.

It provides and authorizes States to offer an insurance policy called catastrophic insurance for people of all ages that would keep a medical catastrophe from turning into a financial catastrophe. It encourages interstate agreements among States in health insurance. It streamlines the innovation waiver—section 1332, we call it—for States that want to do what Alaska did, which is to create a fund to pay for the very sick and then reduce premiums for everybody else by 20 percent and use no new Federal dollars. Most important, it changes the law to make

it easier for States like Iowa, Oklahoma, New Hampshire, Minnesota, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Alaska, and many others to use their creativity to write policies that offer more choices and lower costs.

Some have said: Well, that is not enough. Well, that is more than we have gotten for 8 years, and it is the first step.

I welcome anyone who wants to negotiate further with Senator MURRAY or Senator SCHUMER. That is what the legislative process is about.

Now, because I forgot to do it when I listed the sponsors, I would like to add Senator ISAKSON and Senator GRASSLEY to the sponsor list, which would be two additional Republican sponsors. I would say to Senator MURRAY. That gives us a total of 12. I thank Senator GRASSLEY for his support.

The only thing I would say to those who want to negotiate further to get more flexibility is to keep in mind that with the cost-sharing payments, you can't get most of those changes without 60 votes in the Senate.

I thank Senator MURRAY for being an able and effective negotiating partner. We have worked on many pieces of legislation together. She is tough and respected in her caucus. She does what she says she will do, and she is interested in getting a result. I respect that and I thank her.

I thank President Trump for his encouragement. He called me 10 days ago, he called me last Saturday, and he called me again yesterday. I thank him for his encouragement—to encourage someone to come up with a bipartisan agreement to cover these 2 years so people wouldn't be harmed—and his willingness to consider what we are offering today.

I thank Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER because they have created an environment in which Senator MURRAY and I could make this proposal. I hope they and our other colleagues will seriously consider it.

The President was right to suggest that we need a short-term agreement so people will not be hurt. Now, some people are still objecting to the idea of continuing these temporary cost-sharing payments for 2 years and the other provisions that would have as the objective to keep premiums from going up in 2018 and for premiums to begin to go down in 2019.

They are listening to groups around Washington, DC. I would suggest they listen to some other people. Listen to the waitress, listen to the songwriter, listen to the bricklayer, listen to the small businesswoman, and the people of America—and there are 350,000 in Tennessee—who may be terrified by the prospect of increasing premiums or even by the prospect of not being able to buy insurance at all. These are people who don't get insurance from the government. They don't get it on the

job. They might never know when they are going to lose their job and they will be in this individual market.

We have a solution here. Senator MURRAY and I—24 total Senators—are offering it today. We are certain it can be improved. We look forward to working with those who would improve it, but I do not believe Congress would want to fail to deal with a problem that will hurt millions of Americans if we allow it to continue.

I predict this agreement that we 24 Senators are suggesting today will become law in some fashion before the end of the year. I think most Senators and most House Members will be looking around for a solution when they consider the consequences of a failure to act. When they look for a solution, I believe this solution supported by 24 Senators—half Democrats, half Republicans—will be the easiest solution to adopt. I believe all the Democrats want it. Almost all of the House Republicans have already voted for it this year, and the Senate Republican leaders who would prefer to repeal and replace ObamaCare would put it in their bill if they could get it in there, but they can't because the budget rules will not allow it.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF REPUBLICAN CONSPONSORS

ALEXANDER, ROUNDS, GRAHAM, MCCAIN, CASSIDY, COLLINS, ERNST, MURKOWSKI, GRASSLEY, ISAKSON, BURR, and CORKER.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Title: To stabilize individual market premiums for the 2018 and 2019 plan years and provide meaningful State flexibility.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Bipartisan Health Care Stabilization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. WAIVERS FOR STATE INNOVATION.

(a) STREAMLINING THE STATE APPLICATION PROCESS.—Section 1332 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(C), by striking “the law” and inserting “a law or has in effect a certification”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “OR CERTIFY” after “LAW”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “A law” and inserting the following:

“(i) LAWS.—A law”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) CERTIFICATIONS.—A certification described in this paragraph is a document, signed by the Governor of the State, that certifies that such Governor has the authority under existing Federal and State law to take action under this section, including implementation of the State plan under subsection (a)(1)(B).”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “OF OPT OUT”; and

(ii) by striking “may repeal a law” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “may terminate the authority provided under the waiver with respect to the State by—

“(i) repealing a law described in subparagraph (A)(i); or

“(ii) terminating a certification described in subparagraph (A)(ii), through a certification for such termination signed by the Governor of the State.”.

(b) GIVING STATES MORE FUNDING FLEXIBILITY, TO ESTABLISH REINSURANCE, HIGH RISK POOLS, INVISIBLE HIGH RISK POOLS, INSURANCE STABILITY FUNDS AND OTHER PROGRAMS.—Section 1332(a)(3) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting “or would qualify for a reduced portion of” after “would not qualify for”; and

(B) by inserting “, or the State would not qualify for or would qualify for a reduced portion of basic health program funds under section 1331,” after “subtitle E”; and

(C) by inserting “, or basic health program funds the State would have received,” after “this title”; and

(D) by inserting “or for implementing the basic health program established under section 1331” before the period;

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting before the period, “, and with respect to participation in the basic health program and funds provided to such other States under section 1331”; and

(3) by adding after the second sentence the following: “A State may request that all of, or any portion of, such aggregate amount of such credits, reductions, or funds be paid to the State as described in the first sentence.”.

(c) ENSURING PATIENT ACCESS TO MORE FLEXIBLE HEALTH PLANS.—Section 1332 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “at least as affordable” and inserting “of comparable affordability, including for low-income individuals, individuals with serious health needs, and other vulnerable populations.”; and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D)(i) will not increase the Federal deficit over the term of the waiver; and

“(ii) will not increase the Federal deficit over the term of the 10-year budget plan submitted under subsection (a)(1)(B)(ii).”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) (as amended by subsection (a)) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) BUDGETARY EFFECT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether a State plan submitted under subsection (a) meets the deficit neutrality requirements of paragraph (1)(D), the Secretary may take into consideration the direct budgetary effect of the provisions of such plan on sources of Federal funding other than the funding described in subsection (a)(3).

“(B) LIMITATION.—A determination made by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall not be construed to affect any waiver process or standards or terms and conditions in effect on the date of enactment of the Bipartisan Health Care Stabilization Act of 2017 under title XI, XVIII, XIX, or XXI of the Social Security Act, or any other Federal law relating to the provision of health care items or services; and

“(ii) shall be made without regard to any changes in policy with respect to any waiver process or provision of health care items or services described in clause (i).”; and

(2) in subsection (a)(1)(C), by striking “subsection (b)(2)” and inserting “subsection (b)(3)”.

(d) PROVIDING EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF STATE WAIVERS.—Section 1332(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “180” and inserting “90”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) EXPEDITED DETERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any application under subsection (a)(1) submitted on or after the date of enactment of the Bipartisan Health Care Stabilization Act of 2017 or any such application submitted prior to such date of enactment and under review by the Secretary on such date of enactment, the Secretary shall make a determination on such application, using the criteria for approval otherwise applicable under this section, not later than 45 days after the receipt of such application, and shall allow the public notice and comment at the State and Federal levels described under subsection (a)(4) to occur concurrently if such State application—

“(i) is submitted in response to an urgent situation, with respect to areas in the State that the Secretary determines are at risk for excessive premium increases or having no health plans offered in the applicable health insurance market for the current or following plan year; or

“(ii) is for a waiver that is the same or substantially similar to a waiver that the Secretary already has approved for another State.

“(B) APPROVAL.—

“(i) URGENT SITUATIONS.—

“(I) PROVISIONAL APPROVAL.—A waiver approved under the expedited determination process under subparagraph (A)(i) shall be in effect for a period of 3 years, unless the State requests a shorter duration.

“(II) FULL APPROVAL.—Subject to the requirements for approval otherwise applicable under this section, not later than 1 year before the expiration of a provisional waiver period described in subclause (I) with respect to an application described in subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall make a determination on whether to extend the approval of such waiver for the full term of the waiver requested by the State, for a total approval period not to exceed 6 years. The Secretary may request additional information as the Secretary determines appropriate to make such determination.

“(ii) APPROVAL OF SAME OR SIMILAR APPLICATIONS.—An approval of a waiver under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be subject to the terms of subsection (e).

“(C) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the Bipartisan Health Care Stabilization Act of 2017, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of all waivers approved pursuant to an application under subparagraph (A)(ii) to evaluate whether such waivers met the requirements of subsection (b)(1) and whether the applications should have qualified for such expedited process.”.

(e) PROVIDING CERTAINTY FOR STATE-BASED REFORMS.—Section 1332

(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052(e)) is amended by striking “No waiver” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “A waiver under this section—

“(1) shall be in effect for a period of 6 years unless the State requests a shorter duration;

“(2) may be renewed, subject to the State meeting the criteria for approval otherwise applicable under this section, for unlimited additional 6-year periods upon application by the State; and

“(3) may not be suspended or terminated, in whole or in part, by the Secretary at any time before the date of expiration of the waiver period (including any renewal period under paragraph (2)), unless the Secretary determines that the State materially failed to comply with the terms and conditions of the waiver.”.

(f) **GUIDANCE AND REGULATIONS.**—Section 1332 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **GUIDANCE AND REGULATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to carrying out this section, the Secretary shall—

“(A) issue guidance, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Bipartisan Health Care Stabilization Act of 2017, that includes initial examples of model State plans that meet the requirements for approval under this section; and

“(B) periodically review the guidance issued under subparagraph (A) and when appropriate, issue additional examples of model State plans that meet the requirements for approval under this section, which may include—

“(i) State plans establishing reinsurance or invisible high-risk pool arrangements for purposes of covering the cost of high-risk individuals;

“(ii) State plans expanding insurer participation, access to affordable health plans, network adequacy, and health plan options over the entire applicable health insurance market in the State;

“(iii) waivers encouraging or requiring health plans in such State to deploy value-based insurance designs which structure enrollee cost-sharing and other health plan design elements to encourage enrollees to consume high-value clinical services;

“(iv) State plans allowing for significant variation in health plan benefit design; or

“(v) any other State plan as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(2) **RESCISSION OF PREVIOUS REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.**—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Bipartisan Health Care Stabilization Act of 2017, the regulations promulgated, and the guidance issued, under this section prior to the date of enactment of the Bipartisan Health Care Stabilization Act of 2017 shall have no force or effect.”; and

(2) in subsection (a)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, as applicable” before the semicolon; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall” and inserting “The Secretary may”.

(g) **APPLICABILITY.**—The amendments made by this Act to section 1332 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052)—

(1) with respect to applications for waivers under such section 1332 submitted after the date of enactment of this Act and applications for such waivers submitted prior to such date of enactment and under review by the Secretary on the date of enactment, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) with respect to applications for waivers approved under such section 1332 before the date of enactment of this Act, shall not require reconsideration of whether such appli-

cations meet the requirements of such section 1332, except that, at the request of a State, the Secretary shall recalculate the amount of funding provided under subsection (a)(3) of such section.

(h) **CLARIFYING BUDGET NEUTRALITY.**—Section 1332(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052(a)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by inserting “over both the term of the proposed waiver and the term of the 10-year budget plan” after “Government”.

SEC. 3. COST-SHARING PAYMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, such sums as may be necessary for payments for cost-sharing reductions authorized by section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) for the portion of plan year 2017 that begins [on the date of enactment of this Act] and ends on December 31, 2017, and for plan years 2018 and 2019.

[b] **Ensuring Consumer Benefit in 2018.**—

[1] **COST-SHARING PAYMENTS.**—

[A] **IN GENERAL.**—[(i) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—For plan year 2018, except with respect to issuers of qualified health plans in a State described in clause (ii)(I), amounts appropriated under subsection (a) shall be made available for payments for cost-sharing reductions under such section 1402 to issuers of qualified health plans.]

[(ii) **STATE FLEXIBILITY.**—

[(I) **STATE DESCRIBED.**—A State described in this clause is a State in which the State insurance regulator, before the date of enactment of this Act, directed issuers of qualified health plans to decline cost-sharing reduction payments under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) for the 2018 plan year, through a formal notice or correspondence.]

[(II) **STATE OPTION TO REVERSE DIRECTIVE.**—Nothing in this clause shall prevent a State insurance regulator from reversing a directive described in subclause (I).]

[B] **STATE PLAN.**—

[(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each State insurance regulator not described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services a certification that, with respect to plan year 2018, the State will ensure that each applicable issuer of a qualified health plan in the State provides a direct financial benefit to consumers and the Federal Government, as applicable, and a State plan for so ensuring such benefit. The Secretaries of the Treasury and of Health and Human Services shall assist the States in developing and implementing plans as needed, including by providing technical assistance.]

[(ii) **CONTENT.**—A State plan under clause (i) shall include, as applicable—]

[(I) providing monthly rebates to affected consumers and the Federal Government;]

[(II) one-time rebates for consumers to affected consumers and the Federal Government;]

[(III) after-the-year rebates for affected consumers and the Federal Government;]

[(IV) rebates paid through the process under section 2718 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-18), allowing for the appropriate portion of rebates to be provided to the Federal Government; and]

[(V) other means of providing a direct financial benefit to consumers and the Federal Government approved by the State insurance regulator, provided such means of providing

a financial benefit does not result in increased costs for applicable taxpayers described in section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or the Federal Government.]

[(iii) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—Any rebate amount described in clause (ii)—]

[(I) shall be treated as part of the premium, but the premium under section 36B(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or section 36B(f)(3)(B) of such Code shall not be affected by the rebate amount;]

[(II) shall be treated as if it were an expenditure described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 2718(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-18);]

[(III) shall be accounted for by the Secretary in calculating risk adjustment and reconciling any other relevant downstream financial calculations; and]

[(IV) shall be provided so as not to create an inducement to purchase health insurance coverage from an applicable issuer.]

[(iv) **NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.**—States that adopt a State plan under this subparagraph shall prominently post a notice that enrollees may qualify for rebates or other means and explain how such rebates will be provided.]

[(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue a report describing the activities taken by issuers of qualified health plans in States that submitted certifications and State plans under paragraph (1)(B) to provide a direct financial benefit to individuals enrolled in a qualified health plan and the Federal Government, as applicable, for the 2018 plan year.]

SEC. 4. ALLOWING ALL INDIVIDUALS PURCHASING HEALTH INSURANCE IN THE INDIVIDUAL MARKET THE OPTION TO PURCHASE A LOWER PREMIUM COPPER PLAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1302(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by striking “plan year if—” and all that follows through “the plan provides—” and inserting “plan year if the plan provides—”; and

(C) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(b) **RISK POOLS.**—Section 1312(c)(1) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(c)) is amended by inserting “and including enrollees in catastrophic plans described in section 1302(e)” after “Exchange”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1312(d)(3)(C) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(C)) is amended by striking “, except that in the case of a catastrophic plan described in section 1302(e), a qualified individual may enroll in the plan only if the individual is eligible to enroll in the plan under section 1302(e)(2)”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply with respect to plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2019.

SEC. 5. CONSUMER OUTREACH, EDUCATION, AND ASSISTANCE.

(a) **OPEN ENROLLMENT REPORTS.**—For plan years 2018 and 2019, the Secretary of Health

and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary"), in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, shall issue biweekly public reports during the annual open enrollment period on the performance of the Federal Exchange and the Small Business Health Options Program (SHOP) Marketplace. Each such report shall include a summary, including information on a State-by-State basis where available, of—

- (1) the number of unique website visits;
- (2) the number of individuals who create an account;
- (3) the number of calls to the call center;
- (4) the average wait time for callers contacting the call center;
- (5) the number of individuals who enroll in a qualified health plan; and
- (6) the percentage of individuals who enroll in a qualified health plan through each of—
 - (A) the website;
 - (B) the call center;
 - (C) navigators;
 - (D) agents and brokers;
 - (E) the enrollment assistant program;
 - (F) directly from issuers or web brokers; and
 - (G) other means.

(b) **OPEN ENROLLMENT AFTER ACTION REPORT.**—For plan years 2018 and 2019, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, shall publish an after action report not later than 3 months after the completion of the annual open enrollment period regarding the performance of the Federal Exchange and the Small Business Health Options Program (SHOP) Marketplace for the applicable plan year. Each such report shall include a summary, including information on a State-by-State basis where available, of—

- (1) the open enrollment data reported under subsection (a) for the entirety of the enrollment period; and
- (2) activities related to patient navigators described in section 1311(i) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(i)), including—
 - (A) the performance objectives established by the Secretary for such patient navigators;
 - (B) the number of consumers enrolled by such a patient navigator;
 - (C) an assessment of how such patient navigators have met established performance metrics, including a detailed list of all patient navigators, funding received by patient navigators, and whether established performance objectives of patient navigators were met; and
 - (D) with respect to the performance objectives described in subparagraph (A)—
 - (i) whether such objectives assess the full scope of patient navigator responsibilities, including general education, plan selection, and determination of eligibility for tax credits, cost-sharing reductions, or other coverage;
 - (ii) how the Secretary worked with patient navigators to establish such objectives; and
 - (iii) how the Secretary adjusted such objectives for case complexity and other contextual factors.

(c) **REPORT ON ADVERTISING AND CONSUMER OUTREACH.**—Not later than 3 months after the completion of the annual open enrollment period for the 2018 plan year, the Secretary shall issue a report on advertising and outreach to consumers for the open enrollment period for the 2018 plan year. Such report shall include a description of—

- (1) the division of spending on individual advertising platforms, including television and radio advertisements and digital media,

to raise consumer awareness of open enrollment;

(2) the division of spending on individual outreach platforms, including email and text messages, to raise consumer awareness of open enrollment; and

(3) whether the Secretary conducted targeted outreach to specific demographic groups and geographic areas.

(d) **OUTREACH AND ENROLLMENT ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **OPEN ENROLLMENT.**—Of the amounts collected through the user fees on participating health insurance issuers pursuant to section 156.50 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), the Secretary shall obligate \$105,800,000 for outreach and enrollment activities for each of the open enrollment periods for plan years 2018 and 2019.

(2) **OUTREACH AND ENROLLMENT ACTIVITIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term "outreach and enrollment activities" means—

- (i) activities to educate consumers about coverage options or to encourage consumers to enroll in or maintain health insurance coverage (excluding allocations to the call center for the Federal Exchange); and
- (ii) activities conducted by an in-person consumer assistance program that does not have a conflict of interest and that, among other activities, facilitates enrollment of individuals through the Federal Exchange, and distributes fair and impartial information concerning enrollment through such Exchange and the availability of tax credits and cost-sharing reductions.

(B) **CONNECTION WITH FEDERAL EXCHANGE.**—Activities conducted under this subsection shall be in connection with the operation of the Federal Exchange, to provide special benefits to health insurance issuers participating in the Federal Exchange.

(3) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may contract with a State to conduct outreach and enrollment activities for plan years 2018 and 2019. Any outreach and enrollment activities conducted by a State or other entity at the direction of the State, in accordance with such a contract, shall be treated as Federal activities to provide special benefits to participating health insurance issuers consistent with OMB Circular No. A-25R.

(4) **CLARIFICATIONS.**—

(A) **PRIOR FUNDING.**—Nothing in this subsection should be construed as rescinding or cancelling any funds already obligated on the date of enactment of this Act for outreach and enrollment activities for plan year 2018.

(B) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING.**—The Secretary shall ensure that outreach and enrollment activities are conducted in all applicable States, including, as necessary, by providing for such activities through contracts described in paragraph (3).

SEC. 6. OFFERING HEALTH PLANS IN MORE THAN ONE STATE.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, shall issue regulations for the implementation of health care choice compacts established under section 1333 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18053) to allow for the offering of health plans in more than one State.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor to Senator MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, first I thank Chairman ALEXANDER for his leadership in launching a bipartisan process, as well as his dedication to seeing it through and getting a result, as he said.

I have to say that, after 7 years of intense partisanship on these issues, which would lead everyone to believe that there was no hope for Republicans and Democrats to come together and work to strengthen our healthcare, I am really pleased with this common ground we have been able to find, providing multiple years of certainty when it comes to payments to reduce out-of-pocket costs that affect the people Senator ALEXANDER just talked about—the waitress, the songwriter, and people who care and need this—restoring critical investments, making sure people know about enrollment and can get coverage, and offering States more flexibility to innovate, as the Affordable Care Act intended, while maintaining those essential health benefits, like maternity care, protecting people with preexisting conditions, and the elderly. It does all this while making sure that costs do go down for our families and preventing insurers from double-dipping and getting the benefit of both cost reduction and higher premiums. If there are ways to do this even more, to make sure patients come first and insurers can't pad their profits, I, as I know Senator ALEXANDER is, as well, am open to that.

Chairman ALEXANDER just took some time to lay out the policies we are putting forward in this legislation. So I will not go into those details. But I do want to take a few minutes to focus on what this legislation would mean for the people we are all here to serve because what is really at stake is that patients and families across the country are now looking ahead to next year, and they are realizing they are about to pay the price for the uncertainty and partisanship we have seen, especially from this administration, on healthcare over the last 9 months.

To many of those families, that out-of-pocket cost-reduction payment we are debating in Congress has nothing to do with politics and has everything to do with whether they will be able to make ends meet at the end of the month. Now the law is very clear that these payments are required, but with the President's decision to stop them, families are looking to this Congress and the administration and asking what we plan to do.

So I am very glad that Democrats and Republicans agreed that we need to act. We could do much better working together under regular order rather than doubling down on partisanship and dysfunction. As a result of the hard work of Chairman ALEXANDER and members of our HELP Committee and with input from half of the Senate, we

were able to put forward an answer—a bipartisan solution that prevents families from paying the price of sabotage and uncertainty and one that Members on both sides of the aisle can be proud to support, starting with the list of original cosponsors we are revealing today. Senator ALEXANDER listed the 12 Republicans. The 12 Democrats are Senators MURRAY, KING, SHAHEEN, DONNELLY, KLOBUCHAR, HEITKAMP, FRANKEN, MANCHIN, CARPER, BALDWIN, MCCASKILL and HASSAN.

We are doing this today not only because it will help protect our families from premium spikes that are set to kick off in the next year but because it sends a powerful message that, when Members of Congress decide to get past our talking points and take a few steps out of our partisan corners, there is a lot we can agree on and a lot we can get done.

Chairman ALEXANDER and I are going to continue to make the case for this agreement. We are already getting a promising response from many Members on both sides of the aisle. I am very appreciative of Senator SCHUMER for his strong support and I am optimistic that, with Chairman ALEXANDER working on this, we will continue to build momentum and, as he said, we will get this done.

At the end of the day, this isn't about Republicans or Democrats. It is about doing the right thing for the people we serve. That means having an answer to the premium spikes that are going to set in and burden our families next year. We have been able to find one. It is bipartisan. We both gave on this. I really hope all of our colleagues will work with us to get this signed into law and show the American public that we can get the job done for them and we understand the priorities of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, if I could ask a question, through the Chair, to the Senator from Washington.

In my conversations with President Trump, he has made it clear—and several of my colleagues have made it clear on the Republican side—that they don't want to bail out insurance companies. What I responded is that I 100-percent agree.

I have already said this to the President, but I think it is important for our colleagues to know that probably the most heated debate Senator MURRAY and I had was not over whether we agreed with that but on how to actually do it in the most effective, strongest, toughest way possible.

So I wish to emphasize the point that these payments are designed to help low-income Americans pay their copays and deductibles. We have in our agreement about a page and a half of

language that requires every State to make sure the benefits of those payments go to the consumers in 2018 and not to the insurance companies.

I wish to ask Senator MURRAY if she sees any disagreement at all between her and me, and most of our colleagues on that side of the aisle and over here, about whether we want to bail out insurance companies or whether we would be willing to consider any effective language that would improve our own language.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would respond to my colleague, through the Chair, that negotiations are always tough. There are things you disagree on, and you have to work your way to an answer. The one issue we did not disagree on but we worked the hardest on and had the most discussion on was how we make sure we have the language in place on this—that consumers benefit and it is not a bailout for insurers. We absolutely share that point, and I know we both heard from Members on both sides of the aisle that they share that point.

We have strong language in here, but we are still open together to make it stronger under anybody's suggestion because our intent is to make sure our constituents get the result of this. We are together on that and working on that. I, absolutely, disregard anyone who says this is a bailout for insurers because they haven't read the bill, if they have seen it.

I thank Senator ALEXANDER for his attention, discussions, and hard work to reach this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, before I speak on an amendment that is expected to be voted on later this afternoon, I wish to take just a brief moment and thank my colleagues, the Chairman of the HELP Committee and his ranking member, Senator MURRAY. The work they have done to knit together this compromise—and we all recognize it is a compromise—is such an important one, and it comes at such an important time.

It is not only good from a policy perspective to ensure that we don't pull out the underpinnings of the individual market here, but it is good, from the perspective of the health of our institution, to be able to demonstrate that, at a time when things are a little tense, let's just say, on issues that are highly emotional, highly personal, and highly, highly complex, we can come together and we can demonstrate the ability to govern. It doesn't come without great patience and persistence, and these two individuals, these two leaders, have really helped guide us here in the Senate to find a better path, not only when it comes to how we deal with access to healthcare, reducing costs, reducing premiums, and providing for better lev-

els of care but also a better path for the Senate.

So I want to acknowledge and show my genuine appreciation for their leadership.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Energy Committee, I come to the floor today to urge every Member here to vote against amendment No. 1301, which will be voted on later on this afternoon.

The fiscal year 2018 budget resolution instructs the Energy Committee to raise \$1 billion over the next decade. That is all that it does. It just says: Go out and find \$1 billion over the next decade.

I appreciate Chairman ENZI's willingness to include this instruction, and I have every confidence that our committee will be able to meet the instruction. There are good reasons why we should be able to meet it, and, really, very good reasons why we should oppose an amendment that would preemptively strike it.

I think it is fair to say that we have opportunities within the energy sector to help advance this country when it comes to our energy security, our national security, and our economic security. But we need to be able to move forward with that.

So what we are able to do within this instruction, which is pretty wide open, is to focus on those areas where we might be able to see increased energy production that could bring us new wealth—that could create new wealth in this country.

I am going to be the first to agree that some of our options within this open instruction are better than others. Some will create jobs. Some may end jobs. Some will reduce energy costs as opposed to raising them. Some will increase our energy and mineral security as opposed to sacrifice or selling it off.

What I hope Members will do is look at this instruction as an opportunity to do something constructive for the country. The best example of that is to expand energy development in our Federal areas where we have seen decline in recent years.

I think we recognize that responsible development not only will reduce our immediate deficits, but it is about jobs and job creation. It is about wealth and wealth creation, about allowing us to build new wealth and create prosperity. It will help energy affordability for our families and businesses. That is something I hear about all the time. It will strengthen our national security and our competitiveness.

This is a point that needs to be emphasized over and over again. It is not only energy security, but it is national security. When we are dependent on other nations for our energy resources, there is an energy insecurity and vulnerability. We also realize energy production will ensure the type of growth

we need to finally begin reducing the Federal debt, which is now over \$20 trillion.

In short, what we will be able to do with this energy instruction is allow us to create new wealth. Why wouldn't that be something we would all embrace? I think the instruction will allow us to see some enduring benefits that will be felt all across our country. I think it is important to recognize and to state that this does not come at the expense of our environment. This is not an either/or proposition. Anyone familiar with modern development can recognize that as the scare tactic it is.

Senator SULLIVAN, my colleague from the State of Alaska, was on the floor earlier this morning, and he spoke to the outdated, stale arguments we have heard repeated on the floor and why we must reject them.

The amendment we have in front of us, 1301, simply strikes the section in the resolution that would provide for the Energy Committee instruction. The purpose perhaps takes it a little bit further in mentioning and bringing out the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR. There has been a lot of discussion on the floor about ANWR already.

Senator SULLIVAN, when he spoke earlier, spoke to the broader opportunities we have seen in the Arctic with Arctic development in general. I want to raise a few facts about ANWR more specifically, since it clearly has been put out there for discussion.

As an Alaskan, and one who has been part of these debates for many years now, not only on the Senate floor but in Alaska, we know what we are talking about when we discuss the issue of Arctic development. We know and understand what ANWR is, where the wilderness area is, and what the 1002 area is.

I think it is important to put it into context. ANWR is an area of 19.3 million acres. It is about the size of the State of South Carolina. Included in this ANWR area are 8 million acres of Federal wilderness. You have wilderness area, you have refuge area, but you have nonwilderness area designated as the 1002 area. That is this area on the coastal plain. This is an area of 1.5 million acres. Delaware is about 1.3 million acres. The 1002 area is what was specifically set aside under ANILCA that would allow for consideration for its oil and gas potential. When ANWR was established, it was recognized that there were areas that were appropriate for wilderness, and there were areas that were appropriate to be reviewed and considered for their exploration and production potential.

That is what we are talking about within the 1002 area. Even within this area that was specifically set aside, we are not asking to develop all of the 1002. We are asking to develop just 2,000 Federal acres within it, effectively one ten-thousandths of the refuge area.

You can't see it, but that little red dot is basically what we are talking about. We can say this. We can say we don't need to do more than 2,000 acres, in this 19.3 million-acre area that has been set aside specifically for oil and gas production, because of what has happened over the decades with regard to our technologies, how we have worked to reduce the footprint since Prudhoe Bay opened over 40 years ago. Well pads on the North Slope have shrunk by over 80 percent in these intervening years. We are talking now about pad areas that are 12 acres in size—10, 11, 12 acres in size.

We have reduced the footprint dramatically, but what we have expanded dramatically is the subsurface reach. The new technologies have allowed us to increase the ability to reach out under the surface to an area 125 square miles—125 miles. We have increased it by 4,000 percent, in the years we have been producing, exploring, and innovating up north, due to the technologies we use for exploration. Senator SULLIVAN showed the ice roads we use that reduce the impact on the surface and avoid the need for permanent roads.

We use forward looking infrared cameras to survey for polar bear dens so we can avoid them. There was actually a story just this spring about a polar bear that was denning. We found where she was by using the technologies that we know and literally working around where that polar bear was until she emerged from her den with her cub in the spring. It is working with the technologies we have to allow for the activity but with minimal disturbance to not only the land but to the wildlife there.

Caribou. We all know about the caribou in the North Slope area. What we have learned is that over the years, the caribou that occupy these areas have not suffered. In fact, they have thrived. When oil development first began, we were looking at herds in the numbers of about 5,000. Just this last year, the caribou herd is numbering about 22,000, and it has maintained steady and substantial levels.

When you understand what the 1002 area really is and what development would actually look like, it is not hard to understand why you have Alaskans' support. Over 70 percent of Alaskans support responsible development there.

I want to give you one of the best examples. Matthew Rexford is the president of Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation, KIC, which is a member of the Voice of the Arctic Inupiat. This is a group of community leaders from our North Slope. He wrote a great opinion piece not too long ago, explaining why he supports responsible development in the 1002 area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Matthew Rexford's op-ed.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, Oct. 2, 2017]

ALASKANS SAY YES TO DRILLING IN ANWR

(By Matthew Rexford)

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the largest wildlife refuge in America. Spanning more than 19 million acres, it's an area larger than 10 U.S. states. This vast expanse is home to caribou, fox, bears and other species. Much of that land is also home to the Native Inupiat, and our people have used the resources it has blessed us with for more than 10,000 years. One of those natural resources lies beneath this great land—oil and gas, and lots of it.

The debate over opening ANWR to drilling gained headway nationally in 1980, when President Jimmy Carter set aside less than 8 percent of the refuge for potential oil and gas development. This section of ANWR became known as the 1002 area, after a section of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

Since then, Alaskans and the oil and gas industry have fought unsuccessfully to open the 1002 area to drilling, which literally requires an act of Congress. At the same time, Lower 48 lawmakers, special interest groups across the country, folks and organizations around the world have waged war on the idea, citing the disruption of wildlife and the pristine Arctic environment.

As ANWR debates occur, the views of the Inupiat who call the area home are oftentimes left out. The wishes of the people who live in and around the refuge's coastal plain frequently are drowned out by people who live hundreds—even thousands—of miles away, many of whom have never bothered to set foot anywhere near the Arctic. Well, today is a new day.

Voice of the Arctic Inupiat, an organization with 21 members from across the Arctic Slope region, including members from Kaktovik located inside ANWR, have voted unanimously to pass a resolution supporting oil and gas development in the 1002 area. This is an unprecedented show of unity by community leaders of the North Slope—those who live in and around the coastal plain of the refuge—and should send a clear message to America that we support development of a portion of the coastal plain.

My fellow Inupiat and I firmly believe in a social license to operate, and perhaps no other potential project in the history of America has called for such a blessing from local indigenous peoples more than this one.

When oil was first discovered on our land in 1969, the Inupiat were worried of industry activities and fought hard for self-determination to protect our subsistence resources. So we fully understand the trepidation from outsiders: the fear that the presence of industry on the coastal plain of ANWR could disrupt wildlife and affect America's manufactured perspective of our land and culture.

However, we also have the benefit of decades of experience working with the oil and gas industry to implement stringent regulations to protect our lands, and the industry consistently has lived up to our standards. Prudhoe Bay, the largest oil field on the continent, located 60 miles west of the coastal plain of ANWR, has demonstrated for four decades that resource development and ecological preservation can coexist in the Arctic.

The oil and gas industry supports our communities by providing jobs, business opportunities and infrastructure investments, has

built our schools and hospitals, and has provided other basic services most Americans may take for granted. Our region recognizes its importance to our local and state economy, and we believe that development can be done responsibly in a portion of the 1002 area. We are not alone.

During the past 35 years, the Alaska Legislature has consistently passed resolution after resolution supporting the opening of ANWR to drilling. During that same time, each Alaska member of Congress and every Alaska governor has supported responsible development of the 1002 area.

More recently, in January, U.S. Sen. Lisa Murkowski introduced Senate Bill 49—the Alaska Oil and Gas Production Act—to allow development of 2,000 surface acres in the refuge's coastal plain. This legislation served as the catalyst for the Iñupiat people coming together to make an informed, united decision on whether or not to support drilling in ANWR.

As Iñupiat, we stand to be unarguably the most affected by oil and gas activity in the Arctic. Therefore, we have the greatest stake in seeing that any and all development keeps our land and subsistence resources safe. We know it can be done, because it's being done.

Now is the time to open ANWR to drilling.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. In part, Matthew states:

As ANWR debates occur, the views of the Iñupiat who call the area home are oftentimes left out. The wishes of the people who live in and around the refuge's coastal plain frequently are drowned out by people who live hundreds—even thousands—of miles away, many of whom have never bothered to set foot anywhere near the Arctic. Well, today is a new day.

He goes on to speak to the Voice of the Arctic Iñupiat, which has members from across the Arctic Slope who have voted unanimously to pass a resolution supporting oil and gas development in the 1002 area. He goes on further to state:

When oil was first discovered on our land in 1969, the Iñupiat were worried of industry activities and fought hard for self-determination to protect our subsistence resources. So we fully understand the trepidation from outsiders: the fear that the presence of industry on the coastal plain of ANWR could disrupt wildlife and affect America's manufactured perspective of our land and culture.

However, we also have the benefit of decades of experience working with the oil and gas industry to implement stringent regulations to protect our lands, and the industry consistently has lived up to our standards. Prudhoe Bay, the largest oil field on the continent, located 60 miles west of the coastal plain of ANWR, has demonstrated for four decades that resource development and ecological preservation can co-exist in the Arctic.

The oil and gas industry supports our communities by providing jobs, business opportunities and infrastructure investments, has built our schools and hospitals, and has provided other basic services most Americans may take for granted. Our region recognizes its importance to our local and state economy, and we believe that development can be done responsibly in a portion of the 1002 area. We are not alone.

I am with Matthew and a strong majority of Alaskans are. These are the voices we need to be listening to. My

answer on this discussion is yes. Opening the nonwilderness 1002 area to development is an option to meet the instructions to the Energy Committee, but it is not the only option. I will tell you, it is the best option, and it is on the table.

We should be clear, amendment No. 1301 is not a vote to open the 1002 area or to keep it closed. It is about whether this instruction should stay in the budget resolution, and it is about whether we are going to recognize the substantial benefits that await us or whether we are going to ignore our future energy needs and once again wind up in a situation where we see prices rising, families hurting, and everyone is wondering: Why didn't you act when you had a chance?

I think we all recognize that we are enjoying some benefits of lower energy prices, and some have suggested here: Hey, we are all fine. We don't need to do anything. A few have even said that because we are exporting oil now, we don't need to do more for ourselves here. It is truly an open invitation to ignore the supply side. That is just a bad idea. Quite honestly, we have been down that road before, and we know enough not to be in that place again.

The EIA, the Energy Information Administration, projects that in 2040, the world will be using more oil, not less. They project that our country will still be importing about 7 million barrels a day on a net basis. They project prices will be back above \$100 a barrel. There are other experts who are already pointing to other signs. The International Energy Agency recently found that "global oil supply could struggle to keep pace with demand after 2020, risking a sharp increase in prices, unless new projects are approved soon."

My point here is we have an opportunity. We have an opportunity not only to help America create jobs, to allow for opportunities not only in my home State but around the country, we have an opportunity to ensure a level of energy security while at the same time broadening this to enhance our national security.

So what I am asking my colleagues today is to not preempt this very important conversation. Give us a chance to consider this instruction within our committee. We will have an opportunity for hearings, and we will be able to put these options out on the table and understand more fully how we can do more when it comes to energy production in this country. Let the Energy and Natural Resources Committee do its part in helping. Let's not pull the plug even before we get going.

Given everything that we have heard here on the floor about strengthening our economy and protecting the middle class and making life better for people whom we serve, I think we really have to ask the very legitimate question: Why? Why would one leave energy out

of this debate? Why would we limit our opportunity to create new wealth in this country?

I would again urge the Senate to reject this amendment. It would deprive us of a substantial opportunity to benefit our country and ensure that we have great prospects and possibilities in front of us.

The Energy and Natural Resources Committee wanted to see this instruction in the budget resolution. I have every confidence that we can meet it, so I would urge Members to vote no on the motion to strike when that comes up later today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 1138 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I join my colleague from the State of Virginia, Senator WARNER, in offering an amendment that will prevent tax reform from ballooning our deficits.

The Republican budget, which we are currently considering, includes a troubling provision that would exempt a \$1.5 trillion tax reform bill from the important requirement that legislation that adds costs to the U.S. Government must be paid for rather than merely added to our deficit. This rule, well known to our colleagues, is one by which I am troubled to see a number of my longtime friends choose to ignore this time around—a rule long known in the Senate as the pay-as-you-go rule, or pay-go. It is an important rule that forces Congress to be responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars. It forces Congress to find ways to actually pay for new programs or find offsets for reductions in revenue rather than to add to our national debt. It is the right policy, and it has been in place for years. So it is, frankly, jarring that this budget document would include a provision that explicitly exempts a \$1.5 trillion tax reform bill from the pay-go rule.

Look, I agree that we need to work together toward a bipartisan tax reform bill, one that reduces taxes on the middle class and simplifies our overly complicated Tax Code, but we cannot simply pass a budget that allows Congress to put \$1.5 trillion more on the government's credit card, on our credit card.

I thank Senator WARNER for his long leadership on the need for fiscally responsible governing. Senator WARNER is a former Governor and a successful business leader, and he understands the importance of sound fiscal management and the danger that our national debt poses to our long-term economic prosperity. I am proud to work with him and to remind our colleagues of the Senate's longstanding support of pay-go. I encourage all Members, especially my Republican colleagues, to support this amendment.

Now, with the forbearance of my colleague, I will speak to one other amendment for a moment.

There is an amendment that I have introduced that I know may well not get a vote but that I wanted to speak to. It would ensure that, as we consider tax reform, we do not forget those who are the most in need of our assistance right now and in the future.

The United States was hit very hard by three hurricanes and many wildfires this year. In particular, Puerto Rico, a U.S. territory of 3.4 million people, was devastated by Hurricane Maria, which was wider than the entire island. It caused massive damage and is now resulting in a humanitarian crisis. Puerto Rico's 3.4 million people is several times more than live in my State of Delaware. It is about the size of Connecticut.

Once we get past this initial crisis and restore power, provide clean drinking water, get hospitals functioning, and ensure people have housing, then Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, the areas of Houston, TX, and Miami, FL, as well as areas affected by wildfires in all of these other parts of our country will have significant rebuilding needs.

We have representatives of the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Governor himself here on the Hill this week to clarify just how much more will be needed for the Marshall Plan-style investment to rebuild Puerto Rico. I am going to be advocating that we provide further support for folks from the Corporation for National and Community Service, AmeriCorps volunteers, and NCCC volunteers. Thousands of them have served in response to these emergencies. We are going to need investments in CDBGs for parks and for infrastructure.

Before I hand it over to my colleague from Virginia, I want to reference a second amendment that would prevent us from moving forward with tax reform until we first provide for the needs of Americans who have been affected by these disasters and emergencies. I wish we would take that up.

Let me close by thanking my colleague from Virginia for his long leadership on the issue of responsible fiscal management for our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me thank my friend, the Senator from Delaware, for his kind comments. More importantly, I thank him for his good work that he brings to the issue of fiscal responsibility. Before he served here in the Senate, he served as the head of one of the largest counties in Delaware. Whether you serve as a county chairman or as a Governor, you are used to the notion that you have to pay your bills. I very much appreciate his support for this amendment, that of keeping pay-go in place.

Let me also echo that I absolutely support his notion that the American citizens in Puerto Rico deserve not to be forgotten and deserve to receive the same attention we have bestowed upon Americans in Texas or in Florida or in Louisiana or elsewhere around our great country when they were victims of national disasters. I hope the Senator from Delaware gets a chance to submit his amendment.

While Puerto Rico is not receiving sufficient attention, there is another American territory nearby, the U.S. Virgin Islands, that also has those same kinds of challenges. If the Senator gets a chance to submit that amendment, I hope he will include the U.S. Virgin Islands in there as well.

Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1138, which I filed at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] proposes an amendment numbered 1138 to amendment No. 1116.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the Senate pay-as-you-go exemption for tax cut reconciliation legislation and the exception to rules preventing any legislation from increasing the deficit over the short-term)

On page 50, line 8, strike “, and” and all that follows through “ledger,” on line 9.

Beginning on page 50, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 51, line 3.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment to strike language in this budget resolution that would exempt the \$1.5 trillion tax reconciliation instructions from Senate rules that are meant to prevent this body from dramatically increasing our debts and deficits.

I know that everybody is coming back from lunch, and they probably feel pretty good and do not want to get indigestion, but remember, our country is sitting on top of a \$20 trillion debt at this point, an accumulation in which both parties have unclean hands.

In the years that I have been in this institution, I have worked with my Republican colleagues on issues that try to address debts and deficits, but there is the notion that we are about to take on a budget resolution this afternoon and start with the premise that the rules that are there to try to protect us from being fiscally irresponsible are going to be blown off at the outset. To say that we are going to start with \$1.5 trillion in the hole before we start counting is beyond irresponsible.

I thank my friend, the Senator from Delaware, for joining me in offering this amendment.

Mr. CORNYN. Will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. WARNER. I am pleased to yield to my friend, the Senator from Texas,

for a question as long as I still get a chance to finish my comments.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate that. And the Senator from Virginia is my friend. We work together closely on the Intelligence Committee on a number of matters.

I just want to ask a pretty basic question, which is whether the Senator from Virginia believes that it is possible to improve economic growth as a result of tax reform in such a way as it will close that \$1.5 trillion gap that he is so concerned about. Some economists—ones who I believe are people we can depend on—have suggested that as much as a four-tenths of 1 percent increase in our GDP will essentially improve our economy to the point at which that gap will close to zero, and we will actually see true deficit reduction.

Does the Senator agree with that or disagree?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his comment.

Let me say where I might agree with some of Senator CORNYN's principles. I believe that we need a more simplified Tax Code. I believe that a goal of our Tax Code ought to put American business on a competitive basis with those of other countries around the world. I believe, as well, that to do that, one of the goals of tax reform ought to be to lower corporate rates. I will point out, though, three quick things so that I may get back to finishing my comments.

One, let's actually look at where America's tax burden stands versus those of other nations that actually have lower corporate tax rates, for example. Out of the 34 OECD nations—35 now—if you were to listen to some folks on this floor, you would think that America must rank at the top of that list, but we are 31 out of 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. CORNYN. Thank you, Mr. President. We will continue our conversation.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, since I had a few moments and I was trying to give courtesy to answer my colleague, for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Just to clarify, is the request for an additional 5 minutes of debate?

Mr. WARNER. Five minutes to answer the Senator's question and to make my very short statement.

Mr. CORNYN. I object to any additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

All time has expired. The time was until 2 p.m.

Mr. WARNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeben	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Cochran

Menendez

The amendment (No. 1138) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I came to the floor today in support of the budget resolution for one reason. It is because it provides the Senate a path forward on tax reform. I strongly support this effort to fix America's burdensome tax system. It is my hope that reform will lead to simplifying the Tax Code, strengthening the middle class, and ultimately boosting our economy.

Unfortunately, I cannot offer my support without reservation, so I have

come to the floor today to explain my concerns and remind my colleagues of the important work ahead of us. Even as we support this resolution as a means to achieve meaningful tax reform, we must acknowledge the fact that the underlying budget contains an insufficient level of funding for national defense. As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, my highest priority is to ensure that our men and women serving in uniform have the training, equipment, and resources they need to keep our Nation safe.

The Senate budget resolution will set fiscal year 2018 defense spending at the levels dictated by the Budget Control Act cap. This budget is \$54 billion less than the President's request and \$86 billion less than this body authorized just last month in the National Defense Authorization Act. We passed the National Defense Authorization Act by a vote of 89 to 9, a demonstration of the overwhelming bipartisan belief that the Budget Control Act level of defense spending is inadequate and unacceptable.

Let me be clear. There is no BCA-level defense budget that would be sufficient to provide our military with what they need to fulfill current missions and prepare for future threats.

For those of us who have been paying attention, we heard the warnings of the steady decline of our military. Time and again our senior military and civilian defense leaders have sounded the alarm about the dangers of the Budget Control Act spending caps. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our highest uniformed military officer, General Dunford, has warned that if we continue on the current path, he assesses that "within 5 years, we will lose our ability to project power; the basis of how we defend the homeland, and advance U.S. interests, and meet our alliance commitments."

Make no mistake about what that means. America's military advantage is degrading. Without the ability to project power, the United States will no longer be a global power. That means that we put at risk not only our ability to secure our interests and protect our Nation but also the unprecedented era of security and prosperity that American global leadership has provided the world.

I might add for the benefit of my colleagues that former President George W. Bush today gave a very strong statement emphasizing this problem and the challenge we face. This is the strategic reality we are facing in the next 5 years. It should not be a surprise. We have seen the steady degradation of the military. The strain of constant operational tempo, combined with inadequate and unstable funding has, over the past 16 years, worn down the greatest military in the world.

Just this week, Secretary of Defense Mattis sent a letter to the Armed Serv-

ices Committee expressing his concerns with regard to the National Defense Authorization Act that we are currently negotiating with the House. The very first thing he said before addressing any of the policy changes and reforms in the bill is that his primary concern is the Budget Control Act, and we know why—because the defense spending caps are doing such immense harms to our military. Secretary Mattis wrote:

As I have testified before your committee, no enemy has done more to harm the warfighting readiness of our military than sequestration.

I will repeat that for the benefit of my colleagues.

... no enemy has done more to harm the warfighting readiness of our military than sequestration. Current caps continue to unnecessarily defer critical maintenance, limit aviation availability, delay modernization, and strain our men and women in uniform.

We have seen the evidence of this harm. Over the last few months there have been a rash of training accidents, collisions, and crashes. We are seeing the tragic accidents in the news far too often.

Seven sailors were killed when the USS *Fitzgerald* collided with a container ship off the coast of Japan.

A Marine KC-130 crash in Mississippi killed all 16 troops on board.

An Osprey helicopter crashed off the coast of Australia and that resulted in the deaths of three marines.

An Army helicopter crashed off the coast of Hawaii, with five soldiers presumed dead.

Ten sailors perished when the USS *McCain* collided with a tanker near Singapore.

An Army Black Hawk helicopter went down during a training mission off the coast of Yemen, and one soldier died.

One soldier died during helicopter training at Fort Hood.

An amphibious vehicle explosion at Camp Pendleton injured 15 Americans.

A demolition accident in Fort Bragg killed one soldier and injured seven others.

Two Navy pilots died in a T-45 crash in Tennessee.

My friends, we are now losing more of our men and women in uniform in totally avoidable training accidents than we are in combat. There is plenty of blame to go around for all of these incidents, but we cannot ignore the fact that Congress's inability to provide adequate, stable, and predictable budgeting has contributed to the troubling state of affairs. While increased funding is not the only answer, there is no scenario where our military can get healthy and ready to meet the challenges of an increasingly unstable world without additional resources. There is broad, bipartisan agreement about that from Members of the House of Representatives, here in the Senate,

and the President. Yet we are about to vote for a budget resolution that severely underfunds the military because the reality is that we all know that it would not impact the actual appropriations. To solve these problems and to fulfill our duty to the men and women in uniform we must negotiate a bipartisan budget agreement that will lift the caps on defense spending. Only then can we rebuild the military, reverse the disturbing readiness crisis, and retain our ability to project power and secure our interests around the world.

I remind my colleagues that the fiscal year started 3 weeks ago and that the Defense Department is currently operating under a continuing resolution. We know the harmful effects it will have on the military. That is why getting to work on a budget deal is so urgent. We must delay no longer.

The budget resolution is not meant to provide that broader budget agreement. This budget resolution is simply a means to get us to tax reform. However, this budget resolution does represent something extremely troubling. The Republican Party used to be unified in its support for a strong national defense. If our leaders in Congress and the White House don't immediately get to work negotiating a deal to lift the defense caps and fund the military at a higher level than in this budget resolution, I am not sure we will be able to claim that mantle any longer.

I just want to sum up by saying that we have a problem in the military today, and that is, whenever there are cuts in defense spending, the first thing that goes are the easy ones—the training, readiness, the spare parts, the flying hours. Those are the ones that get cut first because they are the easiest. Cutting a major weapons system or program is extremely difficult.

So now we have this list, as I just read off, of men and women serving in the military and we are responsible, at least partially, for their death and injury. Why? Because they are not able to be trained. They are not able to be equipped. They are not able to be maintained, and 60 percent of the F-18s are not able to fly. We have sailors and airmen who are working 100-hour workweeks. We have gigantic problems with the ability to simply operate.

Meanwhile, our adversaries are stepping up their capabilities. Obviously, every time we turn around there is another crisis of some kind. Look at the world 8 years ago and look at the world today. You will find an incredible deterioration of America's position and influence in the world. The front page of the Economist magazine this week has a picture of the dictator of China and the title is "The world's most powerful man," and it is true.

So here we are with a budget resolution that basically has cut our military—that is basically not funding

what we need. My friends, I do not mean to get emotional, but why should we send these young men and women in uniform in harm's way without all they need in order to fight and defend this Nation? Right now, they are not ready. Right now, their planes can't fly. Right now, they are not able to operate and train. They are not ready, and that is not just MCCAIN's word. That is our military leaders' words and those of some of the most respected people in America and in the world. General Mattis, General McMaster, and General Kelly will all tell you the same thing.

We are sending our young men and women into hazardous situations without their being completely equipped and capable of defending themselves. That is wrong. What greater responsibility do we have than to the men and women who are serving us in uniform today? Four just died in Niger. How many of the 100 Members of this body knew that we even had an operation in Niger? I will not go into the details, in deference to the family, but this is wrong, what we are doing. We saw it in the 1970s, and now we are seeing it again. It was Mark Twain who said: "History doesn't repeat itself, but it often rhymes." It is beginning to rhyme, and if we don't, with this resolution that we are going through, increase our spending to the level as authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act, then we will bear some responsibility for what happens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, later today the majority is going to attempt to pass a budget for 2018. Passing a budget has come to mean all sorts of things in Congress these days. Last year's budget was an attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This budget is supposedly all about tax reform. However, a budget, first and foremost, should be a statement about priorities for the coming year and for the coming decade.

Let's take a moment and examine what this budget says about the majority's priorities. With any budget, I think you need to look at the end result and ask a couple of very simple questions.

First, does this budget help reduce Federal deficits and debt with a responsible, sensible approach? Second, does this budget, ultimately, put us on a sustainable fiscal path?

The answer to these questions is a clear no. Instead, this budget is primarily intended to allow the majority to use an expedited procedure to move tax breaks that would increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion over the next decade.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say that this lost revenue is offset by spending cuts and promises

of new revenues from economic growth far beyond what almost every single mainstream economist predicts.

Let's look at the trillions in cuts that the majority is proposing. Where the budget is specific, it is bad. Medicaid is cut by \$1 trillion. Medicare, which provides essential healthcare services to our seniors, is cut by \$470 billion. On top of that, the budget includes over \$3 trillion in unspecified cuts.

You don't have to be an expert in the Federal budget to know that \$3 trillion in unspecified cuts means one of two things. They are either, No. 1, cuts to programs that families and communities rely on, like Head Start, Pell grants, and transportation funding, or, No. 2, they are unspecified because they are simply never going to happen.

That is what we are voting on today. There is nearly \$1.5 trillion in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, and then there are trillions in cuts that are either so unpopular that no one dares name what they are or trillions more in deficits because there is not a plan.

The Federal budget is about choices. You can learn a lot about which choices a budget puts in black and white and which are left deliberately unspecified. When it comes to the majority's tax plan, we know only a few details, but we know enough to see where there will be winners and where there will be losers. The winners will be the wealthiest Americans in our country and global corporations.

We also need to look at what it means for Michigan families and small businesses, but there is a deliberate lack of detail that makes figuring out what the bottom line is for working families impossible. We don't know where the tax brackets will start and where they will stop. We don't know what personal exemptions families will be able to take. We don't know the size and the scope of the child tax credit. We don't know if important incentives for charitable contributions will be kept. The majority is even keeping open the possibility of raising taxes on Americans who are trying to save for their retirement.

This budget should be straightforward. We should reduce the tax burden on middle class families. We should make it simpler for Americans to file and understand their taxes. We should make it easier for them to save for retirement. We should increase take-home pay for Americans that work hard each and every day to make a living.

Unfortunately, none of these details that are important for middle-class folks were important enough to include in this budget. That is why I will vote against it. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

We cannot add another \$1.5 trillion to the deficit. We cannot slash Medicare and Medicaid. This is simply the wrong direction for our country.

So why are we moving forward with this budget at all? Well, on this issue, I think the administration has been clear. Passing this budget is all about passing a so-called tax reform bill. However, passing this budget is not a requirement for passing tax reform. Passing this budget is only a requirement to pass a tax bill with as few votes as possible—without input or buy-in from Members of the minority. This is not the way we should pass real tax reform. If tax reform is going to be successful, it must have broad bipartisan input. I stand ready to work with my colleagues on real tax reform.

Modernizing and streamlining our Tax Code can boost Michigan businesses, raise take-home pay for workers across sectors, and help create the type of 21st century economy we need.

We can make it easier for small businesses, including manufacturers and family farms, to invest in themselves, and we can make the code fair across sectors. We can establish incentives for smart investment in our communities. We can implement strong, enforceable rules to prevent companies from gaming our tax system and moving profits and jobs overseas.

For families, we can meaningfully boost take-home pay. We can expand the child tax credit and earned-income tax credit, and we can work together to find real ways to help alleviate the cost of child care. We can lessen the burden of student debt, and we can help people save for retirement.

Tax reform can help create more good jobs right here at home, fix some of the issues in the code that drive jobs and companies overseas, and put more money in the pockets of working families.

In 1986, Congress passed the most dramatic reform of the Federal Tax Code in modern history. How many votes did this sweeping overhaul of the tax system get? When tax reform ultimately passed the Senate in 1986, it received 97 votes.

If we want to repeat that accomplishment and truly overhaul our code to make it work better for American families and American businesses, that level of bipartisanship should be our goal, not 50 or 51.

I know we can do these things in a truly bipartisan manner if we are just given the chance. Let's work together to pass real tax reform with broad support from both sides of the aisle. The American people deserve nothing less.

I stand ready to work with the majority, and so do my colleagues. I urge the majority to abandon this effort and start over. Make the decision not to add trillions more to the deficit. Make the decision not to cut Medicare and Medicaid for Americans in need. Start over. Let's find a path forward to find real, lasting, bipartisan solutions.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, budget resolutions set general spending prior-

ities for the Federal Government. The budget resolution before us today, however, sets a path for so-called tax reform that will benefit the wealthiest among us on the backs of hard-working Americans. For all their talk of reining in spending and reducing the debt, the majority is promoting a budget that will explode the debt by \$1.5 trillion. They propose increasing the debt not to invest in our infrastructure or in educating the next generation. They propose increasing the debt not to expand access to healthcare or promote medical research. No—they propose exploding the debt to give corporations and the top one percent a tax cut. Once again, they majority is turning away from the bipartisan traditions of this Senate and toward the hyperpartisan tactics that do not result in progress for the American people.

This budget invests in millionaires and billionaires like the Trump family, the Koch brothers, wealthy corporations, and the top 1 percent. It turns its back on millions of hard-working American families. While the resolution authorizes a \$1.5 trillion increase in the debt, independent experts calculate that the real cost of the Trump tax plan will far exceed that amount. How will the majority pay for the difference? It will slash Medicaid, a proposal already rejected by the Senate this year. It will slash Medicare. It will slash programs for veterans and infrastructure.

It will be middle-class Americans who bear the brunt of these cuts. According to independent analysts, middle-class Americans will see their home values drop and will experience a tax increase as a result of the Trump tax plan. This shameful budget sends the message that the Senate supports putting tax cuts for the wealthy and biggest corporations on our Nation's credit card and, to the extent we pay for any of it, that we do so on the backs of the middle class and seniors and at the expense of protecting the environment. This budget proposes invading the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. These are not Vermont values. These are not American values. This is not how our Nation became the greatest country on Earth.

After years of claiming that the deficit is one of the greatest threats to our country, the majority today will waive away any concern about the long-term impact of increasing it. They argue that the economic growth spurred by these tax cuts will outpace the foregone revenue, but as we saw with the Bush tax cuts, this claim is simply not based in reality. This argument is based on a pyramid scheme of assumptions on top of assumptions, and while we should be taking a close look at the Congressional Budget Office's projections—a range of both dynamic and conventional scores—this budget resolution eliminates the only

existing mechanism that requires the Senate to have a CBO estimate in advance of a vote. Why might the majority want to rush a vote before examining the long-term economic impacts of these proposed tax cuts?

Our Tax Code is complex—very much, overly complex—and I share the view that it is in need of improvement and simplification. We can and should have a meaningful debate about tax reform, but any reforms must be certain to benefit middle-class Americans, not just the top 1 percent. We need to strengthen tax credits that promote community development and the construction of affordable housing. We should extend and make permanent tax credits that help those who are struggling to make ends meet. I am in favor of bipartisan tax reform that brings both parties together and results in balanced changes to the current system. That is in the best tradition of the Senate, and it is the path to enacting truly meaningful reforms that will benefit every single American.

The Senate should reject this partisan effort, just as it rejected last month the unsuccessful partisan efforts to roll back health coverage for millions of Americans. We should—and can—work together to craft a balanced and sustainable budget and tax reform package. No package will be perfect, but it should be bipartisan. It should be fair. The budget before us today fails to meet that test, which is why I will oppose it.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, last week, people across this country celebrated National Wildlife Refuge Week—and rightfully so. National Wildlife Refuges are one of the crown jewels of our Federal public lands network. These refuges provide essential habitat for some of our most imperiled species, including many impacted by climate change. Millions of refuge visitors also fuel local and regional economies by generating billions of dollars in sales.

This week, the Senate is considering a budget resolution that would open one of our refuges, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, to oil and gas drilling. Despite tremendous public support for our refuge system and the economic benefits that the refuges bring to our local economies, efforts to develop these special wild areas are ongoing and have been championed by the current administration. The budget resolution is another such effort to promote development in a refuge, an effort that should be rejected. In some cases, refuges are compatible with development and increased human activity. In others, development decisions, such as the siting of oil and gas drilling, could negatively impact the future of both human and animal inhabitants.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of the largest remaining intact ecosystems in the world, is an example

of the latter. The Refuge has been home to the Gwich'in people for more than 20,000 years. These Native people subsist primarily on caribou. Research shows that oil and gas development in the Refuge, even with a small footprint, could significantly alter Porcupine Caribou migration patterns and calving behavior. These changes would threaten the Gwich'in people's way of life. The U.S. 30-year-old treaty with Canada to conserve the Porcupine Caribou Herd could also be at risk.

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Arctic Refuge is the only national conservation area where polar bears regularly den. It is the most consistently used polar bear land denning area in Alaska. These iconic bears are increasingly vulnerable due to climate change, so the undisturbed Refuge land denning area is especially critical for their survival. The Refuge also hosts nearly 200 species of migratory birds, musk oxen, and wolves.

As the Senate contemplates the future of this spectacular natural area, I want to remind my colleagues that this body has said no to opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge dozens of times. With oil prices significantly lower than they were earlier this decade and oil supplies at historic highs, it is hard to understand why we would change course now. The risks far outweigh any benefits, and the American public has consistently opposed drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

I also want to express my strong concerns with possible pending administrative action in the Santa Ana National Wildlife Refuge, another national treasure. This Refuge is located on the U.S.-Mexico border, along the southernmost stretch of the Rio Grande River at the confluence of the Central and Mississippi flyways. It is home to more than 400 bird species, more than 300 species of butterflies, and more than 450 varieties of plants.

The Santa Ana Refuge supports rare wildlife species, some found only deep in south Texas. The Refuge also provides habitat for at least eight species protected under the Endangered Species Act, including the ocelot. There are less than 50 ocelots left in the United States, so this Refuge is essential to the species' recovery.

The Santa Ana Refuge is also a popular destination for birders and hosts more than 165,000 visitors each year. The booming ecotourism industry in the area is critical for local economies, which is another key reason why we need to ensure this Refuge and its inhabitants can thrive.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers planning actions earlier this year suggest that the Trump administration may shift existing Federal Homeland Security funds to construct a segment of-border wall through the Santa Ana Refuge.

As I have said before, we already have 650 miles of fencing along our southern border with Mexico in the areas where it is most effective. I am not unequivocally opposed to physical barriers where they are needed and where they can be shown to be the most effective method of border security, but the Santa Ana Refuge is not a known problem area for border crossing. Furthermore, a wall through the Refuge would permanently damage critical habitat, block wildlife migration routes, and would likely trap wildlife during floods.

Again, a wall through the refuge would not yield intended outcomes and would harm both wildlife and communities. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to question and oppose construction of this wall segment.

From Alaska to Texas to Delaware, our National Wildlife Refuge System is well worth protecting and preserving for future generations. I look forward to continued work with my colleagues and constituents to this end.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1178, 1139, 1205, 1228, 1422, 1234, AND 1249 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc and reported by number: Flake No. 1178, Baldwin No. 1139, Rubio No. 1205, Heitkamp No. 1228, Portman No. 1422, Donnelly No. 1234, and Kaine No. 1249.

I further ask consent that at 3 p.m., all time on the resolution be yielded back and the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed; that there be no second-degree amendments in order to these seven amendments prior to the votes; finally, that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the managers or their designees prior to each vote and that all votes after the first in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for others, proposes amendments numbered 1178, 1139, 1205, 1228, 1422, 1234, and 1249 to amendment No. 1116.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1178

(Purpose: To make the American tax system simpler and fairer)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAKING THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM SIMPLER AND FAIRER FOR ALL AMERICANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the

pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include provisions to make the American tax system simpler and fairer for all Americans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1139

(Purpose: To prohibit reconciliation legislation that would increase the deficit or reduce a surplus)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT OR REDUCE A SURPLUS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill, resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, motion, or conference report pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 641) that would cause or increase a deficit or reduce a surplus in either of the following periods:

(1) The period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year.

(2) The period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of deficit increases and reductions in a surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 1205

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to tax cuts for working American families)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX CUTS FOR WORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing per-child Federal tax relief, which may include amending the child tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1228

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would increase taxes on taxpayers whose annual income is below \$250,000)

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RAISING TAXES ON TAXPAYERS WHOSE ANNUAL INCOME IS BELOW \$250,000.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that raises taxes on taxpayers whose annual income is below \$250,000.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 1422

(Purpose: To provide for an international tax system that provides or enhances incentives for businesses to invest in America, generate American jobs, retain American jobs, and return jobs to America)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESSES TO INVEST IN AMERICA AND CREATE JOBS IN AMERICA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in federal tax laws, which may include international tax provisions that provide or enhance incentives for businesses to invest in America, generate American jobs, retain American jobs, and return jobs to America, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1234

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that allows companies that have outsourced jobs to foreign countries to benefit from any tax breaks)

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL ALLOWING COMPANIES THAT HAVE OUTSOURCED JOBS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO BENEFIT FROM ANY TAX BREAKS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that permits companies which have outsourced jobs to foreign countries to benefit from any tax breaks.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 1249

(Purpose: To modify section 4111 to reinstate and strengthen a prohibition on voting on legislation without a Congressional Budget Office score)

On page 83, strike lines 12 through 15, and insert the following:

SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.

Section 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

SEC. 4112. PROHIBITION ON AGREEING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION WITHOUT A SCORE IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to vote on the adoption of a covered amendment to a bill or resolution that requires an estimate under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653), unless an estimate described in such section 402 for the covered amendment was made publicly available on the website of the Congressional Budget Office not later than 28 hours before the time the vote commences.

(b) COVERED AMENDMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered amendment” means an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

Mr. ENZI. For the information of all Senators, these are the first seven amendments we will consider during vote-arama, and we will work to get an agreement on a final list of amendments during these votes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I think I am the only one standing between this body and a vote on something that 2 years ago I didn't know existed, and that is a “vote-arama” in local Senate terms. Being an outsider to the political process, I find a lot of this very strange.

I came to Washington, and now I have a new vocabulary. It includes things like “scoring,” which doesn't have anything to do with sports, “vote-arama,” which doesn't have anything to do with the carnival down the road, or “deficit-neutral reserve fund.” I am still trying to figure out what that is; I see the Presiding Officer is smiling up there. Then there are “points of order.” There is a vocabulary centered around what we are going to be doing this afternoon, but I want to speak to the budget process itself.

First of all, I want to be very clear with my colleagues on both sides. I support this budget that we are going to vote on today for one very strong reason. It is a vehicle to get to tax reform in the United States. I will not speak on taxes today in the few minutes that I have, but I do want to speak about the process.

What we are doing in America right now in the Senate and the Congress—and what we have been doing over the last 43 years—is losing the right to do the right thing. Let me say that again. We are losing the right to do the right thing.

Just a few weeks ago, we voted without batting an eye for \$15 billion of allocated funds for the victims of two hurricanes in Florida, Texas, and other southern States, with every dime of that money in borrowed money. We have to go to China and other places and borrow that money so we can spend and do the right thing. That is not an embellishment or an exaggeration.

What about research for the rising, spiraling cost of our healthcare, driven by Alzheimer's, cancer, and diabetes? We spend about the same amount of money on that as we spend on all foreign aid. Yet, if we were to do more, we could cure those heinous diseases and lower our medical costs. We can invest in our infrastructure. We can absolutely take care of victims of wildfires, and now we have Puerto Rico.

Tonight we are going to be asked to vote up or down on a supplemental bill for some \$30 billion-plus for the needs of these catastrophes. We have lost the right to do the right thing, which is, of course, to meet those needs.

Here is the biggest one. You just heard my great colleague, Senator MCCAIN from Arizona. He is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member. He talked about how decimated our military is from a funding standpoint. He talked about readiness. He talked about capitalization. But today, we are borrowing every dime we spend on our military, on our veterans, and on every domestic discretionary program in the United States. That is a fact. Where do we get the money when we run out of our own money? We spend every dime of our own. By the way, we collected over \$3.5 trillion of Federal tax revenue last year. It is the largest amount America has ever collected in income taxes and total taxes for the Federal Government—the most we have ever collected—but all of that money goes to mandatory expenses.

As a matter of fact, since 2000, under one Republican President and one Democratic President, our government has grown from \$2.4 trillion to \$4 trillion. That is not the worst of it. The worst is yet to come. We have added in two Presidencies \$14 trillion to our Federal debt. Of our \$20 trillion, \$14 trillion of it was added under these two Presidents.

In the next 10 years, the current budget under which we are working will add another \$11 trillion to our debt.

Here is the problem. The blue line here is what you heard Senator MCCAIN talk about earlier. That is our discretionary spending. It is flat. As a matter

of fact, between 2009 and today, we have lowered discretionary spending by over one-third, by \$400 billion. But what has happened is that our mandatory expenses have exploded.

On this chart, this line here, are our mandatory expenses; that is, Social Security, Medicare, pension and benefits for Federal employees, and the interest on our debt. This is a formula for financial disaster.

At this point, we already have \$20 trillion of debt. Over the next 30 years, some estimates say that we will have over \$130 trillion of future commitments, liabilities coming at us like a freight train.

We are hamstrung because we have a budget process that doesn't work. One thing that contributes to this is a process that over the last 43 years, since the 1974 Budget Act was put in place, which created this budget process, the budget has worked only four times in 43 years. It has funded the Federal Government only four times. That is not a partisan comment; that is an indictment on this body and on the body across the hall.

In any other environment—sports, medicine, business, military—imagine if you had a process that worked only four times. Imagine if you had a tank in World War II, and you are over there, and every 43 times you fired it, it worked only four times. Imagine what result would be.

What we have here is a system that doesn't work. I am going to try to explain that very quickly.

First, we have committees in the U.S. Senate that involve themselves in appropriations and the funding of the Federal Government. Some are called authorizing committees. These are committees like the Foreign Relations Committee; we have Appropriations. We have all of these authorizing committees over here on the left. On the right here are Appropriations Committees. Today, these committees have to pass 12 bills in order to fund the Federal Government.

Over the last 43 years, out of the 12 bills we have to appropriate to fund the government, we have averaged only 2½ bills. In any other world, that can't work. It doesn't work here. So we end up with 179 continuing resolutions to get us past the end of our fiscal year to continue spending at last year's rate, and then we go to an "omnibus"—another new term that I had never heard of—at the end of the calendar year. Basically, most times, six or eight people will get in a room and decide how to spend \$1 trillion. This current budget deals with, primarily, issues that are not on the mandatory side.

There is a way forward. There are Members on the other side—and I am going to call out one—my good friend from the State of Rhode Island. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I and others have been working on this for quite some

time. He has a great idea: Let's pick a point in the future, make the debt a percentage of our GDP, and work backward from there with guardrails on what we can do every year.

There is a budget process we have been working on that creates a politically neutral platform that allows both sides, in a bipartisan way, to argue and fight over what we think the budget should include, because we believe the budget should be a law.

Today, the budget is only a resolution, which means it is nothing but a political statement by the majority party.

We then go to an authorizing process where the minority party, because they weren't asked to play in the budget process—we have an authorizing process in which, today, we have over \$300 billion of Federal expenditures a year that are not authorized, over \$300 billion.

Then we are supposed to go to an appropriations process. As I have just said, we have appropriated, on average, over those 43 years, only 2½ bills a year instead of 12.

We can fix this. It is not a partisan issue. We will absolutely fix this budget process in a bipartisan way. I am going to vote for this. I hope my colleagues will vote for this budget bill so we can go on and debate taxes.

The debt crisis is the No. 1 crisis we face in our country. It keeps us from doing the right thing—funding our national defense and taking care of our needs.

I will support this budget today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LIEUTENANT PATRICK L. RUTH

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, this is not about the budget, but it is about something that all of us can, unfortunately, understand the importance of.

On Sunday, October 1, U.S. naval aviation instructor, LT Patrick L. Ruth, and student naval aviator, LTJG Wallace Burch, were both killed when their Goshawk training jet crashed in Tellico Plains, TN. Lieutenant Ruth was a native of Louisiana, growing up in Metairie. Lieutenant Ruth served in the Navy for 9 years, beginning his career in the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps at Tulane University. He was commissioned in May of 2008. After flight training, he joined Carrier Airborne Early Warning Squadron 126, based in Norfolk, VA, in 2012.

Lieutenant Ruth flew the E-2C Hawkeye as part of the tactical air

forces of the U.S. Navy. His primary mission was early warning defense of the carrier battle group, as well as air strike control, ocean surveillance, and search and rescue coordination.

In April 2015, he moved to Naval Training Squadron 7, based in Meridian, MS.

As an instructor, Lieutenant Ruth trained the next generation of naval aviators in strike aviation, basic aircraft maneuvering, and landing skills.

Lieutenant Ruth was a dedicated naval aviator. As evidence, he earned two Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medals during his distinguished career.

Our brave men and women in uniform take extreme risks every day to defend our Nation. The risks are necessary, made to ensure that our military is fully prepared to face any threat. We are forever grateful for Lieutenant Ruth and those who answer the call of duty to keep us safe.

We must also think of the incredible sacrifices of Lieutenant Ruth's family and all military families. They may not be wearing uniforms, but they, too, serve our country.

I had the privilege of speaking with Lieutenant Ruth's family. I learned that his younger brother Shane is Active Duty Navy. His older brother is retired Navy. His sisters were, and are, so supportive.

Lieutenant Ruth's parents, David and Mary Ann Ruth, still grieve. How could any parent not?

But to borrow from President Lincoln's letter to a grieving mother:

I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Lieutenant Ruth is survived by his parents, David and Mary; his fiancée, Jessica; and his four siblings. We grieve with you. You are in our prayers.

Lieutenant Patrick Ruth will not be forgotten.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time on the resolution is yielded back.

AMENDMENT NO. 1178

There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Flake amendment No. 1178.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, this amendment would set up a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to making the American tax system simpler and fairer for all Americans.

Not only do we need to do tax reform, but we need to do it urgently. It has been more than 30 years since we have reformed the Tax Code in any significant way. We have more preferences and loopholes and deductions out there than we know what to do with. In fact, if we total all of them together, there

are more expenditures in the Tax Code, or money avoiding coming to Washington—tax avoidance—than we spend on our entire discretionary budget. It is about \$1.26 trillion annually.

So we have to have a code where we lower the rates and broaden the base. Broadening the base means going after some of these popular loopholes and deductions and preferences that make the Tax Code a lot bigger and scarier and more complicated than it should be.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, we yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1178.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Brown	Heinrich	Rounds
Burr	Heitkamp	Rubio
Cantwell	Heller	Sanders
Capito	Hirono	Sasse
Cardin	Hoeven	Schatz
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Isakson	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corker	King	Strange
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Leahy	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCain	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	
Flake	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

Cochran Menendez

The amendment (No. 1178) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1139

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Baldwin amendment No. 1139.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak to Baldwin amendment No. 1139. Wisconsin families need a tax break, and that is what I am working for. This budget will fast-track enormous tax breaks for the wealthiest few. It increases the deficit and puts Medicare and Medicaid on the chopping block to pay for it.

I don't think it is right to ask the middle class to pay for tax breaks for the top 1 percent with cuts to Medicare and Medicaid and rising deficits—deficits that will surely be used by my Republican colleagues to continue to justify an unwillingness to invest in the essential pillars of economic security for families.

The entire reason reconciliation was created was for deficit reduction, which the majority claims to care so much about. My amendment is very simple. It would reinstate a point of order, known as the Conrad rule, against reconciliation legislation that increases the deficit. Let's not use reconciliation to add to our deficit.

I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment that has been cosponsored by Senators WARNER, WHITEHOUSE, KAINE, COONS, KING, WYDEN, and VAN HOLLEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, which would create an uneven playing field for the upcoming congressional reconciliation. If adopted, this amendment would reinstate a point of order from the fiscal year 2008 budget resolution, which Congress repealed 2 years ago. It was repealed to ensure equal treatment of all reconciliation bills by restoring the level playing field that had existed prior to the adoption of the point of order in 2008. That was used under the Byrd rule.

The Byrd rule specifically does not require such budget neutrality inside the budget window. Why? Because reconciliation was designed to be neutral in its orientation. The Budget Act states that reconciliation instructions must enumerate changes in spending and revenue amounts. It does not stipulate those changes must be increases or decreases.

The fiscal year 2016 budget resolution restored the longstanding neutrality principle of the Byrd rule. It was the right thing to do then, and we should reaffirm that position today. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 230 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Cochran Menendez

The amendment (No. 1139) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1205

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Rubio amendment No. 1205.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the child tax credit. It is abundantly clear that perhaps one of the most effective ways to deliver tax relief—tax cuts—to working families is through the expansion of this credit, as it is our hope to achieve during tax reform.

I think it is important to point out that the U.S. Department of Agriculture compiles data on how much it costs to raise children in the 21st century. Today, it is expected that middle-income families are going to spend \$230,000 to raise their children. By the way, that does not include the cost of their going to college.

Being able to deliver relief to hard-working families through the expansion of the child tax credit, which is applicable not just against income tax but payroll tax, is perhaps the single most effective way to do that given the framework under which we will be working. That is what this amendment intends to reserve the opportunity to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise not in opposition to the amendment but to compliment the Senator for bringing this issue forward. I intend to support the amendment, but I just want to make the point that this is a broader issue in that we are going to have to address the child and dependent tax credit.

One of issues is making it refundable so the tax credit is available and useful to lower income families, who are the hardest hit by high child care costs, and also making it available to those families who use these funds to care for perhaps an aged relative or an injured relative.

I agree with the amendment, and I support it, but I think we need to make the point that there is more work to be done. I have introduced a bill with Senator HELLER, Senator BURR, and Senator COLLINS on this subject, and I look forward to bringing that forward for consideration at an appropriate moment.

I urge support for Senator RUBIO's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend debate by 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment.

This would correct a great defect in our Tax Code—the parent tax penalty. We have been punishing parents for decades because of the way our Federal tax system and our senior entitlement programs—Social Security and Medicare—interact. We have to end this tyranny and end this now. This amendment does that, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1205) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1228

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Heitkamp amendment No. 1228.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, as we move forward on tax reform, I think the one great potential for absolute

agreement is that we should lower the burden for middle-income taxpayers, and as we move forward, the one thing we absolutely should not do is in any way increase the tax burden for middle-income taxpayers. This amendment is about guaranteeing that no one who makes under \$250,000 sees his taxes increase in any kind of legislation, including in any tax reform proposal.

I have heard from teachers, nurses, and veterans. They all want to know what this means for them. To guarantee people an absolute bright line that their taxes will not go up is absolutely essential as we move forward.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, again, this is another attempt to do the Finance Committee's work as part of the budget. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The amendment would inappropriately bind the Finance Committee's work on any tax legislation it writes.

This point of order is meant to be a poison pill in the process and would set a 60-vote threshold on tax reform, effectively killing its efforts through reconciliation. This resolution's instructions to Finance do not specify the policy or the provisions that are going to be reported out of the committee, but the framework, as stated, will be just as progressive as the current Tax Code. The chairman of the Finance Committee and members can assure you of that result.

This amendment is unnecessary, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I raise a point of order against this amendment under the Budget Act, section 305(b)(2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 305(b)(2) of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 231 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeben	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Cochran Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 51.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 1234, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Donnelly amendment be modified with the text of his amendment No. 1423, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1234), as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to eliminating tax breaks for companies that ship jobs to foreign countries)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING TAX BREAKS FOR COMPANIES THAT SHIP JOBS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to eliminating tax breaks for companies that outsource jobs to foreign countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I further ask that the pending Kaine amendment

be temporarily laid aside and that the Brown amendment No. 1378 be made pending and be the next vote in the series, with 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1422

There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to Portman amendment No. 1422.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on amendment No. 1422, which is a commonsense and, up to now, bipartisan approach to international tax reform. It simply says that under this budget we would do international tax reform. It would create incentives to have more jobs here in this country. Those are incentives for both U.S. companies and foreign companies to create jobs here in America.

This is not a partisan issue; it has been bipartisan. In fact, it was part of the Simpson-Bowles provisions with regard to tax reform. Only a couple of years ago, I cochaired a working group on this issue with the now minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, where we came up with a proposal which said that the international system is broken and that we need to move to one like the one we are talking about in this amendment that brings back jobs.

One of the problems is that the current Tax Code actually encourages companies to keep their money offshore. We think we could bring back a lot of that money. There is probably \$2.5 to \$3 trillion locked out offshore. But it is worse than that. It also leads to American companies being taken over by foreign companies and these inversions we have heard so much about. In the last 24 hours, we had another major inversion. Companies that have household names are picking up and leaving our country and taking their jobs and investment with them.

This amendment is common sense, Mr. President. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Portman amendment. We can all agree that tax reform should help create more good jobs and protect the good jobs we already have. I support the Portman amendment, and I look forward to colleagues supporting my amendment that ensures that companies that ship American jobs to foreign countries are not eligible for tax breaks. I want to work with my colleagues to make sure any tax reform package is good for American workers.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1422) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1234, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Donnelly amendment No. 1234, as modified.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment I offered to address the outsourcing of American jobs. Currently, American companies that ship jobs to foreign countries can still claim massive tax breaks. That is wrong, and we should claw back incentives and prohibit companies from receiving tax breaks for outsourcing jobs.

My end outsourcing amendment is common sense for taxpayers, supporting companies that invest in American workers, not those shipping jobs to foreign countries. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 1234), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1378 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Brown amendment No. 1378.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1378 to amendment No. 1116.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to providing tax benefits to patriot employers that invest in American jobs and provide fair pay and benefits to workers)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TAX BENEFITS TO PATRIOT EMPLOYERS THAT INVEST IN AMERICAN JOBS AND PROVIDE FAIR PAY AND BENEFITS TO WORKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to income taxes paid by businesses, which may include measures providing tax breaks for companies that have not moved overseas to avoid paying their fair share of taxes, have maintained or expanded their United States workforce, or have provided fair wages and quality health insurance, prepared workers for retirement, hired veterans and workers with disabilities, and provided paid family medical leave, by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask for support of the Patriot Corporation Act amendment. It is all pretty simple. Over the years, we have seen companies shut down production in Mansfield, OH, or Dayton, OH, and move to Tijuana, Mexico, or Hunan, China, and then sell their production back in the United States.

Under this simple idea, the Patriot Corporation Act, companies that do the right thing—companies that pay their workers decent wages; companies that do the right thing by their workers in terms of benefits, healthcare, and pensions; companies that make their products and keep their production in the United States—will get a tax break. They will pay a lower tax rate.

Yesterday at the White House, about 15 Senators met with President Trump. I talked to him about the Patriot Corporation Act. He said he likes the idea.

It is about time that U.S. companies that do the right thing should be rewarded instead of those companies that shut down production and move overseas and sell their products back. It is the right thing to do. It is a simple idea. Its time has come, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The budget resolution's reconciliation instruction to the Finance Committee does not and should not specify the policies or provisions that are being reported out of the Budget Committee resolution. The Finance framework includes international tax reform that will incentivize companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States. But this amendment defines "patriot employers" with a long list of criteria and pinpoints tax breaks for these companies. "Patriot employers" should not be defined by the budget process or by politics but by those that allow our constituents to join and remain in the workforce so as to participate in the American dream.

American companies will be able to create additional jobs based on tax relief envisioned by the Finance Committee. As such, we should pass the resolution and reconciliation in a timely manner, and we should oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BROWN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 232 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Cochran Menendez

The amendment (No. 1378) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1296 AND 1375 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc and reported by number: Paul No. 1296 and Cardin No. 1375.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote in relation to these amendments in the order listed; that there be no second-degree amendments in order to the amendments prior to the votes; finally, that there be 2 minutes, equally divided between the managers or their designees, prior to each vote, and that all votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for others, proposes amendments numbered 1296 and 1375 en bloc to amendment No. 1116.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1296

(Purpose: To modify reconciliation instructions to reduce the deficit)

Strike section 2001 and insert the following:

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$4,800,000,000.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$480,000,000.

(c) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$9,660,000,000.

(d) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$12,070,000,000.

(e) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that—

(1) reduce new budget authority for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$25,100,000,000; and

(2) that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(f) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$6,760,000,000.

(g) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$16,900,000,000.

(h) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$21,720,000,000.

(i) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit for fiscal year 2018 by not less than \$480,000,000.

(j) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) through (i) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

AMENDMENT NO. 1375

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that includes deficit-financed tax cuts)

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT INCLUDES DEFICIT-FINANCED TAX CUTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that includes tax cuts and would cause or increase a deficit or reduce a surplus.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 1296

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to Paul amendment No. 1296.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, this amendment is about whether or not we are serious about the debt. In the current budget, there are instructions to reduce the debt by \$96 billion in mandatory spending. I applaud that, but we need budget reconciliation instructions to allow it to happen. This amendment will allow instructions so we can really do what we say we are going to do, which is to cut spending.

I think, in light of the fact that we are for tax cuts, we ought to also be for reducing spending so we don't explode the debt.

I recommend a "yes" vote on reconciliation instructions to allow for mandatory savings and spending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the Paul amendment. This amendment includes reconciliation instructions to cut nearly \$100 billion in programs that are vital to working families in this country, including education, healthcare, nutrition, affordable housing, and many, many other programs.

This amendment paves the way to make it easier to cut Medicare by over \$400 billion and Medicaid by over \$1 trillion over the next decade in order to provide almost \$2 trillion in tax cuts to the top 1 percent.

This amendment should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PAUL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 94, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 233 Leg.]

YEAS—4

Flake
Lankford

Lee
Paul

NAYS—94

Alexander	Franken	Perdue
Baldwin	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blumenthal	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Harris	Roberts
Booker	Hassan	Rounds
Boozman	Hatch	Rubio
Brown	Heinrich	Sanders
Burr	Heitkamp	Sasse
Cantwell	Heller	Schatz
Capito	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Hoeven	Scott
Carper	Inhofe	Shaheen
Casey	Isakson	Shelby
Cassidy	Johnson	Stabenow
Collins	Kaine	Strange
Coons	Kennedy	Sullivan
Corker	King	Tester
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Thune
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	Markey	Udall
Cruz	McCain	Van Hollen
Daines	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Wyden
Ernst	Murphy	Young
Feinstein	Murray	
Fischer	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—2

Cochran Menendez

The amendment (No. 1296) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1375

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Cardin amendment No. 1375.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this amendment is very simple. It allows a point of order to be raised if the tax reform reported back to the floor by the committee increases the deficit. It is as simple as that. Do you believe we should act on tax reform that increases the deficit? If you agree with me that we should not be increasing the deficit with the tax reform reported back from the committee, then vote for this amendment or, if necessary, vote for waiving the point of order that may be raised.

I urge my colleagues, if you are serious about the deficit, we shouldn't be passing legislation that increases it.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Budget rules don't accommodate current tax policy. This means at least \$460 billion of scored revenue loss can be attributed to the difference between a current law baseline and a current policy baseline. Many of the tax extenders covered by this amount are popular and are supported on a bipartisan basis.

This amendment is corrosive to the budget resolution's privilege. It falls

outside the scope of what is appropriate for inclusion. Adoption of corrosive amendments could be fatal to the resolution's privilege, and loss of privilege could compromise our ability to pass tax reform and to enforce the budget spending limits.

Further, this amendment is also non-germane. The Congressional Budget Act requires that amendments to a budget resolution be germane—a statutory regulation we can't ignore.

So I raise a point of order against this amendment under the Budget Act's section 305(b)(2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, what the chairman is saying is, basically, the process will be used in order to add to the deficit. Therefore, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 305(b) of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 234 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 52.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1298, 1430, AND 1277 TO
AMENDMENT NO. 1116

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc and reported by number: Paul No. 1298, Lee No. 1430, and Paul No. 1277.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate now vote in relation to the Kaine amendment No. 1249 and that following disposition of the Kaine amendment, the Senate vote in relation to the above amendments in the order listed; finally, that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the managers or their designees prior to all further votes tonight and that they be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. The next four votes will be on the Kaine amendment No. 1249, the Paul amendment No. 1298, the Lee amendment No. 1430, and the Paul amendment No. 1277.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments en bloc by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for others, proposes amendments numbered 1298, 1430, and 1277 en bloc to amendment No. 1116.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1298

(Purpose: To reduce discretionary spending by \$43,000,000,000)

On page 4, line 25, decrease the amount by \$43,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by \$35,948,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$33,550,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by \$86,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by \$35,260,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by \$6,450,000,000.

On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by \$860,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by \$35,260,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by \$6,450,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by \$860,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by \$35,260,000,000.

On page 7, line 4, decrease the amount by \$6,450,000,000.

On page 7, line 5, decrease the amount by \$860,000,000.

On page 37, line 19, decrease the amount by \$43,000,000,000.

On page 37, line 20, decrease the amount by \$35,260,000,000.

On page 37, line 24, decrease the amount by \$6,450,000,000.

On page 38, line 3, decrease the amount by \$860,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 1430

(Purpose: To expand the deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the repeal of provisions of title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act)

On page 49, line 5, insert “, which may include nullification of any regulations promulgated under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (including any amendment made by such title)” before “by the”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1277

(Purpose: To provide for reconciliation instructions to the relevant committees for the purpose of repealing and replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act)

In section 2001, strike subsection (c) and insert the following:

(c) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(d) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(e) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(f) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) through (e) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 1249

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1249.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. KAINE. The amendment is a simple amendment, folks. It is about transparency. Two years ago, the Senate passed a budget that added a laudatory requirement to have a Congressional Budget Office score for reconciliation legislation 28 hours in advance of voting on the legislation. There are obvious benefits to the Members who are voting and obvious benefits to the American public.

The budget resolution before us from committee repeals that requirement. The majority has argued that it is unnecessary because the requirement has never been triggered. But I remember that just a couple of months ago, the Senate was debating healthcare legislation that hadn't seen the light of day and didn't have a CBO score.

Do we really believe the answer to our problem is to make it easier to

pass legislation without knowing the cost? I think the 28-hour requirement is worthy, it should be continued, and I think it should be extended to include amendments in the nature of a substitute.

I ask all my colleagues to support transparency and not embarrass the institution by enabling us to more easily pass important legislation without the public knowing the score.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The congressional budget clearly empowers the Budget Committee chair as scorekeeper. Since becoming chairman in 2015, I am pleased to say that the Budget Committee has always discharged its responsibilities with scores in hand, proving our important work and function without this amendment. In fact, the 28-hour rule is a recent creation, and its repeal shows no deviation from Senate practice. It would require 28 hours on every amendment.

It is also important to note that a budget resolution is not a law. Because it is not a law, it cannot supersede or replace any statutory provisions. The Congressional Budget Act is a law and sets forth the rules that the congressional budget must follow.

The proposed amendment attempts to make a significant change to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act, which should be accomplished through regular order legislation which the President signs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 235 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Collins
Coons
Cortez Masto
Donnelly

Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Harris
Hassan
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Klobuchar

Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCaskey
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer

Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester

Udall
Van Hollen
Warner

Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—51

Alexander
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Cochran
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Enzi
Ernst
Fischer

Flake
Gardner
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski

Paul
Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Shelby
Strange
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—1

Menendez

The amendment (No. 1249) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1298

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Paul amendment No. 1298.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, this amendment is about the debt. We have a \$20 trillion debt. It is about whether we are serious about tackling that debt. The budget before us exceeds our own spending caps by \$43 billion.

You will be told that technically that is not so because we hide the money by sticking it in an account we call the Overseas Contingency Operations. Over the past 3 years, we have spent more than \$1.7 trillion in this account, but we don't account for it, and we don't budget for it. What I am asking us to do is to be responsible, budget for this, stay within our self-imposed caps, and actually act as though we really believe in what we say—that the debt is a problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The amendment seeks to reduce discretionary appropriations this fiscal year by \$43 billion. As Members are aware, the resolution's discretionary figures for this fiscal year are fully consistent with the Budget Control Act spending limits. If they weren't, then the resolution would be subject to a 60-vote point of order.

This year's resolution also includes Overseas Contingency Operations funding at \$77 billion. This amount is equal to the President's request and is allowable under the Budget Control Act. The members of the Budget Committee worked hard to craft a resolution with levels that would put us on a better fiscal path, with \$5.1 trillion in spending reductions over the next 10 years. The resolution already contains ample restraint to both discretionary and mandatory spending.

As the Appropriations Committee has reported many of its bills already,

this amendment could be detrimental to the appropriations process as it stands today and the allocation this resolution will provide.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I agree with my colleague that there are no recommendations on where these cuts are coming from. Do they come from the programs that support our Nation's veterans, from the National Institutes of Health—the cutting-edge cancer research it conducts? You can't turn research on and off. Scientists don't hit pause.

Does it come from our transportation and infrastructure? If we really want to make these cuts—and this, of course, would take us well below the postsequester budget caps that are already \$43 billion. If we want to make cuts, have the courage to stand up and say “This is the program I want to cut”—not do something like this, where we don't know if the cut will be for veterans, education, cancer research, or anything else.

I oppose the amendment.

To reiterate, I oppose the Paul amendment and urge others to do the same. The Paul amendment appears to mandate a cut of \$43 billion from non-defense discretionary programs in fiscal year 2018. This is an 8-percent cut to the fiscal year 2018 postsequester budget caps, which are already \$3 billion below last year's levels. It could impact defense as well.

Of course, Senator PAUL provides no recommendations on who he wants to hurt. Should it come from programs that support our Nation's veterans? Should it come from the National Institutes of Health and the cutting-edge cancer research it conducts? You cannot just turn research on and off. Scientists do not hit pause. What if we take it from transportation and infrastructure programs that help repair our Nation's failing roads and bridges?

If those are unacceptable, perhaps we should cut or eliminate programs that assist our Nation's farmers or help promote economic growth in rural communities. I think we can all agree that is not going to happen. It should not happen. We should be investing in our communities to make sure they have the tools they need to grow and flourish, not deserting them.

Members on both sides of the aisle have been calling for months for a bipartisan budget deal. In speech after speech we have heard about the devastating consequences that sequester has on both defense and nondefense programs. If we are going to finish this year's appropriations process, we need

a bipartisan budget deal based on parity that provides us relief from sequester. This amendment takes us in the opposite direction. I urge a “no” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PAUL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 5, nays 95, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 236 Leg.]

YEAS—5

Daines	Lankford	Paul
Flake	Lee	

NAYS—95

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blumenthal	Grassley	Reed
Blunt	Harris	Risch
Booker	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Rounds
Brown	Heinrich	Rubio
Burr	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cantwell	Heller	Sasse
Capito	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Hoeven	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Scott
Casey	Isakson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Kaine	Stabenow
Collins	Kennedy	Strange
Coons	King	Sullivan
Corker	Klobuchar	Tester
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	Markey	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Udall
Cruz	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Fischer	Murray	

The amendment (No. 1298) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1430

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Lee amendment No. 1430.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I am offering amendment No. 1430 to repeal ObamaCare regulations that are wreaking havoc on our health insurance market. Healthcare costs are rising dramatically, unsustainably, and unaffordably.

Healthcare costs are rising as a result of ObamaCare's despotic regime of aggressive healthcare regulations. Countless working families are treading water just to try to stay afloat. A good chunk of these costs also can be pinned directly on the burdensome ObamaCare regulations.

According to one HHS study, ObamaCare regulations caused premiums in the individual market to spike an astounding 105 percent, and a

study by Milliman showed that the guaranteed issue regulation alone caused health insurance premiums to rise by an average of 45 percent. This amounts to \$106 per month. That is thousands of dollars per year for working families. That is money that they could be spending on groceries, on housing, on braces, or on their child's education.

Congress has done very little in the last few years to alleviate the burdens faced by these working class families. I urge my colleagues to act now by supporting this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, Republicans have now put forward proposal after proposal to rip protections away from Americans with preexisting conditions. This amendment is yet another example of Republican efforts to increase costs for people who need healthcare the most. It would put insurance companies back in charge. It would allow them to deny coverage to people with preexisting conditions or discriminate against them by charging higher premiums.

This repeals the essential health benefits, rips away access to critical services like maternity care, mental health, and substance use disorder treatment, and repeals the requirement that coverage be available to dependents under the age of 26.

Americans have rejected this crass partisan proposal. It is long past time to focus on bipartisan proposals like the one that Senator ALEXANDER and I announced today that actually protects people with preexisting conditions while bringing down premiums for patients and family.

I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 seconds.

Mrs. MURRAY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 67, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 237 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Barrasso	Cotton	Flake
Boozman	Crapo	Graham
Corker	Cruz	Hatch
Cornyn	Daines	Heller

Hoeven	Moran	Scott
Inhofe	Paul	Sullivan
Johnson	Perdue	Thune
Kennedy	Risch	Toomey
Lankford	Roberts	Wicker
Lee	Rubio	Young
McConnell	Sasse	

NAYS—67

Alexander	Fischer	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Bennet	Gardner	Peters
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Booker	Harris	Rounds
Brown	Hassan	Sanders
Burr	Heinrich	Schatz
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Schumer
Capito	Hirono	Shaheen
Cardin	Isakson	Shelby
Carper	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	King	Strange
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Tillis
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wyden
Ernst	Murkowski	
Feinstein	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—1

Cochran

The amendment (No. 1430) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1277

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Paul amendment No. 1277.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, across the country, Republicans promised to repeal ObamaCare. They promised to repeal all of ObamaCare, root and branch. Not one Republican promised to keep and block grant ObamaCare. They promised to repeal ObamaCare.

Tonight I present another chance. My amendment will provide budget reconciliation instructions so Republican Senators can fulfill their promise; so they can actually repeal ObamaCare, root and branch, as they promised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment provides reconciliation instructions to three Senate committees for the purpose of repealing and replacing the Affordable Care Act; in effect, rerunning the same bad movie the Senate has now seen three times. By now, Americans understand what these partisan Republican healthcare bills have in store for the middle class: higher premiums, worse healthcare, and a safety net in tatters.

I will close by saying that there is now a desire on both sides of the aisle to set aside this my-way-or-the-high-way approach to governing. Bipartisanship is about taking each other's good ideas, and I believe the Senate can work together to lower people's premiums.

This amendment is a vote to look for more partisan ideological trophies when the Senate ought to be working together to find common ground.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 66, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 238 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cotton	Hoeven	Sasse
Crapo	Inhofe	Scott
Cruz	Johnson	Sullivan
Daines	Kennedy	Thune
Ernst	Lankford	Tillis
Fischer	Lee	Wicker
Flake	Paul	Young

NAYS—66

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Graham	Nelson
Blumenthal	Harris	Perdue
Blunt	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cantwell	Hirono	Sanders
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Strange
Corker	Markey	Tester
Cornyn	McCain	Toomey
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Enzi	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Cochran

The amendment (No. 1277) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1553, 1428, 1404, 1429, 1552, 1301, 1561, AND 1167 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1116

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc and reported by number: Udall amendment No. 1553, Lee amendment No. 1428, Paul amendment No. 1404, Lee amendment No. 1429, Fischer amendment No. 1552, Cantwell amendment No. 1301, Enzi amendment No. 1561, and Perdue-Whitehouse amendment No. 1167.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate now vote in relation to these amendments in the order listed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for himself and others, proposes amendments numbered 1553, 1428, 1404, 1429, 1552, 1301, 1561, and 1167 en bloc to amendment No. 1116.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1553

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the provision of full, permanent, and mandatory funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FULL, PERMANENT, AND MANDATORY FUNDING FOR THE PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing full, permanent, and mandatory funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1428

(Purpose: To modify a deficit neutral reserve fund relating to public land and the environment to address making payments under the payments in lieu of taxes program equivalent to the property tax revenue that would be due to a State or local government if the State or local government owned the land)

On page 57, line 19, insert “, including rewriting the formula for payments under the program” after “program”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1404

(Purpose: To ensure that all Americans receive a tax cut, keeping more of their hard earned money, and enjoy the benefit of tax reform)

On page 47, line 6, strike “\$1,500,000,000,000” and insert “\$2,500,000,000,000”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1429

(Purpose: To establish a spending-neutral reserve fund relating to prohibiting Federal regulation of entirely intrastate species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CLARIFYING FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN RELATION TO INTRASTATE SPECIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting Federal regulation of entirely intrastate species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue

and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1552

(Purpose: To provide tax relief to American workers, families, and job creators in a manner which maintains the progressivity of the tax system by maintaining or raising the share of taxes paid by high income taxpayers)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX REFORM WHICH MAINTAINS THE PROGRESSIVITY OF THE TAX SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include tax reform proposals to ensure that the reformed tax code parallels the existing tax code with respect to relative burdens and does not shift the tax burden from high-income to lower- and middle-income taxpayers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1301

(Purpose: To strike the reconciliation instructions for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate to prevent oil and gas development within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge)

In section 2001, strike subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 1561

(Purpose: To provide other enforcement provisions related to the House of Representatives.)

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

AMENDMENT NO. 1167

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to significantly improving the budget process)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVING THE BUDGET PROCESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to significantly improving the budget process by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, we expect to have this series of votes and then move to passage of the resolution. That means there are hopefully approximately eight votes left. Some of them may be voice votes.

Mr. President, I yield to the leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to colleagues, the consent agreement that was just entered allows us to see the light at the end of the tunnel. If Senators will stay in the Chamber, we will do these 10-minute rolcall votes and wrap it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. We completely agree on this issue. We hope Members on both sides will stay in their seats so we can finish quickly, without going through the ridiculous vote-arama that we have done in previous years.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1553

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Udall amendment No. 1553.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, this amendment calls for legislation to fully and permanently fund the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program. Senator HEINRICH and I have long called for this solution. Rural counties in New Mexico and other States across the West and across the country have large amounts of Federal lands within their boundaries. These counties rely on funding from the PILT Program to provide better schools, maintain roads and bridges, and support thousands of local jobs.

We currently fund PILT year by year. I have fought for this funding as a member of the Appropriations Committee, but we need to do more. We need to pass permanent funding to ensure that local communities can count on our resources being there every year to provide basic services. I urge support for the Udall-Heinrich amendment and yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, reluctantly. I have always fought to make sure the rural communities can keep the lights on. Approximately half of the land in my home State of Wyoming is under Federal control, and counties, therefore, are unable to obtain property tax revenue from a large part of the State.

Payment in lieu of taxes isn't a giveaway to these counties. It is compensation for the money they lose because they are unable to tax Federal lands within their borders, even though they are required to provide services on those lands. However, this resolution already has the reserved funds for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program. I find this amendment to be duplicative and unnecessary. Furthermore, the vote-arama isn't the correct forum to

contemplate making any program permanent and mandatory, even one I have long supported.

I look forward to working with my colleague from New Mexico and with other interested Members from Western States on fiscally responsible legislation to provide fairness and equity for America's rural counties and their communities.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. UDALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Baldwin	Harris	Murray
Bennet	Hassan	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hatch	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Risch
Cantwell	Heller	Sanders
Cardin	Hirono	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Coons	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Tester
Daines	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskey	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gardner	Murkowski	
Gillibrand	Murphy	

NAYS—41

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Flake	Roberts
Blunt	Graham	Rounds
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Hoehn	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott
Cassidy	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Strange
Corker	Kennedy	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	Young
Ernst	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—1

Cochran

The amendment (No. 1553) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I request that everybody sit in their seat, and we could do these votes in 7½ minutes. If everybody wanders off and comes back in, we could be here half the night. There should only be about seven votes

left, and some of those could be by voice vote, like the next one.

Mr. SCHUMER. Our side was in early.

Mr. ENZI. I appreciate the way those on that side have taken their seats and voted.

AMENDMENT NO. 1428

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Lee amendment No. 1428.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment to pay back western communities for the loss that occurs to them as a result of the widespread ownership of Federal public land.

As I have long stressed, Federal land is often a bad bargain for State and local governments, like those in Utah, where almost two-thirds of the land is owned and controlled by the Federal Government, thus prohibiting local governments from taxing that land. Not only does Federal ownership reduce economic opportunity on that land, not only does it rob local residents of local control, but it also shrinks the property tax base that Utahns rely on to fund essential community services.

The Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program, or PILT, was designed to address this very inequity by paying States for the property tax revenue they lost as a result of Federal land ownership, but the current formula for PILT does not adequately compensate local governments for this loss. In fact, it doesn't even come close. My amendment offers these predominantly rural communities a revisited, revised, and improved PILT formula to compensate them for these very losses.

I encourage my colleagues to support it, and I request a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, there is wide support for PILT from both Democrats and Republicans, as witnessed by this last vote. What we need to do now is to make sure that it works fairly for counties and is not done arbitrarily.

The CRS found that taking the approach in Senator LEE's amendment would break the PILT Program. Not only would calculating each county's payments be nearly impossible, the program would not be fair. In fact, the CRS cited a 2010 study that found that the approach in Senator LEE's amendment would result in two-thirds of all of the counties that receive PILT funding receiving lower payments than they do now.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Donnelly	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Udall
Daines	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gardner	Murphy	

The amendment (No. 1428) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1404

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Paul amendment No. 1404.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, rather than bicker over raising taxes on some people and lowering taxes on other people, we should cut everyone's taxes to make sure we get a middle-class tax cut across the board. The best way to do that is to give the tax committee a mandate that is larger, a mandate for a bigger tax cut.

My amendment provides budget reconciliation instructions to increase the tax cut to \$2.5 trillion. If we were to believe this budget, it claims to save over \$6 trillion over 10 years—more than enough to go bigger, better, and bolder on cutting taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the Paul amendment. In the budget we are debating today, my Republican colleagues have required the Finance Committee to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion over the next decade. This budget would pave the way for massive cuts to Medicare and Medicaid in order to provide the wealthiest people in this country with incredibly large tax breaks.

Senator PAUL thinks that doesn't go far enough. His amendment would allow the Senate to increase the deficit by \$2.5 trillion, allowing for even greater cuts to Medicare, to Medicaid, and even bigger tax breaks for the Koch brothers and their friends.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PAUL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 93, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 241 Leg.]

YEAS—7

Cruz	Lee	Sasse
Daines	Paul	
Heller	Perdue	

NAYS—93

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Booker	Harris	Risch
Boozman	Hassan	Roberts
Brown	Hatch	Rounds
Burr	Heinrich	Rubio
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Sanders
Capito	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Hoeven	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Scott
Casey	Isakson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Kaine	Stabenow
Collins	Kennedy	Strange
Coons	King	Sullivan
Corker	Klobuchar	Tester
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCain	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Ernst	Merkley	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

The amendment (No. 1404) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1429

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Lee amendment No. 1429.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, our constitutional structure puts in place a Federal Government with powers that James Madison described as "few and defined" and those reserved to the States as "numerous and indefinite." Among other things, the Constitution gives powers to the Congress to regulate interstate commerce, trade or commerce between the States, with foreign nations, and with Indian Tribes. It does not give the Congress

the power to regulate any and every activity occurring intrastate. Yet, for the last few decades, under the Endangered Species Act, this very power has been abused to regulate species that exists only in one place, only within one State, never crossing State lines, never forming any part of any channel or instrumentality of interstate commerce. This is wrong, it is unconstitutional, and it eviscerates and circumvents the meaning of the 10th Amendment. We need to liberate this country from the dictates of a few bureaucrats in Washington, DC, who have overextended their authority under the Endangered Species Act. My amendment fixes that, and I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 1429.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

Why is this an important amendment vote? Just listen to this. More than 1,000 listed species, 77 percent of all listed species, including the polar bear, the Florida panther are found in one State—one State. Seventy-seven percent of all listed species, including the polar bear, the Florida panther, and many more are found only in one State, and for an island State like Hawaii, all of its species would lose protection.

I urge you to join me in opposing this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 242 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Flake	Paul	
Gardner	Perdue	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Cantwell	Corker
Baldwin	Cardin	Cortez Masto
Bennet	Carper	Donnelly
Blumenthal	Casey	Duckworth
Booker	Collins	Durbin
Brown	Coons	Feinstein

Franken	Manchin	Schatz
Gillibrand	Markey	Schumer
Harris	McCaskill	Shaheen
Hassan	Menendez	Stabenow
Heinrich	Merkley	Tester
Heitkamp	Murphy	Udall
Hirono	Murray	Van Hollen
Kaine	Nelson	Warner
King	Peters	Warren
Klobuchar	Reed	Whitehouse
Leahy	Sanders	Wyden

The amendment (No. 1429) was rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1552

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Fischer amendment No. 1552.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield back all time and ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1552) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1301

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Cantwell amendment No. 1301.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one of the most pristine areas of the United States, and we have been protecting it for decades for a reason. The notion that tonight, after 60-plus years, we would give up what is a biologically important area, that is a critical habitat for polar bears, a breeding ground for caribou, migratory birds, and over 200 species—for what? For oil that we don't need.

We have had record oil production in the last 10 years—a 77-percent increase. The oil that we would get, we wouldn't get until 10 years from now, and it would supply oil for only 1 year in the United States. It is not worth it.

As Representative Mo Udall said in 1980: "If we have to drill at the White House or Arlington Cemetery or the Capitol grounds for oil, we might have to drill in the Arctic Refuge. But let us go there last."

We don't need this oil. We have plenty of supply. The Interior Secretary is trying to open a billion acres, including on-shore and outer continental shelf waters. Vote no and protect a unique special place that has been protected for 60 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to soundly reject this amendment. Those who support this amendment will deny us the opportunity to do something constructive in this country when it comes to our opportunities to produce energy, to produce wealth.

We need to be expanding our energy development in our Federal areas. This

helps us reduce our deficit, build new wealth in this country, strengthen our national security and our competitiveness. We can and we must do more as a nation to responsibly develop our resources, our energy resources providing economic security, energy security, and national security. The Energy Committee is prepared to meet this instruction to raise a billion dollars over the next decade.

I urge Senators to reject this amendment, which would deprive us of a substantial opportunity to benefit our country at the same time that we care for our environment.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 243 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Harris	Peters
Booker	Hassan	Reed
Brown	Heinrich	Sanders
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cardin	Hirono	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	
Flake	Paul	

The amendment (No. 1301) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1561

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Enzi amendment No. 1561.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, first of all, I want to thank everybody who has gotten us to this point. There is this vote, and I hope there will be one voice vote after it and then final passage.

I am urging my colleagues to support this amendment. This amendment offers technical and conforming changes that are needed for the House of Representatives to be able to enforce the budget resolution. This amendment will help maintain fiscal discipline in the House so both Chambers can continue to work and put America on a more sustainable footing. What is also important for my colleagues to know is that these provisions apply to the House only. The Senate enforcement remains unchanged.

I hope you will support me on this amendment.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, Chairman ENZI suggests that this is just a "technical corrections amendment." Actually, that is not quite accurate.

At a time when the United States spends more on defense than the next 12 countries combined, amazingly, this amendment paves the way for a \$91 billion increase in defense spending in fiscal year 2018.

This amendment would renew the Republican effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act and throw up to 32 million Americans off of the health insurance they currently have, increase premiums for older workers, and make even more harmful cuts to Medicaid.

This amendment includes a provision requiring the use of so-called dynamic scoring, or what President George H.W. Bush appropriately referred to as voodoo economics, allowing the Republicans to claim that their massive tax breaks for the rich will pay for themselves.

At a time when the cost of college education is skyrocketing, this amendment calls for dramatic cuts to student financial aid.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 244 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Cornyn	Graham
Barrasso	Cotton	Grassley
Blunt	Crapo	Hatch
Boozman	Cruz	Heller
Burr	Daines	Hoeben
Capito	Enzi	Inhofe
Cassidy	Ernst	Isakson
Cochran	Fischer	Johnson
Collins	Flake	Kennedy
Corker	Gardner	Lankford

Lee
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Perdue
Portman

Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Shelby
Strange

Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Wicker
Young

NAYS—48

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cooms
Cortez Masto
Donnelly
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken

Gillibrand
Harris
Hassan
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy

Murray
Nelson
Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

The amendment (No. 1561) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1167

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to the Perdue-Whitehouse amendment No. 1167.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I have great news. This is the last amendment and the only bipartisan amendment tonight, and after this we will vote on the entire bill.

The purpose of this amendment is to declare this process—the vote-arama—utter nonsense. It is part of a budget process that both parties have perpetrated and persisted with for 43 years. It has only worked four times; to fund the Federal Government, according to the Budget Act of 1974, four times in our history. We are supposed to appropriate 12 bills a year to fund the Government. We have averaged 2½.

I urge all of my colleagues to make clear to the American people that we recognize this budgeting process is broken and we are committed to fix it.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to urge all of my colleagues to give a strong bipartisan voice vote in support of the amendment by the Senator from Georgia. The current budget process does not produce a meaningful budget, does not control the debt or the deficit, and does not contribute to bipartisanship or compromise. What it does produce is a meaningless, partisan vote-arama. If you believe we can do better than a vote-arama, if you believe we can have an improved and meaningful budget process, voice vote aye.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1167) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I know of no further amendments to the resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 1116, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1116, as amended.

Mr. ENZI. That is the substitute. I yield back time on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this is not a bad budget bill. It is a horrific budget bill, an extremely cruel bill, and the most unfair budget ever presented in the modern history of our country.

At a time of massive income and wealth inequality, this budget provides \$1.9 trillion in tax breaks for the top 1 percent. At a time when millions of working families are struggling to keep their heads above water, this budget cuts Medicaid by \$1 trillion. Fifteen million Americans could lose their health insurance.

This is a budget that poll after poll shows the American people do not want. Let us defeat it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I am tempted to debate that, but we will get to do that as we do the provisions of this after it is all voted on.

I hope everybody will adopt the substitute by voice, and then vote on adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any further amendments?

Seeing none, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1116, as amended.

The amendment (No. 1116) in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on adoption of H. Con. Res. 71, as amended.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 245 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Daines	Kennedy
Barrasso	Enzi	Lankford
Blunt	Ernst	Lee
Boozman	Fischer	McCain
Burr	Flake	McConnell
Capito	Gardner	Moran
Cassidy	Graham	Murkowski
Cochran	Grassley	Perdue
Collins	Hatch	Portman
Corker	Heller	Risch
Cornyn	Hoeben	Roberts
Cotton	Inhofe	Rounds
Crapo	Isakson	Rubio
Cruz	Johnson	Sasse

Scott
Shelby
Strange

Sullivan
Thune
Tillis

Toomey
Wicker
Young

NAYS—49

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Donnelly
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand

Harris
Hassan
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markley
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Nelson

Paul
Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71), as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, tonight we completed the first step toward replacing our broken Tax Code by passing a comprehensive, fiscally responsible budget that will help put the Federal Government on a path to balance. The budget also gives us the tools we need to strengthen our economy after years of stagnation under the previous administration.

We have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to replace a failing tax code that holds Americans back with one that actually works for them. To middle-class families across America, we have a very simple message. We want to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more in yours.

With this budget, we are on a path to delivering much needed relief to American individuals and families who have borne the burdens of an unfair tax code for entirely too long. I want to particularly thank Chairman MIKE ENZI and the members of the Budget Committee and the staff for their extraordinary work on this budget.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 2266.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2266) entitled "An Act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.", with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266.

CLOTURE MOTION

I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Rounds, John Thune, Orrin G. Hatch, Deb Fischer, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, James M. Inhofe, Roger F. Wicker, Lindsey Graham.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1568

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with an amendment numbered 1568.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following:
"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1568

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1569 to amendment No. 1568.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1570

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to refer the House message on H.R. 2266 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 1570.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the message to accompany H.R. 2266 to the Committee on Approp-

riations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 1570.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1571

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1571 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1572 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1571

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1572 to amendment No. 1571.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "4" and insert "5"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

THANKING SENATOR ENZI AND THE BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND STAFF

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes following the remarks of the majority leader to thank Chairman ENZI, the bill manager, and the whole Budget Committee for the tremendous work that has been done on this budget resolution.

I also want to express my gratitude and our collective gratitude to the Budget Committee staff, who has done such heroic work to get us this far. This might well be the best and most well-run budget consideration process during my time in the Senate. Certainly, for the fact that Senator ENZI has gotten us to this point at this time of night, when typically this ends in the wee hours of the morning, I think he is to be commended.

The resolution has gone through regular order from the start, working its way through the Budget Committee

where amendments were considered and adopted from both sides. Chairman ENZI has been a very effective floor manager as we have been considering the budget resolution, obtaining consensus from both sides of the aisle to ensure that the Senate has considered a number of amendments in a timely fashion. That is something that is not always so common around here.

I want to take a moment to note the great job the chairman has done in getting us to this point. As we all know, without a budget resolution, there will be no tax reform. This is the first step to getting us to pro-growth tax reform, which will unshackle the sleeping giant of the American economy, something from which all Americans will benefit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

THE BUDGET

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, having been away for a while from the Senate, I am pretty amazed to come back today and see a budget that is passed that throws away years of rhetoric about fiscal conservatism. The Senate just passed a budget that adds \$1.5 trillion to our national debt, a budget that slashes seniors' healthcare by \$473 billion. It decimates the Medicaid Program for parents and grandparents in nursing homes, those who are disabled, and those who are among the poorest, with cuts of over \$1 trillion over the next decade.

In total, the Republican budget would cut more than \$5 trillion over the next decade from education, healthcare, affordable housing, childcare, nutrition assistance, transportation, and other programs that all Americans rely on.

The question many New Jerseyans will be asking me is, Why? Why do Republicans in Congress add \$1.5 trillion to our national debt while slashing the Medicare Program? The answer is simple. We are on a pathway to provide massive tax breaks to corporate interests, special interests, and the wealthiest 1 percent. This has been a Republican agenda for as long as I can remember.

What I find most galling is that this budget plan is meant to set up a special process that we know here as reconciliation to pass the Trump tax plan—a plan, which, by which their own admission, will raise taxes on middle-class families. Think about that. The Republican Party is adding \$1.5 billion to the debt to pay for massive tax breaks for the wealthiest among us—I should say trillion, \$1.5 trillion to the debt to pay for massive tax breaks for the wealthiest among us. They aren't even guaranteeing that middle-class taxes will not go up.

What the Republican budget fails to realize is that budgets are not just about numbers. Budgets are about people, their hopes, their dreams, their ex-

pectations for a better life for themselves and their children.

My view is that this budget sells America short. It is not what the American people believe our collective values would be. Hard-working families want us to work together and pass a budget that addresses their concerns. They want safe communities, not a budget that threatens to cut the firefighter grants and stretches local budgets even thinner. They want peace of mind when they reach their golden years, not a budget that raises their healthcare costs. They want a tax proposal that cuts taxes for the middle class and working people, not more tax breaks for the folks that have been rigging the system against us.

People are willing to do their part if everyone is sharing in the sacrifice. But this budget fails that test. It fails to recognize that we are all in this together and should benefit together and sacrifice together—each of us working for the betterment of all of us.

Mr. President, another area where it is critical that we come together, not as 50 separate States but as the United States of America, is to help the 3.5 million American citizens living in Puerto Rico. I have serious concerns that the current disaster relief package currently being considered by Congress falls far short of that.

Tomorrow will mark 1 month since Hurricane Maria devastated the island of Puerto Rico, leaving in its wake a trail of destruction, despair, and suffering. It is 1 month later, and still 88 percent of our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico don't have power. It is 1 month later, and still one-third of the island lacks access to clean, safe drinking water.

Outside of the city of San Juan, the situation is even worse, as nearly two-thirds of people still remain without water. Let me just pause for a moment to think about that. Think about it: an entire month without clean water, without water to bathe, to cook with, or simply to drink. How many of us can even imagine such an existence? More than half of the island's cell towers are down, which is not just an inconvenience. It is a threat to safety. Imagine the sense of isolation and desperation when your power is out, when you have run out of potable water, with none on the way, and you can't even call for help.

As bad as it looks on TV, the situation on the ground, as I saw it, is tragically worse. I am concerned that the package we are considering now is both inadequate in scope and unfair in treatment—inadequate because it is just a fraction of what Puerto Rico needs to recover, unfair because it treats the people of Puerto Rico different than Florida and Texas, even though they are U.S. citizens.

While all three areas have been devastated by natural disasters, only

Puerto Rico is being required to pay back natural disaster assistance. That is right. Unlike Florida and Texas, the majority of Puerto Rico's assistance is coming in the form of a loan. While there are a lot of things that the people of Puerto Rico need from their Federal Government, one thing they absolutely do not need and simply cannot afford is billions of dollars of more debt.

This is not a normal disaster loan. No. Just like everything else with Puerto Rico, this loan comes with a major stipulation. While disaster loans are normally forgiven according to a standard formula under the Stafford Act, this package overrules longstanding law and leaves the decision entirely in the hands of the Secretaries of the Treasury and Homeland Security.

While disaster loans are normally used to help people be safe and start the recovery process, this legislation gives the Secretaries of the Treasury and Homeland Security the authority to control how Puerto Rico spends the money. If Secretary Mnuchin decides that some, most, or even all of the loan should be used to pay off his friends on Wall Street, there is nothing Puerto Rico can do to stop him. If he decides that debt bondholders are more important than those who are suffering in darkness, there is nothing they can do to stop him. Instead of being treated like the rest of the country, Puerto Rico is left at the mercy of Treasury Secretary Mnuchin. They are at the mercy of someone who made his fortune off the backs of seniors and hard-working families who lost their homes in the foreclosure crisis.

Do we really think that someone who callously rejected the pleas of struggling families to save their homes and instead put them on the fast track to foreclosure is going to suddenly change now for the 3.5 million American citizens in Puerto Rico? Does anyone really believe he is going to put the people of Puerto Rico first? What a tragedy it would be if, instead of helping our most vulnerable citizens, this loan was used to pay off, in whole or in part, vulture funds. We need people saved, not bondholders.

We need a response that answers Puerto Rico's call. Instead of continuing to treat Puerto Rico like a foreign country and make them start a tab at the U.S. Treasury while they are vulnerable and pleading for help, we need to treat them just like their fellow American citizens in Florida and Texas. We need to provide unconditional assistance—real dollars to rebuild roads, the electrical grid, and to put people back in their homes and businesses. We need to address the massive Medicaid cliff that is forcing even more doctors and nurses off the island and threatening the health of the people of Puerto Rico. We need strong protections to make sure that

the disaster relief stays with the people of Puerto Rico, where it is needed the most.

Let me close by saying that I grew up believing the United States was the greatest country the world had ever seen. I still believe that today as strongly as ever. Ultimately, our response as it relates to the people of Puerto Rico is not just about the people of Puerto Rico but about all of us. It is about our values—who we are as a people, who we are as a nation. How we respond to this crisis will test the collective conscience of our Nation, and it will define us.

As I have said many times, I have never shied away from voting for assistance for flooding in Mississippi, for wildfires in the West, for hurricanes like Katrina, and any other natural disaster that has faced our country with our fellow Americans. I was amazed when I had to struggle and fight here on the Senate floor for the first time—I don't know—in my lifetime to get assistance in the New York-New Jersey area after Superstorm Sandy. It took a major fight, with people voting no, even though I had always voted yes.

The people of Puerto Rico do not have a U.S. Senator to cast their vote for them or to raise their voices for them. Yet, as long as I am a Member of this Chamber, I am going to continue to prick the conscience of the Senate to understand that when we walk to the Vietnam wall and see those names, a disproportionate number of them are Americans of Puerto Rican descent, who wore the uniform, gave their lives, and made the ultimate sacrifice. They did not leave the conflict early; they gave it their all. We cannot leave them early, nor should we leave them short. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

THE BUDGET

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I am going to contain my remarks to the budget and its process.

For several days—in fact, for several weeks—I have been listening to the same rhetoric of what this budget will do. This budget is a special process. It does outline a plan for what we can do over 10 years. That is a long time. I don't know that we ever make it past the first year. In fact, some budgets do not last more than 40 days before we waive the budget, but we need to have a blueprint. This is a blueprint that covers 10 years in spite of some of the rhetoric that this bill will not do any of the things that have been claimed. The reason that it will not do any of the things that have been claimed is that everything in the budget requires action by another committee before it can be done. Maybe they will take what we have in the budget and do that. Usually, they do not. If they were to, we could balance it, in this case,

over a 10-year period. That is too long. Interest is going to eat us alive before that time. We are going to have to do something else.

I remember, when President Obama came into office, he had an idea. He said that the economy was too sluggish, so he was going to do a stimulus bill. Here, they are complaining about this \$1.5 trillion that, perhaps, might be part of the flexibility for doing tax reform. We did more than that in the stimulus, and it did not work and went into the hands of a few people. Some of it never did get used. Some of it went to very few people. It was supposed to go to shovel-ready projects. Some of those projects have not been done yet, so that did not work.

We have had a slow economy. In fact, it seemed to have been slowing down, not speeding up, until last November. Last November, people showed a sign of hope, and the economy started going the other way. It is reflected in the stock market and some of the commodity prices because they felt that those could be produced again.

We decided that we had to try a different approach, and the different approach was to try to put the money in the hands of hard-working Americans. That is the middle class that some of the people talk about, and it is the poor that some of the people talk about. It is everybody. When we do tax reform, it will affect everybody. In fact, there are even some studies that show that when you do the corporate tax, it increases money for individuals who are working because there will be more competition for people, and that will drive up wages. Some economists have pointed that out. Yet, rather than argue with the Congressional Budget Office about how much the change is going to be, we said: No. Go ahead. Do your static one just as though no change had been made at all. We are willing to bet that there will be a very slight increase that will cover what we are talking about as a possible deficit and that that deficit will not develop if we increase just a very small amount in productivity.

Just about every economist asked: How come you are picking such a low number? Well, we try to be conservative and hope that the number goes 4 or 5 or 6 points higher than that. If it does, we will have money to start paying back some of the debt. If it just stays at my estimated, conservative amount, at the end of 10 years, we will have a surplus of \$197 billion.

We have a chance to put America on a different route, one that will increase jobs, one that will get the money into the hands of the people, realizing that they probably know better what to do for themselves and their families than we do.

I do hear a lot when I go home about different government programs that are not working. In my studies, I have

found that we not only have programs that are not working but that we have programs that nobody ever takes a look at. We have programs that have a lot of duplication. We have 160 housing programs. There are really only 5 things that those 160 programs do, so shouldn't we have just 5 of them and maybe have them specifically and all under one agency and set some goals and see if they meet those goals?

I was visiting with a lady from Africa who happens to be in charge of finance in her country. She said: You know, we have performance contracts in our country, and a performance contract means that everybody, including the towns, does a list of what they are going to get done during the year.

Because they are smaller than the United States, once a year they get everybody together who has a performance contract, and everybody reviews his performance contract. If you do not meet your performance contract, there is a little bit of public embarrassment; whereas we do not even check to see if they did anything. We do not even check to see if they have plans. We have to change that, and some of the things in this budget will allow that to happen.

I appreciate the way that we finished up in committee. I allowed the other side to see the budget early. Normally, they get to see it after opening statements are done. Imagine that—do the opening statement about what you think is going to be in the budget. Although some of the speakers I have heard around here act like they are still thinking that something might be in the budget that is not, they got to see it 5 days early in exchange for submitting their amendments, which is what every other committee does. Submit the amendments early, and then we can look through them and see how much duplication there is and some that can be accepted from both sides. As a result, we started with over 150 amendments, and we voted on 25. We took five from the other side, making it a bipartisan budget.

Nevertheless, after the committee process, we brought it to the floor, and we had an open amendment process today. In fact, as for the way the rules are on this, after we voted on the last amendment—of course, before we voted on final passage—somebody could have said: Wait a minute, I have one more, and he could have gone on all night. Again, we had to think of a civil process today that would result in our being able to finish at what would be considered an extremely early hour.

There was a little different tone to the amendments than what I had seen before—I think people will agree with that—which was that they were focused on the actual items in the budget, not on “gotcha” amendments. Usually, they say: Well, that person is up, and he has this little soft spot, so if I

throw in this amendment, he will be on record, probably, having to vote against it, or he will vote for it, and that can be used against him. Either way, they would be able to use it. I didn't see those amendments this time, and I appreciate that.

I appreciate my colleagues for their consideration, their cooperation, and a lot of patience that has gotten us to this point.

I thank Leader MITCH MCCONNELL for allowing the Senators to do their jobs, to do them in committee, and to do them here on the Senate floor. This commitment to an open, honest, and transparent legislative process is crucial to helping Congress restore the trust of the American people.

I also owe thanks to the outstanding members of the Senate Budget Committee, who fought so hard and so tenaciously to outline a plan that could balance the budget over the next 10 years while providing the tools needed to reform our Tax Code and boost the economy. The Presiding Officer was a part of that committee, and the Senator who just finished presiding was a part of that committee. I appreciate the careful and calculated way they looked at it, provided suggestions, then asked good questions at hearings and helped to come up with that budget.

Thanks are due, as well, to the many Members on this side who came and spoke on the budget's behalf, who offered amendments to make it better—well, almost always to make it better—and who worked with each of us and each other to move through the resolution's debate and the vote process together.

I would also like to focus for a moment on some of the staff who helped to lead us here. I want to thank the Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee. That is Betsy McDonnell, my staff director, who is relatively new to the position, but you would never know that in the way she took hold with her knowledge and friendship among people, again, on both sides of the aisle. She has been able to work some wonders to where we had the least votes in a vote-arama that, I think, we have ever had. That came from her being able to combine some of them but also in helping them redraft so that they were covering a different area than somebody else might be covering, which eliminated some of the repetition.

I want to thank my deputy staff director, Matt Giroux, and Paul Vinovich, Becky Cole, Thomas Fuller, Elizabeth Keys, Joe Brenckle, Jim Neill, Steve Robinson, Greg D'Angelo, Tom Borck, Richard Berger, Jeremy Dalrymple, David Ditch, Susan Eckerly, Alison McGuire, Will Morris, Steve Townsend, Kelsie Wendelberger, and our interns Catherine Konieczny, Jake Whitaker, and Matt Pfeiffer. They are quite a team that has been

doing a lot of work, both daytime and night and while the Senate has been out of session.

So I would also like to offer a special thank-you to Eric Ueland, who previously served as my staff director. He has been nominated for a post within the administration, and he is still waiting for his vote here, which is being delayed a lot—not just on his but apparently on all of them.

Eric has played an important role on this committee and throughout his time in the Senate. Two years ago, Eric was instrumental in helping Congress approve its first balanced 10-year budget since 2001, which represented an important step toward putting our country on not just another course but a better course. He is careful, precise, and dogged in his work. He has a tremendous knowledge of the history of the Senate and particularly the budget process. I especially appreciate his understanding of the complex Senate rules and precedents, along with the Budget Act. I wish him Godspeed in his next position in service to our great Nation.

As well, thanks are due to my personal office staff who have to carry a load because I am not there when I am working on the budget stuff, but they keep me well informed so we are progressing on some of the State stuff at the same time. I particularly have to thank my chief of staff, Tara Shaw, who, because a new administration came in and liked the employees I had working for me, hired many of them away and we had to find replacements and she did an outstanding job with that. She has helped to kind of hold me together during this whole process and gives me outstanding advice so that I know not only what I am doing but why I am doing it, and, again, she has a tremendous history of what I have done before, which helps me as a good reminder. She is an outstanding chief of staff.

I also want to include my legislative director, Landon Stropko. When you are the budget chairman and you are worried about some of the numbers, you can give the legislative director a heart attack because as budget director you have to vote against some things that have some unusual numbers to it, but it might be something people in Wyoming are interested in. We were able to resolve some of those conflicts. I always support Wyoming, as I mentioned. For anything that happens in the budget process, there is another process that will actually require some votes to finish up anything that is in there, and we will see that everything in there comes out in Wyoming's favor as well as for the rest of the Nation. I am not trying to do anything partial just to our part of the country, although a lot of things I work on have to do with very rural places. We are the least populated State in the Nation,

but we are also the biggest State in the Nation so we have a lot of open space to invite people to.

I also want to thank Bart Massey, Liz Schwartz, Natalia Riggin, Aniela Butler, Charlie Carroll, Shawna Newsome, Garnett Decosimo, Chris Lydon, Aron Wehr, and Dylan Mitchell. I want to thank my Communications Director, Coy Knobel, our press team, Max D'Onofrio and Rachel Vliem, and the rest of the Wyoming team.

I have a bunch of people in Wyoming who primarily work on casework and do an outstanding job doing that.

I also want to thank the Budget Committee's bipartisan staff: Kim Proctor, Katie Smith, George Woodall, Grace Bruno, and Kevin Walsh, as well as Celina Inman, who has been on loan to us from the Government Publishing Office. You can tell around here it takes a lot of government printing.

We have also been supported by the great work of our leadership, the floor and cloak room staff. I thank them for their continued good work and dedication to this institution and the country as a whole.

In particular, I want to thank Sharon Soderstrom, Hazen Marshall, Jane Lee, and Brendan Dunn in the leader's office; Monica Popp, John Chapuis, and Emily Kirlin in the whip's office; and very especially Laura Dove, who really runs this place. She has a history from when her dad was the Parliamentarian, and I am sure there was dinner table talk that has led her to know a lot of the precedents. I have seen when somebody disagreed with her, she was able to just go over and pull out a manual and turn almost instantly to the page and say: Here it is. She does an outstanding job of helping us stay on the right track. I also thank Robert Duncan, Chris Tuck, Megan Mercer, Tony Hanagan, Mike Smith, Katherine Kilroy, and Chloe Barz in the cloakroom.

I would really be remiss if I didn't thank the Senate Parliamentarian, Elizabeth MacDonough, and her team, along with our bill and amendment clerks who kept us on the straight and narrow, but I particularly want to point out our Senate Parliamentarian who has to go through the technical details of every sentence of everything we do. When you talk about a filing cabinet of ideas all contained in one place, she does it. She knows precedent. She has been working at it for a long time. To be Parliamentarian, you have to be somebody who really likes detail work and pressure because when somebody comes in, they don't say: Take a look at this, and maybe I will see what you think next week. No, they want to know right now what you think, and fortunately she is able to, with a very great personality, say: Not yet, and then she does her research and comes up with some great explanations—not ones we always agree with—but great explanations for any

decision she makes, and we really appreciate that.

So you can see that it takes a whole lot of people, and I haven't had a chance to get the list of the people from the other side of the aisle who have been working on, in some cases countering what we are doing and keeping their people informed, but that is the Senate; that is, there are all these people behind the scenes who are helping to make it work and to do it right. That is important. We want to do it right.

Now, I think we could work together a lot better if we were able to work in smaller bites. I get a little upset when we do comprehensive stuff around here. I have watched so many times when we take a comprehensive bill and soundly defeat it or maybe narrowly defeat it, but we defeat it. I figured out, when we do something that ought to be in separate bites, that this piece loses 5 votes and this piece loses 10 votes and this piece loses 12 votes, and pretty quickly you don't have a majority anymore, but if you do it in smaller bites, you may lose 5 votes, lose 12 votes, and it isn't a big deal. Getting it done would be the big deal. So if people would settle for working one issue and sticking to that issue and not say: No, I have this amendment that I know nobody will like, but this is such an important bill, if I could get it in there, it will make it through and hardly anybody will know—that is not legislating, and we shouldn't be operating that way. We should be doing an item at a time, in bite sizes, so the American people can understand it, and we get it done.

I think a lot of people have done a great job here, including the pages. It is late, so rather than go on—I made it to after 10 p.m. so you don't have to have class tomorrow morning. With that, I will close.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Ohio.

TAX REFORM

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, as we have just seen, there is no more decent or honest Senator in the U.S. Senate than the Senator from Wyoming who just spoke, and that is why we were able to expedite the process tonight. It may seem like we are here late, but, frankly, we all expected to be here until 2 or 3 or 4 in the morning, and instead we worked things out. He is an example of why we did, both in committee and on the floor. Senator ENZI was able to work with people, be fair, honest, and that pays off. It gave everybody a fair shot.

I will also say he has produced a budget that does balance, which I think most Americans agree with. As he said so well, the budget is a framework. So the budget itself does not have the specific policies in it. In fact, those have to go to other committees to be passed and then will be passed by

the full Senate and the House and signed into law by the President.

What it does do is it prepares this body to do something really important and really exciting, and that is the opportunity to reform our broken Tax Code. It is so important because it will give us a shot in the arm, in terms of our economy. It will get this economy moving again, and it is going to help people who have been left behind in this economy. Really, when we look over the past 15 years, so many people whom I represent and who are represented by the other Members in this Chamber have not seen their wages go up. In fact, they have been flat, and what has gone up are expenses—healthcare expenses more than any, frankly. It is the biggest single increase people see in their family budget but also food, medicine, and tuition. We have seen flat wages, not more take-home pay, and higher expenses.

What we have an opportunity to do in this tax reform bill—that is a framework, not a mandate—that was made possible by the budget that was passed tonight is we have set the stage for commonsense tax reform that is essential to this effort to grow our economy and create more and better jobs and increased wages for middle-class Americans.

We heard a lot of discussion about it adding to the deficit. I will just add to what has been said already. If we do this tax reform right, it will not add to the deficit. In fact, I strongly believe it will reduce the deficit over the next 10 years. Why do I say that?

I am going to talk for a second about some of the things that are in good pro-growth tax reform that we are planning to implement that will actually grow the economy that will result in more economic activity and more revenue coming into the Treasury.

If you assume, as the Congressional Budget Office does, that we are only going to grow this economy 1.9 percent, which is a pretty paltry amount over the next 10 years—way below what the average has been for the past 30 years—then let's say all this tax reform we are doing only grows the economy by a little bit more. Let's say .4 percent. So instead of 1.9 percent, let's grow the economy at 2.3 percent. That is a conservative estimate, I believe, based on the kinds of things we are talking about. That will mean we actually not only have a revenue-neutral tax proposal, but we begin paying back some of the national debt by having the deficit, once again, as it was in the years 2000 and 2001, be on a unified basis at a zero deficit.

This is an exciting opportunity to help people be able to seek their goals in life but also to actually help with regard to the budget deficit. I agree with the chairman on that. I think we have an opportunity, if we do the right tax relief, to really help to get the budget deficit down.

How does this comprehensive tax reform help the middle class? We talked a little bit about this today. Some offered amendments. I offered one with regard to the business tax side of things, but I think it does it in three ways. First, it immediately helps the family budget by cutting middle-class taxes. So everything that has been laid out in terms of the proposals tonight on the tax side, we can talk about the fact that for families who are working families in this country who are making \$30, \$40, \$50, \$60,000 a year, those folks will see a reduction in their taxes which will help the family budget.

The Tax Code, of course, is very complicated, too burdensome. One thing we are proposing is to double the standard deduction. That means for people who take the deduction now—and about two-thirds of the people I represent do—they will be able to have a doubling of that, from \$12,000 for a family to up to \$24,000 for a family. That is a 0 tax bracket for the first \$24,000 in income. That is significant middle-class tax relief.

Second, we are going to expand the child tax credit. That is really important, not just to provide relief but to help families with kids be able to afford childcare.

Finally, we will adjust the bracket so people who are beyond the standard deduction, double or nothing, and who don't take advantage of the child tax credit also get tax relief.

So these are ways in which folks are going to see immediate help for the family budget, but it is more than that. It is more than that.

I think, frankly, the most significant part of this reform is going to be giving the economy that shot in the arm and helping to increase jobs and improve wages. That is going to happen, I think, through the business tax relief that we have talked about. First, with regard to smaller companies, the so-called passthrough companies, about three-quarters of the companies in America pay their taxes as individuals. This is the corner drugstore; this is the small manufacturing business in your town. Those folks are going to see a reduction in their taxes on their business income so they can invest more in that business and create more jobs, and a lot of the growth is going to come from these smaller businesses. That is the 25-percent rate people are talking about as compared to, say, a 35-percent or higher rate for individuals. That is something that is fair, in part because we are also going to lower the rates for people who are in the larger businesses. These are the C corporations that are being talked about. That rate has to come down. If it does not, America will continue to lose jobs and investment overseas, and that is what is happening right now.

Just in the last 24 hours, another major American company announced

that they are inverting; in other words, they are going overseas. Why? Because of the Tax Code. It is amazing that the Tax Code that this Congress is responsible for improving is so bad that people are actually voting with their feet and leaving the country and taking jobs and investment with them. We have done research on this, we have had investigations on this, and we know what is happening. We know, as an example, that because of our Tax Code, there are almost 5,000–4,700 companies just in the last 13 years that have become foreign companies that otherwise would be American companies. Think about that. That is the Ernst & Young study we recently saw. This is amazing. We know for a fact that it is not just about these companies leaving America and going to other countries and doing these so-called inversions—becoming a foreign company—but it is also foreign companies coming here and taking over U.S. companies, and, again, what is happening here is that jobs and investment are going overseas.

Why is this? Well, it is for a couple of reasons. One is that American companies now have the highest tax rate in all of the industrialized world. So the 35-percent tax rate you hear about, that is a high rate compared to every other country in the world that we do business with. That is a negative, but it is also how we tax. We tax in a way that discourages us from bringing profits back to America to the point that, unbelievably, there is between \$2.5 trillion and \$3 trillion—and some say more—of earnings stuck overseas, locked out of America, which could come back here to expand plants, equipment, and jobs, to actually get this economy moving. This is a huge opportunity for us. We don't want to see these companies go offshore. We want to see them come back.

Trade policy is important. Regulations are important. Worker retraining programs are important. Healthcare cost containment is important. But nothing is more important than fixing this broken Tax Code if we are going to see the kind of economic growth and improvement in wages that we all hope for.

There have been a lot of studies done on this, and they say that we haven't changed our code since the mid-1980s, but every other one of our competitors have. They have all lowered their rates, and they have all gone to a system of taxation that is more efficient to get this money back to their countries.

In 1986, Ronald Reagan was President. He made some great changes. That was 31 years ago. Things have changed a lot since then. By the way, back then Pete Rose was still playing for my Cincinnati Reds. That is how long ago it was.

It is time for us to update this Tax Code, to modernize it, and to bring

back those jobs and that investment. We can do it. We can do it because of what happened tonight. This creates the framework for us to be able to do this.

In a recent business roundtable survey of 150 American companies—these are the CEOs—82 percent said that tax reform that we are talking about will prompt them to increase capital spending. Three-quarters of them—76 percent—said that it is going to increase hiring. And with this reduced tax burden, businesses are going to have the money to invest in their workers.

I will tell you, with the tighter job market that is out there now as the economy has begun to improve, this will increase competition for workers, and this will increase wages. We know that is going to happen.

Every economist agrees that this kind of tax reform is going to change behavior. Some might think it doesn't improve the economy as much as others do, but everyone believes this will incentivize us to create more jobs and improve wages here in the United States of America.

There is a group called the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan group up here that we work with. They have a study that says that as much as 70 percent of the benefit from that lower corporate rate is going to go to the workers in terms of higher wages, better benefits. That is the way we are going to help the middle class also—not just with regard to the tax relief directly but with regard to helping to improve job creation and increase wages. So I am excited about this. I think it can happen. I think it is something that is long overdue.

I think it is something, frankly, that should be bipartisan. This was what the Simpson-Bowles proposal, which was a totally bipartisan proposal, said we ought to do. In fact, they took the top rate down to 28 percent—lower than anybody is talking about here. But they said that we should go to this kind of taxation we are talking about in terms of international businesses, in terms of corporations, in terms of creating jobs.

Two years ago, I worked with CHUCK SCHUMER, who is now the Democratic leader here in the U.S. Senate, and we were asked to cochair a working group on taxation—particularly folks on the international side—and we came up with a consensus, which said that we have to fix this broken Tax Code. It is not working, and we need to bring this money back. We need to bring these jobs back by going through this kind of system we are talking about, a so-called territorial system. In the past, this has been bipartisan, and my hope is it can be again.

Yes, the budget provides the framework for us to get this done, not on a 60-vote basis but a 50-vote basis. But we should do it with more than 60 votes. We welcome input from our

Democratic colleagues. I believe, in the end, this will be bipartisan because I do believe that the vast majority of Americans out there, as they understand this tax reform proposal will say: Yes, I think middle-class tax relief makes sense, and, yes, I think we should be bringing back the jobs and the investment to this country. I think that is going to be something that Members will hear across this country and across this aisle. When they do, I believe we will have the opportunity to have the kind of commonsense, bipartisan tax reform we need in this country. We need to do it to be able to have a thriving American middle class, and we need to do it to have a stronger America.

I am excited about this opportunity. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I yield back my time on that, but I have another matter that I need to do, the closing business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING WADE NELSON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Wade Nelson was a friend who began his professional life as a journalist and served at many levels in public service.

He was regarded as an honest professional in all of his life's work, a father and husband truly dedicated to his family, and a joy to count as a friend.

His colleague and friend, Bob Senter, wrote a remembrance, which I include with this statement. It was given to those of us in attendance at Wade's memorial service at the Unity Temple in Oak Park, IL, on October 7, 2017. The speakers at the service included his wife, Ellen Warren, a respected journalist in her own right, and his sons, Ted and Emmett. They each shared touching stories of Wade as a husband and father. Rick Kogan emceed the celebration with his own signature style and Wade's friends Bern Colleran, Terry Kelleher, Hanke Grateau, and musician Jon Webber each added great memories to the service.

As Bob Senter wrote:

Back in the rambunctious days of Chicago newspapers, Wade Nelson worked for the legendary columnist Mike Royko who sent his "legman" to check out a tip that Cook County judges were issued cushier toilet paper than that stocked in public restrooms.

The easy part for Nelson was grabbing samples from public toilets in the Loop courthouse, now known as the Daley Center.

Obtaining tissue from a judge's inner sanctum was trickier.

So, Nelson made up a pretense to interview Chief Judge John Boyle, then excused himself mid-talk to use the toilet attached to the judge's chambers. He emerged to confront the startled judge with the incriminating evidence, and a great column was born.

Charmin-gate was hardly the highlight of Nelson's days as a reporter. Yet it demonstrated the resourcefulness, spunk, and droll whimsy that propelled him on a rich career path involving being press secretary for the late U.S. Senator Alan Dixon of Illinois, communications director for the federal military base closure commission, political consultant, and chief speech writer for former Chicago Mayor Richard M. Daley.

That resume hardly defines the sum of Nelson, however. Friends remember him as someone with boundless curiosity and a walking encyclopedia of knowledge about interests as varied as Midwestern architecture, jazz, the Cubs, anything Chicago related, the minutia of the small Southern Michigan town of Sturgis where his ancestors were early settlers in the 1800s, and the secret to the perfect martini.

Edward Wade Nelson Jr. grew up in west suburban River Forest, attended Fenwick High School in Oak Park and the University of Missouri where he graduated with a degree in journalism.

As a young adult and beyond, his greatest devotion was reserved for performers at Chicago's varied night club, cabaret and piano bar scene where men and women who played and sang there came to embrace Nelson as an honored guest and friend. He became an audience fixture at venues, most now long gone, like The Acorn on Oak, Toulouse, The London House, the Green Mill, and Yvette. Nelson even came to name his family pets after 20th Century jazz legends.

As Nelson climbed the rungs of journalism jobs, from City News to the suburban Wilmette Life and then the Chicago Daily News, his career tracked closely with another young reporter, Ellen Warren, who later became a White House correspondent for the old Knight-Ridder news service and then a columnist for the Chicago Tribune. They eventually married and had two sons.

Nelson moved back to River Forest, but he rejoined Dixon in the mid-1990s when the former senator chaired a politically sensitive federal commission charged with recommending the closure of surplus military bases across the country.

In subsequent years, Nelson served as a spokesman for then-Cook County Circuit Court Clerk Aurelia Pucinski, now an appellate court judge, and the Illinois State Board of Education and became a program officer and grant manager at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, a Michigan-based non-profit specializing in education grants. Wedged in between these jobs was a multiyear stint as the chief speechwriter for Richard Daley, a difficult task making Chicago's notoriously ineloquent mayor sound eloquent.

Wade is survived by his wife and sons, Ted—and his wife, Sarah—and Emmett of Chicago; a sister, Karen Nelson of Chicago; and a brother, Ted—and his wife, Terry—of Spicewood, TX.

TRIBUTE TO ELAINE NEKRITZ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, earlier this month, Elaine Nekritz retired after more than 14 years of service rep-

resenting the 57th District in the Illinois House of Representatives. Along with being a good friend and dedicated public servant, Elaine was a real leader for her constituents in Northbrook, Arlington Heights, Wheeling, Buffalo Grove, and across her district.

Elaine's legacy in Illinois will always be visible as people travel on high-speed rail from Chicago to St. Louis and throughout the State. As the chair of the Illinois House Railroad Industry Committee, Elaine was a leader in advocating for high-speed rail before it was popular.

During her service in the State House, Elaine championed women's rights, the environment, and criminal justice reform as well. Because of Elaine's efforts, kids who have had run-ins with the law have a better shot at staying out of adult courts and avoiding getting caught in an endless criminal cycle.

Elaine was always willing to listen to colleagues and friends on both sides of the aisle, even when partnership was challenging. She helped craft bold legislation to rescue Illinois from its dire economic circumstances. As house assistant majority leader, she was a leader in working to reform pensions in our State. Fiscal responsibility was always her core value.

The people of the 57th District were lucky to have such a strong advocate. Her energy, creativity, and thoughtfulness will be missed.

I thank her for her service to Illinois and her friendship. I wish her the best of luck in her next adventures and salute her husband, Barry, for his strong partnership with his talented spouse.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 225, on Wyden amendment No. 1302. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 226, on Capito amendment No. 1393. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 227, on Cantwell amendment No. 1141. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 228, on Warner amendment No. 1138. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 229, on Flake amendment No. 1178. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 230, on Baldwin amendment No. 1139. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 231, on Heitkamp amendment No. 1228. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 232, on Brown amendment No. 1378. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 233, on Paul amendment No. 1296. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 234, on Cardin amendment No. 1375. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 235, on Kaine amendment No. 1249. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GAO OPINION LETTER RELATED TO INTERAGENCY GUIDANCE ON LEVERAGED LENDING

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the GAO opinion letter dated October 19, 2017, related to the Interagency Guidance on Leveraged Lending of March 22, 2013, Federal Register citation 78 FR 17766.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GOVERNMENT
ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,

Washington, DC, October 19, 2017.

Subject: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—Applicability of the Congressional Review Act to Interagency Guidance on Leveraged Lending

Hon. PAT TOOMEY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR TOOMEY: You asked whether the final Interagency Guidance on Leveraged Lending (Interagency Guidance or Guidance), issued jointly on March 22, 2013, by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (the Board), and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), is a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act (CRA). CRA establishes a process for congressional review of agency rules and establishes special expedited procedures under which Congress may pass a joint resolution of disapproval that, if enacted into law, overturns the rule. Congressional review is assisted by CRA's requirement that all federal agencies, including independent regulatory agencies, submit each rule to both Houses of Congress and to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) before it can take effect. For the reasons discussed below, we conclude that the Interagency Guidance is a general statement of policy and is a rule under the CRA.

BACKGROUND Congressional Review Act

CRA, enacted in 1996 to strengthen congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, requires all federal agencies, including independent regulatory agencies, to submit a report on each new rule to both Houses of Congress and to the Comptroller General before it can take effect. The report must contain a copy of the rule, "a concise general statement relating to the rule," and the rule's proposed effective date. In addition, the

agency must submit to the Comptroller General a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, and information concerning the agency's actions relevant to specific procedural rulemaking requirements set forth in various statutes and executive orders governing the regulatory process.

CRA adopts the definition of rule under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), which states in relevant part that a rule is "the whole or a part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency." CRA excludes three categories of rules from coverage: (1) rules of particular applicability; (2) rules relating to agency management or personnel; and (3) rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. The Agencies did not send a report on the Interagency Guidance to Congress or the Comptroller General because, as they stated in their letters to our Office, in their opinion the Guidance is not a rule under the CRA.

Interagency Guidance on Leveraged Lending

On March 22, 2013, OCC, the Board, and FDIC (referred to collectively as the Agencies) issued the Interagency Guidance, which forms the basis of the Agencies' review of the leveraged lending activities of supervised financial institutions. Leveraged lending generally encompasses large loans to corporate borrowers for the purposes of "mergers and acquisitions, business recapitalization and financing, equity buyouts, and business . . . expansions." Leveraged loans raise risk concerns because of the size of the loans relative to the borrower's cash flow, and are generally used to finance one-time business transactions rather than a company's ordinary course of business activities. The Guidance outlines the Agencies' minimum expectations on a wide range of topics related to leveraged lending, including underwriting standards, valuation standards, the risk rating of leveraged loans, and problem credit management.

The Interagency Guidance is "designed to assist financial institutions in providing leveraged lending to creditworthy borrowers in a safe-and-sound manner." It does so by describing expectations for the sound risk management of leveraged lending activities and lists a number of considerations for financial institutions: (1) the ratio of a borrower's debt to the company's earnings before interest, taxes, amortization and depreciation; (2) the ability of the borrower to amortize its secured debt, and (3) the level of due diligence performed in evaluating the loan. The Guidance explains the types of actions that concern the Agencies and that might motivate them to initiate a supervisory action that would require an independent finding that an unsafe or unsound action has occurred.

ANALYSIS

As an initial matter, one argument raised by the Agencies is that since the Guidance explicitly states that it is not a rule or a rulemaking action, it should not be considered a rule under CRA. However, although an agency's characterization should be considered in deciding whether its action is a rule under APA (and whether, for example, it is subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements), "an agency's own label . . . is not dispositive." Similarly, an agency's characterization is not determinative of whether it is a rule under CRA.

The focus of the arguments made by the Agencies is that the Interagency Guidance is a general statement of policy and is not subject to the CRA. They assert that the Guidance is a statement that explains how they will exercise their broad enforcement discretion. They maintain that it does not establish legally binding standards, is not certain or final, and does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of third parties. As a result, they claim, the Interagency Guidance is not a rule under CRA.

The Supreme Court has described "general statements of policy" as "statements issued by an agency to advise the public prospectively of the manner in which the agency proposes to exercise a discretionary power." In other words, a statement of policy announces the agency's tentative intentions for the future:

"A general statement of policy . . . does not establish a 'binding norm.' It is not finally determinative of the issues or rights to which it is addressed. The agency cannot apply or rely upon a general statement of policy as law because a general statement of policy only announces what the agency seeks to establish as policy."

The Interagency Guidance provides information on the manner in which the Agencies will exercise their enforcement authority regarding leveraged lending activities, does not establish a "binding norm," and does not determine the outcome of any Agency examination of a financial institution. Rather, the Guidance expresses the regulators' expectations regarding the sound risk management of leveraged lending activities. We agree with the Agencies that the Guidance is a general statement of policy. However, the issue presented here is whether this general statement of policy is a rule under CRA.

GAO has previously held that general statements of policy are rules under CRA. For example, in B-287557, May 14, 2001, we decided whether a "record of decision" (ROD) issued by the Fish and Wildlife Service in connection with a federal irrigation project was a rule under CRA. We found that the ROD was a general statement of policy regarding water flow and ecosystems issues in both the Trinity and Sacramento Rivers. The ROD modified prior policy in an attempt, in part, to restore fish habitat.

We cited to the APA definition of "rule," which includes "the whole or a part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency." This definition includes three key components: (1) an agency statement, (2) of future effect, and (3) designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy. We stated that this definition is broad, and includes both rules requiring notice and comment rulemaking and those that do not, such as general statements of policy.

We noted that, since CRA adopts the definition of "rule" from APA, it too covers both those requiring notice and comment and general statements of policy, which do not. We decided that the ROD fell squarely within CRA as an agency action that constituted a "statement of general . . . applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret or prescribe law or policy." We also noted that Congress intended CRA to cover, not only formal rulemaking, but also rules requiring notice and comment under 5 U.S.C. 553(c), rules that are not subject to notice and comment requirements, including rules that must be published in the

Federal Register before taking effect (5 U.S.C. 552(a)(1) and (2)), and other guidance documents. Since a general statement of policy is specifically included among the types of agency actions subject to the requirements of Sections 552(a)(1) (D) and (a)(2)(B), it is clear that CRA covers general statements of policy.

Additionally, in B-316048, April 17, 2008, we considered whether a letter issued by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to state health officials concerning the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) was a rule under CRA. We concluded that the letter was subject to CRA because it was, in fact, a rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements. However, in that decision we also discussed general statements of policy under CRA. CMS had argued that the letter was a general statement of policy "announcing the course which the agency intends to follow" in future adjudications, i.e., what the agency seeks to establish as policy. We explained that the definition of "rule" under both APA and CRA includes "a statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy." As a device that provides information on the manner in which an agency will exercise its authority or what the agency will seek to propose as policy, we noted that a general statement of policy would appear to fit squarely within this definition of a rule subject to CRA.

In deciding that a general statement of policy is a rule for CRA purposes, our prior decisions cite to the legislative history of CRA, which confirms that rules subject to CRA requirements include general statements of policy. A principal sponsor of the legislation that became CRA made clear that general statements of policy are covered by CRA, stating that "[t]he committees intend [CRA] to be interpreted broadly with regard to the type and scope of rules that are subject to congressional review." The sponsor added that documents covered by CRA include "statements of general policy, interpretations of general applicability, and administrative staff manuals and instructions to staff that affect a member of the public."

Additionally, in a floor statement during final consideration of the bill that became CRA, another principal sponsor of the legislation pointed out that rules subject to CRA include agency general statements of policy.

"Although agency interpretive rules, general statements of policy, guideline documents, and agency policy and procedure manuals may not be subject to the notice and comment provisions of section 553(c) of title 5, United States Code, these types of documents are covered under the congressional review provisions of the new chapter 8 of title 5.

"Under section 801(a) [CRA], covered rules, with very few exceptions, may not go into effect until the relevant agency submits a copy of the rule and an accompanying report to both Houses of Congress. Interpretive rules, general statements of policy, and analogous agency policy guidelines are covered without qualification because they meet the definition of a 'rule' borrowed from section 551 of title 5, and are not excluded from the definition of a rule."

We note that legal commentators also support the conclusion that CRA's requirements are applicable to general statements of policy. They have pointed out that federal agency actions fitting CRA's definition of a rule include "such items as . . . general statements of policy," and that "the legislative

history of the Act . . . makes clear that this scope was understood and intended.”

Nonetheless, the Agencies assert that because the Guidance does not establish legally binding standards, is not certain or final, and does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of third parties, it is not a rule under CRA. They cite to our decisions in which we found that agency actions that imposed binding requirements that were “both certain and final” were rules for CRA purposes. However, while our decisions recognize those characteristics as indicative of certain types of rules subject to CRA requirements, they do not suggest that the absence of those characteristics requires a determination that an agency action is not a rule under CRA. Moreover, when GAO has examined the issue whether an agency’s action substantially affects the rights or obligations of third parties, it has been in the context of analyzing whether the action falls within the CRA exception for agency rules of practice or procedure, not in deciding whether it meets the definition of rule.

The Agencies also cite to language in certain court decisions to suggest that policy statements are not rules under APA. However, those decisions do not support such a conclusion. Indeed, the Supreme Court has recognized that rules under the APA include “‘substantive [legislative] rules’ on the one hand” as well as “‘general statements of policy’” and other non-legislative rules on the other.

We can readily conclude that the Guidance does not fall within any of the three exceptions in CRA. We note here that the Interagency Guidance is of general and not particular applicability, does not relate to agency management or personnel, and is not a rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice.

CONCLUSION

The Interagency Guidance is a general statement of policy designed to assist financial institutions in providing leveraged lending to creditworthy borrowers in a sound manner. As such, it is a rule subject to the requirements of CRA.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN A. POLING,
General Counsel.

CHRISTENING OF THE USNS “HERSHEL ‘WOODY’ WILLIAMS”

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the christening of the United States Navy’s T-ESB 4 Expeditionary Sea Base, USNS *Hershel “Woody” Williams* taking place on October 21, 2017. This vessel is named after the proud West Virginian and last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from the Pacific theater during World War II. This ship will serve as a flexible platform to support Special Forces helicopters and aircraft, as well as counterpiracy and mine countermeasures.

This ship could not have a better namesake than Woody Williams. Woody’s life is the embodiment of what it means to serve this country, both in his military service during World War II, and his service to veterans and Gold Star families in his civilian life. Corporal Williams’ actions on Iwo Jima are the definition of heroism. He went

forward alone, facing deadly machine-gun fire from entrenched Japanese positions and fought bravely for 4 hours, taking out enemy positions one by one. His actions were crucial to his regiment’s success on Iwo Jima, wiping out a heavily defended Japanese position.

In addition to Woody’s wartime heroism, for which he received the Congressional Medal of Honor, he also has devoted his life to servicemembers, veterans, and their families. Through the Hershel Woody Williams Medal of Honor Foundation, he honors Gold Star families who have lost loved ones that bravely sacrificed their lives in defense of our freedom by seeking to establish Gold Star Families Memorial Monuments in all 50 States. His foundation also offers scholarships to Gold Star children and sponsors outreach programs that educate communities about Gold Star families and the sacrifice that they have made. To date, the foundation has established 26 Gold Star Families Memorial Monuments across the country, with 50 other monuments underway in 38 States. Woody also served our Nation’s veterans for 33 years as a veterans service representative in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

At 94 years old, Woody continues to be an energetic, unyielding force for good. I have had the privilege of knowing Woody Williams for many years, and the christening of this mobile sea base vessel is a testament to Woody’s bravery, his dedication to our Nation’s servicemembers, and his unwavering commitment to serving others. I am proud to rise today to recognize Mr. Williams and congratulate him on the christening of the USNS *Hershel “Woody” Williams*.

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BAHÁ’U’LLAH, THE FOUNDER OF THE BAHÁ’I FAITH

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am very pleased to draw attention today to the 200th anniversary of the birth of Baha’u’llah, the founder of the Baha’i Faith.

The Baha’i Faith has over 5 million followers around the world, including over 2,000 in Tennessee. Baha’is come from virtually every racial, ethnic, national, tribal, and linguistic background on the planet.

On October 22, 2017, Baha’i communities across the United States and around the world will commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of Baha’u’llah—the founder of the Baha’i Faith—and celebrate his life and his teachings.

Baha’u’llah was born to a noble family in 1817 in Persia, modern-day Iran. As a young man, he was known for his charity and service to others and was called the father of the poor. In 1844, he founded the Baha’i Faith, a new and independent religion with its own

scriptures, laws, teachings, and practices.

Baha’u’llah proclaimed a message of justice, unity, and peace. This message called for, among other things, the equality of women and men, an end to racial prejudice, universal education, interfaith harmony, and international cooperation. As a result of his teachings, Baha’u’llah was imprisoned and exiled for over 40 years by the Persian and Ottoman empires.

Despite the injustice and oppression he faced throughout his life, Baha’u’llah continued to promote a message of peace and unity based upon harmony within the human race. In every place to which he was banished, he touched the lives of all those around him. Even some of his opponents, after meeting him, became his friends and admirers.

Today Baha’is in Iran are still persecuted for their faith, and human rights experts have called their situation one of the clearest and most severe cases of religious persecution in the world.

The Baha’i Faith first arrived in the U.S. over 120 years ago. Baha’is now live in every State of the Union, including Tennessee, where the community has grown to over 2,000 members.

Wherever they live, Baha’is champion the principles that Baha’u’llah proclaimed. They strive to build a better world by being good citizens, serving their communities, and working side by side with others to promote the common good.

On this important occasion, I congratulate the Baha’i community of Tennessee and across the United States on the bicentennial of the birth of Baha’u’llah.

REMEMBERING EVELYNE J. VILLINES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the passing of disability rights pioneer and my longtime friend, Ms. Evelyn Villines. Ever since I first met Evelyn during my early years in the Iowa House of Representatives, I knew her to be a fierce advocate on behalf of those with disabilities. She had an outstanding work ethic and never stopped campaigning for those with disabilities to be recognized for their abilities and not by what others saw as their limitations.

Thanks to people like Evelyn, our society has made a lot of progress in this area. Evelyn’s tireless work earned her recognition on both the State and national levels as an inductee into the Iowa Women’s Hall of Fame and the national Hall of Fame for Persons with Disabilities. Evelyn’s efforts were recognized as paving the way for passage for the American with Disabilities Act of 1990.

She served on numerous commissions and joined the board of SourceAmerica

in its infancy, leading the company to become one of the largest employers of people with disabilities in the Nation. Evelyne's advocacy and resulting accomplishments have opened the doors of opportunity for people with disabilities.

I am honored to stand before you in recognizing Evelyne for her lifelong commitment to service. Evelyne's legacy will live on for years to come through the countless individuals who will continue to benefit from her life's work.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT HIGDON, JR.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Robert Higdon, Jr., and congratulate him on his appointment as the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

Bobby earned both his law degree and undergraduate degree from Wake Forest University and has a decorated career in public service and in private practice. Prior to law school, he worked for then-Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole and for Senator John East. Upon graduating from law school, Bobby served as a law clerk to Judge Eugene H. Phillips on the North Carolina Court of Appeals. After working for several years in private practice, he began a successful career as a Federal prosecutor.

From 1991 until 2015, Bobby served in the U.S. Attorney's Office and the U.S. Department of Justice in a number of roles, including chief of the criminal division in the Eastern District of North Carolina. He has vast experience investigating, prosecuting, and advising on criminal cases, ranging from violent crime and drug trafficking to white collar and public integrity crimes.

Aside from his sterling legal career, Bobby is an active member of his community, inspiring and helping others. He serves his church as a volunteer and a Sunday School teacher, and he has mentored the next generation of lawyers by coaching in various mock trial competitions. His example reminds us that our roles as public servants extend beyond the office.

It was an honor to recommend Bobby Higdon to President Trump. Anyone who works with him knows he is a dedicated professional who has extensive legal knowledge and expertise. In addition, he is widely respected in the law enforcement community, and these relationships will be incredibly valuable as he takes on this important role. Bobby understands the challenges and issues facing North Carolina, and I know that he will continue to lead the U.S. Attorney's Office with dignity and respect.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO NORMAN JOSEPH

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to commend Norman Joseph of Jackson, a leader in Mississippi athletics, on his induction into the Belhaven University Sports Hall of Fame this month. Coach Joseph is a Vicksburg native who played quarterback and defensive back at Mississippi State University. As a coach in the nearly four decades since, he has delivered a tradition of excellence, success, and Christian character to student-athletes in Mississippi and across the country.

Norman Joseph has coached on every level of 4-year college football. Starting and rebuilding teams became a hallmark of his career. He built the Belhaven University football program from the ground up and served as its inaugural head coach. Coach Joseph launched Belhaven's recruiting program, designed its uniforms, and consulted on the creation of practice facilities and a new athletic complex. Under his leadership, the football program experienced immediate success and achieved a Top 25 ranking for 6 consecutive weeks during its second season.

Coach Joseph has coached at three Jackson-area colleges. In addition to Belhaven, he served as quarterbacks coach at Millsaps College and head coach at Mississippi College in Clinton for nine seasons.

At Mississippi College, Coach Joseph took a program in decline and established a winning culture. Under his guidance, the team had an eight-win season in only 3 years. Within 5 years, the team won the conference championship and went to the second round of the Division III playoffs. Coach Joseph took his team to NCAA Top 25 National Rankings in scoring offense, total offense, passing offense, rushing offense, first downs, and fewest interceptions. In 2009, he coached Mississippi College to the American Southwest Conference cochampions and was named the 2009 American Football Coaches Association Regional Coach of the Year and the 2009 American Southwest Conference Coach of the Year.

Coach Joseph began his coaching career at the University of Louisiana at Monroe as a position coach working for John David Crow, who was Bear Bryant's only Heisman Trophy winner. He later returned to Louisiana Monroe as offensive coordinator and quarterbacks coach, delivering record offense, four consecutive winning seasons, and three NCAA Division IAA championship berths ranked at number four or higher.

He took over the Louisiana College football program 3 years after that program was reinstated and compiled the

school's best record in more than 40 years.

He has also assisted programs at the University of Southern Mississippi, San Jose State University, Vanderbilt University, Louisiana Tech University, Northwestern State University, and Midwestern State University.

Coach Joseph has set offensive records at every school he has coached, including an NCAA Division I record for combined total yards in a game, a record set in 2001 that remained intact until last year.

Coach Joseph's career has been focused on more than gridiron wins and records. As a coach, his attention to the development of players as individuals has resulted in academic and professional success for many young men. Under his guidance, scores of players have earned Academic All-Conference, All-American, All-Conference, and MVP honors. He has the distinction of coaching three quarterbacks with Super Bowl rings, and one of his former players is currently the head football coach of the Philadelphia Eagles.

Coach Joseph has been active in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes. In 2016, he was appointed by Mississippi Governor Phil Bryant to the Governor's Commission on Physical Fitness and Sports.

I am proud to recognize Norman Joseph as an outstanding Mississippian. He and his wife, the former Jane Bird of Vicksburg, have three daughters, Elizabeth, Grace Anne, and Sara Catherine. Elizabeth serves on my staff. This family is active at First Baptist Church in Jackson where Coach Joseph serves as a deacon.

Belhaven University's long tradition of producing successful student-athletes could not be accomplished without outstanding leadership from coaches and staff. I know Norman Joseph provided that leadership and character, and I am pleased he will be honored as a member of the Belhaven University Sports Hall of Fame. •

TRIBUTE TO TODD DUNLAP

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Todd Dunlap from East Helena, MT. Todd served in the U.S. Navy for 24 years as an electronic warfare and cryptology specialist, ultimately attaining the rank of master chief petty officer, the highest enlisted rank in the Navy. Todd's service included seven deployments overseas in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and other efforts. His work supported Special Operations Forces on the ground.

Todd's service did not end when he left Active Duty. He now works for the Montana Department of Veterans Affairs and continues to support those who have also served our country. His peers view him as a highly skilled professional and subject matter expert,

and he has earned a reputation for selfless outreach across the State to assist veterans and their family members navigate the VA.

As someone who continues to serve members of the Armed Forces community, Todd is receiving a gift from a Montana organization that donates a fully outfitted trip to military servicemembers who have provided extraordinary service to our country and to those facing life-threatening illness. I sincerely thank Todd for his continued service to our great Nation. He is well-deserving of this recognition. As an avid outdoorsman myself, I hope he tags a wonderful elk during his time away with family.●

TRIBUTE TO CHRIS HINDOIEN

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing an exceptional volunteer named Chris Hindoién. Chris has helped inform and educate Montanans serving in the National Guard or Reserve component, as well as their employers, about the rights and responsibilities associated with a military mobilization.

In August, Chris was recognized by the Office of the Secretary of Defense for nearly 4 years of service as the State chairman of the Montana Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve, ESGR. For his efforts, Chris received the Exceptional Public Service Award. During his stretch as chairman, he worked tirelessly to make sure that the relationship between military servicemembers and their employers remained strong across Big Sky Country. Chris is the son of the late Brig. Gen. Gary Hindoién, a former commander of the Montana Air National Guard, so his demonstrated commitment to our State and our Nation comes as no surprise.

Montana has a longstanding tradition of public service. Whether it be working on an agriculture project as a Peace Corps volunteer or as an Army Ranger at the tip of the military spear, the Montana attitude towards service to others continues to endure and Chris's work has enabled others to serve. Thank you, Chris, for committing your time and talent to enable the success of others.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3135. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Remedial Action Schemes Reliability Standard" ((18 CFR Part 40) (Docket No. RM16-20-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate

on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3136. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Balancing Authority Control, Inadvertent Interchange, and Facility Interconnection Reliability Standards" ((RIN1902-AF30) (Docket No. RM16-13-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3137. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances" ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9966-84-OCSP)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3138. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 SO₂ and 2010 PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards; North Dakota" (FRL No. 9966-00-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3139. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oklahoma: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revision" (FRL No. 9968-29-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3140. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Final Determination to Defer Sanctions; California; Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin" (FRL No. 9969-03-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3141. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Nebraska Air Quality Implementation Plans; Adoption of a New Chapter under the Nebraska Administrative Code" (FRL No. 9968-76-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3142. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Nebraska's Air Quality Implementation Plan; Operating Permits Program, and 112(1) program; Revision to Nebraska Administrative Code" (FRL No. 9968-78-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3143. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Re-

quirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9968-80-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3144. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9968-82-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3145. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of California Air Plan Revisions; Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9968-35-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3146. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; General Burning Rule Revisions" (FRL No. 9969-04-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3147. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Revisions to Air Pollution Control Rules" (FRL No. 9969-05-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3148. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze State and Federal Implementation Plans" (FRL No. 9968-97-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3149. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Prevention of Significant Deterioration Updates" (FRL No. 9968-90-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3150. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; South Carolina; Interstate Transport (Prongs 1 and 2) for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ Standard" (FRL No. 9968-73-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3151. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Interstate Transport" (FRL No. 9968-72-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3152. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9968-71-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3153. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Florida; Permitting Revisions" (FRL No. 9968-92-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3154. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule" (FRL No. 9968-93-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3155. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances" (RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9964-42-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3156. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: City of Philadelphia; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units" (FRL No. 9969-45-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 21, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3157. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9969-48-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3158. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Amendment to Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone" (FRL No. 9969-40-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3159. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Miscellaneous Metal Parts Surface Coating, Miscellaneous Plastic Parts Surface Coating, and Pleasure Craft Surface Coatings" (FRL No. 9969-32-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3160. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9969-59-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3161. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide Standard" (FRL No. 9969-51-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3162. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Vermont; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule" (FRL No. 9969-56-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3163. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; South Carolina; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule" (FRL No. 9969-27-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3164. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; SC; Multiple Revisions to Air Pollution Control Standards" (FRL No. 9969-29-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3165. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; SC; Miscellaneous Revisions to Multiple Rules" (FRL No. 9969-41-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3166. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Air Curtain Burners" (FRL No. 9969-33-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3167. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Fulton County Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9969-67-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3168. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9969-61-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3169. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9969-26-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3170. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9969-64-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3171. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule" (FRL No. 9969-30-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3172. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia; New Source Review Updates" (FRL No. 9969-43-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3173. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Florida; Stationary Sources Emissions Monitoring" (FRL No. 9969-39-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3174. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Florida; Interstate Transport (Prongs 1 and 2 for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ Standard)" (FRL No. 9969-20-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3175. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; Non-attainment New Source Review Permit Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9969-54-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3176. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; AL; VOC Definitions and Particulate Emissions" (FRL No. 9969-36-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3177. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; AL; VOC Definitions and Particulate Emissions" (FRL No. 9969-35-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3178. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Alabama; PSD Replacement Units" (FRL No. 9969-22-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3179. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; South Carolina; Standards for Volatile Organic Compounds and Oxides of Nitrogen" (FRL No. 9969-31-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3180. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Transportation Conformity" (FRL No. 9969-28-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3181. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Transportation Conformity" (FRL No. 9969-24-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3182. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Transportation Conformity" (FRL No. 9969-25-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3183. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethno-

logical Materials from the Republic of Mali" (RIN1515-AE32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3184. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Health, United States, 2016"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3185. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second semi-annual report of fiscal year 2016 of the Department of Justice's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties; to the Committees on the Judiciary; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-3186. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first semi-annual report of fiscal year 2016 of the Department of Justice's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties; to the Committees on the Judiciary; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-3187. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Size Standards; Adoption of 2017 North American Industry Classification System for Size Standards" (RIN3245-AG84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3188. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Secretary of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 194. A bill to ensure the effective processing of mail by Federal agencies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-176).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Gregory Ibach, of Nebraska, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

*William Northey, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Annemarie Carney Axon, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Thomas Alvin Farr, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

William M. Ray II, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

John C. Demers, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Scott C. Blader, of Wisconsin, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin for the term of four years.

John R. Lausch, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of four years.

J. Douglas Overbey, of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee for the term of four years.

Mark A. Klaassen, of Wyoming, to be United States Attorney for the District of Wyoming for the term of four years.

William C. Lamar, of Mississippi, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitations for deductible new business expenditures and to consolidate provisions for start-up and organizational expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. KING):

S. 1985. A bill to repeal the rules issued by the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health and Human Services entitled "Religious Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" and "Moral Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1986. A bill to amend the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 to extend the jurisdiction of tribal courts to cover crimes involving sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 1987. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the reversionary interest held by the United States in and to certain land in Pottawattamie County, Iowa, and to express the sense of Congress relating to the continued provision of information relating to certain national historic trails; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1988. A bill to streamline broadband infrastructure permitting on established public rights-of-way, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1989. A bill to enhance transparency and accountability for online political advertisements by requiring those who purchase and publish such ads to disclose information about the advertisements to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1990. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amounts payable by the Department of Veterans Affairs for dependency and indemnity compensation, to modify the requirements for dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain veterans rated totally disabled at the time of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1991. A bill to reduce the risk posed by wildfires to communities and the most at-risk federally owned forests; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1992. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require federally licensed firearms importers, manufacturers, and dealers to meet certain requirements with respect to securing their firearms inventory, business records, and business premises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1993. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. LEE):

S. 1994. A bill to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 294. A resolution congratulating the Minnesota Lynx women's basketball team on winning the 2017 Women's National Basketball Association championship; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr.

FRANKEN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 295. A resolution designating October 2017 as "National Employee Ownership Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. Res. 296. A resolution designating the week of November 5 through 12, 2017, as "National Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. Res. 297. A resolution supporting Lights On Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool programs held on October 26, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 298. A resolution supporting the designation of September 2017 as "National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 299. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 20, 2017, as the "National Day on Writing"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 300. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of McDaniel College; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 236

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 301

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1110

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1110, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes.

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1364, a bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1580

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 1589, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1632, a bill to establish an additional fund in the Treasury to meet existing statutory obligations to reimburse costs reasonably incurred as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater support to students with dependents, and for other purposes.

S. 1706

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1706, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1706, *supra*.

S. 1719

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to eliminate duties on imports of recreational performance outerwear, to establish the Sustainable Textile and Apparel Research Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1732

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1732, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to promote testing of incentive payments for behavioral health providers for adoption and use of certified electronic health record technology.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1857

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1857, a bill to establish a compliance deadline of May 15, 2023, for Step 2 emissions standards for new residential wood heaters, new residential hydronic heaters, and forced-air furnaces.

S. 1916

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1916, a bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1945, a bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

S. 1960

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1960, a bill to repeal the amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016.

S. 1967

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1967, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional exemptions to the individual mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 1970

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1970, a bill to establish a public health plan.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 211

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 211, a resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

S. RES. 250

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 250, a resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy.

AMENDMENT NO. 1141

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1141 proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1197

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1197 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1228

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1228 proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the con-

gressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1247

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1247 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1248

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1248 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1271

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1271 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1273

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1273 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1301

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1301 proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1305

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1305 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1315

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1315 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1318

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1318 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1319

At the request of Mr. REED, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1319 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1321

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1321 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1330

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1330 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1332

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1332 intended to be proposed

to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1333

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1333 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1354

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1354 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1372

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1372 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1373

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1373 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1378

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1378 proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1383

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1383 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1386

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1386 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1387

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1387 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1388

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1388 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1391

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1391 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

AMENDMENT NO. 1398

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1398 intended to be proposed to H. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018

and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLI-
BRAND, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1992. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require federally licensed firearms importers, manufacturers, and dealers to meet certain requirements with respect to securing their firearms inventory, business records, and business premises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1992

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Safety Enhancements for Communities Using Reasonable and Effective Firearm Storage Act" or the "SECURE Firearm Storage Act".

SEC. 2. SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERALLY LICENSED FIREARMS IMPORTERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND DEALERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(m) SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) RELATION TO PROVISION GOVERNING GUN SHOWS.—This subsection shall apply to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer except as provided in subsection (j).

"(2) FIREARM STORAGE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A person who is a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer shall keep and store each firearm in the business inventory of the licensee at the premises covered by the license.

"(B) MEANS OF STORAGE.—When the premises covered by the license are not open for business, the licensee shall, with respect to each firearm in the business inventory of the licensee—

"(i) secure the firearm with a hardened steel rod ¼ inch thick through the space between the trigger guard, and the frame or receiver, of the firearm, with—

"(I) the steel rod secured by a hardened steel lock that has a shackle;

"(II) the lock and shackle protected or shielded from the use of a bolt cutter; and

"(III) the rod anchored to prevent the removal of the firearm from the premises; or

"(ii) store the firearm in—

"(I) a locked fireproof safe;

"(II) a locked gun cabinet (and if the locked gun cabinet is not steel, each firearm within the cabinet shall be secured with a hardened steel rod ¼ inch thick, protected or shielded from the use of a bolt cutter and anchored to prevent the removal of the firearm from the premises); or

"(III) a locked vault.

"(3) PAPER RECORD STORAGE.—When the premises covered by the license are not open

for business, the licensee shall store each paper record of the business inventory and firearm transactions of, and other dispositions of firearms by, the licensee at the premises in a secure location such as a locked fireproof safe or locked vault.

"(4) ADDITIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Attorney General may, by regulation, prescribe such additional security requirements as the Attorney General determines appropriate with respect to the firearms business conducted by a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, such as requirements relating to the use of—

"(A) alarm and security camera systems;

"(B) site hardening; and

"(C) other measures necessary to reduce the risk of theft at the business premises of a licensee."

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(q) PENALTIES FOR NONCOMPLIANCE WITH FIREARMS LICENSEE SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) PENALTY.—With respect to a violation by a licensee of section 923(m) or a regulation issued under that section, the Attorney General, after notice and opportunity for hearing—

"(i) in the case of the first violation or related series of violations on the same date, shall subject the licensee to a civil penalty in an amount equal to not less than \$1,000 and not more than \$10,000;

"(ii) in the case of the second violation or related series of violations on the same date—

"(I) shall suspend the license issued to the licensee under this chapter until the licensee cures the violation; and

"(II) may subject the licensee to a civil penalty in an amount provided in clause (i); or

"(iii) in the case of the third violation or related series of violations on the same date—

"(I) shall revoke the license issued to the licensee under this chapter; and

"(II) may subject the licensee to a civil penalty in an amount provided in clause (i).

"(B) REVIEW.—An action of the Attorney General under this paragraph may be reviewed only as provided under section 923(f).

"(2) ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES.—The imposition of a civil penalty or suspension or revocation of a license under paragraph (1) shall not preclude any administrative remedy that is otherwise available to the Attorney General."

(c) APPLICATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the second sentence, by striking "be in such form and contain only that" and inserting "describe how the applicant plans to comply with subsection (m) and shall be in such form and contain only such other"; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(H) the Attorney General determines that the description in the application of how the applicant plans to comply with subsection (m) would, if implemented, so comply."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) INITIAL FIREARM STORAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 923(m)(2) of title 18, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) INITIAL PAPER RECORDS STORAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 923(m)(3) of title 18, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1993. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act. This legislation expands the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to provide surrounding communities much-needed additional access to nature while maintaining private property rights and existing local land use authorities.

This bill adds an additional 191,000 acres, known as the Rim of the Valley Unit, to better protect natural resources and habitats, and provide members of the local community with improved recreational and educational opportunities.

This proposed expansion comes at the recommendation of the National Park Service after a six-year special resource study of the area. The study was directed by Congress in the Rim of the Valley Corridor Study Act, passed in 2008. The National Park Service's recommendation takes into account over 2,000 comments received from the public, elected officials, local organizations, and other stakeholders.

This legislation will significantly expand outdoor recreational opportunities for residents of Los Angeles County, one of the most densely populated and park-poor areas in California.

In fact, 47% of Californians—that's six percent of the U.S. population—live within two hours of the proposed expansion area. Enlarging the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area will provide these communities with increased access to public lands and a boost to the local economy.

The proposed expansion will also protect valuable habitat for endangered wildlife, such as the California red-legged frog. Other species protected include mountain lions, bobcats, foxes, badgers, coyotes, and deer.

Notably, the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act would only allow the Department of the Interior to acquire non-Federal land within the new boundaries through exchange, donation, or purchase from willing sellers. This legislation will not create any additional liability or restrictions for private property owners.

This bill enjoys the support of more than 50 local municipalities, community groups, and elected officials. It is the product of true public engagement in the legislative process.

I would like to thank my colleague, Representative ADAM SCHIFF, for introducing this legislation in the House.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. LEE):

S. 994. A bill to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 994

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Corrections Oversight, Recidivism Reduction, and Eliminating Costs for Taxpayers In Our National System Act of 2017” or the “CORRECTIONS Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—CORRECTIONS ACT

Sec. 101. Recidivism reduction programming and productive activities.

Sec. 102. Post-sentencing risk and needs assessment system.

Sec. 103. Prerelease custody.

Sec. 104. Reports.

Sec. 105. Additional tools to promote recovery and prevent drug and alcohol abuse and dependence.

Sec. 106. Promoting successful reentry.

Sec. 107. Parole for juveniles.

Sec. 108. Compassionate release initiative.

TITLE II—BUREAU OF PRISONS SECURE FIREARMS STORAGE

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Findings.

Sec. 203. Secure firearms storage.

TITLE III—NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Findings.

Sec. 303. Establishment of commission.

Sec. 304. Purpose of the commission.

Sec. 305. Review, recommendations, and report.

Sec. 306. Membership.

Sec. 307. Administration.

Sec. 308. Authorization for use of funds.

Sec. 309. Sunset.

TITLE I—CORRECTIONS ACT

SEC. 101. RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAMMING AND PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(1) conduct a review of recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, including prison jobs, offered in correctional institutions, including programming and activities offered in State correctional institutions, which shall include a review of research on the effectiveness of such programs;

(2) conduct a survey to identify products, including products purchased by Federal agencies, that are currently manufactured overseas and could be manufactured by prisoners participating in a prison work program

without reducing job opportunities for other workers in the United States; and

(3) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a strategic plan for the expansion of recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, including prison jobs, in Bureau of Prisons facilities required by section 3621(h)(1) of title 18, United States Code, as added by subsection (b).

(b) AMENDMENT.—Section 3621 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAMMING AND PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons, shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, make available to all eligible prisoners appropriate recidivism reduction programming or productive activities, including prison jobs, in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) EXPANSION PERIOD.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall, not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, ensure appropriate recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, including prison jobs, are available for all eligible prisoners.

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The National Institute of Corrections shall evaluate all recidivism reduction programming or productive activities that are made available to eligible prisoners and determine whether such programming or activities may be certified as evidence-based and effective at reducing or mitigating offender risk and recidivism.

“(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether or not to issue a certification under clause (i), the National Institute of Corrections shall consult with internal or external program evaluation experts, including the Office of Management and Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States to identify appropriate evaluation methodologies for each type of program offered, and may use analyses of similar programs conducted in other correctional settings.

“(3) RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PARTNERSHIPS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall issue regulations requiring the official in charge of each correctional facility to ensure, subject to the availability of appropriations, that appropriate recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, including prison jobs, are available for all eligible prisoners within the time period specified in paragraph (2), by entering into partnerships with the following:

“(A) Nonprofit and other private organizations, including faith-based and community-based organizations, that provide recidivism reduction programming, on a paid or volunteer basis.

“(B) Educational institutions that will deliver academic classes in Bureau of Prisons facilities, on a paid or volunteer basis.

“(C) Nonprofit or other private organizations, including faith-based and community-based organizations, that will—

“(i) deliver occupational and vocational training and certifications in Bureau of Prisons facilities;

“(ii) provide equipment to facilitate occupational and vocational training or employment opportunities for prisoners;

“(iii) employ prisoners; or

“(iv) assist prisoners in prerelease custody or supervised release in finding employment.

“(D) Industry-sponsored organizations that deliver workforce development and training that lead to recognized certification and employment.

“(4) ASSIGNMENTS.—In assigning prisoners to recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall use the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System described in section 3621A and shall ensure that—

“(A) to the extent practicable, prisoners are separated from prisoners of other risk classifications in accordance with best practices for effective recidivism reduction;

“(B) a prisoner who has been classified as low risk and without need for recidivism reduction programming shall participate in and successfully complete productive activities, including prison jobs, in order to maintain a low-risk classification;

“(C) a prisoner who has successfully completed all recidivism reduction programming to which the prisoner was assigned shall participate in productive activities, including a prison job; and

“(D) to the extent practicable, each eligible prisoner shall participate in and successfully complete recidivism reduction programming or productive activities, including prison jobs, throughout the entire term of incarceration of the prisoner.

“(5) MENTORING SERVICES.—Any person who provided mentoring services to a prisoner while the prisoner was in a penal or correctional facility of the Bureau of Prisons shall be permitted to continue such services after the prisoner has been transferred into prerelease custody, unless the person in charge of the penal or correctional facility of the Bureau of Prisons demonstrates, in a written document submitted to the person, that such services would be a significant security risk to the prisoner, persons who provide such services, or any other person.

“(6) RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAM INCENTIVES AND REWARDS.—Prisoners who have successfully completed recidivism reduction programs and productive activities shall be eligible for the following:

“(A) TIME CREDITS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), a prisoner who has successfully completed a recidivism reduction program or productive activity that has been certified under paragraph (2)(B) shall receive time credits of 5 days for each period of 30 days of successful completion of such program or activity. A prisoner who is classified as low risk shall receive additional time credits of 5 days for each period of 30 days of successful completion of such program or activity.

“(ii) AVAILABILITY.—A prisoner may not receive time credits under this subparagraph for successfully completing a recidivism reduction program or productive activity—

“(I) before the date of enactment of this subsection; or

“(II) during official detention before the date on which the prisoner’s sentence commences under section 3585(a).

“(iii) EXCLUSIONS.—No credit shall be awarded under this subparagraph to a prisoner serving a sentence for a second or subsequent conviction for a Federal offense imposed after the date on which the prisoner’s first such conviction became final, which shall not include any offense under section 1152 or section 1153 for which the prisoner was sentenced to less than 13 months. No credit shall be awarded under this subparagraph to a prisoner with 13 or more criminal

history points, as determined under the sentencing guidelines, at the time of sentencing, unless the court determines in writing at sentencing that the defendant's criminal history category substantially overrepresents the seriousness of the defendant's criminal history or the likelihood that the defendant will commit other crimes and exercises its authority to lower the defendant's criminal history category. No credit shall be awarded under this subparagraph to any prisoner serving a sentence of imprisonment for conviction for any of the following offenses:

“(I) A Federal crime of terrorism, as defined in section 2332b(g)(5).

“(II) A Federal crime of violence, as defined in section 16.

“(III) A Federal sex offense, as described in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (34 U.S.C. 20911).

“(IV) Engaging in a continuing criminal enterprise, as defined in section 408 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 848).

“(V) A Federal crime involving child exploitation, as defined in section 2 of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (34 U.S.C. 21101).

“(VI) A violation of—

“(aa) chapter 11 (relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest);

“(bb) chapter 29 (relating to elections and political activities);

“(cc) section 1028A, 1031, or 1040 (relating to fraud);

“(dd) chapter 63 involving a scheme or artifice to deprive another of the intangible right of honest services;

“(ee) chapter 73 (relating to obstruction of justice);

“(ff) chapter 95 or 96 (relating to racketeering and racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations); or

“(gg) chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation and other abuse of children).

“(iv) IDENTIFICATION OF COVERED OFFENSES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the United States Sentencing Commission shall prepare and submit to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons a list of all Federal offenses described in subclauses (I) through (VI) of clause (iii), and shall update such list on an annual basis.

“(B) OTHER INCENTIVES.—The Bureau of Prisons shall develop policies to provide appropriate incentives for successful completion of recidivism reduction programming and productive activities, other than time credit pursuant to subparagraph (A), including incentives for prisoners who are precluded from earning credit under subparagraph (A)(iii). Such incentives may include additional telephone or visitation privileges for use with family, close friends, mentors, and religious leaders.

“(C) PENALTIES.—The Bureau of Prisons may reduce rewards a prisoner has previously earned under subparagraph (A) for prisoners who violate the rules of the penal or correctional facility in which the prisoner is imprisoned, a recidivism reduction program, or a productive activity.

“(D) RELATION TO OTHER INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.—The incentives described in this paragraph shall be in addition to any other rewards or incentives for which a prisoner may be eligible, except that a prisoner shall not be eligible for the time credits described in subparagraph (A) if the prisoner has accrued time credits under another provision of law based solely upon participation in, or successful completion of, such program.

“(7) SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION.—For purposes of this subsection, a prisoner—

“(A) shall be considered to have successfully completed a recidivism reduction program or productive activity, if the Bureau of Prisons determines that the prisoner—

“(i) regularly attended and participated in the recidivism reduction program or productive activity;

“(ii) regularly completed assignments or tasks in a manner that allowed the prisoner to realize the criminogenic benefits of the recidivism reduction program or productive activity;

“(iii) did not regularly engage in disruptive behavior that seriously undermined the administration of the recidivism reduction program or productive activity; and

“(iv) satisfied the requirements of clauses (i) through (iii) for a time period that is not less than 30 days and allowed the prisoner to realize the criminogenic benefits of the recidivism reduction program or productive activity; and

“(B) for purposes of paragraph (6)(A), may be given credit for successful completion of a recidivism reduction program or productive activity for the time period during which the prisoner participated in such program or activity if the prisoner satisfied the requirements of subparagraph (A) during such time period, notwithstanding that the prisoner continues to participate in such program or activity.

“(8) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) ELIGIBLE PRISONER.—The term ‘eligible prisoner’ means—

“(i) an individual who has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment pursuant to a conviction for a Federal criminal offense; or

“(ii) an individual within the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, including an individual in a Bureau of Prisons contracted facility.

“(B) PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITY.—The term ‘productive activity’—

“(i) means a group or individual activity, including holding a job as part of a prison work program, that is designed to allow prisoners classified as having a lower risk of recidivism to maintain such classification, when offered to such prisoners; and

“(ii) may include the delivery of the activities described in subparagraph (C)(i)(II) to other prisoners.

“(C) RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAM.—The term ‘recidivism reduction program’ means—

“(i) a group or individual activity that—

“(I) has been certified to reduce recidivism or promote successful reentry; and

“(II) may include—

“(aa) classes on social learning and life skills;

“(bb) classes on morals or ethics;

“(cc) academic classes;

“(dd) cognitive behavioral treatment;

“(ee) mentoring;

“(ff) occupational and vocational training;

“(gg) faith-based classes or services;

“(hh) domestic violence education and deterrence programming;

“(ii) victim-impact classes or other restorative justice programs;

“(jj) industry-sponsored workforce development, education, or training; and

“(kk) a prison job; and

“(ii) shall include—

“(I) a productive activity; and

“(II) recovery programming.

“(D) RECOVERY PROGRAMMING.—The term ‘recovery programming’ means a course of instruction or activities, other than a course described in subsection (e), that has been demonstrated to reduce drug or alcohol abuse or dependence among participants, or

to promote recovery among individuals who have previously abused alcohol or drugs, to include appropriate medication-assisted treatment.”.

(c) NO CONSIDERATION OF EARNED TIME CREDIT ELIGIBILITY DURING SENTENCING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3553 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b) through (f) as subsections (c) through (g), respectively;

(B) in subsection (e)(3), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (d)”;

(C) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) In imposing a sentence, the court shall not consider the defendant's eligibility or potential eligibility for credit under section 3621(e), 3621(h), or 3624(b) or any similar provision of law, but shall not be prohibited from informing the defendant of the existence of such credits or related programs.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3742 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section 3553(c)” and inserting “section 3553(d)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “section 3553(b)” and inserting “section 3553(c)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “section 3553(c)” and inserting “section 3553(d)”;

(B) in subsection (g)(2), by striking “section 3553(c)” and inserting “section 3553(d)”;

(C) in subsection (j)(1)(B), by striking “section 3553(b)” and inserting “section 3553(c)”.

SEC. 102. POST-SENTENCING RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 229 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3621 the following:

“§ 3621A. Post-sentencing risk and needs assessment system

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall develop for use by the Bureau of Prisons an offender risk and needs assessment system, to be known as the ‘Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System’ or the ‘Assessment System’, which shall—

“(1) assess and determine the recidivism risk level of all prisoners and classify each prisoner as having a low, moderate, or high risk of recidivism;

“(2) to the extent practicable, assess and determine the risk of violence of all prisoners;

“(3) ensure that, to the extent practicable, low-risk prisoners are grouped together in housing and assignment decisions;

“(4) assign each prisoner to appropriate recidivism reduction programs or productive activities based on the prisoner's risk level and the specific criminogenic needs of the prisoner, and in accordance with section 3621(h)(4);

“(5) reassess and update the recidivism risk level and programmatic needs of each prisoner pursuant to the schedule set forth in subsection (c)(2), and assess changes in the prisoner's recidivism risk within a particular risk level; and

“(6) provide information on best practices concerning the tailoring of recidivism reduction programs to the specific criminogenic needs of each prisoner so as to effectively lower the prisoner's risk of recidivating.

“(b) DEVELOPMENT OF SYSTEM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In designing the Assessment System, the Attorney General shall—

“(A) use available research and best practices in the field and consult with academic and other criminal justice experts as appropriate;

“(B) ensure that the Assessment System measures indicators of progress and improvement, and of regression, including newly acquired skills, attitude, and behavior changes over time, through meaningful consideration of dynamic risk factors, such that—

“(i) all prisoners at each risk level other than low risk have a meaningful opportunity to progress to a lower risk classification during the period of the incarceration of the prisoner through changes in dynamic risk factors; and

“(ii) all prisoners on prerelease custody, other than prisoners classified as low risk, have a meaningful opportunity to progress to a lower risk classification during such custody through changes in dynamic risk factors;

“(C) ensure that the Assessment System is adjusted on a regular basis, but not less frequently than every 3 years, to take account of the best statistical evidence of effectiveness in reducing recidivism rates; and

“(D) ensure that the Assessment System does not result in unwarranted disparities, including by—

“(i) regularly evaluating rates of recidivism among similarly classified prisoners to identify any unwarranted disparities in such rates, including disparities among similarly classified prisoners of different racial groups; and

“(ii) adjusting the Assessment System to reduce such disparities to the greatest extent possible.

“(2) RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT TOOLS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General shall—

“(A) develop a suitable intake assessment tool to perform the initial assessments and determinations described in subsection (a)(1), and to make the assignments described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (a);

“(B) develop a suitable reassessment tool to perform the reassessments and updates described in subsection (a)(5); and

“(C) develop a suitable tool to assess the recidivism risk level of prisoners in prerelease custody.

“(3) USE OF EXISTING RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT TOOLS PERMITTED.—In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General may use existing risk and needs assessment tools, as appropriate, for the assessment tools required under paragraph (2).

“(4) USE OF PRESENTENCE REPORT.—In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General shall coordinate with the United States Probation and Pretrial Services to ensure that the findings of the Presentence Report of each offender are available and considered in the Assessment System.

“(5) VALIDATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Attorney General shall statistically validate the risk and needs assessment tools on the Federal prison population, or ensure that the tools have been so validated. To the extent such validation cannot be completed with the time period specified in subsection (a), the Attorney General shall ensure that such validation is completed as soon as is practicable.

“(6) RELATIONSHIP WITH EXISTING CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS.—The Bureau of Prisons may incorporate its existing Inmate Classification System into the Assessment System if the Assessment System assesses the risk level and criminogenic needs of each prisoner and determines the appropriate security

level institution for each prisoner. Before the development of the Assessment System, the Bureau of Prisons may use the existing Inmate Classification System, or a pre-existing risk and needs assessment tool that can be used to classify prisoners consistent with subsection (a)(1), or can be reasonably adapted for such purpose, for purposes of this section, section 3621(h), and section 3624(c).

“(c) RISK ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) INITIAL ASSESSMENTS.—Not later than 12 months after the date on which the Attorney General develops the Assessment System, the Bureau of Prisons shall determine the risk level and criminogenic needs of each prisoner using the Assessment System.

“(2) REASSESSMENTS AND UPDATES.—The Bureau of Prisons shall update the assessment of each prisoner required under paragraph (1)—

“(A) not less frequently than once each year for any prisoner whose anticipated release date is within 3 years;

“(B) not less frequently than once every 2 years for any prisoner whose anticipated release date is within 10 years; and

“(C) not less frequently than once every 3 years for any other prisoner.

“(d) ASSIGNMENT OF RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAMS OR PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES.—The Assessment System shall provide guidance on the kind and amount of recidivism reduction programming or productive activities appropriate for each prisoner.

“(e) BUREAU OF PRISONS TRAINING.—The Attorney General shall develop training protocols and programs for Bureau of Prisons officials and employees responsible for administering the Assessment System. Such training protocols shall include a requirement that personnel of the Bureau of Prisons demonstrate competence in using the methodology and procedure developed under this section on a regular basis.

“(f) INFORMATION FROM PRESENTENCE REPORT.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the Bureau of Prisons uses relevant information from the Presentence Report of each offenders when conducting an assessment under this section.

“(g) QUALITY ASSURANCE.—In order to ensure that the Bureau of Prisons is using the Assessment System in an appropriate and consistent manner, the Attorney General shall monitor and assess the use of the Assessment System and shall conduct periodic audits of the use of the Assessment System at facilities of the Bureau of Prisons.

“(h) DETERMINATIONS AND CLASSIFICATIONS UNREVIEWABLE.—Subject to any constitutional limitations, there shall be no right of review, right of appeal, cognizable property interest, or cause of action, either administrative or judicial, arising from any determination or classification made by any Federal agency or employee while implementing or administering the Assessment System, or any rules or regulations promulgated under this section.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) DYNAMIC RISK FACTOR.—The term ‘dynamic risk factor’ means a characteristic or attribute that has been shown to be relevant to assessing risk of recidivism and that can be modified based on a prisoner’s actions, behaviors, or attitudes, including through completion of appropriate programming or other means, in a prison setting.

“(2) RECIDIVISM RISK.—The term ‘recidivism risk’ means the likelihood that a prisoner will commit additional crimes for which the prisoner could be prosecuted in a Federal, State, or local court in the United States.

“(3) RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAM; PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITY; RECOVERY PROGRAMMING.—The terms ‘recidivism reduction program’, ‘productive activity’, and ‘recovery programming’ shall have the meaning given such terms in section 3621(h)(8).”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 229 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3621 the following:

“3621A. Post-sentencing risk and needs assessment system.”.

SEC. 103. PRERELEASE CUSTODY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3624(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting “or home confinement, subject to the limitation that no prisoner may serve more than 10 percent of the prisoner’s imposed sentence in home confinement pursuant to this paragraph.”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) CREDIT FOR RECIDIVISM REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding the 10 percent limit described in paragraph (1) and in addition to any time spent in prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (1), a prisoner shall spend an additional portion of the final months of the prisoner’s sentence, equivalent to the amount of time credit the prisoner has earned pursuant to section 3621(h)(6)(A), in prerelease custody, if—

“(A) the prisoner’s most recent risk and needs assessment, conducted within 1 year of the date on which the prisoner would first be eligible for transfer to prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (1) and this paragraph, reflects that the prisoner is classified as low or moderate risk; and

“(B) for a prisoner classified as moderate risk, the prisoner’s most recent risk and needs assessment reflects that the prisoner’s risk of recidivism has declined during the period of the prisoner’s incarceration.

“(3) TYPES OF PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—A prisoner eligible to serve a portion of the prisoner’s sentence in prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (2) may serve such portion in a residential reentry center, on home confinement, or, subject to paragraph (5), on community supervision, in accordance with the following guidelines:

“(A) Lower-risk, lower-need prisoners shall be placed directly into home confinement or community supervision.

“(B) Residential reentry center placements shall be reserved for the higher-risk, higher-need prisoners.”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively;

(4) by inserting the following after paragraph (3):

“(4) HOME CONFINEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon placement in home confinement pursuant to paragraph (2), a prisoner shall—

“(i) be subject to 24-hour electronic monitoring that enables the prompt identification of any violation of clause (ii);

“(ii) remain in the prisoner’s residence, with the exception of the following activities, subject to approval by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons—

“(I) participation in a job, job-seeking activities, or job-related activities, including an apprenticeship;

“(II) participation in recidivism reduction programming or productive activities assigned by the Post-Sentencing Risk and

Needs Assessment System, or similar activities approved in advance by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons;

- “(III) participation in community service;
- “(IV) crime victim restoration activities;
- “(V) medical treatment; or
- “(VI) religious activities; and

“(iii) comply with such other conditions as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons deems appropriate.

“(B) ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF MONITORING.—If compliance with subparagraph (A)(i) is infeasible due to technical limitations or religious considerations, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons may employ alternative means of monitoring that are determined to be as effective or more effective than electronic monitoring.

“(C) MODIFICATIONS.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons may modify the conditions of the prisoner’s home confinement for compelling reasons, if the prisoner’s record demonstrates exemplary compliance with such conditions.

“(5) COMMUNITY SUPERVISION.—

“(A) TIME CREDIT LESS THAN 36 MONTHS.—Any prisoner described in subparagraph (D) who has earned time credit of less than 36 months pursuant to section 3621(h)(6)(A) shall be eligible to serve no more than one-half of the amount of such credit on community supervision, if the prisoner satisfies the conditions set forth in subparagraph (C).

“(B) TIME CREDIT OF 36 MONTHS OR MORE.—Any prisoner described in subparagraph (D) who has earned time credit of 36 months or more pursuant to section 3621(h)(6)(A) shall be eligible to serve the amount of such credit exceeding 18 months on community supervision, if the prisoner satisfies the conditions set forth in subparagraph (C).

“(C) CONDITIONS OF COMMUNITY SUPERVISION.—A prisoner placed on community supervision shall be subject to such conditions as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons deems appropriate. A prisoner on community supervision may remain on community supervision until the conclusion of the prisoner’s sentence of incarceration if the prisoner—

“(i) complies with all conditions of prerelease custody;

“(ii) remains current on any financial obligations imposed as part of the prisoner’s sentence, including payments of court-ordered restitution arising from the offense of conviction; and

“(iii) refrains from committing any State, local, or Federal offense.

“(D) COVERED PRISONERS.—A prisoner described in this subparagraph is a prisoner who—

“(i) is classified as low risk by the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System in the assessment conducted for purposes of paragraph (2); or

“(ii) is subsequently classified as low risk by the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System.

“(6) VIOLATIONS.—If a prisoner violates a condition of the prisoner’s prerelease custody, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons may revoke the prisoner’s prerelease custody and require the prisoner to serve the remainder of the prisoner’s term of incarceration, or any portion thereof, in prison, or impose additional conditions on the prisoner’s prerelease custody as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons deems appropriate. If the violation is nontechnical in nature, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall revoke the prisoner’s prerelease custody.

“(7) CREDIT FOR PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—Upon completion of a prisoner’s sentence,

any term of supervised release imposed on the prisoner shall be reduced by the amount of time the prisoner served in prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(8) AGREEMENTS WITH UNITED STATES PROBATION AND PRETRIAL SERVICES.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall, to the greatest extent practicable, enter into agreements with the United States Probation and Pretrial Services to supervise prisoners placed in home confinement or community supervision under this subsection. Such agreements shall authorize United States Probation and Pretrial Services to exercise the authority granted to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons pursuant to paragraphs (4), (5), and (12). Such agreements shall take into account the resource requirements of United States Probation and Pretrial Services as a result of the transfer of Bureau of Prisons inmates to prerelease custody and shall provide for the transfer of monetary sums necessary to comply with such requirements. United States Probation and Pretrial Services shall, to the greatest extent practicable, offer assistance to any prisoner not under its supervision during prerelease custody under this subsection.”; and

(5) by inserting at the end the following:

“(12) DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS FOR PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—In determining appropriate conditions for prerelease custody pursuant to this subsection, and in accordance with paragraph (5), the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall, to the extent practicable, subject prisoners who demonstrate continued compliance with the requirements of such prerelease custody to increasingly less restrictive conditions, so as to most effectively prepare such prisoners for reentry. No prisoner shall be transferred to community supervision unless the length of the prisoner’s eligibility for community supervision pursuant to paragraph (5) is equivalent to or greater than the length of the prisoner’s remaining period of prerelease custody.

“(13) ALIENS SUBJECT TO DEPORTATION.—If the prisoner is an alien whose deportation was ordered as a condition of supervised release or who is subject to a detainer filed by Immigration and Customs Enforcement for the purposes of determining the alien’s deportability, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall, upon the prisoner’s transfer to prerelease custody pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2), deliver the prisoner to United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for the purpose of conducting proceedings relating to the alien’s deportation.

“(14) NOTICE OF TRANSFER TO PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons may not transfer a prisoner to prerelease custody pursuant to paragraph (2) if the prisoner has been sentenced to a term of incarceration of more than 3 years, unless the Director of the Bureau of Prisons provides prior notice to the sentencing court and the United States Attorney’s Office for the district in which the prisoner was sentenced.

“(B) TIME REQUIREMENT.—The notice required under subparagraph (A) shall be provided not later than 6 months before the date on which the prisoner is to be transferred.

“(C) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—The notice required under subparagraph (A) shall include the following information:

“(i) The amount of credit earned pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(ii) The anticipated date of the prisoner’s transfer.

“(iii) The nature of the prisoner’s planned prerelease custody.

“(iv) The prisoner’s behavioral record.

“(v) The most recent risk assessment of the prisoner.

“(D) HEARING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On motion of the Government, the sentencing court may conduct a hearing on the prisoner’s transfer to prerelease custody.

“(ii) PRISONER’S PRESENCE.—The prisoner shall have the right to be present at a hearing described in clause (i), unless the prisoner waives such right. The requirement under this clause may be satisfied by the defendant appearing by video teleconference.

“(iii) MOTION.—A motion filed by the Government seeking a hearing—

“(I) shall set forth the basis for the Government’s request that the prisoner’s transfer be denied or modified pursuant to subparagraph (E) and include input from local law enforcement authorities regarding prior conduct or any other relevant information; and

“(II) shall not require the Court to conduct a hearing described in clause (i).

“(iv) JUSTICE DEPARTMENT REVIEW OF TRANSFERS TO PRERELEASE CUSTODY.—If the Department of Justice does not seek a hearing under this subparagraph to deny or modify a prisoner’s transfer to prerelease custody, the Department of Justice prior to such transfer shall make a determination to that effect in writing, including the reasons for that determination.

“(E) DETERMINATION OF THE COURT.—The court may deny the transfer of the prisoner to prerelease custody or modify the terms of such transfer, if, after conducting a hearing pursuant to subparagraph (D), the court finds in writing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the transfer of the prisoner is inconsistent with the factors specified in paragraphs (2), (6), and (7) of section 3553(a).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. REPORTS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains the following:

(A) A summary of the activities and accomplishments of the Attorney General in carrying out this title and the amendments made by this title.

(B) An assessment of the status and use of the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System by the Bureau of Prisons, including the number of prisoners classified at each risk level under the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System at each facility of the Bureau of Prisons.

(C) A summary and assessment of the types and effectiveness of the recidivism reduction programs and productive activities in facilities operated by the Bureau of Prisons, including—

(i) evidence about which programs and activities have been shown to reduce recidivism;

(ii) the capacity of each program and activity at each facility, including the number of prisoners along with the risk level of each prisoner enrolled in each program and activity; and

(iii) identification of any problems or shortages in capacity of such programs and activities, and how these should be remedied.

(D) An assessment of budgetary savings resulting from this title and the amendments made by this title, to include—

(i) a summary of the amount of savings resulting from the transfer of prisoners into prerelease custody under this title and the amendments made by this title, including savings resulting from the avoidance or deferral of future construction, acquisition, or operations costs;

(ii) a summary of the amount of savings resulting from any decrease in recidivism that may be attributed to the implementation of the Post-Sentencing Risk and Needs Assessment System or the increase in recidivism reduction programs and productive activities required by this title and the amendments made by this title;

(iii) a strategy to reinvest such savings into other Federal, State, and local law enforcement activities and expansions of recidivism reduction programs and productive activities in the Bureau of Prisons; and

(iv) a description of how the reduced expenditures on Federal corrections and the budgetary savings resulting from this title, and the amendments made by this title, are currently being used and will be used to—

(I) increase investment in law enforcement and crime prevention to combat gangs of national significance and high-level drug traffickers through the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program and other task forces;

(II) hire, train, and equip law enforcement officers and prosecutors; and

(III) promote crime reduction programs using evidence-based practices and strategic planning to help reduce crime and criminal recidivism.

(2) REINVESTMENT OF SAVINGS TO FUND PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAMMING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year after the first report is submitted under paragraph (1), and every fiscal year thereafter, the Attorney General shall—

(i) determine the covered amount for the previous fiscal year in accordance with subparagraph (B); and

(ii) use an amount of funds appropriated to the Department of Justice that is not less than 90 percent of the covered amount for the purposes described in subparagraph (C).

(B) COVERED AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term “covered amount” means, using the most recent report submitted under paragraph (1), the amount equal to the sum of the amount described in paragraph (1)(D)(i) for the fiscal year and the amount described in paragraph (1)(D)(ii) for the fiscal year.

(C) USE OF FUNDS.—The funds described in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be used, consistent with paragraph (1)(D)(iii), to achieve each of the following objectives:

(i) Ensure that, not later than 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act, recidivism reduction programs or productive activities are available to all eligible prisoners.

(ii) Ensure compliance with the resource needs of United States Probation and Pretrial Services resulting from an agreement under section 3624(c)(8) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this title.

(iii) Supplement funding for programs that increase public safety by providing resources to State and local law enforcement officials, including for the adoption of innovative technologies and information sharing capabilities.

(b) PRISON WORK PROGRAMS REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate committees of

Congress a report on the status of prison work programs at facilities operated by the Bureau of Prisons, including—

(1) a strategy to expand the availability of such programs without reducing job opportunities for workers in the United States who are not in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons;

(2) an assessment of the feasibility of expanding such programs, consistent with the strategy required under paragraph (1), so that, not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, not less than 75 percent of eligible low-risk offenders have the opportunity to participate in a prison work program for not less than 20 hours per week; and

(3) a detailed discussion of legal authorities that would be useful or necessary to achieve the goals described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(c) REPORTING ON RECIDIVISM RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress on rates of recidivism among individuals who have been released from Federal prison and who are under judicial supervision, including the rates of recidivism at regular annual intervals during the 10-year period after release from prison.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain information on rates of recidivism among former Federal prisoners, including information on rates of recidivism among former Federal prisoners based on the following criteria:

(A) Primary offense charged.

(B) Length of sentence imposed and served.

(C) Bureau of Prisons facility or facilities in which the prisoner's sentence was served.

(D) Recidivism reduction programming that the prisoner successfully completed, if any.

(E) The prisoner's assessed risk of recidivism.

(3) ASSISTANCE.—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall provide to the Attorney General any information in its possession that is necessary for the completion of the report required under paragraph (1).

(d) REPORTING ON EXCLUDED PRISONERS.—Not later than 8 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the effectiveness of recidivism reduction programs and productive activities offered to prisoners described in section 3621(h)(6)(A)(iii) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this title, as well as those ineligible for credit toward prerelease custody under section 3624(c)(2) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this title, which shall review the effectiveness of different categories of incentives in reducing recidivism.

(e) DEFINITION.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 105. ADDITIONAL TOOLS TO PROMOTE RECOVERY AND PREVENT DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE AND DEPENDENCE.

(a) REENTRY AND RECOVERY PLANNING.—

(1) PRESENTENCE REPORTS.—Section 3552 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) REENTRY AND RECOVERY PLANNING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the information required by rule 32(d) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall contain the following information, unless such information is required to be excluded pursuant to rule 32(d)(3) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or except as provided in paragraph (2):

“(A) Information about the defendant's history of substance abuse and addiction, if applicable.

“(B) Information about the defendant's service in the Armed Forces of the United States and veteran status, if applicable.

“(C) A detailed plan, which shall include the identification of programming provided by the Bureau of Prisons that is appropriate for the defendant's needs, that the probation officer determines will—

“(i) reduce the likelihood the defendant will abuse drugs or alcohol if the defendant has a history of substance abuse;

“(ii) reduce the defendant's likelihood of recidivism by addressing the defendant's specific recidivism risk factors; and

“(iii) assist the defendant preparing for reentry into the community.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The information described in paragraph (1)(C)(iii) shall not be required to be included under paragraph (1), in the discretion of the Probation Officer, if the applicable sentencing range under the sentencing guidelines, as determined by the probation officer, includes a sentence of life imprisonment or a sentence of probation.”;

(C) in subsection (c), as redesignated, in the first sentence, by striking “subsection (a) or (c)” and inserting “subsection (a) or (d)”; and

(D) in subsection (d), as redesignated, by striking “subsection (a) or (b)” and inserting “subsection (a) or (c)”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3672 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the eighth undesignated paragraph by striking “subsection (b) or (c)” and inserting “subsection (c) or (d)”.

(b) PROMOTING FULL UTILIZATION OF RESIDENTIAL DRUG TREATMENT.—Section 3621(e)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) COMMENCEMENT OF TREATMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall ensure that each eligible prisoner has an opportunity to commence participation in treatment under this subsection by such date as is necessary to ensure that the prisoner completes such treatment not later than 1 year before the date on which the prisoner would otherwise be released from custody prior to the application of any reduction in sentence pursuant to this paragraph.

“(D) OTHER CREDITS.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons may, in the Director's discretion, reduce the credit awarded under subsection (h)(6)(A) to a prisoner who receives a reduction under subparagraph (B), but such reduction may not exceed one-half the amount of the reduction awarded to the prisoner under subparagraph (B).”.

(c) SUPERVISED RELEASE PILOT PROGRAM TO REDUCE RECIDIVISM AND IMPROVE RECOVERY FROM ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish a recidivism reduction and recovery enhancement pilot program, premised on high-intensity supervision and the use of swift, predictable, and graduated sanctions for noncompliance with program rules, in Federal judicial districts selected by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in consultation with the Attorney General.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS OF PROGRAM.**—Participation in the pilot program required under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following requirements:

(A) Upon entry into the pilot program, the court shall notify program participants of the rules of the program and consequences for violating such rules, including the penalties to be imposed as a result of such violations pursuant to subparagraph (E).

(B) Probation officers shall conduct regular drug testing of all pilot program participants with a history of substance abuse.

(C) In the event that a probation officer determines that a participant has violated a term of supervised release, the officer shall notify the court within 24 hours of such determination, absent good cause.

(D) As soon as is practicable, and in no case more than 1 week after the violation was reported by the probation officer, absent good cause, the court shall conduct a hearing on the alleged violation.

(E) If the court determines that a program participant has violated a term of supervised release, it shall impose an appropriate sanction, which may include the following, if appropriate:

(i) Modification of the terms of such participant's supervised release, which may include imposition of a period of home confinement.

(ii) Referral to appropriate substance abuse treatment.

(iii) Revocation of the defendant's supervised release and the imposition of a sentence of incarceration that is no longer than necessary to punish the participant for such violation and deter the participant from committing future violations.

(iv) For participants who habitually fail to abide by program rules or pose a threat to public safety, termination from the program.

(3) **STATUS OF PARTICIPANT IF INCARCERATED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the event that a program participant is sentenced to incarceration as described in paragraph (2)(E)(iii), the participant shall remain in the program upon release from incarceration unless terminated from the program in accordance with paragraph (2)(E)(iv).

(B) **POLICIES FOR MAINTAINING EMPLOYMENT.**—The Bureau of Prisons, in consultation with the Chief Probation Officers of the Federal judicial districts selected for participation in the pilot program required under paragraph (1), shall develop policies to enable program participants sentenced to terms of incarceration as described in paragraph (2)(E) to, where practicable, serve the terms of incarceration while maintaining employment, including allowing the terms of incarceration to be served on weekends.

(4) **ADVISORY SENTENCING POLICIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The United States Sentencing Commission, in consultation with the Chief Probation Officers, the United States Attorneys, Federal Defenders, and Chief Judges of the districts selected for participation in the pilot program required under paragraph (1), shall establish advisory

sentencing policies to be used by the district courts in imposing sentences of incarceration in accordance with paragraph (2)(E).

(B) **REQUIREMENT.**—The advisory sentencing policies established under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with the stated goal of the pilot program to impose predictable and graduated sentences that are no longer than necessary for violations of program rules.

(5) **DURATION OF PROGRAM.**—The pilot program required under paragraph (1) shall continue for not less than 5 years and may be extended for not more than 5 years by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

(6) **ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall conduct an evaluation of the pilot program and submit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

(B) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the rates of substance abuse among program participants;

(ii) the rates of violations of the terms of supervised release by program participants, and sanctions imposed;

(iii) information about employment of program participants;

(iv) a comparison of outcomes among program participants with outcomes among similarly situated individuals under the supervision of United States Probation and Pretrial Services not participating in the program; and

(v) an assessment of the effectiveness of each of the relevant features of the program.

SEC. 106. PROMOTING SUCCESSFUL REENTRY.

(A) **FEDERAL REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—

(1) **EVALUATION OF EXISTING BEST PRACTICES FOR REENTRY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall—

(A) evaluate best practices used for the reentry into society of individuals released from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, including—

(i) conducting examinations of reentry practices in Federal, State, and local justice systems; and

(ii) consulting with Federal, State, and local prosecutors, Federal, State, and local public defenders, nonprofit organizations that provide reentry services, and criminal justice experts; and

(B) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that details the evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A).

(2) **CREATION OF REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, select an appropriate number of Federal judicial districts to conduct Federal reentry demonstration projects using the best practices identified in the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1), which may include Federal judicial districts with existing reentry programs. The Attorney General shall determine the appropriate number of Federal judicial districts to conduct demonstration projects under this paragraph.

(3) **PROJECT DESIGN.**—For each Federal judicial district selected under paragraph (2), the United States Attorney, in consultation with the Chief Judge, Chief Federal Defender, the Chief Probation Officer, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the National Institute of Justice, and criminal justice experts shall design a Federal reentry demonstration project for the Federal judicial district in accordance with paragraph (4).

(4) **PROJECT ELEMENTS.**—A project designed under paragraph (3) shall coordinate efforts by Federal agencies to assist participating prisoners in preparing for and adjusting to reentry into the community and may include, as appropriate—

(A) the use of community correctional facilities and home confinement, as determined to be appropriate by the Bureau of Prisons;

(B) a reentry review team for each prisoner to develop a reentry plan specific to the needs of the prisoner, and to meet with the prisoner following transfer to monitor the reentry plan;

(C) steps to assist the prisoner in obtaining health care, housing, and employment, before the prisoner's release from a community correctional facility or home confinement;

(D) regular drug testing for participants with a history of substance abuse;

(E) substance abuse treatment, which may include addiction treatment medication, if appropriate, medical treatment, including mental health treatment, occupational, vocational and educational training, apprenticeships, life skills instruction, recovery support, conflict resolution training, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community;

(F) the participation of volunteers to serve as advisors and mentors to prisoners being released into the community;

(G) steps to ensure that the prisoner makes satisfactory progress toward satisfying any obligations to victims of the prisoner's offense, including any obligation to pay restitution; and

(H) the appointment of a reentry coordinator in the United States Attorney's Office.

(5) **REVIEW OF PROJECT OUTCOMES.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall—

(A) evaluate the results from each Federal judicial district selected under paragraph (2), including the extent to which participating prisoners released from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons were successfully reintegrated into their communities, including whether the participating prisoners maintained employment, and refrained from committing further offenses; and

(B) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(i) the evaluation of the best practices identified in the report required under paragraph (1); and

(ii) the results of the demonstration projects required under paragraph (2).

(b) **STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF REENTRY ON CERTAIN COMMUNITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the impact of reentry of prisoners on communities in which

a disproportionate number of individuals released upon release from incarceration.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall analyze the impact of reentry of individuals released from both State and Federal correctional systems as well as State and Federal juvenile justice systems, and shall include—

(A) an assessment of the reentry burdens borne by local communities and local law enforcement agencies;

(B) a review of the resources available in such communities to support successful reentry, including resources provided by State, local, and Federal governments, the extent to which those resources are used effectively; and

(C) recommendations to strengthen the resources in such communities available to support successful reentry and to lessen the burden placed on such communities by the need to support reentry.

(c) **FACILITATING REENTRY ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 months after the date of the commencement of a prisoner's sentence pursuant to section 3585(a) of title 18, United States Code, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall notify the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor if the prisoner's presentence report, prepared pursuant to section 3552 of title 18, United States Code, indicates that the prisoner has previously served in the Armed Forces of the United States or if the prisoner has so notified the Bureau of Prisons.

(2) **POST-COMMENCEMENT NOTICE.**—If the prisoner informs the Bureau of Prisons of the prisoner's prior service in the Armed Forces of the United States after the commencement of the prisoner's sentence, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall notify the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor not later than 2 months after the date on which the prisoner provides such notice.

(3) **CONTENTS OF NOTICE.**—The notice provided by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor under this subsection shall include the identity of the prisoner, the facility in which the prisoner is located, the prisoner's offense of conviction, and the length of the prisoner's sentence.

(4) **ACCESS TO VA AND DOL.**—The Bureau of Prisons shall provide the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Labor with reasonable access to any prisoner who has previously served in the Armed Forces of the United States for purposes of facilitating that prisoner's reentry.

SEC. 107. PAROLE FOR JUVENILES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 403 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5032 the following:

“§ 5032A. Modification of an imposed term of imprisonment for violations of law committed prior to age 18

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a court may reduce a term of life imprisonment imposed upon a defendant convicted as an adult for an offense committed and completed before the defendant attained 18 years of age if—

“(1) the defendant has served 30 years in custody for the offense; and

“(2) the court finds, after considering the factors set forth in subsection (c), that the defendant is not a danger to the safety of any person or the community and that the interests of justice warrant a sentence modification.

“(b) **SUPERVISED RELEASE.**—Any defendant whose sentence is reduced pursuant to subsection (a) shall be ordered to serve a period of supervised release of not less than 5 years following release from imprisonment. The conditions of supervised release and any modification or revocation of the term of supervise release shall be in accordance with section 3583.

“(c) **FACTORS AND INFORMATION TO BE CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING WHETHER TO MODIFY A TERM OF IMPRISONMENT.**—The court, in determining whether to reduce a term of imprisonment pursuant to subsection (a), shall consider—

“(1) the factors described in section 3553(a), including the nature of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant;

“(2) the age of the defendant at the time of the offense;

“(3) a report and recommendation of the Bureau of Prisons, including information on whether the defendant has substantially complied with the rules of each institution to which the defendant has been confined and whether the defendant has completed any educational, vocational, or other prison program, where available;

“(4) a report and recommendation of the United States attorney for any district in which an offense for which the defendant is imprisoned was prosecuted;

“(5) whether the defendant has demonstrated maturity, rehabilitation, and a fitness to reenter society sufficient to justify a sentence reduction;

“(6) any statement, which may be presented orally or otherwise, by any victim of an offense for which the defendant is imprisoned or by a family member of the victim if the victim is deceased;

“(7) any report of physical, mental, or psychiatric examination of the defendant conducted by a licensed health care professional;

“(8) the family and community circumstances of the defendant at the time of the offense, including any history of abuse, trauma, or involvement in the child welfare system;

“(9) the extent of the role of the defendant in the offense and whether, and to what extent, an adult was involved in the offense;

“(10) the diminished culpability of juveniles as compared to that of adults, and the hallmark features of youth, including immaturity, impetuosity, and failure to appreciate risks and consequences, which counsel against sentencing them to the otherwise applicable term of imprisonment;

“(11) input from local law enforcement authorities regarding prior conduct and any other relevant information; and

“(12) any other information the court determines relevant to the decision of the court.

“(d) **LIMITATION ON APPLICATIONS PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION.**—

“(1) **SECOND APPLICATION.**—Not earlier than 5 years after the date on which an order entered by a court on an initial application under this section becomes final, a court shall entertain a second application by the same defendant under this section.

“(2) **FINAL APPLICATION.**—Not earlier than 5 years after the date on which an order entered by a court on a second application under paragraph (1) becomes final, a court shall entertain a final application by the same defendant under this section.

“(3) **PROHIBITION.**—A court may not entertain an application filed after an application filed under paragraph (2) by the same defendant.

“(e) **PROCEDURES.**—

“(1) **NOTICE.**—The Bureau of Prisons shall provide written notice of this section to—

“(A) any defendant who has served 19 years in prison for an offense committed and completed before the defendant attained 18 years of age for which the defendant was convicted as an adult; and

“(B) the sentencing court, the United States attorney, and the Federal Public Defender or Executive Director of the Community Defender Organization for the judicial district in which the sentence described in subparagraph (A) was imposed.

“(2) **CRIME VICTIMS RIGHTS.**—Upon receiving noticed under paragraph (1), the United States attorney shall provide any notifications required under section 3771.

“(3) **APPLICATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An application for a sentence reduction under this section shall be filed as a motion to reduce the sentence of the defendant and may include affidavits or other written material.

“(B) **REQUIREMENT.**—A motion to reduce a sentence under this section shall be filed with the sentencing court and a copy shall be served on the United States attorney for the judicial district in which the sentence was imposed.

“(4) **EXPANDING THE RECORD; HEARING.**—

“(A) **EXPANDING THE RECORD.**—After the filing of a motion to reduce a sentence under this section, the court may direct the parties to expand the record by submitting additional written materials relating to the motion.

“(B) **HEARING.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The court shall conduct a hearing on the motion, at which the defendant and counsel for the defendant shall be given the opportunity to be heard.

“(ii) **EVIDENCE.**—In a hearing under this section, the court may allow for parties to present evidence.

“(iii) **DEFENDANT'S PRESENCE.**—At a hearing under this section, the defendant shall be present unless the defendant waives the right to be present. The requirement under this clause may be satisfied by the defendant appearing by video teleconference.

“(iv) **COUNSEL.**—A defendant who is unable to obtain counsel is entitled to have counsel appointed to represent the defendant for proceedings under this section, including any appeal, unless the defendant waives the right to counsel.

“(v) **FINDINGS.**—The court shall state in open court, and file in writing, the reasons for granting or denying a motion under this section.

“(C) **APPEAL.**—The Government or the defendant may file a notice of appeal in the district court for review of a final order under this section. The time limit for filing such appeal shall be governed by rule 4(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

“(f) **EDUCATIONAL AND REHABILITATIVE PROGRAMS.**—A defendant who is convicted and sentenced as an adult for an offense committed and completed before the defendant attained 18 years of age may not be deprived of any educational, training, or rehabilitative program that is otherwise available to the general prison population.”.

(b) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections for chapter 403 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5032 the following:

“5032A. Modification of an imposed term of imprisonment for violations of law committed prior to age 18.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any conviction entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 108. COMPASSIONATE RELEASE INITIATIVE.

Section 231(g) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 60541(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “and eligible terminally ill offenders” after “elderly offenders” each place that term appears; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, upon written request from either the Bureau of Prisons or an eligible elderly offender or eligible terminally ill offender” after “to home detention”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or eligible terminally ill offender” after “elderly offender”;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “and shall be carried out during fiscal years 2009 and 2010”;

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting “or eligible terminally ill offender” after “each eligible elderly offender”; and

(B) by inserting “and eligible terminally ill offenders” after “eligible elderly offenders”; and

(5) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “65 years” and inserting “60 years”; and

(ii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by striking “the greater of 10 years or”; and

(II) by striking “75 percent” and inserting “ $\frac{2}{3}$ ”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ELIGIBLE TERMINALLY ILL OFFENDER.—The term ‘eligible terminally ill offender’ means an offender in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons who—

“(i) is serving a term of imprisonment based on conviction for an offense or offenses that do not include any crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code), sex offense (as defined in section 111(5) of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (34 U.S.C. 20911(5)), offense described in section 2332b(g)(5)(B) of title 18, United States Code, or offense under chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code;

“(ii) satisfies the criteria specified in clauses (iii) through (vii) of subparagraph (A); and

“(iii) has been determined by a medical doctor approved by the Bureau of Prisons to be—

“(I) in need of care at a nursing home, intermediate care facility, or assisted living facility, as those terms are defined in section 232 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715w); or

“(II) diagnosed with a terminal illness.”.

TITLE II—BUREAU OF PRISONS SECURE FIREARMS STORAGE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Lieutenant Osvaldo Albarati Correctional Officer Self-Protection Act of 2017”.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-277; 118 Stat. 865) gives certain law enforcement officers, including certain correctional officers of the Bureau of Prisons, the right to carry a concealed firearm in all 50 States for self-protection;

(2) the purpose of that Act is to allow certain law enforcement officers to protect themselves while off duty;

(3) correctional officers of the Bureau of Prisons have been the targets of assaults and murders while off duty; and

(4) while that Act allows certain law enforcement officers to protect themselves off duty, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons allows correctional officers of the Bureau of Prisons to securely store personal firearms at only 33 Federal penal and correctional institutions while at work.

SEC. 203. SECURE FIREARMS STORAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 4050. Secure firearms storage

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘employee’ means a qualified law enforcement officer employed by the Bureau of Prisons; and

“(2) the terms ‘firearm’ and ‘qualified law enforcement officer’ have the meanings given those terms in section 926B.

“(b) SECURE FIREARMS STORAGE.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution—

“(1)(A) provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the institution for employees to store firearms; or

“(B) allows employees to store firearms in a vehicle lockbox approved by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons; and

“(2) notwithstanding any other provision of law, allows employees to carry concealed firearms on the premises outside of the secure perimeter of the institution.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“4050. Secure firearms storage.”.

TITLE III—NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Criminal Justice Commission Act of 2017”.

SEC. 302. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) it is in the interest of the Nation to establish a commission to undertake a comprehensive review of the criminal justice system;

(2) there has not been a comprehensive study since the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice was established in 1965;

(3) that commission, in a span of 18 months, produced a comprehensive report entitled “The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society”, which contained 200 specific recommendations on all aspects of the criminal justice system involving Federal, State, tribal, and local governments, civic organizations, religious institutions, business groups, and individual citizens; and

(4) developments over the intervening 50 years require once again that Federal, State, tribal, and local governments, law enforcement agencies, including rank and file officers, civil rights organizations, community-based organization leaders, civic organizations, religious institutions, business groups, and individual citizens come together to review evidence and consider how to improve the criminal justice system.

SEC. 303. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established a commission to be known as the “National Criminal Justice Commission” (referred to in this title as the “Commission”).

SEC. 304. PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall—

(1) undertake a comprehensive review of the criminal justice system;

(2) make recommendations for Federal criminal justice reform to the President and Congress; and

(3) disseminate findings and supplemental guidance to the Federal Government, as well as to State, local, and tribal governments.

SEC. 305. REVIEW, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND REPORT.

(a) GENERAL REVIEW.—The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive review of all areas of the criminal justice system, including Federal, State, local, and tribal governments’ criminal justice costs, practices, and policies.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress recommendations for changes in Federal oversight, policies, practices, and laws designed to prevent, deter, and reduce crime and violence, reduce recidivism, improve cost-effectiveness, and ensure the interests of justice at every step of the criminal justice system.

(2) UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUIRED.—A recommendation of the Commission may be adopted and submitted under paragraph (1) if the recommendation is approved by a unanimous vote of the Commissioners at a meeting where a quorum is present pursuant to section 306(d).

(3) REQUIREMENT.—The recommendations submitted under this subsection shall be made available to the public.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall also disseminate to the Federal Government, as well as to State, local, and tribal governments, a report that details the findings and supplemental guidance of the Commission regarding the criminal justice system at all levels of government.

(2) MAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED.—Commission findings and supplemental guidance may be adopted and included in the report required under paragraph (1) if the findings or guidance is approved by a majority vote of the Commissioners at a meeting where a quorum is present pursuant to section 306(d), except that any Commissioners dissenting from particular finding or supplemental guidance shall have the right to state the reason for their dissent in writing and such dissent shall be included in the report of the Commission.

(3) REQUIREMENT.—The report submitted under this subsection shall be made available to the public.

(d) PRIOR COMMISSIONS.—The Commission shall take into consideration the work of prior relevant commissions in conducting its review.

(e) STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—In issuing its recommendations and report under this section, the Commission shall not infringe on the legitimate rights of the States to determine their own criminal laws or the enforcement of such laws.

(f) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—The Commission shall conduct public hearings in various locations around the United States.

(g) CONSULTATION WITH GOVERNMENT AND NONGOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

(A) closely consult with Federal, State, local, and tribal government and nongovernmental leaders, including State, local, and

tribal law enforcement officials, including rank and file officers, legislators, public health officials, judges, court administrators, prosecutors, defense counsel, victims' rights organizations, probation and parole officials, criminal justice planners, criminologists, civil rights and liberties organizations, community-based organization leaders, formerly incarcerated individuals, professional organizations, and corrections officials; and

(B) include in the final report required under subsection (c) summaries of the input and recommendations of these leaders.

(2) UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION.—To the extent the review and recommendations required by this section relate to sentencing policies and practices for the Federal criminal justice system, the Commission shall conduct such review and make such recommendations in consultation with the United States Sentencing Commission.

(h) SENSE OF CONGRESS, GOAL OF UNANIMITY.—It is the sense of the Congress that, given the national importance of the matters before the Commission, the Commission should work toward unanimously supported findings and supplemental guidance, and that unanimously supported findings and supplemental guidance should take precedence over those findings and supplemental guidance that are not unanimously supported.

SEC. 306. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 14 members, as follows:

(1) One member shall be appointed by the President, who shall serve as co-chairman of the Commission.

(2) One member shall be appointed by the leader of the Senate, in consultation with the leader of the House of Representatives, that is a member of the opposite party of the President, who shall serve as co-chairman of the Commission.

(3) Two members shall be appointed by the senior member of the Senate leadership of the Democratic Party, in consultation with the Democratic leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(4) Two members shall be appointed by the senior member of the Senate leadership of the Republican Party, in consultation with the Republican leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(5) Two members shall be appointed by the senior member of the leadership of the House of Representatives of the Republican Party, in consultation with the Republican leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(6) Two members shall be appointed by the senior member of the leadership of the House of Representatives of the Democratic Party, in consultation with the Democratic leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(7) Two members, who shall be State and local representatives, shall be appointed by the President in agreement with leader of the Senate (majority or minority leader, as the case may be) of the Republican Party and the leader of the House of Representatives (majority or minority leader, as the case may be) of the Republican Party.

(8) Two members, who shall be State and local representatives, shall be appointed by the President in agreement with leader of the Senate (majority or minority leader, as the case may be) of the Democratic Party and the leader of the House of Representatives (majority or minority leader, as the case may be) of the Democratic Party.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) QUALIFICATIONS.—The individuals appointed from private life as members of the

Commission shall be individuals with distinguished reputations for integrity and non-partisanship who are nationally recognized for expertise, knowledge, or experience in such relevant areas as—

- (A) law enforcement;
- (B) criminal justice;
- (C) national security;
- (D) prison and jail administration;
- (E) prisoner reentry;
- (F) public health, including physical and sexual victimization, drug addiction and mental health;
- (G) victims' rights;
- (H) civil rights;
- (I) civil liberties;
- (J) court administration;
- (K) social services; and
- (L) State, local, and tribal government.

(2) DISQUALIFICATION.—An individual shall not be appointed as a member of the Commission if such individual possesses any personal financial interest in the discharge of any of the duties of the Commission.

(3) TERMS.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(c) APPOINTMENT; FIRST MEETING.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) FIRST MEETING.—The Commission shall hold its first meeting on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, or not later than 30 days after the date on which funds are made available for the Commission, whichever is later.

(3) ETHICS.—At the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall draft appropriate ethics guidelines for commissioners and staff, including guidelines relating to conflict of interest and financial disclosure. The Commission shall consult with the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary as a part of drafting the guidelines and furnish the committees with a copy of the completed guidelines.

(d) MEETINGS; QUORUM; VACANCIES.—

(1) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the co-chairs or a majority of its members.

(2) QUORUM.—Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for purposes of conducting business, except that 2 members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for purposes of receiving testimony.

(3) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. If vacancies in the Commission occur on any day after 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Commission as of such day, so long as not less than 1 Commission member chosen by a member of each party, Republican and Democratic, is present.

(e) ACTIONS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission—

(A) shall, subject to the requirements of section 305, act by resolution agreed to by a majority of the members of the Commission voting and present; and

(B) may establish panels composed of less than the full membership of the Commission for purposes of carrying out the duties of the Commission under this title—

(i) which shall be subject to the review and control of the Commission; and

(ii) any findings and determinations made by such a panel shall not be considered the findings and determinations of the Commission unless approved by the Commission.

(2) DELEGATION.—Any member, agent, or staff of the Commission may, if authorized by the co-chairs of the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take pursuant to this title.

SEC. 307. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) STAFF.—

(1) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Commission shall have a staff headed by an Executive Director. The Executive Director shall be paid at a rate established for the Certified Plan pay level for the Senior Executive Service under section 5382 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The co-chairs of the Commission shall designate and fix the compensation of the Executive Director and, in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this subsection may exceed the equivalent of that payable for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) PERSONNEL AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Executive Director and any personnel of the Commission who are employees shall be employees under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of chapters 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, and 90 of that title.

(B) MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to apply to members of the Commission.

(4) THE COMPENSATION OF COMMISSIONERS.—Each member of the Commission may be compensated at not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States, State, or local government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees.

(5) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—With the approval of the Commission, the Executive Director may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail, without reimbursement, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist in carrying out the duties of the Commission. Any such detail shall not interrupt or otherwise affect the civil service status or privileges of the Federal employee.

(d) **OTHER RESOURCES.**—The Commission shall have reasonable access to materials, resources, statistical data, and other information such Commission determines to be necessary to carry out its duties from the Library of Congress, the Department of Justice, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Department of State, and other agencies of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. The co-chairs of the Commission shall make requests for such access in writing when necessary.

(e) **VOLUNTEER SERVICES.**—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Commission is authorized to accept and utilize the services of volunteers serving without compensation. The Commission may reimburse such volunteers for local travel and office supplies, and for other travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code. A person providing volunteer services to the Commission shall be considered an employee of the Federal Government in performance of those services for the purposes of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work-related injuries, chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, relating to tort claims, and chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, relating to conflicts of interest.

(f) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Commission may secure directly from any agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this title. Upon the request of the co-chairs of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission. The Commission shall not have access to sensitive information regarding ongoing investigations.

(g) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(h) **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTING.**—The Commission shall issue biannual status reports to Congress regarding the use of resources, salaries, and all expenditures of appropriated funds.

(i) **CONTRACTS.**—The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal and State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of activities necessary to the discharge of its duties and responsibilities. A contract, lease or other legal agreement entered into by the Commission may not extend beyond the date of the termination of the Commission.

(j) **GIFTS.**—Subject to existing law, the Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(k) **ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this title. These administrative services may include human resource management, budget, leasing, accounting, and payroll services.

(l) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA AND PUBLIC ACCESS TO MEETINGS AND MINUTES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

(2) **MEETINGS AND MINUTES.**—

(A) **MEETINGS.**—

(i) **ADMINISTRATION.**—All meetings of the Commission shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or any portion of it may be closed to the public if it concerns matters

or information described in section 552b(c) of title 5, United States Code. Interested persons shall be permitted to appear at open meetings and present oral or written statements on the subject matter of the meeting. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to any person appearing before it.

(ii) **NOTICE.**—All open meetings of the Commission shall be preceded by timely public notice in the Federal Register of the time, place, and subject of the meeting.

(B) **MINUTES AND PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Minutes of each open meeting shall be kept and shall contain a record of the people present, a description of the discussion that occurred, and copies of all statements filed. The minutes and records of all open meetings and other documents that were made available to or prepared for the Commission shall be available for public inspection and copying at a single location in the offices of the Commission.

(m) **ARCHIVING.**—Not later than the date of termination of the Commission, all records and papers of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States for deposit in the National Archives.

SEC. 308. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF FUNDS.

For each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, the Attorney General may use, from any unobligated balances made available under the heading “GENERAL ADMINISTRATION” to the Department of Justice in an appropriations Act, such amounts as are necessary, not to exceed \$7,000,000 per fiscal year and not to exceed \$14,000,000 total for both fiscal years, to carry out this title, except that none of the funds authorized to be used to carry out this title may be used for international travel.

SEC. 309. SUNSET.

The Commission shall terminate 60 days after the Commission submits the report required under section 305(c) to Congress.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 294—CONGRATULATING THE MINNESOTA LYNX WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE 2017 WOMEN'S NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 294

Whereas on October 4, 2017, the Minnesota Lynx won the 2017 Women's National Basketball Association (referred to in this preamble as the “WNBA”) championship;

Whereas this is the fourth national championship that the Minnesota Lynx have won in 7 years;

Whereas the Minnesota Lynx beat the Los Angeles Sparks in game 5 of the WNBA Conference Finals and bested the Washington Mystics in the semifinals;

Whereas the Minnesota Lynx finished the regular season with the best record, 27–7, and earned the top seed;

Whereas the 2017 WNBA Finals made ESPN history by becoming the third-most viewed championship series, averaging 559,000 viewers for the 5-game series;

Whereas attendance for this postseason rose to a high of 9,596 spectators per game,

making it the highest-attended WNBA Finals in 7 years, and attracting 10 percent more spectators as compared to last season;

Whereas 14,632 fans attended the sold-out championship game at Williams Arena, known as “The Barn,” in Minneapolis to cheer on the Minnesota Lynx;

Whereas the Minnesota Lynx benefit from the stellar coaching leadership of Head Coach Cheryl Reeve and Assistant Coaches Shelley Patterson, James Wade, and Walt Hopkins;

Whereas the Minnesota Lynx feature 4 world champion and gold medal athletes, including Lindsay Whalen, Maya Moore, Seimone Augustus, and Sylvia Fowles, as well as highly talented professional athletes, including Rebekkah Brunson, Renee Montgomery, Temi Fagbenle, Natasha Howard, Alexis Jones, Jia Perkins, Plenette Pierson, and Cecilia Zandalasini;

Whereas Sylvia Fowles received the 2017 WNBA Finals Most Valuable Player award;

Whereas Rebekkah Brunson is the first WNBA player to win 5 championships; and

Whereas the Minnesota Lynx join the Houston Comets as the only team to win 4 championships, all under the coaching of Head Coach Cheryl Reeve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, fans, and staff whose dedication has helped the Minnesota Lynx win the 2017 Women's National Basketball Association championship; and

(2) recognizes the Twin Cities area and State of Minnesota for the enthusiastic support of women's professional basketball.

SENATE RESOLUTION 295—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2017 AS “NATIONAL EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP MONTH”

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 295

Whereas employee-owned companies give workers a voice in corporate governance, and that voice helps the long-term well-being of the company;

Whereas employee-owned companies often outperform non-employee-owned companies and show greater resiliency during challenging economic conditions;

Whereas employee-owned companies face lower staff turnover, and workers experience greater job security at those companies;

Whereas employee-owners feel better prepared to cover the expenses of life and retire with a greater sense of financial security; and

Whereas employee-owned companies have a rich history in communities across the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 2017 as “National Employee Ownership Month”; and

(2) supports employee-owned businesses;

(3) acknowledges that employee-owned companies have a positive impact on workers, businesses, and communities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 296—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 5 THROUGH 12, 2017, AS “NATIONAL CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING AWARENESS WEEK”

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 296

Whereas carbon monoxide is an odorless, colorless gas that is produced whenever any fuel, such as natural gas, propane, gasoline, oil, kerosene, wood, or charcoal, is burned;

Whereas devices that produce carbon monoxide include cars, boats, portable power generators, gasoline engines, stoves, and heating systems, and carbon monoxide produced from these sources can build up in enclosed or semi-enclosed spaces;

Whereas carbon monoxide is often referred to as the “silent killer” because it is colorless, odorless, tasteless, and non-irritating, and ignoring early stages of carbon monoxide poisoning may cause unconsciousness and continual exposure to danger;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, each year in the United States, carbon monoxide poisoning kills more than 150 individuals and sends approximately 20,000 individuals to emergency rooms;

Whereas when people breathe in carbon monoxide, the poisonous gas enters the bloodstream and prevents adequate intake of oxygen, which can damage tissues and result in death;

Whereas, given their common preexisting medical conditions, individuals older than age 65 are particularly vulnerable to carbon monoxide poisoning;

Whereas for most individuals who suffer from carbon monoxide poisoning, the early signs of exposure to low concentrations of carbon monoxide include mild headaches and breathlessness upon moderate exercise;

Whereas sustained or increased exposure to carbon monoxide can lead to flu-like symptoms, including severe headaches, dizziness, tiredness, nausea, confusion, irritability, and impaired judgment, memory, and coordination;

Whereas breathing in low concentrations of carbon monoxide can cause long-term health damage, even after exposure to the gas ends;

Whereas most cases of carbon monoxide exposure occur during the colder months of December, January, and February, when oil and gas heaters are more heavily in use;

Whereas on January 5, 1996, the Burt family of Kimball, Minnesota, was poisoned by carbon monoxide from a malfunctioning furnace in the home of the Burt family, resulting in—

(1) the deaths of 15-month-old Zachary Todd Burt and 4-year-old Nicholas Todd Burt; and

(2) the hospitalization of Ryan Todd Burt;

Whereas Cheryl Burt, the mother of Zachary, Nicholas, and Ryan Burt, has worked to educate the public about the dangers of carbon monoxide poisoning, including by testifying in December 2009 before the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

Whereas according to the North Dakota Department of Health, among residents over the age of 65, carbon monoxide poisoning was the leading substance-related cause of death in North Dakota from 2009 to 2014;

Whereas the North Dakota Department of Health found that, in 2010, carbon monoxide

poisoning was the second-leading cause of unintentional poisoning death among adults ages 30 through 49;

Whereas on June 7, 2015, 3 adults and 1 child in Blanchard, North Dakota, tragically passed away from carbon monoxide poisoning as the result of a carbon monoxide leak caused by an improperly vented water heater; and

Whereas increasing awareness about the dangers of carbon monoxide can help prevent poisoning and save lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates the week of November 5 through 12, 2017, as “National Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Awareness Week”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 297—SUPPORTING LIGHTS ON AFTERSCHOOL, A NATIONAL CELEBRATION OF AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS HELD ON OCTOBER 26, 2017

Mr. FRANKEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 297

Whereas more than 28,000,000 children in the United States have parents who work outside the home;

Whereas high-quality programs that expand learning opportunities for children, such as afterschool, before-school, summer, and expanded learning opportunities, provide safe, challenging, engaging, and fun learning experiences, including experiences that encourage science, technology, engineering, and math, that help children and youth develop social, emotional, physical, cultural, and academic skills;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs and high-quality expanded learning opportunities provide students with hands-on, engaging lessons that are aligned with the school day;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs complement regular and expanded school days and support working families by ensuring that the children of those families are safe and productive during the hours parents are working;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs engage families, schools, and diverse community partners in advancing the well-being of children and youth in the United States;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs that partner with high-quality community-based organizations build stronger communities by integrating schools with the larger community; and

Whereas Lights On Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool, before-school, summer, and expanded learning opportunities programs, held on October 26, 2017, highlights the critical importance of those high-quality programs to children and the families and communities of those children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports Lights on Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool programs held on October 26, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 298—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 2017 AS “NATIONAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTION RECOVERY MONTH”

Mr. KING (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 298

Whereas September has been declared “National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month”;

Whereas the theme for National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month in 2017 is “Join the Voices for Recovery: Strengthen Families and Communities”;

Whereas drug overdose is the leading cause of accidental death in the United States, with more than 63,000 lethal drug overdoses in 2016 or approximately 170 lethal drug overdoses per day in 2016;

Whereas drug overdose is now the leading cause of death in individuals in the United States under age 50; and

Whereas the motto of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month is “Prevention Works—Treatment is Effective—People Recover”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate joins the voices for recovery to strengthen families and communities by—

(1) recognizing the importance of education and prevention of substance use disorder and the critical importance and effectiveness of treatment for substance use disorder;

(2) recognizing the possibility of recovery from substance use disorder in this and every month; and

(3) honoring and celebrating—

(A) the achievements of the more than 25,000,000 people of the United States who are in recovery from substance use disorder; and

(B) the tens of millions of recovery allies who support those people.

SENATE RESOLUTION 299—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 20, 2017, AS THE “NATIONAL DAY ON WRITING”

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 299

Whereas people in the 21st century are writing more than ever before for personal, professional, and civic purposes;

Whereas the social nature of writing invites people of every age, profession, and walk of life to create meaning through composing;

Whereas more and more people in every occupation consider writing to be essential and influential in their work;

Whereas individuals who write continue to learn how to write for different purposes, audiences, and occasions throughout their lifetimes;

Whereas developing digital technologies expand the possibilities for composing in multiple media at a faster pace than ever before;

Whereas young people are leading the way in developing new forms of composing by using different forms of digital media;

Whereas effective communication contributes to building a global economy and a global community;

Whereas the National Council of Teachers of English, in conjunction with its many national and local partners, honors and celebrates the importance of writing through the National Day on Writing;

Whereas the National Day on Writing celebrates the foundational place of writing in the personal, professional, and civic lives of the people of the United States;

Whereas the National Day on Writing highlights the importance of writing instruction and practice at every educational level and in every subject area;

Whereas the National Day on Writing emphasizes the lifelong process of learning to write and compose for different audiences, purposes, and occasions;

Whereas the National Day on Writing honors the use of the full range of media for composing, from traditional tools, including print, audio, and video, to social media, including Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram, and Internet website tools, including blogs, wikis, and podcasts;

Whereas the National Day on Writing encourages all people of the United States and overseas to write, enjoy, and learn from the writing of others;

Whereas, since the inception of the hashtag #WhyIWrite in 2009, the hashtag has generated hundreds of thousands of tweets and reached millions of people, encouraging students, from elementary school through the university level, athletes, authors, and artists from all over the world to participate;

Whereas, since October 2016, the #WhyIWrite podcast has brought the voices of prominent authors of all genres and mediums into the conversation around the power of the written word; and

Whereas, on the National Day of Writing in 2017, the National Council of Teachers of English encourages all people of the United States to tell others #WhyIWrite through print, social media, or other means: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of October 20, 2017, as the “National Day on Writing”;

(2) strongly affirms the purposes of the National Day on Writing; and

(3) encourages educational institutions, businesses, community and civic associations, and other organizations to celebrate and promote the National Day on Writing.

SENATE RESOLUTION 300—RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF MCDANIEL COLLEGE

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 300

Whereas, on October 21, 2017, McDaniel College, formerly Western Maryland College (referred to in this preamble as the “College”), located in Westminster, Maryland, will celebrate the 150th anniversary of the first academic year of the College;

Whereas the College was the first coeducational college founded south of the Mason-Dixon line and one of the first coeducational colleges in the United States;

Whereas the founder of the College, Fayette Buell, a Westminster teacher, purchased approximately 8 acres of land shortly after the Civil War in 1866 to build the College;

Whereas the College was named Western Maryland College at the suggestion of John Smith, President of Western Maryland Railroad;

Whereas the first academic year of the College began on September 4, 1867, with 5 teachers and 37 male and female students enrolled in 8 areas of study;

Whereas the State of Maryland approved the charter of the College on March 30, 1868;

Whereas the first graduating class of the College honored 7 men and women on June 15, 1871;

Whereas, in 1919, the Department of War authorized the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps at the College, which continues as one of the oldest Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs in the United States;

Whereas, in 1923, the first earned master’s degree was offered at the College for Master of Arts;

Whereas, in January 1975, the College formally disaffiliated from the United Methodist Church and firmly established an identity as an independent private college of the liberal arts and sciences;

Whereas, in 1980, the College received a Phi Beta Kappa charter, making it only the fourth college in Maryland to house a chapter of that prestigious national collegiate honor society;

Whereas, in 1994, the College opened its first branch campus in Budapest, Hungary, which has awarded more than 200 students from over 20 countries baccalaureate degrees and has welcomed more than 400 students from the Westminster campus who have studied abroad there;

Whereas, in 1996, the College was among 40 institutions included in the seminal guide book *Colleges That Change Lives*, and has continued to be included in each subsequent edition of that book;

Whereas, on July 1, 2002, Western Maryland College changed its name to McDaniel College, honoring William Roberts McDaniel, alumnus of the class of 1880, professor, Secretary of the Faculty, Vice President, Treasurer, Acting President, and member of the Board of Trustees of the College;

Whereas, as of October 2017, the College serves approximately 1,600 undergraduate students and 1,400 graduate students in more than 70 undergraduate programs of study (including dual and student-designed majors) and 25 highly regarded graduate programs, and prepares those students with the skills needed to compete and succeed in a changing world;

Whereas, in 2017, the College features 72 buildings on a 160-acre campus;

Whereas the College continues to rank among the top liberal arts colleges in the United States and to be recognized for a commitment to access;

Whereas the College awards greater than 90 percent of students some type of financial assistance, including institutional grants and scholarships and Federal and State aid;

Whereas the more than 28,000 alumni of the College reside in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and 75 countries;

Whereas the College has a tradition of producing top educators, with 3 alumnae of the College being named Maryland Teachers of the Year since 2010; and

Whereas the College continues to be committed to enhancing academic and experiential learning opportunities for students at the College, many of whom are the first in their families to attend an institution of higher education, and producing empowered critical thinkers who are well-prepared for jobs and service that strengthen the State of

Maryland and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates McDaniel College on the 150th anniversary of the founding of the College;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the administrators, professors, students, and various staff who have contributed to the success of McDaniel College; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the president of McDaniel College; and

(B) the provost and vice president for academic affairs of McDaniel College.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1399. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1400. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1401. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1402. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1403. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1404. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra.

SA 1405. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1406. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1407. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1408. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1409. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1410. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116

SA 1454. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1518. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1533. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

SA 1548. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1549. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1550. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1551. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1552. Mr. ENZI (for Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. COLLINS)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra.

SA 1553. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BENNET)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra.

SA 1554. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1555. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1556. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1557. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1558. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1559. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1560. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1561. Mr. ENZI proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra.

SA 1562. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1563. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1564. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1565. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1566. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1567. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1568. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.

SA 1569. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1568 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2266, supra.

SA 1570. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2266, supra.

SA 1571. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1570 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2266, supra.

SA 1572. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1571 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 1570 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2266, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1399. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX SIMPLIFICATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming Federal tax laws, which may include simplifying our existing tax laws and providing other job-creating relief, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1400. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget

for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEPLOYMENT OF UNIVERSAL BROADBAND TO EVERY HOME, COMMUNITY ANCHOR INSTITUTION, AND SMALL BUSINESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the deployment of universal broadband to every home, community anchor institution, and small business by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1401. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING THE BASIC HEALTH PROGRAM AS A PUBLIC OPTION THAT COVERS MORE AMERICANS AT LOWER COST.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the basic health program, which may include expanding the basic health program under section 1331 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18051) as a public option to lower health care costs for Americans in the individual health insurance market, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1402. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND
RELATING TO ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening national security and promoting economic growth and public health by addressing human-induced climate change through increased use of clean energy and energy efficiency technologies to stabilize and reduce United States greenhouse gas emissions while providing adequate resources to support existing coal communities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1403. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND
RELATING TO STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE DRAWDOWN AND SALE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to compliance with the reconciliation instructions for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate under section 2001, which may include the drawdown and sale of crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve established under part B of title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6231 et seq.) during fiscal years 2018 through 2027, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1404. Mr. PAUL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; as follows:

On page 47, line 6, strike “\$1,500,000,000,000” and insert “\$2,500,000,000,000”.

SA 1405. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr.

ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$14,873,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$17,413,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$19,224,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$21,137,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$24,058,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$25,233,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$26,481,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$27,809,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$29,152,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$30,588,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,196,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$9,920,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$13,596,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$16,586,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$19,403,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$21,654,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$23,494,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$25,084,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$26,581,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$28,071,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$5,196,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$9,920,000,000.

On page 6, line 3, increase the amount by \$13,596,000,000.

On page 6, line 4, increase the amount by \$16,586,000,000.

On page 6, line 5, increase the amount by \$19,403,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$21,654,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$23,494,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$25,084,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$26,581,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$28,071,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,196,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by \$15,116,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by \$28,712,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by \$45,298,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$64,701,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$86,355,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$109,849,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$134,933,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$161,514,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$189,585,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,196,000,000.

On page 7, line 4, increase the amount by \$15,116,000,000.

On page 7, line 5, increase the amount by \$28,712,000,000.

On page 7, line 6, increase the amount by \$45,298,000,000.

On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$64,701,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$86,355,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$109,849,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by \$134,933,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, increase the amount by \$161,514,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, increase the amount by \$189,585,000,000.

On page 9, line 12, increase the amount by \$14,843,000,000.

On page 9, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,165,000,000.

On page 9, line 16, increase the amount by \$17,206,000,000.

On page 9, line 17, increase the amount by \$9,713,000,000.

On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by \$18,670,000,000.

On page 9, line 21, increase the amount by \$13,042,000,000.

On page 9, line 24, increase the amount by \$20,106,000,000.

On page 9, line 25, increase the amount by \$15,555,000,000.

On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by \$22,449,000,000.

On page 10, line 4, increase the amount by \$17,795,000,000.

On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by \$22,953,000,000.

On page 10, line 8, increase the amount by \$19,373,000,000.

On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by \$23,453,000,000.

On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by \$20,465,000,000.

On page 10, line 15, increase the amount by \$23,982,000,000.

On page 10, line 16, increase the amount by \$21,258,000,000.

On page 10, line 19, increase the amount by \$24,480,000,000.

On page 10, line 20, increase the amount by \$21,909,000,000.

On page 10, line 23, increase the amount by \$25,024,000,000.

On page 10, line 24, increase the amount by \$22,507,000,000.

On page 36, line 2, increase the amount by \$30,000,000.

On page 36, line 3, increase the amount by \$30,000,000.

On page 36, line 6, increase the amount by \$207,000,000.

On page 36, line 7, increase the amount by \$207,000,000.

On page 36, line 10, increase the amount by \$554,000,000.

On page 36, line 11, increase the amount by \$554,000,000.

On page 36, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,031,000,000.

On page 36, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,031,000,000.

On page 36, line 18, increase the amount by \$1,609,000,000.

On page 36, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,609,000,000.

On page 36, line 22, increase the amount by \$2,280,000,000.

On page 36, line 23, increase the amount by \$2,280,000,000.

On page 37, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,028,000,000.

On page 37, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,028,000,000.

On page 37, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,827,000,000.

On page 37, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,827,000,000.

On page 37, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,672,000,000.

On page 37, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,672,000,000.

On page 37, line 14, increase the amount by \$5,564,000,000.

On page 37, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,564,000,000.

SA 1406. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING GREATER INCENTIVES FOR DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing greater incentives for manufacturers who develop and manufacture their products in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1407. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING THE RESEARCH TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding the tax credit for increasing research activities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1408. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DIRECTING THE BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS TO CONDUCT THE WORK SCHEDULES AND WORK AT HOME SUPPLEMENT TO THE CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enabling the Bureau of Labor Statistics to conduct the Work Schedules and Work at Home Supplement to the Current Population Survey, which may include funding measures or other measures addressing that Supplement, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1409. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REBUILD THE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE OF PUERTO RICO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to rebuilding the critical infrastructure of Puerto Rico by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1410. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING CLEAN DRINKING WATER FOR PUERTO RICO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring clean drinking water for Puerto Rico by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1411. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REBUILDING AND RESTORING HOSPITALS IN PUERTO RICO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to rebuilding and restoring hospitals in Puerto Rico by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1412. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REBUILDING AND REPLACING THE ELECTRIC GRID IN PUERTO RICO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to rebuilding and replacing the electric grid in Puerto Rico by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1413. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REBUILDING AND RESTORING ROADS AND BRIDGES IN PUERTO RICO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to rebuilding and restoring roads and bridges in Puerto Rico by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1414. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REBUILD AND RESTORE TELECOMMUNICATIONS IN PUERTO RICO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to rebuilding and restoring telecommunications in Puerto Rico by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1415. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BOLSTERING UNITED STATES MISSILE DEFENSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to activities undertaken to—

(1) maintain and improve, with the allies of the United States, an effective, robust layered missile defense system capable of defending the citizens of the United States residing in territories and States of the United States, allies of the United States, and deployed Armed Forces of the United States;

(2) increase the capability, capacity, and reliability of the United States homeland and theater ballistic missile defense systems to defend against the evolving and increasingly complex ballistic missile threats of adversaries of the United States;

(3) develop a resilient space-based missile defense sensor layer to provide persistent, launch-to-intercept tracking, discrimination, and kill assessment of ballistic missile threats and provide this capability to the Armed Forces as soon as technically feasible; and

(4) increase funding to homeland missile defense testing to ensure that United States defenses continue to evolve faster than the threats against which they are postured to defend

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1416. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BOLSTERING UNITED STATES MISSILE DEFENSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining and improving, with the allies of the United States, an effective, robust layered missile defense system, and to increasing the capability, capacity, and reliability of the United States homeland and theater ballistic missile defense systems by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1417. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REBUILDING RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE IN PUERTO RICO AND THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to rebuilding infrastructure in Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands destroyed or damaged by Hurricanes Irma and Maria in a resilient and sustainable way that reduces the threat from future disasters, including rebuilding the electric grid and investing in distributed clean energy technologies such as solar, wind, energy efficiency, and battery storage as targeted in local clean energy legislation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1418. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGETS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the

pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring all electric load serving entities to procure 30 percent of the electric supply of the entities from new renewable energy resources by 2030, and electric and natural gas distribution companies to invest in all cost-effective energy efficiency measures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1419. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING RETIREMENT SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving retirement security, by making it easier for small businesses to provide retirement plans for their employees, by easing the administrative burden, and by encouraging individuals to increase their savings, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1420. Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:
SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVIDING A TAX CUT TO THE TOP 1 PERCENT OR CREATING A LOOP-HOLE FOR WEALTHY TAX DODGERS THROUGH LOWERING THE PASS-THROUGH TAX RATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report relating to a reconciliation bill that would—

(1) provide a tax cut on business income to individuals in the top 1 percent of income, or

(2) increase the incentive for workers to receive compensation from their current employer through a pass-through business rather than in the form of higher-taxed wages.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1421. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$470,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,190,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,700,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,020,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,320,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$2,690,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,325,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,450,000,000.
On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$470,000,000.
On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,190,000,000.
On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,700,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,020,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,320,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,690,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,325,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,450,000,000.
On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$470,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,190,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$1,700,000,000.
On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,020,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$2,320,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$2,690,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,325,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,450,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$470,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,190,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,020,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,320,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$2,690,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,325,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,450,000,000.

On page 22, line 20, increase the amount by \$470,000,000.

On page 22, line 21, increase the amount by \$470,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,190,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,190,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,700,000,000.

On page 23, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,700,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, increase the amount by \$2,020,000,000.

On page 23, line 8, increase the amount by \$2,020,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, increase the amount by \$2,320,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, increase the amount by \$2,320,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,690,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,690,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 24, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,325,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,325,000,000.

On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,450,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,450,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by \$23,380,000,000.

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT UNDERGRADUATE FEDERAL DIRECT STAFFORD LOAN STUDENT BORROWERS WILL NOT PAY INTEREST WHILE ATTENDING AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that current Federal policy will continue for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loan student borrowers and such borrowers will not pay interest on their Federal Direct Stafford Loans while enrolled in an institution of higher education, by the amounts provided

in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1422. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. PORTMAN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESSES TO INVEST IN AMERICA AND CREATE JOBS IN AMERICA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in federal tax laws, which may include international tax provisions that provide or enhance incentives for businesses to invest in America, generate American jobs, retain American jobs, and return jobs to America, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1423. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING TAX BREAKS FOR COMPANIES THAT SHIP JOBS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to eliminating tax breaks for companies that outsource jobs to foreign countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1424. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H.

Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING OUTSOURCING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the consideration in Federal contracting policy of whether proposed contractors outsource United States jobs, to the clawing back of tax incentives received by, and the prohibition of tax breaks for, companies that outsource jobs and factories instead of investing in the United States economy, and to providing tax incentives for companies to relocate foreign jobs to the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1425. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REPEALING OIL MORATORIUM THAT PROTECTS MILITARY READINESS.

It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would allow for new oil drilling east of the Military Mission Line in the Gulf of Mexico.

SA 1426. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE COLOMBIAN PEACE AGREEMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments

between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing additional support to the Government of Colombia for the implementation of a Colombian peace agreement which may include the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, which may include conditions relating to counter-narcotics programs aerial eradication or extradition requests, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1427. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO EXPANDING THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing tax relief for working families, which may include an expansion of the child tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1428. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 57, line 19, insert “, including rewriting the formula for payments under the program” after “program”.

SA 1429. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CLARIFYING FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN RELATION TO INTRASTATE SPECIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting Federal regulation of entirely intrastate species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1430. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 49, line 5, insert “, which may include nullification of any regulations promulgated under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (including any amendment made by such title)” before “by the”.

SA 1431. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 56, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(5) assessing nuclear deterrent effectiveness;

(6) encouraging the submission of an overall national security strategy;

(7) limiting United States military engagements abroad that are not explicitly authorized by an Act of Congress;

(8) prohibiting the Armed Forces from participating in a humanitarian operation, or assisting in a civil war, ethnic conflict, tribal or territorial dispute, without an explicit authorization by an Act of Congress; or

(9) placing limitations on United States military engagements and foreign military sales to either party or side (whether rebel, opposition group, or established government) in an internal, domestic, or civil war or dispute within a country or relating to activities in pursuit of autonomy or independence,

SA 1432. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DISPOSAL OF EXCESS FEDERAL LAND TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEFICIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the disposal of excess Federal land to reduce the Federal deficit by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1433. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRATEGIC ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making any regional large-scale strategic energy infrastructure project with the potential to significantly contribute to the economic resilience of the region in which the project is located eligible for a loan guarantee under section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16513), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1434. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION FOR COAL COUNTRY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments

between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funds to States and Indian tribes for the purpose of promoting economic revitalization, diversification, and development in economically distressed communities through the reclamation and restoration of land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining carried out before August 3, 1977, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1435. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A LIFETIME BAN ON SENATORS AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ENGAGING IN LOBBYING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a lifetime ban on Senators and Members of the House of Representatives engaging in lobbying by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1436. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CUT MEDICARE OR MEDICAID BENEFITS FOR WORKING-CLASS AND MIDDLE-INCOME ILLINOISANS WHILE CUTTING TAXES FOR THE WEALTHY AND LARGE CORPORATIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that shortens the financial stability of Medicare or Medicaid or cuts benefits under Medicare or Medicaid for working-class and middle-income Illinoisans while cutting taxes for the wealthy and large corporations.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1437. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING LEGISLATION FROM RAISING TAXES ON MIDDLE-INCOME ILLINOISANS WHILE CUTTING TAXES FOR THE WEALTHY AND LARGE CORPORATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing tax increases on middle-income Illinoisans while cutting taxes for the wealthy and large corporations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1438. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING INVERTED CORPORATIONS FROM AVOIDING UNITED STATES TAXES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing certain corporation from avoiding paying their fair share of United States taxes, which may include reforming the definition of an inverted corporation under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or preventing earnings stripping, by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1439. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TAX INCENTIVES TO BUSINESSES TO HIRE YOUTH FROM ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED AREAS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the modification and extension of the work opportunity tax credit, which may include increasing the amount of the credit and expanding the credit to allow for year-round employment of at-risk youth, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1440. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING CERTAIN CORPORATIONS FROM PROFITING FROM GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing certain corporations that avoid paying their fair share of United States taxes from profiting from Federal government contracts, which may include revising the definition of an inverted corporation or identifying corporations that were previously located in the United States and are now located in foreign countries such as the United Kingdom, Bermuda, or the Cayman Islands, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not in-

crease the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1441. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the business deductions under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include disallowing such a deduction for punitive damages, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1442. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING THE GENDER WAGE GAP THROUGH AN UPDATE OF THE EMPLOYER INFORMATION REPORT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to addressing the gender wage gap through an update of the Employer Information Report (EEO-1) that includes gathering data from employers about compensation by race, ethnicity, gender, and job category, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1443. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING WORKERS FROM WAGE THEFT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting workers from wage theft, which may include (1) creating new civil penalties for employers who engage in wage theft; (2) giving workers the right to receive full compensation for all of the work that they perform; (3) giving workers the right to receive their final paychecks in a timely manner; (4) requiring employers to provide regular paystubs to workers; (5) increasing the amount of damages workers receive when they experience wage theft or experience retaliation for filing a complaint about wage theft; (6) increasing the number of years that workers have to bring a wage theft claim in court and suspending that time limit while the Department of Labor is conducting an investigation; or (7) directing the Department of Labor to refer employers responsible for egregious and comprehensive violations to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1444. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASING OVERTIME PROTECTIONS FOR MIDDLE-CLASS WORKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting workers from working overtime hours without compensation, which may include a substantial increase in overtime protections for middle class workers, by the amounts provided in

such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1445. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ACHIEVING ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL PROCUREMENT BY ENSURING CONTRACTOR COMPLIANCE WITH EXISTING LAW.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving economy and efficiency in Federal procurement by ensuring contractor compliance with existing law, including compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and the National Labor Relations Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1446. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE SHORTFALLS OF THE RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that compensation be provided to people in the United States who were sickened by radiation exposure by above ground nuclear weapons testing throughout the western United States and Pacific islands, and to those who were sickened by radiation while working in the

uranium mining industry during the Cold War, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1447. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOUSING FOR ALL NATIVE AMERICANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that funding under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 provides funding to all Native American communities, including Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians, to address the critical housing needs throughout Indian Country, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1448. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TRUST ACQUISITIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to trust acquisitions, which may include prohibiting regulations that revise the Department of the Interior's land into trust acquisition process, whether for on-reservation or off-reservation acquisitions, or that could result in a de facto moratorium on trust acquisitions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1449. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING THE GEOGRAPHIC IMBALANCE IN FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDING AND IMPROVING RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPACITY THROUGHOUT THE STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (commonly known as “ESPCoR”), which may include support for States and jurisdictions that are historically underserved by Federal research and development funding, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1450. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING CORPORATE DEDUCTIONS FOR COMPENSATION IN EXCESS OF \$1,000,000.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the tax code's subsidization of corporate compensation, which may include eliminating corporate deductions for compensation in excess of \$1,000,000, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1451. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for

fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LIMITING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce health insurance coverage for children, including cuts to Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), or the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, such as restricting Federal requirements that private insurance provide coverage for pediatric services.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1452. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CUTTING LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS FOR SENIORS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cut long term services and supports for seniors, including nursing home care and home and community-based care, under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) by reducing Federal funding of State Medicaid programs, including by instituting a block grant model for Federal funding of State Medicaid programs or imposing per capita caps on Federal funding of State Medicaid programs.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1453. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal

years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING NATIONAL SERVICE OPPORTUNITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening and expanding national service programs offered through the Corporation for National and Community Service, which may include increasing the value of the education awards earned by national service program volunteers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1454. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE MAXIMUM FEDERAL PELL GRANT AWARD AND ADJUSTING THE AWARD FOR INFLATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the maximum Federal Pell Grant award and ensuring that the award is adjusted for inflation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1455. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a program to address critical infrastructure needs in the public elementary and secondary schools of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1456. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING THE COSTS TO BORROWERS IN THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the cost to borrowers of Federal education loans made to students or on behalf of students, including a switch to fair value accounting rules.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1457. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING NEGATIVE SUBSIDIES IN THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM AND REDUCING COSTS FOR BORROWERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Federal student loan programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) to eliminate negative subsidies and reduce costs for borrowers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those pur-

poses, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1458. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FOR FIVE YEARS OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS, WHICH PREVENT LAYOFFS AND KEEP AMERICANS EMPLOYED.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing for five years of Federal funding for short-time compensation programs, which prevent layoffs and keep Americans employed, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1459. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECURING THE LONG-TERM INTEGRITY OF THE AMERICAN WORKFORCE BY MODERNIZING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO HELP INSURE AGAINST JOB LOSS DUE TO AUTOMATION, ECONOMIC DOWNTURNS, AND DISASTERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to securing the long-term integrity of the American workforce by modernizing unemployment compensation, including by insuring against job loss due to automation, economic downturns and disasters, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1460. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to student loan reform, which may include establishing a policy of risk sharing to require institutions of higher education to assume some of the risk for student loans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1461. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX RELIEF FOR NON-CORPORATE SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include reducing the roughly 45% top marginal rate applicable to small business owners, in a manner that will prevent re-characterization of personal income as business income, and further reform the pass-through area, including loophole closers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1462. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPEALING THE DAVIS-BACON ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing the prevailing wage rate requirements by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1463. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN POSTSECONDARY STUDENT FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the eligibility requirements for institutions of higher education to participate in the student financial assistance programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1464. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the

pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding health savings accounts by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1465. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORK REQUIREMENT MODIFICATIONS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND ESTABLISHING A STATE OPTION TO INSTITUTE MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying work requirements for participation in the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), and establishing a State option to institute Medicaid work requirements, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1466. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 49, line 5, insert “which may include prohibiting additional States from adopting the Medicaid expansion established by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or eliminating the enhanced Federal medical assistance percentages applicable to State expenditures for medical assistance provided under such Medicaid expansion,” before “by the amounts”.

SA 1467. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING ACCESS TO HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing access to, and expanding the use of, health savings accounts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1468. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCENTIVIZING PRICE TRANSPARENCY IN OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to allowing States to combine waivers under section 1115 of the Social Security Act and waivers under section 1332 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to better serve the unique needs of the populations in their States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1469. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CARE IN MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to legislation that would improve the quality of care in the Medicaid program, which may include streamlining care delivery, rewarding high-quality care, increasing the ability of States to innovate, improving oversight of waste, fraud, and abuse, and improving quality metrics, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1470. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO GIVING STATES THE ABILITY TO IMPLEMENT ALTERNATIVES TO THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE AND USE OTHER MECHANISMS FOR INCENTIVIZING ENROLLMENT IN HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to giving States the ability to implement alternatives to the individual mandate and use other mechanisms for incentivizing enrollment in health insurance coverage, which may include the option of automatic enrollment in health insurance coverage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1471. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCENTIVIZING PRICE TRANSPARENCY IN OUR HEALTH CARE DELIVERY SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the

pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to incentivizing price transparency in our health care delivery system, which may include addressing surprise medical billing, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1472. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCENTIVIZING PRICE TRANSPARENCY IN OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the ability of States to apply for and receive, and incentivizing States to apply for, a waiver under section 1332 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18052) to act as pass-through entities for funding, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1473. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$7,235,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$7,506,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,666,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$7,763,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$7,657,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$7,748,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$7,847,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,954,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$8,071,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$8,212,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$7,235,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$7,506,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$7,666,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$7,763,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$7,657,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$7,748,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$7,847,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$7,954,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$8,071,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$8,212,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,469,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,614,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$7,815,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$7,630,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$7,723,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$7,820,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,925,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$8,035,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$8,172,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$8,323,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$7,235,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$7,506,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$7,666,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$7,763,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$7,657,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$7,748,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$7,847,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,954,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$8,071,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$8,212,000,000.

On page 22, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,469,000,000.

On page 22, line 21, increase the amount by \$7,235,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by \$7,614,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,506,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, increase the amount by \$7,815,000,000.

On page 23, line 4, increase the amount by \$7,666,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, increase the amount by \$7,630,000,000.

On page 23, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,763,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,723,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, increase the amount by \$7,657,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by \$7,820,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by \$7,748,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by \$7,925,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,847,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by \$8,035,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by \$7,954,000,000.

On page 24, line 2, increase the amount by \$8,172,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by \$8,071,000,000.

On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by \$8,323,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by \$8,212,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, reduce the amount by \$77,659,000,000.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE THE FUNDING FOR FINANCIAL AID MADE AVAILABLE TO LOW AND MIDDLE INCOME INDIVIDUALS THROUGH THE FEDERAL PELL GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce the funding for financial aid made available to low and middle income individuals through the Federal Pell Grant program under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a et seq.), including cuts to mandatory funding and budget authority provided for the Federal Pell Grant increase calculated under section 401(b)(7) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)).

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1474. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING DRUG PRICING TRANSPARENCY FOR CONSUMERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving drug pricing transparency for consumers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1475. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING STUDENTS FROM PREDATORY FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting students, including students who are veterans of the armed forces, from predatory for-profit institutions of higher education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1476. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING FUNDING FOR FEDERAL STUDENT FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce funding for Federal student financial aid programs.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1477. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY MENTORING AND OTHER POLICIES AND HIGH-QUALITY PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AIMED AT IMPROVING SOCIAL CAPITAL FOR FOSTER YOUTH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding access to high-quality mentoring and other policies and high-quality programs and services aimed at improving social capital for foster youth by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1478. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING FUNDING FOR DISEASE PREVENTION EFFORTS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction or elimination of funding under section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11);

(2) reduce the Federal resources provided to communities to invest in effective, proven prevention efforts; or

(3) increase the prevalence of disease rates amongst children.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1479. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 10, insert “by expanding access to State-run retirement plans for private sector workers” before the semicolon.

SA 1480. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 14, strike “or”.

On page 52, line 15, strike the comma and insert “; or”.

On page 52, insert the following after line 15:

(8) paying for successful outcomes in social programs,

SA 1481. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(8) increasing organ donation and improving the organ donation system,

SA 1482. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(8) addressing medical errors and patient safety,

SA 1483. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE V—VESSEL INCIDENTAL DISCHARGE ACT

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This title may be cited as the “Vessel Incidental Discharge Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this title is as follows:

TITLE V—VESSEL INCIDENTAL DISCHARGE ACT

Sec. 5001. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 5002. Definitions.

Sec. 5003. Treatment of existing ballast water regulations.

Sec. 5004. Ballast water discharge requirements.

Sec. 5005. Approval of ballast water management systems.

Sec. 5006. Review and raising of ballast water discharge standard.

Sec. 5007. National Ballast Information Clearinghouse.

Sec. 5008. Requirements for discharges incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel.

Sec. 5009. Best management practices for Great Lakes vessels.

Sec. 5010. Judicial review.

Sec. 5011. State enforcement.

Sec. 5012. Effect on other laws.

Sec. 5013. Quagga mussel.

Sec. 5014. Coastal aquatic invasive species mitigation grant program and mitigation fund.

Sec. 5015. Rules of construction.

SEC. 5002. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES.**—The term “aquatic nuisance species” means a non-indigenous species (including a pathogen, microbe, or virus) that threatens the diversity or abundance of native species or the ecological stability of waters of the United States, or commercial, agricultural, aquacultural, or recreational activities dependent on such waters.

(3) **BALLAST WATER.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “ballast water” means any water and suspended matter taken on board a commercial vessel—

(i) to control or maintain trim, draught, stability, or stresses of the commercial vessel, regardless of how such water and matter is carried; or

(ii) during the cleaning, maintenance, or other operation of a ballast tank or ballast water management system of the commercial vessel.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “ballast water” does not include any substance that is added to water described in subparagraph (A) that is directly related to the operation of a properly functioning ballast water management system.

(4) **BALLAST WATER DISCHARGE STANDARD.**—The term “ballast water discharge standard” means—

(A) the numerical ballast water discharge standard set forth in section 151.2030 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, or section 151.1511 of such title (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act); or

(B) if the standard described in subparagraph (A) has been revised under section 5006, such revised standard.

(5) **BALLAST WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.**—The term “ballast water management system” means any system, including all ballast water treatment equipment and all associated control and monitoring equipment, that processes ballast water—

(A) to kill, render nonviable, or remove organisms; or

(B) to avoid the uptake or discharge of organisms.

(6) **BEST AVAILABLE TECHNOLOGY ECONOMICALLY ACHIEVABLE.**—The term “best available technology economically achievable” has the meaning given that term in sections 301(b)(2)(A) and 304(b)(2)(B) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1311(b)(2)(A) and 1314(b)(2)(B)) as such term applies to a mobile point source.

(7) **BIOCIDE.**—The term “biocide” means a substance or organism that is introduced into or produced by a ballast water management system to kill or eliminate aquatic

nuisance species as part of the process used to comply with a ballast water discharge standard.

(8) **CAPTAIN OF THE PORT ZONE.**—The term “Captain of the Port Zone” means a Captain of the Port Zone established by Secretary pursuant to sections 92, 93, and 633 of title 14, United States Code.

(9) **COMMERCIAL VESSEL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “commercial vessel” means a vessel (as defined in section 3 of title 1, United States Code) that is engaged in commercial service (as defined in section 2101(5) of title 46, United States Code).

(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “commercial vessel” does not include a recreational vessel.

(10) **DISCHARGE INCIDENTAL TO THE NORMAL OPERATION OF A COMMERCIAL VESSEL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “discharge incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel” means—

(i) a discharge into navigable waters of the United States from a commercial vessel of—

(I)(aa) graywater, bilge water, cooling water, oil water separator effluent, anti-fouling hull coating leachate, boiler or economizer blowdown, byproducts from cathodic protection, controllable pitch propeller and thruster hydraulic fluid, distillation and reverse osmosis brine, elevator pit effluent, firemain system effluent, freshwater layup effluent, gas turbine wash water, motor gasoline and compensating effluent, refrigeration and air condensate effluent, seawater piping biofouling prevention substances, boat engine wet exhaust, sonar dome effluent, exhaust gas scrubber washwater, or stern tube packing gland effluent; or

(bb) any other pollutant associated with the operation of a marine propulsion system, shipboard maneuvering system, habitability system, or installed major equipment, or from a protective, preservative, or absorptive application to the hull of a commercial vessel;

(II) deck runoff, deck washdown, above the waterline hull cleaning effluent, aqueous film forming foam effluent, chain locker effluent, non-oily machinery wastewater, underwater ship husbandry effluent, weldeck effluent, or fish hold and fish hold cleaning effluent; or

(III) any effluent from a properly functioning marine engine; or

(ii) a discharge of a pollutant into navigable waters of the United States in connection with the testing, maintenance, or repair of a system, equipment, or engine described in subclause (I)(bb) or (III) of clause (i) whenever the commercial vessel is waterborne.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “discharge incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel” does not include—

(i) any discharge into navigable waters of the United States from a commercial vessel of—

(I) ballast water;

(II) rubbish, trash, garbage, incinerator ash, or other such material discharged overboard;

(III) oil or a hazardous substance (as such terms are defined in section 311 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321)); or

(IV) sewage (as defined in section 312(a)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1322(a)(6))); or

(ii) any emission of an air pollutant resulting from the operation onboard a commercial vessel of a commercial vessel propulsion system, motor driven equipment, or incinerator;

(iii) any discharge into navigable waters of the United States from a commercial vessel when the commercial vessel is operating in a capacity other than as a means of transportation on water; or

(iv) any discharge that results from an activity other than the normal operation of a commercial vessel.

(11) **EMPTY BALLAST TANK.**—The term “empty ballast tank” means a tank—

(A) intended to hold ballast water that has been drained to the limit of the functional or operational capabilities of such tank, such as loss of suction, and otherwise recorded as empty on a vessel log; and

(B) that contains unpumpable residual ballast water and sediments.

(12) **EXCHANGE.**—The term “exchange” means, with respect to ballast water, to replace the water in a ballast water tank using one of the following methods:

(A) **Flow-through exchange.** in which ballast water is flushed out by pumping in mid-ocean water at the bottom of the tank and continuously overflowing the tank from the top until three full volumes of water has been changed to minimize the number of original organisms remaining in the tank.

(B) **Empty and refill exchange.** in which ballast water taken on in ports, estuarine waters, or territorial waters is pumped out until the pump loses suction, after which the ballast tank is refilled with mid-ocean water.

(13) **GENERAL PERMIT.**—The term “General Permit” means the Final National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Vessel General Permit for Discharges Incidental to the Normal Operation of a Vessel noticed in the Federal Register on April 12, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 21938).

(14) **GREAT LAKES STATES.**—The term “Great Lakes States” means Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

(15) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given that term in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304(e)).

(16) **MAJOR CONVERSION.**—The term “major conversion” has the meaning given that term in section 2101(14a) of title 46, United States Code.

(17) **MARINE POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICE.**—The term “marine pollution control device” means any equipment for installation or use on board a commercial vessel that is—

(A) designed to receive, retain, treat, control, or discharge a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel; and

(B) determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, to be the most effective equipment or management practice to reduce the environmental impact of the discharge consistent with the considerations set forth in section 5008(a)(2).

(18) **MID-OCEAN WATER.**—The term “mid-ocean water” means water greater than 200 nautical miles from any shore.

(19) **NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—The term “navigable waters of the United States” has the meaning given that term in section 2101(17a) of title 46, United States Code.

(20) **ORGANISM.**—The term “organism” means any organism and includes pathogens, microbes, viruses, bacteria, and fungi.

(21) **OWNER OR OPERATOR.**—The term “owner or operator” means a person owning, operating, or chartering by demise a commercial vessel.

(22) **PACIFIC COAST REGION.**—The term “Pacific Coast Region” means Federal and State

waters adjacent to Alaska, Washington, Oregon, or California extending from shore and including the entire exclusive economic zone (as defined in section 1001(8) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701(8)) adjacent to each such State.

(23) **POLLUTANT.**—The term “pollutant” has the meaning given that term in section 502(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362(6)).

(24) **PORT OR PLACE OF DESTINATION.**—The term “port or place of destination” means any port or place to which a vessel is bound to anchor or moor.

(25) **RECREATIONAL VESSEL.**—The term “recreational vessel” has the meaning given that term in section 2101(25) of title 46, United States Code.

(26) **RENDER NONVIALE.**—The term “render nonviable” means, with respect to organisms in ballast water, the action of a ballast water management system that leaves such organisms permanently incapable of reproduction following treatment.

(27) **SALTWATER FLUSH.**—The term “salt-water flush”—

(A) means—

(i) the addition of as much mid-ocean water into each empty ballast tank of a commercial vessel as is safe for such vessel and crew and the mixing of the flushwater with residual water and sediment through the motion of such vessel; and

(ii) the discharge of the mixed water, such that the resultant residual water remaining in the tank has the highest salinity possible, and is at least 30 parts per thousand; and

(B) may require more than one fill-mix-empty sequence, particularly if only small amounts of water can be safely taken on-board the commercial vessel at one time.

(28) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise specified, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

SEC. 5003. TREATMENT OF EXISTING BALLAST WATER REGULATIONS.

(a) **EFFECT ON EXISTING REGULATIONS.**—Any regulation issued pursuant to the Non-Indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.) that is in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and that relates to a matter subject to regulation under this title, shall remain in full force and effect unless or until superseded by a new regulation issued under this title relating to such matter.

(b) **APPLICATION OF OTHER REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The regulations issued pursuant to the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.) relating to sanctions for violating a regulation under that Act shall apply to violations of a regulation issued under this title.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties for violations described in paragraph (1) shall increase consistent with inflation.

SEC. 5004. BALLAST WATER DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as provided in paragraph (7), and subject to sections 151.2035 and 151.2036 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act), an owner or operator may discharge ballast water into navigable waters of the United States from a commercial vessel covered under subsection (b) only if—

(A) by applying the best available technology economically achievable, the discharge meets the ballast water discharge standard; and

(B) the owner or operator discharges the ballast water in accordance with other requirements established by the Secretary.

(2) **COMMERCIAL VESSELS ENTERING THE GREAT LAKES SYSTEM.**—If a commercial vessel enters the Great Lakes through the mouth of the Saint Lawrence River, the owner or operator shall—

(A) comply with the applicable requirements of—

(i) paragraph (1);

(ii) subpart C of part 151 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulations); and

(iii) section 401.30 of such title (or similar successor regulations); and

(B) after operating—

(i) outside the exclusive economic zone of the United States or Canada, conduct a complete ballast water exchange in an area that is 200 nautical miles or more from any shore before the owner or operator may discharge ballast water while operating in the Saint Lawrence River or the Great Lakes, subject to any requirements the Secretary determines necessary with regard to such exchange or any ballast water management system that is to be used in conjunction with such exchange, to ensure that any discharge of ballast water complies with the requirements under paragraph (1); or

(ii) exclusively within the territorial waters or exclusive economic zone of the United States or Canada, conduct a complete ballast water exchange outside the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes in an area that is 50 nautical miles or more from any shore before the owner or operator may discharge ballast water while operating in the Saint Lawrence River or the Great Lakes, subject to any requirements the Secretary determines necessary with regard to such exchange or any ballast water management system that is to be used in conjunction with such exchange, to ensure that any discharge of ballast water complies with the requirements under paragraph (1).

(3) **COMMERCIAL VESSELS OPERATING WITHIN THE PACIFIC COAST REGION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) and paragraph (6), the owner or operator of a commercial vessel described in subparagraph (B) shall conduct a complete ballast water exchange in waters more than 50 nautical miles from shore.

(B) **COMMERCIAL VESSEL DESCRIBED.**—A commercial vessel described in this subparagraph is a commercial vessel—

(i) operating between two ports or places of destination within the Pacific Coast Region; or

(ii) operating between a port or place of destination within the Pacific Coast Region and a port or place of destination on the Pacific Coast of Canada or Mexico north of 20 degrees north latitude, inclusive of the Gulf of California.

(C) **EXEMPTIONS.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the following:

(i) A commercial vessel voyaging between or to a port or place of destination in the State of Washington, if the ballast water to be discharged from such vessel originated solely from waters located between the parallel 43 degrees, 32 minutes north latitude, including the internal waters of the Columbia River, and the internal waters of Canada south of parallel 50 degrees north latitude, including the waters of the Strait of Georgia and the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

(ii) A commercial vessel voyaging between ports or places of destination in the States of Washington and Oregon if the ballast water to be discharged from such vessel originated

solely from waters located between the parallel 40 degrees north latitude and the parallel 50 degrees north latitude.

(iii) A commercial vessel voyaging between ports or places of destination in the State of California within the San Francisco Bay area east of the Golden Gate Bridge, including the Port of Stockton and the Port of Sacramento, if any ballast water to be discharged from such vessel originated solely from ports or places within such area.

(iv) A commercial vessel voyaging between the Port of Los Angeles, the Port of Long Beach, and the El Segundo offshore marine oil terminal if any ballast water to be discharged from such vessel originated solely from the Port of Los Angeles, the Port of Long Beach, or the El Segundo offshore marine oil terminal.

(v) A commercial vessel voyaging between a port or place in the State of Alaska within a single Captain of the Port Zone.

(4) EMPTY BALLAST TANKS.—

(A) REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and paragraph (6), the owner or operator of a commercial vessel with empty ballast tanks shall conduct a saltwater flush—

(i) at least 200 nautical miles from any shore for voyages originating outside the United States or Canadian exclusive economic zone; or

(ii) at least 50 nautical miles from any shore for voyages within the Pacific Coast Region.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall not apply—

(i) if a ballast tank's unpumpable residual waters and sediments were subject to a saltwater flush, ballast water exchange, or treatment through a ballast water management system; or

(ii) unless otherwise required under this title, if the ballast tank's unpumpable residual waters and sediments were sourced within the same port or place of destination, or Captain of the Port Zone.

(5) LOW SALINITY BALLAST WATER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and paragraph (6), owners or operators of commercial vessels that voyage to a Pacific Coast Region port or place of destination that has a measured salinity of less than 18 parts per thousand shall conduct a complete ballast water exchange—

(i) more than 50 nautical miles from shore if the ballast water was sourced from a Pacific Coast Region port or place of destination; or

(ii) more than 200 nautical miles from shore if the ballast water was not sourced from a Pacific Coast Region port or place of destination.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a commercial vessel that has a ballast water management system approved for treating freshwater at concentrations prescribed in section 5006(a)(1)(A) or that retains all of its ballast water.

(6) EXEMPTED VESSELS.—The requirements of paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) shall not apply to a commercial vessel if—

(A) complying with such requirements would compromise the safety of the commercial vessel;

(B) design limitations of the commercial vessel prevent ballast water exchange or saltwater flush from being conducted;

(C) the commercial vessel uses a method of ballast water management approved by the Coast Guard under section 5005 of this title or subpart 162.060 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulation);

(D) the commercial vessel is certified by the Secretary as having no residual ballast water or sediments on board or retains all its ballast water while in waters subject to such requirements; or

(E) empty ballast tanks on the commercial vessel are sealed and certified by the Secretary so there is no discharge or uptake and subsequent discharge of ballast waters subject to such requirements.

(7) SAFETY EXEMPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (6), an owner or operator of a commercial vessel may discharge ballast water into navigable waters of the United States from a commercial vessel if—

(A) the ballast water is discharged solely to ensure the safety of life at sea;

(B) the ballast water is discharged accidentally as the result of damage to the commercial vessel or its equipment and—

(i) all reasonable precautions to prevent or minimize the discharge have been taken; and

(ii) the owner or operator did not willfully or recklessly cause such damage; or

(C) the ballast water is discharged solely for the purpose of avoiding or minimizing a discharge from the commercial vessel of a pollutant that would violate a Federal or State law.

(8) LOGBOOK REQUIREMENTS.—Section 11301(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(13) when the commercial vessel does not carry out ballast water management requirements as applicable and pursuant to regulations promulgated and issued by the Secretary, including when a vessel fails to carry out ballast water management requirements due to an allowed safety exemption, a statement about the failure to comply and the circumstances under which the failure occurred, made immediately after when practicable to do so.”.

(9) LIMITATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing requirements under this subsection, the Secretary may not require the installation of a ballast water management system on a commercial vessel that—

(A) carries all of its ballast water in sealed tanks that—

(i) are not subject to discharge;

(ii) have been certified by the Secretary; and

(iii) have been noted in the commercial vessel logbook; or

(B) discharges ballast water solely into a reception facility described in subsection (d).

(b) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) COVERED VESSELS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), subsection (a) shall apply to any commercial vessel that is designed, constructed, or adapted to carry ballast water while such commercial vessel is operating in navigable waters of the United States.

(2) EXEMPTED VESSELS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a commercial vessel—

(A) that continuously takes on and discharges ballast water in a flow-through system, if such system does not introduce aquatic nuisance species into navigable waters of the United States, as determined by the Secretary;

(B) in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that is scheduled for disposal, if the vessel does not have ballast water management systems or the ballast water management systems of the vessel are inoperable;

(C) that discharges ballast water consisting solely of water taken aboard from a public or commercial source that, at the time the water is taken aboard, meets the applicable regulations or permit require-

ments for such source under the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(D) in an alternative compliance program established pursuant to subsection (c);

(E) that carries all of its permanent ballast water in sealed tanks that are not subject to discharge; or

(F) uses other liquid or material as ballast and does not discharge ballast overboard.

(3) EXEMPTION FOR GREAT LAKES AND SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) through (F), subsection (a) shall not apply to a commercial vessel that operates exclusively within the Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence River and is not required to comply with the ballast water discharge standard on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) TERMINATION OF EXEMPTION.—The Secretary shall terminate the exemption for a class of commercial vessels described in subparagraph (A) if the Secretary—

(i) based on testing using water from the Great Lakes, approves a ballast water management system for such class of vessels under section 5005 of this title or subpart 162.060 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulation);

(ii) determines that such ballast water management system meets the practicability criteria described in section 5006(b)(2) with respect to such class of vessels complying with the ballast water discharge standard;

(iii) determines that requiring such class of vessels to comply with the ballast water discharge standard is operationally practicable for such class of vessels; and

(iv) in consultation with the Administrator, determines that the most probable environmental benefits, as described in subparagraph (E), resulting from a requirement that such class of vessels comply with the ballast water discharge standard exceed the most probable economic costs, as described in subparagraph (F), resulting from such compliance.

(C) TIMING OF DETERMINATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the approval and determinations described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (B) are made, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall determine whether the benefits described in clause (iv) of such subparagraph exceed the costs described in such clause (iv).

(ii) RECONSIDERATION.—If the benefits described in subparagraph (B)(iv) do not exceed the costs described in such subparagraph for a class of commercial vessels described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall reconsider the determination of the Secretary under clause (i)—

(I) if a petition is received from a Governor of a Great Lakes State that—

(aa) includes new data or science not considered during such determination; and

(bb) is submitted not less than one year after such determination; or

(II) not later than five years after such determination.

(D) COMPLIANCE DEADLINE.—A class of commercial vessels for which the exemption under subparagraph (A) has been terminated under subparagraph (B) shall comply with the ballast water discharge standard after completion of the first scheduled dry docking of each such vessel that commences on or after the date that is three years after the date that the Secretary informs the owner or operator of such vessel of such termination.

(E) MOST PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS DESCRIBED.—The most probable environmental benefits resulting from a requirement that a class of commercial vessels described in subparagraph (A) comply with the ballast water discharge standard are the net environmental benefits, as determined by the Administrator—

(i) gained from the most probable reduction in risk of establishment of aquatic nuisance species in navigable waters of the United States within the Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence River resulting from compliance with subsection (a) by such class of vessels; and

(ii) as reduced by the extent to which such environmental benefits most probably would not be achieved as a result of the most probable risks of such establishment from other vectors.

(F) MOST PROBABLE ECONOMIC COSTS DESCRIBED.—The most probable economic costs resulting from a requirement that a class of commercial vessels described in subparagraph (A) comply with the ballast water discharge standard are the net costs and foregone revenues resulting from such compliance that most probably will be incurred, as determined by the Secretary, by the—

(i) owners and operators of such class of vessels, including the costs of installation and maintenance of ballast water management systems not passed on to customers and reductions in business activity due to lifetime reduction in cargo capacity and customer demand for cargo transportation services;

(ii) customers of such class of vessels, including reductions in business activity, shifts to other transportation modes, and loss of competitiveness as a result of the costs described in clause (i) passed on to such customers; and

(iii) employees of such owners, operators, and customers, including reductions or foregone increases in jobs, wages, and benefits resulting from costs described in clauses (i) and (ii).

(C) ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator and the Governors of the States, may issue a rule establishing one or more compliance programs that may be used by an owner or operator as an alternative to compliance with the requirements of subsection (a) for a commercial vessel that—

(1) has a maximum ballast water capacity of less than eight cubic meters; or

(2) is less than 3 years from the end of the service life of the commercial vessel, as determined by the Secretary.

(D) RECEPTION FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirements under subsection (a), an owner or operator may discharge ballast water into an onshore or offshore facility for the reception of ballast water that meets the standards established by the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, under paragraph (2).

(2) ISSUANCE OF STANDARDS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, shall publish a rule in the Federal Register that establishes reasonable and practicable standards for reception facilities to receive vessel ballast water to mitigate adverse effects of aquatic nuisance species on navigable waters of the United States.

(3) TRANSFER STANDARDS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, may promulgate standards for the arrangements necessary on a vessel to transfer ballast water to a facility.

SEC. 5005. APPROVAL OF BALLAST WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.

(a) BALLAST WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS THAT RENDER ORGANISMS NONVIALE.—Notwithstanding chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, part 151 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulation), and part 162 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulation), a ballast water management system that renders nonviable organisms in ballast water at the concentrations prescribed in the ballast water discharge standard shall be approved by the Secretary, if—

(1) such system—

(A) undergoes type approval testing at an independent laboratory designated by the Secretary under such regulations; and

(B) meets the requirements of subpart 162.060 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulation), other than the requirements related to staining methods or measuring the concentration of living organisms; and

(2) such laboratory uses a testing method described in a final policy letter published under subsection (c)(3).

(b) PROHIBITION ON BIOCIDES.—The Secretary shall not approve a ballast water management system under subsection (a) or subpart 162.060 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulations), if such system—

(1) uses a biocide or generates a biocide that is a pesticide, as defined in section 2 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136), unless the biocide is registered under that Act or the Administrator has approved the use of the biocide in such ballast water management system; or

(2) uses or generates a biocide the discharge of which causes or contributes to a violation of a water quality standard under section 303 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313).

(c) APPROVAL TESTING METHODS.—

(1) DRAFT POLICY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall publish a draft policy letter, based on the best available science, describing type approval testing methods and protocols for ballast water management systems that may be used in addition to the methods established in subpart 162.060 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulation)—

(A) to measure the concentration of organisms in ballast water that are capable of reproduction;

(B) to certify the performance of each ballast water management system under this section; and

(C) to certify laboratories to evaluate such treatment technologies.

(2) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary shall provide for a period of not more than 60 days for the public to comment on the draft policy letter published under paragraph (1).

(3) FINAL POLICY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall publish a final policy letter describing type approval testing methods for ballast water management systems capable of measuring the concentration of organisms in ballast water that are capable of reproduction based on the best available science that may be used in addition to the methods established in subpart 162.060 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulation).

(B) REVISIONS.—The Secretary shall revise the final policy letter published under subparagraph (A) as additional testing methods are determined by the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, to be capable of measuring the concentration of organisms in ballast water that are capable of reproduction.

(C) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing a policy letter under this paragraph, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator—

(i) shall consider a testing method that uses organism grow out and most probable number statistical analysis to determine the concentration of organisms in ballast water that are capable of reproduction; and

(ii) shall not consider a testing method that relies on a staining method that measures the concentration of organisms greater than or equal to 10 micrometers and organisms less than or equal to 50 micrometers.

SEC. 5006. REVIEW AND RAISING OF BALLAST WATER DISCHARGE STANDARD.

(a) EFFECTIVENESS REVIEWS.—

(1) SIX-YEAR REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2024, and subject to petitions for review under paragraph (3), the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, shall complete an effectiveness review to determine whether, based on the application of the best available technology economically achievable, the ballast water discharge standard can be revised such that ballast water discharged in the normal operation of a vessel contains—

(i) less than 1 organism that is living or has not been rendered nonviable per 10 cubic meters that is 50 or more micrometers in minimum dimension;

(ii) less than 1 organism that is living or has not been rendered nonviable per 10 milliliters that is less than 50 micrometers in minimum dimension and more than 10 micrometers in minimum dimension;

(iii) concentrations of indicator microbes that are less than—

(I) 1 colony-forming unit of toxicogenic *Vibrio cholera* (serotypes O1 and O139) per 100 milliliters or less than 1 colony-forming unit of that microbe per gram of wet weight of zoological samples;

(II) 126 colony-forming units of *Escherichia coli* per 100 milliliters; and

(III) 33 colony-forming units of intestinal enterococci per 100 milliliters; and

(iv) concentrations of such additional indicator microbes and of viruses as may be specified in regulations issued by the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator and such other Federal agencies as the Secretary and the Administrator consider appropriate.

(B) ALTERNATIVE REVISED STANDARD.—If the Administrator finds—

(i) that the ballast water discharge standard cannot be revised to reflect the level of stringency set forth in subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall determine whether the application of the best available technology economically achievable would result in a reduction of the risk of introduction or establishment of aquatic nuisance species such that the ballast water discharge standard can be revised be more stringent than the standard set forth in section 151.2030 or 151.1511 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(ii) that the best available technology economically achievable is more stringent than the standard under subparagraph (A) with respect to a class of vessels, the Administrator

shall determine whether the ballast water discharge standard can be revised for that class of vessels to incorporate such more stringent standard.

(2) **TEN-YEAR REVIEWS.**—Not later than January 1, 2034, not less frequently than every 10 years thereafter, and subject to petitions for review under paragraph (3), the Administrator shall conduct an effectiveness review to determine whether the application of the best available technology economically achievable results in a reduction in the risk of the introduction or establishment of aquatic nuisance species such that the ballast water discharge standard can be revised.

(3) **STATE PETITIONS FOR REVIEW.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Governor of a State may submit a petition requesting the Administrator to conduct a review under paragraph (1) or (2) if there is new information that could reasonably indicate the ballast water discharge standard could be made more stringent to reduce the risk of the introduction or establishment of aquatic nuisance species.

(B) **TIMING.**—A Governor may not submit a petition under subparagraph (A) during the 1-year period following the date of completion of a review under paragraph (1) or (2).

(C) **REQUIRED INFORMATION.**—A petition submitted to the Administrator under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a proposed ballast water discharge standard that would result in a reduction in the risk of the introduction or establishment of aquatic nuisance species;

(ii) information regarding any ballast water management systems that may achieve the proposed ballast water discharge standard;

(iii) the scientific and technical information on which the petition is based, including a description of the risk reduction that would result from the proposed ballast water discharge standard included under clause (i); and

(iv) any additional information the Administrator considers appropriate.

(D) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Upon receiving a petition under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall make publicly available a copy of the petition, including the information included under subparagraph (C).

(E) **TREATMENT OF MORE THAN ONE PETITION AS A SINGLE PETITION.**—The Administrator may treat more than one petition submitted under subparagraph (A) as a single such petition.

(F) **AUTHORITY TO REVIEW.**—After receiving a petition that meets the requirements of this paragraph, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, may conduct a review under paragraph (1) or (2) or such other review as the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, determines appropriate.

(4) **AGENCY ACTION.**—In any review under this subsection in which the Administrator determines—

(A) that the ballast water discharge standard can be made more stringent, the Administrator shall—

(i) promptly publish such determination in the Federal Register and on a publicly available website; and

(ii) inform the Secretary of such determination; or

(B) that the ballast water discharge standard cannot be made more stringent, the Administrator shall—

(i) promptly publish such determination, together with a detailed, written justification, in the Federal Register and on a publicly available website; and

(ii) provide a copy of the documents required under clause (i) to any State that has petitioned the Administrator for the review.

(b) **PRACTICABILITY REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Administrator determines under subsection (a) that the ballast water discharge standard can be made more stringent, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall conduct a practicability review, considering the findings under such subsection, to determine whether—

(A) a ballast water management system that is capable of achieving the ballast water discharge standard as proposed to be revised is operationally practicable; and

(B) testing protocols can be practicably implemented that can assure accurate measurement of compliance with the ballast water discharge standard as proposed to be revised.

(2) **CRITERIA FOR PRACTICABILITY REVIEW.**—In conducting a practicability review under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the Administrator shall consider—

(A) improvements in ballast water management systems, including—

(i) the effectiveness and reliability of such systems in the shipboard environment;

(ii) the compatibility of such systems with the design and operation of a commercial vessel by class, type, and size;

(iii) the commercial availability of such systems; and

(iv) the safety of such systems;

(B) improvements in the capabilities to detect, quantify, and assess whether aquatic nuisance species are capable of reproduction in order to determine compliance with the ballast water discharge standard as proposed to be revised;

(C) the costs, cost-effectiveness, and effects of—

(i) a revised ballast water discharge standard; and

(ii) maintaining the existing ballast water discharge standard; and

(D) other criteria that the Secretary and the Administrator consider appropriate.

(3) **INFORMATION FROM STATES.**—In conducting a practicability review under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall solicit information from the States concerning matters the Secretary and the Administrator are required to consider under paragraph (2).

(c) **ISSUANCE OF REVISED BALLAST WATER DISCHARGE STANDARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall issue a rule to revise the ballast water discharge standard if the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines on the basis of the practicability review under subsection (b) that—

(A) a ballast water management system that is capable of achieving the ballast water discharge standard as proposed to be revised is the best available technology, economically achievable, and operationally practicable; and

(B) testing protocols can be practicably implemented that can assure accurate measurement of compliance with the ballast water discharge standard as proposed to be revised.

(2) **STANDARD NOT REVISED.**—If the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines that the requirements of paragraph (1) have not been satisfied, the Secretary shall publish a description of how such determination was made.

(3) **REQUIREMENT.**—Any modified ballast water discharge standard issued in the rule under paragraph (1) shall be more stringent than the ballast water discharge standard it replaces.

(d) **REVISED BALLAST WATER DISCHARGE STANDARD EFFECTIVE DATE AND COMPLIANCE DEADLINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary issues a rule to revise the ballast water discharge standard under subsection (c), the Secretary shall include in such rule—

(A) an effective date for the revised ballast discharge standard that is 3 years after the date on which such rule is published in the Federal Register; and

(B) for the owner or operator of a commercial vessel that is constructed or completes a major conversion on or after the date that is 3 years after the date on which such rule is published in the Federal Register, a deadline to comply with the revised ballast water discharge standard that is the first day on which such commercial vessel operates in navigable waters of the United States.

(2) **VESSEL SPECIFIC COMPLIANCE DEADLINES.**—The Secretary may establish a deadline for compliance by a commercial vessel (or a class, type, or size of commercial vessel) with a revised ballast water discharge standard that is different than the general deadline established under paragraph (1).

(3) **EXTENSIONS.**—The Secretary shall establish a process for an owner or operator to submit an application to the Secretary for an extension of a compliance deadline established under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) **APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION.**—An owner or operator shall submit an application for an extension under paragraph (3) not less than 90 days prior to the applicable compliance deadline established under paragraph (1) or (2).

(5) **FACTORS.**—In reviewing an application under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider, with respect to the ability of an owner or operator to meet a compliance deadline—

(A) whether the ballast water management system to be installed, if applicable, is available in sufficient quantities to meet the compliance deadline;

(B) whether there is sufficient shipyard or other installation facility capacity;

(C) whether there is sufficient availability of engineering and design resources;

(D) commercial vessel characteristics, such as engine room size, layout, or a lack of installed piping;

(E) electric power generating capacity aboard the commercial vessel;

(F) the safety of the commercial vessel and crew; and

(G) any other factor that the Secretary determines appropriate.

(6) **CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS.**—

(A) **DETERMINATIONS.**—The Secretary shall approve or deny an application for an extension of a compliance deadline submitted by an owner or operator under this subsection.

(B) **DEADLINE.**—The Secretary shall—

(i) acknowledge receipt of an application for an extension submitted under paragraph (4) not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of the application; and

(ii) to the extent practicable, approve or deny such an application not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of the application.

(C) **FAILURE TO REVIEW.**—If the Secretary does not approve or deny an application described in subparagraph (A) on or before the last day of the 90-day period beginning on the date of submission of the petition, the petition shall be conditionally approved.

(7) **PERIOD OF EXTENSIONS.**—An extension granted to an owner or operator under paragraph (3)—

(A) may be granted for an initial period of not more than 18 months;

(B) may be renewed for additional periods of not more than 18 months each; and

(C) may not be in effect for a total of more than 5 years.

(8) PERIOD OF USE OF INSTALLED BALLAST WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), an owner or operator shall be considered to be in compliance with the ballast water discharge standard if—

(i) the ballast water management system installed on the commercial vessel complies with the ballast water discharge standard in effect at the time of installation, notwithstanding any revisions to the ballast water discharge standard occurring after the installation;

(ii) the ballast water management system is maintained in proper working condition, as determined by the Secretary;

(iii) the ballast water management system is maintained and used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications; and

(iv) the ballast water management system continues to meet the ballast water discharge standard applicable to the commercial vessel at the time of installation, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall cease to apply with respect to a commercial vessel after—

(i) the expiration of the service life of the ballast water management system of the commercial vessel, as determined by the Secretary;

(ii) the expiration of the service life of the commercial vessel, as determined by the Secretary; or

(iii) the completion of a major conversion of the commercial vessel.

SEC. 5007. NATIONAL BALLAST INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.

Subsection (f) of section 1102 of the Non-Indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4712(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) NATIONAL BALLAST INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and maintain, in consultation and cooperation with the Task Force and the Smithsonian Institution (acting through the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center), a National Ballast Information Clearinghouse of national data concerning—

“(A) ballasting practices;

“(B) compliance with the guidelines issued pursuant to section 1101(c); and

“(C) any other information obtained by the Task Force pursuant to subsection (b).

“(2) BALLAST WATER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The owner or operator of a commercial vessel subject to this Act shall submit the current ballast water management report form approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB 1625-0069 or subsequent form) to the National Ballast Information Clearinghouse not later than 6 hours after the arrival of such vessel at a United States port or place, unless such vessel is operating exclusively on a voyage between ports or places within a single Captain of the Port Zone (as established by the Secretary pursuant to sections 92, 93, and 633 of title 14, United States Code).

“(B) MULTIPLE DISCHARGES WITHIN A SINGLE PORT.—The owner or operator of a commercial vessel subject to this Act may submit a single report under subparagraph (A) for multiple ballast water discharges within a single port during the same voyage.

“(C) ADVANCED REPORT TO STATES.—A State may require the owner or operator of

a commercial vessel subject to this Act to submit directly to the State a ballast water management report form—

“(i) not later than 24 hours prior to arrival at a United States port or place of destination if the voyage of such vessel is anticipated to exceed 24 hours; or

“(ii) before departing the port or place of departure if the voyage of such vessel is not anticipated to exceed 24 hours.

“(3) COMMERCIAL VESSEL REPORTING DATA.—

“(A) DISSEMINATION TO STATES.—Upon receiving submission of a ballast water management report required under paragraph (2), the National Ballast Information Clearinghouse shall—

“(i) in the case of forms submitted electronically, immediately disseminate the report to interested States; or

“(ii) in the case of forms submitted by means other than electronically, disseminate the report to interested States as soon as practicable.

“(B) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the receipt of a ballast water management report required under paragraph (2), the National Ballast Information Clearinghouse shall make the data in such report fully and readily available to the public in searchable and fully retrievable electronic formats.

“(4) REPORT.—In consultation and cooperation with the Task Force and the Smithsonian Institution (acting through the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Task Force and the appropriate committees of Congress and make available to the public, on a biennial basis not later than 180 days from the end of each odd numbered calendar year, a report that synthesizes and analyzes the data referred to in paragraph (1) for the previous two years to evaluate nationwide status and trends relating to—

“(A) ballast water delivery and management; and

“(B) invasions of aquatic nuisance species resulting from ballast water.

“(5) WORKING GROUP.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act, the Secretary shall establish a working group that includes members from the National Ballast Information Clearinghouse and States with ballast water management programs to establish a process for compiling and readily sharing Federal and State commercial vessel reporting and enforcement data regarding compliance with this Act.

“(6) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 5008. REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCHARGES INCIDENTAL TO THE NORMAL OPERATION OF A COMMERCIAL VESSEL.

(a) MANAGEMENT OF INCIDENTAL DISCHARGE FOR COMMERCIAL VESSELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in concurrence with the Administrator and in consultation with the States, shall publish a final rule in the Federal Register that establishes best management practices for discharges incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel for commercial vessels that—

(A) are greater than or equal to 79 feet in length;

(B) are not fishing vessels, including fish processing vessels and fish tender vessels (as

such terms are defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code); and

(C) are not subject to the best management practices required under section 5009.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The best management practices established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) mitigate the adverse impacts on the marine environment from discharges incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel and aquatic invasive species;

(B) use marine pollution control devices when appropriate;

(C) be economically achievable and operationally practicable; and

(D) not compromise the safety of a commercial vessel.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall implement the best management practices established by final rule under paragraph (1) not later than 60 days after the date on which the final rule is published in the Federal Register as required under such paragraph.

(b) TRANSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 5009(c) and notwithstanding the expiration date for the General Permit, any practice, limitation, or concentration applicable to any discharge incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel that is required by the General Permit on the date of the enactment of this Act, and any reporting requirement required by the General Permit on such date of enactment, shall remain in effect until the implementation date under subsection (a)(3).

(2) PART 6 CONDITIONS.—Except as provided in section 5009(c) and notwithstanding paragraph (1) and any other provision of law, the terms and conditions of Part 6 of the General Permit (relating to specific requirements for individual States or Indian country lands) shall expire on the implementation date under subsection (a)(3).

(c) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN VESSELS.—

(1) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT.—No permit shall be required under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) or prohibition enforced under any other provision of law for, nor shall any best management practice regarding a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel under this title apply to, a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel if the commercial vessel—

(A) is less than 79 feet in length; or

(B) is a fishing vessel, including a fish processing vessel or fish tender vessel (as such terms are defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code).

(2) APPLICATION OF GENERAL PERMIT.—The terms and conditions of the General Permit shall cease to apply to vessels described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REVIEW AND REVISION.—The Secretary, in concurrence with the Administrator and in consultation with the States, shall—

(1) review the practices and standards established under subsection (a) not less frequently than once every ten years; and

(2) revise such practices consistent with the elements described in paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(e) STATE PETITION FOR REVISION OF BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Governor of a State may submit a petition to the Secretary requesting that the Secretary, in concurrence with the Administrator, revise a best management practice established under subsection (a) if there is new information that could reasonably indicate that—

(A) revising the best management practice would—

(i) mitigate the adverse impacts on the marine environment from discharges incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel or from aquatic invasive species; and

(ii) reduce the adverse effects on navigable waters of the United States of discharges incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel; and

(B) the revised best management practice would be economically achievable and operationally practicable.

(2) **REQUIRED INFORMATION.**—A petition submitted to the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the scientific and technical information on which the petition is based; and

(B) any additional information the Secretary and Administrator consider appropriate.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Upon receiving a petition under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make publicly available a copy of the petition, including the information included under paragraph (2).

(4) **TREATMENT OF MORE THAN ONE PETITION AS A SINGLE PETITION.**—The Secretary may treat more than one petition submitted under paragraph (1) as a single petition.

(5) **REVISION OF BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.**—If, after reviewing a petition submitted by a Governor under paragraph (1), the Secretary, in concurrence with the Administrator, determines that revising a best management practice would mitigate the adverse impacts on the marine environment from discharges incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel or from aquatic invasive species, the Secretary, in concurrence with the Administrator and in consultation with the States, shall revise such practices consistent with the elements described in subsection (a)(2).

(f) **REPEAL OF NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.**—Public Law 110-299 (33 U.S.C. 1342 note) is amended by striking section 2.

SEC. 5009. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR GREAT LAKES VESSELS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall publish a final rule in the Federal Register that establishes best management practices for—

(1) ballast water for commercial vessels operating in navigable waters of the United States within the Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence River; and

(2) discharges incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel in navigable waters of the United States for commercial vessels operating exclusively in the Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence River that—

(A) are greater than or equal to 79 feet in length; and

(B) are not fishing vessels, including fish processing vessels and fish tender vessels (as such terms are defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code).

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator and the owners or operators of commercial vessels described in subsection (a), shall ensure that the best management practices established under subsection (a)—

(1) minimize the risk of establishment of aquatic nuisance species from discharges into or upon navigable waters of the United States from such commercial vessels;

(2) minimize the discharge of pollutants into or upon navigable waters of the United States from such commercial vessels;

(3) use the best available technology when appropriate;

(4) are economically achievable and operationally practicable;

(5) minimize disruption of commerce;

(6) do not compromise the safety of a commercial vessel; and

(7) to the extent possible, apply consistently to all navigable waters of the United States within the Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence River.

(c) **TRANSITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), notwithstanding the expiration date for the General Permit and to the extent to which they do not conflict with section 5004(b), the following best management practices applicable to commercial vessels described in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until the date on which the best management practices described in such subsection are implemented under subsection (g):

(A) Best management practices required by Part 2 of the General Permit.

(B) Such other practices as required by the Secretary.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding the expiration date for the General Permit and to the extent to which they do not conflict with section 5004(b), the best management practices described by the sections in Part 6 of the General Permit applicable to the Great Lakes States that are applicable to commercial vessels described in subsection (a) shall expire on the date on which the best management practices described in subsection (a) are implemented under subsection (g).

(d) **OUTREACH.**—The Secretary shall solicit recommendations and information from the Great Lakes States, Indian Tribes, owners and operators of vessels described in subsection (a), and other persons that the Secretary considers appropriate in developing best management practices under subsection (a).

(e) **REVIEW AND REVISION OF BEST PRACTICES.**—Not less frequently than once every 5 years, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall review the best management practices established under subsection (a) and revise such practices by rule published in the Federal Register consistent with subsections (b) and (d).

(f) **REVISED PRACTICES BY STATE PETITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Governor of a Great Lakes State may petition the Secretary to revise current, or employ additional, best management practices, consistent with the elements described in subsection (b), to address new and emerging aquatic nuisance species or pollution threats, implement more effective practices, or update guidelines to harmonize requirements on owners and operators of commercial vessels described in subsection (a).

(2) **DETERMINATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after receiving a petition under paragraph (1), the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall determine which, if any, best management practices included in such petition shall be required of commercial vessels described in subsection (a).

(B) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall consult with the Governors of other Great Lakes States and owners or operators of commercial vessels that would be subject to best management practices pursuant to paragraph (1) before making a determination under subparagraph (A).

(3) **TREATMENT OF PETITION.**—The Secretary may treat more than one petition submitted under paragraph (1) as a single petition.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make publicly available a petition and

any supporting documentation submitted under paragraph (1) for not less than 60 days prior to approving or disapproving such petition.

(g) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall implement the best management practices established by final rule under subsection (a) not later than 60 days after the date on which the final rule is published in the Federal Register as required by such subsection.

(2) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PRACTICES BY STATE PETITION.**—Not later than 90 days after making a determination under subsection (f)(2), the Secretary shall, by rule published in the Federal Register, require commercial vessels that would be subject to the best management practices described in such subsection to implement such practices.

(h) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make publicly available any determination made under this section.

SEC. 5010. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A person may file a petition for review of a final rule or a final agency action issued under this title in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A petition shall be filed under this section not later than 120 days after the date on which the final rule to be reviewed is published in the Federal Register or the final agency action is issued, as the case may be.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a petition that is based solely on grounds that arise after the deadline to file a petition under paragraph (1) has passed may be filed not later than 120 days after the date on which such grounds first arise.

SEC. 5011. STATE ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **STATE AUTHORITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Governors of the States, shall develop and publish Federal and State inspection, data management, and enforcement procedures for the enforcement of standards and requirements under this title by States.

(2) **PROCEDURES.**—Procedures developed and published under paragraph (1)—

(A) may be periodically updated;

(B) shall describe the conditions and procedures under which the Secretary may suspend the agreement described in paragraph (3); and

(C) shall have a mechanism for the Secretary to provide to the Governor of a State, if requested by the Governor, access to Automated Identification System arrival data for inbound vessels to specific ports or places of destination in the State.

(3) **STATE ENFORCEMENT.**—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Governor of a State to authorize the State to inspect vessels to enforce the provisions of this title in accordance with the procedures developed under paragraph (1).

(b) **FEEES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), a State that assesses a permit fee, inspection fee, or other fee related to the regulation of ballast water or a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel before the date of the enactment of this Act may continue to assess such a fee to cover the costs of program administration, inspection, and enforcement activities by the State.

(2) **MAXIMUM FEE.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a State may assess a fee under this subsection of not more than \$1,000 per

qualifying voyage to the owner or operator of a commercial vessel arriving at a port or place of destination in the State.

(3) **COMMERCIAL VESSELS ENGAGED IN COASTWISE TRADE.**—A State may not assess more than \$5,000 in fees per vessel each year to the owner or operator of a commercial vessel registered under the laws of the United States and lawfully engaged in the coastwise trade.

(4) **ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.**—A State may adjust a fee authorized by this subsection every 5 years to reflect the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor for the month of October immediately preceding the date of adjustment exceeds the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor for the month of October that immediately precedes the date that is 5 years before the date of adjustment.

(5) **QUALIFYING VOYAGE.**—In this subsection, the term “qualifying voyage” means a vessel arrival at a port or place of destination in a State by a commercial vessel that has operated outside of that State and excludes movement entirely within a single port or place of destination.

(c) **EFFECT ON STATE AUTHORITY.**—Except as provided in subsection (a) and as necessary to implement an agreement entered into under such subsection, no State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce any statute, regulation, or other requirement of the State or political subdivision with respect to—

(1) a discharge into navigable waters of the United States from a commercial vessel of ballast water; or

(2) a discharge into navigable waters of the United States incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel.

(d) **PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this title may be construed as affecting the authority of a State or political subdivision thereof to adopt or enforce any statute, regulation, or other requirement with respect to any water or other substance discharged or emitted from a vessel in preparation for transport of the vessel by land from one body of water to another body of water.

SEC. 5012. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) **APPLICATION OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in section 5008(b), on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) shall not apply to a discharge into navigable waters of the United States of ballast water from a commercial vessel or a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel.

(2) **OIL AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE LIABILITY; MARINE SANITATION DEVICES.**—Nothing in this title may be construed as affecting the application to a commercial vessel of section 311 or 312 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321; 1322).

(b) **ESTABLISHED REGIMES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, nothing in this title may be construed as affecting the authority of the Federal Government under—

(1) the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) with respect to the regulation by the Federal Government of any discharge or emission that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is covered under the Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, with annexes and protocols, done at London February 17, 1978; and

(2) title X of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (33 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.) with respect to the regulation by the Federal Government of any anti-fouling system that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is covered under the International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-fouling Systems on Ships, 2001, done at London October 5, 2001.

(c) **INTERNATIONAL LAW.**—Any action taken under this title shall be taken in accordance with international law.

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1205 of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4725) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Ballast water and discharges incidental to the normal operation of a commercial vessel, as such terms are defined in the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act, shall be regulated pursuant to such Act.”.

SEC. 5013. QUAGGA MUSSEL.

The Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe by regulation that the quagga mussel (*Dreissena rostriformis bugensis*) is a species that is injurious under section 42 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 5014. COASTAL AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM AND MITIGATION FUND.

(a) **COASTAL AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **COASTAL ZONE.**—The term “coastal zone” has the meaning given the term in section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453).

(B) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a State government, local government, Indian Tribe, nongovernmental organization, or academic institution.

(C) **EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE.**—The term “Exclusive Economic Zone” means the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States, as established by Presidential Proclamation 5030 of March 10, 1983 (16 U.S.C. 1453 note).

(D) **FOUNDATION.**—The term “Foundation” means the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation established by section 2(a) of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3701(a)).

(E) **PROGRAM.**—The term “Program” means the Coastal Aquatic Invasive Species Mitigation Grant Program established under paragraph (2).

(2) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Commerce and the Foundation shall establish the Coastal Aquatic Invasive Species Mitigation Grant Program to award grants to eligible entities, as described in this subsection.

(3) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Program are—

(A) to improve the understanding, prevention, and mitigation of, and response to, aquatic invasive species in the coastal zone and the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States;

(B) to support the prevention and mitigation of impacts from aquatic invasive species in the coastal zone of the United States; and

(C) to support the restoration of marine, estuarine, and the Great Lakes environments in the coastal zone and the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States that are impacted by aquatic invasive species.

(4) **USE OF GRANTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A grant awarded under the Program shall be used for an activity to carry out the purposes of the Program, including an activity—

(i) to develop and implement procedures and programs to prevent, control, mitigate, or progressively eradicate aquatic invasive

species in the coastal zone or the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States;

(ii) to restore habitat impacted by an aquatic invasive species;

(iii) to develop new shipboard and land-based ballast water treatment system technologies and performance standards to prevent the introduction of aquatic invasive species;

(iv) to develop mitigation measures to protect natural and cultural living resources, including shellfish, from the impacts of aquatic invasive species; or

(v) to develop mitigation measures to protect infrastructure, such as hydroelectric infrastructure, from aquatic invasive species.

(B) **PROHIBITION ON FUNDING LITIGATION.**—A grant awarded under the Program may not be used to fund litigation in any matter.

(5) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Foundation, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall establish the following:

(A) Application and review procedures for awarding grants under the Program.

(B) Approval procedures for awarding grants under the Program. Such procedures shall require consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator.

(C) Performance accountability and monitoring measures for activities funded by a grant awarded under the Program.

(D) Procedures and methods to ensure accurate accounting and appropriate administration of grants awarded under the Program, including standards of record keeping.

(6) **MATCHING REQUIREMENT.**—Each eligible entity awarded a grant under the Program to carry out an activity shall provide matching funds to carry out such activity, in cash or through in-kind contributions from sources other than the Federal Government, in an amount equal to 50 percent of the cost of such activity.

(7) **FUNDING.**—The Secretary of Commerce and the Foundation shall use the amounts available in the Coastal Aquatic Invasive Species Mitigation Fund established under subsection (b), to award grants under the Program.

(b) **COASTAL AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MITIGATION FUND.**—

(1) **CREATION OF FUND.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the “Coastal Aquatic Invasive Species Mitigation Fund” (referred to in this section as the “Fund”), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Fund as provided in this section or section 9602 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) **TRANSFERS TO FUND.**—

(A) **APPROPRIATION.**—There is authorized to be appropriated from the Treasury to the Fund each fiscal year an amount equal to the penalties assessed under section 5003(b) in the prior fiscal year.

(B) **AUTHORIZATION OF FURTHER APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund, in addition to the amounts transferred to the Fund under paragraph (1), \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year.

(3) **EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.**—Amounts in the Fund shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary of Commerce and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation established by section 2(a) of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act to award grants under the Coastal Aquatic Invasive Species Mitigation Grant Program established under subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 5015. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS.**—Nothing in this title may be construed to impose any design, equipment, or operation standard on a commercial vessel not documented under the laws of the United States and engaged in innocent passage unless the standard implements a generally accepted international rule, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) **OTHER AUTHORITIES.**—Nothing in this title may be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of the Interior to administer lands or waters under the administrative control of the Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of the Interior.

SA 1484. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BALLAST WATER AND OTHER VESSEL INCIDENTAL DISCHARGE REGULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the enforcement of a national uniform standard for ballast water and other incidental discharges onboard commercial vessels, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1485. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EMPOWERING STATES TO MANAGE GREATER SAGE-GROUSE POPULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to empowering States to manage greater sage-grouse populations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the pe-

riod of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1486. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPEALING THE RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing the renewable fuel standard program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1487. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARIS CLIMATE CHANGE AGREEMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the implementation of the agreement of the 21st Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, adopted at Paris on December 12, 2015, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1488. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING CONGRESSIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing transparency in the process of establishing national monuments by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1489. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 57, strike lines 19 through 21 and insert the following:

- (4) the payments in lieu of taxes program;
- (5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program; or
- (6) chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code.

SA 1490. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE EXPENDITURE OF AMOUNTS FROM THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND FOR THE ACQUISITION OF LAND UNTIL THE DATE ON WHICH THE MAINTENANCE BACKLOG OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE IS REDUCED.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting amounts from the Land and Water Conservation Fund established under section 200302 of title 54, United States Code, to be used for land acquisition until the date on which the National Park Service maintenance backlog is

less than \$5,000,000 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1491. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE UNLAWFUL DETENTION OF A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES THAT VIOLATES CERTAIN RIGHTS OF THE CITIZEN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the unlawful detention of a citizen of the United States, regardless of the circumstances of the arrest of the citizen, that may violate the due process rights of the citizen indefinitely, the right of the citizen to counsel, or the right of the citizen to have the identity of the citizen disclosed to the public, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1492. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ANNUAL REPORTS ON THE DEFENSE SPENDING OF THE ALLIES AND PARTNER NATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to annual reports on the defense spending of the allies and partner nations of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or

the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1493. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE EXTENSION OF THE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE FLAWED END MODERN SLAVERY INITIATIVE (EMSI) GRANT PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the extension of the authorization for the flawed End Modern Slavery Initiative (EMSI) grant program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1494. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMMEDIATELY PROHIBITING THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE ARMED FORCES INTO A FOREIGN COUNTRY FOR HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS NOT PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED BY STATUTE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to immediately prohibiting the deployment of the Armed Forces into a foreign country for humanitarian operations not previously authorized by statute by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1495. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr.

ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING MODIFICATION OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT BY EXECUTIVE OR JUDICIAL ACTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting modification of the applicability of the Military Selective Service Act by Executive or Judicial action by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1496. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES WHO HAVE FAILED TO FULFILL THEIR OBLIGATIONS IN UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS OR WHOSE PEACEKEEPERS HAVE BEEN CONVICTED OF SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE AND HAVE FAILED TO IMPLEMENT NECESSARY CHANGES AND ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting bilateral assistance to foreign countries who have failed to fulfill their obligations in United Nations peacekeeping missions or whose peacekeepers have been convicted of sexual exploitation and abuse and have failed to implement necessary changes and accountability measures by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1497. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE ARMED FORCES IN YEMEN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting operations and activities of the Armed Forces in Yemen by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1498. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPORTING ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF TRANSITION INITIATIVES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to compiling a report on the activities of the Office of Transition Initiatives of the United States Agency for International Development by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1499. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING COMMUNITIES FROM DESTRUCTIVE FEDERAL OVERREACH BY THE FINAL RULE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ENTITLED "AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING".

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting communities from destructive Federal overreach by the final rule of the Department of Housing and Urban Development entitled "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing" by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1500. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PHASING OUT THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to phasing out the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1501. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF THE IMPOSITION OF DUTIES AND OTHER TRADE MEASURES BY THE PRESIDENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to congressional review of presidential trade actions by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1502. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TRANSPARENCY WITHIN THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing transparency practices by the Congressional Budget Office by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1503. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE RECLASSIFICATION OF BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE AS AN INFORMATION SERVICE AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NET NEUTRALITY REGULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the openness of the Internet and the prohibition of net neutrality regulations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1504. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEVOLVING SURFACE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO THE STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the devolution of the responsibility for building and maintaining the surface transportation of the United States from the Federal Government to the States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1505. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

(7) restricting harmful or fraudulent treatments that purport to change the sexual orientation or gender identity of a child, youth, or adult,

SA 1506. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$520,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,850,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,090,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,035,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,955,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$5,955,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$6,925,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,770,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$8,475,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$9,010,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$520,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,850,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,090,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,035,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$4,955,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$5,955,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$6,925,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$7,770,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$8,475,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$9,010,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$520,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,850,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,090,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,035,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$4,955,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$5,955,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$6,925,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$7,770,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$8,475,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$9,010,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$520,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,850,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,090,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$4,035,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$4,955,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$5,955,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$6,925,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,770,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$8,475,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$9,010,000,000.

On page 22, line 20, increase the amount by \$520,000,000.

On page 22, line 21, increase the amount by \$520,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,850,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,850,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,090,000,000.

On page 23, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,090,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,035,000,000.

On page 23, line 8, increase the amount by \$4,035,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,955,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, increase the amount by \$4,955,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,955,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,955,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by \$6,925,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by \$6,925,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,770,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by \$7,770,000,000.

On page 24, line 2, increase the amount by \$8,475,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by \$8,475,000,000.

On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by \$9,010,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,010,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by \$52,585,000,000.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST AN INCREASE IN PAYMENTS FOR FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN BORROWERS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce the benefits available to current or future Federal student loan borrowers using income-driven repayment programs under part B or D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.; 1087a et seq.), including proposals that would increase the amount borrowers must pay to 12.5 percent of discretionary income and extend the cap on repayment for graduate students to 30 years.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1507. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING CONSUMER PRIVACY AND TRANSPARENCY IN THE COLLECTION AND USE OF PERSONAL DATA BY NATION-WIDE CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments

between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing consumer privacy and transparency in the collection and use of personal data by nationwide consumer reporting agencies by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1508. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE REGIONAL BIOSECURITY PLAN FOR MICRONESIA AND HAWAII OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing recommendations in the Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii of the Department of the Navy by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1509. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RELATING TO SUPPORTING, PROTECTING, AND MAINTAINING FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting, protecting, and maintaining Federal public land, including national monuments, in the form in which the national monuments are in as of the date of enactment of this Act, for the enjoyment by current and future generations, to honor the national heritage of the United States, and to recognize the Federal public land as national treasures that belong to all

people of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1510. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRIORITIZING THE USE OF NATIVE PLANTS BY PUBLIC LAND MANAGERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prioritizing the use of native plants by public land managers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1511. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING PUBLIC SHELTERS RATED TO WITHSTAND UP TO CATEGORY 5 HURRICANE WINDS ALONG COASTLINES AND WITHIN ISLAND COMMUNITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing public shelters rated to withstand up to category 5 hurricane winds along coastlines and within island communities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1512. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H.

Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING INVASIVE SPECIES THAT THREATEN THE DOMESTIC COFFEE AND MACADAMIA NUT INDUSTRIES AND NATIVE OHIA TREES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing invasive species that threaten the domestic coffee and macadamia nut industries and native ohia trees by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1513. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING DEFERRED MAINTENANCE AT SCHOOLS OF AGRICULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE RESEARCH FACILITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing deferred maintenance at schools of agriculture in the United States and Agricultural Research Service research facilities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1514. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING THE DEFERRED MAINTENANCE BACKLOG OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the deferred maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, supporting the capacity of the National Park Service to meet annual maintenance needs, or ensuring that the repair, stabilization, or reconstruction of infrastructure is compliant with all applicable historic preservation and natural resource standards by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1515. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STIMULATING INNOVATION TO ADVANCE THE ABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES TO UNDERSTAND, RESEARCH, OR MONITOR CORAL REEF ECOSYSTEMS, OR TO DEVELOP MANAGEMENT OR ADAPTATION OPTIONS TO PRESERVE, SUSTAIN, AND RESTORE CORAL REEF ECOSYSTEMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to stimulating innovation to advance the ability of the United States to understand, research, or monitor coral reef ecosystems, or to develop management or adaptation options to preserve, sustain, and restore coral reef ecosystems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1516. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN CLEAN ENERGY AND PRESERVING THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to energy conservation and renewable energy development or new or existing approaches to clean energy financing, reducing greenhouse gas emissions levels, or Federal programs for land and water conservation and acquisition or the preservation, restoration, or protection of public land, oceans, coastal areas, or aquatic ecosystems by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1517. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENHANCING THE READINESS OF THE ARMED FORCES BY IMPROVING ENERGY RESILIENCE ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing the readiness of the Armed Forces, which may include legislation that improves energy resilience on military installations, including the use of cyber-secure microgrids, energy storage, or renewable energy and other projects that provide power directly to a military facility or installation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1518. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE RELIABILITY AND RESILIENCE OF THE ELECTRIC GRID IN ISLANDED COMMUNITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the reliability and resilience of the electric grid in islanded communities or communities affected by natural disasters, including through the use of microgrids, energy storage, and renewable power sources, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1519. Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING AND EXPANDING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) strengthening and reaffirming the Federal policy in favor of collective bargaining;
- (2) stiffening penalties for companies that violate workers' rights to unionize and act collectively;
- (3) ending company interference in union organizing campaigns;
- (4) preserving the use of official time;
- (5) prohibiting permanent replacement of striking workers; and
- (6) expanding the benefits of the collective bargaining process to new and emerging employment sectors;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1520. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTMENTS IN IMPROVING PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION, FLOOD MAPPING, FLOOD MITIGATION, AND RESILIENCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to investments in improving pre-disaster mitigation, flood mapping, flood mitigation, and resilience by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1521. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, line 2, insert “, including the costs of fraud, waste, abuse, and crime resulting from any deregulation” after “variables”.

SA 1522. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HARDROCK MINING REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal land management, which may include provisions relating to budget deficit reduction, establishment of a reclamation fund, imposition of a locatable mineral royalty, revenue sharing with States, and improvements to the permitting process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1523. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr.

ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE TO MAKE VISITOR LOGS PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring the White House Office to make visitor logs publicly available, including visitors to the White House, Mar-a-Lago, and the Trump National Golf Club in Bedminster, New Jersey, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1524. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, strike lines 1 through 17 and insert the following:

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$33,952,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(4) for Northeast Corridor Grants and National Network Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (commonly known as “Amtrak”).

SA 1525. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal

years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HELPING STATES, COUNTIES, AND INDIAN TRIBES ADDRESS THE RECENT INCREASE IN FOSTER CARE ENTRIES DRIVEN BY THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to helping States, counties, and Indian Tribes address the recent increase in foster care entries driven by the opioid epidemic through means such as allowing Federal child welfare matching funds to be used for substance use treatment and other evidence-based programs to help families stay safely together, providing resources to grandparents and other relatives, and improving the quality and oversight of Federally-funded foster care programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1526. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 _____. PROHIBITION ON PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION WITHOUT A SCORE IN THE SENATE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered estimate”, with respect to covered legislation, means an estimate of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out the covered legislation, as determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate under the authority under section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 643); and

(2) the term “covered legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, amendment between the Houses, or conference report.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to proceed to consideration of any covered legislation unless, not later than 28 hours before the time the Senate proceeds to consideration of the covered legislation, a covered estimate with respect to the covered legislation is made publicly available—

(1) by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate; or

(2) on the website of the Congressional Budget Office.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair

under subsection (b) with respect to a motion to proceed.

SA 1527. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT'S PARTICIPATION IN AND FUNDING OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND UNITED NATIONS-AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OAS REVITALIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2013, AND TO COMPILING A REPORT ON FEDERAL SPENDING IN FOREIGN NATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to comprehensive reviews of the United States Government's participation in and funding of the United Nations and United Nations-affiliated organizations and the United States Government's participation in and funding of the Organization of American States, to the implementation of the OAS Revitalization and Reform Act of 2013, and to compiling a report on Federal spending in foreign nations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1528. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE JOINT INTEGRATION OF THE MODERNIZATION AND SUSTAINMENT OF THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR TRIAD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the joint integration of the modernization and sustainment of the United States nuclear triad by the amounts provided in such legislation for those pur-

poses, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1529. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DECREASING RATES OF METHAMPHETAMINE USE IN NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to decreasing rates of methamphetamine use in Native American communities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1530. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING THE DEFERRED MAINTENANCE NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing the deferred maintenance needs of the National Park Service by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1531. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the

appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$425,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,015,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,420,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$1,765,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,140,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$2,570,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,445,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,825,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$4,105,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$425,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,015,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,420,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,765,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,140,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,570,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,445,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,825,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$4,105,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$425,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,015,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$1,420,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,765,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$2,140,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$2,570,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,445,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,825,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,105,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$425,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,015,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,420,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,765,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,140,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$2,570,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,445,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,825,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,105,000,000.

On page 22, line 20, increase the amount by \$425,000,000.

On page 22, line 21, increase the amount by \$425,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,015,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,015,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,420,000,000.

On page 23, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,420,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,765,000,000.

On page 23, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,765,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, increase the amount by \$2,140,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, increase the amount by \$2,140,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,570,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,570,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,445,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,445,000,000.

On page 24, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,825,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,825,000,000.

On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,105,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,105,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by \$23,725,000,000.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CUTS TO PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN FORGIVENESS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate or reduce the public service loan forgiveness available under section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(m)) to student borrowers of eligible Federal Direct Loans.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1532. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, AND EDUCATION REGARDING NEGLECTED TROPICAL DISEASES IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the Department of Health and Human Services to improve research, surveillance, and education regarding the presence and impact of neglected tropical diseases in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1533. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING AND EDUCATING AMERICANS ABOUT THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR THE HEALTH INSURANCE EXCHANGES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funds for advertising, in-person assistance, and other outreach activities that would promote and educate Americans about the open enrollment period for the health insurance exchanges, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1534. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In Section 2001, strike subsection (b)

SA 1535. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In Section 2001, strike subsection (b)

SA 1536. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing Federal tax relief for families, which may include amending the child tax credit and the child and dependent care tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1537. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE, AND ALL OTHER RELEVANT AGENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting programs administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, and all other relevant agencies, which may include changing the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for all programs administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (including public safety and justice, education, social services and natural resources programs), programs administered by the Indian Health Service, and housing programs carried out pursuant to the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1538. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OR EXPANSION OF PRIVATELY-RUN IMMIGRATION DETENTION FACILITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting funding for the construction or expansion of privately-run immigration detention facilities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1539. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF ALL AMERICANS TO BE FREE FROM DISCRIMINATION BASED ON THEIR SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, RELIGION, RACE, COLOR, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to ensuring that Federal agencies protect the rights of all individuals in the United States to be free from discrimination (such as discrimination in employment, contracting, or programs and services) based on their sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, race, color, sex, or national origin, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and Federal law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1540. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT FROM DEVIATING FROM ITS EXISTING SENSITIVE LOCATIONS POLICY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from deviating from its existing sensitive locations policy or executing enforcement actions at sensitive locations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1541. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEFENDING BROADCAST LICENSEES AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Federal Communications Commission from revoking or otherwise impairing, directly or indirectly, a broadcast license issued by the Commission simply because the President, or another member of the Administration of the President, is dissatisfied by the news content aired by the licensee about the President or the Administration by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1542. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congress-

sional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 ____ . PROHIBITION ON PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION WITHOUT A SCORE IN THE SENATE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered estimate”, with respect to covered legislation, means an estimate of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out the covered legislation, as determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate under the authority under section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 643); and

(2) the term “covered legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, amendment between the Houses, or conference report.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to proceed to any covered legislation by motion or by consent unless, not later than 28 hours before the time the Senate proceeds to consideration of the covered legislation, a covered estimate with respect to the covered legislation is made publicly available—

(1) by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate; or

(2) on the website of the Congressional Budget Office.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair under subsection (b) with respect to a motion to proceed.

SA 1543. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, strike line 3 and insert the following:

In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committee on

On page 47, strike lines 8 through 21.

SA 1544. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 57, strike lines 19 and 20 and insert the following:

(4) resources to assist local communities in recovering from damages relating to wildland fires;

(5) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or

(6) the secure rural schools and community

SA 1545. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD HARM BABIES BORN PREMATURELY BY CUTTING FEDERAL FUNDING FOR MEDICAID THAT SUPPORTS MEDICATIONS, SPECIAL EQUIPMENT, AND THERAPIES TO HELP THESE BABIES THRIVE AND PROTECTS THEIR FAMILIES FROM BANKRUPTCY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would harm babies born prematurely by cutting Federal funding for the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), which supports medications, special equipment, and therapies to help these babies thrive and protects their families from bankruptcy.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1546. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD OF MEDICAL BANKRUPTCY FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES, INCLUDING LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CUT FEDERAL FUNDING FOR MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the likelihood of medical bankruptcy for families in the United States, including any such bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would result in decreased Federal funding for the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 1547. Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. BLUNT, and Mrs. ERNST) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to legislation that would transfer Federal funding from organizations that receive such funding and perform abortions to organizations that provide comprehensive care for women, including community health centers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1548. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING BENEFICIARY CHOICE AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IN HEALTH CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing beneficiary choice and individual freedom in the receipt of health care, which may include the expansion of the available uses and contribution limits applicable to health savings accounts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1549. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING TRANSPARENCY IN HEALTH CARE PRICING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring transparency for costs and pricing of health care services provided through Federal Government programs under which beneficiaries have a financial responsibility, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1550. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. PROHIBITION ON SCORING OF AMOUNTS FROM SALES OR LEASES OF PUBLIC LAND.

In the Senate, for purposes of determining budgetary impacts to evaluate points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) or any concurrent resolution on the budget, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that generate Federal offsetting receipts from the sale or lease of land or interest in land that is part of the National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge System, National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Trails System, National Wilderness Preservation System, National Forest System, or a National Monument shall not be taken into account with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

SA 1551. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE V—BUDGET PROCESS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 5101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (b).

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, aggregates, or other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution.

(d) **DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) **SUNSET.**—This section shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 5102. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) **SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) **SECTION 302 ALLOCATIONS.**—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) **APPLICATION.**—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) **DESIGNATIONS.**—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of

the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 5103. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision were included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year that proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) **AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) **AMOUNT.**—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$19,100,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$17,000,000,000; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5104. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the following headings:

- (1) **GENERAL.**—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.
- (2) **VETERANS.**—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed the following:

(1) **GENERAL.**—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) **VETERANS.**—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available for the first fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 5105. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include, in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, an estimate of any change in debt service costs resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt service costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforcement of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of programs funded by discretionary spending or to appropriation bills or joint resolutions, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

SEC. 5106. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) **ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.**—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall also, to the extent practicable, provide a fair-value estimate of such loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(b) **STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide, to the extent practicable, a fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure that establishes or modifies a loan or loan guarantee program for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) **BASELINE ESTIMATES.**—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budget enforcement requirements.

SEC. 5107. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate of major legislation considered in the House of Representatives provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional

Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending legislation; or

(ii) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 5108. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to the applicable authorizing committee that reports such measure and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 5109. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides the authority to enter into or modify any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis (NPV).

(b) **NPV CALCULATIONS.**—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Use of Energy Saving Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, dated September 28, 2015 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, if any net present value of any covered energy savings contract calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then the budgetary effects of such contract shall not be counted for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) **CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.**—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President's annual budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

SEC. 5110. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of

1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 5111. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5112. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5113. MODIFICATION OF RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2002 shall have no force or effect.

(b) **RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—Not later than November 13, 2017, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report to the House of Representatives changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 5201. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation to the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the levels of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 5202. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 5101 of this concurrent resolution.

(e) **OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.**—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution depending on congressional action on pending reconciliation legislation.

SEC. 5203. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 5204. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 5205. APPLICATION OF RULE REGARDING LIMITS ON DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution if—

(1) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(2) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(3) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report, would not cause the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 to be exceeded.

SEC. 5206. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE HOUSE.

In the House of Representatives, if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 is adopted without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to this concurrent resolution on the budget, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable rules and requirements set forth in the con-

current resolution on the budget, the allocations and list provided for in this section shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as if such allocations and list were in a joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2018. The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations consistent with title I for fiscal year 2018 and for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for the purpose of enforcing 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advance appropriations for the purpose of enforcing section 5104 of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 5207. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title and section 2002—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle C—Adjustment Authority

SEC. 5301. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the House of Representatives, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

Subtitle D—Reserve Funds

SEC. 5401. RESERVE FUND FOR COMMERCIALIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust, at a time the chair deems appropriate, the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and other applicable committees of the House of Representatives, aggregates, and other appropriate levels established in this concurrent resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system if such measure reduces the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by the amount that

would otherwise be appropriated to the Federal Aviation Administration for air traffic control. Adjustments to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the adjustments to the discretionary spending limits under such section 251(c), shall only be made upon enactment of such measure.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, a measure that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system shall be a measure that establishes a Federally-chartered, not-for-profit corporation that—

(1) is authorized to provide air traffic control services within the United States airspace;

(2) sets user fees to finance its operations;

(3) may borrow from private capital markets to finance improvements;

(4) is governed by a board of directors composed of a CEO and directors whose fiduciary duty is to the entity; and

(5) becomes the employer of those employees directly connected to providing air traffic control services and who the Secretary transfers from the Federal Government.

SEC. 5402. RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that invests in national infrastructure to the extent that such measure is deficit neutral for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 5403. RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

In the House of Representatives, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that provides for comprehensive tax reform, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 5404. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, budget aggregates and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program allotments, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 5405. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OR REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals or replaces any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 by the amount of budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom provided by such measure for such purpose.

SA 1552. Mr. ENZI (for Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. COLLINS)) proposed

an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX REFORM WHICH MAINTAINS THE PROGRESSIVITY OF THE TAX SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include tax reform proposals to ensure that the reformed tax code parallels the existing tax code with respect to relative burdens and does not shift the tax burden from high-income to lower- and middle-income taxpayers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1553. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BENNET)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FULL, PERMANENT, AND MANDATORY FUNDING FOR THE PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing full, permanent, and mandatory funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1554. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prescription drug costs under the Medicare program, which may include making prescription drugs more affordable for seniors and for taxpayers by requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prescription drug costs under the Medicare program, particularly with inverted corporations that benefit from Medicare program reimbursements, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1555. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CLOSING THE CARRIED INTEREST LOOPHOLE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the taxation of income from investment partnerships (known as carried interest), which may include legislation that allows for the taxing as ordinary income of a partner's share of income on an investment services partnership interest, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1556. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING WORKER MISCLASSIFICATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that workers are appropriately classified as employees or independent contractors for purposes of labor law and payroll taxes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over both the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1557. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR JOB TRAINING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to employment and job growth, which may include programs that encourage job training partnerships between businesses, educational institutions, and the workforce development system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1558. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DISCHARGE OF FEDERAL AND PRIVATE STUDENT LOANS IN BANKRUPTCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to bankruptcy discharge in order to allow Federal and private student loan borrowers to discharge their student loans in bankruptcy, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of

the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1559. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STUDENT LOAN REFINANCING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to student loan refinancing to help middle class families and borrowers with outstanding Federal and private student loans to refinance at the equivalent interest rates that were offered to Federal student loan borrowers during the 2016-2017 school year and to fully offset the cost of such a program by requiring millionaires to pay at least a 30 percent effective Federal tax rate, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1560. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN BORROWERS ELIGIBLE FOR A BORROWER DEFENSE TO REPAYMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal student loan borrowers eligible for a borrower defense to repayment in order to automatically discharge the total amount of Federal student loans of all borrowers who attended Corinthian Colleges or ITT Educational Services, and all other Federal student loan borrowers eligible for a borrower defense to repayment under section 455(h) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(h)), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of

the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1561. Mr. ENZI proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE V—BUDGET PROCESS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 5101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (b).

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, aggregates, or other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution.

(d) **DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) **SUNSET.**—This section shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 5102. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) **SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) **SECTION 302 ALLOCATIONS.**—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) **APPLICATION.**—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in

subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) **DESIGNATIONS.**—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 5103. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision were included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year that proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) **AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) **AMOUNT.**—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$19,100,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$17,000,000,000; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5104. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report

or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the following headings:

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed the following:

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) VETERANS.—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available for the first fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 5105. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include, in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, an estimate of any change in debt service costs resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt service costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforcement of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of programs funded by discretionary spending or to appropriation bills or joint resolutions, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

SEC. 5106. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall also, to the extent practicable, provide a fair-value estimate of such loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(b) STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide, to the extent practicable, a fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure that establishes or modifies a loan or loan guarantee program for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) BASELINE ESTIMATES.—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budget enforcement requirements.

SEC. 5107. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.—During the 115th Congress, any estimate of major legislation considered in the House of Representatives provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAJOR LEGISLATION.—The term “major legislation” means a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending legislation; or

(ii) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) TIMING SHIFTS.—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 5108. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to the applicable authorizing committee that reports such measure and in-

crease the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 5109. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides the authority to enter into or modify any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis (NPV).

(b) NPV CALCULATIONS.—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Use of Energy Saving Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, dated September 28, 2015 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, if any net present value of any covered energy savings contract calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then the budgetary effects of such contract shall not be counted for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President's annual budget

submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

SEC. 5110. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 5111. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5112. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5113. MODIFICATION OF RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2002 shall have no force or effect.

(b) RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—Not later than November 13, 2017, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report to the House of Representatives changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 5201. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation to the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the levels of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 5202. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 5101 of this concurrent resolution.

(e) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution depending on congressional action on pending reconciliation legislation.

SEC. 5203. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 5204. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 5205. APPLICATION OF RULE REGARDING LIMITS ON DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution if—

(1) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(2) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(3) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report.

would not cause the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 to be exceeded.

SEC. 5206. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE HOUSE.

In the House of Representatives, if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 is adopted without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to this concurrent resolution on the budget, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable rules and requirements set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget, the allocations and list provided for in this section shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as if such allocations and list were in a joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2018. The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations consistent with title I for fiscal year 2018 and for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for the purpose of enforcing 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advance appropriations for the purpose of enforcing section 5104 of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 5207. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title and section 2002—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle C—Adjustment Authority

SEC. 5301. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the House of Representatives, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

Subtitle D—Reserve Funds

SEC. 5401. RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon,

that invests in national infrastructure to the extent that such measure is deficit neutral for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 5402. RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

In the House of Representatives, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that provides for comprehensive tax reform, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 5403. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, budget aggregates and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program allotments, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 5404. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OR REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals or replaces any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 by the amount of budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom provided by such measure for such purpose.

SA 1562. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION OR GENDER IDENTITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to prohibiting discrimination, such as in employment, federally funded programs and activities, public accommodations, education, housing, jury selection, or access to credit, against individuals on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that

such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1563. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO NULLIFYING CERTAIN CIVIL ASSET FORFEITURE ORDERS ISSUED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to nullifying any order implementing adoptive forfeiture practices, which may include the order entitled, "Federal Forfeiture of Property Seized by State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies" (Order No. 3946-2017, dated July 19, 2017), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1564. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING THE GEOGRAPHIC IMBALANCE IN FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDING AND IMPROVING RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPACITY THROUGHOUT THE STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (commonly known as "ESPCoR"), which may include support for States and jurisdictions that are historically underserved by Federal research and development funding, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1565. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to making additional investments to end the tragedy of childhood lead poisoning and avoid related preventable medical, educational, criminal justice, and other costs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1566. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS OF FAMILIES, VETERANS, INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES, AND SENIORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to legislation to preserve existing affordable rental housing and create additional affordable housing opportunities for families, veterans, individuals with disabilities, and seniors, including the 11,000,000 renter households paying more than half of their income toward housing, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1567. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LOWERING PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES BY LIFTING THE BAN ON MEDICARE NEGOTIATING PART D PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to lowering prescription drug prices by lifting the ban that makes it illegal for Medicare to negotiate prescription drug prices on behalf of millions of seniors by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SA 1568. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 1569. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1568 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

SA 1570. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 1571. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1570 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

SA 1572. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1571 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 1570 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The Committee on Agriculture is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 19, 2017, at 2 p.m., in room S-1216, to conduct a hearing the following nominations: Gregory Ibach, of Nebraska, to be Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, and William Northey, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, both of the Department of Agriculture.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 19, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open and closed session to receive testimony on the roles and responsibilities for defending the nation from cyberattack.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 19, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430, to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining How Healthy Choices Can Improve Health Outcomes and Reduce Costs.”

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 19, 2017, at 10:30 a.m. to hold a hearing entitled “Food Aid.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 19, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Stephanos Bibas, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Allison H. Eid, of Colorado, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Annemarie Carney Axon, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Michael Lawrence Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Thomas Alvin Farr, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina, William M. Ray II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Liles Clifton Burke, to

be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Walter David Counts III, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Michael Joseph Juneau, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, Karen Gren Scholer, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Tilman Eugene Self III, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, and John C. Demers, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Scott C. Blader, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin, Mark A. Klaassen, to be United States Attorney for the District of Wyoming, William C. Lamar, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi, John R. Lausch, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, and J. Douglas Overbey, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee, all of the Department of Justice.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 298, S. Res. 299, and S. Res. 300.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2017

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, October 23; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 2266, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that

notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the pending cloture motion ripen at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
OCTOBER 23, 2017, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous con-

sent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:23 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 23, 2017, at 3 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING PETER D. TRUMAN

HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated and accomplished man from our City, former Pennsylvania State Representative, Peter D. Truman.

Peter was born in the City of Philadelphia on January 13, 1935. He received his Bachelor of Business Administration from Florida State Christian College and attended New York State University. From 1959 to 1967, he served as an officer on the Philadelphia Police Department and in 1968, he served as a constable to the 3rd Ward of Philadelphia. After, he worked as assistant to the chief clerk in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives (1968 to 1971). From 1970 to 1982, he served as president of the 3rd Ward Committeeman Association. From 1971 to 1972, he was the director of the Pennsylvania Bureau of General Services. From 1972 to 1973, he worked as the regional director to the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce and was an administrative assistant to the Sheriff of Philadelphia (1973 to 1975).

Further, Peter served as director of the Pennsylvania Bureau of General Services (1971 to 1972) and regional director of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce (1972 to 1973). After, he was an administrative assistant to the Sheriff of Philadelphia (1973 to 1975) and deputy chief clerk to the Philadelphia Traffic Court (1979 to 1982). Additionally, he was a leader of the 3rd Ward Democratic Committee (1982). Admirably, he was elected as a Democrat to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives for the 1983, 1985 and 1987 terms. He resigned from the House, January 4, 1988. He also served as Clerk of Quarter Sessions for the City of Philadelphia (1988 to 1992). In addition to his diverse career of public service, Peter is the founder of Dan-Silo Consultants.

The 2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania extends gratitude to Peter Truman for his dedicated support to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The neighborhood of West Springfield was developed in 1966 by the Richmarr Construction Company. Richmarr generously donated land on which to build a community pool however, financing the construction of the pool itself was left to the community. Determined to take advantage of the opportunity to improve their neighborhood, the citizens of West Springfield came together to raise the necessary funds and one year later, on July 4, 1967, the Village West Pool opened.

Since that time, generations of residents have enjoyed facility. Three levels of swimming programs are offered including the Vikings for swimmers aged 4 to 18. This is a competitive swim team and is part of the Northern Virginia Swim League, the largest summer swim league in the nation. The Little Vikings is the developmental team and also swims in certain meets, including the Lollipop Meet. There is also a Learn to Swim program for very young swimmers who are not yet comfortable in the water. To encourage community spirit and camaraderie, The Pavilion is available to rent for local parties and gatherings. In addition, pool membership fees are discounted to all who agree to volunteer during the pool season.

Mr. Speaker, the health of a community can be judged through its level of civic engagement. The creation of the Village West Pool and its innovative programs are a testament to the level of civic engagement that is present in West Springfield and in fact, throughout Fairfax County. A group of citizens decided that they wanted to do something to make their community better and they set about doing just that. This willingness to work together to achieve a common goal speaks volumes on the health of our communities. Fairfax County remains one of the best places in the country in which to live, work and raise a family due to the efforts of individuals like the ones that came together to create the Village West Pool and the current residents and members who are committed to maintaining and preserving this neighborhood asset. I commend the Pool's Board and the entire West Springfield Civic Association for reaching this historic milestone and ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them great success in their future endeavors.

four years as a Military Policeman, where he actively led protests against segregation. As an honorable discharge, he settled in Philadelphia and secured employment at the Edward G. Budd Company. While there, he was appointed chairman of the union's first Fair Employment Anti-discrimination Committee and Chairman of the Education Committee.

In 1954, Al became a Philadelphia Police Officer where he dedicated his career and life to improving the lives of others. Specifically, he aimed to end unfair police tactics and brutality. To do so, he organized the Guardian Civic League to better relations and understanding between the police and community. Under his leadership the Guardian Civic sponsored various programs such as food baskets for the needy during Christmas and Thanksgiving, sending underprivileged children to Summer Camp, serving as chaperones to teenage programs, supporting revised Fair Housing Legislation and cooperating with other Civic groups to further their efforts in general service to the community. Further, Al served as the first Black man to be assigned to the Labor Squad.

In 1969, Al took a leave of absence train and raised \$52,000 for the Fayette, Mississippi Police Department. The funds raised provided the Fayette Police Department with a much needed police car. Upon his return, in 1980, he was elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and served from 1981 to 1987.

Al dedicated his life to improving the lives of African Americans and was an active member of the NAACP since 1948. He served on various committees, became vice-president, and finally President of the North Philadelphia "Action" branch. Approximately 200 awards from the National, State, and Community NAACP Branches have been presented to either Al individually or to the North Philadelphia "Action" Branch for outstanding achievement. Likewise, the National Black Police Association created a scholarship in honor of Al Deal. In addition to receiving numerous awards and honors, Al served on the Board of Trustees at Temple University.

Although Al faced adversity, it served as a stepping stone to carry on his work of improving the lives of others. The 2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania extends gratitude to Al "The People's Champion" for his dedicated support to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

RECOGNIZING THE VILLAGE WEST POOL 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Village West Pool on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. This historic milestone is a testament to the strength of community spirit in Fairfax County and throughout Northern Virginia.

HONORING ALPHONSO "AL" DEAL

HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated and courageous man from North Philadelphia, Alphonso "Al" Deal, a retired Philadelphia Police Officer and former Philadelphia State Representative.

Al was born in Watertown, Florida. From 1941 to 1945, he served in the U.S. Army for

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CELEBRATING THE MILITARY
SERVICE OF CAPTAIN KELLIE
BYERLY, (RET.)

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a great man for his military service, Captain Kellie S. Byerly, USN (Ret). Captain Byerly was born in Danville, Illinois on October 19, 1939. He began his prestigious twenty-seven-year Naval career in Long Beach, California.

Captain Byerly served in numerous managerial positions on the USS *John Paul Jones* (DDG-32) and as Chief Engineer of the USS *Decatur* (DDG-31). Captain Byerly later worked as a Professor of Naval Science at the State University of New York Maritime College. Captain Byerly held commands as: Executive Officer of the guided missile destroyers USS *Hoel* (DDG-13) and USS *Robinson* (DDG-12). He later served as Commodore of Task Force Sixty-Three in Naples, Italy. Captain Byerly concluded his Naval career as Senior Inspector for the Propulsion Examination Board in San Diego, California.

Following his retirement from the United States Navy, Captain Byerly worked supervising operations in power plants around the world. He was hired by Stewart and Stevenson, an independent power company based in Houston as Vice President of Operations for the company's western region. He later served with General Electric as Vice President of Central American and Western United States regions. Captain Byerly concluded his career with the Calpine Corporation, as Vice President of Operations for the company's Central Region.

Captain Byerly is married to Deborah L. Byerly who he met in Bremerton, Washington while his ship, the USS *Robinson* (DDG-12) was undergoing an overhaul. After retiring from the Navy, Captain and Mrs. Byerly became residents of Nassau Bay, Texas in 1991 and have enjoyed being part of the community ever since. Mrs. Byerly has worked for the NASA Johnson Space Center for over twenty years.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank Captain Kellie Byerly for his many years of selfless service to our great nation in the United States Navy.

RECOGNIZING THE VIENNA HOST
LIONS CLUB 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important member of our local civil society. The Vienna Host Lions Club, based in the Town of Vienna in Fairfax County, Virginia, is observing its 75th anniversary this year. Originally chartered on May 7, 1942 as the Arlington Host Lions Club, the Vienna Host Lions Club has spent three-quarters of a century working to improve the community

around them. Indeed, it currently holds the distinction of being the oldest community service organization in Vienna.

The Club's philanthropic efforts began in the heart of wartime, raising funds to support Allied service members overseas during World War II. The club also took action on the home front, constructing and operating a watchtower to scan for enemy aircraft. At the conclusion of the war, the club collected clothing to send to Europe to aid in reconstruction efforts. In 1965, the Vienna Host Lions Club left a permanent mark on the Town of Vienna by raising funds to build the new Vienna Community Center. Since that time, it has made other significant contributions to the betterment of the Town of Vienna through advocating for the installation of lights on the athletic fields of James Madison High School and other community ballparks, and the construction of a two-story press box at Walters Field.

In addition, the Club sponsors the James A. Bland Music Scholarship, and donates funds to many local organizations including those that address the needs of people with sight or hearing impairments, youth activities, and social welfare programs, as well as American Legion Post 180.

Mr. Speaker, volunteerism and public service are two of the highest callings, and the Vienna Host Lions Club is an example that other civic groups would do well to emulate. The health of a community can be judged through its level of civic engagement. The fact that the Vienna Host Lions Club has endured for such a protracted period of time speaks volumes to the health of not only the Town of Vienna, but the Northern Virginia region as a whole. The Town of Vienna has been named one of the best places in which to live for a number of years, a distinction that is largely due to the efforts of individuals like the members, past and present, of Vienna Host Lions Club. I commend the entire organization for reaching this historic milestone and ask my colleagues to join me in thanking the Club, its officers and members, and all who support it for their service to our community.

HONORING ALEXANDRA "SANDY"
BRESLIN

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sandy Breslin, who passed away on May 31, 2017. Sandy was a longtime environmental and civic activist in Connecticut, and her work to protect the Long Island Sound and to conserve our state's natural wonders will benefit future generations.

A native of New Haven, Connecticut, Sandy was an exceptional leader in Connecticut's environmental community for decades, and worked with a number of organizations to achieve conservation goals and stronger environmental laws. A trailblazing activist for the protection and restoration of Long Island Sound, Sandy's work helped secure passage of the Long Island Sound Stewardship Act as well as tens of millions of dollars in federal conservation funding.

Sandy also worked with groups including the Connecticut Land Conservation Council and the Connecticut Fund for the Environment to improve the state's wildlife protections, preserve more than 18,000 acres of land, and strengthen Connecticut's Environmental Policy Act. Her activism and achievements drew national recognition, and Sandy was awarded the Department of the Interior's Environmental Achievement Award, a Teaming with Wildlife Member Achievement Award, and a Coastal America Award.

Sandy was committed to public service in Connecticut, and leaders of both political parties held her opinion and work in high regard. In addition to her environmental policy work, she was active in local Democratic politics and served as the Chairwoman of the Bethany Democratic Town Committee for many years. She cherished working with young environmental activists and public servants, and leaders across our state have benefitted from her guidance and wisdom. I count myself lucky to have known Sandy as a friend as well as an environmental leader. She was a great woman with knowledge, heart, and a big warm laugh.

Mr. Speaker, Sandy Breslin spent her life working to protect our environment and improve our world. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor her here today, and I extend my deepest condolences to her wonderful mother and to all who knew and loved Sandy. Sandy, we will miss you.

TRIBUTE TO RUTH SUMP

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ruth Sump of Clarinda, Iowa on the occasion of her 101st birthday. Ruth was born on March 1, 1916.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Ruth's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Ruth has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-two Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Ruth in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 101st birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Ruth on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing her nothing but the best.

HONORING THE LUFKIN LITTLE
LEAGUE ALL-STARS, THE 2017
LITTLE LEAGUE WORLD SERIES
U.S. NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a different variety of thunder rolled across Williamsport, Pennsylvania in late August, which provided some respite from the devastating storms which were battering Texas . . . the "Thundering 13" from Angelina County, Texas captured the attention of millions and the title of a lifetime when they emerged victorious as the U.S. National Champions in the 2017 Little League World Series tournament.

The Lufkin All-Stars gained its distinctive nickname of "Thundering 13" during grueling two-a-day practices and games leading up to the tournament, when the young men pounded so many home runs that spectators said it sounded like thunder.

A single loss during the national tournament motivated the team even further, resulting in a rematch where they ultimately emerged victorious against the only team that challenged their bid for the national title.

With the strength of their camaraderie uniting them, and the unwavering support of their family, friends, and fans, this talented, resolute, and relentless national championship team never lost sight of the dream.

This remarkable accomplishment cannot be possible without the determination and hard work of every team member, along with the skill and experience of dedicated Head Coach and Manager Bud Maddux, along with Assistant Coaches Malcolm Deason and Ryan Deaton.

My most enthusiastic praise and congratulations goes to national champions Chip Buchanan, Malcolm Deason, Jr., Charlie Deaton, Hunter Ditsworth, Kolby Kovar, Lance Modisette, Christian Mumphery, Zach Phipps, Mark Requena, Collin Ross, Chandler Spencer, Blake Slaga, and Clayton Wigley.

The path to a championship title can be long and arduous, but the Lufkin All-Stars met the challenge sustained by the solid and enthusiastic encouragement of a fiercely loyal network of community support which provided the foundation upon which a national championship emerged.

These young men bear witness to the fact that anything is achievable though focus, hard work and determination. These are guiding life principles that lead to success not only on the field, but will undoubtedly resonate through every endeavor these valiant championship players undertake in their entire lifetimes.

May God continue to bless these young people, along with their families, friends and neighbors in east Texas and beyond. It is an extraordinary privilege to recognize the Lufkin All-Stars, 2017 Little League World Series U.S. National Champions.

RECOGNIZING THE GRADUATES OF
THE FAIRFAX COUNTY FIRE AND
RESCUE DEPARTMENT HIGH
SCHOOL FIREFIGHTER PROGRAM

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 2017 graduating class of the Fairfax County High School Firefighter Program. Last year, the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department in partnership with Fairfax County Public Schools created its High School Firefighter Program to provide training to students who are considering a career as a firefighter.

Students who participate in this program attend courses taught by qualified instructors at the Fairfax County Fire Academy. In fact, they receive some of the same training as new professional and volunteer firefighters. The course is grueling but upon successful completion, the students will receive six college credits. Should these students decide to apply to the Fairfax County Fire Academy, successful completion of this program will make them very competitive candidates and in fact, a few slots at the Academy are reserved specifically for the top student graduates.

This year, thirteen seniors are graduating as the inaugural class of the High School Firefighter Program. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the names of the following graduates:

Crisol Alvis Rodriguez, Nicholas Arko, Anna Fuentes, Joshua Hone, Alex Hurd, Henry Jimenez-Reyes, Nathan Leite, Gillian Mudge, Michael Murn, Jarod Rambo, Ben Rothwell, Richard Verrier, Leah Walters.

Mr. Speaker, the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department is one of the best fire departments in the country and in the world. I commend the department as well as the public school system for partnering in the creation of this program. I also applaud these young people for their desire to learn more about the department and for their interest in protecting our community. Northern Virginia is fortunate to have such dedicated young citizens. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these students on their successful completion of this program and in wishing them great future success.

CONGRATULATING DR. PAUL
COREIL

HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Paul Coreil. Dr. Paul Coreil, born and raised in Ville Platte, Louisiana, has enjoyed a distinguished career with the 4H Program—the most recent achievement being his induction into the 4H National Hall of Fame. Honored as one of only 16 inducted across the nation, Dr. Coreil has played a major role in the program for more

than 34 years and currently serves as the Director and Vice Chancellor Emeritus for the Louisiana State University Agricultural Center. His work on the Marsh Maneuvers and the Louisiana 4H Foundation Squirrel Hunt has helped raise thousands of dollars to benefit Louisiana 4H programs. Dr. Coreil has received numerous awards and accolades for his contributions 4H and to the great state of Louisiana. I applaud Dr. Coreil for his work and commend him on this well-deserved honor.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY KARG

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Henry Karg of Clarinda, Iowa on the occasion of his 104th birthday. Henry was born on October 29, 1913.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Henry's life. Since his birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the Internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Henry has lived through nineteen United States Presidents and twenty-two Governors of Iowa. In his lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Henry in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish him a very happy 104th birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Henry on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing him nothing but the best.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. BERNARD
FULLER

HON. MARK WALKER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding constituent—Mr. Bernard Fuller. I am honored to congratulate Mr. Bernard Fuller, a teacher at Graham Middle School in Alamance County, North Carolina. Mr. Bernard Fuller is a 2016–2017 recipient of the Outstanding Special Education Teacher of the Year Award by the National Association of Special Education Teachers. This award was presented to 16 teachers across the nation and Mr. Fuller is the only teacher to earn the honor from North Carolina. Mr. Fuller has demonstrated a passionate commitment by developing special skills and going the extra mile for his remarkable students. He is an exceptional example for his colleagues in Graham and teachers everywhere. I join with his friends, family, and the Sixth District in congratulating Bernard Fuller on this excellent accomplishment.

RECOGNIZING THE RESIDENCE INN
FAIR LAKES**HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Residence Inn Fair Lakes on its 20th anniversary. Each year, the Residence Inn provides exemplary service to those living in and visiting the Northern Virginia region. Countless numbers of great reviews and ratings have ensured its reputation as one of the premier hotels in the region. It is an honor to recognize the Residence Inn on its 20th anniversary and celebrate this extraordinary accomplishment.

Opening their doors in 1997, the Residence Inn Fair Lakes filled a need in the community for high quality yet affordable accommodations. Being located in a prime location, the Residence Inn attracts a wide variety of travelers from short stay tourists to longer-term business professionals. Its proximity to Dulles and National Airports, the thriving high-tech region of the Dulles corridor, Fair Oaks Mall, George Mason University, countless restaurants, and of course Washington, D.C., has made the Residence Inn Fair Lakes a premier destination.

In 20 years, the Fair Lakes region of our county has witnessed explosive growth and expansion in residential as well as corporate development. Residence Inn Fair Lakes has positioned itself to give business travelers, both domestic and international, a place to stay that is like a home away from home.

In addition to providing exceptional accommodations to business and leisure travelers, Residence Inn Fair Lakes also offers extensive event planning services. Corporate meetings, conferences and training sessions are frequently scheduled at the Residence Inn Fair Lakes. Social events including engagement parties, showers, and family reunions are made even more special through the outstanding customer service provided by the facility and its staff. And of course, the wedding services and receptions held at the Residence Inn are meticulously planned. No detail is overlooked and the beautiful setting makes the event even more memorable.

The motto of the Commonwealth of Virginia is: "Virginia is for Lovers." The management and staff of the Residence Inn embodies that motto through its hospitality, generosity, kindness, exemplary customer service, and reliability. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Residence Inn Fair Lakes on its 20th anniversary and in wishing it continued success.

BARBARA A. ZDRAVECKY

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the distinguished career and leadership of "one of country's most influ-

ential advocates for women's rights," Barbara A. Zdravecky. She is retiring after serving 24 years as the CEO of Planned Parenthood of Southwest and Central Florida. I am honored to recognize her selfless service and valuable contributions during these challenging times for the health rights of women.

A Pennsylvania native, Barbara graduated from the Indiana University of Pennsylvania and earned her nursing degree from Manatee County's State College of Florida. Barbara served as head nurse of Manatee Memorial Hospital's Psychiatric Program and later served as the Patient Care Coordinator of the First Hospice Program in Key West, primarily caring for HIV/AIDS patients. In 1993, Barbara accepted the offer to lead Planned Parenthood of Southwest Florida as its Chief Executive Officer where she continues to serve and live by their mission to provide comprehensive health care, education, and advocacy for women of all walks of life.

Throughout her career, Barbara advocated to ensure that women have the information and care they need to live strong, healthy lives and fulfill their dreams—no ceilings, no limits. She successfully fought countless legislative battles and then brought legal challenges when the legislative body overreached, such as Florida's House Bill 1411, the Termination of Pregnancies and Planned Parenthood of Southwest and Central Florida v. Celeste Philip, that would have blocked access to health care for women and their families. She kept up the good fight on all attempts to protect against attempts to cut funding for or defund Planned Parenthood altogether.

Under Barbara's leadership, Planned Parenthood grew in stature into the Planned Parenthood of Southwest and Central Florida in 2015. Planned Parenthood of Southwest and Central Florida now covers 22 counties with 11 health centers serving over 45,000 patients in Florida.

Barbara was also instrumental in engineering regional headquarters in Sarasota and constructing the new building at 736 Central Avenue where the health care provider has expanded its services. In September, it became the first in Florida to offer hormone therapy for transgender patients.

Barbara has received numerous awards and accolades for her dedicated service. In 2006, Barbara was honored with the Ruth Green Award as the top Planned Parenthood CEO in the country by Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Equality Florida presented her with the "2014 Voice for Equality Award" and in 2015, she was named "Wonder Woman" by the Women's Resource Center of Manatee County.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of Florida, my neighbors in the Tampa Bay community and women everywhere, I would like to take this opportunity to thank one of the great champions of women's health and equal rights, Barbara A. Zdravecky, for her many years of service and contributions fighting for the rights of women and their families. It is with great honor and joy to congratulate Barbara on her new endeavor as well as the many accomplishments she has had throughout her career, and I know together we will keep up the good fight.

TRIBUTE TO COLLETTA GILLETT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Colletta Gillett of Clarinda, Iowa on the occasion of her 103rd birthday. Colletta was born on November 11, 1914.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Colletta's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Colletta has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-two Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Colletta in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 103rd birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing her nothing but the best.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 105TH
BIRTHDAY OF GEORGE N. LEIGHTON**HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Honorable George N. Leighton, who turns 105 years young on October 22nd.

George was born in New Bedford to Anna Silva Garcia and Antonio Neves Leitao, who emigrated from the Cape Verde Islands. During his childhood, George and his siblings helped their parents who worked as agricultural laborers, and they only attended school for a few months a year. It was while working as a cranberry bog weeder that George first decided to pursue a career in law.

George finished school after the 7th grade and, while working in restaurant kitchens, started taking night classes. He then pursued a degree at Howard University, after he was able to prove he could complete college level work. This was the first time he would use English as his primary language. In 1940, George graduated magna cum laude from Howard University and held a commission as a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Army Reserves Officer Training Corps.

An aspiring lawyer, George would stop at nothing and entered Harvard Law School with a scholarship later that year. As the United States entered World War II, George served in the Pacific Theater for almost three years and was awarded the Asiatic Pacific Service Medal, Bronze Star. Discharged as a Captain in 1945, George reentered Harvard Law

School. He then passed the Massachusetts bar in 1946 and established his law practice in Chicago.

George faced heavy racial discrimination and was not allowed to join the American Bar Association or the Chicago Bar Association. Despite this atmosphere, he became one of the most prominent and respected criminal defense lawyers in Illinois. George often worked as the court-appointed defense counsel for crimes of violence and with the NAACP and ACLU on cases of racial segregation. During this time he worked closely with Thurgood Marshall, among others, and was asked to represent Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. George fought tirelessly for equal voting rights, desegregation in schools, open housing, the right to sit on juries, abolishing the death penalty; and fairness in the criminal justice system.

In 1964, George was elected to the Circuit Court of Cook County, where he gained recognition as one of the finest criminal court judges. Later, in 1969, he was appointed to the First District Appellate Court of Illinois. After gaining a reputation as one of the most thoughtful and fair jurists, President Gerald Ford appointed George to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois in 1976. After retiring in 1987 at the age of 75, George returned to the private practice of law to work on civil and criminal litigation, and to continue to teach at John Marshall Law School.

A member of the bar for over 70 years, George exemplifies service to his community. He led his life fighting for a fair criminal justice system and, in 2011, George played a key role in successfully abolishing the death penalty in Illinois. In addition to the many honors George has received throughout his years fighting for equality, the U.S. Postal Service in New Bedford was also renamed after him, as the "Honorable Judge George N. Leighton Post Office Building."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the Honorable George N. Leighton on this joyous occasion of his 105th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing him many more years of health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING THE CATHOLICS FOR HOUSING, INCORPORATED 2017 FATHER GERARD CREEDON HOUSING AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the anniversary of Catholics for Housing, Incorporated and to congratulate the Father Gerard Creedon Housing Award recipients.

Catholics for Housing, Incorporated was established in 1979 by Father Gerard Creedon and a dedicated group of community members. Together they began working to expand affordable housing options and prevent homelessness in response to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter entitled, "The Right to a Decent Home."

Now in its 38th year, Catholics for Housing has grown substantially in both breadth of mission and clientele. Since its inception, the organization has expanded to provide assistance in 21 counties within the vicinity of the Arlington Catholic Diocese.

The organization has adapted over the years with new goals and a renewed vision while remaining true to its core mission of collaborating with others to support the development, construction, and rehabilitation of affordable housing, as well as to provide senior citizen rental assistance, security deposit assistance, and collaborative education and advocacy efforts. Catholics for Housing provides a continuum of housing through life skills training, senior rental assistance in Fairfax County, down payment assistance in Prince William, Fairfax, Arlington and Loudoun Counties, security deposit assistance, rental homes in Vienna, Arlington, Fairfax and Fredericksburg and homeownership opportunities.

Catholics for Housing is sustained through the dedication and generosity of its board, staff, volunteers, and many community partners. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the following Catholics for Housing partners for sustaining the vision established by Father Creedon and our dedicated community members. The 2017 Father Gerard Creedon Housing Award honorees are St. Mary of Sorrows Catholic Church and Ms. Alice G. Haase.

St. Mary of Sorrows Catholic Church and its parishioners are a Catholic community committed to nourishing through education and to proclaiming and promoting social justice. Through the St. Mary of Sorrows Catholic Church Tithing Fund Allocation, the church has generously provided grants to Catholics for Housing. For the last twelve years, St. Mary of Sorrows has provided funding to ensure the sustainment of the Virginia Ely Senior Rental Assistance Program and the Edie Street Security Deposit Assistance Program. Due to their continued support, the annual funding provided by St. Mary of Sorrows Catholic Church covers the expenses so that two seniors may live independently for a year and covers the security deposit for 10 rental homes.

Alice G. Haase, Esquire is the co-founder of CastroHaase PLLC, a commercial real estate law firm located in Washington, D.C. She dedicates much of her spare time to the betterment of the community. Alice has extended her services to Catholics for Housing to increase access to affordable housing throughout Northern Virginia and further the reach of programs in the community.

In recognition of the efficacy of the unique programs offered, Catholics for Housing has received numerous awards and honors. Catholics for Housing has been recognized by the U.S. Housing and Urban Development for "Best Practices" and received the Best New Project in Northern Virginia Award and an Arlington Community Award. In addition, the organization was named "One of the Best" by the Catalogue of Philanthropy in 2005-06 and again in 2011-12.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2017 Father Gerard Creedon Housing Award recipients and in commending the efforts of Catholics for Housing, Incorporated, its board, staff, and dedi-

cated volunteers who work tirelessly to provide needed support and assistance to many in our community.

HONORING THE KERN WATER BANK AUTHORITY FOR TWENTY YEARS OF SUCCESSFUL OPERATION

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and am joined by my colleagues from California, Congressman DAVID VALADAO and Congressman JIM COSTA, to recognize an essential resource in our community—the Kern Water Bank—and the incredibly positive impact that it has made upon California's Central Valley over the past twenty years.

This year, the Kern Water Bank celebrates twenty years since the signing of the 75 year Habitat Conservation Plan, which allowed the Water Bank to begin operating at its full capacity in the heart of California's San Joaquin Valley. Prior to this monumental agreement, the roughly 32-square mile stretch of land on which the Kern Water Bank operates today was used largely for farming while California experienced wide fluctuations in water supply. The creation of the Kern Water Bank Authority and eventually the Kern Water Bank exemplifies the innovative and determined spirit of the Kern community and the effectiveness with which this community has been able to assist in meeting California's water needs.

Prior to the creation of the Kern Water Bank Authority, the California Department of Water Resources sought to create a system that would serve as a response to the water shortages that often plagued California's agricultural community. The Department of Water Resources struggled for years to achieve anything tangible—facing various legal, institutional, and environmental setbacks that made the project seem nearly impossible. It was at this point that the Kern Water Bank Authority came to fruition, and through the hard work and cooperation of both public and private contributors, the Kern Water Bank was finally feasible. Now, after twenty years of successful operation, we recognize the degree to which the Kern Water Bank has impacted California's water situation, the greater San Joaquin environment and the Central Valley community that Congressman VALADAO, Congressman COSTA and I share.

The daily operations and functions of the Kern Water Bank greatly assisted in combating the drought that has plagued California, especially throughout the past five years. As Delta pumping was slowly reduced, the Kern Water Bank served a particularly important purpose as the prominent storage facility for the water that local farmers and agricultural communities needed even more desperately in light of the drought. Additionally, the Kern Water Bank has become a notable wildlife resource of regional significance. The environment created by the Kern Water Bank supports many special-status species in alignment with the Habitat Conservation Plan and EPA

standards, and creates a unique wetlands area that serves as a refuge for local wildlife. Very rarely do projects of this nature serve so many purposes all at once, and we believe that the Kern Water Bank serves as the ideal model for other similar projects.

The Kern Water Bank is the largest operation of its kind in California, and has even been described as the most effective ground-water storage program in the United States. It is with great pride that Congressman VALADAO, Congressman COSTA and I recognize the vast success of the Kern Water Bank Authority and the Kern Water Bank. We look forward to witnessing the continued efforts of the Bank in serving the water needs of the Central Valley.

TRIBUTE TO ELSIE NEGLEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Elsie Negley of Clarinda, Iowa on the occasion of her 106th birthday. Elsie was born on July 29, 1911 in Page County, Iowa.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Elsie's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Elsie has lived through nineteen United States Presidents and twenty-three Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Elsie in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 106th birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Elsie on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing her nothing but the best.

HONORING LARRY MISHEL

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, for more than 30 years, trickle-down economics has influenced our policies to redistribute economic power to the top.

My friend and outgoing Executive Director, Larry Mishel has long been at the forefront of developing progressive economic alternatives to counter the popularity and effectiveness of trickle-down theory. Thanks in large part to his research; we know trickle-down policies gave us slower growth and stagnant wages for working families.

Throughout his career—before, becoming President of the Economic Policy Institute—Larry focused on researching the wages of

working people and making the case for actions that would raise these wages. He realized how important power was in this equation, and so he argued for measures to improve the rights of working people to organize and bargain for higher wages.

Larry's work on the discrepancy between wages and productivity, and his analysis of skyrocketing CEO pay, were the first of their kind. Larry has expanded on and refined this research over the last 30 years. Larry's recent work focuses on workers' rights and how the erosion of unions has hurt working people—union and non-union alike.

Throughout his career, Larry Mishel has created a necessary counter balance to the "common knowledge" Wall Street approach to economic policy in the U.S. He did this through his own research, but also by building EPI up as a research organization willing to take on the conventional wisdom in either party.

We all know the immeasurable contribution Larry and EPI have made to successive campaigns to raise minimum wages at the federal and state levels. For years, EPI's Policy Center has provided the economic analysis of the Progressive Caucus budget. We know the budget adds up, would boost wages, and would, in time, lower the deficit. We know it would build better infrastructure and a better education system because EPI, under Larry's leadership, runs all the numbers for us, and alerts us if our plans threaten to come up short in any way. Larry's contribution is incredibly valuable as it provides a concrete framework for our fight to support working folks across the country.

After 30 years at EPI—15 as President—Larry is stepping aside at the end of 2017. He will continue to provide innovative research on the rights and wages of working people. And, he will remain at EPI as a senior researcher. Thea Lee, who is the incoming President, will have big shoes to fill. However, Thea is the perfect fit to build on Larry's legacy and EPI's work on behalf of low- and middle-income families.

I want to extend a heartfelt thanks to Larry for his years of service, and I look forward to seeing the incredible work he will do in the months and years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS 2017 CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Fairfax Federation of Citizens Associations on the occasion of its 67th Annual Citizen of the Year Awards Banquet. The Federation is a coalition of civic and homeowners associations who work together to promote and support initiatives that will benefit all. Each year, the Federation honors a few select individuals for their extraordinary contributions to our community. As a former two-term President of the Federation, I understand that those

who volunteer their time, energies, and talents to civic activities play a vital role in making Fairfax County one of the best places in the nation in which to live, work, and raise a family. I am honored to recognize the following individuals for their service to our community:

2017 Citizen of the Year: Joseph Chudzik: "A model citizen with a passion for serving his community." A more apt description could not be found. Joe's contributions to his community are many and varied, from Boy Scouts to the Mason Neck Lions Club to serving as a volunteer at polling stations on Election Day. Joe's passion for service also extends far beyond the borders of Fairfax County. He has served in the Peace Corps, as a Foreign Service Officer in the U.S. Department of State and in the U.S. Air Force. One would not think it was possible to find so many different ways to serve, but Joe has shown that it is. We should all strive to mirror his example.

Citation of Merit: Cheryl Ellsworth: Cheryl is receiving this citation for an issue that is close to my heart, namely affordable housing. During my time on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, I worked to address this important issue in conjunction with combatting homelessness. Cheryl has shown similar dedication to these causes through her work with Good Shepherd Housing and Family Services. Her work has received numerous accolades, including the Washington Post Award for Excellence in Nonprofit Management and the Fairfax County Nonprofit of the Year Award.

Citation of Merit: Emily McCoy: Emily is currently serving her 35th year on the Fairfax County Commission for Women and has spent her entire career fighting for the rights of women and girls. Emily has also been a leader in Fairfax County's efforts to combat the scourge of domestic violence and served as the representative for the Commission for Women to the County's Domestic Violence Prevention, Policy and Coordinating Council for five years.

Citation of Merit: Ken Balbuena: Ken has distinguished himself as a tireless and effective advocate for his community. As President of the North Springfield Civic Association, he has worked to revive County ordinances regarding the upkeep of lawns in neighborhoods, established traffic calming measures to combat speeding and successfully lobbied for the local crossing guard to receive traffic control training. In each of these instances, as well as many others, Ken has kept the community informed on his progress and successfully solicited their input to guide the process according to the will of the neighborhood. He is truly a testament to effective volunteer leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these incredible individuals and in congratulating them on being honored by the Fairfax County Federation of Citizens' Associations. Civic engagement is the foundation of a healthy community, and Fairfax County residents enjoy an exceptional quality of life due in part to the efforts of these individuals. The contributions and leadership of these honorees have been a great benefit to our community and truly merit our highest praise.

CONGRATULATING SHILOH BAPTIST CHURCH ON 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to recognize Shiloh Baptist Church on the occasion of their 100th Anniversary.

For the last century, Shiloh Baptist Church has been an integral part of the community in Waukegan, Illinois. This extraordinary anniversary is a moment of celebration for the entire Shiloh family, and I wish them well as they mark the occasion this weekend.

Shiloh is known for its work to put faith into action through community-based programs of outreach to neighbors. During the harsh, cold weather months, the church runs an emergency shelter for families and individuals experiencing homelessness through the PADS Lake County program. This critical service offers some of our neediest people the immediate shelter they need to stay safe and warm, as well as the more comprehensive resources needed to get out of homelessness and back into permanent housing. In addition, the church organizes a weekly soup kitchen and offers a food pantry available for those in need.

Shiloh also takes seriously the spiritual development of all its members, through Christian education and young adult ministry, as well as outreach to those who cannot attend services, including the sick, elderly, and those incarcerated at the Lake County Jail.

For the last 25 years, Shiloh has been ably led by Pastor Wallstone E. Francis, a dedicated minister to his congregation, scholar of the Scripture, and active leader in the community.

This 100th Anniversary is themed "Embracing Our Past. Enriching Our Present. Envisioning Our Future."

I congratulate the entire Shiloh family on this anniversary and look forward to working with them to enrich our neighborhoods and envision a better future for the communities we love.

TRIBUTE TO MARY AND KENNY SEALES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mary and Kenny Seales on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. The couple married on September 15, 1967 and resides in Thayer, Iowa.

Mary and Kenny's lifelong commitment to each other, their two children and six grandchildren truly embodies Iowa's values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mary and Kenny on their 50 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I did not vote due to other commitments. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 560, Yea on Roll Call No. 561, Yea on Roll Call No. 562, and Yea on Roll Call No. 563.

RECOGNIZING THE GRADUATION OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY FIRE AND RESCUE DEPARTMENT 141ST RECRUIT CLASS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department on the graduation of the 141st Recruit Class. As they prepare to join the ranks of the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department, I encourage the 42 graduates to reflect on the history of the department and the contributions and dedication of the brave men and women who have served before them to protect our community.

The Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department's Recruit School consists of an extensive and demanding 30-week program. In addition to two weeks of orientation, recruits completed eight weeks of EMT training and twenty weeks of fire suppression training. Upon graduation, these recruits will be certified at the level of Firefighter I/II by the Virginia Department of Fire Programs.

These recruits have the distinct honor of joining one of the best Fire and Rescue Departments in the United States. The efforts of the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department have been recognized across this country. Members from the Department serve on the elite VA Task Force I, which is among the first units called to disaster zones to provide search and rescue support. Members of that Task Force were recognized by the International Association of Fire Chiefs with the Benjamin Franklin Award for Valor as a result of their efforts in the aftermath of the devastating earthquakes that struck Nepal in 2015.

As the newest members of the Fire and Rescue Department, the 141st Recruit Class graduates join the department as integral parts of our community's emergency response and public safety team. I am confident that this graduating class will serve the residents of Fairfax County with honor and distinction.

It is my great honor to include in the RECORD the names of the 141st Recruit Class:

Allen E. Bizzell, Calvin W. Branch, Matthew N. Bui, Laura E. Calkins, James T. Campbell, Melissa M. Cary, Che-Shien Chu, Mari A. Christenson, Antonio J. Clavijo, Ashley N. Coleman, Elliott S. Ferrence, Christopher J. George, Jonathan D. Groves.

Adam T. Hall, Walter D. Hanson, Darrell D. Hayes, Quentin J. Hayes, Kyle D. Hihn, Jonathan Hughes, Garrett B. Irving, Robyn A. Kane, Michael T. Lattimer, Gregory S. Leake, Jaeman Lee, Linda Lee, Tyrone L. Lewis, John M. McCollom, Kendrix R. Merritt, Thomas M. Nevin.

John J. Nowadly, Myron J. Parker, Ryan D. Powell, Ian C. Richards, Raymond R. Saney, Joshua M. Schuchman, Sammone E. Smith, Tyler F. Thaler, Jessica Vukmanic, Zachary J. Walton, Lauren A. Wertz, Lauren A. Wickson, Jinson Wong.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the newest members of the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department. I thank them for their service to their community and to all members of the Fire and Rescue Department, past and present, I say: "Stay safe."

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. LILLY PIMENTEL

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Lilly Pimentel on receiving the 2017 Kings County Farm Bureau President's Award.

At the 99th Annual Meeting of the Kings County Farm Bureau, Ms. Pimentel will be recognized as an individual who has gone above and beyond for our local community and honored for her long-term commitment to the students and future leaders of California's agriculture industry.

Lilly Pimentel was born and raised in Hanford, California and grew up on her parent's, Joe and Esther Pimentel, dairy farm. She graduated from Hanford High School in 1992 and then attended the College of the Sequoias. In 1994, Lilly began studying at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, where she received her Bachelor's and Master's Degrees in Agriculture Education.

Between 1998 and 2001, Ms. Pimentel served as an Agriculture Teacher, educating students at Westmont High School, Gustine Unified School District, Riverdale Unified School District, and College of the Sequoias. In 2001, she accepted a position at her own Alma Mater, Hanford High School, where she continues to teach Ag Biology, Ag Science and Veterinary Science today.

Lilly's passion for teaching is known throughout the community and recognized by her students and peers alike. In 2009, Ms. Pimentel was named the Teacher of the Year by the Hanford Joint Union High School District and, in 2010, she received the Teacher of Excellence Award, from the California Agriculture Teacher Association.

Dedicated to strengthening the local agriculture industry, outside of work Lilly has

coached various FFA judging teams, volunteered at State and National FFA Conventions, serves as club leader and advisor for Kings River 4-H, and sits on the Kings County 4-H Council's Board of Directors. She is a member of California Women for Agriculture, serves on the Kings County June Dairy Month Committee, and is the secretary for the Foundation for Vocational Agriculture, the organization that raised the funds to build Hanford FFA's new farm and learning laboratory.

In addition to teaching diverse coursework aimed at ensuring Central Valley students are prepared for prosperous futures in agriculture, she has remained involved in her community, participating in Relay for Life, Kings County, Quilt Guild, and St. Brigid Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Ms. Lilly Pimentel on being honored with the 2017 Kings County Farm Bureau President's Award and thanking her for her service to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANNE SEELEY

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Anne Seeley for her commendable years of service to her community and her country.

Anne spent her college years encouraging debate on international issues and current events. She helped create and also led organizations that addressed preserving civil liberties and women's rights, among other important topics.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, Anne was recruited for a secret training program in cryptography sponsored by the U.S. Navy. As a senior in college, she attended these trainings at night after class, along with twenty other students. She graduated from Smith College in 1942 and answered the call to join the Navy. As part of the Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (WAVES) program, she was an invaluable asset working around the clock to decipher the principal Japanese naval codes.

After the war, Anne went on to receive her Master's degree from Columbia University. She dedicated her career to teaching history, English, and Latin. Not one to rest on her laurels, Anne and her husband would spend their free time tutoring students who did not have access to the educational opportunities that every child deserves. Their hard work paid off and the initiative became known as the Reading is Fundamental project in Newark, New Jersey, which continues to serve students to this day.

Anne remains an active member of her community on Cape Cod. She has served on several town committees and has never missed a town meeting or election. Anne continues to work tirelessly to encourage others to join the conversation, get involved, and vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Anne Seeley for her dedication to her community and country. I ask that my colleagues join me

in thanking her for her work and wishing her all the best as she continues her efforts.

JAMES T. DRUMM FOR 50 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to rise and recognize a pillar of the Hastings-On-Hudson community, James T. Drumm, who for 50 years has dedicated himself to public service and helping others as a integral part of the Hastings-On-Hudson Fire Department at the Riverview Manor Hose Company No. 3. I am honored to be able to offer this recognition to such a dedicated servant of the people.

James has done a tremendous amount for Hastings, but his service actually began in the United States Marine Corps, where he was active duty from 1955 to 1957. As a former member of the Armed Forces, it was only fitting that, upon his discharge, James would continue on a path of serving the public good. He went on to join the Hastings Fire Department, rising through the ranks to become Chief of Department from 1987–1989 and again from 1995–1997. He also served as Deputy Chief, Ambulance Corp Member, Fire Police Officer, and, today, remains active as Village Fire Inspector.

I am very fortunate and proud to represent such a distinguished public servant as James, and after a half-century of remarkable work in service to his country and local community, he too should feel tremendously proud. I want to thank James for all he has done on behalf of Hastings and our grateful nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF KONNI MCMURRY BEING NAMED THE MOORE COUNTY WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Konni McMurray for receiving the Moore County Woman of the Year Award.

This award is presented by the Moore County Community Foundation to an individual who has exhibited selflessness and a humble desire to serve their community. Mrs. McMurray earned this award by putting others before herself and for her decades of service to Moore County.

Originally from a suburb of Kansas City, Konni moved to Moore County in 1989 with her husband, Brian. Currently she is the Vice President of McMurray Fabrics in Aberdeen and Atex Technologies in Pinebluff. Mr. and Mrs. McMurray have provided hundreds of good-paying jobs to the community over the years, but despite her business success, Konni still finds time to support numerous local service organizations. She has served on the

Boards of The O'Neal School, the Boys and Girls Club of the Sandhills, and Sandhills Community College, just to name a few. Konni has also been a tireless advocate for the less fortunate animals in Moore County through her leadership with the Moore County Society of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA)—when she can't find a foster home for a pet in need, she's been known to foster the animals personally.

Konni and her husband, Brian, have four amazing children, and she's instilled the same servant's heart in all of them. I am extremely grateful to count Konni McMurray as a friend, and I know everyone in Moore County is even more grateful for her service and leadership to our community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring Konni McMurray for being named the Moore County Woman of the Year.

TRIBUTE TO SHARON AND HARRY SACKETT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Sharon and Harry Sackett on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. The couple married on October 12, 1957, and resides in Dexter, Iowa.

Sharon and Harry's lifelong commitment to each other, their two children, six grandchildren, twenty great-grandchildren, and two great-great-grandchildren, truly embodies Iowa's values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Sharon and Harry on their 60 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

HONORING WILLIAM F. HENDERSON III, PRESIDENT OF CWA LOCAL 1298 ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to join the many family, friends, and colleagues who have gathered to pay tribute to William F. Henderson III as he retires after forty-three years of dedicated service in the communications industry and, most recently, as the President of the Communications Workers of America Local 1298.

A frame man and then centralized power technician, over the course of his career, Bill worked for Southern New England Telephone, SBC Company and AT&T before moving to a

full-time position at the CWA Local 1298. Bill was active in labor issues from the beginning of his career and served as a steward for thirty years before his election as President. During his tenure, he has guided his members through the transition of company mergers and buyouts and he has fought to protect fair wages and access to quality health benefits, ensure safe workplaces, and preserve retirement security. He has long been a fierce advocate and tireless voice on behalf of his brothers and sisters in the CWA.

In addition to his professional career, Bill has volunteered countless hours to his community. In Waterford, he served for thirteen years as a member of the Representative Town Meeting where he was Chair of the Finance Committee, six years on the Board of Selectmen, eight years as Chairman of the Waterford Industrial Development Committee and served on the Library Board of Trustees and the shellfish commission. In East Lyme, he served two terms on the Board of Education as well as the Zoning Board of Appeals. His is an example of public service to which we should all strive.

I would be remiss if I did not thank Bill for his counsel and collaboration over the years. He has always been just a phone call away and I cherish the strong bond of friendship we have built. Today, as he marks his retirement, I hope he knows that the CWA Local 1298 will simply not be the same without him.

I am proud to stand today to extend my deepest thanks and sincere appreciation to William F. Henderson III for his many good works not professional and personal. I wish him, his wife, Brenda, as well as their children and grandchildren all the best for many more years of health and happiness as they begin this new chapter.

RECOGNIZING THE GREATER RESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ANNUAL EXCELLENCE AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winners of the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce Annual Chamber Excellence (ACE) Awards. These awards are presented by the Chamber to individuals and businesses whose extraordinary efforts make our community a better place.

I have been proud to represent this community since my days as Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. The level of civic engagement celebrated by these awards is a testament to the community spirit of Reston. I have often said that civic engagement is a key indicator of a healthy community and this event is further proof that Reston is one of the healthiest communities in all of Northern Virginia. That is due in no small part to the actions of those honored here today and I extend my congratulations to all of today's honorees. I also wish to thank Charles Kapur, Mark Ingrao and the entire staff of the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce for their tire-

less efforts on behalf of others and in making our community one of the best places in the country in which to live, work, raise a family and start a business.

It is my honor to include in the RECORD the following recipients of the 2017 ACE Awards:

Chamber Committee of the Year: Ambassadors Committee, Janel Giambone and Tom Madden

Small Business of the Year: Pinot's Palette-Dulles

Medium Business of the Year: Not Your Average Joe's

Large Business of the Year: Leidos

Member of the Year: Kevin Taylor, Communicate by Design

New Member of the Year: Jennifer Rhodes, Tagence

Volunteer of the Year: Dave and JoAnne Adams, The Dave and JoAnne Adams Group, Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage

Young Professional of the Year: Savannah Guernsey, Guernsey Inc.

Pinnacle Award: Angela Inzerillo, Impact Business Solutions, LLC

Presidential Award: Michael Delpierre, Conversion Pipeline

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the 2017 ACE Award honorees for their tremendous contributions. I thank the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce for continuing this wonderful tradition, and I express my sincere gratitude to these individuals, businesses, and organizations for lending their time and energy to the betterment of our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CHINESE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF SACRAMENTO'S GOLD MOUNTAIN CELEBRATION AND 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Chinese American Council of Sacramento (CACS) as they celebrate their 30th Anniversary and annual Gold Mountain Celebration. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the voice of the Chinese American Community.

Since 1987, The Chinese American Council of Sacramento has served as an invaluable organization dedicated to the empowerment, representation and support of the Chinese American Community and Asian Pacific Islander American community. Since its conception, CACS has successfully continued to bring awareness to the cultural and historic significance of Chinese Americans and Asian Pacific Islander Americans and their crucial contributions to American society. The Chinese American Council of Sacramento has championed a myriad of social justice issues that plague its community, from discrimination to voter education. Their work to protect and ensure the civil and human rights of the most vulnerable within their community speaks to their tireless dedication to the advancement of Asian-Pacific Islander Americans throughout

the greater Sacramento area. Congratulations on thirty years of exceptional service to our community.

We also celebrate Mr. Clarence Chu as the Hall of Fame inductee. Mr. Chu is being recognized for his enduring contributions to the Chinese American and Asian Pacific Islander American community. The Sacramento Chinese Community Service Center is being recognized with the community service award for the outstanding programs it provides. The community center provides health, human, and social services to immigrants, refugees, and other underserved individuals in Sacramento. Through these programs and their quality education services, The Sacramento Chinese Community Service Center successfully aids its community members in becoming economically self-sufficient and empowered.

Mr. Speaker, as members and friends of The Chinese American Council of Sacramento celebrate their Gold Mountain Celebration, I ask all my colleagues to join me in the celebration of their 30th anniversary and give recognition to all that this exemplary institution has given our community over the past three decades.

TRIBUTE TO ELEANOR AND JERRY STILES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Eleanor and Jerry Stiles on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. The couple were married on September 27, 1957, and make their home in Dexter, Iowa.

Eleanor and Jerry's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa's values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Eleanor and Jerry on their 60 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF EARL WRIGHT RECEIVING THE MOORE COUNTY MAN OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Earl Wright for receiving the Moore County Man of the Year Award in North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District.

This award is presented by the Moore County Community Foundation to an individual who has exhibited selflessness and a humble desire to serve their community. Mr. Wright

earned this award by starting Project Santa, which refurbishes bicycles to distribute to thousands of children on Christmas Day each year. Project Santa started out 22 years ago as a small side-project with only 17 bikes, and has now grown exponentially into a military-sized operation that will distribute some 1,600 bikes this Christmas. As you can see, much like the real Saint Nick, Mr. Wright works year-round to deliver joy to children each Christmas.

Mr. Wright has shown the recipients of these bikes—and the community at large—what it means to truly serve and give to those who need it most. My hope is people will see what Mr. Wright has done for his community and replicate his ambition to help their fellow man. I am extremely grateful for Mr. Wright's service to our community and I wish him continued success.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring Earl Wright for his service to our community and being named the Moore County Man of the Year.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH YEAR DIAMOND JUBILEE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PUERTO RICAN BAR ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Puerto Rican Bar Association of New York (PRBA) on the occasion of its 60th Year Diamond Jubilee Anniversary.

Founded in 1957, PRBA was created to connect lawyers and judges who shared common goals, ideas and concerns relating to the practice of law, the courts and the community. PRBA is credited with mentoring and helping generations of attorneys develop their careers while staying true to its core mission of empowering and giving back to the Puerto Rican and Latino communities.

Through the Puerto Rican Bar Association Scholarship Fund, the Association promotes opportunities for educational and professional advancement for underserved young professionals.

Throughout its rich 60-year history, PRBA has benefited from the leadership of some of the brightest and best Board members and Presidents. This year's PRBA President, Carmen Pacheco, is an inspiring example of what can be accomplished with support and vision. In 1992, Carmen and her business partner Betty Lugo, established Pacheco & Lugo, the first Hispanic women-owned law firm in New York.

PRBA's members have ascended to the highest levels of the legal community within private practice, non-profit and all levels of government including the U.S. Supreme Court by Justice Sonia Sotomayor.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting this year's extraordinary individuals and institutions: Ambassador Mari Carmen Aponte, Elisa D. Garcia, Chief Legal Officer, Macy's Inc., Robert L. Haig, Esq. Partner, Kelley, Drye & Warren LLP, the CUNY Board of Trustees and

the New York State Court of Appeals. I also would like to recognize the Mistress of Ceremonies, Jeanine Ramirez, Brooklyn's own NY1 News outstanding reporter and journalist.

A TRIBUTE TO RUTH ANGUS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ruth Angus, of Mount Ayr, Iowa for being selected as Ringgold County's 2017 inductee into the Iowa 4-H Hall of Fame.

Ruth served as a 4-H club leader for the Clover Belles from 1965–1983. During her time with 4-H, every meeting involved education and hands-on learning. Each member understood the importance of being part of 4-H and gained the necessary skills to move on and be integral parts of their communities. Her dedicated leadership to the club has continued to have a positive impact even years after her involvement.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Ruth embodies the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent her and Iowans like her, in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Ruth for receiving this award and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2017 DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the 2nd Annual Distinguished Service Awards. I applaud the Northern Virginia Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring these awards. Celebrating the achievements of our veterans is important because our veterans in Northern Virginia have sacrificed so much for our community and our nation. It is critical that we all take the steps to honor and uphold the sacred agreement between our society and our veterans. I am honored to recognize the following individuals for their service to our community:

Veteran Business Mentorship Award: Community Business Partnership: Community Business Partnership has been an incredible tool for veterans considering starting a small business and veteran business owners in Virginia. Their Veteran Business Outreach Centers demonstrate their dedication to our community by setting up veterans with training, counseling, and necessary resources for success. These centers also offer regular opportunities for veteran business owners to network and collaborate. The mentorship provided at these centers has been exceptional and critical to supporting those who have dedicated their lives to our country.

Meritorious Veteran Owned Business (Emerging): Semper K9: After six overseas deployments, founder Christopher Baitly has sought to provide trained service dogs to physically and emotionally support veterans and their families. His nonprofit gives veterans with physical impairments or PTSD dogs who can assist them. This service is so important because our veterans deserve all the support they can get when dealing with physical and emotional hardship after service.

Meritorious Veteran Owned Business (Established): Strategy and Management Services, Inc. (SAMS): SAMS is an exceptionally charitable and active organization in our Northern Virginia community that produces sustainable careers and annual community service programs. SAMS promotes social awareness and volunteerism through a variety of volunteer programs, which raise money, collect donations, and provide food services for Virginians who need it most. This organization is so important to our community for its support and for providing the opportunity for Virginians to volunteer and give back to the greater community.

Lifetime Achievement Award: Mr. Jerry D. Norris, Battlespace, Inc.: As president of Battlespace, Inc., Mr. Norris is responsible for negotiating, overseeing, managing and directing all aspects of corporate business. Prior to his career in the private sector, Mr. Norris served in the United States Navy for 28 years, retiring in 1992 as a Captain. After his retirement from the Navy, he focused his energies on improving the business landscape in Northern Virginia, serving as Chairman of both the Arlington Economic Development Commission and the Crystal City Business Improvement District. Mr. Norris also served as a member of the Arlington BRAC Transition Working Group, helping the community respond and reorient itself to the new realities of BRAC.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these incredible individuals and in congratulating them on their awards. Civic engagement is the foundation of a healthy community, and Fairfax County residents enjoy an exceptional quality of life due in part to the efforts of these individuals. The contributions and leadership of these honorees have been a great benefit to our community and truly merit our highest praise.

HONORING GEORGE GEVAS FOR 50 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor for me to recognize constituents who have given so selflessly to the communities I represent. When it comes to Hastings-On-Hudson, few individuals have been as selfless and dedicated to improving the public good as George Gevas, who this year will mark his 50th year of public service in the community.

George has certainly had a storied career in Hastings, first joining the Hastings Fire Department in June of 1967 and completing the Essentials of Firemanship within 2 years. After

20 years of service, he reached the rank of Captain in the department, and subsequent became both a Fire Inspector and Fire Police Officer.

Today, George serves as the Village Police Commissioner, solidifying his unparalleled legacy of public service to Hastings. Though that's not the only legacy he has left. Those in Hastings familiar with the annual Kid's Christmas Run hosted by the Uniontown Hose Company will know that George was in fact the very first man to ever portray Santa Claus at the event; just another example of his good-hearted nature and love for his friends and neighbors.

Few individuals have ever given as much to their community as George Gevas, and Hastings has been incredibly fortunate to have him. I want to congratulate George on a remarkable half-century of public service and thank him for all he has done to strengthen his neighborhood.

REMEMBERING CHARLES L. GRIBI

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Charles L. Gribi, who recently left this earth on September 15, 2017.

A Cincinnati native, Charles grew up in Riverside, and throughout his childhood held numerous jobs in an effort to support his family through the Great Depression.

His compassion for the safety and service of others does not stop there. After winning a scholarship to Xavier University in Cincinnati, Charles enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps at the start of World War II.

His medals from World War II include the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with 5 clusters, each cluster representing an air battle.

A revered Cincinnati native and WWII veteran are just two ways to describe Charles. He was also an adored father and grandfather, and he will be greatly missed.

Thank you, Charles, for your life full of dedication to your country, your community, and your family.

COMMENDING CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT LARRY W. MEADE

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a distinguished serviceman and member of the 55th Wing, CMSgt (ret) Larry W. Meade. Chief Master Sergeant Meade served our country with honor, dedicating the past 44 years of his life to the 55th Wing, as a loyal Airman and a contractor with L-3 Technologies.

During his time as an Airman, Chief Meade always exceeded expectations and established himself as an invaluable piece of the

55th Wing's history. He oversaw all mission system maintenance in the CENTCOM area of responsibility (AOR) throughout the early days of Operations DESERT STORM and DESERT SHIELD. Because of his work, the Rivet Joint cemented its role as key player in the development of the Air Force's Electronic Order of Battle, enabling air-strike planning and the elimination of countless high value enemy targets.

Armed with his wealth of experience, Chief Meade continued his service to our nation and our military as a contractor. During his 18 years with L-3 Technologies, he again proved to be a critical part of the 55th Wing's success. He oversaw the seamless upgrade of 10 minor and 11 major RC-135 mission system baseline updates, an amazing feat. Additionally, Chief Meade facilitated over 150 one time inspections, 200 contract field team visits, 450 maintenance bulletins and 600 engineering technical assistance requests.

Chief Meade has a long, proven, track record of accomplishment and devotion to the 55th Wing, of which I have been a member. Chief Meade leaves behind a legacy of mission success, and countless successful Airmen that he has been able to mentor during his career. I am more than honored to commend him on the floor today.

TRIBUTE TO MARIAN McQUAID

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Marian McQuaid, of Guthrie Center, Iowa for being selected as Iowan of the Day at the Iowa State Fair. Founded in 1997, the Iowan of the Day program allows the Blue Ribbon Foundation to recognize Iowa's most outstanding individuals.

Marian has been an active supporter of the Friends of the Library and founded the Guthrie County Arts Council. She spends time volunteering with groups such as Homestead Helpers and the Fall Arts Festival. She was also instrumental in the completion of the Main Street Iowa designation for Guthrie Center.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Marian embodies the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent her and Iowans like her, in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Marian for her achievements and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

REMEMBERING JAMES M. SCOTT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who dedicated his life to the community he served. Delegate James M. "Jim" Scott was a tireless advocate for all and

his life and deeds have left an indelible mark on the people of Fairfax County and the Commonwealth of Virginia. Sadly, Jim passed away on April 13, 2017. However, his legacy lives on through the numerous community initiatives he started and programs he helped create as well as in the hearts and minds of so many whose lives he touched.

Born in Galax, Va. in 1938, Jim came to Fairfax County as a teacher at Thomas A. Edison High School. Shortly afterwards, he began to work with local non-profits providing assistance with anti-poverty and fair housing initiatives. Jim's quest to help others eventually led him to the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, where he was elected Providence District Representative in 1971. He continued his work on the issues he had dealt with in the non-profit community, introducing resolutions on affordable housing and human and civil rights. A constant champion for quality-of-life issues in the County, Jim used his voice to advocate for the most vulnerable among us and ensured that their needs were not forgotten.

After serving 14 years on the Board of Supervisors, Jim was elected to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1991. His one-vote victory after a six-week recount earned him the nickname "Landslide Jim", but his effect on the House of Delegates was truly earth-shaking. In 1995, he was the lead sponsor of the bill that would become the "Motor Voter" law in Virginia. This bill dramatically expanded access to voter registration in Virginia, allowing individuals to register to vote at locations such as Department of Motor Vehicles, employment and other state offices, as well as by mail. The primary beneficiaries of this legislation were the traditionally under-served and under-represented whose causes Jim had made his life's work. Once again, he had improved the lives of countless individuals for the better. That this was done over the objections of Virginia's sitting Governor at the time gives credence to the tenacity with which Jim pursued his life's mission.

While some would have expected a life mission such as Jim's to be rooted in a political orthodoxy, they would have been surprised to learn the extent of his pragmatic side. He was a constant disciple of the saying "Do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good," a piece of wisdom that he shared with his colleagues on both the Board of Supervisors and in the House of Delegates on numerous occasions.

Mr. Speaker, Virginia has lost a quiet, gentle but forceful advocate for all who feel powerless. Jim Scott was a voice for civil rights, women's rights, and LGBT rights because he believed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States meant what they said. Unusual for a politician, Jim was self-effacing. A natural mentor, he promoted talent and sought to bestow credit on others. He advanced the careers of myriad public officials. His generosity of spirit benefited causes throughout our Virginia Commonwealth. Most of that generosity was unheralded. Jim was a loving and devoted husband to his beloved wife Nancy and a proud dad to two extraordinary and accomplished daughters, Casey and Mary. He was a devout Methodist, and passionate sports fan for North Carolina and the Washington Nationals. It will be difficult to re-imagine the NOVA community without his towering presence and wise guidance. His absence will be a void for those of us privileged to know him. His was a life well-lived, and he will be missed.

SENATE—Monday, October 23, 2017

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of our fathers and mothers, Your glory, majesty, and power sustain us. Lord, we ponder the graciousness of Your providence that lifts our hearts and gives us hope.

Keep our lawmakers true to You, obeying You faithfully and trusting Your wisdom. Lord, provide them with wisdom to cultivate such reverence for You that they will stand for right though the heavens fall. When darkness overtakes them, be for them a shining light. May they face their foes triumphantly, knowing that with You nothing is impossible. May they labor with such integrity that generations to come will celebrate their faithfulness.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 2266, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 2266, a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 1568, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1568), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 1570, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1571 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 1570), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 1572 (to amendment No. 1571), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, let me just speak for a few minutes on the emergency supplemental appropriations for disasters.

No one in this Chamber is immune from disaster. Six years ago, I remember, in Vermont, Marcelle and I watched as communities around Vermont felt the devastating impact of Tropical Storm Irene. That storm washed away entire communities in our State, tearing down homes, local landmarks, and bridges alike. I watched the devastation from a helicopter with the Governor and the head of our National Guard the day after the storm hit. I saw bridges washed away. The only way we could get into the towns was by helicopter because all of the roads were gone that led into them. I saw homes that had been on the north side of a river that were now upside down and destroyed on the south side of the river.

Do you know the one thing that occurred to me as I traveled around the State of Vermont? It is that I had heard from my fellow Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, saying that they would help us rebuild. I had heard the same thing from the President of the United States. They stood by Vermont's side to help us rebuild—again, Republicans and Democrats alike—because that is who we are as Americans. We lift each other up in times of disaster. We are one country.

Today, in California and across the West, families are returning to the charred ruins of their homes—those who were able to get out alive. In Florida and Texas, communities are trying to put their lives back together after Hurricanes Harvey and Irma—again, those who were able to get out alive. In Puerto Rico, hundreds of thousands are still without potable water, electricity, cell service, or adequate medical supplies following Hurricane Maria. The

Virgin Islands are also facing devastation that I can never remember. Millions of Americans all over the country, as well as the Americans in Puerto Rico and the Americans in the Virgin Islands, need us to work together to help lift them up, just as we have seen in past disasters. This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue; this is an American issue. This is who we are as a country. We hold together.

I have been privileged to serve here since the time of President Ford. In times of disaster, I have seen every single President, Republican and Democrat, work to help Americans and do it out of concern for Americans, not for themselves. That is why it is so disappointing that President Trump seems more concerned with claiming credit for a job well done than the actual situation on the ground deserves, particularly in Puerto Rico. President Trump has given himself a 10 out of 10 as though this were a game show for the administration's response to the devastating hurricane, but let's look at some numbers that really matter for the people who have lost everything.

It has been 48 days since Hurricane Irma made landfall in Puerto Rico and 34 days since Hurricane Maria tore through the island. These storms wreaked havoc on those who live there. They destroyed houses and killed at least 49 people. Yet, 48 days later, nearly 80 percent of the island is still without power, and 30 percent of the population is without clean drinking water—some having to resort to drinking contaminated water. Roads are impassable. Bridges are down. The few hospitals that are operating are operating on generators.

Frankly, the administration was slow to respond to the disaster. So to claim that it gets a 10 out of 10 for its response is to ignore the facts, especially the facts that the people who have been hit know so well. As I said before, this is not a reality TV show. It is not where the participant with the highest score advances to the next round. This is not fiction. These are people's lives—real people. They are people's homes. This is the hard part of governing. This is where we roll up our sleeves and dig in for the long haul. We stop patting ourselves on the back. Instead, we use that hand to give a hand to the people who are hurting.

Today we are going to advance a disaster package that contains \$36.5 billion in additional emergency relief. It includes \$18.7 billion for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA, Disaster Relief Fund, \$16 billion for the National Flood Insurance Program debt forgiveness, \$1.2 billion for

nutrition assistance, and \$576.5 million to address these devastating wildfires in the western part of the United States.

As vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same. If we do not act, the Disaster Relief Fund and the Flood Insurance Program will run out of resources in a matter of days. This money, if we pass it, will help FEMA, the Department of Defense, the Army Corps of Engineers, and other agencies to continue their work in all of the devastated communities and to start catching up with the work that needs to be done and to help families begin to rebuild their homes and their lives—those who did not die in the disaster. This is just the next step. This is a multistep process. This is the next step on the road to recovery.

Last week, I met with Governor Ricardo Rossello, of Puerto Rico, and his staff. I have been to Puerto Rico many times, in happier times, but here he detailed the unique challenges that face Puerto Rico. He was telling us what is happening to our fellow Americans. The electric grid was almost completely destroyed. Its infrastructure, itself, was demolished. Houses were flattened. At the same time, Puerto Rico faces a fiscal situation that will make it nearly impossible for it to provide the Federal match that is required for most disaster assistance programs. It faces a Medicaid funding crisis that may leave nearly 1 million people without healthcare in just a matter of months, assuming that we restore their healthcare.

This tells us that our response cannot be business as usual. We need to tailor disaster assistance to meet Puerto Rico's unique challenges. We may need to consider legislation to address its unique needs. Most importantly, we need to think long term. To simply replace and repair what was destroyed would be shortsighted. We have to help our fellow Americans who are in Puerto Rico to recover, to rebuild, and to be more resilient and better prepared. We should invest in the 3.4 million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico and invest in their infrastructure so that the next disaster is not a humanitarian issue and crisis.

Some like to say that the situation is unique in Puerto Rico. It is not. We have to acknowledge that historic-sized storms are now annual occurrences, and we have to respond accordingly. Even with the help from our own citizens and from the U.S. Government, we are just now fully rebuilding in Vermont, and we were not hit as badly as these other places were. Across the country—from wildfires in California to the flood damage in Florida, Texas, the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as what I said about Puerto Rico—we can invest in technology, and we can invest

in conservation and infrastructure. That would mitigate further damage.

Do you know what? It would also make these communities more resilient because we cannot speak about “once in 100 years” storms. Sometimes, as we have seen this year, they have been “once in 2 months” or “once in 3 weeks” storms. This requires a commitment from the U.S. Government. It is not measured by days or weeks or months but in years—a commitment that does not waver, a commitment that does not depend on whether you live in Texas or Florida or Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Today, I urge all Senators to support this emergency supplemental bill that will provide much needed assistance for disaster relief across the country, but it is still just the next step on the path to recovery. The Trump administration is committed to putting forward a third, more comprehensive disaster package in the coming weeks. As vice chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I intend to hold the administration to that commitment.

In conclusion, even in the years since Irene, this Vermonter still takes comfort in the number of Republican and Democratic Senators who called me during that storm and pledged support and, along with the pledge, came through with the support.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, last week, the Senate took an important step for the fiscal and economic future of our country with passage of the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The comprehensive, responsible budget we passed marks out a clear vision for the future. It will put the Federal Government on a path to balance, and it sets out a new course after the long years of the Obama economy, when paychecks stagnated, steady work became harder to find, and retirement for many slipped further away. The budget we passed isn't just about getting our fiscal house in order—though it is certainly about that—it is also about getting our economy going again and growing again.

Perhaps the most important way it does so is by authorizing legislative tools to advance tax reform, and passing tax reform is the most important thing we can do today to get our economy reaching for its true potential.

Tax reform is all about helping the middle class succeed. It is about making it easier to create jobs in America and keep them right here. To summarize the effort in one phrase, it is this: Tax reform is about taking more money out of Washington's pocket and putting more in yours—more for workers, more for small businesses, and more for the middle class. After all, as the President wrote over the weekend,

“we are not talking about the government's money—we are talking about your money, your hard work.”

If you look back a few months, many doubted our ability to get a budget done or to advance tax reform. They didn't see the path forward. Those skeptics underestimated our resolve. The Senate has delivered on the budget, and we will soon have the tools to deliver on tax reform.

We now look forward to our House colleagues' continued consideration and passage of the budget. Once they do so, we can move forward with tax reform for American families.

For Americans who have suffered through years of uncertainty—everything from a recession to outsourcing to unemployment—we are ready to deliver for you. For those who watched opportunity recede while the personal wealth of coastal elites grew beyond comprehension, help is on the way. We want to put more money in your pocket, we want to make retirement a reality for you, we want to get this economy moving the way it should, and tax reform is the key to helping us get there.

I would like once again to thank Chairman ENZI and the members of the Budget Committee for their important work to get this budget resolution passed.

I also would like to thank the cloakroom staff, the Parliamentarians, the clerks, the pages, and the officers of the U.S. Capitol Police who worked into the evening to make sure, as they always do, that the Senate runs smoothly.

Thanks also to Chairman HATCH and the members of the Finance Committee. We now look forward to their continued good work on development of the kind of tax relief that will get our economy truly moving again.

Mr. President, on another matter, the Senate remains committed to doing its part to support the ongoing hurricane relief efforts, and, to that end, today we will take a vote to advance the administration's most recent supplemental funding request. These resources will ensure that FEMA and the rest of the administration have the ability to continue their crucial support to help those impacted by devastating storms.

Like many colleagues, I have been engaged on this issue from the very start. Through several meetings with leaders from Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, I have had the opportunity to hear firsthand how the government can support their relief efforts. I met with Puerto Rico's Governor last week to get another update on the funding request and to hear about the continuing recovery.

In addition, I have continued working with the administration as it responds to these storms. For instance, after the devastation of Hurricane Harvey, I met with the Department of

Homeland Security's Acting Secretary to learn more about what would be needed. I also met with President Trump's eminently qualified nominee to lead that Department.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a supplemental funding request with strong bipartisan support, and now it is our turn to act. As we all know, the administration will continue to actively review hurricane relief and recovery needs. As it does, we can expect the transmittal of additional supplemental requests for our consideration in the near future.

The victims of these hurricanes continue to count on our support, and I look forward to the Senate continuing to do its part to help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I just want to address very briefly one other issue that surfaced last week.

Press reports indicate there are multiple nominees of President Trump awaiting Senate confirmation, but even though they haven't been confirmed—there has not been a vote maybe even in committee, I understand; certainly they have not been confirmed by the Senate. Yet they are engaged in the very duties of the positions for which they have been nominated. That includes nominees showing up to work, even though they are not yet confirmed. It means they attend White House meetings, even though they are not yet confirmed. They show up for photo ops, even though they are not confirmed. This includes officials with at least three different agencies.

If accurate, this is nothing but an end run around our constitutional system. It directly flouts the Senate's constitutional role to check and balance the enormous power wielded by the executive branch. It is our obligation to advise and ultimately consent, vote up or down, the appointment of high-level agency officials. Their decisions impact millions of Americans. I hope that all of us—both Democrats and Republicans—will speak up and defend the prerogatives of the Senate if the Trump administration continues to insist it is above the law.

I have been here a half dozen times when Democrats were in the majority and a half dozen times when Republicans were in the majority. We have always insisted that these kinds of nominees await a vote first. Back in my time during the Ford administration, the Carter administration, the Reagan administration, the Bush administration—the first Bush administration—the Clinton administration, the next Bush administration, the Obama administration, we actually followed the law and the Constitution. It was something that both Republican leaders and Democrat leaders insisted on, and I agreed with it. Although I

may have hated to wait sometimes, we insisted on it. So I raise that point.

It raises a real question. I am told that it may be a violation of the law. It certainly raises a question if they make decisions based on their responsibilities in a position that requires confirmation and they haven't been confirmed. We may be facing lawsuits—taxpayers paying to defend lawsuits—when all they have to do is wait a few days.

Republicans are in charge of the Senate. They can bring up these nominees. Bring them up and vote on them, but don't just pretend the Senate is not here. Let's not pretend the advice and consent part of the Constitution doesn't exist.

Let's actually obey the law and the Constitution. It can be refreshing to do things the way the law and the Constitution requires. In the long run, the country will be better off.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, first, on the issue of healthcare, since I last addressed this Chamber, the bipartisan agreement reached by Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY has amassed enough cosponsors to guarantee its passage. It now has 12 Republican cosponsors and 12 Democratic cosponsors. That is as bipartisan as it gets. I believe all 48 Members of my caucus will support the agreement, which means it has the necessary 60 votes. Even Leader MCCONNELL has made it clear that he will put the Alexander-Murray bill on the floor as soon as President Trump supports it.

Let me make a direct appeal to the President.

Mr. President, come out and support the Alexander-Murray bill. You called it "a very good solution" already. Announce that you will support it, and it will pass through the Senate soon after.

The President's only stated concern was that the Alexander-Murray bill "bails out insurance companies." I can assure the President that Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY took great pains to make sure the insurance companies would not get one extra penny from this deal. I have read the language. I have worked with them. It is good. It is strong. They have included provisions in the bill to prevent insurance companies from double dipping on

the cost-sharing program and ensure that the money goes precisely where it is intended: to keep premiums and other out-of-pocket costs down for low-income Americans.

If the President wants even greater assurances, we can work to move back the start of enrollment 1 month. He may be able to do that administratively, but if not, that is something both Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY wanted to do, which would ensure that there would be new applications, and the rates would be looked at as if cost sharing were happening, but the White House blocked it. If the White House and the President want to make it even stronger—I think it is strong enough already—then we can do that. From what I understand, the President might be able to do that administratively.

This idea that the President isn't supporting this because he doesn't want the insurance companies to make money on this—well, it is wrong. There is some other reason he doesn't want it done. Maybe he doesn't want a bipartisan bill. Maybe it is because he wasn't involved. Maybe it is because on issue after issue the hard-right Freedom Caucus people say don't do it, and he is afraid, because he is not showing much leadership when they stand up to him.

The only reason the President shouldn't support this bill is that he wants to continue intentionally hurting Americans. He has talked about that. He almost seems gleeful: ObamaCare will fail—even though he is trying to make it fail.

The President should know that premiums have shot up 30 percent in Pennsylvania because of the President's decision to end cost sharing. Premiums for silver plans will rise 20 to 25 percent if cost sharing is not restored. It is time for the President to stop the sabotage. He created the problem by for the first time not renewing cost-sharing payments. Now we have a solution that will renew them, but Democrats will have to give. Copper plans have never been our favorite. He should go along with the good compromise.

The President has told me repeatedly that he wants to work in a bipartisan way. He told me that he wants to work in a bipartisan way on healthcare. Well, on this one, I am from Missouri. Shows us. Show me.

It is time, Mr. President, to turn the page on healthcare and pass the Alexander-Murray bill. We have other pressing healthcare issues to grapple with. For the first time in history, again due to lack of leadership from that White House, the authorization for the Children's Health Insurance Program has expired. That must be reauthorized, too, and soon. Kids across America are depending on it.

President Trump, please stop the games. Stop the zigging and zagging.

You are for it one day and against it the next. Stop coming up with fake excuses. Declare your support for this bill so we can move forward in a bipartisan way to improve our Nation's healthcare.

THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Now, Mr. President, on taxes, last week the Republican majority jammed through one of the worst budgets in history. That is not hyperbole; this is one of the worst budgets in history. They should hang their heads in shame. It increases the deficit by \$1.5 trillion, slashes Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion, and sets up the same partisan process the Republicans used for healthcare.

Now it goes to the House for their approval, where many conservative House Republicans will have to rationalize voting for a bill that dramatically increases deficits. For many in the conservative wing of the House Republican caucus, the debt and deficit have been their No. 1 focus in Congress, their *raison d'être*. Many campaigned on the singular promise—made with almost religious fervor—to lower our Nation's debt and deficit. They rhapsodize fiscal responsibility. They hold themselves up as the guardian of preventing the debt from being passed on to our grandchildren. They evangelize constitutional amendments requiring a balanced budget. They were willing to risk default on our Nation's credit for a spurious talking point.

The budget resolution will be a true test of the principles the Freedom Caucus and the hard right in the House have espoused about the evils of deficits for the better part of the last decade, because those same Members of the Freedom Caucus must now vote to approve a budget that increases the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. The House bill didn't do that. The Senate bill clearly does. Yet, so far, we haven't heard a peep from the Freedom Caucus. The most scolding deficit hawks have morphed into deficit doves, eschewing principle for political expediency.

With respect to the deficit, any economist will tell you that a dollar less in revenue due to a tax cut is the same as a dollar less in spending. Yet the Freedom Caucus and deficit hawks only harp on the deficit when it is about spending cuts: Get rid of Medicare. Get rid of Medicaid. Slash them—programs every bit as popular and as important as any.

As Representative WALKER, a conservative of the House, lamented, “[The deficit] is a great talking point when you have an administration that's Democratic-led. It's a little different now that Republicans have both houses and the administration.” Really? So you are a deficit hawk only when it is politically expedient, Representative WALKER?

Well, the Freedom Caucus still has a chance to change the course of their

budget when we vote this week. When the Freedom Caucus came out against the Republican healthcare bill, the Republican majority was forced to make concessions to them. If they were real deficit hawks, honest deficit hawks, consistent deficit hawks, nonpolitical deficit hawks, they would do the same thing here.

Let's see how Representative WALKER and his fellow Members of the House Freedom Caucus vote on a GOP budget to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion.

Another point on the GOP tax plan. The Republicans are so wedded to their desire to give a massive tax break to big corporations and the superrich—which will blow up the deficit even in their fake math models—that they are searching for new ways to sock it to the middle class to make up the difference.

First, Republicans debated eliminating the mortgage deduction, then they included the provision to eliminate State and local deductibility, and recently there have been reports that some Republicans want to cap Americans' pretax contributions to their 401(k)s. That is one of the few provisions we have to encourage middle-class families to start saving for an early retirement. President Trump tweeted this morning that we are not going down that road. The fact that Republicans were even considering raiding American's retirement savings to pay for giant tax cuts for corporations shows just how backward their plan is.

The Tax Policy Center estimated that while the wealthiest 1 percent of America would reap 80 percent of the benefits under the GOP plan, it would also raise taxes on nearly a third of middle-class workers. That statistic reveals the rotten core at the center of this tax plan: The Republicans are so eager to give tax cuts to the rich, they are willing to explore many different ways of raising taxes on the middle class to pay for them. Each time, they bring up different methods—mortgage interest deductions, State and local deductibility, capping pretax 401(k)s—and then back off when they see the political and popular cost to each proposal. That shows you the dilemma they are in.

The fact is, there is no way the Republicans can avoid raising taxes on a good number of middle-class families if they are going to cling to such massive tax cuts for the rich and powerful and still make the numbers work, even with fake math.

Instead of capping middle-class deductions or pilfering retirement savings, how about Republicans drop their proposal to repeal the estate tax? Repealing the estate tax would cost the government hundreds of billions. Why are Republicans looking at middle-class deductions instead of merely scrapping the estate tax repeal, which

goes only to estates of over \$5 million—only to estates over \$5 million. The number who benefit is tiny. It is in the thousands. Their estates get huge, huge benefits. Get rid of that instead of hurting the middle class. The logic is confounding, and our Republican colleagues will not even talk about it.

This plan is so rotten at its core that it has our Republican colleagues turning themselves into pretzels and jumping through hoops, and they can't really say what they believe—trickle down works. The only rationale for this entire plan is that if you give tax breaks to the wealthy and the big corporations, there will be a lot of job growth. It didn't happen when George Bush's tax cuts occurred. It didn't happen when Kansas dramatically cut its taxes. The Koch brothers' center, Kansas—they did just what the Koch brothers wanted. It was a disaster. Growth was much less than the national average even though the taxes were slashed. Although they don't state it, it is contrary to what our Republican colleagues believe.

I respect the Republican Member who comes up and says: Trickle down works; that is why we are doing it. Tax cuts for the very wealthy is what would fuel the economy.

No one else believes it anymore. History disproves it. It is fake. It is a fig leaf so that they don't have to admit what they want to do—give huge tax cuts to the wealthiest of their contributors, the people who have sort of set up the sinew of this Republican Party with their think tanks and op-eds and so many other things, the Koch brothers network.

The American people should know that the money to pay for that giant tax cut for the rich is coming from somewhere, and it is likely to be coming from their pocketbooks.

STEEL AND ALUMINUM IMPORTS INVESTIGATIONS

Finally, one final topic: steel and aluminum. Recently and shockingly, Commerce Secretary Ross has said he is waiting for the Republican tax plan before completing critical investigations into how steel and aluminum imports are impacting the capacity of steel and aluminum U.S. producers to supply our defense needs. I am not sure why the Republican tax plan has anything to do with this national security investigation, which could finally lead to some relief from the predatory trade practices from China and other countries. The two are entirely unrelated.

Secretary Ross's comments smell like an excuse for further delays—and a bad one at that. I would like to see him explain his decision to the thousands of steelworkers whose jobs are on the line because their companies aren't competing on a level playing field because China repeatedly subsidizes, doesn't play by the rules, and cheats.

It is another classic example of the Trump administration promising one

thing and doing another. President Trump has promised many times to crack down on China, and still, 10 months into his administration, his Commerce Secretary is once again needlessly delaying a preliminary step in that effort.

I have known him for 30 years. He is a New Yorker like I am. Every time I see Secretary Ross, I say to him: When are we going to do something on China?

Oh, we are going to do something tough.

Each time, there is a different excuse. This should have happened in the first 2 months of the administration. It hasn't.

Because of the Republican inaction, because of the President's unfulfilled and rapidly becoming broken promise on being tough with China, Senate Democrats will be sending a letter to President Trump and Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross demanding that the administration keep its promise to crack down on China's unfair and predatory trade practices. We are asking that they continue these investigations and expeditiously complete them. These trade investigations have nothing to do with tax reform, and there is no need to delay them.

One more thing on China. Today I read that Tesla—our great car manufacturing company—will be relocating to China.

When you want to sell cars and many other advanced products in China, you have to do one of two things: set up a joint ownership company which lets them steal our intellectual property or face huge tariffs. That is based on the fact that the WTO was poorly negotiated and China was regarded as a developing country. That was the fault of President Bush and President Obama; neither did enough to stop China.

Based on his campaign rhetoric, one would think President Trump would be tougher as China steals our family jewels. It is no longer clothing and furniture; it is our best industries. They steal our intellectual property by these joint ventures. Sometimes they do it by cyber theft—a lot of times they do it by cyber theft—and it is hurting the good-paying jobs that might be available to our children and grandchildren. Based on campaign rhetoric, one would think President Trump would be tougher on China, but so far it has been a lot of talk and not very much action, and the delay in these investigations is another example.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 117, Scott Palk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Marco Rubio, James Lankford, Richard Burr, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 179, Trevor McFadden.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Trevor N. McFadden, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Trevor N. McFadden, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Lamar Alexander, Susan M. Collins, John Boozman, Chuck Grassley, Orrin G. Hatch, Steve Daines, Dean Heller, Bill Cassidy, Cory Gardner, Michael B. Enzi, Thom Tillis, John Thune, John Kennedy, John Cornyn, David Perdue, Joni Ernst, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017—Continued

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion on the House message to accompany H.R. 2266 be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, to accommodate the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent—I understand that he will object, and I will explain it afterward, but it involves what you see here in the aftermath of the hurricane, all of this citrus fruit on the ground—that it be in order to call up my amendment No. 1575—approximately \$3 billion for all of the agriculture for Florida and Texas, which Senator CORNYN, Senator RUBIO, and I have all been working on—to the motion to concur with an amendment to the House message on H.R. 2266 and that the amendment be agreed to with no intervening action or debate.

In order to accommodate the majority leader, I will explain it after he has returned to his meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would say to my good friend from Florida that I hope he knows that the Senate remains committed to doing its part to support the ongoing hurricane relief efforts. We all see this as a multistaged process in providing needed relief.

There will be additional rounds, and we are all fully committed to meeting the needs that have arisen as a result of these devastating hurricanes.

For the moment, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, in my explanation, I will go into it in detail.

It is my hope that the White House promise that this will be taken up in November, which is the next tranche of the hurricane money, the disaster assistance. It has been well past a month since Hurricane Irma hit Puerto Rico and 2 months since it hit Florida, and Floridians all across our State are working as hard as ever to recover.

One group of individuals who were hit especially hard by this storm is Florida's citrus growers. I will refer again to this photograph. You can see the citrus grove. You can see the branches on the citrus trees. Some of the trees have blown over, but in the meantime, you can see all of the fruit that is on the ground.

Toward southwest Florida, at least 75 percent of the crops are on the ground. In more central Florida, it is upward of 50 and 60 percent. Of all the times, this was going to be a bumper crop. Lord knows, with the greening disease—its nickname is "greening," but it is a bacteria—it will kill the tree in 5 years, and it has been declining the citrus production over the course of the last 10 years. We had suffered enough through all of that, and then here had come this hurricane. When it looked as if there was going to be a good crop to turn around the lessened production that had occurred over each of the last 10 years, this is what happened.

If that were not enough—all of the fruit on the ground—take a look at this. This is what has happened to citrus groves. Whole trees have been blown over. Whether you are talking about a grove that is totally demolished or a grove that has lost almost all of its crop, that is why the Florida citrus growers are in such a very difficult economic situation. Some of Florida's farmers lost nearly everything when Irma tore through the State. In fact, the statewide agricultural industry has lost more than \$2.5 billion. Included in that is \$760 million that Florida's citrus industry alone, just by itself, has lost, as you see in these photographs.

Earlier this month, the U.S. Department of Agriculture released its first crop estimates for the 2017–2018 citrus season. They estimated that Florida's citrus growers would harvest 54 million boxes of oranges this year, but that number doesn't yet fully account for all the damage caused by Hurricane Irma.

According to the folks on the ground, they believe the actual estimate is

going to be only 31 million boxes this season. Now compare 31 million boxes to a decade ago when Florida harvested over 203 million boxes. Ten years before that, Florida growers harvested 244 million boxes. Now they are estimating, after the storm, a yield of only 31 million boxes.

So the Florida citrus growers are really taking a hit. They have to have disaster assistance. The citrus industry is a vital part of Florida's economy, and that is why Senator RUBIO is here with us. We have been pushing so hard to get our citrus growers some help.

Just a couple of days after the storm, Senator RUBIO and I met with a group of growers in a citrus grove in Polk County in Central Florida, where the loss is about 50 or 60 percent, unlike South Florida, where the loss is 75 to 90 percent.

Unfortunately, the White House has been saying: No, we can't do it in this disaster assistance bill. As we have been working on a bipartisan amendment that would provide the growers with the help they need, the same amendment that the majority leader had to object to, President Trump has reportedly been making calls urging others in the Chamber to move forward with the overall package as is and to nix the money we need to help Florida's farmers.

Florida's citrus industry may have been one of the industry's hardest hit by the storm, but it certainly wasn't the only industry that was affected in Florida. Florida's fruit and vegetable farms lost more than \$180 million when their fields were flooded and their bushes were ripped straight out of the ground. Row crops, such as peanuts, cotton, sweet corn, potatoes, and sugarcane together experienced nearly \$450 million in losses from the hurricane-force winds and heavy rains.

Senator RUBIO went to Hastings to see the potato farms. He saw how they had been ripped to shreds. Florida's nurseries lost nearly \$625 million when their greenhouses were damaged by the winds. Florida's timber industry lost \$261 million. Florida's cattlemen, whose ranches, barns, fences, and equipment were severely damaged, lost a total of \$237 million in losses. Dairy farmers had to dump more than \$2 million worth of milk because they couldn't store it properly after they lost power.

Farmers are the lifeblood of this country and an important part of Florida's economy. Right now, they desperately need our help. In urging the Senate to move forward with this disaster package as it is, not amended, President Trump has told some of our colleagues that he would support adding this additional agriculture money in a later supplemental next month. To my colleagues who have farmers and ranchers in their own States, you know as well as we do that these families and

businesses can't wait any longer. They need our help, and they need it now. I ask you to consider how you would react if those farmers and ranchers suffered \$2.5 billion in losses from a single natural disaster, as our agriculture industry in Florida has.

So, to accommodate the majority leader, I already made the unanimous consent request, which the majority leader objected to. I want to further state that to fulfill the White House promise of including the disaster aid farmers desperately need, I have placed a hold on the President's nominee for Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Getting the additional money next month could be the difference between whether Florida's farmers can replant their crops next year or not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Thank you, Madam President.

I thank the senior Senator from Florida on this issue. I want to elaborate on it a little further. Any time we ask the taxpayers of this country to step in and help a private industry, it is important and incumbent on us to justify why. The amendment he just made that we have been working to get included in what is before the Senate obviously deals with agriculture at large, and he described some of the different industries in Florida that have been hurt in agriculture and some of the crops in Florida that were impacted by the storm.

The reason I want to focus my attention on citrus is not because we don't care about the other industries that were damaged, but citrus is in a unique and precarious place. I want to describe it to people who may not be as familiar with this as those who live in Florida and see it all the time.

First, I would say that one of the signature issues in the campaign and in politics today is the desire to make more and produce more in the United States; the idea that somehow, because of these changes in the global economy, we have lost significant industries to other countries, and we talk about that primarily in manufacturing, but we also talk about it in technology and things of this nature. I don't think we should leave agriculture out of that conversation. If we want there to be agriculture in the United States, then we have to deal with each of those crops and the unique challenges they face. We most certainly want to have agriculture in the United States.

A lot of people don't identify Florida as an agricultural State. It is better known for its tourism and being one of the largest places where people move to be in warm weather and not have State income tax, but Florida is a large agricultural State. I encourage people to look at the numbers. If you have

spent any significant time in Florida, it is not just something we put on our license plates and not something we call ourselves in our heritage, it is real now. Tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of jobs across the supply chain and entire communities are sustained by the presence of agriculture. In the case of citrus, the overwhelming majority of growers are actually families who have had these operations for sometimes two or three generations and are trying to stay afloat.

You look at this and ask: What is this industry doing wrong to be under these circumstances? Yes, they had a storm, but why can't they rebuild like everybody else? Two things. First, citrus in Florida was already facing an extraordinary challenge. It wasn't a better orange or better grapefruit that some other countries are doing than we are. It is a disease called citrus greening that didn't just blemish the fruit the way the canker did, but it killed the trees. You have a significant number of growers who are on the borderline of being out of business because unlike—and I am not diminishing other people's losses here, on the contrary—but unlike a manufacturing plant that gets wiped out by a storm, where you put the new machine in and in 6 months you are up and running, that is not the way it works with citrus.

The time between when you plant the new tree and produce fruit is 4 to 5 years, and you have to stay afloat in between. They are already facing that. So that already has them on the brink of catastrophe, and they have been working very hard to get around and design scientific solutions. They have made some advances, thanks to the work at the University of Florida, but they are not there yet. In the process, they have been hurting already.

You heard about the production figures and how low they have gotten, and here comes the storm. The first thing it does is knock all the fruit off the trees. When we flew over these groves, all we saw on the ground was fruit all over the place. As those familiar with agriculture know, once that fruit gets in the floodwater, it can't be sold, and you can't do much with it. The fruit continued to fall over the days to come.

On top of everything else they were facing, they lost this year's crops. A lot of these fields were flooded, so they were sitting in feet of water. That kills the trees, and they will continue to lose trees in the weeks to come.

Put yourself in the position of the grower who has to say: I have already lost everything for this year. I lost a bunch of trees that I will not have next year or the year after that. I was facing citrus greening. Do I really want to replant or has the time come to sell my land for some other use, development, or has the time come for me to go into another crop or has the time come to

declare bankruptcy? This is the life challenge of American agriculture families in the State of Florida.

Look, I hope very much that in November we are going to be here next month and we are going to pass a new bill and it will have this money in there and it will be fantastic, but we know how this place works, and I don't know why we wouldn't do it now. Do we truly want to keep American businesses in America? This is a great example of an opportunity to do it.

It is not an industry that benefits from anything extraordinary from the government. They are literally on the verge of going away unless we help them sooner rather than later. We have the entire Florida delegation in the House in favor of it, and they couldn't get it in the House bill. You have both Senators here for it. It can't be a part of this because if we change it, it goes back, and we lose time.

No one can tell you why it is not in there, no one can tell you why they are against it being in there, but it is not in there. Sometimes you start to wonder, and you guess why people look at this process and shake their heads.

Unfortunately, it looks like this has been foreclosed. Obviously, Senator NELSON moved forward and made that motion and it was objected to so it will not be a part of this package, but I hope we think about these men and women and families who own the groves. How do you explain it to them and what happens if it goes away? What happens if we lose this industry? It will not just hurt Florida, I think it hurts the country. I think it sets a precedent for other crops that might be threatened by floods in the future.

I hope this can be reversed, and I am hopeful we will deal with it in November, but if we don't, I just want everyone to understand what this means. This is not hyperbole. This industry is in a lot of trouble. I am not telling you that the amount of money we are asking for alone will save them, but without it, sooner rather than later, I feel we will lose not just Florida citrus, but I feel we will lose something as a key part of the State's heritage and a key crop for the country, and we will depend more than ever on foreign imports to feed our people with this problem.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike

Rounds, John Thune, Orrin G. Hatch, Deb Fischer, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, James M. Inhofe, Roger F. Wicker, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, an act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SUL-LIVAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 246 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Baldwin	Fischer	Murray
Bennet	Franken	Nelson
Blumenthal	Gardner	Peters
Blunt	Gillibrand	Portman
Booker	Grassley	Reed
Boozman	Harris	Roberts
Brown	Hassan	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Cantwell	Heinrich	Sanders
Capito	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cardin	Heller	Schumer
Carper	Hirono	Scott
Casey	Hoeven	Shaheen
Cassidy	Isakson	Tester
Cochran	Kaine	Thune
Collins	Kennedy	Tillis
Coons	King	Udall
Corker	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Cornyn	Leahy	Warner
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Warren
Cruz	Markey	Whitehouse
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Donnelly	McCaskill	Wyden
Duckworth	McConnell	Young
Durbin	Merkley	
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—16

Barrasso	Johnson	Sasse
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Strange
Enzi	Paul	Toomey
Flake	Perdue	
Inhofe	Risch	

NOT VOTING—5

Graham	Moran	Sullivan
Menendez	Stabenow	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 79, the nays 16.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer falls.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, as we speak, our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico, Texas, and Florida are recovering from a series of devastating hurricanes. Over 100 people have lost their lives because of these terrible storms, and many more are struggling to get by day to day.

The crisis is perhaps most acute in Puerto Rico, where 35 percent of the population still does not have access to safe drinking water and four out of five Puerto Ricans do not have power.

The people of Florida, Puerto Rico, and Texas have responded with great tenacity and admirable creativity to this disaster. I wish the same could be said of the politicians here in Washington, DC.

Once again, this body is poised to fail the American people. Instead of helping the victims of these disasters through responsible aid paired with lasting reform, Congress has rushed to its favorite so-called solution—billions of dollars in new spending with little accountability or meaningful oversight.

If this \$36.5 billion aid package passes, it will mean even more money and more power for government programs that in some cases left us vulnerable to these disasters in the first place. If it passes, the politicians and lobbyists will pat themselves on the back for doing a good deed and then move on to the next multibillion dollar spending opportunity. Meanwhile, the people of Florida, Puerto Rico, and Texas will be left to pick up the pieces and to deal with the disastrous consequences of this approach.

Puerto Rico, in particular, has to contend with the effects of a devastating storm and decades of malfeasance that has left Puerto Rico with \$74 billion of debt.

This crisis calls for emergency aid, yes. More than that, it calls for true lasting reform, the type of reform that is noticeably absent from this measure. That is why I am voting no on this shortsighted bill, because it is easy to caricature a vote against emergency aid as calloused or cruel, but it is hard to do the real work that is necessarily required by real, lasting, meaningful reform.

It is harder still to defend these packages when their contents are exposed fully to the light of day. If you were evaluating an emergency aid package, you might reasonably expect it to direct all of its spending to programs that actually help the people of Florida, of Puerto Rico, of Texas, but this proposal does not even come close to directing all of its money to broad-based recovery efforts.

Just under half of the \$36.5 billion in new spending would bail out the National Flood Insurance Program, or

NFIP. In the Houston area, just 17 percent of homeowners were enrolled in the NFIP. In Puerto Rico, the numbers are even more sparse. Just 5,600 Puerto Ricans are enrolled in NFIP, less than 1 percent of homeowners. That means 99 percent of Puerto Ricans will not get anything at all from the \$16 billion to NFIP. But then again, it is not clear that NFIP recipients get much from NFIP to begin with.

The National Flood Insurance Program represents the triumph of good intentions over sound public policy. Its generous subsidies were supposed to reduce the need for Federal aid after massive storms. Instead, NFIP encourages thousands of Americans to live in some of the most dangerous real estate in the country.

NFIP sells flood insurance at rates well below that of any reasonable private insurer. As a result, its policies do not accurately reflect the risk of living in manifestly flood-threatened, flood-endangered areas. These government policies encourage Americans to live in precisely those areas where their livelihoods—and, in fact, even their lives—can be swept away in an instant.

Economists refer to this perverse incentive as moral hazard, and, in more senses than one, that is just what the National Flood Insurance Program is—a hazard to Americans. It is distinctly immoral for the government to subsidize housing in the Nation's flood plains—deep within the flood plains—on the edges of its coast. Instead of building your house on a rock, the government wants you to build it on the sand.

NFIP pays out claims for properties that have been swept away not once, not twice, but many, many times before. Homes that have been flooded multiple times make up just 1 percent of NFIP policyholders, but they account for more than one-third of its claims. This has cost taxpayers more than \$12.1 billion in payouts according to the Congressional Research Service.

When Hurricane Harvey swept through Houston last month, it submerged a house that had been flooded 22 times since 1979. The house is valued at about \$600,000. The government has spent \$1.8 million to rehabilitate it.

No private insurance company would ever offer insurance on the terms that NFIP offers. Such a company would endanger its policyholders, and it would run out of money.

That is precisely what has happened under NFIP. The program is \$25 billion in debt and routinely blows through its statutory debt limits.

The emergency aid package Congress is considering today would cancel \$16 billion of NFIP's debt—no questions asked. Congress isn't making NFIP bring its actuarial practices in line with reality or into conformity with free-market forces. No, it isn't even appropriating new funds for another

failed program. That, at least, would be business as usual in Washington. Instead, Congress is effectively giving a debt amnesty to the National Flood Insurance Program. It is absolving NFIP of its sins and making American taxpayers do the penance.

So that is an example of what is in the bill. Let's consider a little bit of what is not in the bill.

If we want to be responsible leaders in a moment of crisis like this one, we need to provide long-term reforms in addition to any short-term assistance. We need to provide a full meal to those affected by these storms and not just a temporary, passing sugar rush.

But this bill does not include any reforms that would help Puerto Rico attain long-term stability or climb out from underneath its \$74 billion debt. It doesn't even attempt to reform the dysfunctional electrical utility program which, through a combination of neglect and profiteering, has left millions of Puerto Ricans in darkness. Without electricity, Puerto Rico can't power hospitals, clinics, food banks, or even sewage systems. And it doesn't repeal the Jones Act, the protectionist regulation that kept foreign-flagged relief ships out of Puerto Rican harbors for precious days after Hurricane Maria and for a long time has forced Puerto Rican consumers to pay significantly higher prices on just about everything they buy.

Simple reform measures such as reforming PREPA, the electric utility company I mentioned a moment ago, or repealing the Jones Act would provide very meaningful, lasting benefits to Puerto Ricans long after the public's attention has drifted and the relief money has dried up. But Congress, true to form, would rather double down on broken laws and broken programs rather than fix them, and Congress would rather take on more debt than spend according to what we have and prioritize in order to get there.

None of this \$36.5 billion in emergency spending is offset by spending reductions on other programs—none of it—not a single dollar. That is the sad irony of this bill. If the trend of deficit-fueled spending continues, one day soon we will wake up to the cries of our fellow Americans and we will have nothing to give them in support.

Again, this bill doesn't take care of those programs, and it is not as if there aren't solutions out there. One of my colleagues, Senator PAUL, has effectively been blocked from introducing an amendment that would call for offsets to this spending. Another one of my colleagues, Senator FLAKE, has tried to introduce an amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, that would bring about some of these other reforms I have described—reforms to the State-owned utility company, to the Jones Act, and reforms to the way that we spend money through the Federal Government in Puerto Rico.

I hope my colleagues will work with me on a more responsible, sustainable, meaningful way to help our brothers and sisters in areas affected by the recent hurricanes. Congress has the authority to lead, especially over Puerto Rico, where we have plenary power that exceeds the authority we have in other parts of the country within States. In this hour of crisis, especially with regard to Puerto Rico, we are the only ones who indisputably have this power, and we are the ones who must act if we are going to achieve meaningful reform.

If we can only offer money and a pat on the head, it will be our fault when the American people continue to suffer as a result of failed programs that haven't worked and call out to us through their failures for reform.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I urge the Senate to approve the disaster relief supplemental appropriations bill.

This bill will provide additional funding for response and recovery operations in areas devastated by recent hurricanes.

The storms this year have been severe in both strength and number. Communities in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands are struggling to recover.

Both the Disaster Relief Fund and the National Flood Insurance Program are depleted. They will soon run out of money for disaster response and to pay flood insurance claims.

The supplemental funding in this bill will ensure that first responders and Federal agencies have the necessary resources to continue their important work.

This bill also includes funding in response to the deadly wildfires that have ravaged western States. While these emergency funds are needed now, I will continue working with my colleagues to find a better way to fund wildfire suppression in the future.

This will not be the end of our efforts to respond to this year's disasters. The Appropriations Committee will continue to work with the administration and with the affected delegations to determine and provide for additional recovery needs. I am committed to doing what is necessary to get the job done.

Mr. LEE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be

in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BANGLADESH

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, in correspondence with officials of the Government of Bangladesh over a period of several years and in conversations with officials of our own State Department, I, like many others, have raised concerns about enforced disappearances, arbitrary arrests, unfair trials, extrajudicial executions, and other flagrant violations of the rule of law by the government of Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina Wajed and particularly by the Rapid Action Battalion, RAB.

Like the inquiries and appeals of others, my concerns have been responded to by Bangladeshi officials with blanket denials, obfuscation, and even falsehoods.

Despite such attempts to deflect responsibility, it is beyond a doubt that the rule of law is often violated by Bangladeshi law enforcement agencies. This conduct has become so ingrained that it is not an overstatement to describe Prime Minister Wajed's government as one that condones state-sponsored criminality.

Of course, the government would vociferously reject such a characterization, insisting that individuals who have disappeared were kidnapped by militants or joined extremist groups or simply claiming that their whereabouts are unknown to the government. The problem is that there is often credible eyewitness testimony to the contrary or those responsible for the abductions have identified themselves as members of one of the security forces, the RAB being the most notorious.

The State Department's latest Country Reports on Human Rights describes the situation in Bangladesh as follows: "Human rights groups and media reported that multiple disappearances and kidnappings continued, some committed by security services. The government made limited efforts to prevent or investigate such acts. The United Nations Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances contacted the government on March 9 concerning the "reportedly alarming rise of the number of cases of enforced disappearances in the country" and had 34 outstanding cases under review as of May 18, but the working group did not receive a response. Following alleged disappearances, security forces released some individuals without charge, arrested some, some were found dead, and others were never found."

The State Department also cited the practice of torture of detainees in Bangladesh: "Although the constitution

and law prohibit torture and other cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment, local and international human rights organizations and the media reported security forces, including RAB, intelligence services, and police, employed torture and physical and psychological abuse during arrests and interrogations. Security forces reportedly used torture to gather information from alleged militants although members of political opposition parties claimed that security forces also targeted activists within their parties. Security forces reportedly used threats, beatings, kneecappings, and electric shock, and law enforcement officers sometimes committed rapes and other sexual abuses. Two prominent human rights organizations stated that security forces tortured eight persons to death in the first nine months of the year."

The situation has not improved since the State Department published that report earlier this year. Just last week, seven senior representatives of an opposition political party were arrested in Dhaka. Their whereabouts, conditions of confinement, and the evidence against them remain a mystery.

This egregious situation has been cited by the European Parliament, the United Nations, Human Rights Watch, and other reputable human rights monitors; yet the government of Prime Minister Wajed rejects such admonishments out of hand as fabrications or an infringement of sovereignty. Not only do these practices violate the rule of law, they threaten democracy itself. Bangladesh does face a serious problem of violent extremism, which must be effectively addressed, but if peaceful expression and association that challenges government policies or that condemns corruption and police misconduct are equated with terrorism and responded to with threats, arbitrary arrests, and disappearances, extremism will increase, and democracy will suffer.

Other international organizations and governmental bodies have urged the Government of Bangladesh to respond to calls regarding dozens of cases of disappearances and to permanently dismantle the RAB and suspend other law enforcement agencies that have engaged in such crimes until credible investigations of such cases are conducted and those responsible are appropriately punished. I echo those calls and do not support further U.S. assistance for such agencies until the necessary steps are taken.

UGANDA

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I want to speak briefly about the situation in Uganda, which should concern all Senators.

Uganda, located on the Equator in East Africa, has been a friend and partner of the United States for many

years, particularly in the fight against HIV/AIDS. Twenty years ago, Uganda was the epicenter of AIDS in Africa. Thousands were dying, testing was nonexistent, condoms were outlawed, and the future was bleak. Since then, dramatic progress has been made in controlling the disease, although more remains to be done.

The United States has also joined in the fight against the Lord's Resistance Army, which ravaged northern Uganda for many years. I remember a time, not so long ago, when thousands of young children, called "night commuters" would walk each evening from their remote villages into towns where they were protected from being kidnapped by the LRA and forced into servitude as child soldiers.

Throughout that period and to this day, President Museveni has remained in power, for five consecutive terms, solidifying his control increasingly through repression, including the arrest, imprisonment, and even alleged assassination attempts of political opponents and social activists. In 2016, at his most recent inauguration after an election marred by fraud and intimidation, Sudan's President Bashir, indicted by the International Criminal Court, was an invited guest.

In 2012, President Museveni announced that he would "certainly not" seek to remain in office after age 75, consistent with article 102(b) of Uganda's Constitution; yet today, with the next Presidential election scheduled for 2021, an effort is underway in Uganda's Parliament, presumably with President Museveni's blessing, to amend the constitution to eliminate the age limit. If successful, Museveni could remain President for life, in the tradition of other African strongmen like Robert Mugabe.

There is no law against amending the constitution. Our own Constitution poses no such age limit on Presidents or Members of Congress, but doing so for the obvious purpose of perpetuating the increasingly autocratic rule of a serving President, who has used the security forces to silence his opposition and who has systematically undermined the possibility of a free election, is wrong.

Such an outcome would be a tragedy for democracy and the rule of law in Uganda, at a time when corruption, economic stagnation, and internal strife are propelling Uganda backwards. The United States and the international community have provided Uganda with billions of dollars in aid since 1986 when President Museveni first came to power. I supported that investment in Uganda's social, economic, and political stability, and President Museveni deserves credit for many positive developments in Uganda since the horrific years of his brutal predecessors, Idi Amin and Milton Obote; yet today much of that investment is at risk of being squandered.

Ultimately this is a decision for the representatives of the Ugandan people, but I hope the Ugandan Parliament recognizes what is at stake, not only for the people of Uganda and for the future of democracy and stability in that country, but for future support from the United States and the international community.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, unfortunately, I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, emergency supplemental appropriations. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted in favor of cloture.●

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 246, on the motion to invoke cloture on the House message to accompany H.R. 2266, the emergency supplemental. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.●

HONORING NEVADA'S WORLD WAR II FILIPINO VETERANS

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, today I wish to honor several Nevada heroes who are being recognized with a Congressional Gold Medal for their service in the Philippines during World War II: Sergeant Regalado Baldonado, Private Aurelio Dela Cruz, Corporal Benito Anton, Private First Class Leonardo Palao, and the many other Filipino and Filipino American veterans across our Nation. My appreciation for their service and sacrifice is immeasurable.

During World War II, more than 260,000 Filipino soldiers from the U.S. commonwealth of the Philippines answered President Roosevelt's call to fight under the American flag. These individuals fought bravely, some making the ultimate sacrifice in defense of democracy and freedom. More than half a century later, our Nation made a commitment to honoring them for their service.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I believe it is our solemn responsibility to recognize those who put their lives on the line. That is why I was proud to work with my colleague Senator HIRONO to pass into law the Filipino Veterans of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act, Public Law 114-265, to recognize the

dedication and heroism of these individuals.

Now the time has come to award this Congressional Gold Medal to Filipino World War II veterans on October 25, 2017, and I could not be more proud and humbled that Nevada is home to Filipino veterans who served and are most deserving of this medal. Today I would like to again recognize and honor Filipino veterans who are living in Nevada: Sergeant Regalado Baldonado, Private Aurelio Dela Cruz, Corporal Benito Anton, and Private First Class Leonardo Palao. To these heroes, your place in history will not be forgotten. There are also many other Filipino veterans from Nevada who have passed on, but our gratitude extends to their family members who will ensure their legacy lives on.

While the awarding of this Congressional Gold Medal is a proud moment for the Filipino community and America, many Filipino veterans have yet to receive recognition for their service. There is no doubt to me that Filipino soldiers served honorably in the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines, Recognized Guerilla Forces, and New Philippine Scouts alongside U.S. troops during World War II. However, some have still not been verified by the U.S. for their service because they don't have the documentation the U.S. requires. This is an injustice that I will continue fighting so that every Filipino veteran is afforded respect for and acknowledgement of their contributions to our country.

I am honored to acknowledge all Filipino and Filipino American veterans for their dedication to our country and am proud this Congressional Gold Medal will serve as a constant reminder of the importance of the Filipino and Filipino American community in our Nation's history.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT PHILIP J. IYOTTE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I wish to honor and pay tribute to the late Army SGT Philip J. Iyotte, a hero from South Dakota who, after 66 years, has returned home.

At a young age, Philip Iyotte, a member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, was given his Lakota name of Soldier Who Stands Alone. In 1948, Philip enlisted in the U.S. Army and was assigned to the Army's 21st Infantry Regiment of the 24th Infantry Division. Shortly after, he was deployed to the Korean conflict. On September 2, 1950, Sergeant Iyotte was seriously injured from fragments from an enemy missile. Nineteen days later, he bravely returned to the battlefield.

On February 9, 1951, 21-year-old Sergeant Iyotte was declared Missing in Action after being captured by Chinese forces during Operation Thunderbolt. When the war ended, several returning

prisoners of war reported that Sergeant Iyotte passed away around September 10, 1951, and was buried at the main prisoner of war camp in Korea. Sixty-six years after being captured and killed, his remains have finally been returned to his family in White River, SD.

For his bravery and service, Sergeant Iyotte was awarded the Purple Heart, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Prisoner of War Medal, the Korean Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Korean War Service Medal.

I consider it an honor to pay tribute to SGT Philip J. Iyotte. May his family and his Oyate find comfort in knowing that his remains have now been laid to rest and the legacy of his service and sacrifice to our Nation lives on.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO COMMANDER CHRISTIAN LEE

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize CDR Christian A. Lee for his induction into the Coast Guard Academy Athletic Hall of Fame on October 19, 2017.

The Hall of Fame Award recognizes outstanding Coast Guard Academy athletes who distinguish themselves in military or civilian life and seeks to honor those who have substantially contributed to the excellence of Academy athletic programs.

As a three-sport athlete at the Coast Guard Academy, Christian excelled in football, baseball, and track. On the football field, he was a starting wide receiver for 4 years and set a single-season record with 938 receiving yards. He ended his 4-year career with 149 receptions, 23 touchdowns, and continues to hold the Coast Guard Academy record for alltime receiving yards. As captain, he led the team to its first ever NCAA playoff appearance in 1996 and was selected as a first team All-Conference wide receiver and kick returner. He was also named an Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference and New England Football Writers first-team wide receiver.

In addition to his successful football career, Christian substantially contributed to the academy's baseball and track programs and was named the most outstanding senior athlete in 1997. That same year, he led the baseball team with 15 stolen bases, 24 runs scored, and had a batting average of .321, earning him second-team All-Conference honors. As a sprinter on the track team, he was part of a 4x100 record-setting relay team and went on to compete at the New England Championship and the Penn Relays.

Christian was a gifted athlete, and his induction into the Coast Guard

Academy Athletic Hall of Fame is well-deserved. I congratulate him on this honor, and I am grateful for his dedication and service to our Nation.●

REMEMBER MOTHER LULA MAE LOLLAR BELTON

• Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor the life of a great South Carolinian, Mother Lula Mae Lollar Belton, "Mom-mo," who departed this life on September 20, 2017.

Mother Belton was a spiritual, humble, and loving woman who loved the Lord and her community. She worked for the Colleton County Food Service for 31 years, as well as many positions within Buckhead UMC Church, where she was a faithful member. She most notably served as Mother of the Church. Mother Belton always had an open heart to her many children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, great-great-grandchildren, as well as many others in the community and church. She will be greatly missed by the family and community she leaves behind, and I would like to add her name to our October 23, 2017, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.●

REMEMBER DR. OSCAR PERRY BUTLER, JR.

• Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor the life of a great South Carolinian, Dr. Oscar P. Butler, Jr., who departed this life on October 2, 2017. Dr. Butler was a graduate of South Carolina State University and later went on to earn a doctor of philosophy in administration and higher education from Michigan State University. He then spent over 27 years in student personnel development, including as a dean at SCSU. He also served as executive director of 1890 Research and Extension for over 10 years. He has been recognized for Outstanding Service by the N.A.A.C.P., Meritorious Service and Commendations by the U.S. Navy, and given the Distinguished Alumnus Award by SCSU. Dr. Butler was a faithful member of Williams Chapel A.M.E. Church for over 57 years, where he was the recipient of the Unsung Hero Award 2015. Dr. Butler will surely be missed and remembered as a great South Carolinian, and I would like to add his name to our October 23, 2017, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.●

REMEMBERING BISHOP LEWIS NATHANIEL TAYLOR

• Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor the life of Bishop Lewis Nathaniel Taylor, a great South Carolinian, who departed this life on October 2, 2017. Bishop Lewis Taylor

deeply loved his family, church, and community. He pastored in San Diego, California, Washington, DC, and New York. He eventually returned to his native Walterboro, SC, where he continued the legacy of his father and became pastor of Greater Saint James Church. He encouraged, inspired, and mentored many people in the community and abroad. Bishop Taylor served not only as a pastor, but as a carpenter and general contractor as well. In short, Bishop Taylor was a builder-visionary who helped design and construct churches across South Carolina. In 2008 and 2017, the mayor of Walterboro presented Bishop Taylor with the Key to the City. He was known to many as "the little man, with a big vision" and served his community tirelessly and earned the respect and admiration of all people he came in contact with. He will be greatly missed by the Walterboro community and the people of South Carolina.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. AKIL E. ROSS, SR.

• Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I would like to recognize and congratulate Dr. Akil Ross, of Chapin High School, who has been chosen as the National Principal of the Year by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. His nomination is an honor for South Carolina. After graduating from School Without Walls Senior High School in Washington, DC, Akil E. Ross, Sr., studied political science and played football for Duke University. He graduated in 2002 with his B.A. in political science and minoring in history and education. In 2005, he obtained his M.Ed. in secondary educational administration from the University of South Carolina and joined Chapin High School as an assistant principal in July of 2005. After 5 years as an assistant principal, he was named principal in July of 2010. In July of 2012, he completed his doctorate degree in curriculum studies from the University of South Carolina.

Chapin High School has received many awards and recognitions under Dr. Ross, such as Palmetto's Finest, national rankings in academics, 12 State championships in athletics, and 3 State championships in marching band. In September, Dr. Ross was named the 2017 South Carolina Secondary Principal of the Year before being selected as the National Principal of the Year. Dr. Ross is an extraordinary leader who has truly succeeded in providing high-quality learning opportunities for his South Carolina students, whom are lucky to be under his care. Congratulations, Dr. Ross.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to

the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13413 OF OCTOBER 27, 2006, WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN, OR IN RELATION TO, THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO—PM 17

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the situation in, or in relation to, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond October 27, 2017.

The situation in, or in relation to, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which has been marked by widespread violence and atrocities that continue to threaten regional stability, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to the situation in, or in relation to, the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 23, 2017.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker removes the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. WALDEN, as a conferee and appoints the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, to fill the vacancy thereon to the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and that the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources is modified by striking the first reference to section 2863.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3189. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, seven (7) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Agriculture, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3190. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to realistic survivability testing of the Fleet Replenishment Oiler (T-AO 205); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3191. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3192. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, fifty-three (53) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3193. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3194. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3195. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of President, Government National Mortgage Association, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3196. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, five (5) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3197. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Housing and Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3198. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nevada; Recission of Visibility Protection Federal Implementation Plan for the Mohave Generating Station" (FRL No. 9969-85-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3199. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Redesignation of the Chicago and Granite City Areas to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9969-69-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3200. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; NC; Open Burning and Miscellaneous Revisions" (FRL No. 9969-77-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3201. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Open Burning and Miscellaneous Revisions" (FRL No. 9969-78-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3202. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9969-87-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3203. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjusted Applicable Dollar Amount for Fee Imposed by Sections 4375 and 4376" (Notice 2017-61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3204. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch,

Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment of Amounts Paid to Section 170(c) Organizations under Employer Leave-Based Donation Programs to Aid Victims of Hurricane and Tropical Storm Maria" (Notice 2017-62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3205. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "September 2017 Supplement to Rev. Proc. 2014-64, Implementation of Nonresident Alien Deposit Interest Regulations" (Rev. Proc. 2017-46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3206. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3207. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0171-2017-0175); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3208. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of the Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 "Joint Communiqué," and on the treatment of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 "Joint Statement," and the United States-Cuba January 2017 "Joint Statement"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3209. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, four (4) reports relative to vacancies in the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3210. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-141, "Unity Health Care, Inc. Certificate of Need Maximum Fee Establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3211. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-142, "Fort Dupont Ice Arena Programming Temporary Amendment Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3212. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-143, "Voter Rolls Protection Temporary Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3213. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Requesting Approval for a Change in Funding Method" (Rev. Proc. 2017-57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3214. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Automatic approval for certain funding method changes for single-employer defined benefit pension plans subject to the minimum funding requirements of section 430" (Rev. Proc. 2017-56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3215. A communication from the Executive Director, National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Museum's 2016 annual report and financial audit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3216. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Record Disclosure and Privacy" (RIN2120-AA64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-3217. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9143)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3218. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0561)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3219. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0623)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3220. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0809)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3221. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9301)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3222. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9185)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3223. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0511)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3224. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0334)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3225. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0639)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3226. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0494)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3227. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0555)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3228. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turboshift Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0452)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3229. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd and Co KG Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0140)) received

in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3230. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0767)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3231. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Siemens S.A.S. Smoke Detectors" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0099)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3232. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Technify Motors GmbH Reciprocating Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0241)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Report to accompany S. 1536, A bill to designate a human trafficking prevention coordinator and to expand the scope of activities authorized under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's outreach and education program to include human trafficking prevention activities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-177).

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 283

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 372

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Caro-

lina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 372, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to ensure that merchandise arriving through the mail shall be subject to review by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and to require the provision of advance electronic information on shipments of mail to U.S. Customs and Border Protection and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1016, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 1073

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1073, a bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance.

S. 1370

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1370, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 1421

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to support educational entities in fully implementing

title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1787

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1787, a bill to reauthorize the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1839

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1839, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the market access program and the foreign market development cooperator program.

S. 1893

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1893, a bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes.

S. 1942

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1942, a bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 1970

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1970, a bill to establish a public health plan.

S.J. RES. 47

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 47, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Arbitration Agreements".

S. RES. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 139, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 250

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 250, a resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy.

S. RES. 295

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 295, a resolution designating October 2017 as "National Employee Ownership Month".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1573. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1574. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2266, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1575. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2266, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1576. Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2266, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1573. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) OFFSET.—Of the unobligated balances made available to each covered executive department for fiscal year 2018, \$36,517,000,000 are rescinded, on a pro rata basis, in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) DISCRETION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT HEAD.—The head of each covered executive department shall determine from which accounts of the covered executive department and in what amounts the funds required to be rescinded under subsection (a) will be rescinded.

(c) COVERED EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.—In this section, the term "covered executive department" means—

(1) an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SA 1574. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, lines 5 through 10, strike "Provided further," and all that follows through "Secretary of the Treasury:".

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION C—PUERTO RICO ENERGY DELIVERY RELIABILITY AND REFORM

SEC. 2001. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE PRIVATIZATION OF THE PUERTO RICO ELECTRIC POWER AUTHORITY.

It is the sense of Congress that privatizing the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority would lead to lower energy costs for electricity customers in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 2002. EXCEPTIONS TO APPLICATION OF COASTWISE LAWS FOR PUERTO RICO.

Section 55101(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

"(1) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;".

SEC. 2003. TERMS AND AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN LOANS OR OTHER ASSISTANCE.

Nothing in this Act authorizes any loan or other assistance made available under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)—

(1) to include any terms that would impair any lien or collateral securing the claim of any creditor of—

(A) a territory or possession of the United States or a local government agency of a territory or possession of the United States; or

(B) an instrumentality of a territory or possession of the United States or a local government agency of a territory or possession of the United States; or

(2) to be made available for proceedings under title III of the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Security Act (48 U.S.C. 2161 et seq.).

SA 1575. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to author-

ize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title II of division A, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE", add at the end the following:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, \$3,000,000,000, for necessary expenses related to crop losses and other consequences of Hurricanes Irma, Harvey, and Maria: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, payment and income limitations shall not apply with respect to payments made to producers pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That with respect to payments made to producers of citrus, fruits and vegetables, or nursery crops, the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out this paragraph in a similar manner as under the Florida Hurricane Agriculture Disaster Assistance (Special Disaster Relief for Hurricanes Charley and Frances) program of the Farm Service Agency (as revised on September 30, 2004): *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)).

SA 1576. Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2266, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 308 and insert the following:

SEC. 308. Section 1309(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) is amended by striking "\$30,425,000,000" and inserting "\$46,425,000,000".

SAFER ACT OF 2017

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 231, S. 1766.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1766) to reauthorize the SAFER Act of 2013, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting Act of 2017" or the "SAFER Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. PEDIATRIC SEXUAL ASSAULT NURSE EXAMINERS.

Section 304(c)(2) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ", both adult and pediatric," after "role of forensic nurses"; and

(2) by striking "and elder abuse" and inserting "elder abuse, and, in particular, the need for pediatric sexual assault nurse examiners, including such nurse examiners working in the

multidisciplinary setting, in responding to abuse of both children and adolescents”.

SEC. 3. REDUCING THE RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

(a) *REAUTHORIZATION.*—Section 2(c)(4) of the *DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000* (34 U.S.C. 40701(c)(4)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

(b) *SUNSET.*—Section 1006 of the *SAFER Act of 2013* (34 U.S.C. 40701 note) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1766), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2017

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, October 24; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be

deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 2266; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that all time during morning business, recess, adjournment, and leader remarks count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:47 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 24, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

CHRISTOPHER CALDWELL, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON, DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY, VICE CHRISTOPHER A. MASINGILL.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KENNETH J. BRAITHWAITE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO SERVE AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE COAST GUARD RESERVE IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 53(B):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

REAR ADM. ANDREW S. MCKINLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JAMES M. KELLY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. THOMAS ALLAN
CAPT. LAURA M. DICKEY
CAPT. DOUGLAS M. FEARS
CAPT. JOHN W. MAUGER
CAPT. NATHAN A. MOORE
CAPT. BRIAN K. PENOVER
CAPT. MATTHEW W. SIBLEY

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on October 23, 2017 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

TOM MARINO, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY, VICE MICHAEL A. BOTTICELLI, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 23, 2017

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

October 23, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID KUSTOFF to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS IN UNIVERSITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Angie described Amherst College as her dream school. A vibrant American teenager, she couldn't wait to start her new life at the perfect college.

Like all universities, Amherst painted itself in a positive light. It had a good reputation. But Angie had no way of knowing the dark reality hiding behind that facade.

Her initial memories of her freshman year play along a familiar and happy college narrative. Her life was full of new friends, new experiences, and new challenges. But on May 25, everything changed. That happy narrative came to a screeching halt.

An acquaintance of hers invited her over to watch a movie in his campus dorm room. Tired from a long day of classes, Angie finally drifted off to sleep. The next thing she knew, she woke up to find this individual on top of her sexually assaulting her.

The morning after the attack, Angie felt that she was in a daze, and she

acted like she was in a daze. The illusion of college life filled with smiling faces and good times had been shattered.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Justice, one in five women are sexually assaulted during college in the United States—one in five. Of those, less than 25 percent report the sexual assault.

So Angie, fearing that she would be ignored, doubted, and dismissed, carried on in hopeless silence. In the 4 months following her rape, she fell deeper and deeper into depression.

Finally, when the burden became too heavy to bear, she summoned all her remaining strength and courage and went to the campus counselor. But she was shocked at the counselor's response.

The counseling center didn't believe she was sexually assaulted. The counseling center said that she should forgive the rapist. They told her there is nothing they could do or would do. There was no point in pressing charges; her rapist was close to graduating anyway.

But she could not forget what had happened to her. She couldn't deal with the sexual assault. Mr. Speaker, a rape victim cannot just forget what has happened to them.

Mr. Speaker, I was a judge for 22 years and a prosecutor for 8 in Texas. I saw a lot of sexual assault victims, a lot of them. They deal with what happened to them every day, and they feel like the rapist tried to steal the soul of the victim.

A rape victim once told me: "Judge, rape is a fate worse than death." And to a lot of victims, that is exactly the way they feel. It is worse than being murdered.

These sexual assault victims need support, understanding, and care to become survivors. They first need somebody who will listen to them.

Amherst utterly failed Angie, and that failure pushed her deeper and deeper into despair. When she voiced that she had been having suicidal thoughts, university police forcibly escorted her to the emergency room and left her there.

The doctor who examined her had no training on how to deal with traumatized rape victims. Utterly lacking in any kind of compassion for what had happened to her, the doctor told her that she was being irrational and that her story just didn't make any sense to the doctor. He didn't believe a school like Amherst would allow her to be

raped, and he thought she just must be crazy. He ordered that she be admitted into a psychiatric ward and washed his hands of the entire situation.

For 5 days, Mr. Speaker, Angie sat shaking in a sterile room behind locked doors. She becomes the prisoner for the sexual assault that happened to her.

A victim's pain and suffering should never be increased because the hospital doesn't have staff trained to provide victim services for sexual assault victims. So to ensure this doesn't happen to more victims like Angie, I have introduced legislation, along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), my good friend, that would require a hospital to provide access to a staffer who is properly trained to provide care sensitive to the trauma victim and is concerned about what they have experienced, or have a plan in place to get the victim to a nearby hospital that does. This is called a SAFE.

The law should be changed to require a hospital to have a SAFE or a SANE—that is a sexual assault forensic examiner or a sexual assault nurse examiner—on staff or have one at a nearby hospital.

This bill is named for Megan Rondini. Megan Rondini is another victim of sexual assault on campus. She was from Texas and went to the University of Alabama, and she was denied proper post-sexual assault treatment at a hospital. This will ensure victims get the care that they need. Megan couldn't deal with what happened to her, and she finally committed suicide.

Mr. Speaker, we need to, as a body, be concerned about sexual assault victims and provide this basic legislation so universities are trained or have somebody on staff nearby who can deal with sexual assault victims. That is the least we can do for people like Angie and Megan Rondini.

And that is just the way it is.

NATIONAL CO-OP MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Co-op Month and the many co-ops of the big First District of Kansas.

With a history spanning back to the 18th century, co-ops shaped the way American producers and consumers do business, and in doing so, these ventures have become an invaluable part of business in our own Nation.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

From a personal standpoint, I remember my first adventure to a co-op as a 6- or 7-year-old boy on a wheat farm in Kansas. My uncles would let me tag along, riding in our 1952 Chevy truck, and take that wheat to the Burns Co-op. When I was there, I got to taste my first Orange Crush pop. It was the biggest treat of the whole harvest for me, getting to go to that co-op and getting a little bottle of pop.

Over time, though, co-ops have grown far beyond agriculture. We now have co-ops across our district working in broadband, our electric and gas service, housing needs, and so much more.

Run by the people who run and use them, these co-ops, from Kansas to Kentucky, from Alabama to Arkansas to Alaska, are voluntary and self-directed organizations. The benefits are apparent.

Take, for example, MKC, one of the fastest growing co-ops in my State, which has donated more than \$500,000 to our local communities in the last 5 years. The benefits of user-based economic control are growing each year.

National Co-op Month brings to mind the hard work and dedication that goes into providing you and me with items and services that we take for granted every day.

Going forward, I urge my colleagues and fellow Members to continue to work and support our farmers and ranchers, our co-ops and their vital work for all America.

RECOGNITION OF IMPORTANCE OF TRADE TO KANSAS MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of trade to the Kansas manufacturing industry.

I recently had the opportunity to tour a number of local manufacturing companies as part of my Manufacturing Day tour in Kansas and was able to hear how these companies are working to meet both local and global demands for our products.

These companies in Hutchinson, Kansas; McPherson, Kansas; and Moundridge, Kansas, showed me how they partnered with local community colleges to recruit and train employees as well as innovate to improve their own processes. They repeatedly emphasized how important trade is to manufacturing in Kansas.

When it comes to trade, NAFTA remains of critical importance to the Kansas economy. Nearly 40 percent of the manufacturing exports produced in Kansas go to Canada and Mexico. Let me say that again: 40 percent of the goods manufactured in Kansas go to Canada and Mexico, at a value of nearly \$3 billion each year.

As we work through the process of updating and modernizing our free trade agreements, our goal must be to expand and open new markets for American exporters so we can grow our economies and put American-made

products at the forefront of the global marketplace.

RECOGNITION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF ELLY MCNELIS AND BOBBY HEENAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of two amazing Bucks Countians, Elly McNelis and Bobby Heenan.

The Bucks County Central Labor Council has awarded the Trish Coyle Award to Elly McNelis, a member of AFSCME Local 1598, and president of the Neshaminy Bucks Coalition of Labor Union Women. Elly serves as a Bucks County crossing guard and is committed to strengthening the role of women in unions and increasing the involvement of women in the legislative process.

The Bucks County Central Labor Council has also awarded Bobby Heenan with their Man of the Year Award. Bobby serves as the business manager for the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 542. Bobby and his team are committed to producing the most skilled and efficient heavy equipment operators in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize these distinguished individuals for their service to their fellow working families and to our entire Bucks County community.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as the son and brother of breast cancer survivors, I understand the impact of this disease on families throughout our community. Each year, about 200,000 women are diagnosed with breast cancer, and more than 40,000 American women will die of this disease.

It does not have to be this way, Mr. Speaker. This Breast Cancer Awareness Month, I am proud to be working with my colleague Congresswoman DELAURO in advocating for increased access to information about breast cancer that allows women and their doctors to make the best decisions possible.

The fight against cancer is one that transcends politics. By working together, we can pass commonsense legislation that increases the quality of life and care for patients and, ultimately, put an end to this awful disease.

PRESCRIPTION PAIN MEDICATION ABUSE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, nearly 70 percent of individuals who abuse prescription pain medication get them from their friends or family.

As our community continues to grapple with the devastating effects of the opioid epidemic, it is crucial we take every step possible to stop prescription

medications from falling into the wrong hands, including the collecting and safely disposing of unused or expired prescription drugs.

My community in Bucks County has collected over 40 tons of unused medications, the most in Pennsylvania, as part of our successful Prescription Drug Take Back program. This collaborative effort between local government, law enforcement, and community leaders is crucial in the battle against this crisis.

I commend those involved and urge all residents to participate in our next Take Back Day and to utilize the permanent drop boxes that are located throughout our region.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the Members return, we ask Your blessing on all those who are discerning significant options about remaining in the people's House or choosing to run for this office. May a spirit of freedom and public responsibility prevail among all the voices competing for ascendancy in the conversations and debates that ensue.

Bless all Members with wisdom in good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over, that the legacy of great legislators of our history might be carried on with integrity for the benefit of all.

May all that is done in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COMER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), the whole number of the House is 433.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 19, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 19, 2017, at 12:11 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2989.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 20, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 20, 2017, at 3:28 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H. Con. Res. 71.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HOUSTON ASTROS MAKE IT HAPPEN

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is the seventh game of the American League Championship Series. After being down three games to two, the Astros, who dedicated their season to the people of Houston, had tied the ALCS three to three against the powerful New York Yankees.

The winner goes to the World Series against the mighty Dodgers.

It is the top of the ninth inning in Houston. The Astros are up 4 to 0. The Astros take the field. Pitcher Lance McCullers is on the mound throwing curveballs. He strikes out Yankees shortstop Didi Gregorius. One out. McCullers attacks the plate with a dirt-diving curveball. Sanchez strikes out. Two down.

The fans are standing. They are screaming. Bases are empty. One out remains. McCullers throws another curveball to batter Greg Bird, and the Yankees, Mr. Speaker, have trouble with the curve. It is a fly ball, center field.

Springer catches the ball. Third out. The fans go wild. Astros win, Astros win, Astros win. The city of Houston starts singing and dancing in the streets. American League Champs.

And that is just the way it is.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION ECONOMIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week I traveled the district and heard from constituents who

are grateful for the historic progress being made by the Trump administration creating jobs.

President Donald Trump has led a strong pro-business team. The economy has added over 800,000 private sector jobs since January. Consumer confidence is at a 13-year high. The number of unemployment claims has plunged to the lowest level in over 40 years.

I appreciate the President can share the significance of the DOW soaring above 23,000 points, up nearly 5,000 points, or 27 percent, since election day, as you can see in his tweet on Wednesday.

The President's critics will never give him credit for American families. Columnist Clarence Page has described the "anti-Trump derangement syndrome" drives critics to irrational extremes.

But these critics can't dispute the facts. The fresh faces, fresh voices, and fresh ideas that President Donald Trump has brought to Washington is making a difference for American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

RECOGNIZING JANET JOHNSON AS EXTENSION EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Janet Johnson for being named Educator of the Year by the National Extension Association of Family and Consumer Sciences.

Janet Johnson has worked tirelessly for the citizens of Allen County as an agent for the University of Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service. She dedicates her time to extending UK's research knowledge to help Kentuckians build strong families.

Much of Johnson's work revolves around community and economic development. In fact, she helped secure nearly \$20 million in renovation and beautification funding for Allen County.

Johnson was an integral part of "Plate It Up Kentucky Proud," which encourages consumers to purchase and eat local produce. Regionally, she was extremely influential in connecting producers and consumers in south central Kentucky through the Farm to Table program. These accomplishments only scratch the surface of Johnson's contribution to outreach and engagement for communities and families in Kentucky.

Simply put, Janet Johnson is an outstanding professional in family and consumer sciences who has paved the way for many transformative programs in Kentucky. I am proud to recognize

her as Extension Educator of the Year and as a distinguished teacher and colleague.

CONGRATULATING MICHELLE BAUER ON WINNING FIRST PLACE IN THE PENNSYLVANIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE'S ANNUAL ESSAY CONTEST

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a St. Marys Area High School student for winning first place in the Pennsylvania Municipal League's annual essay contest.

Michelle Bauer, a senior at St. Marys Area High School, is the recipient of a \$2,000 scholarship for taking home the top prize at the Pennsylvania Municipal League's 118th annual summit, which took place earlier this month at Erie's Bayfront Convention Center.

This year's essay theme was: Civics and you.

Contest participants were asked to elaborate on this theme by writing about opportunities in their community that allows for civic engagement and encourage citizens to volunteer locally.

Mr. Speaker, I know that civic involvement is something that we can all agree is important to the quality of life in all of our communities.

The mission of the Pennsylvania Municipal League is to strengthen, empower, and advocate for effective local government. It is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that was established in 1900 to advocate for Pennsylvania's third class cities.

I congratulate Michelle Bauer on her first place finish and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

VOTERS BELIEVE MEDIA FABRICATES NEWS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent Morning Consult poll found that nearly half of all voters—46 percent—“believe the media fabricates news stories about President Donald Trump and his administration.”

It is not surprising that the American people feel this way. Each day they wake up to another barrage of negative reporting about a President they elected.

In fact, a recent Harvard University study found that news coverage of President Trump's first 100 days was 80 percent negative, a record high for any recent President.

The news media used anonymous sources to report illegitimate claims

that intentionally placed the President and his administration in a bad light. This is borderline malicious.

The liberal media frequently rushed to print stories with one single biased source. Often, the stories turn out to be false. This is the current state of journalism by the liberal media.

The media should report on the topics of the day in a fair and balanced manner; otherwise, the American people will continue to consider the media's coverage to be fabricated news.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-72)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the situation in, or in relation to, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond October 27, 2017.

The situation in, or in relation to, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which has been marked by widespread violence and atrocities that continue to threaten regional stability, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to the situation in, or in relation to, the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 23, 2017.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BACON) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

DHS ACCOUNTABILITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4038) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reassert article I authorities over the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4038

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “DHS Accountability Enhancement Act”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 872 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 452) is repealed and the item relating to such section in the table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is struck.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended—

(1) in section 506 (6 U.S.C. 316)—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively;

(2) in section 702(b) (6 U.S.C. 342(b)), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) REORGANIZATION.—The Secretary may allocate or reallocate the functions of the Office, or discontinue the Office.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3) of section 2006(b) (6 U.S.C. 607(b)), by striking “sections 506(c)(2)” and inserting “sections 506(b)(2)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the bipartisan DHS Accountability Enhancement Act.

Mr. Speaker, the current threats confronting our homeland continue to evolve each and every day. They come from international terrorists, drug smugglers, human traffickers, hackers engaged in cyber warfare, transnational gangs like MS-13, and natural disasters.

To best address these threats, the American people need a Department of Homeland Security that is effective and accountable to the people it protects.

The Founding Fathers gave Congress the authority to write laws and give direction to the executive branch under Article I of our Constitution. Today, we have an important opportunity to reassert that constitutional authority.

The legislation before us eliminates an outdated provision that gives DHS overly broad authority to act on its own and reorganize without congressional approval. It is authority that was well-intentioned when it was first provided right after 9/11, but the time has come to rebalance this legislative equation.

Mr. Speaker, as you may be aware, it is the only authority of its kind in the entire executive branch. As Members of Congress, we have a solemn obligation to help protect the American people from anyone who wishes to bring us harm.

In the wake of 9/11, we reached across the aisle and worked together to create the Department of Homeland Security and demonstrated that the security of our homeland is not a partisan issue.

This is not just an academic exercise. On October 6 of this year, DHS used this authority for the first time in many years. We also want to work with DHS to support them, but continued use of this authority is not the best way to make the Department stronger.

I am proud to say that the Committee on Homeland Security, which I chair, has a strong bipartisan track record. This year we came together as Republicans and Democrats and passed the first-ever comprehensive reauthorization of DHS through the House with an overwhelming majority support.

Let's continue that progress today and pass this legislation. I also call on the Senate to pass our reauthorization of DHS as soon as possible so our country can be more secure.

I would like to thank Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON, Congressman VELA, and all of the staff on the committee for their hard work on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4038, the DHS Accountability Enhancement Act. H.R. 4038, or the DHS Accountability Enhancement Act, strikes section 872 of the Homeland Security Act. Section 872 grants the Secretary of Homeland Security unilateral authority to reorganize the Department as long as the Secretary notifies Congress 60 days in advance.

H.R. 4038, this bill, rescinds this unilateral authority. As authorizers of the Department of Homeland Security, the Committee on Homeland Security is ultimately responsible for reorganization of the Department. H.R. 4038 reinforces this responsibility.

The separation of powers doctrine compels the elimination of the provision, which gives the Department of Homeland Security unilateral decision-making authority to reorganize the Department.

Moreover, it should be noted that this bill is not without precedent.

While considering H.R. 2825, the Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017, in June, the Committee on Homeland Security unanimously approved eliminating the language found in section 872 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

I believe that this legislation not only ensures this committee's involvement in reorganizations at DHS, but affirms the responsibility of Congress as authorizers.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of this bipartisan legislation. H.R. 4038 is necessary, commonsense legislation. An action as significant as the reorganization of an entire department and its components should be subject to the appropriate vetting and approval measures of this Congress.

I thank Chairman McCAUL for working with Ranking Member THOMPSON on this issue both during the consideration of the DHS Authorization Act and now on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 4038, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4038.

I will say that this committee has passed over 50 bills out of the House that are currently sitting in the Senate waiting action. I urge the Senate to take action on this important legislation, all 50-plus bills, that will help better protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4038, the Department of Homeland Security Accountability Enhancement Act. This legislation works to ensure stability in our nation's Department of Homeland Security (DHS) by requiring the Secretary to submit organizational changes for congressional approval.

Our government is built upon a balance of power; arrangement has helped sustain our country for hundreds of years and is one of the most fundamental properties of our nation. H.R. 4038 ensures oversight of the DHS to guarantee that an appropriate balance of power is maintained. The DHS, the third largest department in the federal government, has already absorbed the Immigration and Naturalization Service and reorganized three new agencies since its creation in 2002. If the Secretary of DHS has the power to make extensive changes, he/she should be held accountable for them and should be required to obtain approval from Congress.

Furthermore, the current administration has been defined by unprecedented instability in the White House, with an extremely large turnover rate in President Trump's cabinet and administration. The DHS currently has no Secretary and is being run by an acting head who did not obtain congressional approval through the nomination process. This legislation would prevent a Secretary that was not confirmed by the Senate from making changes without approval from the American people.

I support H.R. 4038 and I support demanding accountability from the cabinet departments. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4038.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUBAN AIRPORT SECURITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3328) to require a study regarding security measures and equipment at Cuba's airports, require the standardization of Federal Air Marshal Service agreements, require efforts to raise international aviation security standards, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3328

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cuban Airport Security Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FLIGHTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Comptroller General of the United States on the following aspects of security measures at each of Cuba's ten international airports:

(1) Details about the type of equipment used at screening checkpoints and an analysis of such equipment's capabilities and weaknesses.

(2) Information about each such airport's canine program, if used.

(3) The frequency of training for screening and security personnel.

(4) Access controls in place to ensure only credentialed personnel have access to the secure and sterile areas of such airports.

(5) An assessment of the ability of known or suspected terrorists to use Cuba as a gateway to entering the United States.

(6) Security of such airports' perimeters.

(7) A mitigation assessment regarding Man Portable Air Defense Systems.

(8) The vetting practices and procedures for airport employees.

(9) Any other information determined relevant to the security practices, procedures, and equipment in place at such airports.

(b) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—

(1) DISCLOSURE REQUIRED.—No United States air carrier that has entered into a covered agreement may employ a Cuban national pursuant to 31 CFR 515.573 after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act unless the air carrier has publicly disclosed the full text of the covered agreement.

(2) HIRING AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, to the extent practicable, Cuban nationals referred to in paragraph (1) shall not have been recruited, hired, or trained by entities that are owned, operated, or controlled, in whole or in part, by Cuba's Council of State, Council of Ministers, Communist Party, Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or Ministry of the Interior.

(3) COVERED AGREEMENT.—In this subsection, the term "covered agreement" means a formal agreement between a United States air carrier with passenger air service between any location in Cuba and any location in the United States and the Empresa Cubana de Aeropuertos y Servicios Aeronauticos or any other entity associated with the Government of Cuba.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE AGREEMENTS.

(a) STANDARDIZATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall develop a standard working document to serve as the basis for all negotiations and agreements that begin after such date between the United States and foreign governments or partners regarding Federal Air Marshal coverage of flights to and from the United States.

(b) WRITTEN AGREEMENTS.—All agreements between the United States and foreign governments or partners regarding the presence of Federal Air Marshals on flights to and from the United States pursuant to subsection (a) shall be written and signed by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary's designee.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate any agreement entered into under this section within 30 days of such agreement being signed.

SEC. 4. INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Ambassador or the Chargé d'Affaires to the United States Mission to the International Civil Aviation Organiza-

tion shall pursue improvements to airport security, including if practicable, introducing a resolution to raise minimum standards for airport security.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Ambassador or the Chargé d'Affaires to the United States Mission to the International Civil Aviation Organization shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the implementation of subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that will address the critical need to enhance security at airports in Cuba and across the globe.

Last week, I had the privilege to lead a congressional delegation overseas to see firsthand investments our foreign partners in Europe and the Middle East have made to enhance aviation security. We face an unprecedented threat landscape, and they are clearly responding to it.

In order to keep Americans safe, we must advance collaborative counterterrorism efforts with our allies and take a more stringent and risk-based approach with countries that are more hostile to the United States.

In leading this delegation to examine aviation security at international airports, I had the opportunity to meet with many members of our Foreign Service and military, who all work tirelessly on behalf of all of us to advance America's interests abroad.

Unfortunately, it has recently come to light that more than 20 of our American diplomats who were working at the United States Embassy in Havana were the victims of a sonic attack. As a result, many of these members of our Foreign Service have been diagnosed with serious injuries and dangerous symptoms, and, in some cases, even permanent brain damage.

Reports indicate that these attacks started as early as May of 2016, exactly one year after the previous administration removed Cuba's designation as a

state sponsor of terrorism. Our government told our diplomats Cuba was safe. The reality was quite the opposite, and, because of that mistake, some of our diplomats will pay a permanent price.

These horrific attacks on members of our dedicated Foreign Service raise numerous questions about how much trust and, indeed, how much confidence we can have in the Cuban Government.

We have to ask ourselves: If Cuba is unable to ensure the safety and security of foreign diplomats working in the embassies there, how can it possibly prevent terrorists and other nefarious actors from accessing its airports and infiltrating flights bound for the United States?

I recall last year when the Obama administration entered into opening up flights to Cuba, they ceded so much of the authority to the Cuban Government, the communist Cuban Government, over who they are going to hire, who is going to work with the American agencies, and who is going to be in charge of security; and we have very little control and, indeed, very little oversight over anything to do with those airports, yet American citizens are going to be going there and possibly facing danger. That is a real concern.

The legislation we are considering today requires that Cuba's airports be subjected to additional security to ensure that inbound flights to the United States are secure.

I am not here today to relitigate the wider policy towards Cuba or the Cuban Government, but I am here to ensure that Cuba and the rest of the global aviation community are held to security standards that are sufficient in these modern times to respond to the evolving and sometimes grave threats that the aviation sector faces on a regular basis.

The International Civil Aviation Organization standards, which currently serve as the benchmark minimum requirements for all airports with flights to the United States, are simply too weak; and I would submit that they are becoming outdated, given the fact that terrorism aspects nationwide and, indeed, worldwide routinely are adapting, and these standards are not.

This legislation we are considering today requires the Trump administration to take steps to raise minimum standards which will elevate American aviation security around the globe.

No matter how strong our domestic airport and aircraft security is, we must continue to raise the standard of global aviation security for foreign countries and last-point-of-departure airports. It is imperative that aviation security standards are robust and that these standards are commonplace in foreign countries, especially those with flights to the United States.

It is also imperative that these countries meet these standards; not just say

they are going to meet these standards, but that they are, in fact, meeting the standards, something we found out recently is not always the case.

Confidence in aviation security at home begins with the assurance that our global partners are enforcing security standards abroad. By passing this bill today, we can demonstrate to the global community that the United States sees international aviation security as critical, because raising the aviation security standard abroad will obviously and ultimately keep us safe at home.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Chairman SIREs for joining me in championing this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank all the members of the Homeland Security Committee and their staffs for putting politics aside, as we often do on this great committee, and supporting this bill unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation to enhance our national security.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would like to note and echo the sentiments of my colleague and leader of this committee, Mr. MCCAUL. There are more than 50 bills now sitting over in the Senate that have passed the House from the Homeland Security Committee. The very words “homeland security” should not be of question, and they should not be something to serve as an impediment to keeping our country safe; it should be just the opposite. Therefore, I join Mr. MCCAUL and urge my colleagues in the Senate to move swiftly on the passage of these bills to keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, August 30, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 3328, the Cuban Airport Security Act of 2017.

I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further action on this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the Floor, subject to the understanding that this waiver does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. The Committee also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill, and would appreciate your support for any such request.

I ask that you place our exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with

you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3328—the “Cuban Airport Security Act of 2017.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will forego further consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of this bill at this time, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 3328, the Cuban Airport Security Act of 2017. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that foregoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, this is conditional on our understanding that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration. Lastly, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would ask that a copy this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Homeland Security, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor, to memorialize our understanding. I look forward to working with

the Committee on Homeland Security as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3328—the “Cuban Airport Security Act of 2017.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego further consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of this bill at this time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee represented on the conference committee. Further, the Committee on Homeland Security agrees that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

□ 1645

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3328, the Cuban Airport Security Act.

The United States and the global aviation community face an adaptive and agile enemy. Terrorist groups continue to target passenger aircraft and pursue new attack methods.

With those threats in mind, the legislation before us today focuses on raising the level of security in Cuba. H.R. 3328 will ensure that Congress is able to continue its oversight of the TSA's efforts to ensure the Cuban Government adopts aviation security initiatives and makes important security advancements. It is critical that the gains achieved are not eroded.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee and my friend.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Cuban Airport Security Act. Last-point-of-departure airports are critically important to our homeland security. One only need look at the latest laptop ban that was instituted at 10 last-point-of-departure airports, given the fact that the terrorists

have now learned how to turn them into explosive devices.

The American people should have grave concern about the level of security in place at any foreign airport where the host government refuses to allow strict inspections of airport security by Members of Congress.

As a footnote, Mr. Speaker, it was just last year that Mr. KATKO and I applied for visas to the Government of Cuba to inspect these airports to see how safe they were, and the Cuban Government's response to that was to deny our visa applications.

What is more concerning is that over the course of the last year, the United States Government personnel in Cuba have been targeted and subjected to harmful sonic attacks, which in some cases have caused permanent brain damage. This must not be tolerated.

Too many questions remain when it comes to Cuba's airports. Congress is still largely in the dark in terms of Cuba's security equipment, training procedures, and other perimeter security.

This bill takes an important step forward to shed light on current inadequacies and help to ensure proper oversight of inbound flights from Cuba to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my good friend from New York (Mr. KATKO) for his continued leadership on aviation security and last-point-of-departure airports, which has been critical in bringing these issues to the forefront, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House Homeland Security Committee passed H.R. 3328, the Cuban Airport Security Act of 2017, by voice vote in September. While the legislation is focused on raising the level of aviation security in Cuba, it has broader implications.

H.R. 3328 includes a provision requiring the TSA to develop a template for agreements with foreign partners for Federal air marshals to carry out security operations on flights departing or arriving on foreign soil.

As Mr. KATKO mentioned, just last week there were news reports that the DHS and the TSA had acknowledged that intelligence indicates that terrorists are plotting another massive attack on U.S. aircraft.

In the current climate of aviation security threats, the United States has a critical role to play in raising the baseline of global aviation security to keep the traveling public safe, in coordination with our international partners.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 3328, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill for the reasons that I

have already spoken about, but I do want to note that there are two things in this bill that are very important. One is to give us the ability to examine whether or not the airports in Cuba are indeed safe.

As you heard from the statements earlier during this colloquy from myself, from Mr. VELA, and from Mr. MCCAUL, there are gaps in our knowledge of Cuba that are simply unique to most of the other aviation communities. It is incumbent upon us to try and find out what is going on down there.

As my colleague, Mr. MCCAUL, stated, we were denied visas because they knew we were coming to look at their airports. They allow very little oversight from the TSA at their airports.

They or someone in their country have attacked our embassy employees. The communist Cuban party controls the vast majority of what happens with aviation with very little knowledge of what the internal workings of that are. They are not collaborative partners at all, and that is a major concern.

The other part of the bill is reviewing international aviation standards.

Are they keeping up to date with evolving threats, such as the laptop threat and others that we know of around the world? Are they adhering to the standards that are set by the ICAO? And are those standards sufficient going forward?

Those are all things we need to take a look at. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill because it is a Homeland Security bill. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate, including Senator RUBIO, my good friend who is championing the companion bill, I hope that he pushes it over there quickly; and I hope we get this to the President's desk for signature because we can't mess with things that involve homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3328.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C-TPAT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3551) to amend the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 to reauthorize the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3551

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "C-TPAT Reauthorization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. CUSTOMS-TRADE PARTNERSHIP AGAINST TERRORISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title II of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 961 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"Subtitle B—Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism

"SEC. 211. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CUSTOMS-TRADE PARTNERSHIP AGAINST TERRORISM PROGRAM.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established within U.S. Customs and Border Protection a voluntary government-private sector partnership program to be known as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT).

"(b) PURPOSE.—The purposes of the C-TPAT program are to—

"(1) strengthen and improve the overall security of the international supply chain and United States border security;

"(2) facilitate the movement of secure cargo through the international supply chain;

"(3) ensure compliance with applicable law; and

"(4) serve as the Authorized Economic Operator program for the United States.

"(c) DIRECTOR.—There shall be at the head of the C-TPAT program a Director, who shall report to the Executive Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations (in this subtitle referred to as the 'Executive Assistant Commissioner') of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

"(d) DUTIES.—The Director of the C-TPAT program shall—

"(1) oversee the activities of the C-TPAT program, including certification of C-TPAT participants;

"(2) evaluate and make revisions to security criteria pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 213;

"(3) ensure that participants receive a tangible and measurable benefit for participation; and

"(4) carry out other duties and powers prescribed by the Executive Assistant Commissioner.

"SEC. 212. ELIGIBLE ENTITIES AND NOTICE OF BENEFITS.

"(a) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Importers, exporters, customs brokers, forwarders, air, sea, and land carriers, contract logistics providers, and other entities in the international supply chain and intermodal transportation system are eligible to apply for participation in the C-TPAT program.

"(b) TIERED PARTICIPATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Applicants may be eligible to participate as Tier 1 or Tier 2 participants.

"(2) IMPORTERS.—Importers may be eligible to participate as Tier 3 participants.

"(3) EXTENSION.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner may, in his or her discretion, extend Tier 3 participation to other entity types, if appropriate.

"(c) NOTICE OF BENEFITS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall publish, on the U.S. Customs and Border Protection website and through other appropriate online publication, information about benefits to C-TPAT program participants.

“(2) CHANGES.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall publish, on the U.S. Customs and Border Protection website and through other appropriate online publication, notice of any changes to benefits to C-TPAT program participants not later than 30 days before any such changes take effect.

“SEC. 213. PARTICIPATION ELIGIBILITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall review all documentation submitted by an applicant pursuant to subsection (b)(2), conduct a background investigation of such applicant, and vet such applicant.

“(b) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible for participation in the C-TPAT program, an entity shall, at a minimum—

“(1) have a designated company employee authorized to bind such entity that is a direct company employee and will serve as the primary point of contact responsible for participation of such entity in the C-TPAT program;

“(2) at the time of initial application and annually thereafter, including in advance of any recertification or revalidation, submit an international supply chain security profile, which shall identify how such entity meets the minimum security criteria of the C-TPAT program established by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and how such entity will maintain and enhance internal policies, procedures, and practices related to international supply chain security; and

“(3) meet any specific requirements for eligible entities, as established by the Commissioner.

“(c) MINIMUM SECURITY CRITERIA.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall establish minimum security criteria for participants in the C-TPAT program, review such minimum security criteria not less than once every two years, and update such minimum security criteria as necessary. Such minimum security criteria shall seek to address security vulnerabilities in the international supply chain.

“(d) ADDITIONAL AND UPDATED CRITERIA.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may establish additional and updated security criteria for individual C-TPAT program participants, categories of C-TPAT program participants, or particular entity types to meet in order to address a security vulnerability in the international supply chain.

“(e) CONSULTATION.—When establishing or updating security criteria in accordance with subsection (c), and when establishing additional or updated security criteria in accordance subsection (d), the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall consult with C-TPAT program participants and other interested parties, and shall—

“(1) conduct a cost benefit analysis of such proposed new, additional, or updated security criteria in consultation with the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established under section 109 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-125; 19 U.S.C. 4316);

“(2) determine operational feasibility and, where appropriate, conduct a phased implementation of such proposed additional or updated security criteria; and

“(3) provide C-TPAT program participants and other interested parties a 90-day comment period to review and comment on such proposed additional or updated security criteria.

“(f) WAIVER.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may waive

the requirements of subsection (e) if the Commissioner determines there is a significant and imminent risk to the national security of the United States and such a waiver is necessary to protect such national security. Not later than 120 days after the issuance of any such waiver, the Commissioner shall announce on the U.S. Customs and Border Protection website and through other appropriate online publication the Commissioner's intent to either withdraw such waiver or maintain such waiver while commencing efforts to establish minimum security criteria or establish additional or update existing security criteria in accordance with subsection (c) or (d), respectively.

“SEC. 214. BENEFITS FOR C-TPAT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall extend certain benefits to each C-TPAT program participant. Minimum benefits for each such participant shall include the following:

“(1) Assignment of a U.S. Customs and Border Protection Supply Chain Security Specialist.

“(2) Access to the C-TPAT program's web-based Portal system and training materials.

“(3) A periodic and unclassified update on regional and other relevant threats to the international supply chain.

“(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall make publicly available on the C-TPAT portal an annual assessment of the tangible benefits being realized by C-TPAT program participants.

“(c) ANNUAL ASSESSMENT.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall conduct, on an annual basis, an assessment of the benefits conferred to C-TPAT program participants. The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall determine a process to carry out such assessments, to include projected milestones and completion dates for addressing data reliability issues and, as necessary, correcting data weaknesses, so that U.S. Customs and Border Protection can produce accurate and reliable annual assessments that can be compared year-to-year.

“SEC. 215. TIER 1 PARTICIPANTS.

“(a) CERTIFICATION.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall certify the security measures and international supply chain security practices of all applicants to and participants in the C-TPAT program in accordance with section 213(b)(2) and the guidelines referred to in subsection (c) of this section. Certified participants shall be Tier 1 participants.

“(b) BENEFITS FOR TIER 1 PARTICIPANTS.—Upon completion of the certification under subsection (a), a C-TPAT program participant shall be certified as a Tier 1 participant. The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall extend limited benefits to a Tier 1 participant.

“(c) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subtitle, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall update the guidelines and criteria for certifying a C-TPAT program participant's security measures and supply chain security practices under this section. Such guidelines shall include a background investigation and review of appropriate documentation, as determined by the Commissioner.

“(d) TIMEFRAME.—To the extent practicable, the Executive Assistant Commissioner shall complete the Tier 1 certification process within 90 days of receipt of an application for participation in the C-TPAT program.

“SEC. 216. TIER 2 PARTICIPANTS.

“(a) VALIDATION.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall validate the security

measures and international supply chain security practices of a Tier 1 C-TPAT program participant in accordance with the guidelines referred to in subsection (c) to validate such participant as a Tier 2 participant. Such validation shall include on-site assessments at appropriate foreign and domestic locations utilized by such Tier 1 participant in its international supply chain.

“(b) BENEFITS FOR TIER 2 PARTICIPANTS.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner, shall extend benefits to each C-TPAT participant that has been validated as a Tier 2 participant under this section. Such benefits may include the following:

“(1) Reduced scores in U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Automated Targeting System.

“(2) Reduced number of security examinations by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(3) Priority examinations of cargo.

“(4) Access to the Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Lanes at United States ports of entry.

“(5) Recognition as a trusted trade partner by foreign customs administrations that have signed Mutual Recognition Arrangements with U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(6) In the case of importers, eligibility to participate in the Importer Self-Assessment Program (ISA) or successor compliance program.

“(c) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subtitle, the Commissioner shall develop a schedule and update the guidelines and criteria for validating a C-TPAT participant's security measures and supply chain security practices under this section.

“(d) TIMEFRAME.—To the extent practicable, the Executive Assistant Commissioner shall complete the Tier 2 validation process for a C-TPAT program participant under this section within one year after certification of such participant as a Tier 1 participant.

“SEC. 217. TIER 3 PARTICIPANTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall establish a third tier of C-TPAT program participation that offers additional benefits to C-TPAT program participants that are importers or other entity types, in accordance with section 212(b), that demonstrate a sustained commitment to maintaining security measures and international supply chain security practices that exceed the guidelines established for validation as a Tier 2 participant in the C-TPAT program under section 216.

“(b) BEST PRACTICES.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner may designate a Tier 2 C-TPAT program participant as a Tier 3 participant based on a review of best practices in such participant's international supply chain that reflect a continued approach to enhanced international supply chain security, including—

“(1) compliance with any additional or updated criteria established by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection under section 213(d) that exceed the guidelines established pursuant to section 216 for validating a C-TPAT program participant as a Tier 2 participant; and

“(2) any other factors that the Executive Assistant Commissioner determines appropriate.

“(c) BENEFITS FOR TIER 3 PARTICIPANTS.—The Executive Assistant Commissioner, in consultation with the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established under section 109 of the Trade Facilitation

and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-125; 19 U.S.C. 4316) and the National Maritime Security Advisory Committee established under section 70112 of title 46, United States Code, shall extend benefits to each C-TPAT program participant that has been validated as a Tier 3 participant under this section, which may include the following:

“(1) Further reduction in the number of examinations by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(2) Front of the line inspections and examinations.

“(3) Exemption from Stratified Exams.

“(4) Shorter wait times at United States ports of entry.

“(5) Access to the Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Lanes at United States ports of entry.

“(6) Recognition as a trusted trade partner by foreign customs administrations that have signed Mutual Recognition Arrangements with U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(7) In the case of importers, eligibility to participate in the Importer Self-Assessment Program (ISA) or successor compliance program.

“SEC. 218. CONSEQUENCES FOR LACK OF COMPLIANCE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If at any time the Executive Assistant Commissioner determines that a C-TPAT program participant's security measures or international supply chain security practices fail to meet applicable requirements under this subtitle, the Executive Assistant Commissioner may deny such participant benefits otherwise made available pursuant to this subtitle, either in whole or in part. The Executive Assistant Commissioner shall develop procedures, in consultation with Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee, established under section 109 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-125; 19 U.S.C. 4316), that provide appropriate protections to C-TPAT program participants, including advance notice and an opportunity for such participants to provide additional information to U.S. Customs and Border Protection regarding any such alleged failure, before any of such benefits are withheld. Such procedures may not limit the ability of the Executive Assistant Commissioner to take actions to protect the national security of the United States.

“(b) FALSE OR MISLEADING INFORMATION; LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH LAW.—If a C-TPAT program participant knowingly provides false or misleading information to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Executive Assistant Commissioner, or any other officers or officials of the United States Government, or if at any time the Executive Assistant Commissioner determines that a C-TPAT program participant has committed a serious violation of Federal law or customs regulations, or if a C-TPAT program participant has committed a criminal violation relating to the economic activity of such participant, the Executive Assistant Commissioner may suspend or expel such participant from the C-TPAT program for an appropriate period of time. The Executive Assistant Commissioner, after the completion of the process described in subsection (d), may publish in the Federal Register a list of C-TPAT program participants that have been so suspended or expelled from the C-TPAT program pursuant to this subsection.

“(c) NATIONAL SECURITY.—If at any time the Executive Assistant Commissioner deter-

mines that a C-TPAT program participant poses a significant and imminent risk to the national security of the United States or has committed a serious violation of Federal law or customs regulations, or if a C-TPAT program participant has committed a criminal violation relating to the economic activity of such participant, the Executive Assistant Commissioner may suspend or expel such participant from the C-TPAT program for an appropriate period of time. The Executive Assistant Commissioner, after the completion of the process described in subsection (d), may publish in the Federal Register a list of C-TPAT program participants that have been so suspended or expelled from the C-TPAT program pursuant to this subsection.

“(d) RIGHT OF APPEAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall establish a process for a C-TPAT program participant to appeal a decision of the Executive Assistant Commissioner under subsection (a). Such appeal shall be filed with the Commissioner not later than 90 days after the date of such decision, and the Commissioner shall issue a determination not later than 90 days after such appeal is filed.

“(2) APPEALS OF OTHER DECISIONS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall establish a process for a C-TPAT program participant to appeal a decision of the Executive Assistant Commissioner under subsections (b) and (c). Such appeal shall be filed with the Commissioner not later than 30 days after the date of such decision, and the Commissioner shall issue a determination not later than 90 days after such appeal is filed.

“SEC. 219. VALIDATIONS BY OTHER DHS COMPONENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may recognize regulatory inspections conducted by other components of the Department of Homeland Security of entities as sufficient to constitute validation for C-TPAT program participation in cases in which any such component's inspection regime is harmonized with validation criteria for the C-TPAT program. Such regulatory inspections shall not limit the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to conduct a C-TPAT program validation.

“(b) REVALIDATION.—Nothing in this section may limit the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection's ability to require a revalidation by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(c) CERTIFICATION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize certifications of C-TPAT applicants to be performed by any party other than U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“SEC. 220. RECERTIFICATION AND REVALIDATION.

“(a) RECERTIFICATION.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall implement a recertification process for all C-TPAT program participants. Such process shall occur annually, and shall require—

“(1) a review of the security profile and supporting documentation to ensure adherence to the minimum security criteria under section 213; and

“(2) background checks and vetting.

“(b) REVALIDATION.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall implement a revalidation process for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 C-TPAT program participants. Such process shall require—

“(1) a framework based upon objective, risk based criteria for identifying partici-

pants for periodic revalidation at least once every four years following the initial validation of such participants;

“(2) on-site assessments at appropriate foreign and domestic locations utilized by such a participant in its international supply chain; and

“(3) an annual plan for revalidation that includes—

“(A) performance measures;

“(B) an assessment of the personnel needed to perform such revalidations; and

“(C) the number of participants that will be revalidated during the following year.

“(c) REVALIDATION UNDER A MUTUAL RECOGNITION ARRANGEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon request from the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, all Tier 2 and Tier 3 C-TPAT program participants shall provide any revalidation report conducted by a foreign government under a Mutual Recognition Arrangement.

“(2) RECOGNITION.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may recognize revalidations of entities conducted by foreign governments under a Mutual Recognition Arrangement as sufficient to constitute a revalidation for C-TPAT program participation under subsection (b).

“(3) NO LIMITATION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to limit the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection's ability to require a revalidation by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(d) DESIGNATED COMPANY EMPLOYEES.—Only designated company employees of a C-TPAT program participant under section 213(b)(1) are authorized to respond to a revalidation report. Third-party entities are not authorized to respond to a revalidation report.

“SEC. 221. NONCONTAINERIZED CARGO AND THIRD PARTY LOGISTICS PROVIDERS.

“The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall consider the potential for participation in the C-TPAT program by importers of noncontainerized cargoes and non-asset-based third party logistics providers that otherwise meet the requirements under this subtitle.

“SEC. 222. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall establish sufficient internal quality controls and record management, including record-keeping (including maintenance of a record management system in accordance with subsection (b)) and monitoring staff hours, to support the management systems of the C-TPAT program. In managing the C-TPAT program, the Commissioner shall ensure that the C-TPAT program includes the following:

“(1) A 5-year plan to identify outcome-based goals and performance measures of the C-TPAT program.

“(2) An annual plan for each fiscal year designed to match available resources to the projected workload.

“(3) A standardized work program to be used by agency personnel to carry out the certifications, validations, recertifications, and revalidations of C-TPAT program participants.

“(4) In accordance with subsection (e), a standardized process for the Executive Assistant Commissioner to receive reports of suspicious activity, including reports regarding potentially compromised cargo or other border or national security concerns.

“(b) DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall

maintain a record management system to document determinations on the reviews of each C-TPAT program participant, including certifications, validations, recertifications, and revalidations.

“(2) STANDARDIZED PROCEDURES.—To ensure accuracy and consistency within the record management system required under this subsection, the Commissioner shall develop, disseminate, and require utilization of standardized procedures for agency personnel carrying out certifications, validations, recertifications, and revalidations to report and track information regarding the status of each C-TPAT program participant.

“(c) CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION SAFEGUARDS.—In consultation with the Commercial Customs Operations Advisory Committee established under section 109 of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-125; 19 U.S.C. 4316), the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall develop and implement procedures to ensure the protection of confidential data collected, stored, or shared with government agencies or as part of the application, certification, validation, recertification, and revalidation processes.

“(d) RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STAFFING PLAN.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall—

“(1) develop a staffing plan to recruit and train staff (including a formalized training program) to meet the objectives identified in the 5-year strategic plan under subsection (a)(1); and

“(2) provide cross-training in post incident trade resumption for the C-TPAT Director and other relevant personnel who administer the C-TPAT program.

“(e) ENGAGEMENT.—In carrying out the standardized process required under subsection (a)(4), the Commissioner shall engage with and provide guidance to C-TPAT program participants and other appropriate stakeholders on submitting reports described in such subsection.

“(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—In connection with the President's annual budget submission for the Department of Homeland Security, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on the progress made by the Commissioner to certify, validate, recertify, and revalidate C-TPAT program participants. Each such report shall be due on the same date that the President's budget is submitted to Congress.”.

(b) SAVING CLAUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect and apply beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to applicants for participation in the C-TPAT program.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in case of C-TPAT program participants who are such participants as of the date specified in such paragraph. Such participants shall be subject to the amendments made by this Act upon revalidation of such participants to participate in such program. Until such time, such participants shall be subject to the requirements of the C-TPAT program as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle B of title II and inserting the following new items:

“Subtitle B—Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism

“Sec. 211. Establishment of the Customs and Trade Partnership Against Terrorism program.

“Sec. 212. Eligible entities and notice of benefits.

“Sec. 213. Participation eligibility.

“Sec. 214. Benefits for C-TPAT program participants.

“Sec. 215. Tier 1 participants.

“Sec. 216. Tier 2 participants.

“Sec. 217. Tier 3 participants.

“Sec. 218. Consequences for lack of compliance.

“Sec. 219. Validations by other DHS components.

“Sec. 220. Recertification and revalidation.

“Sec. 221. Noncontainerized cargo and third party logistics providers.

“Sec. 222. Program management.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3551, the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism Reauthorization Act of 2017. The Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, or C-TPAT, is the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's flagship global supply chain security program. C-TPAT is recognized throughout the world as the premier cargo pre-vetting program.

My legislation reauthorizes the program for the first time in 11 years to ensure that the program is ready to meet the dynamic threats currently facing the global supply chain, and that C-TPAT participants receive tangible benefits for their partnership with CBP.

When a company joins C-TPAT, they agree to work with CBP to protect the supply chain, identify security gaps, and implement specific security measures and best practices.

In order to receive benefits such as shorter wait times and fewer inspections at ports of entry, applicants must enhance security throughout their supply chain by undergoing vetting and a site visit by CPB.

While the SAFE Port Act of 2006, which established the program, set a strong foundation for the current success of C-TPAT, this bill not only codifies the structure of the current program, but also makes sure C-TPAT remains a true partnership between CBP and private industry.

Under this bill, CBP will be required to formally liaise with industry stakeholders when implementing new or updated security criteria, and provide tangible benefits to all participants at various stages of the CBP vetting process.

My legislation also reduces redundant inspections on pre-vetted cargo and provides CBP with a mechanism to suspend or expel participants from the program if they fail to abide by security requirements or pose a threat to national security.

Furthermore, it establishes a process for CBP with congressional oversight requirements to continuously vet participants, review their security measures, and conduct site visits of their facilities to ensure compliance with and continued dedication to security measures.

Reducing wait times and inspections for participants who enhance the global supply chain greatly enhances cross-border trade and economic growth while reducing the workload of already overworked officers at CBP. C-TPAT achieves this in a way that also strengthens our national security through rigorous initial and recurrent background checks and site visits.

I am proud to sponsor the reauthorization of this highly successful program in order to expand its reach and increase its benefits to private industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I am writing with respect to H.R. 3551, the “C-TPAT Reauthorization of 2017.” This bill contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on Ways and Means will not seek a sequential referral on H.R. 3551 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration. This is done with the understanding that the jurisdictional interests of the Committee on Ways and Means over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 3551 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3551 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3551, the “C-TPAT

Reauthorization Act of 2017.” I appreciate your support in bringing this very important legislation before the House of Representatives, and appreciate the willingness of the Committee on Ways and Means to forego seeking a sequential referral.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral on this bill at this time, the Committee on Ways and Means does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Ways and Means represented on the conference committee for provisions within your jurisdiction.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman,
Committee on Homeland Security.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3551, the C-TPAT Reauthorization Act of 2017.

H.R. 3551 reauthorizes, for the first time in 11 years, the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism Program, also known as C-TPAT.

C-TPAT is a voluntary public-private sector partnership program where CBP works with the trade community to provide high-level cargo security through close cooperation with the principal stakeholders of the international supply chain, such as importers, carriers, consolidators, licensed customs brokers, and manufacturers.

Today, more than 11,400 certified partners spanning the gamut of the trade community have been accepted into the program. CBP pre-vets and certifies C-TPAT partners they consider to be low risk in exchange for benefits, such as fewer examinations and access to expedited or dedicated lanes.

This bill incorporates Democratic amendments, including one of my own that establishes a standard system for C-TPAT partners to report suspicious activity instead of the patchwork system that exists now.

Another important amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. CORREA, was adopted in committee to ensure that when CBP changes up the rules and security criteria for C-TPAT, stakeholders are given adequate notice to comply.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the majority for working with us to recognize that suspension and expulsion from the C-TPAT program has serious economic and repudiation ramifications for companies. The majority agreed to include Democratic language supported by the Border Trade Alliance and other stakeholders that urges CBP not to publish suspended C-TPAT participants, as is the current practice,

until appeals and complete due process is carried out. We found some cases where companies were reinstated in the appeals process, but since they were tagged as a suspended company by CBP in the Federal Register, their business suffered. This language would prevent that from reoccurring.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when U.S. ports, like the Port of Los Angeles in my district, are experiencing CBP staffing shortages, the C-TPAT program helps the supply chain be more efficient and safe. I support the program's reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3551 is an important piece of legislation that has strong support on both sides of the aisle and a broad range of stakeholders.

C-TPAT offers importers and other partners a win-win situation where they voluntarily allow CBP to prescreen them in exchange for benefits, such as shorter wait times and dedicated services. The more we know about our supply chain, the safer we will be.

C-TPAT is a big way we stay informed. As such, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3551, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I appreciate the bipartisan support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3551, the C-TPAT Reauthorization Act of 2017. This legislation reauthorizes the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism Program (C-TPAT).

The C-TPAT program works to improve United States border security and the security of our international supply partners by providing a voluntary public-private sector partnership focused on bolstering trade while keeping Americans safe. Since its creation in 2001, this program has allowed trade partners and American businesses to opt into increased security measures and make corrective actions in order to streamline their entry into our country. The program simplifies the process of suppliers bringing products into our country and allows our country to broaden security trade measures without discouraging trade with those who do not opt in.

In the United States, more than 41 million jobs depend on international trade, and my home state of Georgia boasts the largest single-terminal container facility of its kind in North America, based in Savannah. This industry supports over 360,000 jobs statewide and is vitally important in our local and national economy.

The C-TPAT program is good for trade and promotes the safety of our citizens, and I urge my fellow members to support H.R. 3551 to reauthorize funding for this program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3551, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1700

ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION BUSINESS TRAVEL CARDS ACT OF 2017

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 504) to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 504

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION BUSINESS TRAVEL CARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 417 the following:

“SEC. 418. ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION BUSINESS TRAVEL CARDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection is authorized to issue an Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card (referred to in this section as an ‘ABT Card’) to any individual described in subsection (b).

“(b) CARD ISSUANCE.—An individual described in this subsection is an individual who—

“(1) is a citizen of the United States;

“(2) has been approved and is in good standing in an existing international trusted traveler program of the Department; and

“(3) is—

“(A) engaged in business in the Asia-Pacific region, as determined by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; or

“(B) a United States Government official actively engaged in Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation business, as determined by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(c) INTEGRATION WITH EXISTING TRAVEL PROGRAMS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall integrate application procedures for, and issuance, renewal, and revocation of, ABT Cards with existing international trusted traveler programs of the Department.

“(d) COOPERATION WITH PRIVATE ENTITIES AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may consult with appropriate private sector entities and nongovernmental organizations, including academic institutions.

“(e) FEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall—

“(A) prescribe and collect a fee for the issuance and renewal of ABT Cards; and

“(B) adjust such fee to the extent the Commissioner determines necessary to comply with paragraph (2).

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall ensure that the total amount of the fees collected under paragraph (1) during any fiscal year is sufficient to offset the direct and indirect costs associated with carrying out this section during such fiscal year, including the costs associated with operating and maintaining the ABT Card issuance and renewal processes.

“(3) ACCOUNT FOR COLLECTIONS.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States an ‘Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Account’ into which the fees collected under paragraph (1) shall be deposited as offsetting receipts.

“(4) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited into the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Account established under paragraph (3) shall—

“(A) be credited to the appropriate account of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection for expenses incurred in carrying out this section; and

“(B) remain available until expended.

“(f) NOTIFICATION.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate not later than 60 days after the expenditures of funds to operate and provide ABT Card services beyond the amounts collected under subsection (e)(1).

“(g) TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘trusted traveler program’ means a voluntary program of the Department that allows U.S. Customs and Border Protection to expedite clearance of pre-approved, low-risk travelers arriving in the United States.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 417 the following new item:

“Sec. 418. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards.”.

SEC. 3. ACCOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the repeal of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-54; 8 U.S.C. 1185 note) pursuant to section 4(b)(1), amounts deposited into the APEC Business Travel Card Account established pursuant to such Act as of the date of the enactment of this Act are hereby transferred to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Account established pursuant to section 418(e) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by section 2(a) of this Act), and shall be available without regard to whether such amounts are expended in connection with expenses incurred with respect to an ABT Card issued at any time before or after such date of enactment.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts deposited in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Account established pursuant to section 418(e) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, in addition to the purposes for which such amounts are available pursuant to such subsection, shall also be available for expenditure in connection with expenses incurred with respect to ABT Cards issued at any time before the date of the enactment of such section.

(c) TERMINATION.—After the completion of the transfer described in subsection (a), the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Account established pursuant to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2011 shall be closed.

SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND REPEAL.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 411(c) of section 411 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (17), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (18) as paragraph (19); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (17) the following:

“(18) carry out section 418, relating to the issuance of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards; and”.

(b) REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-54; 8 U.S.C. 1185 note) is repealed.

(2) SAVING CLAUSE.—Notwithstanding the repeal under paragraph (1), an ABT Card issued pursuant to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2011 before the date of the enactment of this Act that, as of such date, is still valid, shall remain valid on and after such date until such time as such Card would otherwise expire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 504, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2017.

The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, or APEC, has been an economic catalyst for the Asia-Pacific region since 1989. APEC facilitates increased trade and business cooperation among the 21 member countries in the region that promote innovation, inclusiveness, and sustainable growth.

Specifically, this bill reauthorizes the APEC Business Travel Card Program. The program began as a pilot in 2011, and this bill would implement best practices found throughout the 7-year pilot program.

The APEC Business Travel Card is a travel document issued to business travelers who are citizens of APEC-participating economies. Valid for 5 years, the card eliminates the need for its

holders to possess a visa when visiting other APEC-participating economies as long as preclearance has been obtained through a trusted traveler application process.

Our partnerships in the Asia-Pacific region are more important now than ever before. The APEC Business Card champions free and open trade, promotes economic integration, enhanced border security, and facilitates a sustainable global business environment. The program also helps to enhance border integrity and security in participating economies by prechecking each applicant against watch lists of other participating economies.

The program offers cost savings to travelers and moves frequent travelers who have been prescreened through the international travel process more efficiently.

The APEC Card is currently set to expire on September 30, 2018. Now is the time to reauthorize this important partnership between the United States and our friends in the APEC region.

I would like to thank my colleagues Miss RICE and Mr. DONOVAN for introducing the House version of this bill, as well as Ms. HIRONO and Mr. DAINES in the Senate for their part in moving this legislation forward.

I urge Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 504, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, APEC, Business Travel Cards Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the APEC Business Travel Cards Act permanently reauthorizes the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program. This trusted-traveler program provides access to fast-track immigration lanes in airports for travelers who conduct verified business in the APEC region. APEC is a forum for 21 Pacific Rim countries, including the U.S. and Australia, to support sustainable economic growth and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection started issuing cards to eligible Americans in 2014 after Congress passed the APEC Business Travel Cards Act in 2011. Today, the program facilitates travel for Americans working on behalf of 30,000 U.S. businesses. Under that law, the authority to issue these travel cards to Americans is set to expire on September 30, 2018.

S. 504, the APEC Business Travel Cards Act of 2017, is supported by a diverse range of stakeholders, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Asia-Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce, the U.S. Council for International Business, the U.S. Travel Association, and the American Hotel and Lodging Association.

On the House Homeland Security Committee, companion legislation to

S. 504 was championed by Congresswoman KATHLEEN RICE of New York. With the leadership of Miss RICE and others, her bill was passed unanimously by our committee.

Allowing ABT cards to expire would be a mistake that puts American businesses at a disadvantage. I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, S. 504 is an important piece of legislation that has strong support on both sides of the aisle. The ABT Card Program allows business travelers and government officials with business in APEC countries to access fast-track processing lanes at APEC airports.

The program saves an estimated 43 minutes per trip, according to U.S. Customs and Border Patrol, and operates entirely on user fees, costing taxpayers nothing. Importantly, it preserves authority for the Department of Homeland Security to revoke or suspend an individual's card for security reasons at any time.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support S. 504 to ensure that the bill gets to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 504, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2017, which is identical to bipartisan legislation I introduced in the House earlier this year along with Representatives DAN DONOVAN, RICK LARSEN and DAVE REICHERT.

This bill would permanently reauthorize the APEC Business Travel Card program, which provides access to fast-track immigration lanes at airports for travelers who conduct verified business in the APEC region.

The U.S. has been participating in this program and issuing cards to verified American business travelers since 2014, after Congress passed the APEC Business Travel Cards Act in 2011.

Under that law, the authority to issue these travel cards to Americans is set to expire on September 30, 2018—meaning that no new cards can be issued after that date, and all cards will expire by 2021, after which Americans will no longer be able to travel throughout the region as easily as business travelers from other APEC countries.

S. 504 will permanently extend that authority, while maintaining the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) authority to revoke or suspend an individual's card for security reasons at any time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a successful program that operates at absolutely no cost to taxpayers and makes American businesses more competitive in the global economy—including many businesses in my home state of New York, which is home to more than 2,300 cardholders.

Allowing these cards to expire would be a mistake that puts American business travelers at a disadvantage, and this legislation reflects a common-sense, bipartisan commitment to reauthorize the program permanently.

I'm grateful to my colleagues from both parties in the House and Senate for their efforts to help move this legislation forward, and I urge all our colleagues to give it their full support today so we can send this bill to the President's desk.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 504, legislation to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a common-sense measure to make permanent a program that has been successful since its inception in 2011.

More than 30,000 Americans currently hold fast-track cards that expedite business travel to Pacific Rim countries. The world economy is fast-paced and constantly evolving, and it's important to reduce bureaucratic obstacles for America to remain competitive.

The APEC Business Travel Card helps Americans travel faster and more efficiently throughout the Asia-Pacific region, allowing them to spend more time on business, and less time in airport lines. We must ensure that our business leaders have the resources they need to compete in an increasingly globalized economy, which is why I'm proud to support the permanent extension of this program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support S. 504, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2017. S. 504 would permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card program, an initiative that provides expedited airport processing to those who are eligible.

The program, originally created for business travelers from Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) countries, expanded to include United States citizens after the passage of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2011. Without reauthorization, the program is set to expire on September 30, 2018.

Georgia is home to one of the world's busiest airports, Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport. Atlanta residents witness firsthand the chaos of international travel and the need for streamlined processing in international airports. S. 504 would permanently authorize designated lanes at airports in participating countries, encouraging companies to continue international trade operations and business transactions. Ensuring smooth and efficient modes of transportation is critical for Americans to expand our economy overseas.

As a member of the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee and member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I look for legislation that will streamline aviation safety, innovation, consumer service, and airport infrastructure. S. 504 achieves many of these goals, and that is why I support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 504.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING EMERGENCY RESPONSE BY DETECTING INCOMING CONTRABAND WITH TECHNOLOGY ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2142) to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2142

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “International Narcotics Trafficking Emergency Response by Detecting Incoming Contraband with Technology Act” or the “INTERDICT Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CHEMICAL SCREENING DEVICE.**—The term “chemical screening device” means an immunoassay, narcotics field test kit, infrared spectrophotometer, mass spectrometer, nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer, Raman spectrophotometer, or other scientific instrumentation able to collect data that can be interpreted to determine the presence of fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances.

(2) **COMMISSIONER.**—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(3) **EXPRESS CONSIGNMENT OPERATOR OR CARRIER.**—The term “express consignment operator or carrier” has the meaning given that term in section 128.1 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (or any similar successor regulation).

SEC. 3. INTERDICTION OF FENTANYL, OTHER SYNTHETIC OPIOIDS, AND OTHER NARCOTICS AND PSYCHOACTIVE SUBSTANCES.

(a) **CHEMICAL SCREENING DEVICES.**—The Commissioner shall—

(1) increase the number of chemical screening devices available to U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers over the number of such devices that are available on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) make such additional chemical screening devices available to U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers as the Commissioner determines are necessary to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, including such substances that are imported through the mail or by an express consignment operator or carrier.

(b) **PERSONNEL TO INTERPRET DATA.**—The Commissioner shall dedicate the appropriate

number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel, including scientists, so that such personnel are available during all operational hours to interpret data collected by chemical screening devices.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner \$9,000,000 to ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection has resources, including chemical screening devices, personnel, and scientists, available during all operational hours to prevent, detect, and interdict the unlawful importation of fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as communities across my district and across our Nation continue to deal with the crisis of opioid abuse and addiction, it is incomprehensible to imagine a synthetic drug up to 50 times stronger than heroin and 100 times stronger than morphine.

Fentanyl is a manufactured opioid which, in its illicit versions, has contributed to tens of thousands of deaths. This fact is especially concerning, given that this drug can be ordered online and delivered via mail or express consignment couriers from places like China.

Fentanyl is highly potent in trace amounts, and this problem is exacerbated due to fentanyl being extremely difficult for our authorities to detect. That is why Congresswoman TSONGAS and I introduced the INTERDICT Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation that provides U.S. Customs and Border Protection access to the most effective chemical screening devices and scientific support to detect and intercept synthetic opioids before they can cause more harm.

Mr. Speaker, the INTERDICT Act will ensure that CBP will have additional portable chemical screening devices available at ports of entry and mail and express consignment facilities, along with additional fixed chemical screening devices available in CBP laboratories.

It also provides CBP with sufficient resources, personnel, and facilities, including scientists available at all

hours, to interpret screening test results from the field and authorizes, based upon professional expertise, the appropriation of \$9 million for hundreds of new screening devices, laboratory equipment, facilities, and personnel for support during all operational hours.

Combined, the additional chemical screening devices, scientists, and other resources will help safeguard CBP field personnel from exposure to fentanyl and other deadly synthetic opioids and narcotics and prevent their unlawful importation.

As an EMT and former Federal drug prosecutor, I have seen firsthand the devastating impact of addiction in our communities and understand the increased danger added by synthetic opioids like fentanyl. Illicit fentanyl being trafficked into the United States poses a continued threat to the American people.

By passing this legislation, this body can follow through on its promise to the American people and align our policy with the President's Commission on Combating Drug Addiction and the Opioid Crisis, which has prioritized regulating the flow of fentanyl in its interim report.

I urge all of my bipartisan Members of this House to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2142, the INTERDICT Act of 2017. H.R. 2142, the International Narcotics Trafficking Emergency Response by Detecting Incoming Contraband with Technology Act, or the INTERDICT Act, is an important piece of legislation in our ongoing fight to stop the flow of illicit opioids like fentanyl from places like China and Mexico.

According to the CDC, the death rate from synthetic opioids, which includes drugs such as tramadol and fentanyl, increased by 72.2 percent from 2014 to 2015. In 2016, CBP seized nearly 200 pounds of fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, primarily from along the southwest border. This is 25-fold increase over seizures from the previous year.

The INTERDICT Act before us today ensures that CBP will have the necessary tools to better combat the flow of these opioids. More specifically, this bill provides CBP high-tech chemical screening devices to help detect and interdict fentanyl and other illicit synthetic opioids. Additionally, the bill provides for the laboratory equipment, facilities, and personnel for support during all operational hours.

This bill was passed by our committee unanimously, and I commend the sponsors of this bill, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and the gentleman from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), for their leadership on this issue.

I urge my colleagues to supports this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2142, the INTERDICT Act, legislation I was pleased to introduce with Congressman FITZPATRICK.

Whenever I meet with local public safety officials in my district, they explain the urgent need for resources and support to combat drugs like fentanyl, which can be up to 50 times stronger than heroin and 100 times stronger than morphine.

In Massachusetts, the proportion of overdose deaths attributed to fentanyl is rising at a meteoric rate. At its lowest, in the third quarter of 2014, fentanyl was present in 18 percent of opioid-related deaths in Massachusetts; but by 2016, fentanyl was present in a staggering 69 percent of the State's opioid-related deaths, resulting in 1,400 fentanyl-related deaths in the Commonwealth, a staggering number.

Although pharmaceutical fentanyl can be misused, most fentanyl deaths are linked to illicitly manufactured fentanyl and illicit versions of chemically similar compounds. The primary source of fentanyl is outside of the United States, in Mexico or China. The drug is smuggled in across the U.S. border or delivered via mail or express consignment couriers.

The INTERDICT Act will provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with the latest in chemical screening devices to deploy across the United States to better detect and intercept fentanyl and other synthetic opioids.

Furthermore, this legislation will ensure that Customs and Border Protection has the resources, personnel, and facilities—including scientists available during all operational hours—to interpret screening test results from the field.

These high-tech devices will also protect law enforcement officers and their four-legged counterparts on the front lines from exposure to the deadly narcotic, which is so powerful that coming into contact with just a few grains can be fatal.

I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee for their support, and I also want to thank Mr. FITZPATRICK for his partnership on this legislation, as well as our colleagues in the Senate, Senators MARKEY, RUBIO, BROWN, and CAPITO, for their bipartisan work on the Senate counterpart legislation.

□ 1715

The Federal Government must do its part to ensure our first responders have the tools they need in this greatest of public health fights. The INTERDICT Act provides important and powerful resources in this endeavor, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. If the gentleman from California has no other speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2142 is an important piece of legislation that has strong bipartisan support. Passage of this bill will go a long way in our fight against opiates. As such, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2142.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2142, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2142, the International Narcotics Trafficking Emergency Response by Detecting Incoming Contraband with Technology (INTERDICT) Act, to aid U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers with narcotics screenings.

In 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) determined that fentanyl and synthetic opioids took the lives of 64,070 people, a 21 percent increase from the previous year. In my home state, the Georgia Department of Public Health found that the number of deaths due to opioid overdoses is now nearly equal to the deaths from motor vehicle crashes. In the 4th District alone, over 200 lives were tragically lost due to this horrible epidemic. As a country, we can no longer afford inaction on an issue that has turned into an epidemic under our watch.

H.R. 2142 requires the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to increase the amount of chemical screenings to prevent the smuggling of fentanyl, opioids, and other narcotics into the country, either through mailing services or through a carrier. The bill also mandates that sufficient funds and employees, including scientists, are available to ensure thorough screenings and resources available at all operational hours. By giving our CBP officers a better chance of detecting these illicit drugs at the border, we may be able to save the lives of hundreds, if not thousands of Americans. Only with our action can we, as members of Congress, start to make a meaningful difference in this fight that is ravaging our country.

This is why I have strongly favored more funding to prevent the spread of the opioid crisis in the past, and will continue to fight for more resources that will end the opioid addiction crisis. For this reason, I am pleased to support H.R. 2142.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend

the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2142, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENA COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4010) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States and title 28, United States Code, to enhance compliance with requests for information pursuant to legislative power under Article I of the Constitution, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4010

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ENFORCEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1365 the following:

“§ 1365a. Congressional actions against subpoena recipients

“(a) SPECIAL RULES.—In any civil action brought by the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate, or a committee or subcommittee thereof, against the recipient of a subpoena to secure declaratory, injunctive, or other relief as may be appropriate concerning the failure to comply with a subpoena issued by a congressional committee or subcommittee, the following rules shall apply:

“(1) The action shall be filed in a United States district court of competent jurisdiction.

“(2) It shall be the duty of the United States district courts, the United States courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any such action and appeal.

“(3) If a three-judge court is expressly requested by the plaintiff in the initial pleading, the action shall be heard by a three-judge court convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, and shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such appeal shall be taken by the filing of a notice of appeal within 10 days, and the filing of a jurisdictional statement within 30 days, of the entry of the final decision.

“(b) MONETARY PENALTIES IN CASES INVOLVING GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—

“(1) The court may impose monetary penalties directly against the head of a Govern-

ment agency or a component thereof held to have willfully failed to comply with any part of a congressional subpoena.

“(2) No appropriated funds, funds provided from any accounts in the Treasury, funds derived from the collection of fees, or other Government funds shall be used to pay any monetary penalty imposed by the court pursuant to this section.

“(c) WAIVER OF PRIVILEGE.—Any assertion of a privilege or other ground for noncompliance (whether statutory, common law, or otherwise) asserted by the recipient of a congressional subpoena may be determined to have been waived as to any particular record withheld from production if the court finds that the recipient failed in a timely manner to comply with the requirement of section 105 of the Revised Statutes of the United States that it produce a privilege log with respect to such record.

“(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Government agency’ means an executive department listed in section 101 of title 5, United States Code, an independent establishment, commission, board, bureau, division, or office in the executive branch, or other agency of the Federal Government, including wholly or partly owned Government corporations.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1365 the following:

“1365a. Congressional actions against subpoena recipients.”.

SEC. 3. COMPLIANCE WITH CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter seven of title II of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 191 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 105. RESPONSE TO CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.

“(a) SUBPOENA BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.—Any recipient of any subpoena from a congressional committee or subcommittee shall appear and testify or produce records in a manner consistent with the subpoena and this section.

“(b) CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS FOR RECORDS.—

“(1) IDENTIFICATION OF RECORDS WITHHELD.—In the case of a record that is withheld, in whole or in part, by the subpoena recipient, the subpoena recipient shall provide a log containing the following information concerning such record:

“(A) An express assertion and description of the legal basis asserted for withholding the record.

“(B) The type of record.

“(C) The general subject matter.

“(D) The date, author, and addressee.

“(E) The relationship of the author and addressee to each other.

“(F) The custodian of the record.

“(G) Any other descriptive information that may be produced or disclosed regarding the record that will enable the congressional committee or subcommittee issuing the subpoena to assess the legal basis asserted for withholding the record.

“(2) MISSING RECORDS.—In the case of any record responsive to the subpoena submitted under paragraph (1) that was, but no longer is, in the possession, custody, or control of the subpoena recipient, the subpoena recipient shall identify the record (including the date, author, subject, and each recipient of the record) and explain the circumstances under which the record ceased to be in the possession, custody, or control of the subpoena recipient.

“(3) **ELECTRONIC RECORDS.**—Electronic records shall be produced pursuant to this subsection in their native or original file format. Electronic records shall be delivered on a storage device (such as compact disk, memory stick, or thumb drive) and, to the extent feasible, shall be organized, identified, and indexed electronically and shall include an index describing the contents of the production.

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section the term ‘record’ includes any books, papers, documents, data, or other objects requested in a subpoena issued by a congressional committee or subcommittee.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for chapter 7 of title II of the Revised Statutes of the United States is amended by adding at the end the following: “105. Response to congressional subpoenas.”.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted to diminish Congress’ inherent authority or previously established methods and practices for enforcing compliance with congressional subpoenas, nor shall anything in this Act be interpreted to establish Congress’ acceptance of any asserted privilege or other legal basis for noncompliance with a congressional subpoena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4010, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to you, having been unanimously voted on a recorded vote out of committee, but it has been a long time in coming and it has a long history of its need. Both under Chairman CONYERS, during the last years of the Bush administration, and under my chairmanship on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, we discovered a flaw in Congress’ subpoena power.

Congress has, and has always had, and has been supported all the way by the Supreme Court, the need to do oversight. With that, we issued subpoenas. The enforcement of those subpoenas has come into conflict over the last several years, both during Mr. CONYERS’ chairmanship when he subpoenaed Harriet Miers to appear, and during my time when I subpoenaed records by the Department of Justice. In both cases, the administrations decided that it was appropriate to question the standing and to delay.

Those delays were unfair to the body and unfair to the American people because it denied them in any reasonable

period of time the effect of factfinding. This is not a partisan issue. It is, in fact, an issue that has already been decided for the American people. Under the Freedom of Information Act, if you do not receive documents within a reasonable period of time, you have the right to go to court. You have standing as a private citizen or an interest group, and the court will decide what documents are appropriate for you to receive.

Yet this very question that was not once, but twice, defended by two different administrations of two different parties calls into question the ability in a timely fashion for Congress, the House or the Senate, to receive the information or the appearance of a witness it needs. We do not seek any new power under this legislation. We only seek an expeditious review by a Federal judge of a claim, either for the appearance of an individual or for documents appropriate to our oversight.

For that reason, I am pleased that both Republicans and Democrats within the committee saw fit to unanimously support this legislation. We believe that it is measured and it is also time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4010, the Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act of 2017. My support of this legislation is tied to my view of our committee’s responsibility to conduct oversight of the executive branch.

Nearly a century ago in *McGrain v. Daugherty*, the United States Supreme Court framed that responsibility this way: “A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation is intended to affect or change; and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is true—recourse must be had to others who possess it.”

In other words, it is our responsibility to ask for the information we require to do our jobs effectively, and the Constitution empowers us to enforce those requests if we are at first denied. We should be very clear on this point. Congress does not require a statute in order to enforce its subpoenas in Federal court.

We know this, of course, because in 2008, the House Judiciary Committee went to court to defend that authority. Ruling in favor of the committee, the court held that the Bush administration’s claim of absolute immunity from our process “is entirely unsupported by existing case law.”

In effect, both government officials and private individuals have a legal obligation to comply with the duly issued congressional subpoena whether or not

the bill before us today is enacted into law, still this legislation is useful as a means to codify certain practices and to expedite enforcement of subpoenas in Federal court.

It also puts the House on equal footing with the Senate, which has had a statute in place since 1978, allowing that body to enforce at least some of its subpoenas in Federal court.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for working with us to make sure that we strike the right balance. This bill both protects our existing authority and mitigates many concerns about abusive subpoena power by a runaway committee. I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) for his leadership on this issue.

We often disagree about the issues we should prioritize for oversight, but I suspect that we stand together on the importance of oversight, both to our committee and to the Congress as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues support the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to further echo the gentleman from New York’s comments. Mr. NADLER is right. We will often, almost unanimously, find a way to disagree on what to look into at various times as a body. But whether it is a Democratic chairman or Republican chairman looking into something, whether it is a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, it is clear that we must, in fact, if a subpoena is issued, be able to enforce it in a timely fashion.

Under this legislation, it has a number of safeguards, but the most important one is the three-judge panel that will review these, followed by an expedited process at the U.S. Supreme Court.

I might note, the interesting history of the two cases Mr. NADLER and I are talking about is one in which a Democratic chairman enforced a subpoena, but had to go to a recently appointed Republican judge, who, in a fairly reasonable period of time, reached the conclusion that: one, the committee had standing, and the House had standing and; two, that it was really without merit for the administration—then the Bush administration—to claim this immunity, this newfound immunity.

Similarly, in a slightly longer period of time, but coincidentally, a Republican chairman went before a freshly minted appointee of the very President who was refusing to comply, and she reached the decision that the documents were unfairly withheld and ordered them released.

So I think the interesting thing to all of us is the independence of the judiciary has worked not once but twice. We only want to codify it in a way that

would cause the judiciary to have that opportunity in a timely fashion, and for the people's right to know to be recognized in that same expeditious fashion.

As Mr. NADLER said, the Senate has, for a long time, had a portion of what we are doing here today. It is an oddity that two coequals have not had the same ability during those many years since the late 1970s.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to share one last thought before closing. In our markup of this bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) had this to say about a recent experience in the Intelligence Committee:

"We had interviewed a witness just 2 weeks ago with respect to our Russia interference investigation. . . .

"After the interview, he gave a public statement . . . and said that he had withheld information from the committee because he was not under subpoena.

"And he also stated that he felt like he had certain privileges to assert that allowed him to withhold this information.

"And so I saw right there . . . that even under a subpoena, individuals believe"—some individuals believe—"that without necessarily having a judicial or legal basis for privilege that they could just assert it.

"And I believe that is because the public is starting to perceive that our subpoena power does not have the weight that it should."

Wherever the Intelligence Committee's investigation lands, Mr. Speaker, we have a great deal of work to do. Given some of our current challenges, it is more important than ever for the House to conduct substantive oversight of the executive branch. This bill contributes to that effort, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, urge the House to pass this bill, move it to the Senate in a timely fashion, and create an equal standing between the House and the Senate as to enforcement of its subpoenas.

I join with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), in the frustration that individuals often feel that they have privileges in a vague sense that are not to be asserted, but simply not to occur.

In the last administration, we have even had individuals claim that they basically lied as little as they needed to, to protect some question of a classified nature. These kinds of claims, in addition to the law enforcement sensitive, confidential, and other security

clearance claims, which are not codified in statute, yet often are the reason for delay or outright refusal to deliver documents, flies in the face of the ability—sometimes behind closed doors, sometimes in public—for Congress' ability to conduct oversight. I look forward to this legislation becoming law, and I think I will close with just one more item.

Mr. NADLER and I have served together as chairman and ranking member for a number of years. We share something which is the many years that we have been here in Congress, we have seen the frustration of both parties trying to do their job against another branch that often takes advantage of the natural rivalry between two different parties.

This legislation is designed to reduce that, to reduce the ability for the executive branch or other outside groups to, if you will, take advantage of the natural division between the two of us. After so many years of being here, the one thing I have learned is that to diminish the House's and the Senate's ability to represent the American people is to diminish our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, although the power of Congress to investigate is not set forth in any particular clause in the Constitution, congressional investigations trace their roots back to the earliest days of our Republic. In fact, what is thought to be the first congressional investigation occurred in 1792, when the House appointed a select committee to investigate the massacre of American troops under the command of Major General Arthur St. Clair. The resolution authorizing that investigation stated that the committee shall "be empowered to call for such persons, papers, and records, as may be necessary to assist their inquiries."

Upon learning of the investigation, President Washington assembled his cabinet to seek their counsel. His cabinet, which included Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, unanimously concluded that the House had every right to conduct its inquiry and request papers from the President. President Washington directed that the relevant papers be provided to the House and the War and Treasury Departments provided voluminous records to the committee.

Unfortunately, not all congressional investigations are met with the cooperation the first investigation received. Rather, sometimes Congress and its committees must rely on another inherent power derived from the Constitution to investigate effectively—the congressional subpoena power.

As the Supreme Court has observed, although "there is no [constitutional] provision expressly investing either house with the power to make investigations and exact testimony . . . the power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function. . . . Experience has taught that mere requests for information often are unavailing . . . so some means of compulsion are essential to obtain what is needed."

That means of compulsion is often a subpoena issued by a congressional committee backstopped by a civil action filed in federal district court. In recent years, the House and its committees have pursued two such civil actions, including one filed by this Committee, to enforce compliance with congressional subpoenas.

The legislation we are considering today, the Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act, codifies and strengthens the existing civil enforcement mechanisms thereby reinforcing the powers granted Congress in Article I of the Constitution. This legislation creates a statutory framework for compliance with and enforcement of congressional subpoenas through a few targeted changes to federal law.

First, the bill puts in place a statutory requirement that recipients comply with congressional subpoenas. Second, the bill statutorily requires subpoena recipients to provide a congressional committee with a privilege log if they assert a legal privilege as a reason for withholding subpoenaed materials. Finally, the bill provides that congressional subpoena enforcement cases are to receive expedited review in the federal courts and that a congressional committee may request that a subpoena enforcement case be heard by a three-judge panel of the district court, with direct appeal to the Supreme Court.

While it is true that some of what is addressed by the bill is currently covered through negotiation with subpoena recipients and is recognized in the precedents of courts in the D.C. Circuit, the current statutory requirements related to compliance with and enforcement of a committee subpoena are limited. Indeed, the existing civil subpoena enforcement statute only covers the Senate and does not apply to Senate subpoenas issued to the Executive Branch. It is time that we put in place a statutorily created, expedited civil enforcement mechanism for congressional subpoenas. Relying on the existing framework to enforce congressional subpoenas has proved to be an inadequate means of protecting congressional prerogatives.

I thank Mr. ISSA for introducing this legislation and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it. This bill is a necessary step to strengthen Congress's ability to exercise its Article I legislative powers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4010, the Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act. This legislation allows the House of Representatives to enforce congressional subpoenas in federal court. Too often, congressional subpoenas are flouted because they lack enforcement mechanisms. Under current law, Congress must refer subpoenas to the appropriate United States attorney for enforcement. Typically, this United States attorney is appointed by the same administration over which Congress seeks to exert its oversight authority.

H.R. 4010 creates a clear set of enforcement mechanisms surrounding the congressional subpoena power. Although congressional subpoenas have been used by Congress and its committees for many years, there is currently no law requiring compliance. This legislation requires that recipients of congressional subpoenas either comply or provide

the committee with an explanation of the legal privilege that allows them to resist. This bill would also provide enforcement cases with an expedited review at the federal court level. Alternatively, committees can request that the enforcement case be heard by a district court panel of three judges with the option to appeal to the Supreme Court. Codifying these enforcement measures will provide Congress and its committees with a clear set of expectations for how to present and enforce subpoenas.

In these especially political times, checks and balances have never been more important. Congress must fully utilize its constitutional right to hold hearings and investigate members of the federal government, and we need tools to enforce these investigations if people refuse to comply. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I stand for transparency and honesty in our government, and as a Congress we have the duty to seek out both for our constituents. H.R. 4010 gives Congress the tools it needs to demand that people attempting to shroud and hide the truth reveal it, and I urge my fellow members to stand with me and support the Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4010, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3551;

The motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 504; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining

electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

C-TPAT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3551) to amend the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 to reauthorize the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism Program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 569]

YEAS—402

Abraham	Cohen	Fortenberry
Adams	Cole	Foster
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Foxx
Aguilar	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Allen	Comer	Fudge
Amodei	Comstock	Gabbard
Arrington	Conaway	Gaetz
Babin	Connolly	Gallagher
Bacon	Conyers	Gallego
Banks (IN)	Cook	Garamendi
Barr	Cooper	Garrett
Barragán	Correa	Gianforte
Barton	Costa	Gibbs
Beatty	Costello (PA)	Gohmert
Bera	Courtney	Gomez
Bergman	Cramer	Gonzalez (TX)
Beyer	Crawford	Goodlatte
Biggs	Crist	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crowley	Gottheimer
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Gowdy
Bishop (MI)	Cummings	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Black	Davidson	Graves (MO)
Blum	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Bonamici	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Bost	DeFazio	Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan	DeGette	Grothman
F.	Delaney	Guthrie
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Brady (TX)	DeBene	Handel
Brat	Demings	Harper
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Hartzler
Brown (MD)	DeSaulnier	Hastings
Brownley (CA)	DesJarlais	Heck
Buck	Deutch	Hensarling
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Dingell	Hice, Jody B.
Burgess	Doggett	Higgins (LA)
Bustos	Donovan	Higgins (NY)
Byrne	Doyle, Michael	Hill
Calvert	F.	Himes
Capuano	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Carbajal	Duncan (TN)	Hollingsworth
Cárdenas	Dunn	Hoyer
Carter (GA)	Ellison	Hudson
Carter (TX)	Emmer	Huffman
Cartwright	Engel	Hultgren
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Hunter
Castro (TX)	Españillat	Hurd
Chabot	Estes (KS)	Issa
Cheney	Esty (CT)	Jackson Lee
Chu, Judy	Evans	Jayapal
Cicilline	Farenthold	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Faso	Jenkins (KS)
Clarke (NY)	Ferguson	Jenkins (WV)
Cleaver	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (GA)
Clyburn	Fleischmann	Johnson (LA)
Coffman	Flores	Johnson (OH)

Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Schrader
Johnson, Sam	Meng	Schweikert
Jones	Messer	Scott (VA)
Jordan	Mitchell	Scott, Austin
Joyce (OH)	Moolenaar	Scott, David
Kaptur	Mooney (WV)	Sensenbrenner
Katko	Moore	Serrano
Keating	Moulton	Sessions
Kelly (IL)	Mullin	Sewell (AL)
Kelly (MS)	Murphy (FL)	Shea-Porter
Kelly (PA)	Nadler	Sherman
Kennedy	Napolitano	Shimkus
Khanna	Neal	Shuster
Kihuen	Newhouse	Simpson
Kildee	Noem	Sinema
Kilmer	Nolan	Slaughter
Kind	Norcross	Smith (MO)
King (IA)	Norman	Smith (NE)
King (NY)	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Kinzinger	O'Halleran	Smith (TX)
Knight	O'Rourke	Smith (WA)
Krishnamoorthi	Olson	Smucker
Kuster (NH)	Palazzo	Soto
Kustoff (TN)	Pallone	Speier
Labrador	Palmer	Stefanik
LaHood	Panetta	Stewart
LaMalfa	Pascarell	Stivers
Lamborn	Paulsen	Suozi
Lance	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Langevin	Pearce	Takano
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Taylor
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Tenney
Latta	Perry	Thompson (CA)
Lawrence	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Lawson (FL)	Peterson	Thompson (PA)
Lee	Pittenger	Thornberry
Levin	Pocan	Tiberi
Lewis (GA)	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Lewis (MN)	Poliquin	Titus
Lieu, Ted	Pollis	Tonko
Lipinski	Posey	Torres
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Loeb sack	Quigley	Turner
Lofgren	Raskin	Upton
Loudermilk	Ratcliffe	Valadao
Love	Reed	Vargas
Lowey	Reichert	Veasey
Lucas	Rice (NY)	Vela
Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Velázquez
Lujan Grisham,	Richmond	Visclosky
M.	Roby	Wagner
Luján, Ben Ray	Roe (TN)	Walberg
Lynch	Rogers (AL)	Walden
MacArthur	Rogers (KY)	Walker
Maloney,	Rohrabacher	Walorski
Carolyn B.	Rokita	Walters, Mimi
Maloney, Sean	Rooney, Francis	Walz
Marchant	Rooney, Thomas	Wasserman
Marino	J.	Schultz
Marshall	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters, Maxine
Massie	Rosen	Watson Coleman
Mast	Roskam	Weber (TX)
Matsui	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
McCarthy	Rouzer	Welch
McCaul	Roybal-Allard	Wenstrup
McClintock	Royce (CA)	Westerman
McCollum	Ruiz	Wilson (SC)
McEachin	Ruppersberger	Wittman
McGovern	Russell	Womack
McHenry	Rutherford	Woodall
McKinley	Sánchez	Yoder
McMorris	Sanford	Yoho
Rodgers	Sarbanes	Young (AK)
McNerney	Scalise	Young (IA)
McSally	Schakowsky	Zeldin
Meadows	Schiff	
Meehan	Schneider	

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—29

Barletta	DeSantis	Renacci
Bass	Duffy	Ross
Blackburn	Frankel (FL)	Rush
Blumenauer	Franks (AZ)	Ryan (OH)
Bridenstine	Granger	Sires
Buchanan	Gutiérrez	Trott
Butterfield	Huizenga	Williams
Carson (IN)	Long	Wilson (FL)
Clay	Lowenthal	Yarmuth
Culberson	Pingree	

□ 1853

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION BUSINESS TRAVEL CARDS ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 504) to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 570]

YEAS—401

Abraham	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Adams	Castro (TX)	Donovan
Aderholt	Chabot	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Cheney	F.
Allen	Chu, Judy	Duncan (SC)
Amash	Cicilline	Duncan (TN)
Amodei	Clark (MA)	Dunn
Arrington	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Babin	Cleaver	Emmer
Bacon	Clyburn	Engel
Banks (IN)	Coffman	Eshoo
Barr	Cohen	Espallat
Barragán	Cole	Estes (KS)
Barton	Collins (GA)	Esty (CT)
Beatty	Collins (NY)	Evans
Bera	Comer	Farenthold
Bergman	Comstock	Faso
Beyer	Conaway	Ferguson
Biggs	Connolly	Fitzpatrick
Bilirakis	Conyers	Fleischmann
Bishop (GA)	Cook	Flores
Bishop (MI)	Cooper	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Correa	Foster
Black	Costa	Fox
Blum	Costello (PA)	Frankel (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Frelinghuysen
Bonamici	Cramer	Fudge
Bost	Crawford	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Gaetz
F.	Crowley	Gallagher
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Galleo
Brady (TX)	Cummings	Garamendi
Brat	Curbelo (FL)	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Davidson	Gianforte
Brooks (IN)	Davis (CA)	Gibbs
Brown (MD)	Davis, Danny	Gomez
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (TX)
Buck	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Bueshon	DeGette	Gosar
Budd	Delaney	Gottheimer
Burgess	DeLauro	Gowdy
Bustos	DelBene	Graves (GA)
Byrne	Demings	Graves (LA)
Calvert	Denham	Graves (MO)
Capuano	Dent	Green, Al
Carbajal	DeSaulnier	Green, Gene
Cárdenas	DesJarlais	Griffith
Carter (GA)	Deutch	Grijalva
Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Cartwright	Dingell	Guthrie

Hanabusa	Maloney, Sean
Handel	Marchant
Harper	Marino
Harris	Marshall
Hartzler	Masse
Hastings	Mast
Heck	Matsui
Hensarling	McCarthy
Herrera Beutler	McCaul
Hice, Jody B.	McClintock
Higgins (LA)	McCollum
Higgins (NY)	McEachin
Hill	McGovern
Himes	McHenry
Holding	McKinley
Hollingsworth	McMorris
Hoyer	Rodgers
Hudson	McNerney
Huffman	McSally
Hultgren	Meadows
Hunter	Meehan
Hurd	Meeks
Issa	Meng
Jackson Lee	Messer
Jayapal	Mitchell
Jeffries	Moolenaar
Jenkins (KS)	Mooney (WV)
Jenkins (WV)	Moore
Johnson (GA)	Moulton
Johnson (LA)	Mullin
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (FL)
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler
Johnson, Sam	Napolitano
Jordan	Neal
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse
Kaptur	Noem
Katko	Nolan
Keating	Norcross
Kelly (IL)	Norman
Kelly (MS)	Nunes
Kelly (PA)	O'Halleran
Kennedy	O'Rourke
Khanna	Olson
Kihuen	Palazzo
Kildee	Pallone
Kilmer	Palmer
Kind	Panetta
King (IA)	Pascarell
King (NY)	Paulsen
Kinzinger	Payne
Knight	Pearce
Krishnamoorthi	Pelosi
Kuster (NH)	Perlmutter
Kustoff (TN)	Perry
Labrador	Peters
LaHood	Peterson
LaMalfa	Pocan
Lamborn	Poe (TX)
Lance	Poliquin
Langevin	Polis
Larsen (WA)	Posey
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)
Latta	Quigley
Lawrence	Raskin
Lawson (FL)	Ratcliffe
Lee	Reed
Levin	Reichert
Lewis (GA)	Rice (NY)
Lewis (MN)	Rice (SC)
Lieu, Ted	Richmond
Lipinski	Roby
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)
Loebach	Rogers (AL)
Lofgren	Rogers (KY)
Loudermilk	Rohrabacher
Love	Rokita
Lowe	Rooney, Francis
Lucas	Rooney, Thomas
Luetkemeyer	J.
Lujan Grisham,	Ros-Lehtinen
M.	Rosen
Luján, Ben Ray	Roskam
Lynch	Rothfus
MacArthur	Rouzer
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard
Carolyn B.	Royce (CA)

Gohmert

Barletta
Bass
Blackburn
Blumenauer

Ruiz	Ruppersberger
Russell	Rutherford
Sánchez	Schrader
Sanford	Schweikert
Sarbanes	Scott (VA)
Scalise	Scott, Austin
Schakowsky	Scott, David
Schiff	Sensenbrenner
Schneider	Serrano
Schrader	Sessions
Schwartz	Sewell (AL)
Scott (VA)	Shea-Porter
Scott, Austin	Sherman
Scott, David	Shimkus
Sensenbrenner	Shuster
Serrano	Simpson
Sessions	Sinema
Sewell (AL)	Slaughter
Shea-Porter	Smith (MO)
Sherman	Smith (NE)
Shimkus	Smith (NJ)
Shuster	Smith (TX)
Simpson	Smith (WA)
Sinema	Smucker
Slaughter	Soto
Smith (MO)	Speier
Smith (NE)	Stefanik
Smith (NJ)	Stewart
Smith (TX)	Stivers
Smith (WA)	Suozzi
Smucker	Swalwell (CA)
Soto	Takano
Speier	Taylor
Stefanik	Tenney
Stewart	Thompson (CA)
Stivers	Thompson (MS)
Suozzi	Thompson (PA)
Swalwell (CA)	Thornberry
Takano	Tiberi
Taylor	Tipton
Tenney	Titus
Thompson (CA)	Tonko
Thompson (MS)	Torres
Thompson (PA)	Tsongas
Thornberry	Turner
Tiberi	Upton
Tipton	Valadao
Titus	Vargas
Tonko	Veasey
Torres	Vela
Tsongas	Velázquez
Turner	Visclosky
Upton	Wagner
Valadao	Walberg
Vargas	Walden
Veasey	Walker
Vela	Walorski
Velázquez	Walters, Mimi
Visclosky	Walz
Wagner	Wasserman
Walberg	Schultz
Walden	Waters, Maxine
Walker	Watson Coleman
Walorski	Weber (TX)
Walters, Mimi	Webster (FL)
Walz	Welch
Wasserman	Wenstrup
Schultz	Westerman
Waters, Maxine	Wilson (SC)
Watson Coleman	Wittman
Weber (TX)	Womack
Webster (FL)	Woodall
Welch	Yoder
Wenstrup	Yoho
Westerman	Young (AK)
Wilson (SC)	Young (IA)
Wittman	Zeldin
Womack	
Woodall	

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—29

Bridenstine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Carson (IN)

Franks (AZ)
Granger
Gutiérrez
Huizenga
Long
Lowenthal

Pingree
Pittenger
Renacci
Ross
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sires
Trott
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1901

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 158, answered “present” 2, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 571]

YEAS—236

Abraham	Dingell	Johnson (LA)
Adams	Doggett	Johnson, Sam
Aderholt	Donovan	Kaptur
Allen	Doyle, Michael	Kelly (MS)
Amodei	F.	Kelly (PA)
Arrington	Duncan (SC)	Kennedy
Bacon	Duncan (TN)	Khanna
Banks (IN)	Dunn	Kildee
Beatty	Ellison	King (IA)
Beyer	Emmer	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Engel	Krishnamoorthi
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Kuster (NH)
Bishop (UT)	Espallat	Kustoff (TN)
Black	Estes (KS)	Labrador
Blunt Rochester	Evans	LaMalfa
Bonamici	Farenthold	Lamborn
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	Larsen (WA)
Brat	Fleischmann	Latta
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Lawrence
Brooks (IN)	Foster	Lawson (FL)
Brown (MD)	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Budd	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (MN)
Bustos	Gabbard	Lipinski
Byrne	Garamendi	Loudermilk
Calvert	Garrett	Love
Carter (TX)	Gianforte	Lowe
Cartwright	Gibbs	Lucas
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez (TX)	Luetkemeyer
Chabot	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham,
Chu, Judy	Gosar	M.
Cicilline	Gottheimer	Luján, Ben Ray
Cleaver	Gowdy	Maloney,
Clyburn	Green, Al	Carolyn B.
Cole	Griffith	Marchant
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Marino
Comstock	Hassie	Masse
Conyers	Harper	McCarthy
Cook	Harris	McCaul
Cooper	Hartzler	McClintock
Courtney	Heck	McCollum
Cramer	Hensarling	McEachin
Crawford	Higgins (LA)	McHenry
Cuellar	Higgins (NY)	McMorris
Cummings	Hill	Rodgers
Davidson	Himes	McNerney
Davis (CA)	Hollingsworth	McSally
Davis, Danny	Hoyer	Meadows
DeGette	Huffman	Meeks
DeLauro	Hultgren	Meng
DelBene	Hunter	Messer
Demings	Hurd	Mitchell
Dent	Issa	Moolenaar
DeSaulnier	Jayapal	Mooney (WV)
DesJarlais	Jeffries	Moore
Deutch	Johnson (GA)	Moulton

Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford

Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Speler
Stefanik
Stewart
Takano
Taylor
Thornberry

Tiberi
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ross
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sires
Trott

Williams
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1909

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 2017, I missed rollcall votes 569, 570, and 571 for health reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 569, "yes" on rollcall 570, and "yes" on rollcall 571.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 469, SUNSHINE FOR REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 732, STOP SETTLEMENT SLUSH FUNDS ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-363) on the resolution (H. Res. 577) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 469) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 732) to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Ms. CHENEY, from the Committee on Natural Resources, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 115-364) on the resolution (H. Res. 555) of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit, respectively, certain documents and other information to the House of Representatives relating to the executive order on the review of designations under the Antiquities Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN JERRY KLECZKA

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise, along with the Wisconsin delegation, to honor the former Congressman, Jerry Kleczka, my predecessor, who passed

away on October 8, 2017, at the age of 73.

He was a very serious, hardworking legislator who served on the Ways and Means Committee. He had a strong work ethic. He was a particularly fantastic steward of our seniors, and he was proud to serve the people of Wisconsin's Fourth Congressional District.

I am pleased to stand here with my colleagues from the Wisconsin delegation to honor his service to our Nation, to the State of Wisconsin, and to the Fourth Congressional District, and I ask our colleagues to join us in a moment of silence.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FALLEN HERO, SERGEANT LA DAVID TERRENCE JOHNSON

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with my deepest sympathy that I rise today to recognize the tragic loss of Sergeant La David Terrence Johnson, one of four brave U.S. Special Forces soldiers—and you see them here listed—killed during an ambush in Niger on October 4 as a result of enemy fire.

Sergeant Johnson was a proud south Floridian, a decorated soldier, having been awarded several honors, and well-loved throughout our community.

Sergeant Johnson was a loving husband to his wife, Myeshia, and a devoted father to their wonderful children, Ah'Leeyssa Jones and La David Johnson, Jr. He leaves behind a baby girl due in January.

Sergeant Johnson will always be remembered as a loyal family man, a dedicated soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

I offer my deepest sympathy to Sergeant Johnson's mourning family, friends, and loved ones.

Godspeed to Sergeant La David Terrence Johnson.

□ 1915

OPPOSE CAPS ON 401(K) CONTRIBUTIONS

(Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, recent media reports have suggested that the House will consider a plan to cap employees' 401(k) contributions as part of tax reform. I urge all my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to reject this proposal. This cap on 401(k) contributions would present a crippling and unnecessary burden on working families across the country by making it harder for everyday Americans to save for retirement.

NAYS—158

Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Cheney
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
Diaz-Balart
Esty (CT)
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Gomez

Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grothman
Hanabusa
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
LaHood
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McGovern
McKinley
Meehan
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
Palazzo
Pallone

Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schradler
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Soto
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rice (SC) Tonko

NOT VOTING—36

Barletta
Bass
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Carson (IN)
Clay
Culberson
DeSantis
Duffy
Franks (AZ)
Gohmert
Granger
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Huizenga
Jones
Long
Lowenthal
Mullin
Pingree
Quigley
Renacci

There is already growing bipartisan opposition to this proposal as President Trump tweeted against it this morning, and in September, the majority leader said that this plan would punish people when they are actually saving for their own retirement.

I agree with the majority leader. Working families already face enormous challenges in saving for retirement. This proposal would create another, and I urge all of my colleagues to strongly oppose it.

THANKING GOOD KARMA ANIMAL RESCUE

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Good Karma Animal Rescue of Minnesota in Maple Grove and their animal efforts in southern Texas after Hurricane Harvey.

After Harvey made landfall at the end of August, Good Karma Animal Rescue made two separate rescue attempts within a 2-week period south of Houston to the communities of Victoria and Rockport, Texas.

Good Karma Animal Rescue, led by Lisa Booth, rescued over 50 animals—ranging in all shapes, sizes, and ages—and brought them back to Minnesota to be treated for various ailments and prepare them for adoption by Minnesota families.

Mr. Speaker, the Twin Cities community loves rescue animals, and I want to thank Good Karma Animal Rescue for their work to find homes for these pets that were left behind in the recent tragic storms.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GARRETT PAIZ

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a local hero, Garrett Paiz, a Mecca native and firefighter, killed in the line of duty while fighting fires in northern California on October 16 at the age of 38.

I grew up with Garrett's family. Garrett embodied the best values of service and sacrifice. He put others above self, willing to rush toward danger when others ran from it. He traveled to northern California with firefighters from around the country to battle the deadly fires threatening so many homes and families. Being a firefighter was his lifelong dream.

He was humble, hardworking, and devoted to his family, and he was always smiling and laughing. Garrett had an adventurous nature and kind heart. He was always willing to do whatever was needed to take care of others.

I join my wife, Monica, and the entire 36th Congressional District to mourn this heartbreaking loss and honor Garrett's legacy.

To his wife, Bobbie; daughter, Terri Ann; parents, Judi and Armando; brother, Carlos; and sister, Cinthia; and the rest of the extended Paiz family, we support you, and we honor Garrett's dedication to selfless service. His life and sacrifice will never be forgotten.

EAGLE SCOUT COMMUNITY SERVICE PROJECT OF THE YEAR

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Boy Scouts of America Leatherstocking Council. For more than 100 years the Boy Scouts of America have molded young boys into men of character, compassion, and commitment.

Last week, I had the honor of attending their annual leadership dinner, where four of our local Eagle Scouts—Nathaniel Degear of DeRuyter, Devyn Guy of Middleburgh, Paul White of Clinton, and Gannon Frisbee of Downsville—were honored as finalists for the Eagle Project of the Year. The four finalists represented more than 120 new Eagle Scouts, who gave over 2,500 hours in service to our community.

It was an honor to finally present Gannon Frisbee with the Eagle Scout Community Service Project of the Year Award. Gannon began his project intending to upgrade lighting and wall decor at a local American Legion.

Soon after beginning his project, Gannon realized the building's structural integrity was at risk. Gannon worked tirelessly to repair the walls and the floor of the American Legion. His project was critical in ensuring that the American Legion was able to return to normal operations.

These young men offer us a glimpse into the Boy Scouts' outstanding tradition of service and commitment to community. They are truly a testament to the strength and the potential of America's next generation of leaders.

GO HOUSTON ASTROS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, go Astros.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey, so many impacted, our boys of summer brought it home this weekend. In the words of David Barron: "With their season on the line, the Astros drew comfort from the familiar ground on which they stood, the sea of noise that greeted their every move, and the

collective will that exemplifies the way they played and the city they represent."

Astros strong, Houston strong.

I am so delighted to have a friendly wager with a dear friend. I don't know for how long. I think he represents the Brooklyn—oh, the Los Angeles Dodgers.

I yield to the gentleman from California, and whether he will accept this friendly wager, I offer you Texas barbecue, Congressman JIMMY GOMEZ.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

In the spirit of good sportsmanship, I accept the gentlewoman's wager and the barbecue that I will get to enjoy next week.

The Houston Astros are an amazing team, with 101 wins, but the Dodgers are better, with 104. I know that the Astros stumbled across that finish line to make it to the World Series. I know it is going to be a hell of a game between the two teams.

If we lose, I will bring some French dip sandwiches from the Louisiana institution, Philippe's, in downtown Los Angeles.

Let the best team win. Play ball.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Reclaiming my time, barbecue is good everywhere in Texas.

Where there is a will, there is a way. The Astros have the will and the way.

Go Astros.

GO LOS ANGELES DODGERS

(Ms. BARRAGÁN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Los Angeles Dodgers for winning the National League Championship Series. They will appear in the World Series for the first time in 29 years. I hope they win it all.

Earlier this year, I had the honor of wearing the Dodgers uniform to the Congressional Baseball Game. I am a huge fan, and we Angelinos love our Dodgers.

When I was a kid, as my father battled Parkinson's disease, we watched every game together. It was our bonding time.

As we watch the game this week, may every kid enjoy our national pastime with a loved one—in person or in spirit.

Go Dodgers.

CONGRATULATING FORT LEE ON 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

(Mr. McEACHIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the 100th anniversary of the United States Army's Fort Lee in Prince George County, Virginia.

The fort that we know today began as Camp Lee in 1917. Camp Lee served as a training base for hundreds of thousands of our country's bravest as they prepared for service in World Wars I and II, a tradition that has continued ever since, often in pathbreaking ways.

In the late 1940s, Camp Lee became the home of the Women's Army Corp Training Center, which established a high-quality training facility for women who wished to serve their country.

Mr. Speaker, Fort Lee continues to prepare men and women for their service as the home to the Combined Arms Support Command, the U.S. Army Ordnance School, the U.S. Army Quartermaster School, the U.S. Army Transportation School, and roughly 20 other organizations and units.

Today and every day, we are grateful to all who have served at Fort Lee for a combined 100 years of dedication and honorable service.

CONTINUE PROVIDING AID TO PUERTO RICO

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Friday marked 1 month since Hurricane Maria devastated Puerto Rico.

According to my constituents, current conditions are as follows: more than 1 million Americans there lack access to clean water; mothers cannot make infant formula; people are getting sick from infected water; and nearly 80 percent of the island still lacks electricity.

Struggles are everywhere: where there is help trickling in, there are lines, always lines; supplies simply aren't enough; medical facilities are running on hope; there is no reliable means of communication, so people cannot even register for aid; entire communities are cut off from modern civilization; millions desperately need assistance.

President Trump visited the island for as long as it takes to play a round of golf, and he went to the wealthiest part of the capital city. Last week, he granted himself a perfect score for his response to the devastation. But the Trump administration continues to fail our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, 3.4 million Americans live in Puerto Rico, and they deserve our full support.

Mr. President, can't you at least air-drop fresh water packets, food provisions, and telephones? Our military can do this anywhere in the world, why not Puerto Rico?

RECOGNIZING THOSE WHO HELPED IN CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, California, northern California, where I am from, has been suffering, as so many people know, from devastating fires these last few weeks. I think it is very appropriate to point out the incredible efforts of our first responders and our firefighters in saving so much valuable property and the lives that have been saved, as well as citizens pulling together to help each other.

We see the best in Americans during these times of crisis, and that has not gone unnoticed in northern California as well. Our hearts are with those folks who have suffered losses and more loss of life than could be imagined in modern-day America with all the fire-fighting apparatus and prevention we have. Still, it shows you have to have preparedness; you have to have defensible space; and you have to be ready, at any given time, during this type of fire season.

Again, our hats are off to our first responders and our firefighters for the amount of property and lives they have been able to save under these conditions. God bless them.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF PATH

(Ms. JAYAPAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is United Nations Day. As we reflect on the value of global partnerships to solve problems, I want to recognize the 40th anniversary of the international global health organization known as PATH, Program for Appropriate Technology and Health.

PATH is headquartered in Seattle, and since its founding, it has been an incredible force for good. It is a place that I had the opportunity to work at for many years in the 1990s.

PATH works in more than 70 countries, improving health for 150 million people each year. PATH has made a difference in countless lives, from stopping preventable deaths of mothers and children to keeping people safe from infectious disease outbreaks.

PATH has also helped make Washington State a global center of development for lifesaving health equity, innovations, and solutions. In 2013 alone, this global health industry generated \$5.8 billion in direct economic impact and employed more than 12,500 people.

PATH collaborates with governments, the private sector, and NGOs to advance more than 100 health strategies and technologies. It has saved \$14 million per year doing things like preventing undamaged vaccines from being discarded.

Congratulations to PATH.

□ 1930

TAX REFORM

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this House and its committees will discuss what is being called tax reform, what is being told to the American public is a middle class tax break.

Well, I am here to tell you it is a con job. It is a tax giveaway to the wealthiest people in this country like never before at the expense of people in the middle class, lesser incomes, who will not get benefits, and if they do, it is chump change. It is the change you give somebody at a restaurant when you get your meal.

Billionaires will get to get away without having to pay an estate tax, like Donald Trump—billions of dollars they will not have to pay to the government to help fund Pell grants, LIHEAP, and other programs that help people who need something. That is something they will not come off of.

They may raise a little rate and say: We are going to put a little higher rate on the wealthy because it is not in there now.

They may say: Give the State and local income tax exemptions back.

But they are not going to go back on the estate tax because that is for the superwealthy, and that is who this bill is for.

Wake up America. It is a con job.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to co-anchor this CBC Special Order hour. Also, I want to acknowledge the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. CEDRIC RICHMOND, from the State of Louisiana, and other Members who are here to participate. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to speak directly to the American people on issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, the constituents that we all represent in our various districts.

For this particular Special Order hour, I am going to open it up and

begin to talk about something that is very important and has been widely discussed within the Congressional Black Caucus, and that is civil rights and some of the things that we are worried about that are going on within the Justice Department.

We have several important Members here to speak on these. Before I go any further, I want to go ahead and recognize them. The first speaker we have is from the State of South Carolina, representing that State's Sixth Congressional District, and also our caucus' assistant leader. That is Mr. JIM CLYBURN.

I thank Representative CLYBURN for joining and being a part of this Special Order hour to talk about this subject matter that is very important to so many members of the Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

I also thank him and our colleague, Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for joining me at the Center for African American Studies at the University of Texas at Arlington last Thursday evening. It was a wonderful experience for me. President Vistas Karbhari, Dr. Jason Skelton, and my longtime friend, Dr. Marvin Delaney, were perfect hosts.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Sergeant La David T. Johnson died a hero's death in a distant land on a mission few Americans know about or understand. This weekend, his grieving family, including his pregnant wife, took him to his final resting place in Florida. Sergeant Johnson's tragic death leaves this young family fatherless.

Mr. Speaker, in his second inaugural address, President Abraham Lincoln called on our Nation to endeavor to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.

Unfortunately, rather than comfort Sergeant Johnson's grieving family, the current occupant of the White House has chosen to use them as his latest prop in his constant effort to sow discord and division in this country.

The President and White House Chief of Staff John Kelly, who happens to be a four-star general, have insulted and smeared an honorable public servant who happens to be a five-star Congresswoman, and, in effect, called her and her grieving widow constituent liars.

Congresswoman FREDERICA S. WILSON has been a champion for the people of south Florida for decades. It is no mystery—and it was not political—that she was accompanying Mrs. Johnson and her family to receive her husband's remains. She had mentored Sergeant Johnson throughout his childhood.

I have participated in several of Congresswoman WILSON's 500 Role Models

events and have spoken for one of their graduations. I also wear this red tie to this floor helping her highlight their efforts. Her passionate work on behalf of those kidnapped girls of Boko Haram is unmatched.

As the husband of a five-star African-American woman for more than 56 years and the father of three African-American daughters who are working hard to earn their stars every day, I feel compelled to respond to General Kelly and completely disregard his concocted misrepresentations.

Mr. Speaker, we can have political differences here in Washington. That comes with the territory. But people need to have the common decency and basic humanity to refrain from exacerbating the pain of those already suffering so much. I was taught from childhood that silence gives consent. I want the White House to know this: I and the members of the Congressional Black Caucus will not be silent, and we will not be silenced.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) very much for his timely and very serious comments. I hope that all of the Members who are here on both sides of the aisle realize the seriousness of the comments. There is nothing humorous about them all, nothing to be smiling or laughing about. It is very timely in light of the unfortunate incident that happened with our colleague. I thank the gentleman very much for bringing that to light.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my fellow Texan from the 18th Congressional District in Houston. I thank very much Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE for joining us this evening. We look forward to the gentlewoman's words.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager, Mr. VEASEY, for his leadership, his sensitivities, his sensibilities, and his empathy, knowing his distinguished wife and the leadership she gives to the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation. I am sure that there are many women in the gentleman's family, and I know that he has a great honor and respect for them.

It is appropriate to follow the leader, Mr. CLYBURN, who is vested in the storied history of African Americans from the East to the West, North to the South. He often diminishes his status by saying that he was raised in a parish house, but when he eloquently rises to the floor to defend, all eyes and all ears are tuned to him.

Now, I want to adhere to our discussion today because it is extremely important, and to also acknowledge my colleagues. So let me hurry through my comments. I do want to acknowledge the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, CEDRIC RICHMOND. I thank the women of the caucus for their eloquent and pointed statement regarding the series of events that has occurred.

Let me, first of all, say that our topic today deals with a retracing of the horrible history that was perpetrated under FBI Director Hoover for the decades that he served in that capacity. So as I label what it is, let me just for a moment deviate to what happened this weekend. I believe that the FBI personnel, through much of its history, were mostly men—fine men—who wanted to protect this Nation. But you see, Mr. Speaker, I have firsthand knowledge of the devastation of FBI surveillance way before the word “terrorism” became part of our normal discussion or language.

So I want to put a pause there and say that in the history of African Americans, we have been subjected to name-calling. That is what happens to you when, in the Constitution, you are not a complete human being. That is what happens to you even after the Emancipation Proclamation and the short-lived Reconstruction, the Nation rushed toward the hanging fruit, Jim Crowism, and the rampant murder of African Americans in the Deep South, some of the very States in which the President stood and called young African-American men sons of Bs.

There is another name-calling. So it seems that even as we have gone through the transition of freedom and we came through the 20th century with civil rights, and then affirmative action, that name-calling seems to be the welcomed and accepted tactic to use with people of color and, in this instance, African Americans.

What would be the explanation for the unseemly events that occurred around a grieving mother, aunt, uncle, and a grieving widow with beautiful children who no longer have their dad?

I offer my sympathy to Sergeants Wright, Black, La David Johnson, and Jeremiah Johnson.

So how their loss, through no fault of their own, in the battle for this Nation turned into an ugly name-calling, I am baffled, except for the fact that it is easy to call African Americans names. It is easy for some White Americans to call African Americans names.

When we are on the floor of the House and we say things that are untoward in some segments of the population, our phones ring off the hook with the N word, N word, N word. I don't know how many of my friends who are not people of color—I am sure we all say things that people disagree with, and I don't know whether they call up and call them White, White, White.

You see, race is something that we are fearful of discussing, and that is because the thought would be: Here she goes again.

But there is a great love—my interaction, my life's history is with the diversity of this world, from White Caucasians, Anglos in Texas, to Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, and beyond

in various religious. I feel comfortable in my soul.

But this weekend was the most difficult time for African-American women who are—in the category of casting, the caste system—at the bottom of the totem pole. Even today, the likes of Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth, Mae Jemison, Shirley Chisholm, Barbara Jordan, doctors, lawyers, and others, we are at the bottom.

So there was much latitude—uncontrolled latitude—in name-calling. Forty-five mentioning untoward words about our colleague, Congresswoman WILSON: name-calling. Nobody—there is no retribution or reprimand. None of his constituents would give a hoot. But it was name-calling.

Mr. Speaker, you don't know how many people stop me in airports, along the road, hurt and appalled. Let me just come to a close on that.

First of all, Congressman CLYBURN has already given the attributes of Congresswoman WILSON. I do want to add that she is a principal. She is an old-fashioned principal, though she is a young woman.

□ 1945

She loved her students. She implemented the 5000 Role Models. She took the children as family, and Sergeant David Johnson was one of those. So if people don't understand the cultural distinctions in the African-American community, we are aunts and uncles without bloodline. We are Godparents. We are family.

Her presence in that car was not as an interloper. She didn't break the door down. She was in there as family. She was not eavesdropping. The phone was on. As indicated by Mrs. Johnson's interview, she asked the phone to be put on speaker.

It seems that her offense in breaking down moved the Representative to articulate, probably seeking some humanity, to say: Can you just, if you hear my words, apologize?

That never happened. The untruth spread all over. You see, as an African-American woman, you don't have to worry about saying the truth about us. We are various names—sons of Bs—and we have got all kinds of disturbing situations going on with names that we can be called. And that is what this White House did.

My dear friend, who I knew in the Southern Command, that is what happens when you are here for just a few years. He had great leadership and loss. I was here when that happened. And I don't want to spend a moment to diminish his status as a Gold Star parent. He has a right to mourn and to speak of his loss.

But then, when you are forced to step from that humble position over to an untruth, you can do it to a Black woman. They have no power. I can talk something that doesn't have any truth,

because I have to defend—and this is said lovingly—a White man who happens to be in the Oval Office.

We don't count. We are the largest group of active, civic women in all kinds of organizations. If there is something being done—first of all, it is women overall, I love them all, but you will see the African-American woman—she is in there scrubbing, she is in there teaching, she is in there handling the religious institutions, she is standing by babies, and she is standing by young people.

She is a civil rights activist, she is a scientist, she is a doctor. She is president of various organizations. She is just in there.

That is what happened that has brought me to this point that what we have now is so dangerous. I hope before the end of the week—maybe before the end of tomorrow—my good friend, General Kelly, seeks to apologize for the distortion. He didn't have to defend a person who does it in his own way and besmirch all of the Gold Star families and this young mother who has not been able to see her son.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are many of us who served in this Congress who have seen their brethren fall. They have been injured. What is it like for their family not to be able to see the body? What is it like to know that the person's body was not found for 48 hours?

I am going to get to an end for my colleagues. I just want to say this. There are those of us who know about the African Command. There are those of us who know the soldiers there. The Congressional Black Caucus was instrumental when George Bush said that an African Command needs to stand up when Charles Taylor was killing his citizens in Liberia.

I know it firsthand. I have been to all those countries. I know ISIL was connected with Boko Haram. We have been trying to say it, but people have deaf ears, maybe because it is Africa.

Now, all of a sudden we are awake. Congresswoman WILSON knew that. She has been there. We have been there. Why don't people listen to Black women who know what they are talking about, along with our distinguished colleagues?

This document that I hold in my hand, "Black Identity Extremists Likely Motivated to Target Law Enforcement Officers," I have a lot to say on, but I am going to summarize.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, this is name-calling. We just got through a reckless weekend of name-calling of a distinguished Member of Congress.

This is name-calling. This is the FBI defining BIEs as individuals who seek, through unlawful acts of force or violence, a response to perceived racism and injustice.

But do you know what will happen, Mr. Speaker? This will be a big fishnet:

the high school student who is getting his fists up; the college student who is rallying around in opposition to racism; the students down in Charlottesville who may believe they should stand up and be counted.

I know this, Mr. Speaker, because, with a little bit of humor, I am young, going backwards, but I served on the Select Committee on Assassinations that investigated the assassination of Martin Luther King—the reopening of the investigation—along with John F. Kennedy.

I was immersed in the files of COINTELPRO. I saw how the FBI dogged a modern-day prophet, a man who only wanted peace and believed in the beloved community. Yes, he was human. When you dog someone, you can find them throwing gum on a sidewalk.

Dr. Martin Luther King was subjected to the COINTEL program. It was dastardly and devastating, and may have been the basis of the loss of his life. If he was subjected to the COINTEL program, we always wondered why he couldn't have been in another hotel.

So the danger of this document that has come under Donald Trump and not under any other President—not Bill Clinton, not George Bush, not President Obama—as I understand it, but it came in August of this year, under President Trump, the same President who could find nothing distinctive between the alt-right and racist vileness talking about Jews and Blacks and everybody else in Charlottesville. There were good people on both sides.

Now we have this document. Lo and behold, what other names of Black activists and African Americans still fighting the war of civil rights peacefully may be caught up in this large net?

Again, I want to be able to say my respect for the service of FBI agents. They are friends of mine. I am on the Judiciary Committee. They are friends to all of us. We continue to salute their service. But this document is a riotous document.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I include in the RECORD: "The History of Surveillance and the Black Community." It goes into the discussion.

[From the Electronic Frontier Foundation,
February 13, 2014]

THE HISTORY OF SURVEILLANCE AND THE
BLACK COMMUNITY
(By Dia Kayyali)

February is Black History Month and that history is intimately linked with surveillance by the federal government in the name of "national security." Indeed, the history of surveillance in the African-American community plays an important role in the debate around spying today and in the calls for a congressional investigation into that surveillance. Days after the first NSA leaks emerged last June, EFF called for a new Church Committee. We mentioned that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was one of the targets of the very surveillance that eventually

led to the formation of the first Church Committee. This Black History Month, we should remember the many African-American activists who were targeted by intelligence agencies. Their stories serve as cautionary tales for the expanding surveillance state.

The latest revelations about surveillance are only the most recent in a string of periodic public debates around domestic spying perpetrated by the NSA, FBI, and CIA. This spying has often targeted politically unpopular groups or vulnerable communities, including anarchists, anti-war activists, communists, and civil rights leaders.

60s. COINTELPRO, short for Counter Intelligence Program, was started in 1956 by the FBI and continued until 1971. The program was a systemic attempt to infiltrate, spy on, and disrupt activists in the name of “national security.” While it initially focused on the Communist Party, in the 1960s its focus expanded to include a wide swathe of activists, with a strong focus on the Black Panther Party and civil rights leaders such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

FBI papers show that in 1962 “the FBI started and rapidly continued to gravitate toward Dr. King.” This was ostensibly because the FBI believed black organizing was being influenced by communism. In 1963 FBI Assistant Director William Sullivan recommended “increased coverage of communist influence on the Negro.” However, the FBI’s goal in targeting Dr. King was clear: to find “avenues of approach aimed at neutralizing King as an effective Negro leader,” because the FBI was concerned that he might become a “messiah.”

The FBI subjected Dr. King to a variety of tactics, including bugging his hotel rooms, photographic surveillance, and physical observation of King’s movements by FBI agents. The FBI’s actions went beyond spying on Dr. King, however. Using information gained from that surveillance, the FBI sent him anonymous letters attempting to “blackmail him into suicide.” The agency also attempted to break up his marriage by sending selectively edited “personal moments he shared with friends and women” to his wife.

The FBI also specifically targeted the Black Panther Party with the intention of destroying it. They infiltrated the Party with informants and subjected members to repeated interviews. Agents sent anonymous letters encouraging violence between street gangs and the Panthers in various cities, which resulted in “the killings of four BPP members and numerous beatings and shootings,” as well as letters sowing internal disension in the Panther Party. The agency also worked with police departments to Department that aided in a raid on BPP leader Fred Hampton’s apartment. The raid ended with the Chicago Police shooting Hampton dead.

The FBI was not alone in targeting civil rights leaders. The NSA also engaged in domestic spying that included Dr. King. In an eerily prescient statement, Senator Walter Mondale said he was concerned that the NSA “could be used by President ‘A’ in the future to spy upon the American people, to chill and interrupt political dissent.”

The Church Committee was created in response to these and other public scandals, and was charged with getting to the bottom of the government’s surveillance overreach. In response to its findings, Congress passed new laws to provide privacy safeguards, including the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. But ever since these safeguards were put in place, the intelligence commu-

nity has tried to weaken or operate around them. The NSA revelations show the urgent need to reform the laws governing surveillance and to rein in the intelligence community.

Today we’re responding to those domestic surveillance abuses by an unrestrained intelligence branch. The overreach we’ve seen in the past underscores the need for reform. Especially during Black History Month, let’s not forget the speech-stifling history of US government spying that has targeted communities of color.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It says: “We mentioned that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was one of the targets of the very surveillance that eventually led to the formation of the first Church Committee. This Black History Month, we should remember the many African-American activists who were targeted by intelligence agencies. Their stories serve as cautionary tales for the expanding surveillance state.”

Where are the conservatives to stand up against this document? We can be safe, we can have the First Amendment, and we speak our different issues, but now we are going to entrap African Americans—young men who are kneeling because of their concern for police reform and violence that has taken the lives of African-American young men.

There are so many law enforcement officers who agree with me on the idea of police reform to help all of us work together. We are not divided, but we will stay divided with a document that is going to label us.

Where is the document for the alt-right, the religious right, the White supremacists? Where is that?

When are we going to understand that the calling of names—in our community, we call it calling me out of my name—by the majority community is a carryover from slavery and Jim Crow.

I am saddened by the last couple of days of steering away from the mourning of those wonderful heroes who reflected the greatness of America. They reflected what young men and women do who are willing to sacrifice their lives. They go without a recognition of what color their fellow soldier is. We honor them with no distinction.

That is what the last couple of days should have been about, as well as the loving care of that widow and the families of the other young men. Yet, in the spirit of the FBI COINTEL program, that may be the downfall, again, of those of us trying to heal and not reflecting on how the best way to deal with those who would do us harm violently, of which I stand against, we are now in the midst of name-calling.

I go to my seat mourning. When is America going to change?

On August 3, 2017, the FBI released their new “Intelligence Assessment” report entitled: Black Identity Extremists (BIE) Likely Motivated to Target Law Enforcement Officers.”

The FBI defines BIE as individuals who seek, through unlawful acts of force or vio-

lence, a response to “perceived” racism and injustice in American society.

The FBI also indicates, there is a desire for black physical or psychological separation based on religious or political beliefs grounded in racial superiority or supremacy.

Blacks fought for America long before it was a country, prerevolutionary period, where during the first 100 years of conflict we stepped up; and will continue, for equality and justice.

Blacks led civil rights movement winning double victories in both World War II and the Jim Crow era, forcing our then President Truman, to announce that “there are no justifiable reasons for discrimination because of one’s ancestry, or religion, or race, or color of his skin.”

Today, Trump’s FBI believes that the African American community’s reality is a mere perception as it relates to the racism and injustice that plague our communities. Why?

The FBI has consistently relied upon a flawed system to determine the number of people killed by officers. This flawed system is shaped by “voluntary law enforcement compliance”—in other words, police departments need not report this stat.

“The Counted” launched by the Guardian, is a public-service project tallying deaths of unarmed persons by law enforcement. They reached a tally of 1,068 at the start of 2015.

Former FBI Director Comey said, this was embarrassing and unacceptable that a Guardian U.S. investigative unit had a better tally than his agency’s near 35,000 employees.

There is no reliable mechanism to accurately depict the true dimensions of an epidemic of lethal violence, force, and shootings committed by police across this country on unarmed civilians.

The reality is Sandra Bland died while in the custody of law enforcement; Michael Brown was gunned down in the street by law enforcement; Eric Garner died from a chokehold at the hands of law enforcement; Freddie Gray died while being transported in the custody of law enforcement; Tamir Rice was shot dead by a law enforcement officer previously deemed an emotionally unstable recruit and unfit for duty; and Laquan McDonald shot in the back and killed by law enforcement officers.

These are just a few of the innocent lives robbed and thus, gone too soon. These are the realities not perceptions that young activists in their own modern ways represent, whether it’s marching, protesting with passion, or even taking a knee.

They are protesting unapologetically with great passion and hunger for justice, but nonetheless, peacefully.

They are not killing others who do not agree with them; nor are they inflicting violence due to religion, nationality and race.

Therefore, it is highly insensitive, offensive and blatantly discriminative and unconstitutional to mount a counter intelligence program, now COINTELPRO 2.0, to once again, aggressively target a race that merely seeks justice and equality it is entitled under our Constitution.

According to sources close to the FBI, the term “Black Identity Extremists” did not exist before the Trump administration. The FBI named BIE, a major threat to national security

and public safety, thereby, criminalizing black activism.

The newly coined term, black identity extremists (BIE) is such a vague terminology that it invites alarming abuse of a specific race's constitutional rights based solely on an Administration's disturbed and visceral approach to race relations.

Under FBI Director Edgar Hoover's leadership, the Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO), a covert, often illegal, campaign was mounted to break up the civil rights movement and "neutralize" activists they perceived as threatening.

COINTELPRO was used to surveil and discredit civil rights activists, members of the Black Panther Party and any major advocates for the rights of black people in our nation's history.

COINTELPRO allowed the FBI to falsify letters in an effort to blackmail Martin Luther King Jr. into silence.

This was such a disgraceful period in our nation's history that our recent FBI Director, James Comey, kept a copy of a 1963 order authorizing Hoover to conduct round-the-clock surveillance of Martin Luther King Jr. on his desk as a reminder of Hoover's abuses.

The FBI's dedicated surveillance of black activists follows a long history of the U.S. government aggressively monitoring protest movements and working to disrupt civil rights groups, but the scrutiny of African Americans by a domestic terrorism unit was particularly alarming to some free speech campaigners.

This administration continues the same vile tactics used in well-documented stories of civil rights leaders who were profiled, targeted and killed for insisting that black people receive equitable treatment under the law in a country whose Constitution guarantees it.

Today the FBI continues its once intrusive, abhorrent and illegal targeting of black activists by labeling the Black Lives Matter movement as BIE.

We know that the Department of Homeland Security has been surveilling Black Lives Matter activists since 2014, but there's no way to know what's next.

With this recent report, the FBI has legitimized the idea that black activism is a threat and should be treated accordingly, with violent force.

Despite Charlottesville and all the other harms inflicted by emboldened white nationalists, the FBI has instead, chosen to target a group of American citizens whom merely decry the injustice seen and felt throughout their communities.

Despite numerous unarmed black individuals, particularly, young black men that are disproportionately the victims of police shootings, the FBI would like us to believe this is not a reality.

Instead, the FBI's report claims there is a danger in black activism by asserting that violence inflicted on black people at the hands of police is "perceived" or "alleged," not real.

This month the Congressional Black Caucus has written to the FBI Director, Christopher Wray, to express our concern over the recent "Intelligence Assessment" report.

We have requested a briefing on both the origins of its research and the FBI's next intended step based on its findings. No response as of date.

We should be allowed to exercise our constitutional and fundamental rights of free speech.

We should not be restricted and criminalized when we demand that those we elect to office exercise justice and fairness.

This FBI report will further inflame an already damaged police/community relation under the leadership of Attorney General Jeff Sessions.

Sessions has dismantled all the safeguards installed under Attorney General Holder's leadership, thus, returning our justice system to the broken system under Ashcroft.

Session has unleashed a merciless approach to "all" crimes including low level drug-related cases, and demands that his attorneys prosecute every case to the fullest extent of the law.

In doing so, Session has taken away any prosecutorial discretion once available to prosecutors throughout our justice system under U.S. law.

The FBI in this Trump Administration has returned to the era of Director Edgar Hoover, in their unleashing of this damaging, discriminative, and unconstitutional COINTELPRO 2.0.

With these lethal forms of attacks on the African American community from both the DOJ and the FBI, where is justice?

Mr. VEASEY. I thank my colleague from the 18th Congressional District for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), my friend and classmate who represents the 10th Congressional District.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Lone Star State, my classmate, Congressman VEASEY, for hosting tonight's Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we find ourselves in this position where the lines are being so blurred that Gold Star families have come into this political discussion and are being dragged into this, unwillingly, over the past several days.

I have great respect for General Kelly and was very delighted to see him get the job as Chief of Staff so that he could maybe bring some semblance of calm and normalcy to the White House, but it seems like he has been infected by the disease that is the scourge in the White House.

There is no reason for him to fabricate what one of our colleagues said. The videotape is there. She never did one thing that General Kelly said she did on that fateful day in the dedication to that FBI building.

I don't understand what is going on with people these days, but these are the times we find ourselves in.

Mr. Speaker, as much as we would like to live in a colorblind society, in an America where people should be judged by the content of their character and not the color of their skin, we aren't there yet. Race, unfortunately, still matters.

Juries devalue Black lives by punishing offenders more harshly when

their victims are White than when their victims are Black. Police are more likely to use force when interacting with Black people than when interacting with White people. Emergency room doctors are less likely to prescribe pain medication to Black patients than to Whites.

Results from psychological studies of racial bias have shown that nearly 90 percent of the White people in the United States who have taken the implicit-association test have an inherent racial preference for White people over Black people. Oh, yes, race matters in America, and we have got to talk about it.

It should not take a crisis for the United States to discuss race and the effects of stereotypes that are baked into our national cultural. We should not have to wait for a police officer to shoot an unarmed Black man before we discuss how negative stereotypes about Black people affect snap judgments.

□ 2000

It should not take mass murder in a Bible study to get us talking about how negative stereotypes of Black people in social media help White supremacists rationalize their racism.

Back in 1997, Professor Jody David Armour warned us that bad actors would try to make racism seem reasonable. Professor Armour wrote a book called "Negrophobia." In it, he predicted that "perhaps the gravest threat today to progress toward racial justice comes from the right-wing ideologues bent on convincing White people of good faith that negative stereotypes about Blacks are justified."

Professor Armour told us to look out for people trying "to prove that Blacks are inherently less intelligent and more violent than Whites." And he explained that these people would try to make racism seem rational by using discredited studies, unscientific experiments, and cooked statistics.

What have we seen on our social media over the past few years? We have seen that negrophobia is alive and well in the United States, and social media is its enabler.

People like the President have used social media to spread cooked statistics and outright lies to rationalize the racist stereotypes that Black people are inherently violent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, countries like Russia have used social media to fuel racial tensions in America's communities, and White supremacists have used social media to organize their hate.

We must not be afraid to ask: What role has Facebook played in fueling negrophobia in America?

Facebook was born in an age of diversity, but it was not born with a commitment to diversity. Only 3 in every 100 Facebook employees are African American.

The company has no Black executives, and it has no Black board members. The company's global director of diversity has said that hiring women and people of color is complicated. Its chief executive officer, Sheryl Sandberg, has promised that Facebook would hire a Black board member sometime soon.

Why has it taken so long? Why have minority voices been left out of the essential media development? Has Facebook's failure to value minority voices inside the company made Facebook an online megaphone for racist voices outside the company?

Facebook's algorithms have the power to affect the way Americans think about Black people, for better or worse. When Facebook accepts money from foreign actors who want to exploit racial tensions in the United States, Facebook perpetuates negrophobia.

By the same token, Facebook's algorithms could weaken negrophobia by enhancing positive messages that challenge people to reexamine and resist discriminatory responses, but that will require Facebook to fully commit to diversity right now, not sometime in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus met with Facebook a week ago in terms of these negative ads that were found out to be bought by Russian actors and spending \$100,000 in doing so, and buying fake "Black Lives Matter" responses and ads and "anti-Black Lives Matter" ads to continue to fuel this division in our country.

If countries are able to see a weakness in our fabric in this Nation, then they will exploit it. We have to come together as Americans and understand that our issues are something that we have to deal with and look each other in the face and have an honest discussion about.

No one is perfect. No one is saying that one side is worse than the other, but we need to come together as a unit, as this great experiment called the United States was meant to be, that all men are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights—all Americans, not just some—and we continue to strive towards that goal, towards that utopia in this country.

This is the greatest country in the world, and we all know it here because we benefit from it, but we have a long way to go in terms of reaching the ultimate goal.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Newark, New Jersey, for his comments, and also to talk about the fact that I am glad that he mentioned Facebook, because one of the things that really sur-

prised me was the fact that some of those ads were purchased in rubles, and no one seemed to notice that, seems absolutely amazing to me. And we need to, again, just continue to have this discussion and talk about these things, so I thank the gentleman very much for his comments tonight.

I yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of Michigan, representing the State's 14th Congressional District, BRENDA LAWRENCE. Again, I want to thank BRENDA for participating. She participates often in this hour, and I just really appreciate her comments. Her district appreciates the comments, her State, and our country, and I appreciate her joining us this evening.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman VEASEY for his leadership and for his dedication.

Today, I am at this mike for a number of reasons. One is that we have witnessed, over the weekend, another time in history that will be written for many to read, for generations to try to understand what exactly happened.

Most of us are raised that, in a time of grieving and mourning, you are sympathetic, you are patient, and, most of all, you try to be understanding.

I am at a loss in trying to understand how the dialogue was reduced to name-calling and then just unfactual information. But what I had hoped and what I feel that, as an American, as a Member of Congress, as a citizen, if someone gets it wrong, that at least I deserve, "I'm sorry, I didn't get the information right," or maybe "I spoke out of turn." And when you are grieving the loss of someone you love dearly, someone who was serving this country, someone who, as the family of a military service person, gave the sacrifice as well for them to represent our country.

I would hope—I was hopeful that that would happen, but it did not. There comes a point in time, Mr. Speaker, as American citizens, that we begin to stand up and say, as our country, there is an expectation. There is an expectation for those we elect, there is an expectation for those in leadership, and truly, there is an expectation of civility and, at minimum, truth.

As we know, the FBI has had a long, troubling history of using its broad investigatory powers to target Black citizens. It is not a myth. It is a fact. It has been written. During the 1960s, Director Hoover used the counterintelligence program to surveil and discredit civil rights activists, members of the Black Panther Party.

For an example, the FBI falsified a letter in an attempt to blackmail the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King into silence.

So the Congressional Black Caucus is concerned by the assertion that coins a new term, "Black identity extremists," and claims, with high confidence, that

they are likely to target law enforcement based on perceptions of police brutality against African Americans.

In August, the FBI Counterterrorism Division issued a chilling and outlandish warning to its agents, all hidden behind the veil of an internal report never meant to be seen by the American people. It worries me because, in 2017, such a misguided and hateful and dangerous report exists at all.

Released just 9 days before the hateful violence in Charlottesville, this report targets so-called Black identity extremists by falsely linking peaceful and necessary calls for justice from Americans, from the African-American community, to entirely unrelated acts of violence against law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I served as a mayor of a diverse city for 14 years and had the responsibility of an entire police force for a city. I have such respect and honor for those who serve us.

I understand how, when there is trouble, the police run to that trouble to protect us, but I also know that the power that is held on the shield of a police force can be used for other than protection of their people. And that in this great country that we live in, time and time again in history, some people will use the comment: Don't be so sensitive about everything that happened. But history has shown us, every change that we have made in this country of freedoms and rights have come from people who had the courage, the political courage, to stand up and fight for that. Is that extremism?

Will you say the right to vote were Black extremists? Would you say that the women who protest and march so that women could have the right to vote, were they extremists? Or were they Americans who believed in this country and had the courage to stand up not just for them but for generations to come?

Our Social Security, when we looked at—and we looked at hunger in this country, and people repeatedly have shown, of all ethnic groups, that nothing in America happens without protests and the courage to stand up. Are they extremists, or they part of this amazing democracy that we have?

And the threat of being labeled by our FBI so you have permission to now treat these individuals, who have the courage to stand up, as unlawful villains and terrorists, and you have the permission now by the FBI to attack and to imprison them.

We must, as a Congress and a country, learn to understand the power of our words, and I am going to close with this.

Your words mean something. If this administration has taught us anything, the words of those who are elected to leadership do matter, whether it is the truth or whether it is a lie. It matters.

It fuels anger and hatred in people. It tells people that it is okay to disrespect others. Words mean something.

And for me to be a Black woman in America and be labeled, if I stand up and fight for my rights, if I stand with others, if Black Lives Matter has not just been Black people standing up—it has been all members of the United States, citizens saying that all lives matter and that we will not tolerate criminal injustice against Black people and the murder rate that we see of those who are of color.

□ 2015

This has been a movement in our country, and now we see this internal labeling by our law enforcement in our country. Does that cause me to feel afraid in my own country? Does that give me the fear that history is going to repeat itself because words have given permission for this to happen when you legitimize people whose only purpose to stand and be in a position in your community is to say that you have no value less than me and we hate you?

But do you know what? There are some very fine people there. Being a Black person in America, I can tell you, we have had some fine days. I would not be standing here, this little Black girl from Detroit, if this country did not give me the opportunities. But it came from the protests; it came in the death and the riots of the people in my generation before me who would not sit down and be quiet.

So now are we being told that we are not to use our constitutional rights of free speech and protests and to gather to say that now you are being an extremist? I am not going to allow that to happen in this country, and if you want to label me, label me. But I would not be here today if it were not for those who had the political courage to stand up for what is right, not just for Black people, but for Americans in this country. And that is something that this report strikes a chord with me.

I stand in opposition. I understand when someone takes their freedom to stand up and oppose something that is happening in America, and I want to protect that First Amendment right. But if we can avoid the consequences of halfway speech fueled by fear and false perceptions, we will be stronger as a country.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Congress to join me and my colleagues in condemning this report and standing with us for a more peaceful, a more accepting, and a more equal country where we can really mean, when we stand up and we say the Pledge of Allegiance and we say, “one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all,” and for all of us we have a name.

We have a name that we were given at birth, and we expect our leadership, our President, our Congress, our Chief of Staff, our military to address us by our names. It is not acceptable, it is embarrassing for us as a country, to re-

duce ourselves to that level. And I stand here tonight, on the RECORD, that I am an American. I am a Member of Congress. I am a woman. I am an African American. I deserve respect, and I expect all of our colleagues to conduct themselves the same way, including the President of the United States.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. LAWRENCE for her comments, which are very timely in light of everything that is happening right now.

Mr. Speaker, before I close out, the one thing that I would like to make note of is that I think, with this COINTELPRO 2.0 that is going on right now, we should take this very seriously. And I just want to remind everybody that may be out here listening right now, we talk a lot about extremist groups. We talk a lot about alt-right and KKK and White supremacist groups, but one thing that we have to keep in mind is that, in the 1960s, when Dr. Martin Luther King came to town, he was not treated like he is now.

I hear so many people—conservatives, liberals, Democrats, and Republicans—talk about how much they admire and respect Dr. King, and rightfully so, because he earned the respect and the admiration that he has now, posthumously, in this country. I don't think that anyone would argue that. But if we could travel back in time to the 1960s, we will find that he was not that welcomed.

And let's just put aside the White supremacists. Let's put aside the alt-right. Let's put aside these hateful forces that, again, all of us agree on are bad people. But remember, when Dr. King came to some of these Southern towns in the 1960s, he was not welcomed. He was not welcomed by people at the Lions Club, people at the Elks Club, people at the First Baptist Church, people at the Methodist Church. People thought that Dr. King was bad, that he was stirring up trouble, that he was not “keeping his place,” and that he had come into these communities to stir up a lot of trouble.

And because regular, everyday people—again, not the Klan, not the White supremacists, just regular, everyday, tax-paying shopkeepers in these little Southern towns—these conservative individuals who represented all segments of our society thought that Dr. King was out of place for doing what he was doing, because of that, the Nation reacted. And one of those people who reacted against Dr. King, against Malcolm X, and against other organizations like the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, SNCC, which was the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and many, many others, they ran the domestic counterintelligence program that you have heard about tonight, this COINTELPRO, and it became a weapon that was used to spy on individuals.

We heard mentioned earlier that our colleague, BARBARA LEE, was one of these people who was monitored. But this was happening to everyday African Americans who were just out there trying to make sure that we can vote and that our water fountains and our schools weren't segregated. And these regular town folk—again, the ones that weren't in the Klan, that were just good old folks that went to Sunday school and went to church every Sunday—were trying to prevent this from happening, and J. Edgar Hoover stepped in and decided that he was going to discredit, disrupt, and neutralize these organizations, again, that were just trying to make sure that African Americans were no longer second-class citizens.

I think these groups and these organizations and these individuals that I mentioned earlier within the Black community that were willing to be part of that circle, I know that I would not be here serving had it not been for that surveillance that they endured, and I know that I would not be here today were it not for them putting their lives on the line, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, because of that.

So what I would just like to say is it is important that we monitor everything that is coming out of the Justice Department in relation to any announcements that they are going to make about investigating these organizations that they disagree with politically because it is dangerous, and we don't want to go back to those times. We don't want to end up in a situation where the organization is doing any sort of domestic spying on people who are practicing their First Amendment rights of free speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining on the clock.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, let me also, again, talk about, very briefly, some of the things that people are concerned about in regards to civil liberties during the Cold War. That is when the FBI started running a lot of these counterintelligence programs, and Dr. King was always very high on the list. That is what people are concerned about. Their concerns are concerns that are very warranted because of what happened.

I know that people always say: Well, those things happened a long, long time ago. But, in reality, there are people who serve with us in this body who, sadly, remember those days. So it didn't happen that long ago because they are still here, and they are still active, very healthy members of society. They weren't Members of Congress back then, but they are now, and they saw this up front. They saw this in a very personal way, and that is important.

Also, one of the things that was mentioned earlier by Representative PAYNE from Newark, New Jersey, was the fact about social media. Social media has been very convenient. It has helped spawn new wealth in this country. It has brought us together like never before, but it can also tear us apart if we let it.

We have to be very serious when we have a foreign entity, a foreign country that doesn't like America, that doesn't like our values, and they have been very open and blatant in saying that you can't have a multicultural society that exists. We need to take that threat very seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) so she can tell her story, and I thank her for joining us this evening.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman VEASEY for yielding, but also for his remarkable leadership here in Congress and for hosting this very important Special Order this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, along with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, with a message for the American people: Wake up. COINTELPRO 2.0 is on the rise.

Mr. Speaker, now, in a report that was never supposed to see the light of day, the FBI's Counterterrorism Division branded African Americans in the fight for equality and justice as Black identity extremists that pose a domestic threat to police officers.

Now, I have witnessed many covert tactics designed to suppress African-American activism in my life, but the revelation of this report is one of the most troubling details I have ever learned about our government.

I remember very clearly the days of COINTELPRO under J. Edgar Hoover. As a community worker who worked closely with the Black Panther Party in their Ten-Point Platform, which made programs like Free Breakfast for Children possible and paved the way for our government's free breakfast program for low-income children, I witnessed firsthand how the lives of good people doing good work were destroyed by COINTELPRO.

Seeing the emergence of what is effectively COINTELPRO 2.0 is not only alarming, it is frightening. Just listen to how the FBI describes young women who take a stand for justice.

According to the FBI: "Black identity extremist, BIE, perceptions of police brutality against African Americans" has been responsible for "an increase in premeditated, retaliatory lethal violence against law enforcement and will very likely serve as justification for such violence in the future."

My God.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, we know that all police officers aren't bad actors. Actually, thousands of officers, the majority of

officers, go to work every morning to protect our communities and to provide public safety for everyone, but I want to be very clear about two things, Mr. Speaker.

Police brutality is not, as they said in this FBI report, a perception. Police brutality is a reality African Americans grapple with every day.

African Americans are three times more likely to be killed by police than White people. That is a reality. That is not a perception. The facts speak for themselves.

Despite being only 13 percent of our population, nearly 25 percent of those killed by police in the United States each year are African Americans. That is a reality. That is not a perception.

Nearly 99 percent of police-involved shootings have not resulted in any officers involved being convicted of a crime. Now, that is a reality, not a perception.

I also want to be very clear that Black identity extremism does not exist. It is simply not real. No academics or journalists have uncovered such a movement. No one has identified as a leader of such a movement. No act of hate or violence has been committed in the name of Black identity extremism.

So what is it, then? It is a twisted attempt by arbiters of the alt-right, including Attorney General Jeff Sessions and this administration, to deflect attention from the realities of police misconduct and the alt-right and White supremacy.

First let me thank Congressman VEASEY for his remarkable leadership in Congress and for hosting this vitally important Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker I rise today along with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus with a message for the American people.

Wake up! COINTELPRO 2.0 is on the rise.

Mr. Speaker, in a report that was never supposed to see the light of day, the FBI's Counterterrorism Division branded African Americans that fight for equality and justice as "Black Identity Extremists" that pose a domestic threat to police officers.

I have witnessed many covert tactics designed to suppress African American activism in my life, but the revelation of this report is one of the most troubling details I have ever learned about our government.

I remember clearly the days of COINTELPRO under J. Edgar Hoover.

As a community worker who worked closely with the Black Panther Party on their 10 point platform, which made programs like free breakfast for children possible, I witnessed firsthand how the lives of good people doing good work were destroyed by COINTELPRO.

So seeing the emergence of what is effectively COINTELPRO 2.0 is not only alarming it is frightening.

Just listen to how the FBI describes young men and women who take a stand for justice.

According to the FBI:

"Black Identity Extremist (BIE) perceptions of police brutality against African Americans"

has been responsible for "an increase in premeditated, retaliatory lethal violence against law enforcement and will very likely serve as justification for such violence" in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we know that all police officers aren't bad actors. Thousands of officers go to work every morning to protect our communities.

But I want to be very clear about two things Mr. Speaker: Police brutality is not a perception. Police brutality is a reality African Americans grapple with every day.

African Americans are three times more likely to be killed by police than white people.

That is a reality, not a perception.

Despite being only 13% of our population, nearly 25% of those killed by police in the U.S. each year are African Americans

That is a reality, not a perception.

And nearly 99% of case of police involved shootings have not resulted in any officers involved being convicted of a crime.

That is a reality, not a perception.

I also want to be very clear that Black Identity Extremism does not exist.

It is simply is not real.

No academics or journalists have uncovered such a movement.

No one has identified as a leader of such a movement

And no act of hate or violence has been committed in the name of Black Identity Extremism.

So what is it then?

Black Identity Extremism is a twisted attempt by arbiters of the alt-right, including President Trump and Jeff Sessions to deflect attention from the realities of Police brutality and white supremacy.

That is why members of the Congressional Black Caucus are here this evening. To sound the alarm.

This is not just another revelation or press report that should be dismissed.

This kind of hateful stigmatization presents a serious threat to the African American community. This is not mere speculation, Mr. Speaker.

If we're honest about the history of our nation, we must admit that the FBI has a disturbing history of surveillance and intimidation of African Americans for political expediency.

I remember all too clearly the lives that were cut short during the civil rights movement through the highly coordinated counterintelligence program known as COINTELPRO.

For 15 years under the direction of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, the federal government spied on civil rights leaders and sowed division among African Americans with one express goal.

To "expose, disrupt, misdirect, discredit, or otherwise neutralize" any individual or group deemed to be subversive or a threat to the established power structure.

Members of the Black Panther Party were the greatest victims of this vitriolic pursuit.

Under the guise of COINTELPRO FBI agents harassed, intimidated and committed acts of violence against Black Panthers and their supporters.

Men and women were killed as a result of this program. We simply cannot allow government sanctioned violence to develop against innocent African Americans fighting for the perfection of our union.

As the conscience of Congress, members of the Congressional Black Caucus are determined to stop COINTELPRO 2.0 dead in its tracks.

That is why we are demanding that the FBI give a full account to Congress on the development of this report and the sources used to inform it.

It has been said that those who do not know their history are doomed to repeat.

Well Mr. Speaker, we are here to give the American people and the Trump Administration a history lesson.

Clearly the FBI has not learned from its mistakes. But I want to be clear about one thing, under no circumstances will we allow another generation of African Americans to be subjected to unwarranted surveillance and harassment.

It will not happen, not on our watch.

I stand with our Chairman Congressman RICHMOND, Congressman CONYERS, Congressman THOMPSON and Congressman CUMMINGS in demanding that the FBI come clean about this report.

Enough is enough.

Mr. VEASEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in my role as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have always taken a serious view of my oversight of the Federal Bureau of Investigations. It is vitally important that we keep a close watch on the activities of law enforcement, especially regarding their operations in domestic intelligence gathering. In the wake of September 11th attacks, a time of crisis when civil liberties can be viewed as a luxury, it was important to ensure that all Americans could rely on the Constitution to both protect our rights and protect public safety.

As we all know, the FBI has a long, troubling history of using its broad investigatory powers to vulnerable or dissenting groups in our society. As a long-serving member, I was here in Congress when the reports of the FBI's surveillance activities against African-American groups involved in the struggle for civil rights first surfaced in the press.

Centralized operations under COINTELPRO officially began in August 1956 with a program designed to "increase factionalism, cause disruption and win defections" inside American Communist Party. Tactics included anonymous phone calls, IRS audits, and the creation of documents that would divide the American communist organization internally. An October 1956 memo from Hoover reclassified the FBI's ongoing surveillance of black leaders, including it within COINTELPRO, with the justification that the movement was infiltrated by communists.

In 1956, Hoover sent an open letter denouncing Dr. T.R.M. Howard, a civil rights leader, surgeon, and wealthy entrepreneur in Mississippi who had criticized FBI inaction in solving recent murders of George W. Lee, Emmett Till, and other black people in the South. When the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), was founded in 1957, the FBI began to monitor and target the group almost immediately, focusing particularly on Bayard Rustin, Stanley Levison, and, eventually, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. During the 1960's Director J. Edgar Hoover also used

COINTELPRO to spy on and attempt to discredit civil rights activists and members of the Black Panther Party.

After the 1963 March on Washington, Hoover singled out King as a major target for COINTELPRO. Soon after, the FBI was systematically bugging King's home and his hotel rooms, as they were now aware that King was growing in stature daily as the leader among leaders of the Civil Rights Movement. Amidst the urban unrest of July–August 1967, the FBI began "COINTELPRO—BLACK HATE", which focused on King and the SCLC as well as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), the Deacons for Defense and Justice, Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and the Nation of Islam. BLACK HATE established the so-called Ghetto Informant Program and instructed 23 FBI offices to "disrupt, misdirect, discredit, or otherwise neutralize the activities of black-nationalist hate type organizations."

The program was successfully kept secret until 1971, when the Citizens' Commission to Investigate the FBI burgled an FBI field office in Media, Pennsylvania, took several dossiers, and exposed the program by passing this material to news agencies. In 1976, the "Church Committee" (Sen. Frank Church-Idaho) launched a major investigation of the FBI and COINTELPRO. Journalists and historians speculate that the government has not fully released the many dossiers and documents related to the program.

Against this backdrop, the Congressional Black Caucus is justified in its concern about the FBI's investigation of African-American political organizations. The coining of the phrase "Black Identity Extremists" and claims with "high confidence" that these groups are likely to target law enforcement based on "perceptions of police brutality against African Americans" takes us back to claims about groups like the Black Panthers in the 1960's.

While it is important that the FBI monitor all threats domestic, its activities around the American Muslim community and efforts to "combat violent extremism" have raised questions about tactics and constitutional norms. The CBC has called for an FBI briefing on the origins on this research and the Bureau's intended next steps. I have supported this request in my role as Ranking Member on the Judiciary Committee and intend to keep a close eye on the Bureau's activities. This is not the time for a COINTELPRO 2.0 in America.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) published a report on August 3rd with findings that "black identity extremists" and their views on police brutality have very likely contributed to an uptick in premeditated violence against police officers. While many questions about the origins and intentions behind this report still remain unanswered, I cannot help but feel that this troubling assessment is reminiscent of the 1960's era Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO) that targeted black activists during the Civil Rights Movement.

There are no doubts that the 2012 shooting of Trayvon Martin or the 2014 death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri have paved the way for increased tension within our

communities. The subsequent protests and rise of the Black Lives Matter movement born out of the 2013 acquittal of Trayvon Martin's murderer fueled further tension between law enforcement and racial minorities. However, these protests—while interspersed with bouts of violence—have been largely peaceful at their core.

Interestingly, we have yet to also see a comparable FBI report investigating the white supremacists that have emerged during rallies in Charlottesville, VA and other parts of the country. This apparent double standard sets a dangerous precedent for race relations in the United States. The FBI's recent report is also extremely troubling given the rise and prominence of far-right movements throughout the country during this tense moment in our history.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus has called for an FBI briefing on the origins of this report and the Bureau's intentions on next steps. I will join my colleagues in eagerly awaiting a response from the FBI, so that we can make sure that there is no impropriety or racial bias fueling this investigation. I am disappointed in the FBI's report and urge my colleagues to tread carefully as we look to avoid a repeat of history by using government institutions and resources to unfairly target racial minorities.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative VEASEY, and our colleague Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for joining me at the Center for African American Studies at the University of Texas at Arlington last Thursday evening. It was a wonderful experience for me and President Vistas Karbhari, Dr. Jason Skelton and my longtime friend Dr. Marvin Delaney were perfect hosts.

Earlier this month, Sergeant La David T. Johnson died a hero's death in a distant land on a mission few Americans know about or understand.

This weekend, his grieving family, including his pregnant wife, took him to his final resting place in Florida. Sgt. Johnson's tragic death leaves this young family fatherless.

Mr. Speaker, in his Second Inaugural address, President Abraham Lincoln called on our nation to endeavor "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan. . . ."

Unfortunately, rather than comfort Sgt. Johnson's grieving family, the current occupant of the White House has chosen to use them as his latest prop in his constant effort to sow discord and division in this country.

The President and White House Chief of Staff John Kelly, who happens to be a Four-Star General, have insulted and smeared an honorable public servant who happens to be a Five-Star Congresswoman, and in effect called her and her grieving widowed constituent liars.

Congresswoman FREDERICA S. WILSON has been a champion for the people of South Florida for decades. It is no mystery—and it was not political—that she was accompanying Mrs. Johnson and her family to receive her husband's remains. She had mentored Sgt. Johnson throughout his childhood.

Mr. Speaker, I have participated in several of Congresswoman WILSON's 500 Role Models events and have spoken for one of their graduations. I often wear a red tie to this floor

helping her highlight their efforts. And her passionate work on behalf of those kidnapped girls of Boko Haram is unmatched.

As the husband of a five-star African American woman for more than 56 years and the father of three African American daughters who are working hard to earn their stars each and every day, I feel compelled to respond to General Kelly and completely debunk his concocted misrepresentation.

Mr. Speaker, we can have political differences here in Washington, D.C. That comes with the territory. But people need to have the common decency and basic humanity to refrain from exacerbating the pain of those already suffering so much.

I was taught from childhood that silence gives consent. I want the White House to know this, I and the members of the Congressional Black caucus will not be silent or silenced.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend Rep. VEASEY for hosting tonight's special order.

Let me begin by offering my condolences to the families of Sgt. La David Johnson and his fellow soldiers who lost their lives in Niger.

Those who give their lives in the service of this great nation and their families deserve our honor, respect and thanks. The White House's treatment of Sgt. Johnson's Gold Star widow is an embarrassment to our nation.

Furthermore, the White House's attacks on Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON's character are baseless and shameful. I know Congresswoman WILSON as a woman of integrity who has proven her deep commitment to her constituents and community over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to share a concern about the leaked FBI's assessment creating a new class of threats and unjustly labeling ordinary Americans exercising their constitutional rights as extremists.

In the report, the FBI coins a new term—black identity extremists—which can easily give the perception that African Americans speaking out against police brutality or anyone who identifies as black for that matter is a threat to law enforcement.

I can't help but wonder, what led the FBI to reach such a conclusion. Was it the Facebook ads purchased by Russian operatives targeting the Black Lives Matter movement?

This type of mischaracterization is dangerous and further erodes the trust between law enforcement officials and communities of color.

We have seen this before. The FBI has a long and troubling history of targeting African Americans in this country.

In the 1960s, the FBI's Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO) was used to surveil and discredit civil rights activists fighting institutional racism, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and black members of Congress.

These activists were fighting for equality, access to the ballot box, educational opportunities, and decent housing. They no longer wanted to be treated as second-class citizens. Put simply, they were seeking an even playing field and equal treatment under the law as should be provided to every American.

Here we are sixty years later, and we continue to fight for the same rights.

We have seen it play out in the unrest that unfolded in communities like Ferguson, Baltimore, and Cleveland where those who are being paid to protect and serve are not held accountable for killing unarmed African American citizens.

This report makes clear that we have harkened back to the dark days of J. Edgar Hoover. COINTELPRO 2.0 undermines the progress we have made and continues the current Administration's disturbing trend of demonizing communities of color.

At some point, Members on both sides of the aisle must stand up and speak out against these efforts to mischaracterize actions of Americans fighting for a fairer and more just America.

We all have rights under the Constitution, and no American seeking equal treatment under the law should be unfairly labeled when exercising those rights.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 24, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2872. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pecans Grown in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas; Establishment of Assessment Rates [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0027; SC17-986-1 FR] received October 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2873. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an Executive Order amending Executive Order 13223, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1601 (H. Doc. No. 115—73); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

2874. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B) Ethnicity and Race Information Collection [Docket No.: CFPB-2017-0009] (RIN: 3170-AA65) received October 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2875. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Delaware River; Dredging [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0947] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2876. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Camp Lejeune, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0792] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2877. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Remedial Action Schemes Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM16-20-000; Order No.: 837] received October 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2878. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's regulatory guidance — Physical Inventories and Material Balances at Fuel Cycle Facilities (Regulatory Guide 5.88) received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2879. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG revision — Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Service Provider Licenses (NUREG-1556, Volume 18, Revision 1) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2880. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's regulatory guidance — Emergency Planning for Research and Test Reactors and Other Non-Power Production and Utilization Facilities (Regulatory Guide 2.6, Revision 2) received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2881. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's regulatory guides withdrawal — "Conduct of Nuclear Material Physical Inventories", and "Statistical Evaluation of Material Unaccounted For" [NRC-2017-0196] received October 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2882. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulator Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Final Rule To List the Maui Dolphin as Endangered and the South Island Hector's Dolphin as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act [Docket No.: 160614520-7805-02] (RIN: 0648-XE686) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2883. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Tennessee River, Chattanooga, TN [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0727] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2884. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Cumberland River, Nashville, TN [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0812] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2885. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Marine Events Held in the Coast Guard Sector Northern New England Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0998] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2886. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Pacific Ocean, Kilauea Lava Flow Ocean Entry on Southeast Side of Island of Hawaii, HI [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0172] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2887. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Roanoke River, Plymouth, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0886] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2888. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors; Baltimore, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0808] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2889. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Blue Angels Air Show; St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0577] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2890. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary interim rule — Safety Zone; Sector Key West COTP Zone Post Storm Recovery, Atlantic Ocean, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0939] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2891. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary interim rule — Safety Zone; At-

lantic Intracoastal Waterway, Socastee, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0801] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2892. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary interim rule — Safety Zone; Belt Parkway Bridge Construction, Gerritsen Inlet; Brooklyn, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0937] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2893. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards; Adoption of 2017 North American Industry Classification System for Size Standards (RIN: 3245-AG84) received October 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Small Business.

2894. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Procedures for Obtaining Approval to Use Plan-Specific Substitute Mortality Tables (Rev. Proc. 2017-55) received October 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2895. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Updated Static Mortality Tables for Defined Benefit Pension Plans for 2018 [Notice 2017-60] received October 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2896. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Physical Presence of Certain Individuals in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or the United States Virgin Islands Under Section 937(a) Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria [Notice 2017-56] received October 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2897. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major final regulations — Mortality Tables for Determining Present Value under Defined Benefit Pension Plans [TD 9826] (RIN: 1545-BM71) received October 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4010. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States and title 28, United States Code, to enhance compliance with requests for information pursuant to legislative power under Article I of the Constitution, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-360). Referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3898. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to place conditions on certain accounts at United States financial institutions with respect to North Korea, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3972. A bill to clarify that family offices and family clients are accredited investors, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 577. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 469) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 732) to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-363). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. House Resolution 555. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit, respectively, certain documents and other information to the House of Representatives relating to the executive order on the review of designations under the Antiquities Act; with an amendment (Rept. 115-364); adversely. Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3279. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to provide that extraction of helium from gas produced under a Federal mineral lease shall maintain the lease as if the helium were oil and gas (Rept. 115-365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3921 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4090. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to establish a task force to address fentanyl and heroin trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 4091. A bill to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System the areas included in Indian Peninsula Unit FL-92 and Cape San Blas Unit P-30 in Florida; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 4092. A bill to create a nonimmigrant H-2C work visa program for agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 4093. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen prevention and response measures for hate crimes on college campuses by establishing robust accountability measures, providing needs-based grants, and amending the Clery Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 4094. A bill to establish a public health plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 4095. A bill to repeal Public Law 114-145; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish a prize competition for the research, development, or commercialization of technology that would reduce the amount of carbon in the atmosphere, including by capturing or sequestering carbon dioxide or reducing the emission of carbon dioxide; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 4097. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of methadone under Medicare part B; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 4098. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit schools and libraries that receive universal service support from blocking Internet access to les-

bian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SEN-SENRENNER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. KATKO):

H.J. Res. 119. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 576. A resolution reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States of America and the country of Georgia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 578. A resolution honoring the lives, work, and sacrifice of Joseph Curseen, Jr., and Thomas Morris, Jr., the 2 United States Postal Service employees who died as a result of their contact with anthrax while working at the United States Postal Facility located at 900 Brentwood Road, NE, Washington, DC, during the anthrax attack in the fall of 2001; United States Postal Service employees, who have continued to work diligently in service to the people of the United States notwithstanding anthrax attack; as well as the other 3 Americans who died and the 17 who became ill in the attacks; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 4090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 4091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 4092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 4093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 4094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 4095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 4097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 4098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.J. Res. 119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution states that "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . ." This joint resolution is submitted for Congress to consider whether it is necessary to amend the Constitution to include it.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 103: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 173: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. BERA, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 176: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 184: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 233: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 296: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 299: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 377: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 389: Mr. HIMES and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 392: Ms. TITUS and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 444: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 445: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 535: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 539: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 564: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 613: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 619: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 635: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 669: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 681: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 685: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 747: Mrs. BUSTOS and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 771: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 772: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 781: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 785: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 807: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

- H.R. 820: Mr. TROTT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 828: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 846: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COOK, and Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 849: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
- H.R. 866: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 930: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. RENACCI.
- H.R. 1014: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mrs. DEMINGS.
- H.R. 1017: Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 1046: Mr. KILMER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 1057: Mr. SIREN and Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 1090: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
- H.R. 1098: Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 1133: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
- H.R. 1148: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1155: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H.R. 1156: Mr. WALKER.
- H.R. 1187: Mr. SUOZZI.
- H.R. 1204: Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 1270: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 1291: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 1305: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 1322: Mr. PANETTA.
- H.R. 1341: Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 1342: Mr. PERRY.
- H.R. 1360: Mr. WENSTRUP.
- H.R. 1363: Ms. TSONGAS.
- H.R. 1406: Mr. PANETTA.
- H.R. 1456: Mr. TONKO and Mr. GOMEZ.
- H.R. 1475: Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 1528: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. HUNTER.
- H.R. 1568: Mr. FLORES.
- H.R. 1592: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BRAT, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
- H.R. 1639: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 1661: Mr. COMER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 1673: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 1686: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 1698: Mr. GALLAGHER and Ms. FUDGE.
- H.R. 1699: Mr. COMER.
- H.R. 1749: Mr. MAST.
- H.R. 1825: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
- H.R. 1832: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 1836: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 1861: Ms. ADAMS.
- H.R. 1865: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 1898: Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
- H.R. 1899: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 1911: Mr. KILMER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. CROWLEY.
- H.R. 1949: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 1953: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. CICILLINE.
- H.R. 1955: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
- H.R. 2230: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BACON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 2234: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 2242: Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 2285: Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 2295: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
- H.R. 2340: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2358: Mr. GOMEZ.
- H.R. 2366: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 2401: Mr. WELCH and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 2418: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 2431: Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 2434: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 2465: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 2499: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 2501: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 2526: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 2550: Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 2601: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
- H.R. 2623: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 2663: Mr. SMUCKER.
- H.R. 2670: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 2723: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
- H.R. 2740: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. ROYCE of California.
- H.R. 2765: Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 2790: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 2801: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
- H.R. 2820: Ms. TENNEY and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 2856: Mr. NUNES.
- H.R. 2862: Mr. ISSA and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 2865: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H.R. 2920: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. GAETZ.
- H.R. 2936: Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 2946: Mr. EMMER.
- H.R. 2968: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
- H.R. 2999: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 3073: Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 3117: Mr. HARPER.
- H.R. 3124: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 3127: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 3128: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 3179: Mrs. WAGNER.
- H.R. 3197: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 3199: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 3211: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. GRIMALVA.
- H.R. 3265: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 3274: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. VELA, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HECK, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COMER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. FERGUSON.
- H.R. 3282: Mr. FASO.
- H.R. 3297: Mr. BARR and Mr. HARPER.
- H.R. 3320: Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 3329: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BARR, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CHENEY, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 3342: Mr. BACON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. SINEMA.
- H.R. 3380: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 3400: Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 3402: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 3409: Mr. TROTT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. BARTON.
- H.R. 3441: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COLE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HULTGREN.
- H.R. 3445: Mr. REICHERT.
- H.R. 3477: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. WALKER.
- H.R. 3495: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
- H.R. 3541: Mr. ISSA.
- H.R. 3550: Ms. JAYAPAL.
- H.R. 3552: Ms. JAYAPAL.
- H.R. 3577: Mr. HECK.
- H.R. 3596: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 3605: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
- H.R. 3635: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
- H.R. 3648: Mr. SHIMKUS.
- H.R. 3671: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 3711: Mr. MEADOWS.
- H.R. 3712: Mr. HIMES.
- H.R. 3738: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 3758: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 3759: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. DELAURO.
- H.R. 3768: Mr. BEYER.
- H.R. 3784: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
- H.R. 3792: Ms. LEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. KIHUEN.
- H.R. 3798: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 3820: Mr. MCKINLEY.
- H.R. 3832: Mrs. WAGNER.
- H.R. 3845: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3862: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 3866: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
- H.R. 3875: Ms. ADAMS.
- H.R. 3898: Mr. POLIQUIN.
- H.R. 3913: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. FUDGE.
- H.R. 3940: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 3956: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
- H.R. 3966: Mr. SANFORD.
- H.R. 3969: Ms. NORTON and Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 3971: Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 3984: Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 3990: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 4010: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 4013: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 4020: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4022: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. MESSER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4024: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4025: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 4030: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 4038: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 4040: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4047: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4049: Mr. KHANNA and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 4057: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 4073: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4079: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 4082: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BERA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr.

TED LIEU of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. HECK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. KIHUEN.

H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. COHEN and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 57: Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 59: Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 81: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H. Res. 31: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. KNIGHT.

H. Res. 58: Mr. ZELDIN and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 220: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BEYER.

H. Res. 236: Mr. BARR.

H. Res. 274: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H. Res. 276: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H. Res. 307: Mr. HUDSON.

H. Res. 401: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 464: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. YODER.

H. Res. 466: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 495: Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 529: Mr. CAPUANO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 532: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H. Res. 554: Ms. MOORE.

H. Res. 560: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Chairman GOODLATTE, or a designee, to H.R. 469, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2017, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Chairman GOODLATTE, or a designee, to H.R. 732, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO THE BAHÁ'Í COMMUNITY COMMEMORATING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF BAHÁ'U'LLÁH

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Baha'i community as they celebrate the 200th anniversary of the birth of their founder, Bahá'u'lláh. Born as a nobleman in Persia in 1817, Bahá'u'lláh spread a message of peace and tolerance, emphasizing the fundamental unity of all people. His teachings of peace among nations, equality between men and women, tolerance among religions, and justice for people of all races and nationalities are as important today as they were in the 19th century.

Today, there are over 5 million Baha'is around the world, including a community in my Congressional District. In California and around the world, Baha'is strive to promote the ideals that Bahá'u'lláh championed to promote peace and unity throughout the world. They are active members of their communities and advocate for human rights, especially those of Baha'is in Iran who are unable to practice their religion openly.

I encourage my colleagues to take up and pass H.Res. 274 to condemn Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority, and its continuing violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in sending good wishes to the Baha'i community of California's 18th Congressional District and across the United States on the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Bahá'u'lláh.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOOD PRODUCTION FACILITY IN STILWELL, OKLAHOMA

HON. MARKWAYNE MULLIN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 75th anniversary of the Stilwell Oklahoma food production facility. The food production facility in Stilwell, originally called the Stilwell Canning Company, first opened on March 16, 1942 when World War II drove up the demand for canned items. An expansion project completed in 1999 made the Stilwell plant the largest frozen dessert production plant in the country.

Schwan's Company acquired the plant in 2003 when it purchased the Mrs. Smith's pie

brand from Flowers Foods. A recent \$40 million investment by the Schwan's Company gave the Stilwell dessert manufacturing facility a state-of-the-art pie line and put the facility on the leading edge of pie production in the industry. Schwan's Company is one of the largest employers in Adair County, with over 300 employees.

The Mrs. Smith's, Edwards, and Schwan's pies and okra produced each day at this facility are enjoyed by families across our great country. I am honored to recognize this facility today before the United States House of Representatives and I wish them a very happy 75th anniversary.

HONORING THE COMPLETION OF THE FOLSOM DAM JOINT FEDERAL PROJECT

HON. AMI BERA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the completion of the Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project.

This project has been nine years in the making and will provide critical increased flood capacity with Folsom Dam. Last week, the Army Corps of Engineers transferred control of the new auxiliary spillway to the Bureau of Reclamation.

In connection with the existing gates, the new auxiliary spillway will help release water more quickly from Folsom Reservoir to help create space for precipitation during our wet winters.

I want to thank all of the engineers, construction workers and staff from both the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation who worked on this important project. These agencies worked together with the Central Valley Flood Protection Board and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency to get the project completed.

The city of Sacramento faces the second highest flood risk in the country. So this new spillway is just one part of several infrastructure upgrades to increase flood protection in the region. I look forward to working with my colleagues to support the remaining upgrades including completing levee repairs, updating the water control manual, and raising the dam walls.

Finally, I want to also extend many thanks to Mr. David Thomas, who was the ACE Sacramento District Mega Project Center Director and the lead point person for the JFP.

Soon, Mr. Thomas will retire after more than 30 years of service in the Army Corps of Engineers. He has served in a wide variety of stations from New York and Houston to Italy, Afghanistan and Iraq. Mr. Thomas received his Bachelor's degree of Engineering in 1985 from

Texas A&M University. In 1993, he attended the Army Management Staff College and also holds a Master's degree in Public Administration in 1995 from Harvard University.

I want to thank him for his work over the past 5 years here in Sacramento as the Mega Project Director and his instrumental role in to helping get this project across the finish line.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Thomas and wish him the best in retirement and his next adventure. The Joint Federal Project has been a great example of how cooperation should work between government agencies and what happens when we make government work on behalf of the American people.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT NEWLEN

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Robert Newlen, for his decades of service to the Library of Congress. Beginning his career in 1975 at the Congressional Research Service and working his way up to Deputy Librarian of Congress, Mr. Newlen is truly an inspiration.

During his time at the Library of Congress, he has served in various capacities, including assistant director and then director of the Knowledge Services Group in CRS, law librarian for collections, outreach and services in the Law Library, the Library of Congress' Chief of Staff, and as of last year the Deputy Librarian of Congress. Mr. Newlen's personal commitment and devotion to the institution is unparalleled. He has committed his entire professional career, 43 years to be exact, to making the Library of Congress a vital part of the deliberations of the legislative branch.

Mr. Newlen's behind-the-scenes efforts in the Law Library were critical in bringing the Magna Carta, one of history's most celebrated documents and a major influence on our Founding Fathers, to the Library of Congress for exhibit in 2014.

Mr. Newlen is known as a quiet leader and a mentor among his colleagues and friends at the Library, who has inspired many and has forever left his mark on this great institution. I have had the good fortune of interacting with Mr. Newlen many times. As many say, he is a gentleman and a scholar.

After leaving the Library of Congress, Mr. Newlen will be moving to my home state of California to work as the head of the Dwight D. Opperman Foundation. Mr. Speaker, Robert Newlen has been an extraordinary public servant, and I know the House of Representatives joins me in wishing him well in the future.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING CHICAGO'S POLISH
HIGHLANDERS MARUSZYNA
KOLO NO. 35 ON ITS 40TH ANNI-
VERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chicago's Maruszyna Kolo No. 35, a lodge of the Polish Highlanders Alliance of North America, which celebrates its 40th anniversary on October 21, 2017.

As a member of the Polish Highlanders Alliance, the lodge aims to organize Polish Highlanders in the Chicago area into a cohesive family. In addition to providing a meeting place for Highlanders across the Chicago area, the lodge cultivates Polish Highlander arts, customs, and traditions. The members also provide material assistance to the church and two schools in the village of Maruszyna in Poland.

The lodge, located at 4808 S. Archer Avenue, is an important pillar of the community on the Southwest Side of Chicago. Polish Highlanders come from all across the region for celebrations at Maruszyna Kolo. On the first weekend of August every year, the lodge hosts a picnic on the same day that the village of Maruszyna hosts a fair celebrating its annual parish holiday. The picnic is attended by over 400 guests annually. The lodge also hosts a celebration during the second week of January where members share Christmas wafers and mark the end of Christmas celebrations by wishing one another well for the New Year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing all that Maruszyna Kolo No. 35 does to bring together Polish Highlanders in the Chicago area and to support Poland. The lodge's dedication to community is admirable and I wish them the best as they continue their traditions and service for generations to come. One hundred years (Sto lat).

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF WSRE

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the fiftieth anniversary of WSRE. WSRE-TV is viewer supported Public Broadcasting Station for the Gulf Coast. On September 11, 1967, WSRE began its over-the-air broadcast television station on UHF Channel 123 and today broadcasts four digital channels.

WSRE was an early pioneer producing national, quality programming beginning with Earl Peyroux's Gourmet Cooking to its most recent documentary They Were Our Fathers.

WSRE is licensed to the District Board of Trustees of Pensacola State College. Its 43,000 square foot facility includes three studios that are used to produce local programming. The facility houses a full-time staff, as well as volunteers who contribute thousands of hours of service on a regular basis.

The mission of WSRE is to open doors to a larger world with quality programming and educational outreach services for every person on the Gulf Coast who desires to be more educated, informed and entertained. WSRE helps people make informed decisions with a better understanding of the community and world in which they live. As a community-supported, outreach service of Pensacola State College, WSRE brings forth culture and ideas that enhance the quality of life and promote the joy of discovery and learning.

The vision of WSRE is to positively influence the daily lives of all on the Gulf Coast through broadcast programming and educational outreach services that encourage us to engage more deeply in the world around us.

WSRE has always and continues to demonstrate an exceptional dedication to education and learning.

From the very start, WSRE has partnered with local school districts to provide educational resources that enhance learning in the classroom. Through community partnerships WSRE enriches the efforts of Pensacola in becoming "America's First Early Learning City" and launched the 24/7 WSRE PBS KIDS channel and mobile app. By utilizing the latest digital technology, the Imagination Station at Wahoo Stadium, provides exposure for thousands of children and guardians each year to the resources and value of early learning.

Television reaches a large number of persons from all walks of life and WSRE keeps the community connected through its various local and national programs. WSRE's commitment to the surrounding communities has proven to be deeply valuable and has endured throughout the decades.

By operating as a public television station, WSRE also encourages an informed electorate by producing RALLY candidate forums and Legislative Review to connect the community with lawmakers since the 1970s while also broadcasting The Florida Channel.

I would like to extend my gratitude to all who have served in any capacity with WSRE throughout its 50 years. WSRE has been and will continue to be a steadfast and invaluable contributor to the enhancement and growth of our community and to all who have benefited from its services.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to congratulate WSRE on 50 years of providing quality programming and educational outreach services to Northwest Florida.

HONORING MAYOR BARBARA
SHARIEF

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to recognize my good friend, The Honorable Barbara Sharief of Miramar, Florida, on her successful tenure as mayor of Broward County.

Mayor Sharief is the first African American woman, as well as the first Muslim, to serve

as Broward County mayor. She was first elected to the nine-member County Commission in 2010, was elected mayor by her fellow commissioners in November 2013, and was re-elected in 2015. As mayor, she oversees Broward County's \$4.3 billion operating budget, which operates the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport, Port Everglades, and a variety of regional services, such as parks, libraries, public works, and transit.

Mayor Sharief has focused her mayoralty on the theme of "Broward Means Business." Mayor Sharief understands that small business is the backbone of our economy and has steadfastly highlighted and promoted county programs to ensure they succeed and thrive. To that end, she has begun every commission meeting by recognizing the civic leadership of one business in Broward County.

As she concludes her second term, Mayor Sharief continues the county's tradition of hosting the Mayor's Gala to raise funds for the United Way's Mission United program, helping veterans transition from active duty to civilian life.

In addition to making Broward County a better place for all business, Mayor Sharief manages her own business, South Florida Pediatric Home Care Inc., which she built from the ground up. She holds both a Master of Science in Nursing and an Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioner degree from Florida International University, and is pursuing a Doctorate of Nursing Practice. In addition to her role as mayor, businessowner, and student, she is also the mother of five children—Amanda, Zach, Alyssa, Meia, and Hailey.

Mayor Sharief is an extraordinary public servant whom I am proud to have worked alongside for the betterment of the residents of Broward County. I thank her for her dedicated service, and I wish her much success in all her future endeavors.

HONORING NICK LARIGAKIS FOR
HIS 30 YEARS OF SERVICE
STRENGTHENING U.S.-GREECE
RELATIONS THROUGH HIS WORK
AT THE AMERICAN HELLENIC IN-
STITUTE (AHI)

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the extensive and unique contributions that my friend, Nick Larigakis, has made in strengthening the strategic alliance between the United States and Greece throughout his impressive 30-year tenure at the American Hellenic Institute. The American Hellenic Institute (AHI) is a non-profit Greek American public policy center which Mr. Larigakis has led with his renowned passion for justice and the rule of law. He manages the day-to-day operations of AHI and its affiliated organizations. He is directly responsible for strategic planning, policy analysis, public affairs, government relations, financial development and communications—essentially a one man show.

During his many years of distinguished service, Mr. Larigakis has hosted 70 successful

legislative conferences and two trade conferences. He has also hosted multiple Congressional fact-finding trips to Greece and Cyprus, and led nine summits on the Future of Hellenism in America. Through his tireless advocacy and unwavering commitment to Hellenic causes he has molded AHL into a premier organization that regularly makes meaningful contributions in the public policy arena. As Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Affairs, as well as Co-Founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Hellenic Israel Alliance, I, along with my colleagues have especially benefitted from Nick's counsel and from the support of AHL in fostering mutually beneficial relations between the United States, Cyprus and Greece. His effective and respected political advocacy work has educated and informed the U.S. Congress about the protection and promotion of Hellenic-American interests. Furthermore, his efforts have helped form a strong bond within the Hellenic community and served as an invaluable resource for Philhellenes throughout our great nation.

I congratulate Mr. Larigakis on reaching this important milestone in his career and thank him for his outstanding service, which has benefited our country, Greece, Cyprus and Hellenes worldwide while helping to preserve our rich cultural heritage. I look forward to working with him for many years to come. In the astute words of Pericles, "What you leave behind is not what is engraved in stone monuments, but what is woven into the lives of others." Throughout his remarkable career, Mr. Larigakis has left behind a passion for perpetuating the cornerstones of Hellenism: justice and democracy. Axios.

IN HONOR OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL (RET) SAMUEL MILTON SELBY ROLLINSON

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a respected public servant, outstanding citizen, and hero to his community, Lieutenant Colonel (Ret) Samuel Milton Selby Rollinson. Sadly, Lt. Col. Rollinson passed away on Friday, September 22, 2017. A memorial service will be held on Saturday, October 28, 2017 at the Fort Benning Infantry Chapel at 2:00 pm.

A native of Jacksonville, Florida, Samuel was born to Sam and Ruth Rollinson, as the fourth of five sons. After graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, in 1982, he was commissioned as a ranger and later promoted to an infantry lieutenant, where he received his Airborne badge.

Following his retirement from the Army as a Lieutenant Colonel, Samuel served as a government civilian by becoming Fort Benning's first Protocol Officer. He then served as the Civilian Deputy Chief of Staff, and ultimately, the Deputy TRADOC Capability Manager for the Stryker Brigade Combat Team. His co-workers and fellow servicemen cherished his seasoned wisdom and passion for reveling in the beauties of life.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind him distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." Although his passing was tragic and before his time, Lt. Col. Rollinson proved to us all what it truly meant to be a hero. He left this world doing what he loved most—serving the people of Fort Benning and Columbus, Georgia. His impression on this earth extends beyond himself to the very wellbeing of his community, and for that he will be remembered for time to come.

For his outstanding selflessness to the Columbus community, he was awarded the Rotary Club Mary Reed Award. Beyond this achievement and the respect held for him by servicemen and civilians, he was an honorable human being who loved deeply and, in return, was deeply loved.

Lt. Col. Rollinson is survived by his mother, Ruth; wife of 32 years, Sarah; children, Sam, Michelle, and Zack; daughter-in-law, Katherine; brothers, Jon Martin, Matt and Jim; and a host of friends and those whose lives he has impacted.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, the nearly 730,000 people in Georgia's 2nd Congressional District, and all Americans, in extending our sincerest appreciation to Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Milton Selby Rollinson, for his dedicated service to our nation and to his community. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Lieutenant Colonel Rollinson's family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

CELEBRATING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF STAFF SERGEANT JAMES HARRELL, U.S. MARINE CORPS, RETIRED

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of Staff Sergeant James Harrell, U.S. Marine Corps, Retired, who served his country and continues to selflessly serve his fellow veterans and his community following his retirement. He is a fitting recipient of a Congressional Veteran Commendation.

SSG Harrell served six years in the United States Marine Corps, including two tours in Vietnam. During his service, SSG Harrell was a recipient of numerous awards and recognitions, including the Marine Combat Action Ribbon. After being Honorably Discharged, SSG Harrell returned to Texas where he rose to become the Assistant Chief Deputy for Williamson County's Sheriff's Department.

SSG Harrell's love for his country is matched only by his commitment to his fellow service members. After recognizing the needs of our county's less fortunate veterans, SSG Harrell joined his good friend Major Barry

Richard, United States Air Force, Retired to help over twelve Williamson County veterans by rebuilding homes, bringing them up to code, doing repairs, and more for over five years. Together, they've made real and lasting impacts on the lives of their fellow veterans.

SSG Harrell serves his fellow men with the same dedication, honor, and humility with which he defended his country. He exemplifies what it means to be an American, consistently placing his country and fellow men before himself. I thank and commend SSG Harrell, a passionate leader with a servant's heart, for his dedication and service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a family commitment. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 564, YEA on Roll Call No. 565, YEA on Roll Call No. 566, NAY on Roll Call No. 567, and YEA on Roll Call No. 568.

RECOGNIZING MARGE MEDELLIN IN CELEBRATION OF HER 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Marge Medellin's 80th birthday celebration. Marge is the former mayor of Madera, California and a dear friend of mine. She has been an inspiration to many and trailblazer throughout her career in public service. It is both fitting and appropriate that we honor Marge as she celebrates this special milestone.

Margaret Medellin was born on October 8, 1937 to Mary and James Martinez. She is a lifelong resident of Madera. Marge overcame adversity at a young age and went on to have a successful career at the Madera County Office of Education. She worked there from July 1956 to December 2002.

Marge was married in 1957. She was blessed with four children, eight grandchildren and four great grandchildren.

A call to service and the desire to help the community led Marge to run for the Madera City Council. She was first elected in March 1978, serving two terms from March 1978 to December 1986 and another term from December 1988 to December 1992. Marge served the city of Madera as mayor, beginning in 1982, for two consecutive terms and an additional four-year term. She was recognized by the state as California's first Latina Mayor.

Aside from her career in office, Marge has served on countless boards and commissions throughout the years. She is a founding member of the Pan American Club which provides college scholarships for young Hispanic students. She is also a founding member of

Latinas Unidas, an organization that empowers young Hispanic women.

One of her proudest moments came in December 2016, when Marge swore in her son Andy Medellin as the mayor of Madera. Marge and Andy are believed to be the first mother and son elected mayor to the same city in California.

Marge is a true pioneer. She is known as an advocate for equal rights and always leads by example. Marge has served as a mentor and inspiration to many. She has made an indelible mark on Madera and our Valley.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Marge Medellin as she celebrates her 80th birthday. I ask that you join me in wishing her and her family continued health and happiness.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE OF FREDERICK SPENCER CRITTENDEN

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Frederick Spencer Crittenden, a resident of Virginia's First District, who passed away on September 27, 2017. Fred was a graduate of Syringa High School and Randolph-Macon College, where he is a distinguished alumnus. He played minor league baseball for the Orlando Senators before being drafted into the United States Air Force to serve this great nation. After his service, Fred was a player, coach, and manager of the Deltaville "Deltas" baseball team. He started the Middlesex Baseball League for boys serving as the organizations first president.

Fred and his father ran T.H. Crittenden & Son, Riverdale Farm where they raised hogs, cattle, vegetables, and grain. He went on to start a purebred Duroc Swine herd and found the Virginia Purebred Livestock International promoting the swine industry in Virginia and globally. Fred was inducted into the Virginia Livestock Hall of Fame.

Fred made an impact on the community serving as a member of the Board of Directors of the Deltaville Civic Association, Middlesex County School Board, Middlesex County Board of Supervisors, Middlesex County Social Security Services board, and the Airport Committee.

Fred is survived by his wife, Jane; daughter, Susan; sons, Thomas and Gerald; eight grandchildren, and two great grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Fred's life and his service to Virginia.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT
RUFUS HONEYCUTT, USMC, RETIRED

HON. JOHN R. CARTER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Rufus

Honeycutt, USMC, Retired for his dedication and commitment to our country. SSG Honeycutt's extraordinary devotion to community and service reflects the best values of Central Texas. He is a fitting and worthy recipient of a Congressional Veterans Commendation.

SSG Honeycutt enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in 1960, and spent six years proudly defending his country. His military career included wartime deployment with the first combat unit to see action in Vietnam and earned him numerous awards and medals including the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for Vietnam Service.

Following his military career, Rufus has served those around him with boundless altruism and exemplary leadership. A profoundly respected pillar of the Round Rock community, SSG Honeycutt has dedicated his time to numerous community organizations, including six years of service on the Round Rock City Council. He continues to support fellow veterans by providing transportation to the VA, working as the Blood Drive Coordinator at Ft. Hood, and much more. He has volunteered countless hours in his community, and has consistently placed his neighbors' needs before his own. For these reasons and many more, his community came together in 2002 to honor Rufus Honeycutt as Round Rock Citizen of the Year.

SSG Honeycutt is a hero who has devoted his life to defending our freedoms abroad and serving his community at home. Dedicated public servants like him make Central Texas a great place to live. I join his family and friends in saluting his honored work and commitment to our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT DAVID'S INDUCTION INTO THE MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS HALL

HON. DAVID A. TROTT
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Novi resident Robert David. For over 38 years, Mr. David has built a distinguished broadcasting career highlighted by his passion for broadcasting excellence, dedication to community service, and political activism.

After an extensive radio broadcasting sales and management career, Mr. David founded Handyman Productions, where as President and General Manager, he produces the award-winning, nationally-syndicated "Handyman Show with Glenn Haeger" to help homeowners maintain and improve their homes and neighborhoods.

Both in the control room and outside the studio, Mr. David is a pillar of our community. Raising over \$1 million in scholarships for broadcasting students, Mr. David has helped cultivate the next generation of broadcasters. Furthermore, he is someone dedicated to protecting and preserving our neighborhoods, graduating from the FBI Citizen's Academy, Lakes Area Citizen's Police Academy, and Novi Ambassador Academy.

This year, Mr. David's career is bestowed a distinction fitting of his lifetime of accomplishments—induction into the Michigan Association of Broadcasters (MAB) Hall of Fame. Joining the broadcasting icons of our great State of Michigan, he is sure to fit right in with the best of the best.

My heartfelt congratulations to Mr. David on this well-deserved recognition.

TRIBUTE TO MR. LARRY SERVIES

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable Hoosier, Mr. Larry Servies, who is being honored by the community in Montgomery County for his 67 years of service as a volunteer fireman. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to the Waveland community.

Mr. Servies is a lifelong Hoosier and Waveland resident. He was a charter member of the Waveland Community Volunteer Fire Department and served 30 years as its chief. In those years of leadership, he has been credited with overseeing the purchase of a new fire truck, building a new fire station, steadfastly meeting regulation requirements, and providing quality training to future generations of volunteer firefighters. Though he has already devoted 67 years of service to the Waveland Fire Department, it is my understanding he is not going anywhere and plans to remain a member of the department as long as his good health stays with him.

Mr. Servies embodies the generous spirit and dedication to community like so many of our volunteer firefighters in Indiana and across this country. He is an army veteran, a member of the Waveland Covenant United Methodist Church, and has been active in various community service organizations and trade associations. As a long-time businessman, Mr. Servies owned and operated a furniture store, hardware and lumber business, and funeral home which provided needed products and services to the Waveland community.

I am honored to congratulate Mr. Larry Servies for his dedication to helping make Waveland a safer and better place to live. His commitment to the community serves as an example for all of us on how to be good citizens. May God continue to bless Mr. Servies and the Waveland Community Volunteer Fire Department.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL RAUL VILLARONGA, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

HON. JOHN R. CARTER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the service and achievements of an esteemed and valued citizen of Killeen, Texas. Colonel Raul Villaronga, U.S.

Army Retired, has dedicated himself to serving his community and is an embodiment of the Army values of honor, loyalty, and selfless service. He is a deserving recipient of a Congressional Veteran Commendation.

His commission as an Infantry 2nd Lieutenant in 1959 began his 24 years of service in which he completed assignments in Fort Bragg, the Panama Canal Zone, Vietnam, Germany, and Fort Hood. While assigned to the 8th Special Forces Group, he participated in numerous classified Mobile Training Teams in Central and South America. COL Villaronga deservingly received awards including the Silver Star, the Bronze Star Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Meritorious Service Medal as a testament to his exemplary service.

COL Villaronga is a respected citizen serving in a number of roles showcasing his commitment to community and nation. Returning from the Air Force, COL Villaronga served three terms as Mayor of Killeen. As Mayor, he founded the Killeen Youth Advisory Commission and worked on the Joint Use Agreement for the Robert Gray Army Airfield. As Chairman of the Killeen League of United Latin American Citizens Council 4535 Foundation, COL Villaronga has been responsible for the donation of over \$175,000 in scholarships for local graduating seniors. He continues to serve veterans in his community alongside his wife. His tireless efforts have made Central Texas a place that we're proud to call home.

COL Villaronga's patriotism and commitment to service reflect the very best values of Central Texas. He is a hero who has devoted his life to defending our freedoms abroad and serving his community at home. I join his wife, Julia, along with his family and friends in wishing him the best in the years ahead.

BAHA'I BICENTENARY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on the 200th anniversary of the birth of Baha'u'llah, the founder of the Baha'i Faith, it is with great pleasure that I send warm greetings to the Baha'i community of South Florida and beyond.

Baha'is have thrived in the United States for over 120 years, making the world a better place by being good citizens, serving their communities, and working with those around them to promote the common good. With over five million followers around the world, the Baha'i Faith continues to promote Baha'u'llah's message of justice, unity, and peace, as it calls for equality, education, interfaith harmony, and international cooperation, and an end to racial prejudice.

Despite the Baha'i message of peace, Baha'is in Iran continue to endure severe persecution because of their faith. In the last two Congresses, I have been honored to introduce a resolution which condemns "the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights." Last year the House unanimously

passed this resolution, sending a strong message that Iran must be held accountable for its actions, and we continue to garner strong bipartisan support for a similar measure, H. Res. 274, this year.

As we celebrate the bicentenary of the birth of Baha'u'llah, let us remember his words: "so powerful is the light of unity that it can illuminate the whole earth." In our quest for justice and peace, we must all work together to combat religious persecution whenever and wherever it is found.

My best wishes to the entire Baha'i community on this very special occasion.

HONORING THELMA COLLINS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the retirement of Ms. Thelma Collins, who has tirelessly devoted herself to the betterment of Itta Bena, Mississippi, through her works as a Servant Mayor for 12 years. As a native to this Delta community, Mrs. Collins has always believed in her dreams to see Itta Bena develop into a vibrant, healthy place for growing up and growing old.

In the pursuit of her vision, Mrs. Collins attended and graduated from Mississippi Valley State University, and then continued her education by receiving a Master's Degree at Mississippi State University. Post-graduation, Mrs. Collins began her career with over 30 years in education—serving as a teacher, an adjunct professor at Mississippi Valley State University, and as a recognized member of many civil and spiritual boards.

In August 1996, Mrs. Collins was elected to serve her first Mayoral term in the city of Itta Bena, Mississippi. After sitting four years out of office, Mrs. Collins' continued vision inspired her to return to office and serve a second term in 2005. Still hopeful to see a progressive Itta Bena, Ms. Collins returned to serve a spiritual led third term in 2009. However, due to the poor economic state of Itta Bena, Ms. Collins refused a salary, and served this final term pro bono.

Amongst Mrs. Collins many noteworthy accomplishments, is her dedication and the success she achieved in not only getting the IRS to remove the city's lien, but also to abate it's more than \$200,000 tax debt.

Mrs. Collins has been married to Reverend Johnny Collins for forty-nine years. They have one son, John Paul Collins, a daughter-in-law, and five grandchildren. At this juncture during her retirement, her ultimate aspiration is to continue her works in the improvement and livelihood of her citizens of Itta Bena, while remaining close and led by her relationship with Christ.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Mrs. Thelma Collins, for her dedication and service to the great city of Itta Bena, Mississippi.

DALLAS LOVE FIELD CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the centennial of Dallas Love Field Airport, which celebrated one hundred years of operation this month. Since the airport's opening in 1917, Dallas Love Field has experienced tremendous growth and positive change that has strengthened the Dallas area in a multitude of ways. Today, Dallas Love Field stands as an invaluable gateway for North Texas.

Dallas Love Field is rich in history and culture. The airport was initially opened as an Army Air Service field, named for Lieutenant Moss Lee Love, the eighth aviation officer to be killed and the 10th fatality in Army aviation. However, as flying became more accessible airlines started conducting commercial flights out of Love Field and eventually the airport was made the headquarters for Southwest Airlines when the company was founded in 1971. Throughout American history, it has stood as an important landmark, not only for the City of Dallas, but for the entire United States as well.

The airport has hosted aviation pioneer Charles Lindbergh, after recently finishing the first flight from New York to Paris. In 1959, Lady Bird Johnson celebrated the launching of the first jet service, an American Airlines 707, out of Love Field. Later, in November of 1963, the airport hosted an historic moment during one of the most shocking days that our country has ever lived through, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. It was at Love Field where First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy stood by Lyndon Johnson's side as he was sworn in as President.

Today, countless Americans rely heavily on Love Field's convenient access to air travel and the first class amenities that it provides for travelers. Love Field stands as a model for other municipalities in how to manage and grow a self-support airport of this caliber. I am proud to recognize Dallas Love Field during this important milestone, and I look forward to experiencing even more positive growth and change at Love Field in the coming years.

IN RECOGNITION OF ALFRED WILLIAM DE SANTIS, SR.

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Alfred William De Santis, Sr. for his 55 years of service to the Port-Au-Peck Chemical Hose Company No. 1 in Oceanport, New Jersey. Mr. De Santis' outstanding record will be celebrated at the company's 40th annual "Old Timer's Night," which Mr. De Santis himself originated.

Mr. De Santis' leadership and commitment to the department is evident. A Life Member and Ex-Chief, Mr. De Santis began his service

with the company in March of 1962. In addition to his election as Chief of the Oceanport Fire Department in 1971, Mr. De Santis also served as Captain, Secretary and Treasurer of the company. He was elected Company President for six terms. He remains an active member of the company and is dedicated to his fellow fire fighters, organizing the annual "Old Timer's Night" celebrating and honoring members for the past 40 years.

In addition to his service with the Oceanport Fire Department, Mr. De Santis was a member of the Fire Police Division for 30 years and served as Secretary of the Oceanport Relief Association and Secretary of the Exempt Association of Oceanport for 35 years. He also held leadership positions with the Ex Chief's Association of Eatontown, Oceanport and West Long Branch.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I join with the Port-Au-Peck Chemical Hose Company No. 1 in honoring Alfred William De Santis, Sr. on his outstanding record of accomplishment. Mr. De Santis has dutifully served Oceanport for 55 years and his selfless commitment is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

RECOGNIZING "MOTHER" ROSA
MCKIE

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of "Mother" Rosa McKie, who for the past 50 years has shown tremendous dedication to the community of the Mason Temple Church of God in Christ on Williams Avenue in Brooklyn.

Known as a source of pure kindness, inspiration and fortitude, Ms. McKie's longstanding service to the Church earned her the title of "Church Mother". Ms. McKie migrated to New York in 1943 and has since called Brooklyn her home. A World War II Navy Bride, she married the late Charles McKie as he was on active duty. This summer, on July 17th, she turned 100 years old, proving that age has not slowed her from counseling, nurturing and investing in her community.

Present at nearly every worship service that takes place at the Church, Ms. McKie has fulfilled roles as diverse as usher, Choir Director, and outreach missionary. It is this spirit of willingness to meet every need that has earned her such a warm legacy among congregants.

It is my great honor to wish Mother McKie a joyful birthday and lifetime celebration as she leaves her daily role with the Church to relocate and live with her daughter. For someone who has been a living inspiration for so many, it is my deep hope that this service is a chance for her community to return the love.

HONORING FIRST SERGEANT WILL
WILLIAMS, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor First Sergeant Will Williams, U.S. Army, Retired, of Round Rock, Texas, for his selfless dedication and service to our nation and his continued, unparalleled contributions to his community. I'm honored to award him a Congressional Veterans Commendation.

Following his enlistment in 1976, SGT Williams contributed 24 years of service that included deployments from Panama and Somalia, to Desert Shield and Desert Storm as an Army Ranger, Small Weapons Specialist with the 2nd Division. His commitment to keeping our nation safe is in his blood. Three generations of his family served in combat roles in the United States Army, and among the three they share 4 Bronze Star Medals.

SGT Williams' service and sense of duty did not culminate with his military service. Upon returning to Round Rock, SGT Williams dedicated his civilian life to the uplifting and betterment of his community. In 2013, he helped raise \$50,000 for Dell's Children's Hospital and over \$10,000 for the Ronald McDonald House. In Round Rock, SGT Williams organized a food drive, sent out a care package to deployed soldiers, and provided clothing and supplies to 300 foster kids through Project Care.

His service has been recognized and appreciated throughout the community. SGT Williams was recognized with the Service to Mankind Award by the Round Rock Sertoma Club, received the Leadership Award from the "Heart of Texas Award" organization, and was honored with the Governor's Lone Star Achievement Award from Texas Governor Greg Abbott.

I commend First Sergeant Will Williams' selfless service to his community and nation. His commitment to excellence and citizenship reflect the best values we hold as Americans. I join his family, friends, and colleagues in saluting his great work and dedication to our country.

CHARLESTON HIGH SCHOOL GOLF

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to congratulate Charleston High School for winning the 2017 IHSA Class 2A Boys State Golf Tournament.

In their State Championship effort, the Trojans set a new school record by six strokes with a team score of 599 over the two day tournament. The members of the Charleston High School Golf team dedicated their State Championship, like they had their entire 2017 season, to their classmate and friend Jordan Holly, who passed away this past May. I commend these young people for selflessly hon-

oring others during one of their greatest achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to the Head Coach Randy Hapster and to team members Keegan Gowin, Ben Lanman, Robert Rardin, Preston Smith, Blake Wolfe, and Zach Will. They should all be very proud of their accomplishments this season and I wish them nothing but the best for the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHNNY C.
TAYLOR, JR.

HON. MARK WALKER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding leader and defender of Historically Black Colleges and Universities and their students. Johnny C. Taylor, Jr. has served as the President and CEO of the Thurgood Marshall College Fund since 2010, and today, we honor his service to the nearly 300,000 students the organization represents. Named for the first African American justice of the United States Supreme Court, the Thurgood Marshall College Fund honors Justice Marshall's legacy by assisting in the development of tomorrow's leader.

Through Johnny C. Taylor, Jr.'s leadership, this organization has advanced the education of students through scholarships, programs and research initiatives. Thurgood Marshall College Fund member schools confer more degrees than any other Historically Black Colleges and Universities organization and provides access to an extraordinary pipeline of talented individuals as they enter the workforce.

Johnny C. Taylor, Jr. has been an instrumental part of Thurgood Marshall College Fund's mission: "Changing the World . . . One Leader at a Time." His impact can never be fully measured, but we appreciate his dedication and service to many of our nation's students.

CELEBRATING THE SERVICE AND
ACHIEVEMENTS OF CAPTAIN
DENNIS DEWINE, U.S. ARMY, RE-
TIRED

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the service and achievements of an esteemed and valued citizen, Captain Dennis DeWine, U.S. Army, Retired. He has dedicated himself to his community and nation and is an embodiment of the Army values of honor, loyalty, and selfless service. CPT DeWine is a fitting and worthy recipient of a Congressional Veterans Commendation.

CPT DeWine joined the Army in 1967 as a helicopter pilot and spent the next seven years flying over the treacherous skies of Vietnam. As a testament to his valorous service, the

President of the United States presented CPT DeWine with the Distinguished Flying Cross award for his actions above and beyond the call of duty. After being Honorably Discharged CPT DeWine was inducted into the Ohio Military Hall of Fame for Valor.

CPT DeWine's leadership skills have been invaluable throughout his post-military career. After rejoining civilian life, he became the founder, broker, and president of ERA Colonial Real Estate and Colonial Residential Properties, Inc. Despite his busy schedule, CPT DeWine remains dedicated to serving his community. He can often be found in jeans and boots working alongside his friends and neighbors. CPT DeWine's passion to serve is evident through his participation and leadership in numerous organizations, such as Central Texas Voices for Life, where he serves as Chairman. CPT DeWine has also proven his commitment to serving others through his company's efforts to successfully raise \$100,000 for Muscular Dystrophy.

Despite his business and charitable commitments, CPT DeWine has found time to raise a close-knit family, volunteer in community organizations, and remain active in his church. With admiration and deep respect, I pay tribute to Dennis DeWine for his sacrifices and the lasting impact he has had on his community and country.

RECOGNITION OF TONY REED

HON. DAVE BRAT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Anthony "Tony" Reed who passed away in June, and was a good friend who had a deep love for America.

Born in the United Kingdom in 1938 as it was hurtling towards the start of World War II, Tony eventually immigrated to Virginia with his mother and stepfather in 1947. Before his 20th birthday, Tony enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve and joined the C&P Telephone Company. Tony's reserve career was distinguished, rising from the rank of Private to Colonel in the Army Special Forces. He also achieved the status of Master Parachutist, logging over 900 parachute jumps.

In 2015, Tony sat down with me and my former Chief of Staff to discuss a white paper he wrote for my attention on China. He was a Senior Fellow at The International Strategic Studies Association and was steeped in world history. Tony was a true gentleman and scholar and gave us many great memories.

Tony will certainly be missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. MERRILL O. NAYLOR BEING NAMED A RECIPIENT OF THE 2017 CARNEGIE MEDAL FOR ACTS OF EXTRAORDINARY CIVILIAN HEROISM

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American and my constituent, Mr. Merrill O. Naylor, of Stephens City, Virginia, who is a recipient of the 2017 Carnegie Medal for Acts of Extraordinary Civilian Heroism.

This year, eighteen individuals from throughout the United States and Canada will receive the Carnegie Medal for risking their lives and showing outstanding courage in saving the life of another person.

Through fire and smoke, Mr. Naylor answered the call for help from his neighbor, Ms. Sheryl C. Lewis, on the evening of November 4, 2015, rescuing her from a burning building that she was trapped in. Mr. Naylor's heroic actions and valor are an inspiration to us all, and serve as an example of the qualities of service and selflessness that we should all aspire to have. The determination and resolve he displayed that day speaks volumes about his character and shed light on the definition of true courage.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me and the people of Virginia's 10th Congressional District in honoring Mr. Merrill Naylor for his brave service to the people of Stephens City, Virginia. We Americans are so fortunate to have heroes like Merrill Naylor who are willing to put their lives at risk to protect their neighbors, and we honor him on being the recipient of a 2017 Carnegie Medal for Acts of Extraordinary Civilian Heroism.

HONORING THE BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BAHÁ'U'LLÁH

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Bahá'u'lláh, the founder of the Bahá'í Faith.

Yesterday, October 22, marked the birth of Bahá'u'lláh. During his life, Bahá'u'lláh touched the lives of all those around him and was known for his charity and his message of the unity of mankind, justice, and peace. His message still lives on today in the religion he founded and in over five million Bahá'ís around the world. Wherever they live, Baha'is strive to be good citizens, serving their communities and the common good and working side-by-side with other faiths to advance education, interfaith harmony, and international cooperation.

The Baha'i Faith has spread to every state since arriving in the U.S. more than 120 years ago. I want to specifically highlight the Bahá'í community in Cincinnati. Throughout my time

in Congress, I have had the opportunity to meet with Bahá'í representatives many times and to learn how they have enriched and blessed our city.

Unfortunately, the Bahá'ís are not free to practice their religion in Iran, Bahá'u'lláh's homeland. Since the Revolution of 1979, Iran has executed at least 200 Baha'is. 10,000 Bahá'ís have been dismissed from their jobs and 700 have been arrested since 2005. Bahá'ís have seen their homes raided, their property confiscated, and their children denied education.

During my service on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have vocally supported the Bahá'ís rights in Iran. That is why I joined my colleague, Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, to introduce H. Res. 274 earlier this year which once again condemns Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Bahá'í minority. As the Bahá'í celebrate Bahá'u'lláh's birth, we must remember that his followers are not yet free to practice in his homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize this momentous occasion, and wish those Bahá'í in my district, throughout America, and around the world, a joyous celebration.

HONORING REVEREND BARRY W. LYNN OF AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 23, 2017

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great champion of religious freedom and my friend, the Reverend Barry W. Lynn, who will soon retire after 25 years as executive director of Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

An ordained minister in the United Church of Christ and an attorney, Rev. Lynn has paired his two callings and been a leader in the fight to protect our civil rights and civil liberties, especially the First Amendment. His work has helped protect our right to believe (or not) as we see fit and guarantee that the government does not promote religion. Rev. Lynn has been on the frontlines of the fight to ensure that religion is not used as an excuse to discriminate against others, dictate people's private lives, tell others whom they can love, or limit people's access to healthcare.

Under Rev. Lynn's leadership, Americans United has grown into one of the most prominent organizations in the country working to protect religious freedom. During his tenure, the organization has led the charge to defend the wall of separation between church and state.

Rev. Lynn's tenure is marked by efforts to ensure that all people feel welcomed in their community regardless of their faith. He led Americans United's fight to ensure that students at public schools were taught science rather than creationism in their classrooms and for the removal of the 2½ ton monument to the Ten Commandments erected at the Alabama Supreme Court. During his leadership, Americans United successfully stopped a proposed constitutional amendment to allow public school-sponsored prayers and fought for

women's health and equality when it stood up for students when their university cited religion to block their access to birth control.

Rev. Lynn is an author and educator who has shared his expertise with audiences across the country, giving speeches, appearing on television, hosting his long-running radio show, and testifying in Congress, about why the constitutional principle of church-state separation is the only way to ensure freedom of religion for all Americans.

Although he will now have more time to spend with his twin grandchildren, just born this summer, Rev. Lynn's lifelong passion for social justice remains. I feel confident he will continue to engage in social justice issues and stand up for important causes for years to come.

It has been my pleasure to work with Rev. Lynn over the last two decades. I commend him for his transformational service to Americans United, our Constitution, and our country, and I wish him well in his retirement.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 24, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 25

Time to be announced

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Melissa Sue Glynn, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Enterprise Integration), Randy Reeves, of Mississippi, to be Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs, and Cheryl L. Mason, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing naval forces and the Navy's current and planned capabilities to meet those threats.

SVC-217

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the commercial satellite industry.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Michael Dourson, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, and William L. Wehrum, of Delaware, Matthew Z. Leopold, of Florida, and David Ross, of Wisconsin, each to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, Paul Trombino III, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, and Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine an original bill entitled, "the Wildfire Prevention and Mitigation Act of 2017".

SD-406

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy

To receive a closed briefing on Niger security.

SVC-217

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the economic outlook.

LHOB-1100

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Jeff Tien Han Pon, of Virginia, to be Director, and Michael Rigas, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director, both of the Office of Personnel Management, and Emily Webster Murphy, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 1223, to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine S. 1870, to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, S. 1953, to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and S. 1942, to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians.

SD-628

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine working and aging with disabilities from school to retirement.

SD-562

OCTOBER 26

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on Niger.

SVC-217

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. 1928, to establish a review of United States multilateral aid, S. Res. 279, reaffirm-

ing the commitment of the United States to promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in Cambodia, and the nominations of Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Haiti, Peter Hoekstra, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Kenneth Ian Juster, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of India, Larry Edward Andre, Jr., of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Djibouti, Daniel J. Kritenbrink, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Kathleen M. Fitzpatrick, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, Richard Duke Buchan III, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Spain, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to Andorra, Richard Grenell, of California, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, Jamie McCourt, of California, to be Ambassador to the French Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Principality of Monaco, Edward T. McMullen, Jr., of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Principality of Liechtenstein, Peter Henry Barlerin, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, Michael James Dodman, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Nina Maria Fite, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, Daniel L. Foote, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia, David Dale Reimer, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mauritius, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles, and Eric P. Whitaker, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger, all of the Department of State.

S-116

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine advanced cyber technologies that could be used to help protect electric grids and other energy infrastructure from cyberattacks.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, and Suzanne Israel Tufts, of New York, each to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-538

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine free speech on college campuses.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine improving oversight of the regulatory process, focusing on lessons from state legislatures.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 807, to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers, and the nominations of Allison H. Eid, of Colorado, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Stephanos Bibas, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Liles Clifton Burke, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Walter David Counts III, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Michael Joseph Juneau, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, Karen Gren Scholer, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Tilman

Eugene Self III, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, and John F. Bash, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Texas, Erin Angela Nealy Cox, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Texas, and R. Andrew Murray, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina, all of the Department of Justice.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine strengthening the entrepreneurial ecosystem for women.

SR-428A

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

OCTOBER 30

5 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the Authorizations for the Use of Military Force,

focusing on Administration perspectives.

SD-419

NOVEMBER 1

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Scott Garrett, of New Jersey, to be President, Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be First Vice President, Mark L. Greenblatt, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, and Spencer Bachus III, of Alabama, Judith Delzoppo Pryor, of Ohio, and Claudia Slacik, of New York, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors, all of the Export-Import Bank.

SD-538

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine building tribal economies, focusing on modernizing tax policies that work for Indian country.

SD-628

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 24, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 24, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TREY HOLLINGSWORTH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes. Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the President returned from his trip to Puerto Rico, I received a shipment in my office of paper towels. It didn't come with a note or an explanation, just 12 rolls of Viva. I guess there is a little irony maybe because it is in Spanish.

Maybe after watching the President entertain himself by tossing paper towels at hurricane victims in Puerto Rico, some well-intentioned person thought that giving paper towels to Puerto Ricans was an appropriate sign of respect—the gift you give to Puerto Ricans after a major disaster trying to cheer us up, Viva.

Having returned from my second trip to Puerto Rico since the hurricane, I can tell you one thing for sure: we need a lot more than paper towels from the President and this Congress.

This is Loiza. I was visiting with the mayor. I want you to look at the pictures. This woman here, she has a dis-

abled adult sleeping on a wet mattress. Yes, sleeping on a wet mattress. That is the home in which she takes care of her son. Four weeks after the hurricane, children hiding behind barricades, homes destroyed.

This is Comerio where food, 4 weeks after the hurricane, because there is no food, has to be handed neighborhood to neighborhood, hilltop to hilltop, hamlet and village to village within the town.

See this? People sleep there on that bed without tarps because somehow we forgot that in a hurricane-destroyed society it might have—be a good idea to have something over your head. Of course, the President said he gave himself a 10. Tell that to the people who have lived there 4 weeks.

I just came back from this trip on Saturday. I am now not surprised that the congressmen, my colleagues, are taking day trips to Puerto Rico. Yes, that is what we do as Members of Congress, we get there at 9 o'clock during the Sun of the day, and we leave by 4 before the darkness comes because, of course, there is no electricity, and then they take us on a helicopter ride around the island. That is no way to visit.

You get off the plane and off the helicopter and you stay overnight when it is pitch black because that is the way 3.4 million American citizens live 1 month after the hurricane. That is how they live. So I don't know, maybe congressmen should stop taking day trips where they get there at 9 and leave by 4. Spend the night, get out of your comfort, and go talk to the American citizens that you are supposed to be representing.

America, see this? That is a horse stable, abandoned house where people live. I met a 13-year-old girl there with her mom and her 12-year-old brother. That is where they live. See this mom and the two children? No roof over their heads. Just a little tarp to keep one part of their house and no place to sleep.

See this man right here? He lives in this abandoned house in a little tent with a 2-month-old child and his wife, disabled in a wheelchair, and no electricity to run his air tank so that he can get the vital air that he needs to sustain his life.

This is what I saw, and this was without the help of the Federal Government because, if you ask for help, they will put you on a helicopter and take you on a nice tour and you will not talk or see anybody.

And I know there are some in America who say they should just do this for themselves. Well, guess what? They are citizens of the United States of America. They are a colony of the United States of America. And I would just ask America—there are over half a million people on that island who are homeless, whose homes have been destroyed, and our government—here is the one question people kept asking me no matter where I went, they said: Where is FEMA? Where is the help that we expect from the most powerful and richest Nation on the Earth in this moment of despair?

And soon it will be out of the headlines, and soon it will be out of the rotation, and we will try to forget, but they will continue to suffer.

I came back on a flight from Puerto Rico this past Saturday night filled with people fleeing, and I met this wonderful woman who said to me: I have my child here. I am dropping her with my sister so that she can be free.

We would not allow this in Texas. We would not allow this in New Jersey. We would not allow this in Florida. We did not allow it even after a week in Katrina. Let's not allow it in Puerto Rico either.

A TRUE AMERICAN PATRIOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and service of Major General Richard C. Nash. Major General Nash recently retired after serving as adjutant general of the Minnesota National Guard for 7 years.

In his role as adjutant general, Nash had the important responsibility of overseeing Minnesota's Army and Air National Guard units, an important role where he saw great success. Having served in the Army National Guard since 1976, General Nash was selected for the job of general because of his experience and strong leadership during the conflict in Bosnia and the Iraq war.

During his time in the National Guard, as a testament to his hard work and commitment to our great Nation, General Nash has received many awards like the Bronze Star and the Meritorious Service Medal.

General Richard Nash is a true patriot whose service to our Nation has been a blessing to us all. I speak for all Minnesotans when I thank him for his dedication and wish him the best in his well-deserved retirement.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

MINNESOTA'S HONORARY CAREGIVER

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Carlene Johnston and the beautiful partnership she shared with her loving husband, Dan Johnston.

Originally diagnosed with breast cancer in 2012, Carlene passed away in 2016, after a long and hard fight. Carlene's devoted husband, Dan, stood by his wife's side through every moment, keeping his marriage vow to love his wife in health and in sickness.

On the day that Carlene passed, Dan shared in a post that caring for his wife in her final days was easy, writing: When you're helping someone you love, it's not a burden.

As tribute to Dan's and Carlene's strong marriage and Dan's commitment to caring for his sick wife, Dan was awarded the Waconia Relay for Life's 2017 Honorary Caregiver Award.

Our most sincere condolences go out to the Johnston family, and we thank Dan for epitomizing love in its truest form. You are an amazing role model.

BRINGING THE WORLD EXPO TO MINNESOTA

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support Minnesota's bid to host the 2023 World Expo. I was proud to cosponsor and see both Chambers of Congress unanimously pass the U.S. Wants to Compete for a World Expo Act earlier this year to give Minnesota and the United States a chance to showcase the best we have to offer.

The President signed the Expo Act into law in May, and since then, the State Department, the Expo 2023 coalition, and the entire Minnesota delegation have been working hard to bring this prestigious international event back to the United States.

Now, as we near the November 15 announcement from the Bureau of International Expositions, Minnesota is one of the three finalists in the running to host the 2023 event with a proposed theme of "Healthy People, Healthy Planet."

I can think of no better place to hold such an event, as Minnesota is one of the healthiest States in the country, a hub for medical innovation and a world-class location to host the first Expo in the United States in more than 30 years.

I am grateful for the support of my colleagues in Congress and the President to make this opportunity a reality, and I look forward to putting the United States and the State of Minnesota back on the world stage as the host of the 2023 World Expo.

A TOP HONOR FOR SHERBURNE COUNTY

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Sherburne County Sheriff's Office for receiving accreditation from the American Correctional Association. Sherburne County received this accreditation because of the quality of the county jail and the high standards the staff maintains.

The accreditation was actually earned by the 116 correctional officers

who operate the jail and the strong leadership of Sherburne County Sheriff Joel Brott.

This is quite an accomplishment. In fact, out of Minnesota's 87 counties, only one other county jail in Minnesota received this accreditation. Congratulations to Sheriff Brott and his officers. We are proud to represent you and to work for you.

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING
CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends are going to be asked this month to embrace a budget and a tax proposal with highly disputed benefits. But what is not in dispute is it will add \$1.5 trillion to the national debt and up to \$4 trillion in cuts to programs Americans care deeply about, like Medicaid and Medicare.

There is a better way. I spent much of this last weekend in Orlando, Florida, with leaders of the American Trucking Association. These are people who understand the infrastructure crisis America faces because they and their employees deal with it every single day. Instead of cutting transportation funding or having some mythical program without details, they are willing to step up and invest more, raising their fuel taxes—they already pay about half the total cost of the Highway Trust Fund—to be able to make a difference.

And I would hope that Congress will look at that example, listen to those people, and be able to do its part.

In no small measure, because of the leadership of many small businesses and trucking associations around the country, over half the States, since 2012, have stepped up to raise their transportation resources, and the States are seeing the benefit. They are seeing the economic impact of the construction, and it is making a difference on the ground for people and communities.

It is important that the Federal Government does its part. We need to be there for projects that are multimodal, that are multi-State, and multiyear. That Federal partnership has played a vital role since the enactment of the Interstate Highway System in 1956.

The trucking industry was able to make the point that the public is already paying the cost, about \$1,500 a year extra cost for the typical family for car maintenance and congestion.

The transportation industry is paying some \$63 billion of cost every year due to congestion. For about \$2 a week, from the average family, we could take critical steps to make sure that we address this infrastructure funding crisis.

If people really want to have some congressional action that will put peo-

ple to work at family wage jobs, not the disputed trickle-down economics, it is undisputable that every \$1.2 billion invested in infrastructure creates almost 30,000 jobs.

□ 1015

It creates almost about \$2 billion of economic activity. For each \$1.2 billion invested, it will reduce the deficit \$200 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time that this Congress stops shirking its responsibility. We ought to be in partnership not just with the truckers, but with AAA, engineers, contractors, construction unions, local government, the vast array, the largest coalition of groups dealing with a controversial issue before Congress. If we would give 2 weeks to hear from these leaders across the country of this broad coalition, the case would be made and I think Congress would finally step up and do its job.

Our partners in the private sector, in State and local government, and people in the communities can expect Congress to be a partner to make our communities more livable, to make our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

I hope when some of our friends from the trucking industry join us this week on Capitol Hill, that Members will listen to their case and be able to have the courage to step up and invest in our future. Our constituents deserve no less.

TEXAS TECH PEACE OFFICER
FLOYD EAST, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Officer Floyd East, Jr., of the Texas Tech Police Department recently responded to a routine student welfare check at the dormitory. Callers reported a 19-year-old individual named Hollis Daniels, who was acting erratically and potentially had a weapon.

So Officer East went to Daniel's dorm room, and he discovered drugs and drug paraphernalia. Hollis, the defendant, was arrested and taken to the station for a standard debriefing.

But that is when the intake procedure at the police station went haywire. The defendant was not adequately searched before booking. Suddenly, the dastardly criminal whipped out a gun and fired pointblank into 48-year-old Officer East's head, instantly killing him. This is a photograph of Officer East. Yet another peace officer, another guardian of the thin blue line, murdered for no reason.

The suspect then fled, going on the lam, taking Officer East's body cam with him. The university went on lockdown, anxiously waiting for the killer to be found. Sure enough, thanks

to the quick actions of the Texas Tech police force, the outlaw was located on campus and apprehended again.

Officer East was an El Paso, Texas, native. He is survived by his wife, Carmen, and two daughters, Anna and Monica. The funeral was a solemn remembrance wrapped up with the release of over 1,000 black and blue balloons, which flooded the west Texas blue sky, all in Officer East's memory.

Peace officers from all over Texas, and even other States, showed up for the funeral. As the body passed the Army National Guard Armory, officers and military stood at attention and saluted Officer East's body.

Officer Floyd East began his career with the Texas Tech Police Department on December 1, 2014. He started as a security guard at Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center in El Paso, Texas.

While working as a security guard, he went on to school at El Paso Community College Law Enforcement Academy to obtain his basic peace officer license to be a peace officer in the State of Texas.

Court documents show that the defendant, when he was arrested, concealed a weapon in his pants; and when Officer East's back was turned, the coward drew the weapon and murdered Officer East. The weapon that he had was stolen.

The defendant is charged with capital murder, and a \$5 million bond is set. May Texas justice occur.

Mr. Speaker, our men and women in blue voluntarily do everything they can to help protect and serve our communities, especially at our colleges and universities. For these remarkable men and women, their safety, like all peace officers, is never guaranteed. While the badge and the uniform represent safety for citizens, for some reason, in our society it becomes a target for other people, like this defendant.

Officer East worked with university students, helping protect young Texans eager to learn on their university campus. He was senselessly killed. There is never an answer for murder, except to hold the person who did the murder accountable.

The defendant's friends quickly jumped to the defendant's defense online, claiming Daniels was not a monster. Mr. Speaker, college students do make mistakes. A mistake is like missing class and sleeping in. Mistakes are not murdering people.

The defendant is totally responsible for his own actions. He can't blame the drugs, he can't blame the fact that he was young, or he can't blame the fact that he was not thinking right.

Mr. Speaker, I was a judge in Texas for 22 years and heard cases like the murder of Officer East. People are responsible for what they do. In our society, we cannot have this feeling that people are not responsible and that

something else calls them to do things. People are totally responsible for the choices that they make.

I have heard all of the excuses. I have heard: "Oh, I was too young." "Oh, I was too old." "I was on drugs." "I was affluent." "I wasn't affluent." I have heard all of the excuses.

There is no excuse. People, like this defendant, are responsible for their actions.

Officers like East are a cut above the rest of us, and they protect us from harm's way and they protect us from evildoers. He is of a rare breed, he is the Texas breed of law officers that sacrifice for the rest of us.

Taps have been played for Officer East. He has been laid to rest. We pray for his family, friends, and those officers in west Texas and Texas Tech University.

And that is just the way it is.

CALIFORNIA FIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the worst fire in the history of California has devastated nearly 300,000 acres, destroyed some 7,000 homes, caused billions of dollars in damage, burned to the ground many businesses, and, most sadly, taken the lives of 42 people; and that number may, in fact, rise.

This fire was like no other, propelled by winds that reached speeds of over 70 miles an hour. It moved so fast, burning at times 200 feet per second—that is three football fields every 30 seconds—that people had little time to escape their burning homes.

People fled with only their night clothes—no time to grab even their medication, important papers, or personal belongings. Thousands of families were displaced and will have to find housing, rebuild their homes and businesses, and rebuild their lives.

Over 100,000 people were evacuated during the late hours of the first night of this monster firestorm. Many of you saw the news coverage play out on your television. The most covered area in the news is an area in Santa Rosa called Coffey Park. This is it. There alone, some 1,300 homes were burned to the ground. This area is on the far western side of the fire-devastated area, a county away from where it started.

The winds were so high that they pushed the blaze across eight lanes of freeway and over two frontage roads to destroy the homes and the lives of these 1,300 families. The winds were so high that cars were not only burned beyond recognition, but they were flipped over. There is a metal garage door that remains stuck about 35 feet off the ground in the remains of a burned-out pine tree.

Leader MCCARTHY was with me in Coffey Park and saw firsthand the devastation. I want to thank the leader for his commitment to work with us to help our communities and the many people so devastated by this unprecedented disaster. I thank also the 11,000 firefighters, the many law enforcement, and National Guard that put their life on the line to stop the raging inferno and protect the lives of the people of my district and the other fire-threatened areas of California. Some of those first responders lost their own homes, but worked 24/7 to help others.

The response was awesome and truly appreciated. Mutual aid came from every county in California, States across our great country, Federal agencies, and from other countries. The actions of civilian heroes and heroines saved an untold number of lives and continue to make life tolerable to those affected by this fire disaster.

The fallout from the disaster will be felt for years, if not decades. You just can't rebuild 7,000 homes and neighborhoods overnight.

The heartbeat of our community—doctors, nurses, workers, teachers, CEOs, and small business owners—were burned out and must start over. My colleagues and I appreciate all of their words of comfort and offers to help. The people hurt by this monster fire will need all of our help. As we move forward, we have to work together to address this devastation that has befallen the people of my district and other parts of northern California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a lot of time with my friend, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, over the past week because our districts neighbor each other. While the worst of this fire was in Congressman THOMPSON's district, portions of that terrible Santa Rosa fire spilled over to affect my constituents, and I had a separate fire in Mendocino County, the Redwood Complex, that itself would have ranked among the top 20 wildfires in California history. The fact that all of these fires happened together is truly an unprecedented and a dreadful crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. THOMPSON. He has been everywhere in the region. I thank our local government partners, and I thank our colleagues, Minority Leader PELOSI, and Majority Leader MCCARTHY. The support has been bipartisan and it has been nationwide. FEMA has been on the ground along with first responders doing heroic work to get the recovery and the rebuilding process started. We are grateful for all of that, but we are only at the beginning.

If you want to see your government doing good work, go to the local assistance center in Santa Rosa or in Ukiah and watch how the wraparound services are there. Every need that these

fire victims, these devastated families, can imagine is there to be met. But we are at the beginning, and we are going to need that support over a long-sustained period.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for standing with us at this early stage of dealing with this crisis. We are going to need them over the long haul. We will be talking more about this going forward.

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, everyone remembers the excitement of receiving that first paycheck and the feeling of accomplishment that hard work brings. We also remember just as vividly the disappointment we experienced when we saw just how much of our hard-earned money went to taxes.

It is a rite of passage that we have grown used to, but that doesn't mean it is right. Americans deserve to take home more of their pay.

That is exactly why we need tax reform, tax cuts, and tax simplification, and why I am working with President Donald Trump to make our tax system work for West Virginia's families.

Our tax framework would cut taxes for West Virginia's middle class families, double the standard deduction for individuals and couples, and create jobs by making small businesses and American companies more competitive.

West Virginia's families work hard and have been squeezed by our State's economic downturn. Under our tax framework and with the support of President Trump, help is on the way.

We will also make it easier and simpler for Americans—West Virginians—to file their taxes. Most families will be able to file their taxes just on a postcard, saving them both time and money.

Our plan for tax reform, our plan for tax cuts, our plan for tax simplification will help us build a better America, a better West Virginia, one where families have more opportunities, more jobs, and more money in their pockets.

□ 1030

NATURAL DISASTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues Congressman THOMPSON and Congressman HUFFMAN in paying tribute to the first responders who responded to the fires in northern California and, indeed, in southern California as well.

The spirit of our community is so magnificent seeing people come to-

gether to help each other. I salute our colleague MIKE THOMPSON, who so much of his district was like an inferno, but much of his district is still thriving and one group helping another, and Mr. HUFFMAN there, side by side with him, the whole time.

This is very tragic. The loss of life is heartbreaking, the loss of livelihood is devastating, and the loss of homes, of course, takes a while to replace.

We have seen other natural disasters in the rest of the country, in Harvey and Irma and Maria and Nate, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Texas, and Louisiana. So many of the people of our country devastated in a short period of time.

So, in times of natural disaster, it is very important for the Federal Government to honor its social compact with the American people and to be there for them. I look forward to working in a bipartisan way for us to have the resources for FEMA to do its job and for the SBA to do its job to help businesses and homeowners recover their losses. And, again, pray; our hearts and prayers are with the families of those who lost their loved ones, their livelihoods, and some who are still in need of recovery.

REPUBLICANS' DEVASTATING TAX CUT PLAN

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the devastating tax cut plan that the Republicans are putting forth. If you are in the middle class, you will most likely be having your taxes increased. If you have a family member on Medicare or Medicaid, you will be, most likely, devastated by the impact of this.

This is a bill that the Republicans are putting forth that will add trillions of dollars to the national debt while they sing the praises of fiscal responsibility. The fiscal hawks have become an endangered species. No longer are they there to say: We are not going to borrow from our future in order to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country.

Indeed, 80 percent of the Trump-GOP tax framework, the framework net tax cuts go to the top 1 percent of Americans. The top 1 percent of Americans get 80 percent of the Trump-GOP framework net tax cuts.

As they increase the deficit, anyone who might be haunted by the thought that, well, we better cut someplace, where do you think they are going to go? They will devastate Medicare. They will devastate Medicaid.

What does that mean in the lives of the American people? It means that middle class families in our country will be subsidizing tax cuts for the wealthiest families and wealthiest corporations in our country. This is completely wrong.

It will also have a devastating impact on our budget priorities. In our budget priorities, our budget should be a statement of our national values.

What is important to us as a country should reflect what is in the budget: investments in education so that children and families can reach their aspirations, so that communities can reach their economic success, so that America continues to be number one globally, competitively, and so that we, again, have the resources to invest in science and technology and our national security to keep America number one.

Infrastructure, so talked about, infrastructure—build, build, build:

Build across America roads, bridges, broadband. Build water systems and the rest, all of the needs that we have.

Build the human infrastructure of America by investing in education and healthcare and the rest.

Build our democracy by making sure that our democratic process has the resources necessary to be conducted in a way where every person's vote is counted as cast.

So all of this is connected to governance, and all of this is harmed by the assault on our budget that this tax proposal will present.

Middle class taxes will increase. Middle-income families will pay more. Tens of millions of middle class families will pay higher taxes.

One of the ways they will is because of the great idea the Republicans have to stop the deduction for State and local taxes. This is a big hit on middle class families in our country.

It steals trillions of dollars, borrows from the future and from our children's future to give tax cuts to the wealthiest. Eighty percent of the GOP tax cuts go to the wealthiest 1 percent at the expense of our children and working families and our country's future.

It would devastate Medicare and Medicaid. After adding trillions to the deficit, the GOP will use the deficits to justify destroying Medicare and Medicaid. And they are on it. They are already, in the bill, saying that they are going to means test Medicare. It is in keeping with their theory that Medicare should wither on the vine.

Democrats are for A Better Deal, for real bipartisan tax reform. Any business will tell you that what they want in tax reform is some level of certainty that this is going to last for a while. The only way to do that is to have bipartisanship at the table.

Go to the table. What will create growth? What will create good paying jobs? What will reduce the debt? This bill does exactly the worst.

Don't let them tell you that, even though they are adding trillions of dollars to the debt, that is going to be paid for by economic growth. It has never happened. Trickle-down economics, President Bush tried that. It was tried before. It has never done that. It has never paid for itself. In fact, it has only increased the national debt.

In that regard, Bruce Bartlett, who was an economist in the Reagan years

as well as worked very closely with Jack Kemp in supply side economics as an advocate for supply side economics, said: We never said it would pay for itself. Anybody who tells you that these additions to the deficit will pay for themselves by growth, it is not true, it is nonsense, and, he said, BS.

Forgive me, Mr. Speaker. I am just quoting. I am just saying what he said.

So this is a moment of truth for our country. What are our values? How are they reflected in our budget? How do we grow the economy in a way that increases the paychecks of America's working families so that they have consumer confidence? they spend? they inject demand into the economy? they create jobs? they bring revenue to the Treasury?

How is it a good idea to cut education in order to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country? Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than investments in education, early childhood, K-12, higher ed, postgrad, lifetime learning for our workers.

So, with stiff competition, mind you, having tax cuts which will steal from our budget investments in education is, with stiff competition, one of the worst ideas that the Republicans have to offer. But this is something that people should be alerted to, forgetting the policy and all the rest of it, what it means in your life.

Most likely, middle class family, you will pay more taxes. If you have a family member who is dependent on long-term healthcare, long-term care, whether in a nursing home or at home, most likely you will pay a price. If you have a family member who is on Medicare or if you are, Social Security disability, you will be affected by it.

The President said in his campaign the system is rigged. This is the rigging of the rig. This is taking the rig to a step that is almost impossible for us to return from. They take us down this road to ruin. They take us down this path to severe increase in the national debt to the tune of trillions of dollars, not even counting the debt service on it, at the cost of investments in our future, in our children, in our families, in fairness in our economy, in opportunity for America.

This is something that must be stopped, and we can start by stopping the assault on the State and local taxes deduction. Let's hold Members of Congress accountable for what they do that affects your pocketbook and your future.

We will be continuing this conversation for awhile, and we will have charts and the rest to visually demonstrate what this is.

Governance is about how you raise the money and how you invest it, and this is the dialogue that our country needs to hear very clearly for not only the policy aspects of it, but the per-

sonal consequences in their lives. This is a very bad deal for the American people, for middle class families.

Democrats want A Better Deal, better jobs, better pay, better future, and, by the way, to do this in a very bipartisan way.

REMEMBERING LUKE JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of 22-year-old Luke Johnson, a graduate of Pennsbury High School in my home of Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Luke was known for his quirky sense of humor and his laid-back demeanor. He was a football standout at Pennsbury and was named best defensive player of the year his senior year. He also wrestled. He played soccer, baseball, and could throw a Frisbee a mile.

Above all, Luke loved to be with his family and with his friends, and it was his tight-knit group who supported Luke as he battled the increasingly common enemy of opioid addiction.

On May 17, 2017, Luke lost his battle with this disease after many difficult years of trying to return to normal.

Throughout his fight, like so many, he was haunted by shame, loss of self-worth, and the stigma of being addicted to opioids. This pain was shared by his friends and family, affecting the entire community, who just wanted to help, to see Luke be Luke.

As he tried to work his way towards recovery, Luke's parents, Maureen and John, discovered the genesis of his addiction: a prescription opioid pill given to him on his first day in high school. It progressed further when he was offered opioids after football game wins during his junior and senior year in high school. Ultimately, he was offered and accepted the invitation to try heroin.

Imagine the difficulty for this family and millions like them. At first, Luke's family was dumbfounded, angry, and hurt. They had no idea the difficulty he was facing.

They mobilized to support Luke by placing him into a local rehabilitation facility, but later found out that their insurance would not cover inpatient treatment, so they sold their car for his initial recovery. However, when Luke came home, the people, places, and things from his old life triggered a relapse.

His parents hoped that a facility in Florida would remove these triggers from Luke's life and put him on the road to recovery. After several months of recovery in Florida, Luke was forced to find another place to live. This was the move, Mr. Speaker, that he was not ready to make. He died a few days

later, before he had fully unpacked the few belongings that he had.

Following Luke's death, his parents established the Luke's HERO in ME Foundation in Yardley, Pennsylvania. Their goal is to help with the awareness, education, and to destigmatize opioid addiction. Ultimately, they want to ensure that other family, friends, and community networks can save their Luke.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from Luke's parents.

OCTOBER 17, 2017.

CONGRESSMAN FITZPATRICK: Thank you for speaking with me at the David's New Day event last weekend. Your support for the opioid crisis has been more than welcome. The recent news, spurred by the 60 Minutes investigation, suggests that there are very deep rooted issues that need to be addressed to fully confront this issue. In short, you and your colleagues have much work to do. If there is anything we can do to help, please let me know.

I have included my son's story below to go along with the funeral card I gave you. I hope putting names, faces and stories to the cause will help drive the needed change.

John Luke Johnson, always known as Luke or Lukey or Duke, was a handsome athlete with piercing blue eyes. He was known for his quirky sense of humor and "chill" demeanor. He loved his dog Ethel (aka Ed Rendell)—she was just as quirky as Luke—and it never ceased to amaze me how gentle and kind Luke was to Ethel and all animals. He was a good athlete, playing football (named Pennsbury's best defensive player his senior year), wrestled, played soccer and baseball. He could throw a Frisbee a mile. He loved to be with his friends. He had more friends than I could count. But, his best friends—Tyler (an Army Ranger), Fardin (a college student) and Christian D (recent college grad), Christian H (a college student) he loved most. Like his family, these friends supported and loved Luke; despite the pain and battle that comes with addiction, they stuck around until the very end. In Luke, we lost that good guy next door—that guy that everyone loved and enjoyed being with.

One May 17th, 2017, our son Luke lost his battle with this terrible disease only after suffering for a few, very difficult years trying to return to "normal". Throughout his battle he was haunted by shame, a loss of self-worth and the stigma of being an addict. This pain was shared by his family and friends. Our aspirations for him and the aspirations he had for himself were replaced by the day to day struggle against the emotional and physiological damage caused by this disease.

During the process of recovery, we learned about Luke's path to becoming an addict. It started with a female friend giving him a pill (an opioid) to try his first day of high school. She passed away of an overdose last year. It progressed further with a mom rewarding football players with opioids after game wins during his junior and senior year. Ultimately, he was offered and accepted the invitation to try heroin.

Until Luke found himself fully addicted and came to us for help, the indications were almost silent. He had the normal ups and downs of a teen and at times indulged in alcohol and smoked pot. While we had many discussions about making good choices and

the implications of drug and alcohol abuse, we were not aware of the opioid use and the changes to his brain. We are confident Luke was not aware of the permanency of his actions and what he would ultimately have to battle.

Initially, we were dumbfounded, angry and hurt. Our understanding was limited to the stereo-type junkie from the 70's and the "just say no" Dare program information we received during the elementary school assemblies. We had no clue about how the drug had changed his brain and the very real difficulty he was in. We were quickly enlightened by our daughter Alex, who had recently studied this in college.

We mobilized to support Luke by placing him into a local facility. Our insurance would not cover inpatient treatment (we were told only after a relapse) and we sold our car and scraped up the 20k it cost for his initial recovery. After a 24 day stay, Luke came home but soon returned to using—despite meetings and drug tests the triggers "people places and things", we learned, were very real.

We found a place in Florida for Luke and assumed that being away from the triggers was best for Luke. He lasted 3 or 4 months and returned home only to use again. After several months, Luke found another place and was in recovery and clean for 9 months. After the facility in Florida changed ownership (and the new staff now cared more for insurance money than keeping their charges clean), Luke was forced to find another place to live. This was a move he was not ready to make. He died a few days later, before he had fully unpacked the few belongings he had.

After Luke's death, we established the Luke's HEROin ME foundation. The goal of the foundation is to help with the awareness, education and to destigmatize opioid addiction; ultimately, so others can save their Luke. While we have much more to do, we have made progress in our local high school, have shared Luke's story on radio, in the press and have begun to organize events to meet our goals. We will push to have a national standard that can be applied uniformly across the country. We need to have more standards for rehab facilities, many of which have become corrupt machines that fuel relapse and overdose deaths.

With opioid overdose (and the more recent introduction of fentanyl and carfentanyl into commonly used drugs) as the leading cause of death among our young people, we have little choice.

We would love to support you in any way in your endeavor to end the opioid crisis. We are in this for the long haul, and want to help save as many lives as we can.

JOHN AND MAUREEN JOHNSON.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, with opioid overdose as the leading cause of death among our young people, we have little choice but to act.

When I met Luke's father, he gave me this picture of Luke, and he asked that we remember Luke as we work to end this epidemic.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this call to action.

□ 1045

IN DEFENSE OF AN HONORABLE WOMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to stand in the well of the House, and I am honored to do so today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to defend the Honorable FREDERICA WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to defend her not because of her color. She is a person of African ancestry, but, Mr. Speaker, I don't rise to defend her color. I believe that it is not the color of skin but rather the character within that determines the worth of men and women, so I rise to defend her worth. I rise to defend who she is. I rise to defend her integrity, her honor, and her dignity. I rise to defend an honorable woman.

Mr. Speaker, I do so because, in this country, we have allowed public discourse to be degraded to the extent that the President of the United States of America would call a Member of Congress, an honorable woman, wacky. Mr. Speaker, this is not a wacky person. This is a person of honor and integrity and of intellect.

Mr. Speaker, she is a former principal. She didn't just show up in the Congress one day. She was a State representative and a State senator before coming to Congress.

I rise to defend her. I rise to defend her because, Mr. Speaker, it has been said that she is an empty barrel. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that one who has served the country as well and as capable and as able that the maker of that statement would do so. But it says something about the influence that this President is having on people of honor and integrity. It says something about the influence that he is having on society. This is not an empty barrel. She is a person of intellect.

It has been said that she is all hat and no cattle. That is an insult. That is an insult because somehow someone is trying to send a signal that others will receive as a person who is an airhead. She is not an airhead. She is not a person who is all hat and no cattle. She has sponsored meaningful legislation. She has been in a fight to free many young women who have been taken captive. She is tenacious. She doesn't give out, she doesn't give up, she doesn't give in. She is a fighter, and I stand and I rise to defend her.

I do this, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that Carlyle is right: "No lie can live forever." She has been lied on, Mr. Speaker.

I do so because I believe that William Cullen Bryant is right: "Truth, crushed to Earth, shall rise again." There are people who have tried to bury the truth about this good woman in an earthly grave of lies.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to defend her because I believe that if we allow one person to go undefended in a circumstance like this, every person is at risk of being treated in a similar fashion. We are in some very difficult times, and many of us don't realize it. We have a

person who is at the top who is setting a tone and tenor for the country who is demeaning the dignity and respect that his office commands.

Mr. Speaker, this has to stop. There are those who say wait until the next election. I am not one of them. I believe that the remedy for this kind of behavior and the impact that it is having on society is impeachment.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi David-Seth Kirshner, Temple Emanu-El, Closter, New Jersey, offered the following prayer:

As we embark on this sacred day of work to better the lives of all Americans, we ask that You, God, help instill these leaders of the 115th Congress with patience, wisdom, empathy, and respect to achieve and exceed our goals for today and for tomorrow. Help us demonstrate our gratitude for our service people and first responders who work as our partners in fulfilling our shared mission.

God, we ask You today to disseminate Your sunlight and shower down Your rain, which will help us cultivate the seeds of securing our freedoms, celebrating our democracy, and championing tolerance for now and forever.

May it be Your will that the generations to come that will live within and lead this great Nation can enjoy the blooming flowers and sweet fruits of our labors on this sacred day.

God, we ask You to bless this Congress and these United States of America.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING RABBI DAVID-SETH KIRSHNER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome to the U.S. House of Representatives my dear friend and my adopted rabbi, David-Seth Kirshner, the leader of Temple Emanu-El in my congressional district in Closter, New Jersey.

As a lifelong New Jersey resident, Rabbi Kirshner has dedicated his career to serving his family, community, and our country. Dori and David are proud and loving parents to Eve and Elias, and I am glad they are here. Rabbi Kirshner is a spiritual mentor to many and a man of deep faith, conviction, and conscience.

Temple Emanu-El has been a beacon of civic engagement, youth education, and community service in our State, and under Rabbi Kirshner's leadership, Temple Emanu-El has brought a warm and open atmosphere that will endure for generations to come, building on its 85-year history of service to our State.

Rabbi Kirshner and Temple Emanu-El call on each of us to do our part to engage in "repair of the world," "tikkun olam," to love your neighbor as yourself, and to fulfill God's commandments with the work of our hands.

In addition to his work as rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, Rabbi Kirshner is a leader among his colleagues, serving as the vice president of the New Jersey Board of Rabbis and as a member of the Chancellor's Rabbinic Cabinet at the Jewish Theological Seminary.

A strong advocate for the U.S.-Israel relationship, Rabbi Kirshner is on the New Jersey-Israel Commission. He is a believer that Israel is a key strategic ally and a defender of democracy and freedom against the evils of terror.

I would like to thank Rabbi Kirshner for praying with us today and representing all faiths of the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey.

May God continue to bless the United States of America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

2018 NATIONAL PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to recognize Dr. Akil Ross, the principal of South Carolina's Chapin High School, as the 2018 National Principal of the Year. I appreciated being with Dr. Ross, alongside Chapin High School students, family, teachers, staff, board members, and community leaders last Friday as they surprised him with this fantastic news.

Dr. Ross works diligently each day to create an environment that allows students to rise to their full potential. At Chapin High School, he is known for promoting the six Rs, including ready to learn, respectful to others, and responsible to ourselves.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am both grateful and humbled to have such wonderful educators and students located in the Second Congressional District.

It is inspiring to work with leaders in the Second Congressional District who are building a great foundation for younger generations of South Carolina so they can leave high school ready for fulfilling lives.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

NEED TO REJECT TAX BREAK

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I think all Americans and certainly Members of Congress agree that we need to simplify our Tax Code, make it easier for middle class families to get ahead and to stay ahead. Unfortunately, what we know about the Republican tax plan, as the details begin to leak out, go in a different direction.

This is a tax break, a big tax cut for billionaires at the expense of working families. According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, a family making \$50,000 could see their tax bill increase by as much as 380 percent—less money to set aside for retirement, less money to set aside for a child's education, less money to pay the bills that families who struggle work hard every month to pay, in order to fund a tax break for the wealthiest Americans.

5,400 families would get a \$270 billion tax cut funded by increased taxes on people who work hard every day just to make ends meet. Just saying that this is tax relief for all Americans over and over again does not make it true. The details actually matter.

This is a big tax break for the wealthiest Americans. People like the Trumps and the DeVoses don't need more relief. We need to reject it.

TIME TO PASS NEW AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE

(Mr. BANKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, four U.S. servicemembers were killed in Niger by Islamic militants. We thank these American heroes who paid the ultimate price for our country. Their service will never be forgotten.

As we learn more about this situation, many of my constituents have asked why American personnel are in Niger to begin with.

Today, we have U.S. servicemembers around the globe fighting or advising operations against ISIS, al-Qaida, and other terrorist groups on several continents. However, they are doing so under war authorization that Congress passed in 2001 and 2002, in the wake of the September 11 attacks.

Rather than continuing to fight ISIS under an authorization passed by Congress 16 years ago, it is time to pass a new authorization for the use of military force that is focused on present-day and future threats.

The authorizations passed by Congress in 2001 and 2002 are out of date. I have introduced new AUMF legislation that addresses the modern threats we face.

The Constitution grants Congress the power of declaring war, and we need to take that obligation seriously and debate these important issues. My bill is a good starting point.

TIME TO PASS THE DREAM ACT

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, we live in the land of opportunity where, if you are willing to set goals, work hard, and give back to your community, anything can be done.

This idea is the grandest of American traditions and is sewn into the fabric of everything that we do, yet we are failing to live up to our ideals.

A few weeks ago I met a college student in my district named Beatriz. Beatriz moved to the United States with her family when she was 3 years old. And while she wasn't born here, she told me: "Today, I couldn't even tell you what my homeland looks like, Congressman."

A good student, Beatriz earned good grades to get into college, but would not be able to afford it, except that she received financial aid from the State because she is ineligible from the Federal Government.

But her life was changed when she applied for DACA in high school. Beatriz was able to attend Cal State

San Bernardino with the help of financial aid and is now on her way to becoming the first in her family to earn a college degree.

She said it is the most exciting experience to make progress and contribute to the economy. This is her home, Mr. Speaker. It is time that we pass the Dream Act.

HIGHLIGHTING THE 2017 MIAMI WALK TO END ALZHEIMER'S

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the 2017 Miami Walk to End Alzheimer's that will take place at Museum Park in downtown Miami on Saturday, November 4.

Alzheimer's is a devastating disease that impacts over 54,000 seniors in my county of Miami Dade and more than 500,000 individuals across the Sunshine State. It is not just the patients who suffer. Family members and caregivers also bear the brunt of this tragic and emotionally draining disease.

I know this personally, having lost my mother due to complications from Alzheimer's 6 years ago. The Miami Walk to End Alzheimer's plays an essential role in helping advance Alzheimer's care and research in our community and across our Nation.

This wonderful event is also important to patients, families, and caregivers as a reminder that they have the full support of our community as they battle this terrible disease.

I encourage everyone in our south Florida community to come out on November 4 and support and raise awareness for Alzheimer's.

OAKLAND COUNTY WATER MAIN BREAK AND INFRASTRUCTURE CRISIS

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address the infrastructure crisis our country is facing.

Today, in Oakland County, Michigan, in the heart of my district, we are struggling with a major water main break. In my district, schools are being closed and hospitals are transporting patients to nearby areas. It will be days before the region will receive access to reliable, safe drinking water.

This is not an isolated incident. We are not investing in our Nation's infrastructure. Not surprisingly, Michigan's infrastructure received a D grade from the American Society of Civil Engineers. This is unacceptable.

Lack of investment, lack of action is a matter of public health and public safety. It is a matter of life and death. It is obvious today in my district, but also in districts across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to ignore this crisis. We need an infrastructure plan. Flint, Michigan, showed us that infrastructure is about the lives of American citizens. Let's work together to fix our Nation's infrastructure.

FUNDS GOING TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE STARKIST CONSENT DECREE STAY ON THE ISLAND

(Mrs. RADEWAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in care and concern for my people in American Samoa in a time of need. I am humbled to represent them to you now.

Over this Thanksgiving, 2,000 of our families are being put out of work and small businesses will lose commerce as American Samoa's only large employer closes for a period of 6 weeks.

The Department of Justice Starkist Consent Decree requires payment of \$6.3 million. Unfortunately, this money comes to Washington, D.C. The workers and their families lose their paychecks. The small businesses around them absorb losses. That is wrong. These funds should stay on the island to help them through this time.

In fact, a case won by Attorney General Talauega establishes the unique economic responsibility the U.S. has to American Samoa through the Deed of Cession.

American Samoa has high unemployment and low incomes. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the burden our Federal Government is placing on American Samoa this Thanksgiving.

□ 1215

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 24, 2017.

Speaker PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Due to my election to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, this letter is to inform you that I resign my seats on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the House Homeland Security Committee. It has been a privilege and an honor to serve with Chairmen Royce and McCaul as a subcommittee chair.

Blessings in Liberty,

JEFF DUNCAN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 579

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Duncan of South Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 469, SUNSHINE FOR REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 732, STOP SETTLEMENT SLUSH FUNDS ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 577 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 577

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 469) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-34. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by

the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 732) to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all

Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 577, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 469, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, and H.R. 732, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for each of the bills under consideration, and also provides for a motion to recommit on both bills. Additionally, the rule makes in order six amendments to each bill, respectively, representing ideas from Members on both sides of the aisle.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee received testimony from Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Representative JAMIE RASKIN. In addition to the discussion of the underlying legislation at the Rules Committee, I previously joined my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee in a robust debate of the major components of these bills at Judiciary markups earlier this year.

I introduced H.R. 469 to address a problem that, unfortunately, has become all too common: the practice of regulating behind closed doors and absent public input through what is known as sue and settle agreements.

H.R. 469 also includes the Judgment Fund Transparency Act, introduced by Representative CHRIS STEWART, and the Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, introduced by Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE.

The rule also provides for consideration of the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act, which was introduced after an extensive investigation by the House Judiciary Committee found that the Department of Justice was systematically circumventing Congress and directing settlement money to activist groups.

The legislation provided for by today's rule strengthens the balance of power and Congress' Article I authority, which we have allowed executive agencies to erode over time.

Regardless of the political party in power, Congress has a constitutional obligation to carry out its duties and ensure that the legislative branch writes the law. When Congress fulfills its role as intended, the Federal Government is more responsive to the needs of the electorate and more accountable to our citizenry.

My legislation, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and

Settlements Act, otherwise known as sue and settle, addresses the problem of regulation through litigation. We have seen this problem explode in recent years, particularly under the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, I could offer you dozens of examples of this abuse, yet my time would expire long before I could list them all. A few particularly notable examples, however, highlight the enormous costs and burdens that regulation through litigation can impose on unsuspecting Americans.

The infamous Utility MACT and Boiler MACT rules resulted from sue and settle cases. They carry price tags of \$9.6 billion and \$3 billion in costs and compliance, respectively.

The Chesapeake Bay Clean Water Act rules boast a whopping \$18 billion in compliance costs. These rules also resulted from covert sue and settle maneuvers.

I don't think it is fair to ask hard-working job creators, farmers, and ranchers of northeast Georgia—or anywhere in this Nation, for that matter—to foot the bills for policy that bureaucrats secretly put in place.

I am sad to report that the prevalence of these sue and settlement agreements have only grown in recent years. The second term of the previous administration brought us 77 sue and settle cases related to the Clean Air Act. By comparison, President Clinton's second term witnessed 27 sue and settle cases, and President Bush's second term saw 28 such cases.

But let me also say just right there, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't matter which administration or which party is in the White House. This is not a bill that is designed to go for one party or another. It is simply saying that there is an Article I of the Constitution, and that is the legislative branch that writes the laws, and then the executive is to enforce the laws, not write them. I want to make it clear—and I know it is going to be talked about that this is not, but I do want to make it clear that this is for any administration.

The Obama administration's penchant for circumventing Congress and its constitutional authority was incredible, and its legacy has endured. The weight of these improper agreements hangs around the necks of American businesses, employees, farmers, and ranchers.

Fortunately, the Trump administration has recognized the impropriety of this practice and is taking steps to start curbing abuse of sue and settle agreements and the Federal rule-making process. In fact, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt recently issued a directive to increase public engagement in policymaking at the EPA.

This is a critical step and one that I applaud, but it doesn't negate the need for Congress to act decisively. In fact, it only highlights it. Congress has a

right and an obligation to defend its constitutional prerogatives.

Like the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulator Decrees and Settlements Act, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act will make our government more accountable to the people by providing real transparency. The Judgment Fund Transparency Act is based upon the principle that the American people have the right to know how their government is spending their hard-earned tax dollars.

The Judgment Fund was created over 50 years ago as a way to provide for efficient payment of lawful claims against the U.S., but it has become a permanent appropriation shrouded in secrecy.

While many payments out of the Judgment Fund are both legitimate and appropriate, the fund remains the subject of egregious abuse. For example, last year, the administration paid Iran \$1.3 billion out of the Judgment Fund—primarily in the form of foreign currency—as a payment for the interest that had accrued on Iranian assets that had been frozen because Iran sponsors terrorism without shame. As you might imagine, the Obama administration stonewalled congressional efforts to investigate those payments.

This much-needed legislation would not only ensure that such payments could not be hidden from Congress and the Americans they represents, it outright prohibits payments to state sponsors of terrorism and foreign terrorist organizations, which should be one of the least controversial actions ever to grace the floor of this House.

As I have said before, transparency and accountability are the best remedies for a government run amuck. Title III of H.R. 469, Chairman GOODLATTE's legislation, the Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, will further strengthen Congress' powers under Article I and, in doing so, will help restore checks and balances between the three branches of government.

When the Federal courts are deciding important matters regarding the Constitution, congressional powers, and Federal law, it is critical that Congress have the opportunity, should it deem the action necessary, to file an amicus or otherwise intervene in pending litigation.

The need for this legislation is compounded when, as was the case during the previous administration, the executive branch decides not to defend constitutionality of Federal law. This leads our adversarial legal system without anyone to litigate significant cases and shifts interpretation of the Constitution from the courts to the executive branch.

This provision will ensure that the House, like the Senate, has a statutory right to file amicus briefs or intervene when Congress' powers and responsibilities are called into question.

The Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, like the other bills contained in this measure, is an important step toward restoring government transparency, balance, and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, you might be able to detect a theme that is emerging here today. My colleagues and I are working hard to ensure the American people have a government by the people and for the people. We are working to restore the balance of powers that our forefathers put into place and to ensure that the executive overreach that was the hallmark of the previous administration won't be able to undermine transparency in the future.

In that vein, the rule also provides for consideration of the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act. The Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act prevents the Department of Justice from subverting Congress' power of the purse by prohibiting settlements that direct payments to a nonvictim third party. Again, the misdirection of funds to irrelevant third parties is a problem that we have seen grow and that must be addressed.

Under the previous administration, the Department of Justice funneled nonvictim third party groups as much as \$880 million. The Department of Justice did this by collecting money from parties who had broken the law and then using that money to create a slush fund for special interest groups rather than sending the money to victims of illicit activity.

The Department of Justice allowed the "donations" required under the settlements to count as double credit against defendants' payment obligations. Let me say that again. The Department of Justice allowed the "donations" required under the settlements to count as double credit against defendants' payment obligations.

Interestingly, in some settlements under the previous administration, credit for direct relief to consumers was counted only as dollar for dollar, indicating the importance the Department of Justice places on directing these funds to nonvictim third party groups.

The Department of Justice's policy move actually incentivized the funneling of money to nonvictim groups rather than the people who were injured. The slush fund scheme actually disadvantaged victims in favor of special interests.

□ 1230

For example, the Department of Justice negotiated settlement agreements to the tune of millions of dollars with major banks for misleading investors over mortgage-backed securities.

Then the Department of Justice said that banks or other parties that it settled with could meet some of their settlement obligations by making, again, donations to certain groups. The money went to these groups partially

under the guise that those groups would provide services to the aggrieved parties.

In reality, this practice directs funds away from the victims and allows the Department of Justice to steer money to nonvictim third-party groups, usually politically motivated organizations.

Additionally, the parties that receive the funds, these nonvictim third-party organizations, aren't a part of the case at all. This means that they don't represent the victims and aren't subject to congressional oversight for the funds they receive. Even if most of these groups weren't activist groups, which many were, this scenario should concern everyone, Mr. Speaker. In fact, many of these groups are political or ideological in nature.

Under the previous administration, in the mortgage settlement cases, groups like the National Council of La Raza received more than \$1 million in Department of Housing and Urban Development grants under these settlements.

I don't know about you, but I think when the DOJ requires a settlement, the funds should go to the victims involved in the case, including victims back home in northeast Georgia. If the victims cannot be found or if the problem cannot be directly rectified, then the settlement funds should go to the Treasury so that Congress, elected by individual Americans, can appropriately decide how to use them.

I don't think it is acceptable to shortchange victims to benefit special interest and politically friendly third-party organizations.

It is time to reassert congressional authority over this process so that hardworking folks are protected from more executive overreach and so that we can restore the separation of powers outlined in the Constitution.

I am here fighting to make sure that the Federal Government puts the hardworking Georgians whom I represent and the rest of the citizens of the United States—not special interests—first.

These bills help ensure that the American citizens have their voices heard, that they regain input into the system, and that the Federal Government is more transparent, accountable, and responsive to their needs.

I would encourage others who share that goal to support this rule and the underlying bills.

Again, as you look ahead for this, the thing that hopefully came out in this is that this is an Article I issue. This is simply about, over time, that has given a way from us in this body that we have done, that it is now time to reassess that, especially in light of the needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume,

and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to debate the rule for consideration of H.R. 469, the Congressional Article I Powers Strengthening Act; and H.R. 732, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act, two Judiciary bills that are deficient in both process and in substance.

First, let me address the Congressional Article I Powers and Strengthening Act, a bill that my Republican friends purport will provide common-sense solutions to curbing regulatory abuse, but will, in fact, undermine the ability of Federal regulators to protect the health and safety of Americans, threaten the privacy of victims of government misconduct, and intrude on the Department of Justice's enforcement discretion, raising serious separation of powers concerns.

Mr. Speaker, just as appalling as the substance of this bill is the process by which we are considering it and many other bills deriving from the Judiciary Committee lately.

This bill is actually three Judiciary Committee bills wrapped in one Rules Committee print. However, one of the bills, H.R. 4070, was introduced last week without a hearing, without a markup, without notice to Democrats on the Judiciary Committee, and without consultation with constitutional lawyers and experts and interested citizens.

This process is truly a slap in the face of regular order. A bill that has zero input from members on the Judiciary Committee or been the subject of any thoughtful discussion is suddenly on the House floor for a vote.

Interestingly, when I listened to my friend from Georgia, who I know is particularly serious about his approaches to legislation, I sat here and then I looked into the gallery, and there were 20 people who were seated there. I didn't see on the faces of those that I could see any understanding of one thing that he said, not because of the speed of his manner of speech, but because of the complexity of issues that give rise to us.

Among the things he said was transparency, accountability, and wanting to make sure that we, this body, exercise our prerogative with reference to for the people, by the people, and of the people.

I would imagine that people listening to this debate would want to believe that half of this body, half of the people who are represented in this country had input to this legislation. Let me tell you, People, they had none, zero. No Democrat had any input to this measure that I just discussed.

How can we expect Members of this body, let alone the American people, to have any idea as to what we are voting on with this measure and what its impact will be when it seems the path it

took to getting a vote is based solely on the whim of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee?

Unfortunately, there is total disregard for even a semblance of regular order. That term is utilized a lot here, and, again, the American people, many of them, don't have a clue what we are talking about.

What we are talking about, basically, is matters that go to committees have hearings, have both sides have input, have witnesses who are experts or have responsibilities in that arena, and then the matter comes to the Rules Committee and is granted a bill of substance to come here to the floor, and that process is generally known by those of us with Congress-speak as regular order.

It is nothing new for the Republican-controlled Judiciary Committee, which has been the worst offender of regular order, when it comes to pushing for a closed process.

During the 115th Congress, bills coming to the floor from the Judiciary Committee were granted the most closed rules of any of the committees in this august body, eight closed rules. There is no committee chair in this Congress who has requested the Republican-controlled Rules Committee grant more closed rules than the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Indeed, this departure from a process that we refer to as regular order, from a process that allows input from outside experts and other witnesses, a process that allows both parties, if there is a hearing, to ask questions of those witnesses, this departure is astounding, and that is within the context of this Congress, which, in just the first 10 months, will soon become the most closed Congress in history.

I remember when I ran for office in 1992, I appeared a lot on radio stations. In many of those appearances, the opposition, not just my opponent, but the major party, had begun a drumbeat of the Democrats are not following regular order, they are having closed rules.

Little did I know in 1992, nor did I aspire when I came here, to be on the Rules Committee to have a better understanding, but I kept listening to this closed rule argument, and many persons lost their elections because of that.

If there is ever a time for us to address it, it would be now. We have that prerogative to be able to open up this process so that all Members can be involved.

When this Congress began, the distinguished Speaker of this body promised an open and transparent House. He called for a return to regular order. After what we have seen over the last 10 months, I shudder to think what the distinguished Speaker considers a closed process.

I might add, the next tier under closed is structured rules, which we are

here today on, which, yet again, limits the number of activities by others, amendments, and other processes that would be appropriate.

Yesterday, when my colleague and I were in the Rules Committee, we had before us matters that were germane to this issue that were denied, that could have, under an open process, been made in order so that we could discuss it here today.

This Republican process, shutting out the voice and input of representatives of nearly half the country, is not just an affront to normal House procedure, which it is, it is downright undemocratic and emblematic of the Republican majority's true inability to govern.

Mr. Speaker, I turn to the second bill encompassed in this rule, H.R. 732, a bill as misguided and substantively unnecessary as the first bill was lacking in process. In fact, in the last Congress, a law professor testifying on an identical bill described it as a solution in search of a problem.

That was as true in the last Congress as it is in this one, which is too bad, because we do not lack in actual problems in desperate need of sensible solutions.

H.R. 732 would prevent Federal agencies from requiring third-party payments, such as those to charities, in settlement agreements with entities accused of wrongdoing.

Now, there in the report pointed out by the chairman of the Rules Committee yesterday shows the number of banks and mortgage companies and others that have violated the law and entered into settlements with the government for billions of dollars. Such payments, in excess of what the victims have agreed to, and the settlements that have been entered into and approved by judges, each one of these settlements, my friend said these payments may have gone to politically motivated—may be politically motivated organizations, and he cites to La Raza, which did receive money, but so did other charitable organizations: the New Christian Joy Full Gospel Baptist Church, the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago, the Catholic Charities Financial and Housing Counseling.

We sought yesterday while we were in the committee—I sought and asked staff to provide for me some of the organizations that my friends say may be politically motivated, or activists, as he referred to them, and it is 49 pages of organizations that were available to receive these funds, and, yes, some of them are liberal and also some of them are conservative organizations as we know them.

Such payments to charities are a common enforcement tool in settlements and have long been used to help provide communities with relief from systemic harm caused by illegal behavior.

Now, for example, following the 2008 financial crisis, in some of the settlement agreements with Wall Street banks, President Obama's Department of Justice required banks to donate money to charities committed to neighborhood stabilization and foreclosure prevention efforts, and this made perfect sense.

□ 1245

In the wake of the crisis, as many as 10 million families lost their homes to foreclosure. Both the Government Accountability Office and the Federal courts have long upheld this practice in settlement agreements. Perhaps unsurprisingly, my Republican colleagues considered these provisions to be an attempt by President Obama's administration to use, as they say, "a slush fund," to enrich, "liberal friends," despite the fact that certified charities eligible to receive these payments encompass liberal and conservative groups alike.

They even launched an investigation which yielded no credible evidence to substantiate their claims. Yet, despite the GAO, the Federal courts, and a Republican-led investigation showing no wrongdoing, we are considering this bill today to ban this longstanding legal practice aimed at assisting communities in the wake of suffering systemic abuse—abuse that I will underline again, and even say slowly, hurt Democrats and Republicans.

I suppose the only question left to ask my Republican friends is, 10 months into the new administration, nearly a year after the last election, why are they continuing to conduct pointless and partisan oversight of the Obama administration?

Let me see if I can make this clear. President Obama is no longer the President of the United States, nor is Bill Clinton or George Bush. The President of the United States now is a new individual who we have to deal with, and it would be helpful if we were to address some of the matters ongoing that this particular administration is deserving of oversight.

I know that President Obama was a useful foil for many in the Republican Party when it came to messaging and campaigning, but he is not the President anymore. He won his two elections. That is the past. This bill represents nothing but the Republican majority grasping at straws and trying their best to turn their oversight attention away from doing their duty and providing oversight of the Trump administration.

Today, two new inquiries, I don't even have the time or wouldn't take the time to go into the inquiries that ain't going nowhere, have been announced, certainly as a distraction to many of the negatives that come out by virtue of this particular Congress not having done anything. It is the do-nothing Congress on steroids.

If there was ever an administration that needed rigorous oversight, it is the current one. In just 10 months, we have had reports of gratuitous use of private jets, the use of private email servers by senior staff, and I might add that one of those things identified today is they are going to go after Hillary or have oversight hearings on Hillary Clinton's emails. Enough already. Hillary Clinton lost her election, and lost with the emails as well, but we have current staff who are using private email servers. Given your history, should that not at least pique your oversight interest?

Spending tens of millions of taxpayers' dollars to use Mar-a-Lago for official meetings, waste, cronyism, the list goes on and on and on. How about oversight of a little, old company in Montana that doesn't have any successful history getting a \$200 million no-bid contract in Puerto Rico to reestablish those facilities there? Out of Montana, little, old company, \$200 million, no-bid. You got it. You go forward. You talk about waste and cronyism. And what do we get from the Republicans? Deafening silence.

Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that we are considering the rule for a bill today entitled Article I Powers Strengthening Act when this Republican Congress has shown they can't even undertake the basic Article I duty of providing oversight of the executive. They don't need to strengthen Article I, they need to just start doing their jobs in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) from the Second District. He is a sponsor of the Judgment Fund Transparency Act.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing up H.R. 469, which includes, as indicated, the text of my bill, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act.

The purpose of this act is really very simple. Actually, contrary to previous arguments, the rule of this and the intent of this is so simple. It is simply for government transparency. This bill will go a long way in providing our constituents and taxpayers a better idea of how their tax dollars are spent.

Now, heaven knows, and for heaven's sake, those of us here, we certainly know, the Federal Government isn't perfect. It is prone to errors that can cause harm to individuals or organizations from time to time, and when these errors are particularly egregious, the government is sued and damages are awarded to those who are harmed.

Early on, in fact, this Congress spent a large part of its time doing nothing but sorting through claims and making appropriations to pay those claims. In fact, not even 100 years ago, much of this body's work consumed only that

topic, and it wasn't until 1956 that Congress established the Judgment Fund and gave authority to the Treasury Department to resolve these claims in "a permanent and definite appropriation." That simply has been abused.

In keeping with the law's requirement to report on the fund from time to time, the Treasury Department files a yearly report of the Judgment Fund with Congress, and also maintains a web page that can be searched.

Now, this sounds good. Right? But the cryptic and otherwise limited information related to each payout has made the database almost entirely worthless. There is no information on what the government did wrong. There is no information on the claimant. In fact, journalists and transparency groups revealed in the last few months that from 2009 to 2015, the government paid out more than \$25 million to unnamed or redacted recipients. A \$25 million secret. We don't know who was paid, we don't know why they were paid, and, in some circumstances, we don't know how much they were paid.

Now, we are all familiar with the previous administration's decision to take \$1.3 billion out of the fund, convert it to cash, and deliver it to Iran, yet this isn't the only egregious use of this fund.

Three years ago, The New York Times reported on what was likely an illegal billion-dollar payout to thousands of farmers who had never even sued the government. This isn't just unacceptable, it is crazy. It is horrible government. It is the type of thing that makes people resent the Federal Government.

This bill aims to clarify and to reduce that. It aims to clean up the ambiguity that exists between the current law and provide much-needed transparency. It would require the Treasury to make public any payment from the Judgment Fund and to include very simple things that common sense would surely demand: the name of the agency named in the judgment, the name of the plaintiff, the amount they were paid, any other fees such as attorneys' fees or interest, and then finally a brief description of the facts which led to the claim.

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act may not prevent bad decisions by all government employees or government agencies, but it will shine a light on those decisions to the American people. This is about helping to increase the amount of trust between the American people and a government that they simply don't trust. We give them reasons not to trust us. Let's bring accountability and transparency to that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on passage of this crucial bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to have my friend understand that I am getting close to closing. I don't think I have any speakers, but I do have words that I wish to put forward right now.

It is shameful that we would be in a position where the DACA program is being threatened without a single thought to the consequences this decision would have on the 800,000 young lives this program protects.

While this may appear to be off message with regard to the measures that are before us, the minority is given an opportunity to present what is called a previous question, and it can be on matters germane to the thoughts of the minority and can be on any subject that they choose. In this instance, we choose to, with the previous question, address DACA.

Do the American people even want DACA to end? The answer is clearly no. According to a Politico/Morning Consult poll, support for allowing these immigrants to remain in the United States spans across party lines: 84 percent of Democrats, 74 percent of Independents, and 69 percent of Republicans think they should stay. Congress must act to protect our DREAMers.

Mr. Speaker, here is a chance to rectify the President's decision and restore the American people's faith in this institution.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), from Georgia's 12th Congressional District, to speak on these issues of Article I.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support my fellow Georgian's, Congressman DOUG COLLINS, bill, H.R. 469.

One of the biggest complaints I hear about the Federal Government is the lack of accountability or these backroom deals. One glaring example of this is what is referred to as sue and settlement litigation.

Under previous administrations, left-leaning groups would sue a Federal agency to try and enact regulatory changes without going through the normal rulemaking process. Both parties, the Federal Government and special interest groups, settle in court with an already-agreed-upon deal.

Regulatory rules are then made quickly without any public notice or the input of any other relevant parties but carry the rule of law.

These new rules are often the most burdensome and cost our businesses billions of dollars each year. This doesn't sound like draining the swamp to me.

H.R. 469 stops these unfair arrangements by requiring agencies to publicly post and report to Congress on sue and settlement complaints, consent decrees, and settlement arrangements. It also prohibits the same-day filing of complaints and settlement agreements in cases seeking to compel agency action.

Congressman COLLINS' legislation, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, will provide greater accountability and transparency to the American public, while stopping special interests from improperly influencing our Nation's regulatory regime. We must uphold a fair and transparent regulatory process. The American people demand this from us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule on this commonsense legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I mentioned that there were 49 pages—I didn't realize how extensive it really was—of organizations that were eligible to receive funds under the Justice Department's prerogative. It includes organizations that did, in fact, receive these funds.

□ 1300

They come from a wide array of organizations in our respective communities that, in my judgment, have on-the-ground ability to be efficient and to make sure that the expenditure of those funds benefit those who have suffered from systemic inequities by large organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a portion of these organizations that were eligible to receive funds under the Justice Department's prerogative.

AGENCY NAME

Money Management International, Anchorage, AK.; Neighborworks Anchorage Formerly Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Covington County; Birmingham Urban League, Inc.; Gateway Financial Freedom/CCCS of Central Alabama; Jefferson County Committee for Economic Opportunity; Jefferson County Housing Authority; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Birmingham, AL; Neighborhood Housing Services of Birmingham, Inc.; United Way of Central Alabama, Inc.; United Way of Central Alabama, Inc.; Community Action Partnership of North Alabama—Cullman Branch; Community Action Partnership of North Alabama, Inc.; Community Action Agency of Northwest Alabama, Inc.; Hale Empowerment and Revitalization Organization (HERO); Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Butler County; Orga-

nized Community Action Programs Inc.—Lowndes County; CCCS of Tennessee River Valley; Community Action Partnership, Huntsville/Madison & Limestone Counties, Inc.; Family Services Center, Inc.

CCCS of Mobile—Jackson; Telamon Corporation; CCCS of Mobile; Center for Fair Housing; Mobile Housing Board; CCCS of Alabama—Montgomery; Legal Services Alabama Inc; CCCS of Mobile—Montrose AL; Community Action Partnership of North Alabama—Moulton Branch; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Dale County; Housing Authority of the City of Prichard; Community Action Agency of Northwest Alabama—Franklin County; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Crenshaw County; Community Action Agency of Northwest Alabama—Colbert County; Organized Community Action Program, Inc.; Community Service Programs of West Alabama, Inc.; Organized Community Action Programs Inc.—Bullock County; Credit Counseling of Arkansas—Bentonville; Mississippi County, Arkansas Economic Opportunity Commission, Inc.; Hope Enterprise Corporation.

Family Service Agency—CCCS; Arkansas River Valley Area Council, Inc.; Money Management International El Dorado; Credit Counseling of Arkansas; Crawford Sebastian Community Development Council; Credit Counseling of Arkansas Fort Smith; Northwest Regional Housing Authority; Southern Bancorp Community Partners; Jonesboro Urban Renewal and Housing Authority Housing and Community Development Organization (JURHA HCDO); Arkansas Development Finance Authority; Better Community Development, Inc.; Community Resources Technicians, Inc.; Family Service Agency—CCCS; In Affordable Housing, Incorporated; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Little Rock, AR; Southern Bancorp Community Partners; Universal Housing Development Corporation; Credit Counseling of Arkansas—Springdale; Southeastern Arizona Governments Organization; Community Action Human Resources Agency.

Housing Solutions of Northern Arizona, Inc.; Money Management International, Inc. Flagstaff, AZ; Northern Arizona Council of Governments; Administration of Resources and Choices; Money Management International, Inc. Glendale, AZ; Western Arizona Council of Governments (WACOG)—Kingman Branch Office; Housing Counseling and Education Services; Money Management International, Inc. Mesa, AZ; Springboard—Mesa; Chicanos Por La Causa—Nogales; Nogales Community Development Corporation; Chicanos Por La Causa, Phoenix; City of Phoenix Neighborhood Services Department; Community Housing Resources of Arizona; Desert Mission Neighborhood Renewal; Greater Phoenix Urban League; Labor's Community Service Agency; Money Management International Phoenix Phone Center; Money Management International, Inc. Phoenix, AZ Central.

NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Phoenix, AZ; Neighborhood Housing Services of Phoenix; NID-HCA Phoenix Randolph; Take Charge America; Money Management International, Inc. Prescott, AZ; Campesinos Sin Fronteras; Comite De Bien Estar, Inc.; Credit Advisors Foundation; Money Management International, Inc. Phoenix, AZ—North; Housing America Corporation; Greenpath Debt Solutions; Money Management International, Inc. Tempe, AZ; Newtown Community Development Corporation; Administration of Resources and

Choices; Catholic Community Services of So. Arizona, Inc. DBA Pio Decimo Center; Chicanos Por La Causa-Tucson; Family Housing Resources; Money Management International, Inc. Tucson, AZ—SE; Money Management, Inc. Tucson, AZ—NW; Old Pueblo Housing Development, Inc.

Southern Arizona Legal Aid, Inc.; Southwest Fair Housing Counsel; The Primavera Foundation, Inc.; Tucson Urban League; Northern Arizona Council of Governments; Western Arizona Council of Governments (WACOG); Western Arizona Council of Governments NCOA HECM; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County; CCCS of the North Coast; CCCS of Kern and Tulare Counties; Community Housing Council of Kern Co.; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County; Korean Resource Center; Surepath Financial Solutions; Consumer Credit Counselors of Kern and Tulare Counties; Money Management International Chula Vista; California Rural Legal Assistance—Coachella; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Commerce Branch; Catholic Charities of the East Bay; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO).

Money Management International Concord; National Asian American Coalition (Formerly Known as Mabuhay Alliance); California Rural Legal Assistance—Delano; Able Works; Springboard—El Cajon; California Rural Legal Assistance—El Centro; Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board—El Centro Branch (Imperial County); Community Housing Works; Pacific Community Services Fairfield; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County; Money Management International Fremont; Project Sentinel; California Rural Legal Assistance—Fresno; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions Inc.—Fresno Branch; Community Housing Council of Fresno; Housing Authority of the City of Fresno; California Rural Legal Assistance—Gilroy; Project Sentinel; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Glendale Branch; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Granada Hills Branch.

NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Los Angeles, CA; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO); Springboard—Hemet; Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board—Indio Branch (Riverside County); Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency; Springboard—Ladera; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Lakewood Branch; California Rural Legal Assistance—Lamont; Pure Hearts R Us Housing Corporation; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO); Tri-Valley Housing Opportunity Center; Home Preservation and Prevention (HPP Cares); Operation Hope Inc.—Long Beach Branch; Springboard—Long Beach; East La Community Corporation (ELACC); Korean Churches for Community Development; Korean Resource Center; Los Angeles Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.; New Economics for Women; NID-HCA Reeves;

Operation Hope, Inc.; Operation Hope, Inc.—La Branch; Shalom Center for T.R.E.E. of Life; Thai Community Development Corp.; Watts Century Latino Org.; West Angeles Community Development Corp.; California Rural Legal Assistance—Madera; California Rural Legal Assistance—Marysville Office; Operation Hope, Inc.—Maywood Branch; National Asian American Coalition (Formerly Known As Mabuhay Alliance); California Rural Legal Assistance—Modesto; Community Housing and Shelter Services; Habitat for Humanity, Stanislaus County; Project Sentinel; Montebello Housing Development Corp.; California Rural Legal Assistance—

Monterey; Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.; Project Sentinel; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO); Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley.

Money Management International Oakland; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Oakland, CA; National Association of Real Estate Brokers—Investment Division, Inc; NID-HCA Oakland Main Branch; Operation Hope, Inc.—Oakland Branch; The Spanish Speaking Unity Council of Alameda County, Inc. (The Unity Council); Faith Based Community Development Corporation; Money Management International Oceanside; Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board; Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services, Inc.; Neighborhood Housing Services of Orange County; California Rural Legal Assistance—Oxnard; Ventura County Community Development Corporation; Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.; Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO); California Rural Legal Assistance—Paso Robles; Pacific Community Services, Inc.; Operation Hope, Inc.—Poway Branch; Hometown Community Development Corp. DBA Homestrong USA; Housing Opportunities Collaborative—Inland Empire Branch.

Community Housing Development Corporation of North Richmond; Richmond Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.; Community Connect; Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.; Springboard—Shine Center (Latham); Springboard Non Profit Consumer Credit Management Inc.—HPF Affiliate; Springboard Non-Profit Consumer Credit Management, Inc.; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Sacramento Branch; Sacramento Home Loan Counseling Center; Sacramento Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.; California Rural Legal Assistance—Salinas; Housing Resource Center of Monterey County; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—San Bernardino Branch; Neighborhood Housing Services of The Inland Empire, Inc.; NID-HCA Inland Empire J. Jackson; Bayside Community Center; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—San Diego Branch; Community Housing Works; Housing Opportunities Collaborative; Housing Opportunities Collaborative—Branch for San Diego/Imperial Counties; Money Management International San Diego.

National Asian American Coalition (Formerly Known as Mabuhay Alliance); Navicore Solutions—San Diego, CA; Neighborhood House Association; San Diego Urban League; Union of Pan Asian Communities; Asian Incorporated; CCCS of San Francisco; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of San Francisco—HPF Affiliate; Mission Economic Development Association (MEDA); Project Sentinel; San Francisco Housing Development Corporation; Neighborhood Housing Services Silicon Valley; Project Sentinel; Santa Clara County Asian Law Alliance; Surepath Financial Solutions—San Jose; NID-HCA San Leandro—Chambers; California Rural Legal Assistance—San Luis Obispo; Peoples' Self Help Housing; Fair Housing of Marin; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Santa Ana Branch.

Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County; Housing Opportunities Collaborative—Orange County Branch; Legal Aid Society of Orange County; Orange County Fair Housing Council, Inc.; California Rural Legal Assistance—Santa Barbara; Project Sentinel; California Rural Legal Assistance; California Rural Legal Assistance—Santa Maria; Wise & Healthy Aging; California Rural Legal Assistance;

Catholic Charities, Diocese of Santa Rosa; CCCS of San Francisco; Centro Familia

Esperanza; Operation Hope Inc.—South Gate Branch; California Rural Legal Assistance—Stockton; Clearpoint Credit Counseling Solutions—Stockton Branch; NID-HCA A. Jones; Visionary Home Builders of California; Project Sentinel; Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority, United Native Housing Development Corp.

City of Vacaville Department of Housing Services; Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation; Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board—Victorville Branch (San Bernardino County); CCCS of Kern and Tulare Counties; Community Services and Employment Training, Inc. (CSET); Self Help Enterprises; California Rural Legal Assistance—Oceanside; Surepath Financial Solutions—Watsonville; Rural Community Assistance Corporation; Community Resource and Housing Development Corporation—Alamosa; City of Aurora Community Development Division; Boulder County Housing Authority; Greenpath, Inc.; Upper Arkansas Area Council of Governments; CCCS of Greater Dallas—Colorado Springs; Adams County Housing Authority; Colorado Housing and Finance Authority; Colorado Housing Assistance Corporation; Del Norte Neighborhood Development Corporation (NDC); Denver Housing Authority.

Greenpath, Inc.; Money Management International Denver, Aurora Branch; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Denver, CO; NEWSED CDC; Northeast Denver Housing Center; Southwest Improvement Council; Housing Solutions for the Southwest; Regional Housing Alliance La Plata Homes Fund; Brothers Redevelopment, Inc.; Greenpath Debt Solutions; Neighbor to Neighbor; Northeast Colorado Housing, Inc.; Tri-County Housing & Community Development Corporation; Neighbor to Neighbor; Grand Junction Housing Authority; Greenpath Debt Solutions; Money Management International Highlands Ranch; Douglas County Housing Partnership; Boulder County Housing Authority; Neighbor to Neighbor.

Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Pueblo, CO; Neighborworks of Pueblo; Summit County Family Resource Center; San Miguel Regional Housing Authority; Community Resources and Housing Development Corporation; Money Management International Westminster; Bridgeport Neighborhood Trust; Housing Development Fund, Inc.—Bridgeport Branch; Housing Development Fund—Danbury Branch; Financial Counselors of America Connecticut Branch; Money Management International East Hartford; Community Renewal Team, Inc.; Hartford Areas Rally Together; Housing Education Resource Center; Mutual Housing Association of Greater Hartford, Inc.; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Hartford, CT; Urban League of Greater Hartford, Inc.; Money Management International Milford; Neighborhood Housing Services of New Britain, Inc.; Greater New Haven Community Loan Fund.

Mutual Housing of South Central CT, Inc.// Neighborworks New Horizons; Neighborhood Housing Services of New Haven; Catholic Charities, Norwich, CT; Connecticut Housing Finance Authority; Housing Development Fund, Inc.; Urban League of Southern Connecticut; Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc.; National Council on Aging (NCOA); Asian American Homeownership Counseling; Carecen—Central American Resource Center; Greater Washington Urban League; Homefree—USA Washington DC

Branch; Housing Counseling Services, Incorporated; Latino Economic Development Corporation; Lydia's House; Manna, Inc. Marshall Heights Community Development Organization; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Washington, DC; National Capacd; National Community Reinvestment Coalition.

National Community Reinvestment Coalition, Inc.; National Council of La Raza; National Foundation for Credit Counseling, Inc.; Neighborhood Reinvestment Corp. DBA Neighborworks America; NID-HCA Williams; Operation Hope, Inc.—DC Branch; United Planning Organization; United Planning Organization—Anacostia Center; United Planning Organization—Petey Greene Community Svc. Center; United Planning Organization Shaw Community Svc. Center; University Legal Services; University Legal Services; CCCS of Maryland and Delaware; Delaware State Housing Authority; First State Community Action Agency, Inc.; National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research Fund, Inc. (NCALL Research, Inc.); First State Community Action Agency, Inc.; National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research Fund, Inc. (NCALL, Research, Inc.); Hockessin Community Center; First State Community Action Agency, Inc.

National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research Fund, Inc. (NCALL Research, Inc.); YWCA Delaware; Telamon Corporation; CCCS of Delaware Valley, DBA Clarifi; CCCS of Delaware Valley, Inc. DBA Clarifi; CCCS of Maryland and Delaware; Delaware Community Reinvestment Action Council; Housing Opportunities of Northern Delaware, Inc.; Interfaith Community Housing of Delaware; Neighborhood House, Incorporated; West End Neighborhood House; Homes in Partnership, Inc.; We Help Community Development Corporation; Florida Cooperative Extension—Holmes County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Boynton Beach Faith Based CDC; Catholic Charities Diocese of Venice, Inc.; Manatee Community Action Agency, Inc. F/K/A Manatee Opportunity Council, Incorporated; Florida Cooperative Extension Levy County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Hernando County Cooperative Extension Service; All-American Foreclosure Solutions, Inc.

Cape Coral Housing Development Corporation; Florida Cooperative Extension—Washington County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Bright Community Trust, Inc.; Clearwater Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.; Consumer Credit and Budget Counseling, DBA National Foundation for Debt Management; Consumer Credit and Budget Counseling, DBA National Foundation for Debt Management; Housing Services of Central Florida; Tampa Bay Community Development Corporation; Homes in Partnership, Incorporated; Credit Card Mgmt Svcs, Inc. D/B/A Debthelper.Com; Florida Cooperative Extension—Brevard County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Brevard County Cooperative Extension Service (Duplicate); CCCS of West FL; Florida Cooperative Extension Dixie County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Pasco County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Adopt A Hurricane Family, Inc. DBA Crisis Housing Solutions; Apprisen—CCCS—Davie; Florida Cooperative Extension—Broward County Cooperative Extension; Central Florida Community Development Corporation; Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida, Inc.

Mid-Florida Housing Partnership, Inc.; Florida Cooperative Extension—Walton

County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Volusia County Cooperative Extension Service; H.E.L.P. Community Development Corp.; Affordable Housing by Lake, Inc.; Centro Campesino, Farmworkers Center, Inc.; New Visions Community Development Corporation; Urban League of Broward County Main Office; Urban League of Broward County (Branch Office); Affordable Homeownership Foundation Inc; Home Ownership Resource Center of Lee County; Housing Authority of the City of Ft. Myers; Lee County Housing Development Corporation; CCCS of West FL; City of Gainesville Housing Division; Florida Cooperative Extension; Florida Cooperative Extension—Alachua County Cooperative Extension Service; Florida Cooperative Extension—Alachua County Cooperative Extension Service (Duplicate); Neighborhood Housing & Development Corporation; CCCS of the Midwest.

Community Housing Partners Corporation; Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida, Inc.—Inverness Office; Black Bottom/Springfield Human Development Corporation, DBA St. Joseph Homeownership; Community Home Ownership Center, Inc. F/K/A Jacksonville FL Chapter Assoc. of Housing Counselors & Agencies CDC; Family Foundations of Northeast Florida, Inc.; Florida Cooperative Extension—Duval County Cooperative Extension Service; Greenpath, Inc.; Habitat for Humanity of Jacksonville, Inc.; Jacksonville Area Legal Aid, Inc.; Jacksonville Urban League; NACA (Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America) Jacksonville, FL; Operation New Hope CDC; Wealth Watcher, Inc.; Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida, Inc.—Kissimmee Office; Florida Cooperative Extension—Osceola County Cooperative Extension Service; The Agriculture and Labor Program, Inc.; Florida Cooperative Extension—Columbia County Extension Service; Springboard—Lake Mary; Catholic Charities of Central Florida; Keystone Challenge Fund, Inc.

Florida Cooperative Extension—Pinellas County Cooperative Extension Service; Broward County Housing Authority; Florida Cooperative Extension—Citrus County Cooperative Extension Service; Debt Management Credit Counseling Corp; Debt Management Credit Counseling Corp; Debt Management Credit Counseling Corp; Florida Cooperative Extension—Suwannee County Cooperative Extension Service; Greenpath Debt Solutions; Florida Cooperative Extension—Baker County Cooperative Extension Service (Duplicate); Florida Cooperative Extension—Baker County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Florida Cooperative Extension—Madison County Cooperative Extension Service (Terminated); Community Housing Initiative, Inc.; Cuban American National Council, Inc.—Miami; Little Haiti Housing Association, Inc.; Neighborhood Housing Services of South Florida; Real Estate, Education and Community Housing, Inc.; SER Jobs for Progress; Miami Beach Community Development Corp; NID-HCA Florida Felton; Housing Development Corporation of SW Florida, Inc.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I do want to acknowledge that my friend from Georgia does have a companion bill in the other body. I believe it is S. 333. I would—like I will when the Georgia-Florida game comes up—make a wager with my friend that that bill ain't going nowhere. But, anyway, we are here talking about it, so my wager with the gentleman will be under ap-

propriate measures. I wish he and I could go to Jacksonville together at what they say is the greatest cocktail party in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that at least one of the bills wrapped up in today's, in my view, nonsense, ought to continue to be described as a solution in search of a problem. I am not fully convinced that the observation is not an apt one for the whole lot of bills before us today. As I just mentioned, this is particularly disturbing as this country has real problems which need real solutions.

The Children's Health Insurance Program has expired, and there seems to be little to no will on the other side of the aisle to right this wrong at this time. Sure, we hear possibilities of a solution. When I came back this week, I thought that we would certainly address it. September 30 was when it expired. Yet we and, more importantly, millions of children and organizations wait for an answer.

We know that we are fast approaching a government shutdown, but instead we come to the floor week after week forced to debate ridiculous bills that, in substance, are well-thought-out by the persons presenting them, but, in reality, are not going to become law and are nothing more than talking points of the day, when these things that we should be addressing are going unmet.

We need to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, yet the answer to this issue evades my friends across the aisle. We need to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, yet we wait.

We need to address the crippling epidemic that is gun violence in this country. We need to remember that not even a month ago, this man out in Las Vegas took aim from the 32nd floor of a hotel and rained terror down upon thousands of innocent people enjoying a music festival. The weapons of war he used that night are just as readily available today as the day he bought them.

Finally, I understand people may want to forget the following, but we cannot, and I will not let you forget that there are millions of people across the United States Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, and there are thousands in Florida and in Texas who are still awaiting visits from FEMA.

On the plane up yesterday, I was reading a 3-page-long article addressing, right in my community, the fact that people are sitting waiting for FEMA's response. I continue to raise at the same time that these hurricanes in Texas, southwest Louisiana, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico have occurred, forest fires in California and Montana and Oregon have occurred, and we haven't addressed drought in other areas that occurred. Just last week, tornadoes occurred in Oklahoma. We have these disasters occurring.

I heard my colleague earlier today during morning hour make a presentation regarding a main burst in Detroit, Michigan, and that they don't have in her area sufficient drinking water. We know that the Flint, Michigan, matter isn't resolved.

This past weekend, I busted a tire on a bumpy-hole road, and we need to fix our roads in this country. This Capital ought to be called the "Pothole of the World."

Yet we stand here day after day discussing things that are going nowhere when people in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are craving electricity, opening schools with no electricity, moving people from hospitals. We need safe drinking water all over this country. They need for us to show compassion and at least some decency with reference to humanity with those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that this body can do better. My friend from Florida outlined his opinion of what those may be. He also outlined his opinion of what will be a nice Georgia victory come Saturday, this weekend, in Jacksonville. I do appreciate his acknowledgement of what will be coming.

But I think there are also some other things that we need to discuss, and we can talk about that. I will take, first off, the issue of the Judiciary Committee on which I serve, which I believe, frankly, I have the privilege of serving on what I believe are two of the hardest-working and longest-hour committees on this Hill, and that is the Rules Committee and the Judiciary Committee. Chairman GOODLATTE is very thoughtful.

We can disagree, Mr. Speaker, and I can understand my friend's frustration on issues of closed bills which do come and have been under both parties, but today's bills are not one of those. These two bills both have amendments that are offered on the floor by both parties. There are Republican amendments and there are Democrat amendments. This is not one of those.

So I think, from the perspective of how process and regular order—and we can go through those—I would stand with my chairman and Chairman GOODLATTE on that issue that we are working toward, and it is something that really matters here.

I think also, as we look at this, it is talking about grasping of straws. One of the things is we can get sidelined many times on looking at what could be or want to be and what we want to focus on. But also, it is a matter—as I come down here in this role many

times, let's focus on the line right now, let's focus on the minute ahead, let's focus on the next vote, and that is talking about these bills in this process.

I thought it was interesting to say that these are solutions in search of a problem. It is really interesting to me that, undoubtedly, these solutions in search of a problem—I think the problem is when they have, especially under sue and settle, \$9.6 billion annual cost, \$500 million in the first year cost; Oil and Gas Rule, \$738 million annually; \$632 million annually for the Florida Nutrient Standards and Estuary Flowing Waters Rule; Boiler MACT, \$3 billion. I mean, I could go on. And \$90 billion for reconsideration of 2008 ozone.

Let's make it very clear what sue and settle does. Sue and settle does not take the power for an agency to enter into a consent decree. Consent decrees are used often. The problem with this one is that when you have two parties on the same page suing, in essence, what amounts to one so that they can get a desired result without talking to the others who were affected, that is just wrong.

It is like me taking another congressman, or you, Mr. Speaker, and saying: You know, let's work out a deal.

But the reality is it is going to affect my friend from across the aisle, but we are not going to tell him. We are simply going to say: We are going to work our deal out. We are going to go to the Court. We are going to get the Court to sign off on it and we are going to implement everything that we have without proper insight and oversight.

That is all that we are asking for. It is called fairness. I am not sure how you could be against that, unless you like the idea of writing regulatory law in cubicles down the street instead of here on the floor of the House.

The other issue I see here is this issue of slush funds. We have talked about this, and the gentleman put 10 pages into the RECORD. He can put 49 into the Record; he can put 550 into the RECORD of eligible agencies for this money.

The problem is not eligible agencies. Number one, they are not victims. Number two, they are not part of the suit, yet we are giving it at sometimes double the rate to the offenders. Those that the Justice Department said were doing wrong—let's get this clear. Like in the housing issue—said you are doing wrong in this mortgage issue.

But what we are going to do, instead of giving the money at 1:1 back to victims, we are going to give it at 2:1 if you go to our preferred charity in donation form. It sounds like to me the only people who are getting problematic here are the victims of it; and the others of these pages of people who may or may not have political leanings

or religious leanings or anything else, they are the recipient of the lottery.

They said, "We will go help these people; give us money," instead of saying this is an issue that needs to be dealt with in a settlement to the victims.

It also has been said that this is just giving money to help those in those areas so that they can get back on their feet. But it also went further than that. There were two instances in particular that I can come up with: the Housing Council, which this body said we are not funding any longer, yet the administration used these donations to circumvent the appropriations process and fund it. That is not the role of the executive branch. That is an article I role.

The electric vehicle subsidy, \$2 billion, again, this body said no. They said: No worries. We will go get a settlement. We will just take the donations and we will fund something that Congress has already said no on.

So it is easy to paint with broad strokes and say this is not important, this does not matter. But for some of us it does matter.

Those stories—why people are so upset when they look at this town is they just remember what their old civic books told them: that there was a Congress, there was an executive branch, and there was a judicial branch; each required all to do their part.

If we decide that it is too far down the road, let's bind the hands of the executive branch. We will do whatever. This is nothing except Congress saying this is what we are going to do. It is saying, this is what matters for us. And we may call it cheap; we may call it little; we may call it solutions in search of a problem, but you talk about the businessowners and the industries and the States who had to pay out on these sue and settle agreements.

When you talk about the millions—the billions that were sent to Iran, I think there will be a lot of people, when you look at both sides of this case, who will say: Yes, Congress, I want you to stop this because this is the way it should be set up.

That is why these bills are on the floor today. That is why we are taking them up. That is the reason we are bringing them forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 577 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the

cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the pur-

pose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2142.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Budd	Diaz-Balart
Aderholt	Byrne	Donovan
Allen	Calvert	Duffy
Amash	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Amodei	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Arrington	Chabot	Dunn
Babin	Cheney	Emmer
Bacon	Coffman	Estes (KS)
Banks (IN)	Cole	Farenthold
Barr	Collins (GA)	Faso
Barton	Collins (NY)	Ferguson
Bergman	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Biggs	Comstock	Fleischmann
Bilirakis	Conaway	Flores
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Fox
Black	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Culberson	Gaetz
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Gallagher
Brady (TX)	Davidson	Garrett
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Gianforte
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Gibbs
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Gohmert
Buck	DeSantis	Goodlatte
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Gosar

Gowdy	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer
Granger	MacArthur	Royce (CA)
Graves (GA)	Marino	Russell
Graves (LA)	Marshall	Rutherford
Graves (MO)	Massie	Sanford
Griffith	Mast	Scalise
Grothman	McCarthy	Schweikert
Guthrie	McCaul	Scott, Austin
Handel	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Harper	McHenry	Sessions
Harris	McKinley	Shimkus
Hartzler	McMorris	Shuster
Hensarling	Rodgers	Simpson
Herrera Beutler	McSally	Smith (MO)
Hice, Jody B.	Meadows	Smith (NE)
Higgins (LA)	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Hill	Messer	Smith (TX)
Holding	Mitchell	Smucker
Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Stefanik
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Stewart
Hultgren	Mullin	Stivers
Hunter	Newhouse	Taylor
Hurd	Noem	Tenney
Issa	Norman	Thompson (PA)
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Thornberry
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Tiberi
Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Tipton
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Turner
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Upton
Jones	Pearce	Valadao
Jordan	Perry	Wagner
Joyce (OH)	Pittenger	Walberg
Katko	Poe (TX)	Walden
Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	Walker
Kelly (PA)	Posey	Walorski
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Walters, Mimi
King (NY)	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Kinzinger	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Knight	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup
Kustoff (TN)	Roby	Westerman
Labrador	Roe (TN)	Williams
LaHood	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)	Wittman
Lamborn	Rohrabacher	Womack
Lance	Rokita	Woodall
Latta	Rooney, Francis	Yoder
Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Thomas	Yoho
LoBiondo	J.	Young (AK)
Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IA)
Love	Ross	Zeldin
Lucas	Rothfus	

NAYS—189

Adams	DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.
Aguilar	DeGette	Kaptur
Beatty	Delaney	Keating
Bera	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Beyer	DeBene	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	Demings	Khanna
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Kihuen
Blunt Rochester	Deutch	Kildee
Bonamici	Dingell	Kilmer
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett	Kind
F.	Doyle, Michael	Krishnamoorthi
Brady (PA)	F.	Kuster (NH)
Brown (MD)	Ellison	Langevin
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Bustos	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Butterfield	Espallat	Lawrence
Capuano	Esty (CT)	Lawson (FL)
Carbajal	Evans	Lee
Cárdenas	Foster	Levin
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Lewis (GA)
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Chu, Judy	Gallego	Loeb
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lofgren
Clark (MA)	Gomez	Lowe
Clarke (NY)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lujan Grisham,
Clay	Gottheimer	M.
Cleaver	Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lynch
Cohen	Grijalva	Maloney,
Connolly	Gutiérrez	Carolyn B.
Conyers	Hanabusa	Maloney, Sean
Cooper	Hastings	Matsui
Correa	Heck	McCollum
Costa	Higgins (NY)	McEachin
Courtney	Himes	McGovern
Crist	Hoyer	McNerney
Crowley	Huffman	Meeks
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Meng
Cummings	Jayapal	Moore
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Moulton
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)

Nadler Rosen
Napolitano Roybal-Allard
Neal Ruiz
Nolan Ruppertsberger
Norcross Rush
O'Halleran Ryan (OH)
O'Rourke Sanchez
Pallone Sarbanes
Panetta Schakowsky
Pascrell Schiff
Payne Schneider
Pelosi Schrader
Perlmutter Scott (VA)
Peters Scott, David
Peterson Serrano
Pingree Sewell (AL)
Pocan Shea-Porter
Polis Sherman
Price (NC) Sinema
Quigley Sires
Raskin Slaughter
Rice (NY) Smith (WA)
Richmond Soto

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta Burgess
Barragan Carson (IN)
Bass Huizenga
Bridenstine Long
Buchanan Lowenthal

□ 1337

Mmes. NAPOLITANO, MURPHY of Florida, Mses. SANCHEZ, SHEA-PORTER, Messrs. GALLEGGO, and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 572.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

AYES—227

Abraham Byrne
Aderholt Calvert
Allen Carter (GA)
Amash Carter (TX)
Amodei Chabot
Arrington Cheney
Babin Coffman
Bacon Cole
Banks (IN) Collins (GA)
Barr Collins (NY)
Barton Comer
Bergman Comstock
Biggs Conaway
Bilirakis Cook
Bishop (MI) Costello (PA)
Bishop (UT) Cramer
Black Crawford
Blackburn Culberson
Blum Curbelo (FL)
Bost Davidson
Brady (TX) Davis, Rodney
Brat Denham
Brooks (IN) Dent
Buck DeSantis
Bucshon DesJarlais
Budd Diaz-Balart

Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant

NOES—190

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)

Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)

Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppertsberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)

Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta Buchanan
Barragan Burgess
Bass Griffith
Bridenstine Huizenga
Brooks (AL) Long

□ 1344

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

(Mr. THOMPSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the worst fires in the history of California have devastated nearly 300,000 acres, destroyed some 8,000 homes, caused billions of dollars in damage, burned to the ground many businesses, and, most sadly, taken the lives of 42 people—and that number may very well rise.

These fires were like no other, propelled by winds that reached speeds of over 70 miles per hour. The worst of the fires were in my district. They moved so fast, burning at times 200 feet per second. That is three football fields every 30 seconds.

People had little time to escape their burning homes. They fled with only the clothes on their back and, in some cases, with their homes already in flames.

The most covered area on the news is a neighborhood in my district in Santa Rosa called Coffey Park. There, alone, the entire neighborhood, some 1,300 homes, were burned to the ground. The winds were so high that they pushed the blaze across eight lanes of freeway and over two frontage roads to destroy the homes and lives of those 1,300 families.

Eleven thousand firefighters, thousands of law enforcement and National

Guard soldiers put their lives on the line to stop the raging inferno and protect Californians in the line of the fire. Some of those first responders lost their own homes, but they worked 24/7 to help others. The actions of civilian heroes and heroines saved an untold number of lives.

The fallout from this disaster will be felt for years, if not decades. You can't just rebuild 8,000 homes and entire neighborhoods overnight.

My colleagues and I from California appreciate all of your words of comfort and offers to help, and the people hurt by this monster fire will need all of our help.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House now observe a moment of silence for those who lost their lives in this terrifying fire and to show our commitment to help rebuild the lives of the many thousands of people who have lost everything.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING EMERGENCY RE- SPONSE BY DETECTING INCOM- ING CONTRABAND WITH TECH- NOLOGY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2142) to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 3, not voting 17, as follows

[Roll No. 574]

YEAS—412

Abraham	Black	Butterfield
Adams	Blackburn	Byrne
Aderholt	Blum	Calvert
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Capuano
Allen	Blunt Rochester	Carbajal
Amodeli	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Arrington	Bost	Carson (IN)
Babin	Boyle, Brendan	Carter (GA)
Bacon	F.	Carter (TX)
Banks (IN)	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Barr	Brady (TX)	Castor (FL)
Barton	Brat	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Bera	Brooks (IN)	Cheney
Bergman	Brown (MD)	Chu, Judy
Biggs	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Billirakis	Buck	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Bucshon	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (MI)	Budd	Clay
Bishop (UT)	Bustos	Cleaver

Clyburn	Harper	McHenry
Coffman	Harris	McKinley
Cohen	Hartzer	McMorris
Cole	Hastings	Rodgers
Collins (GA)	Heck	McNerney
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	McSally
Comer	Herrera Beutler	Meadows
Conaway	Hice, Jody B.	Meehan
Connolly	Higgins (LA)	Meeks
Conyers	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Cook	Hill	Messer
Cooper	Himes	Mitchell
Correa	Holding	Moolenaar
Costa	Hollingsworth	Mooney (WV)
Costello (PA)	Hoyer	Moore
Courtney	Hudson	Moulton
Cramer	Huffman	Mullin
Crawford	Hultgren	Murphy (FL)
Crist	Hurd	Nadler
Crowley	Issa	Napolitano
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Neal
Culberson	Jayapal	Newhouse
Cummings	Jeffries	Noem
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Nolan
Davidson	Jenkins (WV)	Norcross
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Norman
Davis, Danny	Johnson (LA)	Nunes
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	O'Halleran
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Olson
Delaney	Jordan	Palazzo
DeLauro	Joyce (OH)	Pallone
DelBene	Kaptur	Palmer
Demings	Katko	Panetta
Denham	Keating	Pascarell
Dent	Kelly (IL)	Paulsen
DeSaulnier	Kelly (MS)	Payne
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Pearce
Deutch	Kennedy	Pelosi
Diaz-Balart	Khanna	Perlmutter
Dingell	Kihuen	Perry
Donovan	Kildee	Peters
Doyle, Michael	Kilmer	Peterson
F.	Kind	Pingree
Duffy	King (IA)	Pittenger
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Pocan
Duncan (TN)	Kinziger	Poe (TX)
Dunn	Knight	Poliquin
Ellison	Krishnamoorthi	Polis
Emmer	Kuster (NH)	Posey
Engel	Kustoff (TN)	Price (NC)
Eshoo	Labrador	Quigley
Españillat	LaHood	Raskin
Estes (KS)	LaMalfa	Ratcliffe
Estry (CT)	Lamborn	Reed
Evans	Lance	Reichert
Farenthold	Langevin	Renacci
Faso	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Rice (SC)
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Richmond
Fleischmann	Lawrence	Roby
Flores	Lawson (FL)	Roe (TN)
Fortenberry	Lee	Rogers (AL)
Foster	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Fox	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Franks (AZ)	Lewis (MN)	Rokita
Frelinghuysen	Lieu, Ted	Rooney, Francis
Fudge	Lipinski	Rooney, Thomas
Gabbard	LoBlundo	J.
Gaetz	Loeb	Ros-Lehtinen
Gallagher	Loeb	Rosen
Gallego	Lofgren	Roskam
Garamendi	Loudermilk	Ross
Garrett	Love	Rothfus
Gianforte	Lowe	Rouzer
Gibbs	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Royce (CA)
Gomez	Lujan Grisham,	Ruiz
Gonzalez (TX)	M.	Ruppersberger
Goodlatte	Luján, Ben Ray	Rush
Gosar	Lynch	Russell
Gothier	MacArthur	Rutherford
Gowdy	Maloney,	Ryan (OH)
Granger	Carolyn B.	Sánchez
Graves (GA)	Maloney, Sean	Sanford
Graves (LA)	Marchant	Sarbanes
Graves (MO)	Marino	Scalise
Green, Al	Marshall	Schakowsky
Green, Gene	Massie	Schiff
Griffith	Mast	Schneider
Grijalva	Matsui	Schrader
Grothman	McCarthy	Schweikert
Guthrie	McCaul	Scott (VA)
Gutiérrez	McClintock	Scott, Austin
Hanabusa	McCollum	Scott, David
Handel	McEachin	Sensenbrenner
	McGovern	

Serrano	Taylor	Walorski
Sessions	Tenney	Walters, Mimi
Sowell (AL)	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Shimkus	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
Shuster	Thornberry	Waters, Maxine
Simpson	Tiberi	Watson Coleman
Sinema	Tipton	Weber (TX)
Sires	Titus	Webster (FL)
Slaughter	Tonko	Welch
Smith (MO)	Torres	Wenstrup
Smith (NE)	Tsongas	Westerman
Smith (NJ)	Turner	Williams
Smith (TX)	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Smith (WA)	Valadao	Wittman
Smucker	Vargas	Womack
Soto	Veasey	Woodall
Speier	Vela	Yarmuth
Stefanik	Velázquez	Yoder
Stewart	Visclosky	Yoho
Stivers	Wagner	Young (AK)
Suozzi	Walberg	Young (IA)
Swalwell (CA)	Walden	Zeldin
Takano	Walker	

NAYS—3

Amash	Jones	Sherman

NOT VOTING—17

Barletta	Burgess	Hunter
Barragán	Comstock	Long
Bass	DeSantis	Lowenthal
Beyer	Doggett	Trott
Bridenstine	Frankel (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Buchanan	Huizenga	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1355

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER AMENDMENT IN LIEU OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 PRINTED IN PART A OF HOUSE REPORT 115-363 DURING CONSID- ERATION OF H.R. 469, SUNSHINE FOR REGULATIONS AND REGU- LATORY DECREES AND SETTLE- MENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 469, pursuant to House Resolution 577, the amendment I have placed at the desk be in order in lieu of the amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-363 and numbered 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

AN AMENDMENT OFFERED IN LIEU OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 PRINTED IN PART A OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 115-363 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS OF MICHIGAN

Page 3, line 17, strike “; and” and insert “, other than an excepted consent decree or settlement agreement;”.

Page 4, line 4, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 4, insert after line 4 the following:

(6) the term “excepted consent decree or settlement agreement” means a covered consent decree or covered settlement agreement that prevents or is intended to prevent discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, or any other protected category.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

FAMILY OFFICE TECHNICAL CORRECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3972) to clarify that family offices and family clients are accredited investors, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3972

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Family Office Technical Correction Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ACCREDITED INVESTOR CLARIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), any family office or a family client of a family office, as defined in section 275.202(a)(11)(G)-1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be an accredited investor, as defined in Regulation D of the Securities and Exchange Commission (or any successor thereto) under the Securities Act of 1933.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (a) only applies to a family office with assets under management in excess of \$5,000,000, and a family office or a family client not formed for the specific purpose of acquiring the securities offered, and whose purchase is directed by a person who has such knowledge and experience in financial and business matters that such person is capable of evaluating the merits and risks of the prospective investment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3972, the Family Office Technical Correction Act, which passed out of the House Financial Services Committee earlier this month with the unanimous support of my Republican and Democratic colleagues.

This timely legislation provides a technical clarification that makes it very apparent that family offices are considered accredited investors under regulation D.

Under Dodd-Frank, a family office or, in other words, a company that only has family clients, is owned by the family, and is not a public investment adviser can give financial advice to family members without the office registering under the Investment Advisers Act.

□ 1400

The rationale behind this was that family members will look out for one another. Thus, this legislation, for the same reason, allows family offices to count as accredited investors, which would allow them to make private placement investments.

The end result is that more capital will be available for investment in businesses, resulting in more jobs and greater economic opportunity for Americans of all walks of life.

I want to thank Representative CAROLYN MALONEY and Chairman HENSARLING for their leadership on this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support the Family Office Technical Correction Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3972 would expand the definition of “accredited investor” to organizations known as family offices and their family clients.

Family offices manage the financial interests of wealthy families. Deeming family offices and family clients to be accredited investors would allow them to more easily invest in private, unregistered security offerings.

Today, each family client, family member, and associated employees and entities must independently meet the accredited investor definition. This would require, for example, that each individual in a family independently meet certain income or net worth thresholds.

As I understand it, this process can be cumbersome for private funds that may lose their private, unregistered status if they fail to appropriately

verify their investors as accredited or otherwise qualified to invest in private offerings. If there is any doubt, a private fund could deny a family office or family client the opportunity to invest.

This bill seeks to remedy that problem by recognizing that family offices and family clients are financially sophisticated in their own right. Thanks to an amendment by Representative MALONEY that was unanimously accepted during the committee markup, the bill ensures that these family offices and family clients have the financial wherewithal and knowledge to invest as accredited investors in typically risky, illiquid private security offerings.

Specifically, the bill would apply the same standards currently in place for trusts so that, number one, the family office must have more than \$5 million in assets; two, the family office and family clients must not be formed for the specific purpose of acquiring the securities offered; and, three, the family office and family client must be dedicated—or directed, rather, by a sophisticated person.

These restrictions limit the potential unintended consequences of the bill so that, for example, someone who could not otherwise meet the accredited investor test alone could not circumvent the rules by investing with another family member as a “family office.”

They would also prevent estranged family members, who could be up to 10 generations removed, from investing as an accredited investor without receiving any services of or otherwise being affiliated with the family office.

I support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

This did pass our committee on a unanimous basis.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for her leadership and for her other areas of leadership on our committee. As a very senior Democrat, her counsel is always important; her leadership is always important.

This is indeed, as was described, Mr. Speaker, in many respects, a technical correction that needed to take place. We need to ensure that our family offices, that those investment funds can be put to their highest and best use to help grow the economy.

I was happy that the ranking member used the phrase “unintended consequences” because, indeed, Mr. Speaker, from time to time, there are unintended consequences of regulation.

We do wish to ensure that these family offices that otherwise meet the definition of accredited investors have the full range of investment opportunities before them. This bill will do this.

Again, it came out on a strong bipartisan, indeed, a unanimous basis from the Financial Services Committee, and so I would urge all Members of the House to adopt it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the author of the bill and the sponsor of the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3972, and I am very thankful to gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member, for their support and assistance on this legislation.

This bill is very simple. It makes what I consider to be a technical fix to the rules for family offices.

Family offices are entities that are established by wealthy families to manage their own money and to provide financial services to their family members.

The original family office was created by John D. Rockefeller 135 years ago and still exists in the district that I represent. So family offices have a long and storied history in this country and have become important sources of liquidity for our markets.

It is also important to note that family offices do not pose a systemic risk and did not cause any problems in the financial crisis, so they don't pose any safety and soundness risk to the financial system.

Family offices aren't regulated by the SEC as investment advisers because they don't have traditional clients or outside investors. They invest money in their funds like most investment advisers.

A family office is just that: a family office managing its own family money. Their clients are primarily family members, and disputes between family members are better handled either internally by the family or through State courts, which have laws to govern disputes between family members.

Prior to Dodd-Frank, the SEC had been exempting family officers and offices from the Advisers Act for decades on a case-by-case basis. In Dodd-Frank, we codified the exemption for family offices and required the SEC to write a rule formally defining "family offices." The SEC finalized that rule in 2011, so family offices, to meet the SEC's definition, do not have to register with the SEC or as investment advisers.

However, a problem has now come up that we did not anticipate. We assumed that every family client or a member of the family would qualify as a sophisticated accredited investor under the SEC rules. But it turns out that there are very limited circumstances in which a family client of a family office may not actually qualify as an individual accredited investor.

For example, a 19- or 20-year-old member of a wealthy family may be in his or her first job after school and may not be making enough money to qualify as an accredited investor, which is over \$200,000, annually.

The real problem is, under the rules we have now, if just one of these family clients—a young person, in most cases—in a family office is not an accredited investor, then the entire family office is not considered an accredited investor and, thus, cannot buy any securities that are limited to accredited investors, like privately issued stocks or bonds. My bill would fix this by just clarifying that all family offices and family clients are, in fact, accredited investors.

The bill does not allow that any 19- or 20-year-old can go out on their own and buy securities. It is limited to accredited investors that can only be done through the family office.

The bill also includes some important limitations: The family office has to have at least \$5 million in assets, which is the same limitation that applies to trusts in the current accredited investor rule. The family office also has to have its investments directed by a sophisticated investment professional, which provides yet another layer of protection.

So, really, this bill is very narrowly tailored and provides what I consider to be a technical fix that will allow family offices to better serve their own family members.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3972, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OTTO WARMBIER NORTH KOREA NUCLEAR SANCTIONS ACT

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3898) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to place conditions on certain accounts at United States financial institutions with respect to North Korea, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3898

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) On June 1, 2016, the Department of the Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network announced a Notice of Finding that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern due to its use of state-controlled financial institutions and front companies to support the proliferation and development of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and ballistic missiles.

(2) The Financial Action Task Force (FATF) has expressed serious concerns with the threat posed by North Korea's proliferation and financing of WMD, and has called on FATF members to apply effective countermeasures to protect their financial sectors from North Korean money laundering, WMD proliferation financing, and the financing of terrorism.

(3) In its February 2017 report, the U.N. Panel of Experts concluded that—

(A) North Korea continued to access the international financial system in support of illicit activities despite sanctions imposed by U.N. Security Council Resolutions 2270 (2016) and 2321 (2016);

(B) during the reporting period, no member state had reported taking actions to freeze North Korean assets; and

(C) sanctions evasion by North Korea, combined with inadequate compliance by member states, had significantly negated the impact of U.N. Security Council resolutions.

(4) In its September 2017 report, the U.N. Panel of Experts found that—

(A) North Korea continued to violate financial sanctions by using agents acting abroad on the country's behalf;

(B) foreign financial institutions provided correspondent banking services to North Korean persons and front companies for illicit purposes;

(C) foreign companies violated sanctions by maintaining links with North Korean financial institutions; and

(D) North Korea generated at least \$270 million during the reporting period through the violation of sectoral sanctions.

(5) North Korean entities engage in significant financial transactions through foreign bank accounts that are maintained by non-North Korean nationals, thereby masking account users' identity in order to access financial services.

(6) North Korea's sixth nuclear test on September 3, 2017, demonstrated an estimated explosive power more than 100 times greater than that generated by its first nuclear test in 2006.

(7) North Korea has successfully tested submarine-launched and intercontinental ballistic missiles, and is rapidly progressing in its development of a nuclear-armed missile that is capable of reaching United States territory.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACCOUNTS AND TRANSACTIONS AT UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) CORRESPONDENT AND PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNTS HELD BY FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly facilitates a significant transaction or transactions or provides significant financial services for a covered person.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—

(A) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—A person who violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under this subsection shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed the greater of—

(i) \$250,000; or

(ii) an amount that is twice the amount of the transaction that is the basis of the violation with respect to which the penalty is imposed.

(B) **CRIMINAL PENALTY.**—A person who willfully commits, willfully attempts to commit, or willfully conspires to commit, or aids or abets in the commission of, a violation of regulations prescribed under this subsection shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$1,000,000, or if a natural person, may be imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

(b) **RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BY UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to prohibit a United States financial institution, and any person owned or controlled by a United States financial institution, from knowingly engaging in a significant transaction or transactions with or benefitting any person that the Secretary finds to be a covered person.

(2) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—A person who violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under this subsection shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed the greater of—

(A) \$250,000; or

(B) an amount that is twice the amount of the transaction that is the basis of the violation with respect to which the penalty is imposed.

SEC. 4. OPPOSITION TO ASSISTANCE BY THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.

(a) **INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 73. OPPOSITION TO ASSISTANCE FOR ANY GOVERNMENT THAT FAILS TO IMPLEMENT SANCTIONS ON NORTH KOREA.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at the international financial institutions (as defined under section 1701(c) of the International Financial Institutions Act) to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose the provision of financial assistance to a foreign government, other than assistance to support basic human needs, if the President determines that, in the year preceding consideration of approval of such assistance, the government has knowingly failed to prevent the provision of financial services to, or freeze the funds, financial assets, and economic resources of, a person described under subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 7(2) of the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act.

“(b) **WAIVER.**—The President may waive subsection (a) for up to 180 days at a time

with respect to a foreign government if the President reports to Congress that—

“(1) the foreign government's failure described under (a) is due exclusively to a lack of foreign government capacity;

“(2) the foreign government is taking effective steps to prevent recurrence of such failure; or

“(3) such waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States.”.

(b) **EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.**—Section 2(b) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) **PROHIBITION ON SUPPORT INVOLVING PERSONS CONNECTED WITH NORTH KOREA.**—The Bank may not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the export of a good or service to a covered person (as defined under section 7 of the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act).”.

SEC. 5. TREASURY REPORTS ON COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) **QUARTERLY REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate that includes—

(A) a list of financial institutions that, in the period since the preceding report, knowingly facilitated a significant transaction or transactions or provided significant financial services for a covered person, or failed to apply appropriate due diligence to prevent such activities;

(B) a list of any penalties imposed under section 3 in the period since the preceding report; and

(C) a description of efforts by the Department of the Treasury in the period since the preceding report, through consultations, technical assistance, or other appropriate activities, to strengthen the capacity of financial institutions and foreign governments to prevent the provision of financial services benefitting any covered person.

(2) **FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—

(A) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(B) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The unclassified portion of such report shall be made available to the public and posted on the website of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) **TESTIMONY REQUIRED.**—Upon request of the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence shall testify to explain the effects of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, on North Korea's access to finance.

(c) **INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND.**—Title XVI of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262p et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1629. SUPPORT FOR CAPACITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND TO PREVENT MONEY LAUNDERING AND FINANCING OF TERRORISM.

“The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to support the use of the administrative budget of the Fund for technical assistance that strengthens the capacity of Fund members to prevent money laundering and the financing of terrorism.”.

(d) **NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies shall include in the report required by section 1701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r) for the fiscal year following the date of the enactment of this Act a description of—

(1) the activities of the International Monetary Fund in the most recently completed fiscal year to provide technical assistance that strengthens the capacity of Fund members to prevent money laundering and the financing of terrorism, and the effectiveness of the assistance; and

(2) the efficacy of efforts by the United States to support such technical assistance through the use of the Fund's administrative budget.

SEC. 6. SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES.

(a) **SUSPENSION.**—The President may suspend, on a case-by-case basis, the application of any provision of this Act, or provision in an amendment made by this Act, for a period of not more than 180 days at a time if the President certifies to Congress that—

(1) the Government of North Korea has—

(A) committed to the verifiable suspension of North Korea's proliferation and testing of WMD, including systems designed in whole or in part for the delivery of such weapons; and

(B) has agreed to multilateral talks including the Government of the United States, with the goal of permanently and verifiably limiting North Korea's WMD and ballistic missile programs; or

(2) such suspension is vital to the national security interests of the United States, with an explanation of the reasons therefor.

(b) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President makes the certification described under paragraph (2)—

(A) section 3, subsections (a) and (b) of section 5, and section 6(a) of this Act shall cease to have any force or effect;

(B) section 73 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as added by section 4(a), shall be repealed; and

(C) section 2(b)(14) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as added by section 4(b), shall be repealed.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—The certification described under this paragraph is a certification by the President to the Congress that—

(A) the Government of North Korea—

(i) has ceased to pose a significant threat to national security, with an explanation of the reasons therefor; or

(ii) is committed to, and is taking effective steps to achieving, the goal of permanently and verifiably limiting North Korea's WMD and ballistic missile programs; or

(B) such termination is vital to the national security interests of the United States, with an explanation of the reasons therefor.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) **TERMS RELATED TO NORTH KOREA.**—The terms “applicable Executive order”, “Government of North Korea”, “North Korea”, “North Korean person”, and “significant activities undermining cybersecurity” have the meanings given those terms, respectively, in section 3 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9202).

(2) **COVERED PERSON.**—The term “covered person” means the following:

(A) Any designated person under an applicable Executive order.

(B) Any North Korean person that facilitates the transfer of bulk cash or covered goods (as defined under section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations).

(C) Any North Korean financial institution.

(D) Any North Korean person employed outside of North Korea, except that the Secretary of the Treasury may waive the application of this subparagraph for a North Korean person that is not otherwise a covered person and—

(i) has been granted asylum or refugee status by the country of employment; or

(ii) is employed as essential diplomatic personnel for the Government of North Korea.

(E) Any person acting on behalf of, or at the direction of, a person described under subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(F) Any person that knowingly employs a person described under subparagraph (D).

(G) Any person that facilitates the import of goods, services, technology, or natural resources, including energy imports and minerals, or their derivatives, from North Korea.

(H) Any person that facilitates the export of goods, services, technology, or natural resources, including energy exports and minerals, or their derivatives, to North Korea, except for food, medicine, or medical supplies required for civilian humanitarian needs.

(I) Any person that invests in, or participates in a joint venture with, an entity in which the Government of North Korea participates or an entity that is created or organized under North Korean law.

(J) Any person that provides financial services, including through a subsidiary or joint venture, in North Korea.

(K) Any person that insures, registers, facilitates the registration of, or maintains insurance or a registration for, a vessel owned, controlled, commanded, or operated by a North Korean person.

(L) Any person providing specialized teaching, training, or information or providing material or technological support to a North Korean person that—

(i) may contribute to North Korea's development and proliferation of WMD, including systems designed in whole or in part for the delivery of such weapons; or

(ii) may contribute to significant activities undermining cybersecurity.

(3) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION DEFINITIONS.—

(A) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” means a United States financial institution or a foreign financial institution.

(B) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “foreign financial institution” has the meaning given that term under section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(C) NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “North Korean financial institution” includes—

(i) any North Korean financial institution, as defined in section 3 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9202);

(ii) any financial agency, as defined in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code, that is owned or controlled by the Government of North Korea;

(iii) any money transmitting business, as defined in section 5330(d) of title 31, United States Code, that is owned or controlled by the Government of North Korea;

(iv) any financial institution that is a joint venture between any person and the Government of North Korea; and

(v) any joint venture involving a North Korean financial institution.

(D) UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “United States financial institution” has the meaning given the term “U.S. financial institution” under section 510.310 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) KNOWINGLY.—The term “knowingly” with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from California (Mrs. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to sponsor H.R. 3898, the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act, which imposes the most far-reaching financial sanctions ever directed at North Korea.

Since 2006, North Korea has undertaken six nuclear tests and, earlier this summer, test-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of reaching United States territory. The most recent nuclear device that the country detonated on September 3 had an estimated explosive power 10 times greater than the bomb dropped at Hiroshima. We must not allow the North to threaten a U.S. city with such weapons.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this bill would impose secondary sanctions on foreign financial institutions that do business with virtually anyone that trades with North Korea. In addition, H.R. 3898 would essentially cut off Pyongyang's ability to earn hard currency through North Korean laborers working abroad, and it would use our leverage at the IMF, the World Bank, and other international financial institutions to incentivize countries to crack down on North Korea's illicit activities.

As many of my colleagues know, North Korea is already subject to both U.S. and international sanctions, the latter deriving from a series of U.N. Security Council resolutions. These sanctions have fallen short, however, for two main reasons:

First, they have not given sufficient attention to North Korea's enablers in third countries, especially foreign

banks and middlemen in China, Southeast Asia, and other parts of the world.

Second, even though U.N. Security Council resolutions are supposed to bind U.N. members to enforce them, implementation has been weak. As the U.N. Panel of Experts concluded earlier this year, member nations' compliance with sanctions has been so lax that North Korea retains access to the international financial system.

As the Trump administration has made clear, U.N. sanctions are a floor, not a ceiling, for U.S. action. H.R. 3898 embodies this principle through the use of secondary sanctions.

Here is how such sanctions would work, Mr. Speaker:

The front companies and middlemen that North Korea relies on in third countries still need banks. Those banks, in turn, use correspondent or payable-through accounts held at U.S. financial institutions to process international transactions. It is counterproductive for U.S. policy to permit foreign banks to do business in America as well as business that ultimately helps North Korea. It is time for those banks to choose between aiding and abetting the North Korean Government or standing for peace with America and its allies.

□ 1415

H.R. 3898 forces foreign banks to make that choice. Foreign banks can either do business benefiting North Korea or business with the United States. They cannot do both.

Under an executive order issued in September, the President authorized the Treasury Department to levy sanctions on foreign banks that finance North Korean trade. While this was a crucial step forward, H.R. 3898 would widen the net still further.

Under this legislation, Congress would be codifying mandatory sanctions on foreign banks. If someone is dealing with North Korea, there is nowhere to run or hide: a foreign financial institution is subject to sanctions for doing business with you, even if that bank claims that it is not directly financing the trade.

H.R. 3898 also covers more economic activity than any previous sanctions on North Korea, including the current U.N. sanctions round. That means this bill goes after banks involved with petroleum, labor, and virtually any kind of investment or North Korean use of shipping vessels.

In addition, H.R. 3898 targets the knowledge and technological support that North Korea needs for its weapons program and hacking activities. Pyongyang's threats against cybersecurity are critical for the regime to get its hands on financing.

The goal, Mr. Speaker, is to show North Korea that the path they are on has devastating costs and leads to nowhere regardless. H.R. 3898 provides an

off-ramp for North Korea if the country wants sanctions relief, but it is up to Pyongyang to take it. Until then, the sanctions we will be passing today hold tremendous economic pain in store for the Kim Jong-un regime and its foreign enablers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are honored to dedicate this bill to the memory of Otto Warmbier, a young man who traveled to North Korea to understand the country with his own eyes, and whose life was cut short by the regime's brutality. Otto was a student at the University of Virginia, my alma mater, and a special community that continues to mourn the loss of this special young man. Otto held out his hand in friendship to the people of North Korea, as we do. It is Pyongyang's nuclear ambitions, though, that threaten what Otto represented: a world of openness, understanding, and a desire for peaceful relations between our country and North Korea. It is fitting that this legislation bears Otto's name, and that its goals embody his spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, allow me to say that I am very pleased that, by naming this legislation after Otto Warmbier, we are able to honor him and let his family know that we will not forget him. Nor will we forget the brutal, lethal treatment of this young, decent American student by the Government of North Korea.

There is simply no justification for the fury with which the Kim regime turned the massive power of the state on this young American man, who is alleged to have done nothing more than take a poster from a hotel. It is this kind of brutality—and the ongoing fundamental depravity of the North Korean regime—that will keep it from being a member of the global community of nations.

This is also why the rapid acceleration in the scale and range of North Korea's nuclear and missile programs is so alarming, including the launch of two intercontinental ballistic missiles in July, one of which experts believe could have had the capacity to reach the continental United States. Then, in September, the regime tested its sixth nuclear explosive device, and, according to U.S. and international estimates, this thermonuclear test was significantly higher in magnitude and yield than any previous test.

This has led to a bipartisan consensus in the Financial Services Committee that a new policy towards North Korea involving a maximum pressure campaign of financial isolation is the best chance we have to resolve this situation peacefully.

Such a strategy must entail a dramatically greater level of pressure than North Korea has faced to date,

one strong enough to change Kim Jong-un's calculus about whether he is safer with or without his nuclear program.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 3898, calls for just such a U.S. strategy towards North Korea—and it is one that has the advantage of presenting an option other than a military-first response. As many experts have called for, this legislation takes a page from the Iran sanctions playbook by mandating the use of secondary sanctions, which were widely credited with forcing Iran to the negotiating table.

In the context of North Korea, an American program of secondary sanctions wouldn't just ban U.S. companies from doing business with North Korea, it would also force companies, individuals, banks, and governments to make a choice: stop doing business with North Korea and its enablers or be cut off from the global financial system.

Although we saw in the Iran context just how powerful this approach can be when carefully fashioned as part of a broad coalition, we must remember that sanctions alone are not a strategy. Sanctions are a tool, and in order for them to work, they must be linked to a broader strategic effort, with the high level of skill in their design and implementation, and with a clear understanding of the policy goals we are trying to achieve.

According to Adam Szubin, who formerly served as the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, when Congress adopted a series of secondary sanction measures in 2010, aimed at containing Iran's nuclear program, the administration was already staffed, well-resourced, and ready to immediately deploy senior officials around the world.

Specifically, senior Treasury, White House, and State Department officials traveled around the world to explain the new U.S. sanctions regime and pressure governments, bankers, traders, and companies to enforce these sanctions in a tough and meaningful way.

Today, there is widespread recognition that a successful strategy to isolate and pressure North Korea must not only entail the effective implementation of sanctions, but also arguably an even more complex and sophisticated degree of statecraft in order to coordinate with our allies, and, in particular, to convince China that we have shared objectives when it comes to addressing the increasing destabilizing North Korean threat.

It is extremely concerning, therefore, that President Trump has shown virtually no capacity or willingness for the hard work necessary to secure concessions from North Korea, or enlist China and other key players to do their part to isolate the Kim regime. In fact, President Trump's reckless threats, his vow to destroy the Kim regime, his

name-calling, warmongering, and rejection of diplomacy contradict key administration officials, and leading experts, who continue to stress the importance of imposing pressure on the Kim regime. It also demonstrates a Commander in Chief who lacks the discipline and quality of leadership it takes to convince our allies to join us in dealing with the North Korean threat.

Given the high-stakes objectives; the lack of a unified, coherent policy from the executive branch; and concern about U.S. credibility on the global stage, I am pleased that, on this critical issue, Members from both sides of the aisle were able to come together behind a concrete strategic objective to force Pyongyang into nuclear diplomacy with the goal of permanently and verifiably limiting North Korea's WMD and ballistic missile programs.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to not engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3898, the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act, which our committee, the Financial Services Committee, passed on a unanimous basis.

I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who is leading this debate today, for his leadership on our committee and for this bill. I also thank his ranking member, Ms. MOORE, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, for her work on this bipartisan bill as well.

I also think that it is a good and proper thing, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is named after Otto Warmbier, a young life that was tragically ended far too soon, who, in his untimely demise, has become an international symbol of the crushing brutality of the North Korean regime.

So it is with his memory that this bill is designed. And, simply put, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today represents the toughest set of financial sanctions ever directed against the nuclear armed North Korean regime, a regime that still represents a clear and present danger to the global community.

The sanctions our committee is bringing to the House today target foreign financial institutions that, in some way, are connected to North Korea's economic activity—activity that ultimately allows this rogue regime to both develop and proliferate weapons of mass destruction.

Under H.R. 3898, those foreign financial institutions are going to be confronted with a choice. As my colleague

from Kentucky put it, they can either do business that benefits North Korea or they can do business with the United States, they cannot do both.

Given the far-reaching impact of the sanctions, our committee does not take them lightly. They are reserved for the gravest threats to our national security, and their application should be targeted at clear and achievable goals. That is why H.R. 3898 cuts off virtually any path that North Korea can take to generate hard currency, yet it holds out the prospect of sanctions relief, if there are real and verifiable limits to the regime's weapons program.

As punishing as these sanctions will be, there is a way out for North Korea, if it chooses to take it, and that is to comply. Otherwise, the Kim regime and its foreign enablers will learn that hostility towards America carries enormous cost.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his effort, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this vitally needed legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for her leadership on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3898.

In August, I was part of a congressional delegation led by Senator MARKEY that visited South Korea, Japan, and the border between China and North Korea. It is just a short drive from Seoul, a city of about 10 million people, to the DMZ, which is the border line with North Korea. Standing there, you understand and see firsthand that even though the United States would prevail unquestionably in any armed conflict, the casualties suffered by South Korea would be horrendous.

Later, I hosted a meeting with Congresswoman WAGNER with South Korean Foreign Minister Kang here in the Congress. From these two meetings, I came back more convinced than ever that we have to leave no stone unturned to solve the most dangerous problem of our times peacefully through negotiations.

I firmly believe that the only way to drive North Korea to the negotiation table is to increase the financial pressure on this reckless rogue regime, which is what this bill does. It is one of the toughest sanction bills financially we have ever considered, and may be the toughest.

The fact that the dollar is the world's Reserve currency gives our country a very important bit of leverage. Companies doing business all over the world want to be paid, need to be paid, in dollars, not in any other currency. So if we restrict international and U.S. financial institutions from doing busi-

ness with North Korea, then no matter how determined they might be to continue their destabilizing reckless course, they simply will not be able to get the dollars to buy the tools of terror that they need on the international market.

□ 1430

This is not the kind of action we should ever take lightly. This is not a tool to use, an action to take indiscriminately. But in this rare case, in the case of North Korea, such action is not only justified, it is necessary for the defense of our Nation and the defense of other nations.

If North Korea cannot buy the materials necessary to build long-range, nuclear-tipped missiles because they just don't have the dollars, then every country, every person on this globe can breathe a little easier and be a little safer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is really an urgently needed bill that not only directly addresses our own security needs, but also does a great service to the community of nations.

I would like to thank my friend, Mr. BARR, for all of his creative and hard work on this bill. I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their leadership and support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, appreciate the bipartisan work on this piece of legislation, but I just do have to respond to my friend, the gentlewoman from California, and her comments about the Trump administration and the shift in policy.

It is hard to dispute that President Trump's public statements and official actions on North Korea have gotten Beijing's attention in a way that previous American Presidents have not. President Trump's tough rhetoric and tough talk on North Korea matches a shift in policy away from strategic patience to one that uses enhanced pressure through sanctions and the credible threat of military force to give substance and meaning to our diplomacy.

Even the Democrat witness in our hearing on this legislation admitted that the President's strong language had made a difference in giving us additional leverage in our negotiations with China.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support Mr. BARR's legislation, the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act.

North Korea has continued to prove a dangerous and destabilizing force to the northeast Asian region, as well as to the United States and its allies. Its repeated missile tests, nuclear weapons tests, and heinous human rights violations demand that the United States continue its diplomatic and economic isolation campaign.

Today's bill is named for my constituent, Otto Warmbier, from Wyoming, Ohio, in the greater Cincinnati area.

Otto passed away on June 19 after spending 18 months in detention by the North Korean regime, the brutality of which was far beyond human decency or civility. The pain and heartache endured by Otto, his family, and his friends can never be undone or erased, but Congress can continue to take action by passing H.R. 3898 today and imposing the most far-reaching sanctions yet to be directed at North Korea.

There is no simple solution to countering such complex national security threats, but it is critical that we utilize both economic and diplomatic tools to hold hostile regimes like North Korea accountable when they act repeatedly and aggressively against our interests, our allies, our citizens, and our security.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly and sincerely urge support of this bill by every Member of this Chamber.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To my colleague on the opposite side of the aisle who was responding to part of my statement, of course there are many in this country who worry about President Trump's reckless threats, his promise of fire and fury, his vow to destroy the Kim regime, his name-calling, warmongering, and rejection of diplomacy.

It directly contradicts his leading Cabinet officials who continue to stress the importance of imposing pressure on the Kim regime. It also demonstrates a Commander in Chief who lacks the discipline and the capacity to convince our allies to join us in dealing with the North Korean threat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. The gentlewoman will happily not engage in personalities except to say that the rhetoric to call Kim Jong-un the little rocket man is not productive and it does not do us well.

We have a situation in which nearly every high-level official in the U.S. Government believes the threats posed by the North Korean nuclear and missile programs must be front and center in U.S. national security decision-making.

This is a time for U.S. diplomatic and foreign policy efforts to be aggressively focused on intensifying economic and

diplomatic coordination with our allies and China in a strategy that would entail sophisticated policymaking capacity and coordination across the U.S. Government. Instead, a week ago, in a move that I believe history will strongly condemn, President Trump refused to recertify the Iran nuclear deal, throwing into question continued U.S. support for the landmark nuclear accord.

Whether you support or hate the Iran nuclear deal, it is widely viewed, at least so far, as successfully containing Iran's nuclear ambitions, and will for many years.

There can be no question that President Trump's threat to walk away from the international nuclear accord will have a direct and profoundly negative effect on our ability to convince Kim Jong-un or our allies that America will honor any commitment to integrate North Korea into the global community if it gives up its nuclear and missile programs.

In short, the President's threat to withdraw from the Iran nuclear deal undermines our credibility as a negotiating partner and throws into question the prospect of any effective nuclear diplomacy with North Korea. At a time when we are facing a nuclear crisis with North Korea, raising questions about our commitment to the Iran nuclear deal not only defies strategic logic, but it also undermines our national security.

On that issue, I would welcome, as I do with the legislation before us today, a stronger, more unified, bipartisan front.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the vice chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation sponsored by my friend and colleague, Mr. BARR from Kentucky.

This legislation sends a clear message to the rest of the world: you can either do business with the United States and the free world or you can do business with the brutal dictatorship of Kim Jong-un and the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea. You cannot deal with both.

Mr. Speaker, the gravest threat facing our Nation today is North Korea, the world's worst perpetrator of human rights. Kim's contempt for human life animates both his human rights record and his nuclear ambitions.

Just this past June, we learned how Kim's regime tortured University of Virginia student Otto Warmbier. His parents, Cindy and Fred, went public with the details of their son's suffering

in September during an interview with CNN.

These are just a few of the details that Fred and Cindy shared in that interview: "Halfway up the stairs, we hear this loud, guttural howling, inhuman sound."

They found him strapped to a stretcher. He has a shaved head. His eyes are darting around. He is blind, he is deaf, he is on a feeding tube. His bottom teeth looked like they had been taken with a pair of pliers and rearranged. His mother, Cindy, described how his hands and legs were totally deformed.

Otto's story serves as a very real and very tangible reminder, and teaches a new generation of Americans of what happens under totalitarian governments and communist dictators.

Now, as the brutal Kim regime continues its nuclear quest, the same barbarism that killed Otto threatens all Americans. This July, the dictatorship claimed they had the capacity to send an intercontinental ballistic missile anywhere in the world. In September, they conducted their sixth nuclear weapons test and claimed to have detonated a hydrogen bomb that could be mounted on an intercontinental ballistic missile. These actions must not be ignored.

This legislation adds secondary sanctions to those passed in May. It not only prevents persons from trading with, facilitating trade with, investing in or participating in a joint venture with a North Korean entity, but it also targets foreign financial institutions from aiding in such actions. Simply put, this bill forces banks to cut off all participation with North Korea-related business interests, freezing out the capital that funds North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, 56 years ago, at the height of the Cold War, when another godless communist regime threatened the world, President Kennedy reminded us of America's exceptional nature and consequent leadership in the world. His inaugural address included this reflection: "And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation not just for Otto and his family, but for all those who might be harmed by North Korea if we do not act now.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership on this vital issue.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished subcommittee chairman

for yielding. I am proud to support my colleague from Kentucky on his bill, H.R. 3898, the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act.

I think it is important for all of us in this Chamber to know, as well as the people across this country, that there is no daylight between the two political parties in this capital, and there is no daylight between the United States Government and our Allied Governments around the world in working together to develop sanction regimes both bilaterally here in the United States and multilaterally across the world to end this nuclear threat.

For 24 years, Mr. Speaker, we have had three Presidencies—we are in our fourth Presidency—dealing with this issue. This issue has not been handled. We have not sanctioned this regime. We have not enforced those sanctions. We have not obtained multilateral sanctions. We have not ever given the Kim dictatorship one reason to think that our government and our allied friends around the world are serious about ending the nuclear threat from North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for standing up in the Financial Services Committee and leading the way for secondary sanctions. I thank my friends, Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL in the Foreign Affairs Committee, for their work with this administration to end this threat to not only north Asia, our economic allies, our national security allies, but also our friends around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Representative BARR's bill, the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act.

Mr. Speaker, how is it that a tiny, isolated country like North Korea has the ability to fund and develop a nuclear weapons program with the capability to strike American soil?

The answer to that question is found in part through correspondent and payable-through accounts, which are tools used by North Korea to bypass the existing U.S. and U.N. sanctions against them.

Non-North Korean actors use these accounts to fund the government through shell and front companies. While these sanctions are implemented in good faith, it is time to acknowledge that sometimes they just don't work.

There is some good news, Mr. Speaker. If enacted, this bill requires the Treasury Secretary to impose strict conditions on those who knowingly do business with North Korea through those accounts.

We have also seen the United Nations take action recently by banning North Korea's export of iron ore, which is another legitimate step in stopping the continued development of their nuclear weapons program.

Finally, the Trump administration's executive orders will help us more easily target companies that do business with North Korea.

These actions, plus the enactment of this legislation, will create the most debilitating sanctions package Pyongyang and their financial surrogates have ever seen.

Of all the positive things in this bill, though, I am most excited by the language amending the Bretton Woods Agreement Act to instruct U.S. executive directors at international financial institutions, like the IMF and the World Bank, to use our "voice and vote" to oppose financial assistance to governments that knowingly support the Kim regime.

□ 1445

The United States has long used its economic influence, a more aggressive element of soft power, to advance an agenda that liberates the oppressed in the darkest corners of the world like North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for introducing this bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), another distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in strong support of this legislation.

Every single week, I make phone calls to Hoosiers back home, and I hear every night on those phone calls how hard they are working to build a better and brighter future for themselves, for their families, and for their children; but they understand that, in order to have a brighter, better future, they must have a future. I hear on the phone every single night how concerned they are that there won't be a future with all that they see, all that they read, all that they hear about these threats from North Korea.

We in Congress have heard their pleas to do something, that enough is enough, that threats against Guam, that ICBMs flying off the Peninsula, that nuclear tests, that the time has come for decisive action, and decisive action is what we are taking here.

The toughest financial sanctions ever put in place, that is what this bill does, and that is what we need to put in place to ensure that we demand real

change from North Korea, that we demand that they stop threatening Americans and the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, support the work that is being done to confront this challenge once and for all, and this bill demands the question: Will you do business with the United States or will you do business with North Korea?

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to stand up in support of this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), another distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Kentucky for his leadership and my colleague from Indiana for his leadership on this legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, from day one, President Trump's message to North Korea has been clear: the U.S. will not tolerate any North Korean actions that threaten American lives.

Hoosiers appreciate President Trump's leadership and understand the crisis we face. North Korea is an erratic and brutal regime. We simply cannot accept a world in which North Korea has nuclear weapons that can reach American shores.

Unfortunately, with each missile test, we are moving closer to that world becoming a reality. That is why I am proud to work with my colleague from Kentucky and other colleagues on the Otto Warmbier North Korean Nuclear Sanctions Act. With this bill, we will give foreign financial institutions a clear choice: you can either do business with Kim Jong-un in North Korea, or you can do business with the United States—but not both.

By imposing the toughest financial sanctions ever on North Korea, this bill cuts off crucial resources that the regime relies on to finance its weapons program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, help us meet the North Korean threat head-on, and do what is necessary to protect our country.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3898, the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act of 2017. This legislation imposes heavy economic sanctions on North Korea.

These sanctions will signal to North Korea and its enablers that the United States condemns North Korea's current nuclear and long-range missile programs. Specifically, the bill would impose conditions and oversight of foreign banks that seek to open American accounts for any North Korean or any agent of North Korea.

As United Nations Ambassador Nikki Haley stated, "[c]ountless innocent men and women have died at the hands of North Korea, but the singular case of Otto Warmbier touches the American heart like no other." In remembrance of Otto Warmbier, this bill demonstrates to North Korea that its human rights violations and military actions are unacceptable. North Korea's nuclear and long-range missile programs have been a noted threat to our security for many years and its frequent missile testing in the past year demonstrates the even greater risk they now pose. By supporting H.R. 3898, we are showing North Korea that there are consequences to its pursuit of nuclear warfare and we intend to increase economic pressure on it each time they show willingness to use force against us or our allies.

We have a responsibility to do all that we can to protect American citizens. H.R. 3898 will discourage North Korea from further developing their nuclear weapons program and take a much-needed step towards the goal of international peace, and this is why I support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3898, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STRENGTHENING CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING AND COORDINATION IN OUR PORTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3101) to enhance cybersecurity information sharing and coordination at ports in the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows

H.R. 3101

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. IMPROVING CYBERSECURITY RISK ASSESSMENTS, INFORMATION SHARING, AND COORDINATION.

The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) develop and implement a maritime cybersecurity risk assessment model within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, consistent with the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity and any update to that document pursuant to Public Law 113-274, to evaluate current and future cybersecurity risks (as such

term is defined in section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148));

(2) evaluate, on a periodic basis but not less often than once every two years, the effectiveness of the maritime cybersecurity risk assessment model under paragraph (1);

(3) seek to ensure participation of at least one information sharing and analysis organization (as such term is defined in section 212 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 131)) representing the maritime community in the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(B) of section 227 of such Act;

(4) establish guidelines for voluntary reporting of maritime-related cybersecurity risks and incidents (as such terms are defined in section 227 of such Act) to the Center (as such term is defined subsection (b) of such section 227), and other appropriate Federal agencies; and

(5) request the National Maritime Security Advisory Committee established under section 70112 of title 46, United States Code, to report and make recommendations to the Secretary on enhancing the sharing of information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with the responsibilities of the Center, between relevant Federal agencies and—

(A) State, local, and tribal governments;

(B) relevant public safety and emergency response agencies;

(C) relevant law enforcement and security organizations;

(D) maritime industry;

(E) port owners and operators; and

(F) terminal owners and operators.

SEC. 3. CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENTS TO MARITIME SECURITY ACTIVITIES.

The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall direct—

(1) each Area Maritime Security Advisory Committee established under section 70112 of title 46, United States Code, to facilitate the sharing of cybersecurity risks and incidents to address port-specific cybersecurity risks, which may include the establishment of a working group of members of Area Maritime Security Advisory Committees to address port-specific cybersecurity vulnerabilities; and

(2) that any area maritime transportation security plan and any vessel or facility security plan required under section 70103 of title 46, United States Code, approved after the development of the cybersecurity risk assessment model required by paragraph (1) of section 2 include a mitigation plan to prevent, manage, and respond to cybersecurity risks (as such term is defined in section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148)).

SEC. 4. VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS AND SECURITY PLANS.

Title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 70102(b)(1)(C), by inserting “cybersecurity,” after “physical security,”; and

(2) in section 70103(c)(3)(C), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of clause (iv), by redesignating clause (v) as clause (vi), and by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) prevention, management, and response to cybersecurity risks; and”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act.

More than \$1.3 trillion in cargo travels through American seaports along our coasts every year. A safe but constant and unrestricted flow of goods and services through our maritime transportation system have played a vital role in allowing the United States to become the global superpower it is today. To put it simply, our seaports are the gateways to our economic survival.

Unfortunately, as our port systems increasingly benefit from new technology, high-capacity information technology, and computer systems, they are also increasingly finding themselves in the crosshairs of those who are waging a cyber war against the United States. These attacks originate from rogue hackers, terrorist groups, and adversarial nation-states, and America is a constant target.

In recent years, China successfully stole over 20 million security clearances from OPM. Russia has waged a cyber war against our political system. Equifax had a breach that jeopardized sensitive information on over 43 million people.

In June, the Port of Los Angeles, one that several of our committee members will be visiting next week, was briefly shut down because of a cyber attack. This is one of our busiest ports, and it is estimated that it cost nearly \$300 million in economic damage. We must do more to strengthen cybersecurity of these essential maritime hubs.

Fortunately, we have that opportunity. The legislation before us requires the Department and the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement a risk assessment model which focuses on cybersecurity vulnerabilities and risk. This assessment will be reviewed periodically so we can determine the best security practices to implement at each port.

The bill also requires that the DHS Secretary work with the National and Area Maritime Security Advisory Committees to analyze and share cyber risks and to report to Congress measures that have been taken to improve cybersecurity at our Nation's ports. This bill will strengthen the security of

our homeland and protect our economic assets.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman TORRES and other members of the Homeland Security Committee for their hard work on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 19, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

I write concerning H.R. 3101, the Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act of 2017. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that foregoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, this is conditional on our understanding that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration. Lastly, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would ask that a copy this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Homeland Security, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor, to memorialize our understanding. I look forward to working with the Committee on Homeland Security as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,

Washington, DC, October 19, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3101, the “Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act of 2017.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego further consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of this bill at this time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future.

In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee represented on the conference committee. Further, the Committee on Homeland Security agrees that mutually agreed upon changes to the legislation will be incorporated into the bill prior to floor consideration.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of H.R. 3101, the Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act.

Port facilities serve as a vital economic function for our Nation and the communities in which they are located. The approximately 360 commercial maritime ports operating across the United States handle more than \$1.3 trillion in cargo, annually.

To facilitate and maintain this level of economic activity, the maritime sector increasingly relies on technology to facilitate the movement of cargo into and through port facilities. Collectively, navigation, operations, and communication technologies enhance the competitiveness, safety, and reliability of the U.S. maritime sector.

However, as port operations have become more automated, exposure to cyber threats and attacks have also increased. This homeland security threat is not unique to the maritime sector. In fact, since 2003, the Government Accountability Office has warned about the vulnerability of critical infrastructure and has called on the Federal Government to support efforts to bolster cybersecurity.

To better protect port facilities from cyber attacks, Congress must ensure that expertise in both the private and public sector is leveraged effectively. H.R. 3101 would direct DHS to be more proactive in how it addresses cybersecurity risks at our Nation's ports.

The first step in reducing cyber vulnerabilities is identifying the weak points in network security through risk assessments. H.R. 3101 requires these assessments. The bill directs the Coast Guard to provide port facilities with guidelines on how to report cybersecurity risks in order to enhance the ability of both the Coast Guard and port operators to respond effectively to such attacks.

By promoting cybersecurity information sharing and coordination between public and private partners at maritime facilities, H.R. 3101 seeks to make a positive difference in how quickly terminal and port operators are able to prevent, mitigate, and recover from such attacks.

H.R. 3101, if enacted, will help foster an environment in which DHS, the

Coast Guard, ports, and port stakeholders work together to enhance the cybersecurity at our Nation's ports.

Lastly, I would like to note the bipartisan support for this bill in the Homeland Security Committee. I thank Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, and my colleague Congresswoman TORRES for their hard work and leadership in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was considered last Congress and earlier this fall, committee colleagues on both sides of the aisle agreed that H.R. 3101 is a timely and worthwhile measure to support. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3101.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank the chairman and also Ranking Member THOMPSON and Ranking Member VELA and all of their committee staff for their great work and support of this very important legislation. We would not be here today without their commitment to keeping our ports safe. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, you can't turn on the television or visit your favorite website without seeing cyber threats dominating the news. All industries, including our own Federal agencies, have been targets, costing our economy dearly and exposing the personal information of hundreds of millions of employees.

This is a growing problem that is not going away. Rather, these threats are becoming more common and more severe. From the interference in our elections to attacks on government workers, email hacks, and the theft of credit card information, cyber threats are everywhere, and it is time that we modernize the Federal Government's planning and response to these threats.

In June, a Danish shipping company was infected with malware that affected 17 of its shipping container terminals worldwide. The virus spread to 2 million computers within a 2-hour period. As a result, the largest terminal at the Port of Los Angeles shut down for 4 days from the cyber attack.

A recent study estimated the cost of a shutdown of the Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach at \$1 billion per day to the local economy.

More than \$1.3 trillion in cargo moves, annually, through our Nation's 360 commercial ports, and many of the goods that enter through the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach come to my district before being shipped to the rest of the country.

With this much economic activity and the increased use of cyber technology to manage port operations ranging from communications and navigation to engineering, safety, and cargo, it is critical to protect our maritime cyber infrastructure.

□ 1500

It is time that Congress modernize our Federal agencies. This is why I am proud to bring the Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act to the floor today.

This legislation would improve information sharing and cooperation in addressing cybersecurity risks at our Nation's ports through several measures: setting standards for reporting, providing guidance to ports, bringing port representatives to the table for future planning, and modernizing how the Coast Guard addresses cyber threats.

Mr. Speaker, these are commonsense measures. This bill has bipartisan support. The Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act passed the House unanimously last year, and I am confident that passage today will push the Senate into action.

This legislation is supported by the Port of Los Angeles, Congressional PORTS Caucus chairs, and it is endorsed by the Maritime & Port Security Information Sharing and Analysis Organization. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation because we simply can't afford not to. Ports are too critical to our economy and our Nation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. If the gentleman from Texas has no other speakers, I am prepared to close once the gentleman does.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

H.R. 3101 will help improve the way we manage cybersecurity risks at our Nation's commercial maritime ports. With the increased need for and use of technology at maritime facilities, it is in our national and economic interest for there to be better cyber information sharing and coordination efforts at our Nation's ports.

By assessing cyber risks at individual port facilities and establishing countermeasures to mitigate these risks, the U.S. maritime sector will be better prepared to protect these important centers of economic activity.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3101, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I once again urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. I want to thank Congresswoman TORRES for her strong leadership on this bill, Mr. VELA, Ranking Member THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed over 50 bills out of my committee, out of the House floor, and sent them to the Senate, where they still sit there with no action whatsoever. And when it comes to homeland security measures, I believe that it is dangerous to do nothing, and I urge the Senate to take up

action on this bill and the other 50 bills that we have sent over to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3101, the Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act of 2017.

I thank Congresswoman TORRES for introducing this important piece of legislation that addresses security at our nation's ports.

H.R. 3101 requires the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to facilitate increased information sharing about cybersecurity among maritime interests.

The bill requires DHS to:

Develop, implement, and continually review a maritime cybersecurity risk assessment model to evaluate current and future cybersecurity risks;

Seek input from at least one information sharing and analysis organization representing maritime interests in the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center;

Establish voluntary reporting guidelines for maritime-related cybersecurity risks and incidents;

Request that the National Maritime Security Advisory Committee report and make recommendations to DHS about methods to enhance cybersecurity and information sharing among security stakeholders from federal, state, local, and tribal governments; public safety and emergency response agencies; law enforcement and security organizations; maritime industry participants; port owners and operators; and maritime terminal owners and operators; and

Ensure that maritime security risk assessments include cybersecurity risks to ports and the maritime border of the United States.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and former Ranking Member of the Committee's Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I am well aware of the hard work that the Houston Port Authority, and the Department of Homeland Security has done to secure the port, its workers, and the millions of tons of imports and exports that traverse the waters of the Port of Houston each week.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation the U.S. maritime border covers 95,000 miles of shoreline with 361 seaports.

Ocean transportation accounts for 95 percent of cargo tonnage that moves in and out of the country, with 8,588 commercial vessels making 82,044 port calls in 2015.

The Port of Houston is a 25-mile-long complex of diversified public and private facilities located just a few hours' sailing time from the Gulf of Mexico.

In 2012, ship channel-related businesses contributed 1,026,820 jobs and generated more than \$178.5 billion in statewide economic activity.

In 2014, among U.S. ports the Port of Houston was ranked:

1st in foreign tonnage;

Largest Texas port with 46 percent of market share by tonnage and 95 percent market share in containers by total TEUS in 2014;

Largest Gulf Coast container port, handling 67 percent of U.S. Gulf Coast container traffic in 2014;

2nd in total foreign cargo value (based on U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Census).

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports that the Port of Houston port, and its waterways, and vessels are part of an economic engine handling more than \$700 billion in merchandise annually.

The Port of Houston houses approximately 100 steamship lines offering services that link Houston with 1,053 ports in 203 countries.

The Port of Houston is a \$15 billion petrochemical complex, the largest in the nation and second largest worldwide.

These statistics clearly communicate the potential for a terrorist attack using nuclear or radiological material may in some estimations be low, but should an attack occur the consequences would be catastrophic, and for this reason we cannot be lax in our efforts to deter, detect and defeat attempts by terrorists to perpetrate such a heinous act of terrorism.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) plays an essential role in domestic defense against the potential smuggling of a weapon of mass destruction in a shipping container or the use of a bomb-laden small vessel to carry out an attack at a port.

Earlier this year, a global malware attack occurred that caused significant harm to international shipping giant A.P. Moller-Maersk.

That attack revealed serious vulnerabilities in our nation's maritime security, which is still being assessed.

The only way port operations were able to resume following the attack at one of our nation's busiest ports was to revert to a manual system to process cargo and ships.

This was not the first time that cyber criminals used technology against port operations.

Approximately \$1.3 trillion in cargo passes through our nation's 360 commercial ports.

The convenience, precision and accuracy provided by digital technology in processing cargo through our nation's ports adds to their capacity to manage tonnage.

Securing cyber technology to manage port operations, ranging from communication and navigation to engineering, safety, and cargo, is critical to protect our nation's maritime cyber infrastructure.

Government leaders and security experts are concerned that the maritime transportation system could be used by terrorists to smuggle personnel, weapons of mass destruction, or other dangerous materials into the United States.

They are also concerned that ships in U.S. ports, particularly large commercial cargo ships or cruise ships, could be attacked by terrorists.

A large-scale terrorist attack at a U.S. port, experts warn, could not only cause local death and damage, but also paralyze global maritime commerce.

This is of particular concern at the Port of Houston, which is the busiest port in the United States in terms of foreign tonnage, second-busiest in the United States in terms of overall tonnage, and fifteenth-busiest in the world.

DHS, through U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Transportation Security Administration, and the U.S. Coast Guard, administers several essential programs that secure our Nation's ports and waterways.

I include in the RECORD a letter dated March 30, 2017, that I sent to the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security requesting a field hearing on the topic of port security.

I ask my colleagues join me in voting to pass H.R. 3101, the Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act of 2017.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 30, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,

Chair, House Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,

Ranking Member, House Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING

MEMBER THOMPSON: Your leadership to secure the homeland from terrorist attacks by putting the needs of the nation first in matters before the Committee is commendable. I am writing to request that as Chair and Ranking Member that you invite senior members of the Committee to join you for a meeting with Houston Port facility security and industrial manufacturing professionals to discuss the work and industry that takes place at that port.

The issue of port security remains integral to our Committee's work, and this opportunity for you, and senior members of the committee to learn more about modern ports is appreciated. Ports are indispensable to our nation's economic health as engines of commercial transportation as well as the gateway for food and essential goods to the nation's interior. The evolution of major ports, like the Port of Houston into co-location sites for manufacturing means port security challenges have expanded.

Thank you for your work to secure our nation from terrorist threats by keeping the committee abreast of the most critical security issues facing our nation. I look forward to your positive reply to this request.

Very truly yours,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE,

Member of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 3101, the Strengthening Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Coordination in Our Ports Act of 2017. This legislation would increase cybersecurity measures at ports.

As we have seen in the last couple months, all sectors of our government are in danger of being compromised due to our outdated cybersecurity standards. This past June, the Port of Los Angeles and businesses were compromised by hackers, shutting down essential structures of our economy. The security firm, Symantec, warned that hackers may have even gained access to parts of our energy grid.

H.R. 3101 authorizes the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to more freely share information regarding the cybersecurity threats to our naval interests. As a part of this bill, the DHS would continuously assess current and future cybersecurity risks, seek input from the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, create guidelines to encourage the reporting of cybersecurity risks, and implement recommendations from other agencies to enhance the security for emergency response agencies, law enforcement,

ports, and our maritime border. The bill would also direct the Coast Guard to share information regarding port-specific vulnerabilities and enact security plans to prevent and respond to cyber threats. Because of today's constant cybersecurity risks, it is imperative that we have proper contingency plans in place to respond to any threats that may appear. We must actively take steps to ensure the safety and security of our maritime infrastructure to better prepare ourselves for the threats of the 21st century.

As a Representative of Atlanta, I was shocked to see how hackers were able to infiltrate Equifax and so easily compromise the privacy of millions of Americans. By being proactive, this body has the chance to prevent other similar cybersecurity attacks that would target our government and infrastructure. I have previously supported other cybersecurity-related legislation that would secure the integrity of our elections and now I believe that we should extend this security to other vital infrastructure, which is why I am pleased to support H.R. 3101.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3101, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOP SETTLEMENT SLUSH FUNDS ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 732.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 577 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 732.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1504

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 732) to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes, with Mr. LUCAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last Congress, the House Judiciary Committee commenced an investigation into the Obama Justice Department's pattern or practice of requiring settling defendants to donate money to third-party groups. In its final 2 years, the Obama DOJ directed nearly \$1 billion to third parties entirely outside of Congress' spending and oversight authority.

All along, the Obama Justice Department strained to deny the obvious problem: that mandatory donation provisions create opportunities to play favorites. Deputy Associate Attorney General Geoffrey Graber testified that the Department was not "in the business of picking and choosing which organization may or may not receive any funding under the agreement."

But internal DOJ documents tell a different story. They show that, contrary to Graber's sworn testimony, the donation provisions were structured to aid the Obama administration's political friends and exclude conservative groups.

From the outset, Graber's boss, Associate Attorney General Tony West, was keenly interested in choosing the organizations that would receive settlement money. In the lead-up to the first troubling settlement, West's deputy emailed the Office of Legal Counsel asking: "Can you explain to Tony the best way to allocate some money toward an organization of our choosing?"

Explaining the final settlement to the press team, West's deputy wrote that the donation provisions require banks to "make donations to categories of entities we have specified, as opposed to what the bank might normally choose to donate to."

Sure enough, Congress received testimony, in 2016, that the donation beneficiaries were Obama administration allies. These include the Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America, whose director calls himself a bank terrorist.

But aiding their political allies was only the half of it. The evidence of the Obama DOJ's abuse of power shows that Tony West's team went out of its way to exclude conservative groups.

On July 8, 2014, 6 days before DOJ finalized its settlement with Citi, Tony West's top deputy circulated a draft of the agreement's mandatory donation terms. A senior official from the Office of Access to Justice, who had been

working closely with Tony West to direct settlement money to legal aid organizations, responded, requesting a word change.

She explained that the rewording would achieve the aim of "not allowing Citi to pick a statewide intermediary like the Pacific Legal Foundation," which she explained, "does conservative property-rights free legal services." The change was made.

It is not every day in congressional investigations that we find a smoking gun. Here we have it.

Unfortunately, the chief architect of this outrage was lauded, not punished. The recipients of the donations, from which PLF was excluded, circulated an email seeking ways to recognize "Tony West who, by all accounts, was the one person most responsible for including the donation provisions."

One organization replied: "Frankly, I would be willing to have us build a Tony West statue and then we could bow down to this statue each day after we get our \$200,000-plus."

Mr. West's abuse of power stands in stark contrast to the reassertion of integrity by the current Attorney General Jeff Sessions. Attorney General Sessions shut down the use of mandatory donations to benefit outside groups, barring the practice through a policy directive issued earlier this year.

This legislation, however, remains necessary because history shows that we cannot rely on the current DOJ policy remaining in place. In point of fact, in 2009, the incoming Obama administration reversed course from previous DOJ guidance that had started imposing limits on settlement payments to nonvictims. This reversal led to the abuses I highlighted.

H.R. 732 is a bipartisan bill that would make the ban on settlement payments to nonvictim third parties binding on future administrations. The bill makes clear that payments to provide restitution for actual harm directly caused, including harm to the environment, are permitted.

It was obvious, from the outset, that mandatory donation provisions create opportunities for abuse; that such abuses actually occurred is now proven.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this good governance measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act would prohibit the Federal Government from entering into or enforcing any settlement agreement requiring donations to remediate harms that are not "directly and proximately" caused by a wrongdoer's unlawful conduct.

I, regretfully, oppose this measure for several reasons. To begin with, the

bill would prohibit these types of settlement agreements even though they have been successfully used to remedy various harms, particularly those caused by reckless corporate actors.

For example, these settlement agreements helped facilitate an effective and comprehensive response to the predatory and fraudulent mortgage lending activities of financial institutions that nearly caused the economic collapse of our Nation, and that led to the Great Recession.

In fact, settlement agreements with two of these culpable financial institutions, Bank of America and Citigroup, required a donation of less than 1 percent of the overall settlement amount to fund foreclosure prevention and remediation programs to help harmed consumers.

Now, contrary to the majority's claim, the Justice Department did not use any of these settlement agreements to fund active groups. Notwithstanding the production of hundreds of pages of documents by the Justice Department, along with hundreds of pages of documents produced by private parties, we have not seen a shred of evidence that the government included unlawful or politically motivated terms in its settlement agreements with Bank of America or Citigroup.

The majority also asserts that these settlement agreements are used by the Justice Department and other agencies to circumvent the congressional appropriations process. But existing law already prevents agencies from augmenting their own funds.

By law, donations included in settlement agreements must have a clear nexus to the prosecutorial objectives of the enforcement agency. And both the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Research Service have concluded that settlement agreements providing for secondary remediation do not violate Congress' constitutional power of the purse.

Finally, H.R. 732 would prevent the remediation of systemic harms in civil and criminal enforcement actions.

These settlement agreements allow parties to resolve their civil or criminal liability by voluntarily remediating the harms caused by their unlawful conduct. For some types of unlawful conduct, such as discrimination based on race or religion, secondary remediation of harms may be the only remedy available for systemic violations of the law.

□ 1515

The victims of such conduct are typically not themselves parties to the underlying action. Therefore, secondary remediation in the form of voluntary compliance and training programs serves as an important tool in these cases to protect victims of discrimination. Yet H.R. 732 would effectively prohibit such relief.

Given these serious problems and some others presented by the bill, I strongly am led to oppose H.R. 732.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At this time, I would like to include in the RECORD a number of exhibits:

Exhibit A, in which under oath we had testimony that said the Department of Justice did not want to be in the business of picking or choosing organizations that may or may not receive any funding under an agreement.

Yet, exhibit B, in which the number three at Department of Justice under President Obama said, "Can you explain to Tony the best way to allocate money toward organizations of our choosing," in a \$9 billion settlement.

And in exhibit C, in which they specifically said they had concerns, including not allowing Citibank to pick a statewide intermediary like Pacific Legal Foundation that does conservative causes.

EXHIBIT A

Chairman GOODLATTE. Well, let me just add that this committee will not stand silent, nor will, I am sure, the Financial Service Committee, and you can expect that this will escalate if you do not provide the documentation that we requested over 2 months ago.

Secondly, did anyone at the Department of Justice ever consider the serious appearance of impropriety in requiring banks to make available to activist organizations the lion's share of funding that Congress has previously cut off to them? That is one of the reasons why we want to see the communications. We want to know what considerations went into making this decision to take this action.

Mr. GRABER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, understand the concern. And I can tell you that one of the reasons that the Department wanted to use a preexisting list, the one that I believe you are referring to, the HUD approved counseling agency list, is because that list is preexisting. The Department did not want to be in the business of picking and choosing which organization may or may not receive any funding under the agreement.

Chairman GOODLATTE. No, but it is the Congress' responsibility to appropriate funds, and the Congress' responsibility to be picking and choosing who gets appropriations for expenditures. And we want to know what connection there is between the fact that cuts were made and . . .

EXHIBIT B

From: Taylor, Elizabeth G. (OAAG)
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 10:58 AM
To: (OLC); Seitz, Virginia A (OLC)
Cc: Martinez, Brian (OAAG); Graber, Geoffrey (OAAG); (OLC)

Subject: back again with questions

I'm sorry to be a pest. We keep tinkering with the settlement agreement and I want to make sure that we are doing it right. I also am not sure that I am a good messenger between you and Tony because he asks me follow up questions that I'm not sure I can answer. Do you have a few minutes today to meet with Tony and let him ask you questions directly?

Here are our current issues:

Can you explain to Tony the best way to allocate some money toward an organization of our choosing? We have been discussing having the agreement provide that JPM agreed to pay \$9 billion but that, if, by the time we sign the settlement agreement, JPM has given \$60 million to x organization, they will only have to pay \$8.04 billion. I think that's ok. We understand that we would have no control over what x organization does with the money.

Thanks

EXHIBIT C PART I

From: Frimpong, Maame Ewusi-Mensah (OAAG)

Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 1:07 PM

To: (A2J)

Subject: RE: new language

Thanks! We made the proposal. They had one question whenever you have a moment.

From: (A2J)

Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 9:47 AM

To: Frimpong, Maame Ewusi Mensah (OAAG)

Subject: RE: new language

You go girl. The prospective settlement was on NPR this morning, in case you didn't have your radio on . . .

Acting Senior Counselor for Access to Justice

U.S. Department of Justice

From: Frimpong, Maame Ewusi Mensah (OAAG)

Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 9:42 AM

To: (A2J)

Subject: RE: new language

Cool. I will keep you posted.

From: (A2J)

Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 9:34 AM

To: Frimpong, Maame Ewusi Mensah (OAAG)

Cc: (A2J)

Subject: RE: new language

Importance: High

Got it. Ok, this will hopefully address the concerns we'd like to avert:

Donations to state-based Interest on Lawyers' Trust Account (IOLTA) organizations (or other statewide bar-association affiliated intermediaries) that provide funds to legal aid organizations, to be used for foreclosure prevention legal assistance and community redevelopment legal assistance.

Concerns include: a) not allowing Citi to pick a statewide intermediary like the Pacific Legal Foundation (does conservative property-rights free legal services) or a statewide pro bono entity (will conflict out of most meaningful foreclosure legal aid) we are more likely to get the right result from a state bar association affiliated entity; b) making

EXHIBIT C PART II

sure that it's legal assistance provided, not a scenario where the bank can direct IOLTA or other intermediary to give to even a legal aid organization but to do only housing counseling, for example, under the umbrella "foreclosure prevention assistance."

This get you closer?

Acting Senior Counselor for Access to Justice

U.S. Department of Justice

From: Frimpong, Maame Ewusi Mensah (OAAG)

Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2014 6:10 PM

To: (A2J)

Subject: new language

H

I think we are going to have to be as thin as possible here, not add new definitions, and not limit to particular states. What do you think about the following:

Donations to state-based Interest on Lawyers' Trust Account (IOLTA) organizations

or other statewide intermediaries that provide funds to legal aid organizations, to be used for foreclosure prevention assistance and community redevelopment assistance.

Regards,
Maame
Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong
Principal Deputy Associate Attorney General

Office of the Associate Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

EXHIBIT D

From: Frimpong, Maame Ewusi-Mensah (OAAG)

Sent: Friday, August 15, 2014 4:01 PM

To: Canale, Ellen (OPA)

Subject: "stretching by the banks"

Hi Ellen

Here are some examples of consumer relief items that we believe require the banks to do more than they would be economically motivated to do on their own in Citi:

Make donations to categories of entities we have specified (as opposed to what the bank might normally choose to donate to).

I hope this is helpful. Let me know if you have questions or need more. Big picture, we are requiring the bank to change its behavior and at the very least, choose the actions we prefer among various options that it might be economically motivated to take. This in itself is valuable because we are pushing them to focus their activities on the borrowers and areas and relief of most concern to us and that we believe will have the greatest impact in redressing the harm their actions caused to consumers and communities.

Thanks!

Maame

EXHIBIT E

From: Martinez, Brian (OAAG)

Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 1:04 PM

To: Graber, Geoffrey (OAAG)

Subject: Consumer Relief

Geoff, this is what we received from HUD a little while ago.

From: Smith, Damon Y

Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 12:06 PM

To: Taylor, Elizabeth G. (OAAG)

Cc: Martinez, Brian (OAAG)

Subject: RE: update for Tony?

Attached is a clean and redline of where we are. Don't be afraid of the extent of the redline. Much of it is shifting around and the preamble, footnotes and other language are all new so we're just getting down to negotiating it.

Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Damon

From: Taylor, Elizabeth G. (OAAG)

Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 11:48 AM

To: Smith, Damon Y (HUD)

Cc: Martinez, Brian (OAAG)

Subject: update for Tony?

Right after I sent my email, Tony called me asking for an update, especially on where we are on liquidated damages and on one or more third party beneficiaries. Can you get on a call with Tony (and me) and update him? I'm copying Brian to assist in scheduling. Let me know if you think Sec. Donovan needs to be included, but I'm sure that would complicate scheduling and Tony really just want to know where things are.

EXHIBIT F

From: (A2J)

Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2014 9:28 AM

To: Frimpong, Maame Ewusi Mensah (OAAG)

Cc: (A2J)

Subject: Memo re: bank settlement

Hi Maame,

Hope all is well and that you are settling in on the 5th floor.

We wanted to give you a heads up that we will be sending a memo your way today. By way of background, Cindy contacted yesterday about an issue that we've been discussing with Tony for months and one that we've been meaning to connect with you on adding language that incorporates legal aid into the Department's large bank settlement agreements (as part of consumer/victim relief). We understand that Tony wants a quick turnaround on this, so please feel free to reach out to us with any questions.

Best,

an

Senior Counsel

Access to Justice Initiative

U.S. Department of Justice

EXHIBIT G

DELIBERATIVE AND PRE-DECISIONAL DOCUMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MEMORANDUM

To: Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong

From: an

Date: June 23, 2014

Subject: Including Legal Aid Organizations in Distribution of Bank Settlement Funds

As requested by Associate Attorney General Tony West, ATJ has researched options for incorporating legal aid into the Department's large bank settlement agreements. Based on our current understanding of the potential scale, we identified three options that would best align with organizational capacity and litigation goals, and achieve the ASG's goal of a distribution mechanism that reaches a broad coalition of legal aid organizations.

The options listed below could be pursued either separately or in some combination. As set out below, we recommend a combination of options 1 and 2:

- 1) distribute the majority of funds set aside for legal aid to IOLTA foundations; and
- 2) reserve sufficient funds for a national organization to establish Consumer Protection Fellowships in specific states pursuant to the settlement, to focus on foreclosure prevention solutions that help people keep their homes and prevent future mortgage abuses.

IOLTA foundations are especially appropriate intermediaries in cases involving banks because a) they have capacity to effectively distribute large sums of money; and b) the historically low bank interest rates from the beginning of 2008 to the present, have meant the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to legal aid programs nationally, while the need for free legal services has grown.

Legal aid offices respond to the wide range of legal problems faced by low-income communities in distress, with lawyers working on cases involving housing and consumer protection as well as family law matters and access to public benefits. Often clients have multiple, interrelated legal problems, such as a loss of housing that may exacerbate or lead to other debt problems or an acute need to access other public benefits. Some larger organizations also have expertise in broader community development work, like working on behalf of citizen groups to negotiate community benefits agreements (such as requiring development to include affordable housing or prioritize local labor). Typically, as non-profit organizations subject to oversight by boards of directors, legal aid offices have a formal process for setting local priorities with oversight and input from their boards. It could be logistically difficult for large

scale funding through IOLTA to have subject matter restrictions on it (such as only for housing cases). Like most IOLTA funding, and like federal funds from the Legal Services Corporation, it is best to have as few strings as possible—both to respect established local priorities and avoid overly burdensome accounting. However, for the smaller portion of funding in option 2, it makes sense to be targeted both as to geography and subject matter.

Finally, while we recommend as few restrictions as possible on funding going to legal aid organizations, we note that some organizations already live with funding restrictions—such as not being allowed to pursue class actions. If, to build support for these ideas generally, there is a need to fashion reasonable restrictions, then ATJ can help with further development of such options.

EXHIBIT H

From: Bob LeClair

To: Charles Dunlap; david; Amy Sings in the Timber; Judith Baker; Shannon Scruggs; Amy Johnson; Libhart, Stephanie S.; Choy, Stephanie; Norsworthy, Nancy; Alvaro Flores; comalley; lphillips

Cc: Groudine, Beverly

Subject: RE: NAIP letter to Tony West at DOJ

Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:32:43 PM

Great idea! We should do a resolution, and we also should do some formal plaque that would say "for outstanding service" or other such words.

Frankly, I would be willing to have us build a statue and then we could bow down to this statue each day after we get our \$200,000+.

Heap big fun!

Bob LeClair.

From: Charles Dunlap

Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:21 PM

To: david; Amy Sings in the Timber; Judith Baker; Shannon Scruggs; Amy Johnson; Libhart, Stephanie S.; Bob LeClair; Choy, Stephanie; Norsworthy, Nancy; Alvaro Flores; comalley; lphillips

Cc: Groudine, Beverly

Subject: NAIP letter to Tony West at DOJ

Hi NAIP Board members. Now that it has been more than 24 hours for us all to try and digest the Bank of America settlement, I would like to discuss ways we might want to recognize and show appreciation for the Department of Justice and specifically Associate Attorney General Tony West who by all accounts was the one person most responsible for including the IOLTA provisions. I am in the process of sending him a thank you letter today on behalf of NAIP and all of its members. I also wanted to see if there are any other ideas to honor him and the DOJ in a more meaningful way (resolution, other award, ceremony at the midyear?) and am looking for any creative ideas to try and show him how important this is to our community and more importantly what a huge impact it will have on those in need. Any ideas are appreciated. Thanks again for your suggestions.

Chuck

INDIANA BAR

Charles R. Dunlap

Executive Director

EXHIBIT I PART I

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights

The Leadership Conference

MEMORANDUM

TO: Elizabeth Taylor, US Department of Justice

FROM: The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights

RE: JPMorgan Chase Toxic MBS Accountability in Prince William County, VA

DATE: November 8, 2013

Thank you for taking my call earlier today. I thought our conversation was helpful, and I appreciate your willingness to hear my suggestions regarding a "pilot project on community reinvestment" in Prince William County, Virginia, as an element of the anticipated JPMorgan Chase settlement. For the record, it is important that I offer the following disclaimer: this proposal is made on our own initiative, and without the encouragement, approval, or suggestion by either you or the Department of Justice.

By way of background, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights is the nation's leading civil and human coalition. We have been actively involved for many years in housing and lending policies both before and in the wake of nation's financial crisis. As I mentioned when we spoke, we are working with several community-based organizations in Prince William County that seek to promote the public interest through leveraged investments in neighborhoods that have been hard hit by home foreclosures.

For example, VOICE, a broad-based citizens organization with 50 religious and community institution members in Northern Virginia, has asked The Leadership Conference to assist them in their fight to get JPMorgan to reinvest a portion of the more than \$300 million in equity it stripped from Prince William County, VA communities and families through predatory loans, toxic Mortgage-backed Securities (MBSs), and foreclosures (see attached one-page summary of JP Morgan's Prince William track record).

We are asking DOJ officials negotiating with JPMorgan Chase to consider including in any settlement significant equity capital or grant funds to promote and capitalize a Prince William County Restoration Fund (see attached concept paper) which will revitalize blighted neighborhoods, rebuild homeownership, and address

EXHIBIT I PART II

Metro IAF

VOICE for justice

NATIONAL COMMUNITY RESTORATION FUND
JP MORGAN CHASE & FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
MBS SETTLEMENT

Goal: Require JPMorgan Chase to reinvest some of the equity its predatory mortgages stripped from communities as part of the US Department of Justice's proposed \$13 Billion Settlement with JPMorgan over regulatory issues and mortgage-backed securities (MBSs).

Metro Industrial Areas Foundation, a network of 22 broad-based citizens organizations in the East, Midwest, and South, proposes that this occur in one of two ways;

Ideal Proposal: The Federal Government should require JPMorgan Chase to pay \$2 billion in cash to capitalize a National Community Restoration Fund that would help restore communities and be available on a competitive basis. The National Restoration Fund could capitalize 50 local community restoration equity funds to rebuild communities across the country that were de-

stroyed by JPMorgan's predatory loans and toxic MBSs.

Alternative Proposal: The Federal Government should include in its consent agreement, as part of the consumer relief portion, a requirement that JPMorgan Chase capitalize local community restoration equity funds through significant grants (at least \$10 million+ each) or Equity Equivalent (EQ2) investments over 20+ years on a non-recourse basis at very low interest rates (0%-1%) to rebuild communities devastated by foreclosure. JPMorgan Chase could be given enhanced credit towards its settlement requirements for this type of grant or investment.

Background: JPMorgan Chase's predatory loans—packaged into toxic MBSs—did not just hurt investors and individual homeowners; they destroyed entire communities for which JPMorgan should be held accountable to reinvest. MBSs allowed predatory lenders to originate trillions of dollars of sub-prime loans that were structured to fail, targeted at low-wealth and minority borrowers, and concentrated in low-income neighborhoods in cities and aging suburbs throughout the US. The cumulative effect of these failed mortgages was to:

Leave large-numbers of blighted and vacant homes that depress property values, preventing remaining homeowners from securing a loan modification because they are underwater. These properties also attract crime and other public safety issues;

Devastate homeownership rates, replacing owners with renters vulnerable to negligent absentee investors and destabilizing neighborhoods;

Create pressures on available affordable rental housing as demand rises from families recently foreclosed, raising rents and making rental housing unaffordable;

Deny large swaths of former homeowners, who are stuck in high-priced rental housing,

EXHIBIT J

Best,

Peter J. Kadzik

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

Office of Legislative Affairs

From: Martin Trimble

Sent: Saturday, February 15, 2014 6:13 PM

To: Kadzik, Peter J (OLA)

Cc: Luke Albee; Michelle Malwurm; Clyde Ellis; Keith Savage; Wilson Michael; Frank McMillan

Subject: VOICE/Metro IAF Meeting with US Deputy Attorney General Tony West

MR. KADZIK: It was good to talk with you on Wednesday. Thank you for agreeing to speak with US Deputy Attorney General Tony West about meeting with VOICE—Virginians Organized for Interfaith Community Engagement Leaders—to discuss VOICE & Metro Industrial Areas Foundation's (Metro IAF) proposal to create a \$5 Billion National Community Equity Restoration Fund to rebuild communities devastated by predatory loans and toxic Mortgage Backed Securities issued by financial institutions.

The VOICE-Metro IAF National Community Equity Restoration Fund concept paper is attached. As you know, VOICE worked with Senator Mark Warner, Federal officials, and other allies to get "grants to capitalize community equity restoration funds" included as one way JP Morgan Chase can fulfill its consumer relief obligations under the Department of Justice-JP Morgan Chase \$13 billion toxic Mortgage Backed Securities settlement. This precedent potentially creates a vital resource to rebuild communities hard hit by predatory loans and foreclosures. We will brief Deputy Attorney General West

on how community equity restoration funds established by VOICE/Metro IAF sister groups are transforming blighted communities on a large scale in Baltimore, New York, Milwaukee as well as the VOICE restoration plan for Prince William County, VA. VOICE & Metro IAF will make the case that the Department of Justice should make "grants to capitalize community equity restoration funds" mandatory in all future settlements.

Below is background information on VOICE and its organizing to hold financial institutions accountable for the predatory loan and foreclosure crisis in Prince William County, VA as well as Metro IAF. Watch this short video for the story about VOICE's organizing: VOICE Foreclosure Organizing Video. The concept paper has details on the effectiveness of community equity restoration funds in rebuilding blighted communities.

Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to talking with you again soon.

Sincerely,

Martin Paul Trimble

EXHIBIT K

From: West, Tony (OAG)

Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 1:51 PM

To: Taylor, Elizabeth G. (OAG)

Cc: Martinez, Brian (OAG); Graber, Geoffrey (OAG)

Subject: RE: meeting with VOICE

Let's discuss later today.

From: Taylor, Elizabeth (OAG)

Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 12:50 PM

To: West, Tony (OAG)

Cc: Martinez, Brian (OAG); Graber, Geoffrey (OAG)

Subject: meeting with VOICE

I met today, on your behalf, with a VOICE—Virginians Organized for Interfaith Community Engagement. They would like us to include in the consumer relief portion of the next rmb settlement a requirement that the bank contribute to a National Community Equity Restoration Fund, which, in turn, would capitalize community equity restoration funds in communities across the country that were harmed by the banks' creation and securitization of toxic mortgages. I explained the limits of what we can do in a securities settlement, including the facts that the suit is aimed at harm to investors and that the federal government could not administer such a fund. Still, proposal is According to, this kind of community equity restoration fund has been successful in developing affordable housing and restoring blighted neighborhoods in New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, DC and Milwaukee. I will invite you and any of us who are interested to come see the work they have done in Baltimore and DC. Damon.

Damon

but says that BofA has already committed \$10 million to making low interest loans in Virginia. I'll try to find out whether BofA is getting credit toward the NMS for this money, claims that they shamed BofA into this by storming their shareholder meeting. Perhaps we can discuss this more when we meet this afternoon. I'll also scan the proposal and send it around.

EXHIBIT L CITY SETTLEMENT 7/14/14

Annex 2

E. Donations to state-based Interest on Lawyers Trust Account (IOLTA) organizations (or other statewide bar-association affiliated intermediaries) that provide funds to legal aid organizations, to be used for foreclosure prevention legal assistance and community redevelopment legal assistance E. \$1.00 payment = \$2.00 Credit***

Menu Item 4E Minimum = \$15 million payment

F. Donations to HUD-approved housing counseling agencies to provide foreclosure prevention assistance and other housing counseling activities F. \$1.00 payment = \$2.00 Credit* * *

Menu Item 4F Minimum = \$10 million payment

115% Early Incentive Credit for Menu Items 4A–F

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing forth this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I am a lawyer, like many of our members on the Judiciary Committee. I served as a prosecutor and as a judge, and we have a lot of those legal beagles on our Judiciary Committee.

Although I worked primarily in State court as a judge and a prosecutor, I have always had great respect for those people in the Justice Department who work on behalf of the people of the United States in Federal court. However, over the last few years, my opinion of the Justice Department has changed, and it has changed not for the better.

It has changed because I see that the Justice Department is acting as a political entity. I didn't say partisan entity. I said as a political entity, making decisions that appear to be based on politics rather than the law and policy.

This legislation does one thing: it tries to elevate the Justice Department back to a nonpolitical entity, which it has, unfortunately, in my opinion, become a political entity. It is unfortunate that it has become that. Some of the things that the Justice Department has done, and this legislation I think would prevent, would be to make sure that the Justice Department does not become a political entity in determining settlements of lawsuits that the Justice Department files on behalf of the American public.

So what happens is that these lawsuits are settled, and then the Justice Department tells the defendant: We the people are suing. You contribute to this entity and this will all go away. This case will be settled. There won't have to be a trial.

So that is what has been happening over the last few years.

In 2012, the Department of Justice forced Gibson Guitars to pay a \$50,000 "community service payment" to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, even though the Foundation was not a victim of the crime that Gibson Guitars was involved in. It had no connection to that case.

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation received a bigger windfall again in 2012, when the government required British Petroleum—we all remember

the BP spill—to donate \$2.5 billion to the Foundation over a 5-year period in connection with the criminal investigation of the Gulf of Mexico oil spill.

Discretion on the part of the Department of Justice on where the money goes smells, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't pass the smell test.

In 2006, the Department of Justice forced a wastewater plant that had been accused of violating the Clean Water Act to give \$1 million to the United States Coast Guard Alumni Association. Now, I love the Coast Guard. We probably all love the Coast Guard. But government shouldn't be making a decision to give taxpayer money, or money, to any association. It is political decisions that the Justice Department has been making.

The wastewater treatment firm was also forced to pay another \$1 million to the Greater New Haven Water Pollution Control Authority in Connecticut to fund unspecified environmental improvement projects.

A recent attack on the DOJ bank settlement with Goldman Sachs required a \$250 million fee to be assessed, financing donations toward affordable housing. This is a political decision by the Justice Department. And there are many other examples that we will put into the RECORD. This should not be a Department of Justice decision on a settlement. If they sue somebody and they settle the case, the money should go to the victims of that lawsuit. It should not go to the Department of Justice's discretion to pick political entities.

Remember, I didn't say partisan. I just said political entities. Go to the victim. Go to the Victims of Crime Act. Go to where crime victims get funds. Go back to the U.S. Treasury, but the money should not be discretionary with the Justice Department.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. But let's take the politics, the decisionmaking, and the credibility—or lack of credibility—of the Justice Department in settling cases on behalf of the United States people, and take it away from the Justice Department and put it where it is supposed to go: to the victims of that lawsuit.

That is where it should go. And if it doesn't go there, then it should go to the Victims of Crime Act, a Federal Government entity where funds for criminal violations go into a fund. Or it should go to the United States Treasury.

Remove the politics no matter who the President is. Remove the politics of the Justice Department so they can regain credibility with the American people for being involved in justice, not politics.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee, who is ranking member on the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 732, the inaptly titled Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017, which would flatly ban the enforcement of any settlement agreement that seeks to remedy the general harms caused by unlawful conduct.

This prohibition would broadly apply to all civil and criminal settlements with limited exception, encroaching on the Justice Department's longstanding legal authority to negotiate and enter settlement agreements.

Since its establishment in 1870, the Justice Department has possessed plenary authority to litigate on behalf of the government in all civil and criminal litigation except as otherwise provided by law.

Since at least as early as 1888, the Supreme Court has upheld this broad grant of authority, holding that it extends to settling litigation on behalf of the government or making enforcement decisions in light of priorities and resources.

In *Heckler v. Chaney*, for example, the Court held in 1985 that, in many cases, enforcement decision within the Justice Department's expertise make it "far better equipped than the courts to deal with the many variables involved in the proper ordering of its priorities."

This rationale also extends to the terms of settlement agreements, which "involve numerous complicated technical issues as well as important judgments respecting the use of limited prosecutorial resources" and are "best left in the hands of expert agencies and prosecutors, rather than dictated by Congress or the Federal courts," as environmental law professor Joel Mintz has noted.

H.R. 732 undermines this longstanding policy by strictly curtailing the enforcement discretion of the Justice Department and the other enforcement agencies when resolving a party's civil or criminal liability on behalf of the Federal Government.

As the Justice Department observed last Congress in the context of a substantively similar bill, "limiting the Department's discretion to negotiate appropriate terms of settlement, which are voluntary and agreed to by the parties, may result in fewer settlement agreements, protracted litigation, and delays for victims who need the relief."

Without this discretionary authority, the Department concluded that, "the government may not be able to adequately address the full scope of the harms that a defendant's illegal actions caused."

In contrary to the arguments of the gentleman from Virginia, despite 2 years of investigation by the Judiciary Committee into the Justice Department's use of settlement agreements, no evidence was found to show that the mortgage fraud settlements contain terms that were politically motivated. But we did learn that the sole mission of the Justice Department's settlements under the prior administration was to aid the families whose economic security was jeopardized by reckless Wall Street behavior and prevent them from losing their homes due to fraudulent mortgage practices.

There are many examples where generalized harm is impossible to calculate or impractical to quantify in the courts. Without this ability by the Justice Department to enter into these settlement agreements, corporate wrongdoers are going to be free to do whatever they want.

I give you one example: Deepwater Horizon, which destroyed the coastline. As part of that settlement, there was State-based cleanup that was provided. There was funding for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for remediation; things that were directly responsive to the harm caused. But you couldn't quantify to an individual person, and that is what this legislation will prevent.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If the minority has not gone through the discovery that we have, that we placed in the RECORD, I will be glad to give Mr. CICILLINE or anyone else a copy.

I am just going to repeat, though, after receiving testimony that they didn't pick winners and losers, what we are marking as exhibit B and exhibit C make it clear they were, and specifically choosing, to exclude a "conservative group."

I think the important things here, though, Mr. Chairman, are if they want to have money in a settlement, such as the Deepwater Horizon tragedy, they certainly could, as long as it directly provides aid to the victims; which, of course, cleanup did. But when we look at these others, one of the great things is if they want to put it into a victim's fund as part of it, a government-controlled fund, they can if they want.

If the Department of Justice wants specific authority the way they do, for example, in water settlements, particularly related to Native American Tribes, they offer a deal, they put one together, and, Mr. Chairman, they come to Congress. This Congress, in the last Congress, settled multiple longstanding disputes with Tribes. What is interesting is they made sure the money went to those who had been harmed when they came to Congress and said: Please codify this agreement.

But in the many agreements that seems to go on in the Obama administration—and we now have the smoking gun of that—they made political decisions. Making political decisions is why you have to put this back in the light of day and with real congressional oversight.

What is amazing is, during the markup of this bill, there were a number of Members of the other party who specifically talked about not trusting the current occupant of the White House and the current Attorney General. It baffles me that they would not want to take back this authority knowing that the Department of Justice could bring to us a request for a bill that would authorize a specific settlement that could have outside groups or grant authority on a case-by-case basis.

□ 1530

The reality is the slush fund system has to stop. That is why Chairman GOODLATTE's bringing this bill today was so critical.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. You have got a minority report you are putting in which cites lists of abuses; is that correct?

Mr. ISSA. It is majority. Yes, you have copies of it.

Mr. COHEN. I just wondered, do you have in there all the things Chris Christie did that came up in a hearing that we held in 2009 in our committee showing the abuses of the system by Chris Christie?

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair, please.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asks for a colloquy.

Although I don't have them, I am sure they prove the same point: that the light of day, the cleanliness of sunlight, and congressional oversight and appropriation would have protected against the abuses the gentleman is probably describing.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. PASCRELL will discuss it in more detail.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. PASCRELL will go into this in some detail.

But we held hearings on this, and we didn't have any support from the other side of the aisle when we pointed out all of the abuses that were going on in New Jersey, Mr. Chairman, with monitors being appointed that were making \$52 million—Mr. Ashcroft, in particular—other monitors who had involvement in cases that Mr. Christie was involved in, which his brother was involved in, and where money was

given to Mr. Christie's law school and other pet projects. Nobody on the other side criticized it. It was only when they cared about Obama.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's points are good. I am afraid his conclusion may be the part I have to differ slightly with, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman from Tennessee is right to note past and other indiscretions. That is why we have this bill before you today. In fact, it is why passage is so important.

We don't want to have anybody of either party—the current occupant of the White House is from my party, a Republican. The current Attorney General is from my party, a Republican and former Republican Senator. The fact is that now is the time not to necessarily disparage any past activity but to stop it.

We are not a body that is supposed to trust as much as we are a body to have some trust and to verify. When we find wrongdoing, it is our job to make sure it doesn't happen again. This bill, including the comments of the gentleman from Tennessee, seeks to do that. I am convinced that it is good for that reason, and it is even good for the example that Mr. COHEN suggests.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 732. This misguided legislation would restrict the government's flexibility to resolve lawsuits against corporate wrongdoers and would make it harder to provide a remedy to all those who are harmed by the company's malfeasance.

Under well-established law, when settling claims with some corporate defendants, the Department of Justice may seek to include among the terms a contribution by the defendant to a third-party organization. Because it is often difficult to identify each individual who was harmed by the company's actions, particularly those who suffered the secondary effects of such wrongdoing, these third-party payments are intended to address the generalized harms caused by corporate bad actors. But this bill would prohibit any payment to a party that is not for restitution or to remedy a harm that is "directly and proximately" caused by the defendant. Such restrictions will needlessly hamper the Department of Justice's ability to efficiently resolve claims and to provide relief to all those injured by a defendant's actions.

For example, in the wake of the financial crisis, the Department of Justice, under Attorney General Holder,

sued several large banks whose egregious misconduct destabilized the housing market and threw millions of people out of their homes, with millions more placed on the brink of foreclosure, all while the banks reaped massive profits. The banks agreed to resolve these claims by paying record-setting fines to the government in recognition of the tremendous damage they had caused.

Some of these voluntary agreements also included payments to housing counseling agencies and legal aid organizations responsible for assisting homeowners devastated by the foreclosure crisis that those banks helped create. The Republican majority sneers at these nationally recognized community organizations, however, and dismisses them as nothing more than activist groups. Republicans are so concerned that funds were going to organizations that help level the playing field between corporations and individuals that they drafted this legislation to prohibit the government from entering into a settlement that provides for any third-party payments.

Homeowners and communities across the country are still struggling with the aftermath of the foreclosure crisis, and the third-party payments negotiated by the Obama administration have been vital in helping both the direct victims and all those who suffered the collateral consequences of the banks' misconduct.

Attorney General Sessions recently announced that his Justice Department will not include such terms in the settlements it negotiates. But supporters of this bill insist that we must tie the hands of future administrations as well, weakening their ability to efficiently resolve claims and preventing them from using this tool to seek relief for the victims of corporate misdeeds.

This unnecessary and irresponsible legislation is yet another attempt by the Republican majority to favor wealthy corporations over individuals, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make sure I provide a little clarity. We are not talking about leftwing, rightwing, or other groups who get it. What we are talking about is a basic question of fungibility of money.

If something has been done wrong and a judge or the Department of Justice has X amount of determination of wrongdoing, the first question is: How much of that money can get to the victims? In a perfect world, the victims are made 100 percent whole. In a perfect world, 100 percent of the money passes from the perpetrator to the victim.

The Department of Justice making a decision not to a left- or rightwing group, but a political decision to give \$1 million to the Coast Guard, to their

charitable foundation, was a decision that clearly was not part of the mitigation but, rather, a general charitable decision. That was \$1 million that did not go to the victim, did not go to the general Treasury, but it went to the whims of a bureaucrat.

We seek to make sure that, if that is an appropriate action, they come to Congress with that and not decide that charity begins with some unelected individual in the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 732, which would prohibit the U.S. Government from entering into settlement agreements or enforcing settlement agreements if the settlement agreement includes a term that provides a payment to be made to a third party. In the class action context, these donations are known as cy-pres.

Under existing laws, settlements from Federal enforcement actions can include payments to third parties to advance programs that assist with recovery, benefits, and relief for communities harmed by lawbreakers to the extent such payments further the objectives of the enforcement action. This bill would cut that ability off. It cuts off any payments to third parties other than individualized restitution and other forms of direct payment for actual harm. That restriction would handcuff Federal enforcement officials from actually doing justice.

This legislation arose out of the Wall Street too-big-to-fail episode in 2008, which resulted in the Great Recession, where millions of Americans lost their homes to foreclosure because of the actions of these too-big-to-fail banks insofar as the subprime mortgage crisis is concerned.

So the Department of Justice sued these big banks, which, by the way, have continued to just get bigger and bigger after they received their Wall Street bailout, and the American people who lost their homes did not receive a bailout.

This legislation is to protect those same banks, and I would add that we have got Steve Mnuchin now as the head of the Treasury Department in the Trump administration. So this legislation is in keeping with that which would protect and coddle these Wall Street thugs who have now ascended to the seat of government and look to lock down their control. With this legislation, they prevent themselves from being sued.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are complicit. They support too

big to fail. They support the big banks. It is at the expense of the little guy, the people who work hard every day working for a salary, an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, which seems to be harder and harder to do these days because of the legislation that this Congress passes.

This is just another in a long line of pieces of legislation that coddles and protects those who really need no protection. They should be under the jail for what they have done to the American people.

I fight against this kind of legislation. It is wrong for America, and it is wrong for its citizens. It is great for the big banks.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in short response.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes the obvious is missed in the debate. The gentleman from Georgia talks about locking down power. Quite frankly, Republicans do have a majority in the House and a slim majority in the Senate, and the current occupant of the White House is from my party. So when we are trying to reduce potential misconduct by the executive branch, we are not doing it to take any money away.

As a matter of fact, this law would clearly cause more money to flow from the same amount of initial payment, more money to flow to the victims. So we are trying to flow more money to the victims. We are in no way reducing any aspect of settlements other than, if the current occupant of the White House, the President, and the Attorney General want to give to the charity of their choice, they can either do it with their own money or they can come to Congress for authority.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Justice, the same Federal agency that obtained benefits for the homeowners who were hurt by the excesses of the big banks, that Justice Department is now controlled by Jefferson Beauregard Sessions, who is not very keen on trying to recover damages on behalf of the people. If he has to get permission from Steve Mnuchin of the Treasury Department to do it, they work so hand in hand, you know that there is not going to be any relief for the homeowners of this country.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking Member, Chairman GOODLATTE, I start by expressing my appreciation to Chairman GOODLATTE for acknowledging the actions that were

taken by the Governor of New Jersey when he was the U.S. attorney back in 2006 to 2007.

By the way, the former Justice Department was not even in existence yet.

I agree with much, on both sides, of what has been said here, but I think we are missing the point. The legislation is needed to prohibit this from happening again.

Congressman POE, the gentleman from Texas, wants to take the political preference out of the Justice Department. He is absolutely correct, I agree, but not just about where the money is going to go.

We have a major problem here. I have been shouting from the rooftops about the need to reform the Justice Department's settlement agreement process for almost a decade on this floor.

When we talk about lawsuits being settled, deferred prosecutions are to get rid of the defendant so that the defendant, at the cost of doing business, pays a fine. That is how it is done. This bill does nothing about that—zero.

□ 1545

Many of the corporations that stood before the courts—and I am not a lawyer, as most of you guys and gals are—they stood before the courts for 15 years, representing those corporations, and what they got out of it was: Look, we are going to slap you on the wrist. We are going to give you a little fine. At that time, you can give the money to whoever you wish. And then you go away. Nobody is prosecuted. Nobody goes to jail. Nobody is going to go to jail with these banks that cheated middle class folks. Nobody. Guaranteed.

But under the guise of "ensuring accountability," H.R. 732 is a political exercise missing real reprimand for these practices, reforms to the system, or redress to actual victims.

For years, we have known deferred prosecution agreements get out of hand, regardless of whether there is a Democrat running the Presidency or a Republican. So for anybody to stand up there and just say this was Obama's problem, they don't know history.

I suggested a modest reform to improve the transparency of these agreements. I was rebuffed by some of the very people who are in this room.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. There is much to be said here, but if we remember the Bristol-Myers Squibb case, they avoided prosecution for securities fraud in exchange for \$5 million to the Governor's law school alma mater. Now, that is what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, you don't accept that. If you are on the Judiciary Committee, you can't accept that either. You have got to be kidding me. To allow the

courts to do something like this—and any administration, Democrat or Republican, to go along with this—no wonder the people have little faith in the justice system in the United States of America.

I simply want fairness, Mr. Chairman. I have asked for it many times. This is not a new subject to me, and I will be back talking about it again.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to agree with the gentleman from New Jersey. The idea that you can pay a fine to get out from underneath criminal prosecution is one that I would like to see either eclipsed to where it is almost invisible and rarely used or done away with altogether. I would certainly agree to join with the gentleman in finding further prohibitions to that practice.

It has been too often that a corporation able to pay large amounts of money not only escapes its actions, but, of course, it escapes the prosecution of key individuals who may, in some cases, be responsible for the loss of life and/or health.

So I want to join with the gentleman from New Jersey. That is not what this bill is about. It doesn't deal with it, nor does it fail to deal with it. It is not the subject of the bill.

I urge the gentleman, who does agree with a portion of what we have to say, to work with me. I will be happy to be his cosponsor on a piece of legislation to try to curtail that practice.

Today, we are trying to curtail a practice in which we have examples of both Republicans and Democrats in the Office of the Attorney General, their justice departments, from making settlements that seem to have political bias. And that is what we are here to stop.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I would only offer to say that there is not one Judiciary Committee Democrat on this so-called bipartisan bill. That is where you first start the bipartisanship: you work with members who may, in fact, believe that some of the issues that have been raised by my good friend from California may have merit.

Maybe this bill could have been drafted in a way that would have responded to some of the failures, if there are some, such as evidenced by our good friend from New Jersey, who recalled a lot of failures not by Democrats but by Republicans. But when you start off with a bill talking about

slush funds, then you negate the good work of so many organizations that have benefited to do the very good that the consent decree was intended to do.

Today, I stood with the Latinas Against Domestic Violence. They came here to stand against the violence against women that goes on and on and on. Some of them may be in the gallery.

But what I would say, Mr. Chairman, is: Why would we not want to give that organization funds if they were in line to get dollars to help prevent or intervene in the vileness of domestic violence?

So the idea that our friends on the other side are missing is the value some of these entities have been given.

The only word that I have heard over and over again, as I have heard from the administration, I have heard from the Attorney General, the former Secretary of Health and Human Services, is one word. In fact, I think the English language has been limited to one word on the floor of the House: Obama. I like to call him President Barack Obama. That is the respect I give him.

Every legislative initiative has come forward on the shoulders of a man who finishes 8 years, might I say, with a great deal of respect.

So here is what the bill the people are opposed to will do:

This bill would not give dollars to those victims who are harmed and could engage in workplace monitoring, as well as other payments to remedy generalized harm, including remedies designed to prevent the recurrence of sexual violence or discrimination in the workplace.

They wouldn't give it to an environmental remedy project, such as needed cleanup efforts following the hazardous toxic pollutant spills that spoil protected areas, preventing families and children from enjoying recreation on State lands designed for public use.

They wouldn't give it to federally certified housing counseling intermediaries by preventing housing counseling, relief to communities that have been preyed upon by financial institutions that have broken the law.

I even hate to use the term "slush." They are dollars out of a consent decree that are managed and monitored by career professionals to those in need.

So I am opposed to the underlying bill, and I will offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I will also be on this floor offering letters opposing, again, not only this dastardly named legislation—who would want to see this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: slush fund—undermining, as I said, the professionalism of our career employees in

the DOJ and undermining American citizens and nonprofits who are working every day to make the life of America and America's children better.

This is a bad bill. Vote it down. It is not bipartisan. No Judiciary Committee Democrat saw fit for it to be legitimate.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 732, the "Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017."

The proposed legislation, as currently drafted, is intended to preclude all third-party payments in settlement agreements, other than restitution to identifiable victims.

Specifically, this legislation seeks to block federal law from including payments that provide relief in negotiated settlements to victims, such as in cases of predatory lending, employment discrimination and pollution through environmental hazardous.

For the average American, this harmful bill translates as thwarting settlement donations to legitimately harmed victims for:

1. Workplace monitoring, as well as, other payments to remedy generalized harm, including remedies designed to prevent the recurrence of sexual violence or discrimination in the workplace;

2. Environmental remedy projects, such as needed clean-up efforts following the hazardous, toxic pollutant spills that spoil protected areas, preventing families and children from enjoying recreation time on state lands designed for public use; or

3. Federally-certified housing counseling intermediaries by preventing housing counseling relief to communities that have been preyed upon by financial institutions that have broken the law.

This legislation fails to recognize the critical role and positive benefits that housing counseling organizations now play in addressing and ensuring that the discriminatory practices and abuses, like those that led to the housing and financial crisis, never happen again.

The Republican narrative suggests that this bill attempts to make technical changes to the way that courts operate; but in reality, for the everyday hard working American, this legislation along with its companion bills (H.R. 720, the "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act," and H.R. 725, the "Innocent Party Protection Act,") is merely a concerted effort to chip away at Americans' ability to seek justice and, therefore, must be opposed.

This legislation is intended to cut off proceeds from government settlements to "third-party" entities, which would stop a critical source of funding for the nonprofit sector—including public interest community organizations, foundations or trusts and other similar groups.

Oftentimes, allowing these monies to be available to third-parties is the best way to assure harmed persons will be made whole.

By barring government settlements from directing payments to non-profit organizations, this legislation would thereby hamstringing the parties' ability to fully remedy the wrongdoing underlying the lawsuit.

Congress lacks the time, expertise, and resources to properly review and make enforcement decisions on behalf of Federal agencies.

The cost of delays associated with this scheme would have devastating con-

sequences for the public health, environment, and local communities.

H.R. 732 would greatly strain Congress' already limited legislative resources and scarce time, while opening the doors to industry influence and obstruction in routine enforcement matters.

This legislation pushes the everyday hard working American to the margins of the justice system by requiring restitution only in cases with a showing of actual harm directly and proximately caused by the party making the payment.

The bill's definition excludes any payment by a party to provide restitution for, or otherwise, remedy the actual harm, directly and proximately caused by the alleged conduct of the party that is the basis for the settlement agreement, including payments requiring monitoring and other payments for generalized harm.

This exception is too narrowly drawn to allow for numerous beneficial uses of settlement monies, especially for vulnerable plaintiffs trying to access the courts in search of restitution from legitimate harm.

As you know, following the subprime meltdown, the U.S. Department of Justice pursued lawsuits against mortgage lenders and banks that engaged in discriminatory lending practices, such as those targeted by this legislation.

Research shows that African Americans and Latinos were discriminated against and steered into subprime loans even when they qualified for conventional loans.

Moreover, African Americans and Latinos were two to three times more likely than white homebuyers to receive subprime loans which resulted in foreclosure rates 10 times that of conventional loans.

Pursuant to the settlement agreements, available under current law, the Justice Department ordered that financial institutions dedicate a portion of their settlement payments to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) certified housing counseling intermediaries to provide consumer relief in the communities that were hit hardest.

HUD has approved thirty-seven housing counseling intermediaries that financial institutions have the discretion to choose as third-party providers of consumer relief under the terms of the Justice Department settlement agreements.

Additionally, these HUD-certified housing counseling providers deliver financial education and coaching to individuals to inform them of their home-buying options and rights, and to ensure they become and remain homeowners.

In fact, since 2008, 40 affiliates have provided housing counseling services—to date serving more than 200,000 clients in mostly underserved areas.

The success of housing counseling programs is undisputed.

Borrowers who have used housing counseling are one-third less likely to be seriously delinquent on their loan payments, and those who are in default are 60 percent more likely to save their homes.

The benefits of these programs are tangible and must continue to be made available to the public.

This example is particularly pertinent as Houston recovers from hurricane Harvey, a tragedy that displaced tens of thousands of my constituents.

There are still over 61 thousand people living in hotels throughout Texas.

The public has found itself in need of protection from environmental harms caused by absconding deep pocket defendants.

To ensure these protections, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) may request Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) in settlement agreements to offset the harms of unlawful conduct by requiring parties to undertake an environmentally beneficial project or activity that "is not required by law," but that a defendant agrees to undertake as part of the settlement of an enforcement action.

In workplace discrimination cases, victims are guarded by the Civil Rights Act passed by Congress in 1964 to remove discriminatory barriers and to promote equality in employment opportunities.

Cases, nonetheless, involving workplace discrimination claims often occur without identifiable victims and tend to affect the interests of persons who are not likely to receive compensation for unlawful conduct (e.g., unidentifiable victims such as former and future employees).

In these cases, a settling party that violated antidiscrimination laws may seek to resolve its civil liability through workplace monitoring or training programs that seek to remedy systemic unlawful conduct.

Furthermore, the claim that the funding received by organizations to provide home counseling services to harmed individuals amount to a "slush fund," is an egregious and shameless attempt to smear and impugn the integrity of longstanding and trusted nonprofits and civil rights organizations.

As the Justice Department has observed, remedies can correct both noncompliance and recidivism through settlement terms that require a party to undertake activity to prevent future misconduct.

Not only is this legislation an unnecessary intrusion into the province of the federal courts, it is a part of a larger push to limit Americans' ability to seek justice in a court of law.

An innocent-sounding name aside, this bill poses a grave threat to our court system—the nation's stronghold for protecting our democracy.

In the current political climate, where the justice system is the last line of defense for our nation's values, I urge my colleagues not to cede that ground.

Congress should applaud and elevate the benefits of housing counseling, and the good work of frontline organizations, in righting the injustices of the past and present.

The working men and women of America, as well as their families deserve fair and impartial access to real justice when major corporations, inadvertently as it may be, inflict harm.

It is our duty as guardians of the judicial system to ensure real restitution is available to all, including the most vulnerable.

For these reasons, I urge all Members to vote against H.R. 732.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from National Urban

League and a letter from Public Citizen.

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE,
New York, NY, February 1, 2017.

Re Opposition to H.R. 732—The Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
Ranking Member, Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE AND RANKING MEMBER CONYERS: As President and CEO of the National Urban League, the nation's largest historic civil rights organization dedicated to economic empowerment of African Americans and other underserved urban communities, I write to urge you to oppose H.R. 732, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017. This legislation seeks to block federal law enforcement from including in negotiated settlements payments that provide relief to victims of predatory lending. Specifically, the bill targets federally certified housing counseling intermediaries such as the National Urban League by preventing these organizations from providing housing counseling relief to communities that have been preyed upon by financial institutions that have broken the law. H.R. 732 fails to recognize the critical role and positive benefits that housing counseling organizations now play in addressing and ensuring that the discriminatory practices and abuses, like those that led to the housing and financial crisis, never happen again.

As you know, following the subprime meltdown, the U.S. Department of Justice pursued law suits against mortgage lenders and banks that engaged in discriminatory lending practices. Research shows that African Americans and Latinos were discriminated against and steered into subprime loans even when they qualified for conventional loans. Moreover, African Americans and Latinos were two to three times more likely than white homebuyers to receive subprime loans which resulted in foreclosure rates 10 times that of conventional loans. Pursuant to the settlement agreements, the Justice Department ordered that financial institutions dedicate a portion of their settlement payments to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) certified housing counseling intermediaries to provide consumer relief in the communities that were hit hardest.

The National Urban League is one of thirty-seven HUD-approved housing counseling intermediaries that financial institutions have the discretion to choose as third-party providers of consumer relief under the terms of the Justice Department settlement agreements. The National Urban League is accredited by the Better Business Bureau and has a 4-star rating from Charity Navigator, placing it in the top 10 percent of all U.S. charities for adhering to good governance, fiscal responsibility and other best practices.

As a HUD-certified housing counseling provider, the National Urban League successfully delivers financial education and coaching to individuals to inform them of their home-buying options and rights, and to ensure they become and remain homeowners. In fact, since 2008, 40 of our affiliates have provided housing counseling services—to date serving more than 200,000 clients in mostly underserved areas.

The success of housing counseling programs provided by National Urban League and others is undisputed. Borrowers who have used housing counseling are one-third

less likely to be seriously delinquent on their loan payments, and those who are in default are 60 percent more likely to save their homes. The benefits of these programs are tangible and must continue to be made available to the public.

On a separate note, it has come to my attention the National Urban League and National Council of La Raza have been singled out during recent hearings on this legislation. The claims made during congressional testimony that the funding received by our organizations to provide home counseling services amounts to a "slush fund," is an egregious and shameless attempt to smear and impugn the integrity of longstanding and trusted nonprofits and civil rights organizations. Congress should applaud and elevate the benefits of housing counseling, and the good work of frontline organizations, like the National Urban League, in righting the injustices of the past and present.

Therefore, I respectfully urge you to oppose H.R. 732 and any efforts to include similar provisions in legislation moving through Congress.

Sincerely,

MARC H. MORIAL,
President and CEO.

PUBLIC CITIZEN,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2017.

Re Oppose the assault on civil justice.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: On behalf of Public Citizen, a non-profit membership organization with more than 400,000 members and supporters nationwide, we express extreme opposition to a slate of three harmful bills scheduled to be marked-up in Committee tomorrow: the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2017 (H.R. 720), the Innocent Party Protection Party Act of 2017 (H.R. 725), and the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017 (H.R. 732). Seen separately, these bills attempt to make technical changes to the way that courts operate; taken together they are a concerted effort chip away at Americans' ability to seek justice and, therefore, must be opposed.

LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2017 (H.R. 720)

The proposed Rule 11 changes in H.R. 720 will make federal litigation more complicated, costly, and inaccessible to consumers and employees. We urge you to reject this legislation.

Currently, judges have discretion to impose sanctions on a lawyer or a party in litigation to deter sanctionable conduct in pleadings, motions, and other court papers. The so-called Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, or LARA, would revise Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to require sanctions, rather than leaving the decision whether to impose sanctions to the discretion of federal judges. This proposal would make litigation longer and more expensive.

The problems with this bill are not theoretical, but proven. In 1983, changes to Federal Rule 11 removed judicial discretion for issuing sanctions. Those changes were overturned a decade later, because the 1983 Rule caused a marked increase in business-to-business litigation and abusive Rule 11 motion practice by lawyers arguing more about sanctions than about the merits of the cases. Because 1983 changes proved to discourage lawyers from cooperating with each other, the changes prolonged litigation, rather than advancing the goal of coming to a just conclusion. We must not repeat this failed experiment.

Additionally, LARA would obstruct Americans' access to justice, especially in cases such as those alleging civil rights violations, as those types of cases can be based on novel legal theories. In those cases, LARA would chill the filing of meritorious suits, and justice for some will go unserved.

INNOCENT PARTY PROTECTION PARTY ACT OF
2017 (H.R. 725)

H.R. 725, the Innocent Party Protection Act (called the Fraudulent Joinder Protection Act in previous Congresses) is a supposed fix for an imagined problem. It addresses a federal district court's consideration of a plaintiff's motion to remand a case to state court, after a defendant has removed the case from the state court in which it was filed to federal district court on the theory that the plaintiff had fraudulently joined a non-diverse defendant for the purpose of defeating federal-court jurisdiction. The purpose of the bill is to assist defendants in keeping cases in federal court after removal. The bill purports to achieve this purpose by specifying that the federal court consider evidence, such as affidavits, and by specifying four findings that would require a federal district court to deny a plaintiff's motion to remand.

Congress should not get into the business of micro-managing the motion practice of the federal courts without strong evidence that current court procedures are not serving their purpose: facilitating justice. In this instance, there is no evidence to support the assumption that the district courts are not denying motions to remand in appropriate cases. Congress has no basis to revise the courts' procedures when the current standards are not producing unjust results. The Committee should hesitate before taking the step into micromanagement of the federal courts' consideration of one specific type of motion, where that motion has existed for more than a century and there are only the flimsiest of arguments in favor of changing it.

STOP SETTLEMENT SLUSH FUNDS ACT OF 2017
(H.R. 732)

This legislation is intended to cut off proceeds from government settlements to "third-party" entities, which would stop a critical source of funding for the nonprofit sector—including public interest community organizations, foundations or trusts and other similar groups.

The bill would bar government settlements from directing payment to non-profit organizations, thereby hamstringing the parties' ability to fully remedy the wrongdoing underlying the lawsuit. Oftentimes, allowing these monies to be available to third-parties is the best way to assure harmed persons will be made whole.

Not only are these three bills unnecessary intrusions into the province of the federal courts, they are part of a larger push to limit Americans' ability to seek justice in a court of law. Their innocent-sounding names aside, these bills pose a grave threat to our court system—the nation's stronghold for protecting our democracy. In the current political climate, where the justice system is the last line of defense for our nation's values, we urge you not to cede that ground.

Sincerely,

LISA GILBERT,
Director, Public Citizen's
Congress Watch division.

SUSAN HARLEY,
Deputy Director, Public Citizen's Congress Watch division.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman spoke quickly, and I know she had a lot of important information there. Some of it simply was wrong.

One of them is that she touched on environmental cleanup. Very clearly, nothing in this legislation would limit the cleanup related to the wrongdoing or the damage. Not so. A third party could be hired to do the cleanup.

Additionally, nothing stops a settlement from requiring a company to have counseling or other mitigation. It simply stops the Department of Justice from picking a charity of its choosing to go to do it.

Now what I would really like the gentlewoman—who may not be on the floor any longer—to understand is that the Department of Justice has grant authority and does multiple grants every single month of the year to some of the very same groups under its authority that these settlements are going toward. Congress has allowed it a certain amount of money to provide grants for general harm.

Additionally, every year, Congress allocates hundreds of millions of dollars to some of the very same groups and efforts the gentlewoman knows that we are talking about.

So, although her speech was quick, the thing that she said that may have misled some people here in the Chamber I think needs to be corrected. Direct harm will be mitigated. It can be done by anyone. A company can agree and be forced under supervision to mitigate and to hire people to help in that effort.

Very clearly, many of the groups being talked about here today already receive money through the grant process or through direct appropriation by Congress. That is the right way to do it. It is the reason this is a bipartisan bill and this is an effort by our Congress to make sure that we hold the reins of authority where they should be under the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish what the gentleman from California was saying was right, but as I listen to these tax cuts that are being talked about, many of these fine programs that help individuals from being thrown out of their house or in need of illegal aid are being cut back.

Each time I have seen on the floor the priorities of the party of the gentleman from California, I see that these essential, consumer-oriented not-for-profits are losing their funding.

So I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 732. This bill would tie the hands of prosecutors that

go after financial fraud, including the mortgage schemes that led to the 2008 crisis.

Apparently, my Republican colleagues have forgotten that not just Democrats, but all Americans, faced the negative effects of the mortgage fraud that led to the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Americans lost nearly \$13 trillion in wealth, the unemployment rate reached a high of 10 percent, and 11 million Americans lost their homes. We all saw business opportunities evaporate in our communities and good-paying jobs wither away.

To reverse these wrongs, the Obama administration reached record settlements with firms that engaged in fraud. Through these settlement agreements, the Department of Justice directed billions of dollars toward: number one, affordable housing initiatives, including downpayment programs that would help young people enter the housing market; number two, financial counseling programs that would help consumers avoid unsafe financial products; and number three, community development initiatives that would spur economic growth in rural and urban communities alike.

So I am baffled that my colleagues would want to prevent our prosecutors from ensuring fraudulent firms to right their wrongs.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEKS. This should not be a partisan issue, Mr. Chairman; not at all. Americans from the East, from the West, from the North, from the South, from middle America; Americans who are Democrats, Republicans, and Independents have all suffered as a result of what the Justice Department has done by fighting to make sure that we correct this wrong by fighting and winning decisions on making sure that those who have no voice, have a voice.

Many of the individuals who were funded here were giving a voice to the voiceless. Without that voice, those who have will continue to do and perpetuate the fraud that is committed upon many.

So this should not be a red issue; this should not be a blue issue. Just as former President Barack Obama said, this should be a red, white, and blue issue. It is a red, white, and blue issue where justice should be given a fair chance to prevail for all of America's people.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am putting this sign up not for the people in the Chamber, because people in the Chamber on the other side have continued to read the same talking points from their leadership that says there is no evidence.

This is in the record. This is a bigger part of it. So for the people in their of-

fices who will come down to vote, if there is not a motion to recommit, they are not going to get an opportunity to see this.

So I hope that they will look just now and realize this is one of those things you don't normally get. As Chairman GOODLATTE said, this is a smoking gun. This is a clear statement that an ideological bent against a non-profit was very specifically there, while other emails in the same chain of emails shows that they were picking who they wanted.

□ 1600

That is the politics that was going on. It is the politics we are trying to prevent. As I said in my previous statement, the Department of Justice is given a number of dollars for grant programs, and we may not always agree with how those grant programs are run, but we give them that.

Additionally, the Congress appropriates a tremendous amount of money, much of it going to the same groups. A little over 1½ years ago, 2 years ago, this body came together on the reauthorization on Violence Against Women, which has and will continue to do very good work in exactly the area that people are talking about.

This is the reason we have legislation before us today. We have had political activity that has been going on, according to the Democrats, by Republican Attorneys General; according to this document, by the last Attorneys General. The fact is, we need the legislation. We have to have it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I note that a broad coalition of public interest organizations, including Public Citizen, Americans for Financial Reform, the National Urban League, among others, strongly oppose H.R. 732. They warn: “This measure would undermine law enforcement goals by reducing the availability of suitable remedies to address these kind of injuries to the public caused by illegal conduct.”

This bill is, in effect, a gift to lawbreakers that comes at the expense of families and communities impacted by injuries that cannot be addressed by direct restitution, and so I have to ask: Why are we giving a gift to lawbreakers in the guise of H.R. 732?

If you value, as I do, upholding the rule of law, then you will join me and many others in opposing this seriously flawed measure.

I thank everyone who has participated in this discussion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I don't believe there is any question at all but that the minority has missed the point.

In no way, shape, or form are we changing. We intend to make sure the Department of Justice prosecutes wrongdoing, both criminal and civil.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) rightfully said we shouldn't have money paid in lieu of criminal prosecution; it should be both. I agree with him.

What we are dealing with here is a recognition that, under Republican and Democratic administrations, we have had mandatory donations that, in fact, went to charities, if you will, or organizations of the choice of those political entities. The fact is what we are doing is reining in—reining in—wrongdoing that is actual and has been observed, nothing more.

One of the challenges we face every day and one of the reasons I am imploring both sides to come together on this vote, one of the challenges we face is how much of our obligation we have ceded to the executive branch, often then only to be horrified when, behind closed doors, unelected, unaccountable people make decisions that would never be made on the House floor or the Senate floor, and this is one of them.

We are scrutinized when we pick non-profits to provide funding to on the left, on the right, or, if there is such a thing left in America, in the middle. We are scrutinized. But when we scrutinize the Department of Justice's action, according to my colleagues, under Republicans, there has been clear wrongdoing. According to the documents that we put in the RECORD today and showed on the floor, in the last administration, there was clear partisan politics.

We are simply saying, if they want to make that kind of a settlement, bring it to Congress; otherwise, it is very clear that they must—and I repeat, must—stop the action of taking money that would otherwise go to the victims and moving it to nondescript third parties of their choosing, no matter how benevolent they might be, including the Coast Guard Foundation. It can't continue to happen. We have to have the money that is in settlements flow to the victims or flow to the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FITZPATRICK). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 732

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON DONATIONS MADE PURSUANT TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES IS A PARTY.

(a) LIMITATION ON REQUIRED DONATIONS.—An official or agent of the Government may not enter into or enforce any settlement agreement on behalf of the United States, directing or providing for a payment or loan to any person or entity other than the United States, other than a payment or loan that provides restitution for or otherwise directly remedies actual harm (including to the environment) directly and proximately caused by the party making the payment or loan, or constitutes payment for services rendered in connection with the case or a payment pursuant to section 3663 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) PENALTY.—Any official or agent of the Government who violates subsection (a), shall be subject to the same penalties that would apply in the case of a violation of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) and (b) apply only in the case of a settlement agreement concluded on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “settlement agreement” means a settlement agreement resolving a civil action or potential civil action, a plea agreement, a deferred prosecution agreement, or a non-prosecution agreement.

(e) REPORTS ON SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning at the end of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit electronically to the Congressional Budget Office a report on each settlement agreement entered into by that agency during that fiscal year that directs or provides for a payment or loan to a person or entity other than the United States that provides restitution for or otherwise directly remedies actual harm (including to the environment) directly and proximately caused by the party making the payment or loan, or constitutes payment for services rendered in connection with the case, including the parties to each settlement agreement, the source of the settlement funds, and where and how such funds were and will be distributed.

(2) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection.

(3) SUNSET.—This subsection shall cease to be effective on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) ANNUAL AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning at the end of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Inspector General of each Federal agency shall submit a report to the Committees on the Judiciary, on the Budget and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, on any settlement agreement entered into in violation of this section by that agency.

(2) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-363. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the

report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-363.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 17, insert “and, to the extent any victim thereof was an identifiable person, suffered by the payee or lendee,” before “or constitutes”.

Page 3, insert after line 19 the following (and redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly):

(b) LIMITATION ON CY-PRÈS.—Amounts remaining after all claims have been satisfied shall be repaid proportionally to each party who contributed to the original payment.

Page 3, line 21, insert after “subsection (a)” the following: “or (b)”.

Page 4, line 1, strike “and (b)” and insert “(b), and (c)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017 prohibits settlements that provide for payments to nonvictim third parties. But what happens to leftover money if the settlement does not specifically provide for its disposition?

It turns out that this situation is ripe for abuse.

In 2013, a shocking New York Times expose revealed that the Obama administration bilked over a billion dollars from the taxpayer-funded Judgment Fund and handed it to special interests. The case, called Keepseagle, concerned claims against the Department of Agriculture.

The settlement, spearheaded by then Assistant Attorney General Anthony West, vastly overstated the number of claims against the government. One result was a \$60 million windfall for the plaintiff's lawyer, who was on President Obama's transition team the year before.

The other result was \$380 million in funds left over. This was taxpayer money. But instead of demanding it back, the Department of Justice agreed to direct it to nonvictim third parties to be selected by the same plaintiff's lawyer and member of President Obama's transition team. This, quite rightly, troubled the presiding judge.

My amendment would close this loophole by requiring that money left over after all victims have been compensated must be returned to wherever it came from.

This amendment also clarifies that permitted remedial payments must go to victims who suffered the injuries on which plaintiffs' claims are based. This prevents situations in which a payment is classified as remedial but is directed to an intermediary.

The abuses of power that I outlined today in the settlement context are truly disturbing. This is our opportunity to stop the abuse. We should be as comprehensive as possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, Members of the House, this amendment makes a bad bill even worse. To begin with, it would prohibit cy-pres distributions pursuant to which parties attempt to find the next best use of funds that remain after a class action settlement has been finally administered. Cy-pres is especially important in actions where the recovery is so small for an individual class member that he or she may not bother to make a claim or where a distribution is not practical.

For example, courts under cy-pres may permit unclaimed settlement funds to provide indirect compensation to the class, such as future price reductions or remediation efforts. As a result of this amendment, however, the unclaimed settlement funds would be returned to the very entities that caused the injury in the first place. Simply put, this amendment would benefit the wrongdoers to the detriment of the victims they harmed.

In addition, this amendment would restrict the amount of compensation a victim could receive under a settlement agreement to the extent the victim was actually harmed by the wrongdoer. The amendment completely ignores the pragmatic realities of systemic harms, such as widespread long-term or latent environmental damage like lead-contaminated public water drinking systems—think of Flint, Michigan—where the extent of a victim's exposure to such harms may be difficult and, perhaps, even impossible to quantify.

In a letter opposed to this amendment, a group of public interest organizations, including Earthjustice, Public Citizen, Alliance for Justice, the Center for Justice & Democracy, and the American Association for Justice, said it is terrible public policy because wrongdoers would benefit from a windfall for cheating and harming consumers, undoing the accountability or

deterrence function of the entire settlement. This is absolutely the wrong result, and so I urge that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment which strengthens the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-363.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert after "settlement agreement" the following: "(except as provided in subsection (g))".

Add at the end of the bill the following:

(g) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of this Act do not apply in the case of a settlement agreement in relation to discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, or any other protected category.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the reason I have this amendment is because I don't think the bill is a good bill, and it shouldn't affect settlement agreements on the basis of race, religion, national origin, or any other protected category.

I was kind of shocked that it was put in order; I will be even more shocked if it passes. But the reality is it doesn't make any difference because this bill isn't going anywhere in the Senate.

□ 1615

Most of what we do in the Judiciary Committee is highly partisan matters that won't go anywhere in the Senate. We are one of the four committees of jurisdiction that can deal with matters dealing with the White House, with Russian interference in our election, and with issues concerning obstruction of justice and the firing of James Comey with Emoluments Clause violations, abuse of power, and attacks on the judiciary.

The Senate and House Intelligence Committees have investigations. So does the Senate Judiciary Committee. Only our committee has done absolutely nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Today, Senator JEFF FLAKE, a gentleman who I served with in the House and a man of moral rectitude, said he cannot continue to serve in the Senate

because to be quiet on issues concerning the White House in relation to decency, truth, and other matters would involve complicity. He couldn't remain complicit.

By our committee not taking any actions concerning activities in the White House, we are complicit. We should be the most responsible committee in the Congress because we are the people's House, and we have the judiciary, the FBI, and elections all within our purview, yet we have remained silent.

Part of the reason that has been said is because other groups are investigating. Well, we are the group that should be doing the investigating because we are the people's House. We don't not take up bills like this because the Senate is not going to pass them. We take them up all the time, throw them over there, and they don't come back.

So I am distraught by the fact that my friend JEFF FLAKE, who is one of the finest people I have served with, a man of rectitude, is not going to run for reelection. He wasn't a knee-jerk Republican, just like BOB CORKER is not a knee-jerk Republican. And both have said many truths today about what is going on in the executive branch.

We are an equal branch of government that has responsibility to be a check and balance, and the House Judiciary Committee has that responsibility. I once again call on the chairman of the committee to hold hearings on elections, on Russian interference in our elections, on threats to our democracy, on violations of the Emoluments Clause, obstruction of justice, and the firing of the FBI Director.

The FBI is under our charge. We should have hearings. We should have hearings on emoluments. We should have hearings on all of these issues and not be complicit. Being complicit is the same as being guilty.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that we pass the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is unnecessary because it would exempt certain discrimination settlements from the bill's ban on third-party payments. But nothing in the underlying bill prevents a victim of discrimination from obtaining relief, and that is the important point.

The Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2016 explicitly permits remedial payments to third-party victims who are directly and proximately harmed by the defendant's wrongdoing. Nor does the bill preclude wider conduct remedies used in discrimination cases.

For example, nothing in the bill bars the Department of Justice from requiring a defendant to implement workplace training and monitoring programs. The ban on third-party payments merely ensures that the defendant remains responsible for performing these tasks itself and is not forced to outsource set sums for the work to third parties who might be friendly with a given administration.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 115-363.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert after "settlement agreement" the following: "(except as provided in subsection (g))".

Add at the end of the bill the following:

(g) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of this Act do not apply in the case of a settlement agreement that directs funds to remediate the indirect harms caused by unlawful conduct, including the intentional bypassing, defeating, or rendering inoperative a required element of a vehicle's emissions control system in violation of section 203 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7522).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to this so-called Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act. It is not a slush fund at all. It is a fund that goes to compensate people who are harmed due to the wrongdoing of mostly large multinational corporations. So this is misnamed. It talks about a slush fund. There is no slush fund involved here.

This is an unwise and odious bill. What my amendment would do would be to exempt cases concerning manipulations of emissions standards from the harshness of this bill. In other words, the Federal Government, through the EPA, could institute a lawsuit against a firm or company, large multinational

foreign company like Volkswagen, as it did a couple of years ago, and obtain benefits that would accrue to not just the direct recipients of the harm from Volkswagen, but also to society at large that was harmed by Volkswagen's fraudulent activity.

What happened was that Volkswagen sold about 590,000 diesel-powered vehicles here in the United States. These vehicles were supposed to conform with U.S. law insofar as emissions standards are concerned. What Volkswagen did was put a mechanism in the cars that would defeat the ability of the regulators who wanted to check to find out whether or not the vehicles complied with emissions standards. So Volkswagen cheated. They sold 590,000—almost 600,000—vehicles on America's roads that were unknowingly polluting the very air that all of us breathe. So we all suffered a harm as a result of Volkswagen's fraud. But there were 590,000 vehicle owners who had to be protected as well.

So the EPA sued Volkswagen. Volkswagen knew they were wrong. They settled the case. It was about \$15 billion. That shows you how much money they have and how much money they are trying to protect here with this bill. The \$15 billion was to go to compensate the aggrieved vehicle owners as well as society at large for the harm that was done due to the fraudulent conduct.

Now, what this legislation would do would be to cut the ability of the U.S. Government to sue a corporate wrongdoer and receive benefits that it would then put into the hands of the individuals who were harmed, as well as to rectify the harm done to society.

This amendment would exempt this kind of case, the Volkswagen case, from the harsh restrictions of this legislation. So I would ask, in the interest of our environmental consciousness, that this body would vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unnecessary because it would exempt settlements that direct funds to remedy indirect harm resulting from violations of the Clean Air Act and other violations. But that is precisely the problem.

How best to address indirect harm is a policy question that is properly decided by the elected representatives of Congress only and not by agency bureaucrats or prosecutors.

An example that highlights this is the \$2.7 billion mitigation fund that the Department of Justice required in its settlement of claims against Volkswagen. That fund mitigated direct

harm, which is permitted under this bill.

The problem was that, through a second fund, the Obama Justice Department required Volkswagen to spend an additional \$2 billion on an administration electric vehicle initiative after Congress twice refused to appropriate funds for it. It is that subversion of Congress' power of the purse that this bill is designed to target. Nothing in this bill lets corporate polluters off the hook, and it is nonsense to say otherwise.

If direct remediation of the harm is impossible or impractical, the full penalty is still paid, but it goes to the Treasury. After that, the decision on how best to use it is left to the people's elected representatives in Congress rather than the executive branch.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it is nonsense to say that this bill protects corporate polluters and corporate wrongdoers—that is what we just heard—and that the amendment is unnecessary because it addresses indirect harm, and that indirect harm should be addressed by not bureaucrats in the EPA, but by Congress.

Now, we all know how gridlocked Congress has been over the years. There has been nothing coming out of this Congress. I predict they won't even be able to do—they couldn't do repeal and replace. They were at it for 9 months, stalled everything else out, couldn't do repeal and replace. So now they are on comprehensive, what they call, tax reform, which is only tax breaks for the top 1 percent when you peel everything back.

They are not going to be able to do that because my friends in the Freedom Caucus will prevent them from adding \$1.5 trillion to the national debt. I support them in that endeavor. They can count on my vote for that.

But this is nonsense, ladies and gentlemen. We have to stop protecting these corporate wrongdoers and put the hands back into the courts and to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the gentleman a question.

You made reference to the decision of—I forget the word you used to describe bureaucrats.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I have the script right here. Let me tell you how I define them.

I don't know. Bureaucrats. You tell me.

Mr. CICILLINE. I think you said some pejorative word describing bureaucrats.

But I just want to ask the gentleman—the settlements that are described or the subject of this legislation, of course, are settlements that would require court approval and enforcement. So I think in fairness, when you say it is so that a bureaucrat doesn't get to decide this, this is pursuant to litigation which the parties come to an agreement that then the court must approve.

So this is really about respecting the ability of the court to assess the propriety of a judgment. And I think there was a very famous decision where one of the courts said the purpose of the Clean Water Act was not to endow the Treasury, but to prevent harm. So the idea is not just to generate money for the government, but to actually remediate and respond to the harm that was caused by the corporate wrongdoer.

I think that is why Mr. JOHNSON's amendment is important, brilliant, and deserves our support.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time about the brilliant amendment, it is, again, not necessary.

And in response to the question, the court does not always approve every one of these; and that is the point.

The gist of this amendment and the purpose of the bill is to restore and strengthen our Article I power under the Constitution. You may not like the way Congress operates, you may not like all of the decisions that are made here, but in their infinite wisdom, this is how the Founders designed our system. It has worked very well, and it will continue to do so. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 115-363.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert after "settlement agreement" the following: "(other than an excepted settlement agreement)".

Page 4, strike line 4, and insert the following:

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term "excepted settlement agreement" means a settlement agreement that pertains to providing restitution for a State.

(2) The term "settlement agreement"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I think, when we come to the floor, we are obligated to as much educate our colleagues who may be back in their offices or in meetings as it is to educate the general public.

□ 1630

The name of this bill is distorted and incorrect. I think it is important to note what happens when the Department of Justice engages in lawsuits on behalf of the American people, and they are the American people's lawyer, or they are sued.

In many instances, there is something called a consent decree and a settlement that generates funds that can be utilized for the betterment of the American people.

So why don't you view this side of the aisle with the betterment of the American people because we are questioning legislation that would eliminate the opportunity for those who are doing good work to be funded by career professionals in the Justice Department.

So the basis of this bill is to throw this money over into the Congress, of which I have great respect in terms of its Article I powers, requiring a congressional appropriation for each beneficiary fund established as relief in a lawfully negotiated settlement to victims, such as in the case of predatory lending, employment discrimination, pollution, environmental hazards, and would greatly strain Congress' already limited legislative resources and scarce time.

They want us to now, line by line, disseminate these funds that can be done by career professionals dealing with improving on the issue upon which the government was sued. It opens the doors to industry influence and obstruction.

I don't believe we have earmarks anymore. I happen to be a supporter of getting moneys to the community. We don't have an appropriations bill now, we don't have a budget now. So it is almost November, and the Congress has not yet appropriated funds to run the government nor have they passed a budget. That would be the maze of which you would throw a very proficient process of allowing these funds to be distributed.

The Jackson Lee amendment would exempt from this confused bill settlement agreements that would provide restitution to States that are not par-

ties to the litigation. That means, for example, after Hurricane Harvey, there was an explosion at the Arkema chemical plant. Nine trailers exploded and several first responders went to the hospital. I would want to seek funds to be able to help them.

We also understand that there are many organizations representing the people. Public Citizen, a nonprofit membership organization, they are against it. The Urban League is against it. The counties have issued a resolution, local counties. They are against it.

I think there is no clearer evidence to vote this particular bill down, but to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would exempt settlements providing restitution to a State, the idea presumably being that the State could then distribute money as it sees fit for generalized harm to its citizens, but nothing in this bill prevents Congress from making block grants to States to address generalized harm. Indeed, Congress regularly appropriates money to States to deal with challenges, including environmental cleanups. Examples of this include the EPA Superfund and the Brownfields grants.

This bill merely insists that decisions on when such grants are appropriate and in what amounts, that those decisions be made by accountable representatives in Congress and not agency bureaucrats and prosecutors.

Compensating direct victims is a job for the Justice Department. Broader projects are a policy question that should be decided by Congress.

Mr. Chair, accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, this is my very point. My very point is a transparent and clear system of distribution of funds, and the career professionals determining what entities need those funds is a clearer system than what would occur if moneys were dumped onto Congress outside of the normal budgetary and appropriations process, of which we are having a very difficult time as we speak.

The process that we have now, my amendment says that these settlement agreements that provide restitution to States that are not parties to the litigation, they shouldn't be covered by the elimination of the right for the career professionals to distribute these funds.

It also acknowledges the respect for the Congress and the work that it has to do, but it also acknowledges counties like Jefferson County, Texas, the

resolution to the National Association of Counties. They are against this bill because it would disallow funds derived from court settlements for injuries to the environment from being distributed to States, counties, and parishes, borrowers in proximity to the pollution event. These are real people representing real people right on the ground asking for us to not pass this legislation.

I would say to my good friend, why don't we use our Article I powers to begin investigations on the separation of powers relevant to the administration and its actions. Why don't we begin looking at whether there are high crimes and misdemeanors.

I mean, there are many things that our Article I powers can do, but, in this instance, I think that this has not proven to be a failure, and the only failure in it is the obsession that my friends have with the past administration.

I want to have something that has worked for the county governments, people who live in counties and cities and States. If they were harmed during Hurricane Harvey, for example, by an explosion and 23 first responders went to the hospital and many houses were evacuated, I believe it would be appropriate to leave the system in which those dollars can go directly to those counties and cities and States and to improve the quality of life.

Mr. Chair, I ask my friends to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, the proposed legislation, as currently drafted, could be construed to preclude all third-party payments in settlement agreements, other than restitution to identifiable victims.

Requiring a congressional appropriation for each beneficiary fund established as relief in a lawfully negotiated settlement to victims, such as in cases of predatory lending, employment discrimination and pollution through environmental hazardous, would greatly strain Congress' already limited legislative resources and scarce time, while opening the doors to industry influence and obstruction in routine enforcement matters.

Congress lacks the time, expertise, and resources to properly review and make enforcement decisions on behalf of Federal agencies.

The cost of delays associated with this scheme would have devastating consequences for the public health, environment, and local communities.

Accordingly, the Jackson Lee Amendment would except cases where funds are directed to states to remediate the generalized harm of unlawful conduct beyond harms to identifiable victims.

Specifically, the Jackson Lee Amendment would exempt from H.R. 732 settlement agreements that provide restitution to states that are not parties to litigation.

As you know, following the subprime meltdown, the U.S. Department of Justice pursued lawsuits against mortgage lenders and banks that engaged in discriminatory lending practices, such as those targeted by this legislation.

Research shows that African Americans and Latinos were discriminated against and steered into subprime loans even when they qualified for conventional loans.

Moreover, African Americans and Latinos were two to three times more likely than white homebuyers to receive subprime loans which resulted in foreclosure rates 10 times that of conventional loans.

Pursuant to the settlement agreements, available under current law, the Justice Department ordered that financial institutions dedicate a portion of their settlement payments to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) certified housing counseling intermediaries to provide consumer relief in the communities that were hit hardest.

HUD has approved 37 housing counseling intermediaries that financial institutions have the discretion to choose as third-party providers of consumer relief under the terms of the Justice Department settlement agreements.

Additionally, these HUD-certified housing counseling providers deliver financial education and coaching to individuals to inform them of their home-buying options and rights, and to ensure they become and remain homeowners.

In fact, since 2008, 40 affiliates have provided housing counseling services—to date serving more than 200,000 clients in mostly underserved areas.

The success of housing counseling programs is undisputed.

Borrowers who have used housing counseling are one-third less likely to be seriously delinquent on their loan payments, and those who are in default are 60 percent more likely to save their homes.

The benefits of these programs are tangible and must continue to be made available to the public.

This example is particularly pertinent as Houston recovers from hurricane Harvey, a tragedy that displaced tens of thousands of my constituents.

There are still over 61 thousand people living in hotels throughout Texas.

Under current law, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) may include Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) in settlement agreements to offset the harms of unlawful conduct by requiring parties to undertake an environmentally beneficial project or activity that "is not required by law," but that a defendant agrees to undertake as part of the settlement of an enforcement action.

In 2012, the EPA and Justice Department resolved the civil liability of MOEX Offshore through a settlement agreement resulting from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, that included funds to several Gulf states, including Texas, where Texas was not a party to the complaint, but received \$3.25 million for SEPs and other responsive actions.

H.R. 732, would prohibit these agreements and many of the important benefits now provided by EPA.

The bill's definition excludes, "any payment by a party to provide restitution for or otherwise remedy the actual harm (including to the environment), directly and proximately caused by the alleged conduct of the party that is the basis for the settlement agreement."

This exception is too narrowly drawn to allow for numerous beneficial uses of settlement monies.

Thus, for example, the bill would appear to ban the following entirely legitimate, appropriate uses of settlement funds that are currently permitted by EPA:

(1) Pollution prevention projects that improve plant procedures and technologies, and/or operation and maintenance practices, that will prevent additional pollution at its source;

(2) Environmental restoration projects including activities that protect local ecosystems from actual or potential harm resulting from the violation;

(3) Facility assessments and audits, including investigations of local environmental quality, environmental compliance audits, and investigations into opportunities to reduce the use, production, and generation of toxic materials;

(4) Programs that promote environmental compliance by promoting training or technical support to other members of the regulated community; and

(5) Projects that provide technical assistance or equipment to a responsible state or local emergency response entity for purposes of emergency planning or preparedness.

Each of these programs provide important protections of human health and the environment in communities that have been harmed by environmental violations.

However, because they are unlikely to be construed as redressing "actual (environmental) harm, directly and proximately caused" by the alleged violator, the bill before this committee would prohibit every one of them.

On August 31, 2017, in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey, dangerous chemicals at the Arkema chemical facility in Crosby, Texas, exploded and burned.

Nine trailers at the plant contained organic peroxides that first exploded and burned, sending 23 first responders to the hospital. In addition, despite a 1½ mile radius evacuation from the chemical releases, dozens of residents were effected for days by the noxious fumes, including headaches, dizziness, vomiting, and burning eyes.

This recent incident is a prime example of how restitution to a community under an enforcement settlement should work. EPA should (not sure if they are) engage in enforcement activities against Arkema, including civil fines and restitution to the community. There were clear health impacts on many in the community and a settlement could, as an example, fund health care assistance short term, or even long term monitoring of lung health. However, if H.R. 732 were law, only first responders would likely have the ability to seek restitution. This is not okay. It utterly fails to help make a community whole after such a terrible event.

Background facts:

23 first responders were sent to the hospital due to exposure to chemical fumes.

Residents within a 1½ mile radius were asked to evacuate, though in this low-income neighborhood in the aftermath of the storm, many were unable to.

Congressman TED POE (R-TX), and original cosponsor of H.R. 732 and representative of

the district that plant and affected community are located in, at the time told ABC News as events were unfolding that the situation was “very dangerous . . . (and) . . . the worst-case scenario is that this chemical plant could explode.”

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Jackson Lee Amendment.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON THE STOP
SETTLEMENT SLUSH FUNDS ACT

A resolution from Jefferson County, Texas to the National Association of Counties seeking to maintain the status quo for states, counties, parishes and boroughs being able to receive damages payments for environmental crimes in proximity to them (e.g., Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon).

Issue: H.R. 732, a bill that may restrict or disallow Department of Justice Supplemental Environmental Plans from benefiting states, counties, parishes and boroughs in proximity to pollution events that result in court settlements for environmental damages.

Proposed Policy: The National Association of Counties (NACo) opposes any provisions within the final version of H.R. 732 that would disallow funds derived from court settlements for injuries to the environment from being distributed to states, counties, parishes and boroughs in proximity to the pollution event.

Background: On Jan 30, 2017, Representative Goodlatte, along with 34 other cosponsors, introduced the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017 (H.R. 732) which could ban or restrict the current practice involving Supplemental Environmental Projects’ distribution of court settlement proceeds to states, counties, parishes and boroughs.

H.R. 732 has been referred to the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Committee and assigned to the Regulatory Reform, Commercial & Antitrust Law Subcommittee.

Members of the Committee are unclear about H.R. 732’s provisions relating to payments to remediate direct harm, including environmental harm, done by defendant’s wrongful activity.

This is particularly important in the environmental context, in which the injury to the environment may be diffuse and there may be no identifiable victims.

Currently, the U.S. Department of Justice and the Congress may both have roles in determining eligibility for states, counties, parishes and boroughs in proximity to a pollution event for receiving funds from a settlement agreement.

H.R. 732 is unclear on this issue, prompting dissenting opinions about whether the bill prevents states, counties, parishes and boroughs in proximity to pollution events (e.g., the Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon oil spills) from receiving funds derived from court settlements.

NACo should oppose any provision in H.R. 732 that modifies or restricts current practice in distributing proceeds from court settlement agreements for environmental damage events.

Fiscal/Urban/Rural Impact: Congressional concurrence with this NACo resolution upholds the status quo practice in court settlement agreements for environmental events.

Sponsor: Jeff R. Branick, Judge, Jefferson County, Texas

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I would just respond to my

learned colleague by quoting a renowned liberal legal scholar, the late Abner Mikva, who explained in a law review article back in 1986, that even if it were less efficient to go through Congress, that would be no reason to cede the point of principle. This is what he wrote:

“To ensure that Congress would act as the first branch of government, the constitutional Framers gave the legislature virtually exclusive power to control the Nation’s purse strings. . . . They knew that the power of the purse was the most far-reaching and effectual of all governmental powers. . . . Doubtless they understood that a collection of diverse individuals representing diverse interests . . . would less efficiently and less coherently devise fiscal policy than would a single ‘treasurer’ or ‘fiscal czar.’ Yet they chose, for good reason, to suffer this cost and bear its risks.”

That is from a liberal legal scholar, and, of course, conservatives agree.

The system that the Founders set up, the reason and purpose for Article I, is to allow these major decisions to be made by the elected Representatives of Congress, and, for that reason, we oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DONOVAN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 115-363.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert after “settlement agreement” the following: “(except as provided in subsection (g))”.

Add at the end of the bill the following:

(g) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of this Act do not apply in the case of a settlement agreement that resolves the criminal or civil liability of a financial institution for the predatory or fraudulent packaging, securitization, marketing, sale and issuance of residential mortgage-backed securities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which would exempt from H.R. 732 any settlement agreement that directs funds to reduce the effects of the mortgage foreclosure crisis through foreclosure prevention assistance programs.

There is little debate that predatory and fraudulent activity in the residential mortgage securities market was the primary cause of the mortgage foreclosure crisis.

As U.S. District Court Judge Max Cogburn observed in 2014, one need not “be an expert in economics to take notice that it was the trading of toxic RMBS”—residential mortgage-backed securities—“between financial institutions that nearly brought down the banking system in 2008.”

The financial crisis blighted entire cities and communities, resulting in more than 13 million Americans losing their homes between 2006 and 2014, an average of 850,000 per year.

Beyond the life-changing hardship and stress placed on families by unlawful conduct in the housing market, the exponential rise in foreclosures imposed significant external costs on families and communities across the Nation.

Fraudulent activity in the housing market depressed home and commercial real estate values, undermined economic development and municipal revenue, deprived communities of public services, and resulted in increases of violent crime in communities of significant foreclosure activity.

Leading studies have also documented the contagious effects of foreclosures, and not just the neighborhood immediately affected by the foreclosures, but nearby vicinities as well, underscoring the diffuse and systemic impacts of unlawful mortgage securities practices.

In response to the financial crisis, President Obama announced in 2012, the creation of an investigatory unit within the Justice Department to: “. . . hold accountable those who broke the law, speed assistance to homeowners, and help turn the page on an era of recklessness that hurt so many Americans.”

This unit secured more than \$40 billion in civil penalties, compensation, and consumer relief through settlement with five financial institutions for alleged misconduct involving the packaging, marketing, and sale of residential mortgage-backed securities.

Geoffrey Graber, who directed this effort within the Justice Department, testified in 2015 that these settlements meaningfully addressed the vicious cycle of harm caused by fraud in the housing market by achieving accountability from financial institutions that engaged in wrongdoing related to residential mortgage-backed securities, and to the extent possible, bringing some measure of relief to homeowners

who suffered as a result of the financial crisis.

In addition to civil penalties, these settlements included statements of fact describing the pervasive fraud that permeated the mortgage market. In just one example, a bank employee stated that he would not be surprised if half of these loans went down, and that the banks should start praying.

The settlements also included consumer relief provisions designed to enable many Americans to stay in their homes by directing funds to distressed homeowners, community reinvestment and stabilization, and income-based lending for borrowers who lost homes to foreclosure.

The Department's settlement with Citigroup and Bank of America additionally directed \$50 million in funds to charitable housing council programs and legal aid organizations to provide counsel to homeowners entitled to relief under the settlement because they were directly affected by the fraudulent and predatory conduct of the settling banks.

As the Center for American Progress has noted, these funds account for less than 1 percent of the overall amount of each settlement, and will support services provided by housing counselors and other trusted intermediaries that enable consumers to access the consumer relief to which they are entitled under the settlements.

We should be doing everything in our power to keep American families in their homes and off the streets, not letting big banks off the hook for their predatory and fraudulent practices, and so I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment that will address this very important issue.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, this amendment would exempt settlements resolving allegations of predatory or fraudulent conduct involving residential mortgage-backed securities, as we have heard. Ironically, it creates an exception in the very situation in which the abuses we highlighted earlier arose.

The key point here is that nothing in the underlying bill prevents direct victims of mortgage fraud from obtaining relief.

The concern of this amendment is that there may be cases of generalized harm to communities that cannot be addressed by restitution, but this misses the fundamental point.

The Department of Justice has authority to obtain redress for victims. Federal law defines victims to be those "directly and proximately harmed" by the defendant's acts.

Once those victims have been compensated, deciding whether additional moneys, other than for penalties, should be allocated to address related problems becomes a policy question properly decided by elected representatives in Congress and not agency bureaucrats or prosecutors.

Indeed, Congress already funds homeowner assistance programs through the annual appropriations process, balancing it against competing priorities.

As we have repeated throughout this debate, the spending power is one of Congress' most effective tools in reining in the executive branch. This is true, by the way, no matter which party is in the White House.

This amendment would weaken that essential congressional power, and, for that reason, we urge Members to oppose it on institutional grounds.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, if I might just say briefly, the notion that Congress can just do these appropriations itself sort of misses the point. It is the responsibility of Article III courts to hear disputes, supervise litigation, and enforce settlements.

It is an odd moment for Congress to take on the work of another branch of government when we can't even do our own work here.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my friend, for yielding.

Mr. Chair, this is a subject that I think we have a great deal of experience on in this country. It is only a decade since the housing crisis wreaked havoc, not just on individual families, but on whole communities.

□ 1645

The notion that one of the available tools that we can deploy to deal with the consequence of this sort of predatory activity by going right at the source of that predation and require them to supply the resources to offset the impact of that activity is something that we really ought to think carefully about.

Mr. Chair, mortgage foreclosures wreck families, but also wreck communities. We ought to use every tool we can to prevent them by ensuring that individuals know and have access to the resources they need in order to prevent this from happening again. The impact is devastating, and we ought to do everything we can to prevent it from happening again.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I would just respond by saying that those compelling policy arguments should be made appropriately in this Chamber, and it is the elected representatives of the people in this

Chamber who can make those fateful decisions. There may be good arguments. There may be things that we need to do, but the point is that we are the persons who have the constitutional authority to make those decisions, not bureaucrats, not prosecutors.

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 115-363.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert after "settlement agreement" the following: "(except as provided in subsection (g))".

Add at the end of the bill the following:

(g) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of this Act do not apply in the case of a settlement agreement that directs funds to remediate the indirect harms caused by unlawful conduct resulting in an increase in the amount of lead in public drinking water.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt from H.R. 732 settlement agreements that direct funds to remediate the indirect but catastrophic effects of unlawful conduct resulting in lead contamination in public drinking water.

Lead contamination in public drinking water is potentially a national public health crisis as older cities continue to rely on aging lead pipes for the delivery of public drinking water.

A report from the American Water Works Association estimates that this problem could potentially affect millions of water service lines. For example, Highland Park, located in my district, has been dealing with issues resulting from aging lead pipes. Just last month, officials closed public water fountains and fixtures due to unsafe samples of lead in public drinking water.

The well-publicized Flint water crisis is another painful example of the disastrous consequences of lead contamination in public drinking water.

The director of the pediatric residents at Hurley Children's Hospital in Flint wrote: "To understand the contamination of this city, think about drinking water through a straw coated in lead. As you sip, lead particles flake off into the water and are ingested. Flint's children have been drinking water through lead-coated straws."

The Flint water crisis has generated numerous lawsuits by individuals, local and State agencies, and public interest organizations such as the Natural Resources Defense Council and the American Civil Liberties Union.

While these cases tend to involve numerous victims directly affected by unlawful conduct, they can also affect the interests of persons who are not parties to the case or are likely to receive compensation for unlawful conduct.

Given the systemic nature of lead contamination in drinking water, settlement agreements resolving civil and criminal liability related to the Flint water crisis may require setting aside funds for unidentifiable victims, directing payments to address generalized harm, or establishing an environmental compliance program to avoid lead contamination in the future.

Unfortunately, these entirely legitimate forms of indirect remediation of environmental harms would be prohibited by H.R. 732.

Mr. Chair, accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, this amendment undercuts Congress' power. It is another attempt to do so, and it should be opposed for that reason.

It would exempt settlements that direct funds to remedy indirect harm resulting from lead in drinking water. It is a terrible problem. The amendment is forced to focus on indirect harm because nothing in the bill prevents remediation of direct harm.

But settlement provisions addressing indirect harm are precisely why this bill is needed. The bill's guiding principle is that once direct victims have been compensated, deciding the best use of additional funds to address related problems—whether that is addressing indirect harms or otherwise—is, again, a policy question properly decided by elected representatives in Congress and not agency bureaucrats or prosecutors.

We have proven the point. Last year, Congress actually acted on this. Congress appropriated \$120 million to address drinking water problems in Flint, Michigan. If there is further need, Congress can make additional appropriations. The Department of Justice should not be permitted to augment

those funding decisions entirely outside of the congressional appropriations and oversight processes because they are important to protect and preserve.

Again, the spending power is one of Congress' most effective tools in rein-ing in the executive branch, and we cannot afford to weaken that essential congressional power.

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I urge all Members to oppose this amendment on institutional grounds, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and particularly for this thoughtful amendment. I am from Flint; born and raised in Flint. I represent Flint. I was here on the floor and I was the one pushing for the legislation that the gentleman on the other side mentioned that provided \$120 million to help offset the cost of this terrible tragedy.

When I introduced the first legislation, we calculated what the total direct and indirect cost was: \$1.5 billion.

Now, here is the point: again, we ought not put a community like Flint in the position of having to depend on this Congress to fully fund the total cost of that recovery, or another community that might be facing a similar situation.

If the gentleman is sincere that Congress can act to help offset the incredible indirect costs that my home community is facing, then I would suggest the gentleman join me in my effort to do just that. So far, Congress has not done that.

The notion that we would exempt the people of Flint from access to the resources that could be determined by a court as being part of the justice that they deserve is not an act that we ought to engage in.

Flint, as sad as this case is, is not an anomaly. Flint is a warning, and when we need to make sure we heed that warning.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I would just respond by saying that no tragedy, however sad and however large, justifies us deviating from our Constitution, from the way the Founders set up this system and the way that this body operates. There is a reason that these responsibilities were given to us as Members of Congress. Each of us has the same challenge. When there is a tragedy or a mishap or a natural disaster or anything that affects our districts, our job is to come here and convince a sufficient number of our colleagues to support those appropriations to handle those measures. The system is designed with safeguards in place. It is designed so that the interests of the entire Na-

tion can be represented here in this Chamber. For that reason, this amendment would bypass that. It would bypass the design. It would bypass article I, and it would create a whole different way of governing. We simply can't allow that.

Mr. Chair, this is about preserving the original intent of the Constitution, preserving the power of this body. For that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115-363 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CONYERS of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 233, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

AYES—187

Adams	Bonamici	Capuano
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Carbajal
Beatty	F.	Cárdenas
Bera	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Beyer	Brown (MD)	Cartwright
Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)
Blumenauer	Bustos	Castro (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Butterfield	Chu, Judy

Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman

Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell

NOES—233

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher

Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan

Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rice
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus

Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rice
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Barragán
Bass
Bridenstine
Burgess
Huizenga
Joyce (OH)
Long

□ 1721

Messrs. JORDAN, DUNN, WALDEN, COMER, SIMPSON, BABIN, GROTHMAN, DENT, and DUFFY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. JEFFRIES, DOGGETT, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 235, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

AYES—183

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Iliadis
Johanna
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

NOES—235

Budd
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar

Gottheimer Marchant
 Gowdy Marino
 Granger Marshall
 Graves (GA) Massie
 Graves (LA) Mast
 Graves (MO) McCarthy
 Grothman McCaul
 Guthrie McClintock
 Handel McHenry
 Harper McKinley
 Harris McMorris
 Hartzler Rodgers
 Hensarling McSally
 Herrera Beutler Meadows
 Hice, Jody B. Meehan
 Higgins (LA) Messer
 Hill Mitchell
 Holding Moolenaar
 Hollingsworth Mooney (WV)
 Hudson Mullin
 Hultgren Newhouse
 Hunter Neom
 Hurd Norman
 Issa Nunes
 Jenkins (KS) Olson
 Jenkins (WV) Palazzo
 Johnson (LA) Palmer
 Johnson (OH) Paulsen
 Johnson, Sam Pearce
 Jones Perry
 Jordan Peters
 Katko Peterson
 Kelly (MS) Pittenger
 Kelly (PA) Poe (TX)
 King (IA) Poliquin
 King (NY) Posey
 Kinzinger Ratcliffe
 Knight Reed
 Kustoff (TN) Reichert
 Labrador Renacci
 LaHood Rice (SC)
 LaMalfa Roby
 Lamborn Roe (TN)
 Lance Rogers (AL)
 Latta Rogers (KY)
 Lewis (MN) Rohrabacher
 LoBiondo Rokita
 Loudermilk Rooney, Francis
 Love Rooney, Thomas
 Lucas J.
 Luetkemeyer Ros-Lehtinen
 MacArthur Roskam

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Griffith

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta Huizenga
 Barragán Joyce (OH)
 Bass Long
 Bridenstine Lowenthal
 Burgess Scalise

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1726

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 234, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—185

Adams Gallego
 Aguilar Garamendi
 Beatty Gomez
 Bera Gonzalez (TX)
 Beyer Green, Al
 Bishop (GA) Green, Gene
 Blumenauer Grijalva
 Blunt Rochester Gutierrez
 Bonamici Hanabusa
 Boyle, Brendan Hastings
 F. Heck
 Brady (PA) Higgins (NY)
 Brown (MD) Himes
 Brownley (CA) Hoyer
 Bustos Huffman
 Butterfield Jackson Lee
 Capuano Jayapal
 Carballo Jeffries
 Cárdenas Johnson (GA)
 Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B.
 Cartwright Kaptur
 Castor (FL) Keating
 Castro (TX) Kelly (IL)
 Chu, Judy Kennedy
 Cicilline Khanna
 Clark (MA) Kihuen
 Clarke (NY) Kildee
 Clay Kilmer
 Cleaver Kind
 Clyburn Krishnamoorthi
 Cohen Kuster (NH)
 Connolly Langevin
 Conyers Larsen (WA)
 Correa Larson (CT)
 Costa Lawrence
 Courtney Lawson (FL)
 Crist Lee
 Crowley Levin
 Cuellar Lewis (GA)
 Cummings Lieu, Ted
 Davis (CA) Lipinski
 Davis, Danny Davis, Danny
 DeFazio Loebsack
 DeGette Lofgren
 Delaney Lowey
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham,
 DelBene M.
 Demings Luján, Ben Ray
 DeSaulnier Lynch
 Deutsch Maloney,
 Dingell Carolyn B.
 Doggett Maloney, Sean
 Doyle, Michael Matsui
 F. McColium
 Ellison McEachin
 Engel McGovern
 Eshoo McNeerney
 Espallat Meeks
 Esty (CT) Meng
 Evans Moore
 Foster Moulton
 Frankel (FL) Murphy (FL)
 Fudge Nadler
 Gabbard Napolitano
 Neal

NOES—234

Blum Collins (GA)
 Bost Collins (NY)
 Brady (TX) Comer
 Brat Comstock
 Brooks (AL) Conaway
 Brooks (IN) Cook
 Buchanan Cooper
 Buck Costello (PA)
 Bucshon Cramer
 Budd Crawford
 Byrne Culberson
 Calvert Curbelo (FL)
 Carter (GA) Davidson
 Carter (TX) Davis, Rodney
 Chabot Denham
 Cheney Dent
 Coffman DeSantis
 Cole DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart King (IA)
 Donovan King (NY)
 Duffy Kinzinger
 Duncan (SC) Knight
 Duncan (TN) Kustoff (TN)
 Dunn Labrador
 Emmer LaHood
 Estes (KS) LaMalfa
 Farenthold Lamborn
 Faso Lance
 Ferguson Latta
 Fitzpatrick Lewis (MN)
 Fleischmann LoBiondo
 Flores Loudermilk
 Fortenberry Love
 Foxx Lucas
 Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer
 Frelinghuysen MacArthur
 Gaetz Marchant
 Gallagher Marino
 Garrett Marshall
 Gianforte Massie
 Gibbs Mast
 Gohmert McCarthy
 Pocan McCaul
 Polis Goodlatte
 Price (NC) Gosar
 Quigley Gottheimer
 Raskin Gowdy
 Rice (NY) Granger
 Richmond Graves (GA)
 Rosen Graves (LA)
 Roybal-Allard Graves (MO)
 Ruiz Griffith
 Ruppersberger Grothman
 Rush Guthrie
 Ryan (OH) Handel
 Sánchez Harris
 Sarbanes Hartzler
 Schakowsky Hensarling
 Schiff Herrera Beutler
 Schneider Hice, Jody B.
 Schrader Higgins (LA)
 Scott (VA) Hill
 Scott, David Holding
 Serrano Hollingsworth
 Sewell (AL) Hudson
 Shea-Porter Hultgren
 Sherman Hunter
 Sires Hurd
 Slaughter Issa
 Smith (WA) Jenkins (KS)
 Soto Jenkins (WV)
 Speier Johnson (LA)
 Suozzi Johnson (OH)
 Swalwell (CA) Johnson, Sam
 Takano Jones
 Thompson (CA) Jordan
 Thompson (MS) Katko
 Titus Kelly (MS)
 Tonko Kelly (PA)
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta Huizenga
 Barragán Joyce (OH)
 Bass Long
 Bridenstine Lowenthal
 Burgess Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1730

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 231, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

AYES—189

Adams	Gallego	Napolitano
Aguilar	Garamendi	Neal
Beatty	Gomez	Nolan
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Beyer	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Pallone
Blunt Rochester	Griffith	Panetta
Bonamici	Grijalva	Pascarell
Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Payne
F.	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Perlmutter
Brown (MD)	Heck	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Bustos	Himes	Polis
Butterfield	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capuano	Huffman	Quigley
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Richmond
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Jones	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Ciçilline	Keating	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sánchez
Clay	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kihuen	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kildee	Schiff
Cohen	Kilmer	Schneider
Connolly	Kind	Schrader
Conyers	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Correa	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Costa	Langevin	Serrano
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Crist	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lawrence	Sherman
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Cummings	Lee	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Levin	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lewis (GA)	Soto
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Speier
DeGette	Lipinski	Suozi
Delaney	Loeb sack	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lofgren	Takano
DelBene	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	M.	Titus
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
Diaz-Balart	Lynch	Torres
Dingell	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
F.	Matsui	Vela
Ellison	McCollum	Velázquez
Engel	McEachin	Visclosky
Eshoo	McGovern	Walz
Españlat	McNerney	Wasserman
Esty (CT)	Meeks	Schultz
Evans	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moore	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Nadler	

NOES—231

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Byrne
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Allen	Black	Carter (GA)
Amash	Blackburn	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Blum	Chabot
Arrington	Bost	Cheney
Babin	Brady (TX)	Coffman
Bacon	Brat	Cole
Banks (IN)	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barton	Buchanan	Comer
Bergman	Buck	Comstock
Biggs	Bucshon	Conaway
Bilirakis	Budd	Cook

Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)
Costello (PA)	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cramer	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Katko	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kelly (MS)	Rokita
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (PA)	King (IA)
Davidson	King (IA)	King (NY)
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Kinzing
Denham	Kinzing	Knight
Dent	Kustoff (TN)	Labrador
DeSantis	Labrador	LaHood
DesJarlais	LaHood	LaMalfa
Donovan	LaMalfa	Lamborn
Duffy	Lamborn	Lance
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Latta
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Lewis (MN)
Dunn	Lewis (MN)	LoBiondo
Emmer	LoBiondo	Loudermilk
Estes (KS)	Loudermilk	Love
Farenthold	Love	Lucas
Faso	Lucas	Luetkemeyer
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Marino
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Marshall
Fleischmann	Marshall	Massie
Flores	Massie	Mast
Fortenberry	Mast	McCarthy
Fox	McCarthy	McClintock
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	McHenry
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	McKinley
Gaetz	McKinley	McMorris
Gallagher	McMorris	Rodgers
Garrett	Rodgers	McSally
Gianforte	McSally	Meadows
Gibbs	Meadows	Meehan
Gohmert	Meehan	Messer
Goodlatte	Messer	Mitchell
Gosar	Mitchell	Moolenaar
Gowdy	Moolenaar	Mooney (WV)
Granger	Mooney (WV)	Mullin
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Newhouse
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Noem
Graves (MO)	Noem	Norman
Grothman	Norman	Nunes
Guthrie	Nunes	Hartzer
Handel	Hartzer	Palazzo
Harper	Palazzo	Palmer
Harris	Palmer	Paulsen
Hartzer	Paulsen	Pearce
Hensarling	Pearce	Hill
Herrera Beutler	Hill	Peters
Hice, Jody B.	Peters	Peterson
Higgins (LA)	Peterson	Pittenger
Hill	Pittenger	Poe (TX)
Holding	Poe (TX)	Poliquin
Hollingsworth	Poliquin	Posey
Hudson	Posey	Ratcliffe
Hultgren	Ratcliffe	Reed
Hunter	Reed	Reichert
Hurd	Reichert	Renacci
Issa	Renacci	Rice (SC)
Jenkins (KS)	Rice (SC)	Burgess
Jenkins (WV)	Burgess	MacArthur
Johnson (LA)	MacArthur	Scalise
Johnson (OH)	Scalise	Trott
	Trott	Wilson (FL)
	Wilson (FL)	

NOT VOTING—12

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1735

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 229, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—191

Adams	Garamendi	Nolan
Aguilar	Gomez	Norcross
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Bera	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Panetta
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Perlmutter
F.	Heck	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Himes	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Polis
Bustos	Huffman	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capuano	Jayapal	Raskin
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Cartwright	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Ciçilline	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Sarbanes
Clay	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schiff
Clyburn	Kind	Schneider
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Langevin	Scott, David
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sires
Cuellar	Levin	Slaughter
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Soto
DeFazio	LoBiondo	Speier
DeGette	Loeb sack	Suozi
Delaney	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lowe y	Takano
DelBene	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (CA)
Demings	M.	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Deutch	Lynch	Tonko
Dingell	Maloney,	Torres
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
F.	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McCollum	Vela
Engel	McEachin	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Españlat	McNerney	Walz
Esty (CT)	Meeks	Wasserman
Evans	Meng	Schultz
Foster	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Gabbard	Nadler	Yarmuth
Gallego	Neal	

NOES—229

Abraham	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Aderholt	Bishop (MI)	Budd
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Byrne
Amash	Black	Calvert
Amodei	Blackburn	Carter (GA)
Arrington	Blum	Carter (TX)
Babin	Bost	Chabot
Bacon	Brady (TX)	Cheney
Banks (IN)	Brat	Coffman
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Bergman	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Biggs	Buck	Comer

Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)

Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Barragán
Bass
Bridenstine

Burgess
Comstock
Huizenga
Long

Lowenthal
Scallise
Trott
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1739

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. DONOVAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 732) to limit donations

made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 577, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3898.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

AYES—238

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa

Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson

Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—183

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Española
Esty (CT)

Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui

McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Wasserman
Titus	Vela	Schultz
Tonko	Velázquez	Waters, Maxine
Torres	Visclosky	Watson Coleman
Tsongas	Walz	Welch
Vargas		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Barletta	Burgess	Scalise
Barragán	Huizenga	Trott
Bass	Long	Wilson (FL)
Bridenstine	Lowenthal	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1747

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OTTO WARMBIER NORTH KOREA NUCLEAR SANCTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3898) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to place conditions on certain accounts at United States financial institutions with respect to North Korea, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

YEAS—415

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Comer
Adams	Brown (MD)	Comstock
Aderholt	Brownley (CA)	Conaway
Aguilar	Buchanan	Connolly
Allen	Buck	Cook
Amodei	Bucshon	Cooper
Arrington	Budd	Correa
Babin	Bustos	Costa
Bacon	Butterfield	Costello (PA)
Banks (IN)	Byrne	Courtney
Barr	Calvert	Cramer
Barton	Capuano	Crawford
Beatty	Carbajal	Crist
Bera	Cárdenas	Crowley
Bergman	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Beyer	Carter (GA)	Culberson
Biggs	Carter (TX)	Cummings
Bilirakis	Cartwright	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Davidson
Bishop (MI)	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Davis, Danny
Black	Cheney	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Blum	Cioccilline	DeGette
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Cleaver	DeBene
Bost	Clyburn	Demings
Boyle, Brendan	Coffman	Denham
F.	Cohen	Dent
Brady (PA)	Cole	DeSantis
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	DeSaulnier
Brat	Collins (NY)	DesJarlais
Brooks (AL)		Deutch

Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Pelosi
Dingell	Kennedy	Perlmutter
Doggett	Khanha	Perry
Donovan	Kihuen	Peters
Doyle, Michael	Kildee	Peterson
F.	Kilmer	Pingree
Duffy	Kind	Pittenger
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Pocan
Duncan (TN)	King (NY)	Poe (TX)
Dunn	Kinzinger	Poliquin
Ellison	Knight	Polis
Emmer	Krishnamoorthi	Posey
Engel	Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)
Eshoo	Kustoff (TN)	Quigley
Espallat	Labrador	Raskin
Estes (KS)	LaHood	Ratcliffe
Esty (CT)	LaMalfa	Reed
Evans	Lamborn	Reichert
Farenthold	Lance	Renacci
Faso	Langevin	Rice (NY)
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)	Rice (SC)
Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Fleischmann	Latta	Roby
Flores	Lawrence	Roe (TN)
Fortenberry	Lawson (FL)	Rogers (AL)
Foster	Lee	Rogers (KY)
Fox	Levin	Rohrabacher
Frankel (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Rokita
Franks (AZ)	Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Francis
Frelinghuysen	Lieu, Ted	Rooney, Thomas
Fudge	Lipinski	J.
Gabbard	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Gallagher	Loeb sack	Rosen
Gallego	Lofgren	Roskam
Garamendi	Loudermillk	Ross
Garrett	Love	Rothfus
Gianforte	Lowe	Rouzer
Gibbs	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Royce (CA)
Gomez	Lujan Grisham,	Ruiz
Gonzalez (TX)	M.	Ruppersberger
Goodlatte	Luján, Ben Ray	Rush
Gosar	Lynch	Russell
Gowdy	MacArthur	Rutherford
Granger	Maloney,	Ryan (OH)
Graves (GA)	Carolyn B.	Sánchez
Graves (LA)	Maloney, Sean	Sanford
Graves (MO)	Marchant	Sarbanes
Green, Al	Marino	Schakowsky
Green, Gene	Marshall	Schiff
Griffith	Mast	Schneider
Grijalva	Matsui	Schrader
Grothman	McCarthy	Schweikert
Guthrie	McCaul	Scott (VA)
Gutiérrez	McClintock	Scott, Austin
Hanabusa	McCollum	Scott, David
Handel	McEachin	Sensenbrenner
Harper	McGovern	Serrano
Harris	McHenry	Sessions
Hartzer	McKinley	Sewell (AL)
Hastings	McMorris	Shea-Porter
Heck	Rodgers	Sherman
Hensarling	McNerney	Shimkus
Herrera Beutler	McSally	Shuster
Hice, Jody B.	Meadows	Simpson
Higgins (LA)	Meehan	Sinema
Higgins (NY)	Meeks	Sires
Hill	Meng	Slaughter
Himes	Messer	Smith (MO)
Holding	Mitchell	Smith (NE)
Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Mooney (WV)	Smith (TX)
Hudson	Moore	Smith (WA)
Huffman	Moulton	Smucker
Hultgren	Mullin	Soto
Hunter	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Hurd	Nadler	Stefanik
Issa	Napolitano	Stewart
Jackson Lee	Neal	Stivers
Jayapal	Newhouse	Suozi
Jeffries	Noem	Takano
Jenkins (KS)	Nolan	Taylor
Jenkins (WV)	Norcross	Tenney
Johnson (GA)	Norman	Thompson (CA)
Johnson (LA)	Nunes	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (OH)	O'Halleran	Thompson (PA)
Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke	Thornberry
Johnson, Sam	Olson	Tiberi
Jones	Palazzo	Tipton
Jordan	Pallone	Titus
Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Tonko
Kaptur	Panetta	Torres
Katko	Pascrell	Tsongas
Keating	Paulsen	Turner
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Upton
Kelly (MS)	Pearce	Valadao

Walz	Wilson (SC)
Wasserman	Wittman
Waters, Maxine	Womack
Watson Coleman	Woodall
Weber (TX)	Yarmuth
Webster (FL)	Yoder
Welch	Yoho
Wenstrup	Young (AK)
Westerman	Young (IA)
Williams	Zeldin

NAYS—2

Amash

Massie

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Conyers	Lowenthal
Barragán	Gaetz	Scalise
Bass	Gottheimer	Swalwell (CA)
Bridenstine	Huizenga	Trott
Burgess	Long	Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1753

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to impose secondary sanctions with respect to North Korea, strengthen international efforts to improve sanctions enforcement, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 71, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-369) on the resolution (H. Res. 580) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 3545

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 3545, a bill originally introduced by Representative MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3798

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representative ED PERLMUTTER as a cosponsor of my bill H.R. 3798. He was mistakenly added to the legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

BINGHAMTON OPIOID FORUM

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a recent community forum I held at Binghamton University to raise awareness about the heroin and opioid epidemic ravaging our country.

Every day in America, more than 144 Americans die of a drug overdose. In Broome County, where our forum was held, 76 people died of an overdose last year, 90 percent from opioids.

Before the forum, I had the opportunity to tour the New Horizons Alcohol & Chemical Dependency program at United Health Services to see firsthand the arduous work our healthcare professionals are undertaking to fight back against this disease.

In addition to the tour, the forum highlighted that our panel of healthcare professionals, law enforcement agencies, and community organizations continues to struggle to keep pace with the rise of addiction, and it became clear to me by the end of the forum that more resources are needed.

It was an honor to bring together members of our community to talk about solutions and highlight that there is hope for the future. I look forward to taking those ideas that I learned at the forum and putting those ideas into action by working with my colleagues to reduce and eliminate the scourge of addiction.

GOLD STAR FAMILIES

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we mourn with Gold Star families, but we cannot feel their pain. There is nothing anyone can say or do to really comfort families suffering the loss of a loved one. But there is a lot people can say or do to cause grieving families additional pain, as we have seen over this past week.

As Members of Congress, we are there for our constituents. They are our families. It is our obligation to speak up when they are hurt.

The loss of American servicemembers should not be politicized. Our fallen heroes should be honored.

Sergeant La David Johnson is an American hero.

Staff Sergeant Jeremiah Johnson is an American hero.

Staff Sergeant Bryan Black is an American hero.

Staff Sergeant Dustin Wright is an American hero.

The 28 men and women who lost their lives in service to their country this year are all American heroes. Let us honor their sacrifices and comfort their families, as has been the tradition in this country until last week.

□ 1800

RECOGNIZING BAT WEEK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bat Week, which is an annual, week-long event highlighting the important ecological and economic benefits of bats.

With more than 1,300 different species worldwide, bats are both diverse in appearance and how they keep ecosystems balanced. Bats play an essential role with insect control, pollination, and seed dispersal. One bat can eat 2,000 to 6,000 insects each night, including moths, beetles, flies, mosquitoes, and more.

Because of their incredible appetites, farmers can use fewer pesticides to control insects. This helps our Nation's farmers and saves billions of dollars each year.

Mr. Speaker, bats also play other roles outside of our ecosystems, including in medical research. Scientists studying vampire bats have created anticlotting medication to help stroke victims.

These are just a small portion of the ways bats positively impact our daily lives, and I am pleased to see these wonderful creatures recognized during Bat Week.

I appreciate the great work being performed by private conservation organizations, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, U.S. Geological Survey, and many other State partners, such as the Pennsylvania Game Commission on Bat Week 2017.

HONORING BUFFALO POLICE OFFICER CRAIG LEHNER

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Buffalo Police Officer Craig Lehner, who lost his life in the line of duty this past week. On October 13, tragedy struck. Officer Lehner went missing while performing underwater recovery training

in the Niagara River. For 5 days, State, local, Federal, and Canadian agencies heroically assisted in the search and recovery.

Officer Lehner lived a life of service to his country and to his community. A resident of south Buffalo, Lehner was a 9-year veteran of the Buffalo Police Department, a 16-year National Guardsman who served in Iraq, and a member of the canine unit.

Those who knew Officer Lehner knew how much he loved his job and the people of Buffalo. Buffalo is the hardest working city in America, the city of good neighbors.

In the past several days, there has been an outpouring of support for Officer Lehner's family and the Buffalo Police Department. I want to extend thanks to the many brave first responders who worked around the clock in recovery efforts.

Officer Lehner, thank you for your service, and may you rest in peace.

TAX BREAK FOR SENIORS

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, every year, middle class seniors are forced to pay billions in taxes on their Social Security benefits. This tax is fundamentally not fair and penalizes folks who have paid into the system their entire lives.

There is a better way. We should give these seniors a tax cut, let them keep more of their benefits, and create a better, fairer system for all Americans.

In 1984, when Congress passed this tax on seniors, it was designed to only impact high-income seniors, about 14 percent. But the tax was never adjusted for inflation, and today, fully half of seniors are paying this onerous tax. In fact, there are over 280,000 Hoosiers making less than \$75,000 per year who are subject to this tax.

I introduced the Social Security Tax Fairness Act to give these seniors the tax break they deserve. This bill cuts taxes for seniors, single and married seniors, and ends the marriage penalty on Social Security benefits, too.

Under this bill, a retired married couple with \$70,000 in income will see \$2,000 in tax cuts. It is time to deliver tax cuts for every American, and this legislation would ensure Hoosier seniors aren't left behind either.

NEED FOR MORE FEMA INSPECTORS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, citing from The New York Times, "Outside Rachel Roberts' house, a skeleton sits on a chair next to a driveway, a

skeleton child on its lap, an empty cup in its hand, and a sign at its feet reads, "Waiting on FEMA."

I want to acknowledge that FEMA workers from around the country have worked without ceasing, but we have got to do a better job. My constituents in Houston, Harris County, Texas, after Harvey, are waiting on those inspectors.

That is the only way, Mr. Speaker, that they can begin the repair of their homes. Many people are there without coverage and truly need to have their homes repaired.

I have given suggestions. I am sorry that we didn't stand up enough Federal FEMA inspectors. But what about college students, people who are unemployed, using a FEMA app, dividing the area in sectors, finishing one sector then going to another sector? This includes the State of Florida as well. People are on hold for hours at a time.

I have spoken to those who are now looking at it. I want them to know that I appreciate them taking my call and reviewing this, but reach out for help. We have got to have more inspectors. If we do not have inspectors, they will not be able to repair their homes. If they cannot repair their homes, they are living in dangerous conditions. If they are living in dangerous conditions, the quality of life deteriorates.

Help us in Texas. We need more FEMA inspectors. We need them now.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF JOHN HANCOCK

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, when you look at the heavens tonight, you may notice a new bright star. My fellow Texans from Sugar Land and Fort Bend County have seen that star for years. It is our John Hancock.

John enjoyed life with us for 89 years. John is a native Texan, Houston proud, born on February 13 of 1928. He is a Korean Army veteran, 33 years with Mobil Oil, an investment adviser.

John loved many things. He loved University of Texas football, Hook 'em Horns. He loved his Astros, our baseball team. He loved his hometown of Sugar Land. He loved going to church at Sugar Land First United Methodist Church. He loved to bowl. He bowled 297 points when he turned 80. But most of all, he loved his amazing wife, Linda.

John and Linda are in Heaven together right now. Linda is there saying, "Roll Tide," for her beloved Alabama Crimson Tide playing their football games. John is beside her saying, "Beat LA," which is exactly what his beloved Astros will do in a few hours.

Thank you, John. May the peace of Christ be with you and Linda forever.

RESOLUTION TO COMMEMORATE INTERNATIONAL DAY OF RURAL WOMEN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, the world celebrated International Day of Rural Women and the invaluable global contribution of women farmers and small holders.

To do our part in expressing solidarity, I rise to introduce this resolution to commemorate this very important day. According to the United Nations, rural women make up over one-quarter of the globe's total population and represent 43 percent of the agricultural workforce. They play a critical role in agricultural production, food security, and economic stability.

Women serve as the bedrock of society. They feed the world's families. They feed our neighbors and our countrymen and -women. They are admirable role models for younger generations, and unfortunately, despite this, they still face many societal and economic limitations both here and abroad.

This resolution shines a light on women farmers and seeks to empower them to succeed as entrepreneurs. It calls on the people of the United States and the world to recognize their critical contributions and to recommit to reducing barriers and limitations that heretofore have stunted their full progress. Let us plant the seeds of hope. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

PLANS TO PREVENT FLOODING IN THE FUTURE

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Harvey ravaged the coast of Texas, hammering it with 50 inches of rain, massive flooding, and massive damage.

After the rain stopped, the decision to release water from Addicks and Barker Reservoirs and Lake Conroe have left many questions in the Houston area. The release of this water caused even more flooding downstream.

Why did the Corps of Engineers open Barker and Addicks Reservoirs for 15 days? Why weren't the communities of Humble and Kingwood given proper notice of the historic release of floodwater from Lake Conroe by the San Jacinto River Authority? And there are more questions.

I have introduced the Texas Flood Accountability Act. This legislation requires the Army Corps of Engineers to evaluate the cause of the floods and what can be done for long-term plans to prevent flooding in the future. They must produce this plan within 90 days after enactment.

We must move from paying for disasters to preventing them. We need a plan, Mr. Speaker.

And that is just the way it is.

FOCUS TAX RELIEF ON MIDDLE CLASS

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the President and congressional Republicans claim they want to, "Put more money in the pockets of average Americans." Well, the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center analyzed their plan, and they found out what it really does, put billionaires first. They found that 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts would go to the richest 1 percent.

But that is not all. Also, under their plan, 50 million Americans will see a tax increase. Many of them happen to be constituents of mine, middle class families and working families in Pennsylvania.

It is wrong to raise the taxes of my constituents to pay for tax cuts for billionaires. That is wrong, it is bad economics, and it will crush our economy. We need an economy that works for everyone. Let's focus tax relief where it counts, and that is on the middle class.

BRIDES MARCH FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, close to 100 women in wedding gowns from all over our country came to Washington, D.C. They came here to give a face and a voice to victims of domestic violence.

I was also flooded by the courage of my colleagues, other Members of Congress, whose loved ones had been victims and had even been killed because of domestic violence. Domestic violence is something that can impact anybody on any day, even on your wedding day.

The Brides March honors the memory and tragedy of Gladys Ricart, who, on September 26, 1999, lost her life on her wedding day at the hands of her abusive ex-boyfriend.

This march has now spread beyond New York, to Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Florida, Washington, D.C., and even other countries like the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Brazil, and Spain.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, today I am Gladys Ricart. We are all Gladys Ricart. The Brides March and the advocacy of New York Latinas Against Domestic Violence is a thundering statement against domestic violence and a reminder that domestic violence remains a pressing issue in our communities and sometimes in our families.

Mr. Speaker, domestic violence and violence against women is unacceptable.

□ 1815

REJECT THE BUDGET

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, it has been 8 years. For 8 years, from the day Barack Obama was sworn in until the day he left office, I heard my Republican colleagues telling me that we weren't paying enough attention to the national debt, that we were mortgaging our children's future, and that we needed to do more to get our debt and deficit under control. Heck, to be honest with you, I agreed with what they were saying.

But now that they are in power—control the Presidency and both Chambers—what are they doing?

Totally ignoring the debt deficit is what they are doing.

Worst yet, actually, the budget of theirs that has just come out adds \$1.5 trillion to the deficit over the next 10 years. This is their stated strategy in the budget. This is \$1.5 trillion our children and grandchildren need to pay back. I just can't believe it. The hypocrisy is beyond belief.

Apparently, my Republican colleagues are only fiscally conservative when the Democrats are in control.

Let's reject this unconscionable budget and work across the aisle for tax reform that actually improves our children's future.

BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, an interesting week out ahead. As we begin this week, as we look at the budget for the United States of America, as we look and prepare to deal with the tax cut issue, we really ought to start that discussion with a clear understanding of what our goal is.

I often use this when I talk here on the floor because it is foundational. It is foundational to what I believe we should use to test the various pieces of legislation that come before us. This would certainly be applicable as we look at the question of the Republican budget, which will be on the floor in the next couple of days, perhaps as early as tomorrow, and, of course, the tax cuts beyond.

Here it is. This is from Franklin Delano Roosevelt—FDR. This is actu-

ally etched into the marble at the memorial for Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I came across it one day, and I think it is a very good criteria to judge.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Using this as the criteria to judge the Republican budget and the upcoming tax reform or tax cuts, we would have to judge both as a miserable failure. We are looking at a situation in which somewhere between \$2.5 trillion to \$5 trillion of revenue will be removed from the Federal Government. That is about somewhere between \$250 billion a year to \$500 billion of revenue.

It doesn't mean a thing until you translate that into real programs. Keep in mind that to reduce the revenue of the Federal Government somewhere around \$500 billion a year, you would have to remove 80 percent of the total money spent by the Department of Defense in all of the wars and all of the programs that they do in order to make up for that lost revenue.

Alternatively, you would have to reduce almost all of the other discretionary funding. No, we wouldn't build a wall. In fact, we would have to fire all of the immigration authorities. The TSA would no longer be in our airports. There would no longer be any educational programs. There would be no programs dealing with all of the Coast Guard. There would be no programs for the Department of Homeland Security or the Department of Transportation.

\$500 billion of reduced revenue is possible as a result of both the budget, as well as the tax proposals that are coming before the House and the Senate in the days ahead. It may be just half that so we don't have to reduce all of those programs.

This is a monumental, critical issue upon which, if we were to use this as the criteria to judge it, we would say: Wait a minute. What about national defense?

Or we would say: Wait a minute. What about all of those programs that are necessary for our children, like the School Lunch Program?

It is critical that we analyze this carefully.

What does it do for the wealthy?

Well, let's take a look at that.

Now, given that the proposals are not yet defined down to the line and the text—but we do know from a general outline of our Speaker's previous proposals when he ran the budget here in the House and when he was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; and we have also President Trump's proposal—if it is the Ryan-McConnell-Trump proposal—it is the billionaires-first tax plan. It cuts the taxes for the wealthy. Eighty percent

of the \$2½ trillion to \$5 trillion reduction winds up in the hands of the top 1 percent of Americans. Incredible.

At the same time, what does it do for the rest of the public?

Well, if you take a look at the detail in the budget that did pass this House and will be up for a vote in the very near future, it reduces Medicare and Medicaid by as much as \$2 trillion. So you have got a reduction in revenue to be made up by a \$2 trillion cut in Medicaid and Medicare.

Who receives Medicaid?

Across the United States, it is the working poor, and 60 percent of the total Medicaid budget is for seniors in nursing homes.

So what we have here is a tax policy that cuts the taxes for the wealthiest of America's, the great 1 percent. They get 80 percent of the tax reductions. The rest of the public, 99 percent, will somehow share in the remaining 20 percent of reductions.

Sounds like a bad deal?

It certainly is, if you are to compare that against what Franklin Delano Roosevelt said should be our criteria for judging legislation.

Now, it will be argued that the middle class will receive a tax cut. Well, some, perhaps, but not many. The majority of the middle class will actually receive a tax increase.

How does that happen?

The elimination of the deductions, State and local taxes, and other gimmicks that they have in it. So a family of four making somewhere around \$50,000 could see their tax bill increase by as much as 380 percent.

Whoa. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. What are we talking about here?

We are talking about a tax plan that does not even come close to meeting this criteria of judgment.

Does it do more for the wealthy?

Oh, yes. Oh, yes. We are talking about trillions of dollars of tax reductions for the corporations and the superwealthy.

And what does the rest of the country get for those who have little?

They get even less.

So what we have here, when you consider that they are proposing as much as a \$2 trillion reduction in Medicare—we are talking about the healthcare system for seniors—and Medicaid—the healthcare system for, again, seniors in nursing homes—about 60 percent of that money goes to those seniors. The remaining 40 percent goes to the working poor and the poor.

That alone, together with this transfer of the tax reductions for the superwealthy, amount to the largest transfer of wealth ever in any legislation that has been proposed, and hopefully will not pass, but has been proposed in this House. It is even a greater transfer of wealth than we saw in the effort to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

Beware, America. Be wary. The hucksters are promising something that they are only going to deliver to the superwealthy and to American corporations.

One more point I would like to make here is that often you will hear the argument that cutting corporate taxes will somehow lead to more jobs and that the employees will receive more benefits. Well, it turns out that a cut in corporate tax rates actually comes back to the top 1 percent. They will receive about 34 percent of the tax reductions that go to corporations.

I have heard this argued by our Treasury Secretary, that if we are somehow to cut corporate tax rates, we will see the corporations investing in their workers.

Wow. Wouldn't that be great?

So we cut the corporate tax rate from some 35 percent down to 10 percent, or maybe 15 percent, as our President has suggested. All of those reduced taxes will flow to the corporation's bottom line after tax profits will increase, and, wow, they will create jobs, they will pay higher wages.

What are the facts? What are the facts here?

Well, first of all, most of it will not wind up in the pockets of the workers. It will wind up in the top 20 percent of taxpayers, of which 34 percent of that will be the top 1 percent. So, once again, if you look at the corporate tax reductions, it is going to wind up benefiting the wealthy, not the workers.

There is another fact out there. In the 1970s, American corporations would invest about 50 percent—maybe slightly more than 50 percent—in capital improvements, building new factories, expanding the work floor, expanding the workers, workers' wages, benefits, and research and development. It is right there.

If you take a look at the Fortune 500 in the 1970s, well over 50 percent was reinvested in American jobs, American workers, expanding the factory floor, expanding the business, expanding research and development, and growing the corporation.

A remarkable and extremely important thing happened beginning in the 1980s, at about the time of the Reagan tax cuts, and continuing on, and is in place today. That has shifted.

Today, American corporations do not invest in America, they don't invest in new capital, and they don't invest in R&D. Ninety percent of the after-tax profits in the Fortune 500—most of the Fortune 500, or many of them—wind up in stock buybacks and executive salaries or overseas, not in American jobs.

If you are wondering why the American middle class has seen a flat and actually declining share of the GDP, it is because American corporations have shifted from investing in American jobs, American planting equipment, research and development; and they have

shifted into manipulating their stock price by buying back their own stock, using the after-tax profits, some 90 percent of it, for executive salaries and for stock buyback.

□ 1830

If you have got 100 stocks out there and they are valued at \$10 apiece, you buy back 50 percent of the stock, guess what. You have doubled the stock price. By creating more jobs? By creating more profit. By increasing wages? By R&D? No. By manipulating your stock price by buying back that stock.

Now, maybe there is somebody who would like to debate this point. Come on down. Let's debate it.

The reality is just as I said. It is laid out there.

Oh, there is another fact. One of America's largest corporations, the CEO said: Not to worry. You reduce my company's tax rate, and I will invest in our workers. I will invest in new plant and equipment.

Interesting. In the last 8 years, the tax rate for AT&T is about 8 percent—not 35 percent, not 20 percent, not 15 percent, but 8 percent—and yet during that period of time, AT&T laid off 80,000 workers.

So you are going to tell me lowering a major American corporation's tax rate is somehow going to lead to more employment, more jobs? Then tell me why AT&T, that has an effective tax rate of 8 percent over a 7-, 8-year period of time, laid off 80,000 people. So let's argue this point. Let's see what is going on here.

We have before the House of Representatives and the Senate a fundamental question: Are we going to transfer even more wealth to the superwealthy by reducing their taxes and pushing off to the working men and women of America, the middle class, a higher burden?

Along with that, we either increase the deficit by \$2.5 trillion or \$5 trillion, depending upon how this finalizes—that is the tax reduction; that is the lost revenue to the Federal Government—or are we going to make massive cuts?

I am telling you what our Republican colleagues are promising us. Massive tax cuts for the superwealthy. The top 1 percent will get 80 percent of the tax reduction benefits, the remaining 99 percent of Americans will have to figure out how to share the small remaining 20 percent.

The probability associated with those tax cuts, a significant reduction in programs that serve seniors—Medicaid, in nursing homes, the working poor, the Medicaid expansion program wiped out, Medicare reductions, all of these things—and quite possibly reductions in children's health programs, school programs, school lunch programs, environmental support programs, clean

water programs, transportation programs, all the rest. So a tax cut for the wealthy is going to be a burden on American workers.

Once again, if it happens, it will be the largest transfer of wealth from the working men and women of America to the superwealthy, as if we already do not have income inequality in America. It can be calculated that the income inequality in America today is the greatest it has been in any country for the last 500 years, dating back to when Spain was ripping off the Western Hemisphere taking all the gold, all the silver, anything else they could find, and transferring it to the Spanish Government, to the King and the Queen and their favorite folks. Income inequality is real.

There are many, many pieces of this puzzle that we need to understand. One of them is the way in which certain States that have heavy burdens because they are urbanized States will be particularly impacted by the proposals that we have seen.

Joining me tonight is the Representative from one of those States, New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE, would you like to comment on this extraordinary transfer once again that is in this piece of legislation, the way it harms your State and my State?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to start by thanking my colleague, Congressman GARAMENDI from the great State of California, for hosting this afternoon's Special Order hour on the Republicans' massive tax giveaway to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want a tax plan that creates jobs, builds infrastructure, helps out the poorest among us, strengthens the middle class, and requires billionaires to pay their fair share.

Unfortunately, the Trump-Ryan-McConnell tax plan puts billionaires first and working class people last. The Republicans' tax plan will cut taxes for the wealthiest 1 percent, and it will raise taxes for more than a quarter of New Jersey's households. That is 1.2 million families in the State that I represent.

Across the country, the average tax increase for families under the Trump-Ryan-McConnell tax plan is \$794 a year, another \$794 a year on families struggling now to make ends meet. In New Jersey, that is money a family could use to pay for a month of childcare or 7 months of an electric bill.

The President spends a lot of time golfing at his resort in Bedminster, New Jersey. He knows many working class people in New Jersey. He employs some of them. His proposal to eliminate the Federal deduction for State and local taxes will hurt them dramatically.

Eliminating the Federal deduction for State and local taxes will take

money out of people's pockets and out of New Jersey to fund tax cuts for the wealthy. That is just not going to work for the American people. Eliminating the Federal deduction for State and local taxes doesn't work for New Jersey, and it doesn't work for the American people.

Nearly 2 million people in New Jersey take the deduction. That is more than a third of the State's taxpayers. Most of them are from New Jersey's lower and middle-income families. Getting rid of that deduction means higher taxes for regular people.

So let's be clear. The Republican tax plan claims to be cutting taxes, but in reality, it raises taxes on millions of New Jersey's families and millions of other families nationwide.

The Federal deduction for State and local taxes is good for families. It keeps them from paying twice on the same income. If you pay State and local taxes on your hard-earned money, the Federal Government should respect that. After all, State and local taxes pay for our roads, our schools, our police, and all essential services we rely on each and every day.

New Jersey already pays more to the Federal Government in taxes than it receives in return. In fact, according to the Tax Policy Center, for every dollar New Jersey pays to the Federal Government in taxes, we get back only 77 cents. That is 77 cents on every dollar. The Trump-Ryan-McConnell tax plan is asking people from my State to send more to Washington so the wealthiest 1 percent can get a tax cut. That is just wrong.

When he unveiled his tax plan, President Trump claimed taxes are something he is very good at. Yeah, protecting billionaires is all this tax plan is good at.

Elected officials from both parties must continue to stand against the Trump-Ryan-McConnell proposal and prevent billionaires' first tax overhaul from crushing hardworking families.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PAYNE, thank you so very much. You made a very, very important point, and it is one I know your State and Representatives from your State are very aware of, and we are in California.

You said that for New Jersey here, you pay \$1 in taxes to the Federal Government and you get back 77 cents. It turns out that California is in the same situation. We pay \$1. I think we get back somewhere around the same, 70 percent back from the Federal Government.

Similarly, the other States, upper Midwest, this area, Nebraska, Colorado, Minnesota, these States also wind up paying more. Then over here, Illinois and New York, Massachusetts, it looks like, and New Jersey down here, Connecticut, also, these States wind up paying more.

It turns out that the program proposed by the Republicans is to further

harm these particular States by taking away—these are high cost States. They have big populations, and they have expenses that are associated with those large populations.

They, the Republicans, want to eliminate the State and local tax deduction, which, as you said, not only burdens the individuals, but it is going to be seriously harming these particular States. Already, these States are paying more.

If they are successful, they, the Republicans, are successful in eliminating the State and local taxes, the tax burden on these particular States, the big States, is going to go up, and the benefit will continue to flow to the States with lower populations. And you can see that on this map, because the rest of the Nation is red, meaning they receive more money than they pay in taxes.

So this is a particular problem. I am not going to say this is the only problem because you raised the issue, also, of the top 1 percent getting 80 percent of the tax break, but this is a very interesting map that is really not understood by our colleagues here.

Down here in Alabama and Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, and so forth, relatively low tax States, they are actually subsidized by the high tax States; and so the elimination of State and local taxes increases the taxes on the high cost States already, who are already paying more than they are getting back from the Federal Government, so their burden is further increased.

We have got a fight on our hands.

Mr. PAYNE. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So we are ready.

Mr. PAYNE. And to your point, I appreciate you bringing this map out to show these States that are subsidizing, and you are being very generous in that statement, other States.

To have Members, over the past several weeks, come to the floor and admonish New Jersey and say that we really don't need the deduction, when—if I can tell, North Carolina is one of those States being subsidized. It is disingenuous to come to the floor and critique this plan when it is one of the only ways that people, citizens from New Jersey have as a way to balance things out to some degree.

We all have to pay our fair share, but at some point in time New Jerseyans would like to see a return on their investment as well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, exactly so. This proposal that is going to be before the House very soon will simply make this inequality between the States even worse.

Now, in Texas, this horrible problem down here in Houston, terrible—similarly, with Florida—there will be even greater money flowing to those States that have seen these natural disasters, and so this is probably going to get

even more so. If they are successful in doing away with the State and local tax deduction, this will become even more onerous for people in my State.

□ 1845

Frankly, I cannot understand how my Republican colleagues from California could possibly support something that would substantially increase their constituents' taxes. So we will see.

It is an interesting map. I came across it not too long ago, and I think I will use it even more.

I appreciate and thank Mr. PAYNE for joining us tonight. I am going to keep putting this back up here.

What are we here for?

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little.

I am going to toss another thing up here. Included in this Republican program is the elimination of the estate tax.

If you want the wealthy to get even wealthier, then you move forward with the proposal that would shift the tax burden to the working men and women and away from those who are super-wealthy. It has been said in an article in *The New York Times* that our President, under these proposals that he has put forward together with Mr. RYAN and Senator MCCONNELL, that he would receive a billion-dollar reduction in taxes.

We don't have his tax returns so it is hard to say that that is the case, but based upon past tax returns, it appears as though, yeah, one of the beneficiaries of all of this tax reduction is the President and his Cabinet. His Cabinet is made up of some of the wealthiest people in America, and they are not only going to receive a huge tax cut if it were to go forward and as proposed today, the 400 highest income taxpayers whose incomes average more than \$300 million a year—and I think that is probably most of the Cabinet, and certainly the President has been in that if he is not there today—that range of income would get an average tax cut of at least \$15 million. That is enough for a few rounds of golf.

There is another piece of this puzzle, and I want to put this one up here. We are going to hear a lot of discussion about the estate tax and how somehow the estate tax harms American families, particularly American farmers.

Now, I represent a very large agricultural district, and I said let's do some research and see across the broad breadth of America. Is it the American farmers that are harmed by the estate tax?

It turns out that, yeah, there are some American farmers that are going to have to pay estate tax. There are 50 of them. There are 50 American farm

families that would now be burdened by the current estate tax. Thousands upon thousands, millions of small farmers out there that the estate tax will never even come close to touching. It is \$5.6 million of estate value for one, the spouse—another 5,000—so you have got \$11.2 million for the family. It turns out it affects, perhaps, 50 families across America. The estate tax itself really only affects 5,200 families.

When you hear all this talk about the death tax or the estate tax, as it is really called, ask the question: Who does that affect?

Well, it certainly affects at least the President, Mr. Speaker. It affects the President and many members of his Cabinet. I can think of four right off who would be burdened by having to pay the estate tax. It is about \$20 billion a year that is involved here.

So you have got 2.7 million estates of which just two-tenths of 1 percent would actually be affected by the estate tax. So don't get all excited, America, about eliminating the death tax, unless you want to see the programs on which you depend: education, childcare, children school lunch programs—if you are worried about the border, you are worried about the Homeland Security agency and their ability to provide those men and women. So it is about \$20 billion a year that would be eliminated from the Federal tax base if the estate tax were to disappear.

If you care at all about income inequality, then you better keep the estate tax. Eliminate the estate tax, then the rich will get richer and the poor will get poorer, and we will see even greater income inequality in the years ahead. So we have got some very heavy lifting to do here over the next couple of weeks.

Before I come back and end this with Franklin Delano Roosevelt, I would just say that the Democrats in this House and in the Senate really want to have tax reform. We want to reform the tax system. We know that the corporate tax rate of 35 percent is the highest in the world, or at least the industrialized world, and it does need to be reduced.

We also know that there are very few corporations that actually pay the 35 percent. They are clearly burdened by a higher tax rate. We want to lower that tax rate. We want to do it in a way that encourages investment in the United States; that we go back to those days in the 1970s and early 1980s, when American corporations actually invested in expanding their business in the United States; that they would invest in capital formation, in plant and equipment, and hiring workers and paying higher wages, and engaging in research and development. There are ways we can do this in corporate tax reform.

For example, we could provide a faster write-off depreciation for invest-

ment in American research and development, in American factories, in plant and equipment. We might even structure it in such a way that we would provide an immediate 1-year or 2-year write-off depreciation of capital equipment placed in American factories that was made in America. If you want to buy Chinese equipment for your factory, well, you are going to have to depreciate that over 15 years.

There are ways in which—some very simple ways in which we can encourage corporations to invest in America by modifying the depreciation schedules. If it is an American-made piece of equipment, a Caterpillar tractor that is manufactured in America, write it off in 1 year.

You want to buy a Kubota manufactured in Japan?

Okay. You can write that off in 10 years.

In other words, a positive encouragement for American-made equipment is just one of many examples. As we bring down the corporate tax rate, we build into it very specific things to build the American economy. There are other things, and certainly the wages are part of this, R&D, and all of the other elements. We Democrats want to engage with our Republican colleagues in that kind of tax reform.

On the personal income tax side, yes, we are willing to talk about the tax rates, but we don't want to see the tax cut benefit go to the superwealthy that are already doing extraordinarily well. We want that benefit to go to the working men and women of America. We can expand their deductibles, and the Republicans are talking about that, but it is done in a limited way. And when you add back into it the elimination of State and local income tax and other things that they are talking about doing, it turns out that a very limited number of middle-income and low-income taxpayers are going to benefit, and many will find their taxes go up. We think that is wrong.

As we look at this on the personal income tax side, we want to make sure that we are able to structure those personal income tax changes in such a way as to simplify, absolutely, and eliminate a lot of scurrilous deductions that only benefit the rich and the wealthy, and come to a program that is simpler, more straightforward, and really benefits the great American middle class, or as the President likes to say, let's make the middle class great again. We can do that through tax policy. That is what we want to do.

I am telling you where we are headed today. We are headed today in a program in which our Republican colleagues are going to ignore our Democratic participation in this democracy, and they are going to ram through their own version of tax reform, which is simply a monumental tax decrease for American corporations, many of

which are offshoring jobs. I can come back to that in a moment, and the high-income Americans as their taxes are reduced and their estate tax is eliminated. We think that is wrong, but they are not asking us how we can work together. They are not asking us to work with them.

They have structured it through the budget deal that they can do it with 51 votes in the Senate, totally ignoring the Democratic Senators, and here in the House of Representatives, following a tradition that has been underway for several years now of simply writing a tax bill on their own, writing a repeal on their own, and ignoring the Democrats who we believe have a better deal for Americans.

We believe that there is a better deal, that we can increase American pay by writing a corporate Tax Code that encourages investment in America, that encourages investment in workers, in worker training, worker preparation, and all the technical skills that a modern American economy needs. Yes, we do know there is a better way in writing the Tax Code. We also know that we can write a Tax Code that would lower the cost for those American corporations, businesses, and farmers who are investing in America. I have given some of those ideas already here a moment ago.

Finally, we know that there is a better deal for Americans when we provide the tools for the 21st century, and this has to do with those tools of training and retraining so that the American workers are prepared to take the jobs that are out there.

How do you repair that robot that has replaced you on the manufacturing floor? How do you repair it? How do you program it?

That is a skill set that Americans are going to need.

In my area, we have pharmaceutical companies that are technologically driven. Their laboratories need to be staffed by American workers who understand the intricacies of biology and the biotechnical industry, which is emerging in my district and in California. That is a skill set.

We know that there is a better deal for Americans. We know that there is a better way for tax reform. We know that there is a necessity in America to build the infrastructure, the foundation of economic growth. But we also know that if our Republican friends are successful in reducing Federal revenues by somewhere between \$2.5 trillion to \$5 trillion, this is their proposal, revenues reduced by that, we will not have money for training American workers. We will not have money for the infrastructure investments, which are necessary to repair our bridges, build our roads, our airports and the like so that we have a foundation upon which the economy will grow. We know that.

We have to persuade our Republican colleagues, so we are going to have to

rely on the American people, just as we relied upon you when the repeal and replace legislation was before the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The American public said: Whoa, whoa, wait a minute. This is a bad deal, not a better deal, but a bad deal for Americans.

So the tax reform or the tax cuts that are before us in the next weeks—the next 4 weeks—are a bad deal for Americans, and we are going to have to rely upon the American public becoming aware of what is going on here in Washington, and then speaking out and saying: No, no. Time out, folks. You are not going to screw us again. You are not going to do that again. We don't want the wealthy to get wealthier while we get poorer.

So the American public, I would expect, will say, "No, no way," just as they did when the great repeal and replace legislation was before Congress just a month ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have covered the issue for the night, but I want us all to remember that the test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is, rather, whether we provide enough for those who have too little. It is etched in the monument and the marble of the FDR Memorial, and it is a pretty good test of our progress here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do greatly appreciate my friend across the aisle. Mr. GARAMENDI made some good points. For example, the people speak, and we are thankful they do. And that is why, when the Democratic House Members and Democratic Senate Members voted to pass something known as ObamaCare—it is hard to call it the Affordable Care Act because it has come at the cost of some people's lives, their doctors, their insurance policies, their medicines they needed—but the American people did speak, and they said, "Not again," and they put Democrats out of the majority as a result of that bill.

As I explained to some of my colleagues in the Republican Conference who were saying that the Speaker is the one who got us the majority back, I pointed out in conference, if you look at the polls, it is very clear. No one person got us the majority back in November 2010. The Democrats got the Republicans the majority back.

The polls back then showed that we were not trusted any more than we had

been so much in the past, as they were, the voters were just upset with the Democrats passing a bill they didn't want, that the Democrats had not read, and didn't know what it said, and they were going to have to pass it to find out what was in it.

And they were lied to repeatedly. You can keep your insurance if you like it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor, and all those. Turns out they knew in advance—not all of the people here, but the people in the Obama administration who kept saying it, they knew they were lying because they knew people would not keep their insurance whether they liked it or not; they would not keep their doctors if they liked them as they may well not be in the network and probably wouldn't be in many networks.

So it is so true that the people speak, and thank goodness they do. And then they have returned, not only Republicans to majorities in the House, repeatedly, on the promise of repealing ObamaCare, but also gave the Senate the majority twice now on the promise to repeal ObamaCare and, unfortunately, the Senate has not delivered.

We passed a bill here in the House, it was after much wailing and gnashing of teeth, and a terrible bill at first that would have allowed premiums to continue to go up. Some say, yeah, but you should have voted for it; it would give the President some wind at his back.

But when the American people found out that premiums were going to continue to go up, their deductibles would continue to go up, the insurance companies would continue to get bailouts after record profit years, they were not going to be returning Republicans to the majority.

So it is still very critical that we keep our promises and we take a lesson from the actual planks of the platform that got our great President elected: number one, build a wall and secure the border; number two, repeal ObamaCare; number three, we would have tax reform. Those seem to be the three biggest promises that most all of us made on our side of the aisle.

The reason ObamaCare was not, at least the majority of it, repealed was because the Senate could not bring itself to act because there were some Senators who decided that, after winning their election, promising in the primary and general election that if you elect me, I will be the one who can get ObamaCare repealed, they decided to break that pledge, break that repeated promise.

So the thing I am grateful to the President—well, actually a number of things, but one is that he continues to say: We are not done. We are not through. We are going to repeal at least most of ObamaCare.

We have got to. People have got to have relief. They have got to. They cannot continue on like they are.

Obviously, we can see now, in hindsight, ObamaCare was designed to fail. Unfortunately, the insurance companies did not realize that when they signed on to ObamaCare, they were signing on to their death warrants; that the designers were counting on insurance companies to have people at the top who were so overwhelmed with greed they would not see the end coming as it came barreling toward them. They would be busy making record profits, getting bailouts, until the American people said we can't stand it anymore. The insurance companies had record profits and still got bailed out.

We never thought we would say this, but surely the government would be better than these greedy insurance companies; and that would be the end of the insurance companies.

And sure, some of the insurance executives would have taken their golden parachute and their millions after record profits and dropped out before the industry that made them rich ceased to exist, but that day is still coming if we don't act; and the American people would then be resolved to have much worse healthcare than the VA because the government would be the only game in town.

I know, from talking to one legislator in England, I was surprised. I thought everybody was mandated to be part of the government healthcare there. And it was true, but he said that his wife had had cancer, and, fortunately for them, they could afford to pay the private insurance above the ridiculously wasteful insurance the Britons have.

I remember looking at the numbers back in 2010, when we were debating ObamaCare, and seeing at that time that someone who was diagnosed with breast cancer at a similar time in the staging of cancer, breast cancer, as someone in the U.S., as someone in England, that the American had a 20 percent better chance of surviving than the British citizen under British healthcare did. That is terrifying to some of us. We don't want the kind of healthcare England has.

So if you have a wife and three daughters, like I do, the chances are much better that you will lose one of them if you have British-type healthcare.

I have one guy from Tyler, who lives in Tyler, was from Canada originally, said, his father was put on the list to have bypass surgery in Canada, and after 2 years of waiting, he died. It kind of sounds like the VA and the problems that have been experienced by some of our veterans.

But I would submit, if those who have laid down much of their lives for their country in our armed services are treated the way many of our veterans have been treated, then you can't expect that American citizens that have never offered to lay down their life for

their country would be treated much better.

We need to get off the track we are on. We need to return healthcare back to the control of a patient and a doctor, and get the insurance companies and the government out from between the patient and the doctor. We can do that with the kind of thing the President has been talking about, health savings accounts.

Instead of paying \$1,000 a month to an insurance company, put \$800 or \$900 in a health savings account; start building this huge healthcare, health savings account. And sure, there will be some people who are chronically ill or chronically poor. Those who don't have to be chronically poor, that could work, as we found out when welfare reform took place in the mid-nineties by the first Republican majority in many decades; as they found out, statistics showed, and there is a graph I saw at a conference in Harvard, for the first time since welfare began, 1995, after the work requirement kicked in for welfare, up through 2005, single moms' income, when adjusted for inflation, for the first time since welfare began, had an increase—that was incredible—when the government encouraged individuals to reach their potential, instead of luring them away from their potential with welfare when they could have had a job, that people do a lot better.

It is terribly unfortunate, though, that the lessons learned in the mid-nineties, including getting to balanced budgets, over the objections of the Clinton administration. President Clinton didn't want balanced budgets, but, eventually, the Republican Congress forced him when they had enough to override his veto, so he signed them.

And now, all these years later, when people don't remember, President Clinton likes to take credit for having the first balanced budget in years. Well, the Republicans took him, figuratively, kicking and screaming and, obviously, now, he is proud that they did, though they don't get the credit for it.

Well, we need to encourage people to reach their potential—that is the job of government—not luring them away from their potential. We should be encouraging the best healthcare that could be had.

We don't need insurance companies managing all our healthcare. We don't need the government managing all our healthcare. We need individuals managing their own healthcare.

If somebody wants to volunteer and say, "Here's all my income for the rest of my life. Government, you manage, tell me what I can have and not have in the way of surgeries or healthcare or medicine," well, we ought to make a place for them to do that. But for the rest of us who would rather make our own decisions about our healthcare, we could do that.

But one of the things, and I put it in the bill that I filed back in 2009—I was

encouraged by former Speaker Newt Gingrich, and he said: You have got to put your ideas into a bill, get it scored.

CBO refused to score it for many months. Former Speaker Gingrich thought if I had gotten it scored, that it could have changed the debate on healthcare.

But CBO dutifully did the bidding of Speaker PELOSI, scored their bills, refused to score mine, and so we didn't have the score.

And let's face it. CBO, on ObamaCare scoring, their margin of error apparently is somewhere, plus or minus, 250 to 400 percent; so why should they score anything anyway? But that is another matter.

But if the health insurance companies and the government don't manage all our healthcare, who would do that? Well, we would do that. If somebody's chronically poor and cannot provide for themselves, we can help them. But for those who can, they should.

If you put that kind of money in a health savings account, where it can never be used for anything but healthcare, not like retirement, where you can pull it out and pay a 40 percent tax, leave it in there. It can only be used for healthcare.

Give the individual a debit card that is coded that will only pay for medical expenses, medicine, crutches, doctors' appointments. Then most people would have enough built up in their health savings account by the time they are 65 or 70, they not only would not want government participation in decisions about their healthcare, but they wouldn't need it, and we could make our own decisions, after consulting with physicians. That saves healthcare.

The last 100 years of healthcare, some medical historians say, have been the only 100 years in American history where people had a better chance of getting well after seeing a doctor than of getting worse.

□ 1915

Even just over 200 years ago, the man without whom there would be no free America, George Washington, he was bled to death. The last bleeder was his very good friend, Dr. Craik, who had been with him through so many things. He thought he was helping him, and he was bleeding him to death, preventing him from getting well.

But here, 200 years later, doctors are actually curing disease, curing things we thought were incurable. We had the best healthcare that could ever been found at any time in history anywhere in the world, and we have done a great deal to destroy it since the passing of ObamaCare.

People have found out they lost their insurance. They are paying more than they ever dreamed they would pay. And, yes, there are some who are paying minimal amounts, and some are getting subsidies, but the President

had to make up some law in order to pay out some of the things he did.

Because of all of the distraction with ObamaCare, perhaps that is why the Obama administration dropped the ball on following through regarding Russia's efforts to sidetrack American politics.

This article from John Solomon and Alison Spann, October 22, in *The Hill*: "FBI Watched, Then Acted As Russian Spy Moved Closer to Hillary Clinton."

It says: "As Hillary Clinton was beginning her job as President Obama's chief diplomat, Federal agents observed as multiple arms of Vladimir Putin's machine unleashed an influence campaign designed to win access to the new Secretary of State, her husband, Bill Clinton, and members of their inner circle, according to interviews and once-sealed FBI records."

"Some of the activities FBI agents gathered evidence about in 2009 and 2010 were covert and illegal."

"A female Russian spy posing as an American accountant, for instance, used a false identity to burrow her way into the employ of a major Democratic donor in hopes of gaining intelligence on Hillary Clinton's Department, records show. The spy was arrested and deported as she moved closer to getting inside State, agents said."

"Other activities were perfectly legal and sitting in plain view, such as when a subsidiary of Russia's state-controlled nuclear energy company hired a Washington firm to lobby the Obama administration. At the time it was hired, the firm was providing hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in pro bono support to Bill Clinton's global charitable initiative, and it legally helped the Russian company secure Federal decisions that led to billions in new U.S. commercial nuclear business, records show."

"Agents were surprised by the timing and size of a \$500,000 check that a Kremlin-linked bank provided Bill Clinton"—that is the former President, and although none of the mainstream media would ever say this, Democrat Bill Clinton—"with for a single speech in the summer of 2010. The payday came just weeks after Hillary Clinton helped arrange for American executives to travel to Moscow to support Putin's efforts to build his own country's version of Silicon Valley, agents said."

"There is no evidence in any of the public records that the FBI believed that the Clintons or anyone close to them did anything illegal."

Yeah, that is pretty understandable that *The Hill* would say that and that the FBI would make sure those records were not available.

The article goes on. It says: "But there's definitive evidence the Russians were seeking their influence with a specific eye on the State Department."

"There is not one shred of doubt from the evidence that we had that the

Russians had set their sights on Hillary Clinton's circle, because she was the quarterback of the Obama-Russia reset strategy and the assumed successor to Obama as President,' said a source familiar with the FBI's evidence at the time. . . ."

"That source pointed to an October 2009 communication intercepted by the FBI in which Russian handlers instructed two of their spies specifically to gather nonpublic information on the State Department.

"Send more info on current international affairs vital for R., highlight U.S. approach,' part of the message to the spies read, using the country's first initial to refer to Russia. ' . . . Try to single out tidbits unknown publicly but revealed in private by sources closer to State Department, government, major think tanks.'"

This isn't in the article, but that might also mean, if the State Department Secretary had a server through which classified information was sent and it is not very well protected, gee, grab all of the information from that server that you can. Shouldn't be hard to hack them. That had to have been part of the thinking of the Russians. They surely figured out that Secretary of State Clinton was using different sources for her emails.

The article goes on: "The Clintons, by that time, had set up several new vehicles that included a multimillion-dollar speechmaking business, the family foundation, and a global charitable initiative, all of which proved attractive to the Russians as Hillary Clinton took over State.

"In the end, some of this just comes down to what it always does in Washington: donations, lobbying, contracts, and influence—even for Russia,' said Frank Figliuzzi, former FBI assistant director for counterintelligence.

"Figliuzzi supervised the post-arrest declassification and release of records from a 10-year operation that unmasked a major Russian spy ring in 2010. It was one of the most important U.S. counterintelligence victories against Russia in history, and famous for nabbing the glamorous spy-turned-model Anna Chapman.

"While Chapman dominated the headlines surrounding that spy ring, another Russian woman posing as a mundane New Jersey accountant named Cynthia Murphy was closing in on accessing Secretary Clinton's Department, according to records and interviews.

"For most of the 10 years, the ring of Russian spies that included Chapman and Murphy acted as sleepers, spending a 'great deal of time collecting information and passing it on' to their handlers inside Russia's SVR spy agency, FBI record state."

Inserting parenthetically here, also, we now know, due to the great investigating work of Luke Rosiak with The

Daily Caller, who apparently has done much more investigation into Imran Awan, the Awan family, and IT or computer workers, some of whom apparently didn't do any work but who were making the maximum amount of money that anybody can make working on the Hill for Congress, as I believe Luke testified or indicated in a prior meeting, he indicated that actually every time one of the Awan family added enough part-time work for Members of Congress with their computers, they would add another family member to start getting part-time until they built up to the \$160,000 or so level.

But in any event, we now know that, apparently, Imran Awan copied dozens of Democratic Members of Congress' servers into one place so that all of those servers could easily be accessed by someone who did not have permission to access those Congress Members' computer systems and servers.

It is interesting that that was occurring for him as a Pakistani native. He became a citizen but, at the time he began working on Capitol Hill, was here by visa working for Members, Democratic Members of Congress.

But how interesting that the Russians were doing everything they could to get any information, not just classified, but any inside information, stuff like you would find in emails, for example. And now we are finding all of this out about the Awan brothers, and his wife and a couple of people, one of whom quit because he was doing too much of the work and not getting as much pay as the others.

But it is incredible that it was after President Obama left office we started hearing all of this screaming about how the Russians were trying to affect elections. And who knew about that? Well, Robert Mueller, former FBI Director knew all about it because he was the FBI as this stuff was being investigated. Wouldn't it be nice if he had said something about that previously?

But if he had talked about it previously, he might not—and I am sure, in fact, would not—have gotten an appointment to be special counsel to investigate potential ties by the U.S. Government with Russia, specifically, the Trump campaign, or the Trump support ring, those who were supporting Donald Trump as a candidate. Wow.

But then again, Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein might have appointed Mueller, because it turns out he was involved in the investigation back then. Wouldn't it have been nice if Rosenstein or Mueller had had the moral fiber and the ethical fiber to say: "You know what? The AG has recused himself, but, actually, I was involved in this stuff back under the Obama administration investigating all this, and I had developed opinions, made statements back in those days—weren't public."

And if Mueller had done the same thing: "I was head of the FBI. We were investigating ties to Hillary Clinton, efforts to get in touch with and utilize the Clinton Foundation, Hillary Clinton."

Wouldn't it have been nice if that information had come from Robert Mueller or Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein before Rosenstein appointed Mueller, because those two people would not even be involved at all, I don't believe, had we known the extent of their involvement in the investigation into Russia before, when they were with the Obama administration. But they didn't disclose that.

And I think it is a little insidious, myself, on the very day that James Comey testified on Capitol Hill that there were no known ties between President Trump and the Russians, the collusion that was talked about, there were no ties, no evidence of that, it was the same day it was leaked, apparently by Mueller or his staff, that now they were investigating obstruction by the Trump administration.

Now, why would that get leaked the very night that James Comey testified there were no known ties, no evidence of any collusion between President Trump and the Russians? Well, because if there was no evidence to support what Mueller had been appointed to investigate, then President Trump would have had every right and it would have made sense to say: "Okay, Mr. Mueller, it sure would have been nice if you had disclosed the reasons that you should have been disqualified to accept this special counsel job. But even though you didn't, there is no reason for you to be special counsel because there is no evidence, according to this FBI Director, so we don't need you anymore."

□ 1930

But by Mueller or his clan leaking out that now we are investigating President Trump for obstruction of justice, that set him up in a position that President Trump could not afford to fire him, or else it would look like Nixon's Saturday Night Massacre before they had a chance to come after him. So, clearly, former FBI Director Mueller who, in my opinion, did more damage to the structure of the FBI than anyone since J. Edgar Hoover, ran off thousands of years of experience from the FBI and spent millions of dollars on programs that didn't work out. Apparently he got rid of a lot of people that would not say yes to him all the time. He also—let's give him credit—he did purge the FBI training materials of anything that offended radical Islamists.

I would submit there is a reason why when an FBI agent was finally sent out to talk to the older Tsarnaev brother after Russia had reported twice—actually doing America a favor—hey, this guy has been radicalized. Do they look

at where he had been to see that he had been in areas that were very radical and what he was like?

No. They sent out an FBI agent to talk to him. According to Director Mueller, in essence, he indicated he was not a terrorist, so that was good enough for them. But they went the extra mile and asked his mother if he was a terrorist, and, in essence, she indicated he was a good boy and not a terrorist. That was good enough for the new Mueller FBI that had purged itself of the ability to know what a radical Islamist looked like.

When I asked about their going out to the mosque to investigate whether Tsarnaev had been radicalized, of course, again, they purged their training materials, they didn't know what to ask. They didn't know whether to ask if he had been memorizing verses of the Koran, what verses those were. Kim Jensen, who had a 700-page program to teach FBI agents about what to look for in radical Islamists, under Mueller, was ordered to destroy all of those. Fortunately, there was an extra copy. As I understand it, the FBI is now trying to teach some of the higher-level agents exactly what a radical Islamist is. But if Mr. McMaster has his way, that won't last much longer.

But, nonetheless, Director Mueller, as head of the FBI, as one intelligence official told me, they were blinded of the ability to see the enemy—the enemy being radical Islamists who want to destroy our Nation, destroy our freedom, and kill us. They don't know what to look for, thanks to Director Mueller.

Of course, as the Washingtonian article pointed out in 2013, basically Mueller and Comey were joined at the hip, that if the world was on fire, Mueller would be the last one standing beside Comey, protecting him, with him, supporting him, whatever. Which, by the way, is another reason, if Mr. Mueller had been as ethical and moral as he should have been, he should have disclosed immediately: I can't accept this special counsel role because James Comey is a friend. He sees me as a mentor. We talked, including about his testimony he was going to give before Congress. We are just too close, and he is a central witness to all of this. I can't do it.

Unfortunately, Director Mueller did not take that position not feeling that he needed to do that, because, after all, it is a great job. It pays a lot of money. He can hire anybody he wants to and hire good Democratic supporters, as he has. For people who hate Republicans, this will be a great job. Apparently it is. He just basically makes up whatever he wants to investigate anytime he sees fit, and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein should have been disqualified and not been able to appoint special counsel had the Attorney General known what all he had been involved in

previously. He certainly is not going to fire Mueller, as he should.

Going over to a different article, this is from National Review by Andrew McCarthy, October 21. Andrew McCarthy is the former prosecutor of The Blind Sheikh that masterminded the first World Trade Center attack in 1993 during Democrat Bill Clinton's Presidency.

Andrew McCarthy says: "Not only the Clintons are implicated in a uranium deal with the Russians that compromised national security interests. Let's put the Uranium One scandal in perspective: the cool half-million bucks the Putin regime funneled to Bill Clinton was five times the amount it spent on those Facebook ads—the ones the media-Democrat complex ludicrously suggests swung the 2016 Presidential election to Donald Trump. The Facebook-ad buy, which started in June 2015—before Donald Trump entered the race—was more leftwing agit-prop, ads pushing hysteria on racism, immigration, guns, et cetera, than electioneering. The Clintons' own long-time political strategist Mark Penn estimates that just \$6,500 went to actual electioneering. You read that right: \$6,500. By contrast, the staggering \$500,000 payday from a Kremlin-tied Russian bank for a single speech was part of a multimillion-dollar influence-peddling scheme to enrich the former President and his wife, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. At the time, Russia was plotting—successfully—to secure U.S. Government approval for its acquisition of Uranium One, and with it, tens of billions of dollars in U.S. uranium reserves.

"Here is the kicker: the Uranium One scandal is not only, or even principally, a Clinton scandal. It is an Obama administration scandal. The Clintons were just doing what the Clintons do: cashing in on their 'public service.' The Obama administration, with Secretary Clinton at the forefront but hardly alone, was knowingly compromising American national security interests. The administration green-lighted the transfer of control over one-fifth of American uranium mining capacity to Russia, a hostile regime—and specifically to Russia's state-controlled nuclear-energy conglomerate, Rosatom. Worse, at the time the administration approved the transfer, it knew that Rosatom's American subsidiary was engaged in a lucrative racketeering enterprise that had already committed felony extortion, fraud, and money-laundering offenses."

It is not in the article, but it does raise the question: Gee, I wonder if the Obama administration or Director Mueller of the FBI, knowing all these things apparently, did anybody bother to tell Secretary Clinton about the situation and that the entity that they were being courted by was actually tied to felony extortion, fraud, and money-laundering offenses?

I thought the Obama administration was pretty close-knit. It seemed like they would have surely told Secretary of State Clinton who had access to classified information. We know because she put it on her server that wasn't classified.

But it looks like somebody would have told the Secretary of State: Hey, this outfit that is courting you has ties to the people paying your husband half a million dollars for one speech, paying \$145 million or so to the Clinton Foundation, these folks are bad folks.

Surely somebody in the Obama administration would have told them. Well, we don't know, and, certainly, Director Mueller is not going to investigate any inappropriate actions that he or James Comey or Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein took or didn't take.

The article goes on to say: "The Obama administration also knew that congressional Republicans were trying to stop the transfer. Consequently, the Justice Department concealed what it knew."

That being from congressional Republicans who were trying to stop the transfer.

In fact, "the DOJ allowed the racketeering enterprise to continue compromising the American uranium industry rather than commencing a prosecution that would have scotched the transfer. Prosecutors waited 4 years before quietly pleading the case out for a song, in violation of Justice Department charging guidelines. Meanwhile, the administration stonewalled Congress, reportedly threatening an informant who wanted to go public.

"Obama's 'reset,' to understand what happened here, we need to go back to the beginning. The first-tier military arsenal of Putin's Russia belies its status as a third-rate economic power. For well over a decade, the regime has thus sought to develop and exploit its capacity as a nuclear-energy producer. Naïvely viewing Russia as a 'strategic partner' rather than a malevolent competitor, the Bush administration made a nuclear-cooperation agreement with the Kremlin in May of 2008.

"That blunder, however, was tabled before Congress could consider it. That is because Russia, being Russia, invaded Georgia. In 2009, notwithstanding this aggression, which continues to this day with Russia's occupation of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, President Obama and Secretary of State Clinton signaled the new administration's determination to 'reset' relations with Moscow. In this reset, renewed cooperation and commerce in nuclear energy would be central. There had been such cooperation and commerce since the Soviet Union imploded. In 1992, the administration of President George H. W. Bush agreed with the nascent Russian Federation that U.S. nuclear providers would be

permitted to purchase uranium from Russia's disassembled nuclear warheads, after it had been down-blended from its highly enriched weapons-grade level.

"The Russian commercial agent responsible for the sale and transportation of this uranium to the U.S. is the Kremlin-controlled company 'Tenex,' formally, JSC Technobexport. Tenex is a subsidiary of Rosatom. Tenex, and by extension, Rosatom, have an American arm called 'Tenam USA.' Tenam is based in Bethesda, Maryland. Around the time President Obama came to power, the Russian official in charge of Tenam was Vadim Mikerin. The Obama administration reportedly issued a visa for Mikerin in 2010, but a racketeering investigation led by the FBI determined that he was already operating here in 2009. The racketeering scheme as Tenam's general director, Mikerin was responsible for arranging and managing Rosatom/Tenex's contracts with American uranium purchasers.

"This gave him tremendous leverage over the U.S. companies. With the assistance of several confederates, Mikerin used this leverage to extort and defraud the U.S. contractors into paying inflated prices for uranium. They then laundered the proceeds through shell companies and secret bank accounts in Latvia, Cyprus, Switzerland, and the Seychelle Islands—though sometimes transactions were handled in cash, with the skim divided into envelopes stuffed with thousands of dollars in cash. The inflated payments served two purposes: they enriched Kremlin-connected energy officials in the U.S. and in Russia to the tune of millions of dollars; and they compromised the American companies that paid the bribes, rendering players in U.S. nuclear energy—a sector critical to national security—vulnerable to blackmail by Moscow. But Mikerin had a problem.

"To further the Kremlin's push for nuclear-energy expansion, he had been seeking to retain a lobbyist—from whom he planned to extort kickbacks, just as he did with the U.S. energy companies. With the help of an associate connected to Russian organized-crime groups, Mikerin found his lobbyist. The man's name has not been disclosed, but we know he is now represented by Victoria Toensing, a well-respected Washington lawyer, formerly a Federal prosecutor and counsel to the Senate Intelligence Committee.

□ 1945

"When Mikerin solicited him in 2009, the lobbyist was uncomfortable, worried that the proposal would land him on the wrong side of the law. So he contacted the FBI to reveal what he knew. From then on, the Bureau and Justice Department permitted him to participate in the Russian racketeering

scheme as a 'confidential source'—and he is thus known as 'CS-1' in affidavits the government, years later, presented to Federal court in order to obtain search and arrest warrants. At the time this unidentified man became an informant, the FBI was led by Director Robert Mueller, who is now the special counsel investigating whether Trump colluded with Russia," which we keep hearing there is no evidence of.

"The investigation was centered in Maryland, Tenam's home base. There, the U.S. Attorney was Obama appointee Rod Rosenstein—now President Trump's Deputy Attorney General, and the man who appointed Mueller as special counsel to investigate Trump.

"Because of CS-1, the FBI was able to understand and monitor the racketeering enterprise almost from the start. By mid-May 2010, it could already prove the scheme and three separate extortionate payments Mikerin had squeezed out of the informant.

"Equally important: According to reporting by John Solomon and Alison Spann in 'The Hill'—which we were just speaking about—"the informant learned through conversations with Mikerin and others that Russian nuclear officials were trying to ingratiate themselves with the Clintons."

It goes on and on, Mr. Speaker, but it is clear this definitely needs investigation. It needs investigation as to the propriety of the actions of Robert Mueller, FBI Director. It needs investigation into the propriety of the actions by Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein.

We need a special counsel. If the current Attorney General considers himself recused, there is only one person who has the power to make that appointment, and that is the President of the United States, from whom the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein derive their power to appoint special counsel.

The President needs to appoint somebody to investigate this mess, because I guess former Secretary Clinton knew with authority when she said the Russians were clearly trying to hack and to influence this election. Yes, they sure were.

It appears they were doing more to influence the Clintons and the Obama administration than they were even the American people: \$500,000 to Bill Clinton himself and only \$6,500 to the ads to try to affect the American people.

So this really does need to be investigated. I know Congress really hasn't gotten into it in any depth, but if Congress is to do that, it has got to take a page out of Judicial Watch's notebook, and that is you have got to be willing to go to court and demand people produce evidence, produce people.

We can't just continue to be obstructed the way we have allowed the IRS Director to do after he has obfus-

cated, lied to Congress, and I believe perjured himself, after Lois Lerner appears certainly to have committed crimes, to me, and we have let her get away with such apparent criminal activity.

But in the few minutes I have left, in addition to this scourge upon the United States that we find out was going on during the Obama administration, there is a tremendous irony that is playing out, and it is reflected in the article by J.E. Dyer, October 10.

The article is titled: "NFL meltdown blows the dam on MSM's centralized media model."

I thought about this. I did not realize, but Colin Kaepernick first began to kneel down after he apparently has also supported a group that wants to kill cops and thinks cops should be killed, the people who are protecting us and allowing us to continue safely in our way of life and our freedom.

He doesn't have that respect. He knelt. He had nothing but contempt for America's police and for those protecting America. He did not appreciate America, which was bringing him millions of dollars. Just contempt. Apparently, his belief is there is racism in America, though he was adopted by, as I understand it, a White family.

But he started this, and the American people didn't like it. After 9/11 particularly, they realized: You know what? We owe so much to first responders and to law enforcement that have been willing to lay down their lives for us against enemies, foreign and domestic. And they continue, as police around the country, law enforcement, continue to be willing to lay down their lives for Americans and our way of life, our freedom. We appreciated that after 9/11.

After my 4 years in the Army, when we were sometimes ordered not to wear our uniform because of hatred for people in uniform after Vietnam, I didn't think we would ever come to a day when people would again appreciate our military. But that also came out in amazing ways after 9/11.

As evil and hateful as the actions were that day in an effort to kill as many innocent people as these radical Islamists could, we saw the good in Americans. We saw the good in first responders. We saw the good in our military. We saw men and women willing to evidence the greatest love, as Jesus said, willing to lay down their lives for their fellow Americans.

Yet, during the last administration, somehow the President normally took the wrong side. He spoke up before the evidence was in and often derided the wrong people. I just can't believe that our President for those last 8 years set us back so many years in race relations. It is incredible. I thought we were beyond that, but we got set back many years.

Huge numbers of Americans didn't appreciate the way the Obama administration set us back in race relations. For the first time, we had a President and First Lady who had not normally been proud as Americans. The First Lady said she was finally proud of America.

I have been proud of America all my life. I was not proud of the activities of some Americans. Americans have been a force for good in the world since it came into existence. This article points out that, actually, that started something, because then other NFL players, as we have heard, didn't even realize what Colin Kaepernick was actually kneeling for. It is interesting to hear their explanations. They are not sure. They just have contempt for something, so they kneel during the national anthem.

It has so affected many Americans that many of us are not watching the NFL like we used to. It used to be a priority. I was always glad to get home from church and turn on the NFL, maybe see the Dallas Cowboys. I haven't been doing that. It hasn't been a priority. Colin Kaepernick started that.

Now, as this article points out, the one thing that allowed the mainstream media to bundle all kinds of programming that they forced cable companies or dish companies to take was the NFL. It was the big breadwinner that forced cable companies and satellite companies to take programming they really didn't want. But if you wanted the NFL, you had to take what the networks were bundling.

Now that the NFL is not turning into the cash cow it once was, and viewership and attendance drops, and, therefore, advertising dollars are plummeting, it may just be that that act of taking a knee back when it first started ends up leading to the liberal mainstream media not force-feeding Americans liberal pabulum that they have been able to do for years. Wouldn't that be an ironic result of one player taking a knee?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from improper references to the President.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1616. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2989. An act to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 190. An act to provide for consideration of the extension under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of nonapplication of No-Load Mode energy efficiency standards to certain security or life safety alarms or surveillance systems, and for other purposes.

S. 585. An act to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

S. 920. An act to establish a National Clinical Care Commission.

S. 1617. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 77 North in Sarita, Texas, as the "Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint".

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 24, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2989. To establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission.

H.R. 1616. To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2898. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Frederick S. Rudesheim, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2899. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General Mark E. Weatherington, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2900. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting

the report entitled "Health, United States, 2016", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 242m(a)(1); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 308 (as amended by Public Law 100-177, Sec. 106(a)); (101 Stat. 989); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2901. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Institute for Children's Health Quality, transmitting the Institute's report on the Sick Cell Disease Treatment Demonstration Program for September 2017, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300b-1 note; Public Law 108-357, Sec. 712(c); (118 Stat. 1559); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2902. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States for 2016, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 287b(a); Dec. 20, 1945, ch. 583, Sec. 4(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 1501A-465); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2903. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2904. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2905. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Sec. 804 of the Palestine Liberation Organization Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (Title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246)), as amended, and Secs. 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 ("the Act", Public Law 107-228); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2906. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-150, "Access to Emergency Epinephrine in Schools Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2907. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-151, "Public School Nurse Assignment Temporary Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2908. A letter from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2909. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting four (4) notifications of a designation of acting officer and discontinuation of service in

acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2910. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting notification of a vacancy, designation of acting officer, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2911. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting four (4) notifications of designation of acting officer and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2912. A letter from the Director, White House Liaison, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education, transmitting notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2913. A letter from the Director, White House Liaison, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2914. A letter from the Director, White House Liaison, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Department of Education, transmitting notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2915. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2916. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties Activities Semiannual Report covering April 1, 2016, through September 30, 2016, pursuant to Sec. 803 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, Public Law 110-53, 121 Stat. 266, 361-62 (codified at 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1(f)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2917. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties Activities Semiannual Report covering October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016, pursuant to Sec. 803 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, Public Law 110-53, 121 Stat. 266, 361-62 (codified at 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1(f)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2918. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Thirty-Ninth Annual Report to Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2919. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification that the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3385-EM in the State of Florida has exceeded the

\$5 million limit for a single emergency declaration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(3); Public Law 93-288, Sec. 503(b)(3) (as amended by Public Law 100-707, Sec. 107(a)); (102 Stat. 4707); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2920. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification that the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3384-EM in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has exceeded the \$5 million limit for a single emergency declaration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(3); Public Law 93-288, Sec. 503(b)(3) (as amended by Public Law 100-707, Sec. 107(a)); (102 Stat. 4707); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2921. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Technify Motors GmbH Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0241; Product Identifier 2017-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-19045; AD 2017-19-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2922. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9185; Product Identifier 2016-NM-077-AD; Amendment 39-19040; AD 2017-19-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2923. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0494; Product Identifier 2016-NM-126-AD; Amendment 39-19047; AD 2017-19-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2924. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0511; Product Identifier 2016-NM-176-AD; Amendment 39-19036; AD 2017-19-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2925. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0809; Product Identifier 2017-NM-094-AD; Amendment 39-19030; AD 2017-18-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2926. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0334; Product Identifier 2017-NM-008-AD; Amendment 39-19039; AD 2017-19-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2927. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Annual Report of the Student Loan Ombudsman, pursuant to Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1035; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Education and the Workforce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROYCE of California: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 3329. A bill to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-366, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROYCE of California: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 3342. A bill to impose sanctions on foreign persons that are responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights by reason of the use by Hizballah of civilians as human shields, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-367, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2600. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land in Pottawattamie County, Iowa, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 580. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027 (Rept. 115-369). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committees on Financial Services and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3329 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3342 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4099. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that children of homeless veterans are included in the calculation of the amounts of certain per diem

grants; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4100. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to revise the Federal charter for the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 4101. A bill to reverse declining milk consumption in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HURD):

H.R. 4102. A bill to apply certain medical requirements to an operator of an air balloon; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BARRAGAN):

H.R. 4103. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit an annual report to Congress on certain statistics related to applications for a permit to drill an oil or gas well, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 4104. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the additional temporary exception from the Medicare site-neutral inpatient payment rate to additional DRG codes for severe wound discharges from long-term care hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 4105. A bill to amend title XX of the Social Security Act to extend the health professions workforce demonstration project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 4106. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the amount of monthly dependents and survivors income security benefit payable to surviving spouses by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 4107. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, their bravery, and their service to the nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 4108. A bill to establish an Anti-Bullying Roundtable to study bullying in elementary and secondary schools in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 4109. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the deposits of bidders in auctions of spectrum frequencies to be deposited in the Treasury; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KIND, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 4110. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that all provisions shall apply to legally married same-sex couples in the same manner as other married couples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 4111. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 4112. A bill to ensure the safety of workers of contractors that serve and supply the Armed Forces and the accountable use of taxpayer dollars; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 4113. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain agreements with non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers if the Secretary is not feasibly able to provide health care in facilities of the Department or through contracts or sharing agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. KIHUEN):

H.R. 4114. A bill to require Federal agencies to address environmental justice, to require consideration of cumulative impacts in certain permitting decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H. Res. 579. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BACON:

H. Res. 581. A resolution congratulating the people of the Republic of Turkey and Turkish Americans nationwide on Turkish Republic Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H. Res. 582. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Joseph Leon George should be honored for heroism at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H. Res. 583. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the last week in October as "Black Women's Health Week"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. PINGREE):

H. Res. 584. A resolution recognizing the International Day of Rural Women on Octo-

ber 15, 2017, in celebration of women farmers around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H. Res. 585. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to direct the Chief Administrative Officer to carry out an annual information security training program for Members, officers, and employees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

139. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to House Resolution No. 57, supporting Congress' efforts to censure President Donald Trump, calls upon President Donald Trump to publicly apologize to all Americans for his racist and bigoted behavior, and calls upon all other state legislatures to ask the same of Congress and the President; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 18

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 4102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution that grants Congress the authority, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 4103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a
The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 4104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 4105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:

H.R. 4107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, to make all laws, which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 4108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 4109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 4110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 4111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3: "To Regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and Among the several state, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 4112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 4113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section VIII of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 35: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 113: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 154: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 173: Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. GALLEGU.

H.R. 233: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 252: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 299: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 377: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 380: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 392: Mr. COMER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 422: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 502: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 579: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 719: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 741: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 754: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 757: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 761: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 782: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 807: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROSKAM, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 811: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 812: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 821: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 846: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 860: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 881: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 918: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 919: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1017: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1078: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1094: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1143: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1155: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1156: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1224: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1243: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1279: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1281: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1341: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1360: Mr. LATTA and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1378: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1409: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1456: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1463: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1478: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1494: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. GABBARD and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1515: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1520: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1563: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1580: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 1617: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1626: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1673: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1674: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1730: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1757: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1776: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1832: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1847: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1865: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 1896: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1900: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 2092: Mr. CORREA and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2101: Mr. COLE, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2119: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 2121: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 2150: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2198: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 2310: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HARPER, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 2319: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 2320: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2327: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2351: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2394: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2401: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2403: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2404: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2436: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. FASO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2499: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2575: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2599: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2601: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 2633: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2641: Mr. RUSH and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2644: Mr. POCAN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2651: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2690: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2718: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2790: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2797: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2799: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2823: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2851: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2862: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2884: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2902: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HECK, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2909: Mr. COOK and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 2938: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 2948: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CRIST, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSS and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 2973: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 2980: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 2996: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3018: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3030: Mr. DONOVAN and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3032: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3076: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3108: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3117: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3148: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 3179: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 3227: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3258: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3271: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 3274: Mr. DUNN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. COLE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 3275: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 3296: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 3320: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 3329: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 3342: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 3380: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3394: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 3419: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
 H.R. 3459: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 3556: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 3576: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 3596: Mr. EMMER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 3632: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 3635: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 3656: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 3671: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 3681: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 3712: Mr. GALLEGO.
 H.R. 3716: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3720: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 3731: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 3758: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 H.R. 3767: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANCE, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 3768: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 3770: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 3782: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 3811: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3866: Mr. WESTERMAN and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 3887: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3889: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 3931: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 3939: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 3956: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3963: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 3966: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. BUCK.
 H.R. 3988: Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 4007: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 4012: Ms. ROSEN, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
 H.R. 4013: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 4073: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 4079: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 4082: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. ADAMS.
 H.R. 4090: Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 4098: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. COOPER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. LABRADOR.
 H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. FOSTER.
 H. Res. 15: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. KIND.
 H. Res. 142: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H. Res. 149: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H. Res. 188: Mr. BERA.
 H. Res. 220: Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 283: Mr. HECK.
 H. Res. 307: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 318: Mr. KATKO.
 H. Res. 346: Ms. LEE.
 H. Res. 359: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. MOULTON.
 H. Res. 466: Mr. BOST, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H. Res. 529: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H. Res. 556: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 557: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 565: Ms. LEE.
 H. Res. 571: Ms. GABBARD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3798: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

64. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, Texas, relative to remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation by Congress that would end the status of "Columbus Day" as an official Federal holiday; which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

SENATE—Tuesday, October 24, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, who is enthroned on high, thank You for the happiness we receive because of fellowship with You. Keep us grateful for Your sustaining presence that surrounds us with Your favor.

Lord, bless and sustain our Senators. Remind them that You will not forget their faithful service to You and country. Deliver them from anxiety about what the future holds as they confidently trust You to care for them. Clothe them with Your righteousness, and prepare them to see Your face in peace. Help them to see themselves as Your servants, bringing the illumination of Your wisdom and peace to Capitol Hill.

God of our hopes and dreams, we bless Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 24, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN SASSE, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SASSE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

NATURAL DISASTER EMERGENCY FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today, the Senate will pass an important measure to provide relief for communities that are struggling to rebuild after the natural disasters that have affected many different parts of our country. Soon, this emergency funding legislation will be on its way to the President for his signature.

With these new resources, Federal aid workers from FEMA and the rest of the administration can continue their critical recovery operations, including search and rescue missions, debris removal, and infrastructure repair, as well as providing much needed assistance to individuals and to families.

I will continue to monitor these disaster response efforts, and I will continue to engage with leaders both in Washington and on the ground. The Senate will also continue doing its part to help the victims recover.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, as we continue our work in the Senate, we look forward to hearing the President's perspectives on how to advance our shared agenda, particularly the upcoming debate on bringing tax relief, economic growth, and jobs to Americans through tax reform.

Last week, the Senate passed a comprehensive, responsible budget that will help put the government on a path to balance and help put our economy on a road to robust growth. This week, the House plans to bring the budget to the floor for passage by Thursday. Once they pass it, we will have important legislative tools to help our economy grow through tax reform.

As we all know, after years of an economy that failed to live up to its full potential, the time is now to pass tax reform so that we can get America going again and growing again. We want to make taxes lower, simpler, and fairer. We want to close loopholes that are exploited by the wealthy. We want to make it easier to create new jobs in America and keep them here. In short, we want to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more in yours.

These are the ideas that drive tax reform. They are shared by the President. They are shared by Americans in both political parties. They should be shared by Senators of both political parties, as well, and for many years, they actually were. The former chairmen of the Finance Committee, Sen-

ator WYDEN, called our current Tax Code an "anticompetitive mess." The senior Senator from Michigan, Ms. STABENOW, expressed her concern for a tax code that incentivizes jobs to be shipped overseas, and our friend, the Democratic leader, wrote about our Tax Code's failure to help American workers compete.

Many Democrats called for action to get tax reform done. I hope that our Democratic friends will work with us now in a serious way to actually do it. After all, it is not as if the need for tax reform has changed since our friends made these statements as recently as a few years ago. The only thing that has changed is the occupant of the White House. That is the only difference. So let's get this done. The American people are counting on us.

NOMINATIONS OF SCOTT PALK AND TREVOR McFADDEN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, in addition to our important legislative priorities, the Senate is also working hard to confirm the President's excellent judicial nominees.

Last night, I filed cloture on two nominees for U.S. district courts.

Scott Palk has been nominated to serve as a district judge for the Western District of Oklahoma. He has served in multiple roles in the U.S. attorney's office in prosecuting organized crime and terrorism cases, and the Senate Judiciary Committee sent his nomination to the floor with an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

Another nominee, Trevor McFadden, was voted out of the Judiciary Committee with no opposition at all. He has been tapped to serve as a district judge for the District of Columbia, and as a former police officer, Mr. McFadden will bring a wealth of law enforcement experience to the bench.

The Senate will vote on both of these nominees this week, and then we will continue working to confirm President Trump's outstanding judicial nominees. I look forward to supporting these nominees, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm them.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, good morning.

Before I get into everything, I have just seen that President Trump has resumed his Twitter war with another Member of this body, our friend from Tennessee. It is long past time for the President to quit his daily compulsion of engaging in Twitter feuds and, instead, get to work for the American people. We have a lot of serious issues to deal with in this country. Our challenges are too entrenched and complex to be solved if the President spends his time in a meaningless war of words on Twitter—today with this person, tomorrow with another.

We need President Trump to roll up his sleeves and get to work—to stop tweeting and start leading. Let me repeat that. Maybe the President will hear it. For the good of America, we need our President to roll up his sleeves and get to work—to stop tweeting and start leading.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, concerning North Korea, instead of undermining his Secretary of State and picking Twitter fights with Kim Jong Un that risk a war, President Trump should formulate a serious strategy to put the heat on China to pressure the North Koreans and resolve this crisis. China holds the cards here, but they have done nothing to help us or very little at least.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on healthcare, President Trump should stop playing games with America's healthcare and publicly declare his support for the Alexander-Murray compromise.

President Trump is meeting with the Senate Republicans at their caucus lunch today, with Senator ALEXANDER and all other 11 Republican cosponsors of the bill. Why not provide some clarity? Why not say, as he has said in the past, that he supports Senator ALEXANDER's work? I believe many more Republican Senators want to sign their name onto this bill, but they are waiting to hear definitively from the President before they announce their support. After all, nearly every Republican here voted to extend the cost-sharing program already. It was part of their first healthcare bill. Every Democrat supports cost-sharing.

So the President has talked to me about wanting to be bipartisan on

healthcare, and the best way to do it is to support Alexander-Murray. It is time that the President catches up to the rest of us and supports the bill. Right now he is the barrier.

Leader McCONNELL has said that if the President will sign it, he will put it on the floor of the Senate. It will get an overwhelming vote. It will then have to be put on the House floor. So Speaker RYAN will have no choice, or the rise in premiums will be on his back and the backs of his Members whom he seeks to protect.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Probably most of all, when we talk about the President, it is time to stop tweeting and start leading on taxes. Mr. President, it is time to start really engaging with the substance of the tax plan that your staff and congressional Republicans have put together because, Mr. President, your rhetoric does not match the reality on the tax bill.

The President has been selling his tax plan as a boon for the middle class. He told a group of truckers earlier this month that his tax plan is "a middle-class bill." He said: "The biggest winners will be everyday American workers." In his words, the Republican tax plan would bring about a "middle-class miracle."

President Trump, I urge you to look closely at the tax plan that your staff and congressional Republicans have put together. Ask the advisers around you what about this tax plan benefits the middle class and the everyday American worker more than the wealthy and the powerful, because trickle-down, if that is the only thing that benefits the middle class in your thinking, doesn't work. No one believes in trickle-down anymore except a small group of very wealthy business people who have undue influence on the Republican Party and, I hope, not on you, Mr. President.

Let's look at this plan that supposedly is a middle-class plan. It repeals the estate tax. That applies to a small number of families with estates over \$5 million. It lowers the rate on passthrough entities. That benefits wealthy law firms and hedge fund managers so they can pay less in taxes than the average citizen. It lowers the top rate while raising the bottom one. The cut in the corporate rate would hardly help the American worker. This is trickle-down. Our Republican colleagues don't talk about trickle-down because they know most of America doesn't believe in it.

Our corporations are flush with cash already. They are flush with cash. Giving them more cash is not going to change their behavior. What are they doing with this cash? Most of the large corporations are not creating jobs with the cash they now have. Stock divi-

dends, stock buybacks, dividends, increases in CEO salaries—that is where it goes. So this bill is not a middle-class bill. I believe the President believes it is. You have to read it. No more tweeting, no more superficiality—read the bill. Don't let your advisers just walk in and say: Mr. President, it is a great, middle-class bill, and you just let them go by.

It has already been shown—not just by me but by many others—that Mnuchin and Cohen don't tell the truth about this bill, and they know better. The Tax Policy Center said that the top 1 percent of our country will reap 80 percent of the benefits from this plan. They also said, Mr. President, that it is a middle-class bill. According to the Tax Policy Center—no one has disputed it—a third of all middle-class taxpayers will see their taxes go up. Is that a middle-class tax bill, Mr. President, one in which taxes go up, not down, on nearly 30 percent of middle-class taxpayers?

Now, if this is such a middle-class tax plan, then, why do Republicans here on the Hill keep floating new middle-class deductions to cut—the very deductions on which the middle class depends. First, it was the mortgage deduction and, then, the elimination of State and local deductibility, which made it into the plan. Now they are even talking about capping pretax contributions to 401(k) plans.

There are such huge tax breaks for the wealthy and such a huge deficit hole that the tax writers have no choice but to raise taxes on the middle class and cut deductions. Even the great doubling of the standard deduction, Mr. President, is undone by the elimination of the personal deduction. If you are a family of three, you break even. If you are a family of four, you lose money even before they cut the other deductions.

Now, on State and local, in many Republican districts in the House, in many of our Republican colleagues' States, over 30 percent—certainly, 20 percent, and the lowest number is 17—of taxpayers would use that deduction. Eliminating the State and local deduction is a dagger to the heart of the middle class, Mr. President. You should tell your tax writers in the House and Senate to take it out of the bill.

Here is what PricewaterhouseCoopers just found out. Home values would go down 10 percent if we eliminated the State and local deduction. Homes are the piece of the rock for the middle class. People wait and struggle and pay every month so they can own their own home free and clear, and then that value declines because we eliminated State and local deductibility. Every homeowner is affected, even those who take the standard deduction.

If this were such a middle-class plan, I would say this to the President: Why wouldn't Republicans on the Hill scrap

the repeal of the estate tax, which only benefits the very rich—not one drop goes to the middle class—instead of looking for more middle-class deductions, like the 401(k), to reduce or eliminate?

President Trump says he wants to do a middle-class bill, but if the only benefit to the middle class is this trickle-down theory, it is not a middle-class bill at all.

We Democrats have said all along that we want to update our Tax Code to provide middle-class tax relief. My caucus wants to provide tax relief to small businesses, not to big corporations. They are the ones that need the money to create jobs, not the big corporations who are flush with money.

Incidentally, as for AT&T, which is leading the charge for this tax cut, their average tax rate over the last 10 years was 8 percent, and they eliminated 80,000 jobs. So much for the idea that when you pay a low tax rate you are creating jobs.

So we offer this to the President: Come work with Democrats on a real middle-class tax bill. The plan your advisers put together with Republicans on the Hill doesn't do what you say it does. We can put together a tax bill in a bipartisan way that actually gets the job done for the middle class and that tells the rich corporate leaders and financiers that they shouldn't be in control of the bill, which they are now, and you, Mr. President, are going along wittingly or unwittingly. Either way is no good for you, no good for your party, and no good, most of all, for America.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, one final word here on wildfires, which I know my colleague from California is ready to speak about. She has seen the damage and is working so hard to help the people of her State.

So we are going to talk about wildfires, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. First, we can't forget about the 3.5 million American citizens in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, who continue to suffer the terrible effects of Hurricane Maria, the strongest storm to hit the island in a century. It has been more than a month since Maria, and 75 percent of Puerto Rico is still without electricity, only a third of the island's cell sites are functional, and many who have diseases like diabetes and other diseases or who are in need of dialysis have been unable to receive their specialized treatments and medication.

One million Americans in Puerto Rico are suffering without access to clean water. We have seen the pictures of them drinking sewage and water from Superfund sites. I read this report that they have accidentally used wells located in one of the most contami-

nated Superfund sites, Dorado, to get water, because they are so desperate.

I have called on the White House to put a point person in charge of the recovery, and I repeat that request today. The administration should appoint a CEO for response and recovery for Puerto Rico, someone with the ability to bring all the necessary Federal agencies together, cut redtape on the public and private side, turn the lights back on, get clean water flowing, and help bring recovery. It is a national tragedy that deserves the most organized and efficient response. A CEO for response and recovery with a direct line to the President in the White House would help get the house in order.

Now, at the same time, we can't forget the devastation brought by wildfires out West. A group of Senators will be speaking on the floor today—my colleague from California is about to do just that—in support of swift passage of disaster aid for those regions, and I wholly support the effort.

As the number of forest fires and the cost of fighting these fires has risen dramatically, it has left the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior at a severe funding deficit. This has forced the Forest Service to take money from other accounts within the agency to cover the firefighting deficit, in a process called fire borrowing. Fire borrowing prevents the agency from carrying out its other missions, including investing in forest fire prevention.

As we have seen, the terrible forest fires rage across the West, hitting so hard the State of California, which my colleague is going to address. We must take action and provide the Forest Service with a long-term wildfire funding fix.

Some Members want to bog down this process with environmental and forest management riders, but I stand with Secretary of Agriculture Perdue and others who have called to simply fix the funding problem, without riders, to allow the agency to carry on its mission.

I yield the floor and ask unanimous consent that my colleague be given the time she requires to finish her remarks because I went a little over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 2266, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 2266, a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 1568, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1568), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, for his words of emphasis on the need to ensure that not only do our fellow Americans in Florida and Texas receive the relief they so dearly and sorely need but also that our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well, receive the relief they need and receive the priority they deserve.

California has been devastated, frankly, by the wildfires that we have just experienced. Ten days ago, I was in Santa Rosa, CA, and witnessed firsthand the devastation that took place throughout that region and, in particular, in Coffey Park.

I met with evacuees. I met with firefighters. I met with community leaders, elected leaders, and others who traveled to that area out of concern and with a desire to help. I met county supervisors, and for two of them in particular, Supervisors Gore and Gorin, their entire districts were on fire. One of the supervisors even lost her own home. Yet they were leading the charge in the recovery efforts and doing so in such a selfless way and with such courage.

Entire communities were devastated, and people have lost everything and are still suffering to an incredible extent because of the loss they have experienced and the fact that they have not been resettled.

My heart breaks, as I know all of us feel for the 42 people and their families whose lives were ended in these fires. There were 42 people in this region who lost their lives. In addition, more than 8,400 homes and buildings were destroyed. For example, in Santa Rosa, 5 percent of the entire housing stock is gone. Many of the folks in these neighborhoods are middle-class families—working families. They are plumbers and teachers and first responders who

were barely able to meet their mortgage. The fires have scorched more than 245,000 acres, and 100,000 Californians were forced to evacuate.

I must tell you, I am in awe of the work of the firefighters and first responders who fought tirelessly day and night. I heard stories of firefighters who worked 80 hours straight to do the work of evacuation, ensuring that no lives were lost and no lives were in peril. I am in awe of their work.

I met a firefighter. His first name is Paul, who, when I met him, was finally taking a moment of rest from the firefighting he had been doing. He was wearing sweatpants and a sweatshirt and flip-flops he borrowed from another firefighter because he lost his home and everything he had. Yet there he was on the frontlines fighting to make sure no other Californians, no other people faced the kind of devastation he faced.

There were more than 11,000 total firefighters who went to the fire. Some were from other States and even other countries. They deserve our thanks. I stand here in the U.S. Senate to thank them for the work they did, coming to California and helping us deal with this crisis.

First responders and medical professionals did important work as well. Fifty-one doctors from Santa Rosa Memorial Hospital who lost their homes and possessions still stayed overtime to help crowded emergency rooms full of patients. I am uplifted by what I know, and the world now sees, which is the character of Californians. People rushed to help the elderly in nursing homes evacuate. I heard the story of a doctor who used his motorcycle to save newborn babies from a neonatal unit.

Now these folks need our help. Senator FEINSTEIN and I will continue to demand FEMA resources, which include the need for housing, individual assistance, transportation, and water infrastructure. We need to make sure all Californians, regardless of status, can get help at the shelters.

I spoke with DHS Acting Secretary Elaine Duke and confirmed that ICE will suspend immigration enforcement in the area until further notice. It is our belief, and it is our understanding as Californians, that notice will be clear as to when this effort will end, in terms of not enforcing immigration. We want to be clear when it is going to start so we can tell Californians because right now they are trusting DHS's word that this immigration enforcement has been suspended. We are told that FEMA, through Elaine Duke, will also support emergency packages that provide disaster relief for the hurricanes in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

California is resilient and will rebuild, but we need help. More than 12,000 constituents have contacted our office, and we will continue to work

with FEMA, HUD, the Small Business Administration, and the USDA to ensure that those affected in my State will get all the relief that is necessary.

Congress needs to fund programs like community development block grants and section 8 housing to help provide affordable housing for low- and middle-class residents. They need the help to find affordable housing. California is facing an affordable housing crisis like many other States in our country, and this is something that has been highlighted by the devastation these various States and territories have experienced recently, but it is an ongoing issue we must deal with.

We cannot stop there. We need larger supplemental emergency packages that include helping California. This has to be a long-term commitment. California is experiencing the worst fires in history, and they are becoming more frequent. In the 1980s, fires burned and wildfires burned under 25 acres, on average. Now typical wildfires will burn over 100 acres. California's 2017 fire season has not yet ended, and it has already burned more acres than the average for the past 5 years. In Southern California, from Kern County to San Diego, red flag warnings are occurring as we speak. There are currently up to 55 mile-an-hour winds and warm, dry weather, with no humidity or very little humidity. These are the conditions that were at play during the most recent wildfire crisis.

We must also look at the future and how we can prevent wildfires from reaching this magnitude as we go forward. We must pass the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act.

Today, over half of the U.S. Forest Service budget is dedicated to combating wildfires, compared to just 13 percent of the budget in 1993. The wildfires are treated differently than floods or hurricanes. The Forest Service is not allowed to use general disaster relief funds at FEMA, and that makes no sense.

Prevention is cheaper than reaction. The U.S. Forest Service estimated that there are 6.3 billion dead trees in the Western States. Removing them would improve safety by mitigating wildfires. Also, it would have an economic benefit and create jobs. There are certain bills, and the bill I mentioned, that will help achieve this because it will allow the Forest Service to dedicate part of the budget to forest management and not just reacting.

We must listen to the experts. For example, CAL FIRE agrees. Too often, States are picking up the bill for prevention in forest management, and we should make it very clear that fires are not partisan. This bill I mentioned, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, is a bipartisan bill, and it should be inserted cleanly into the next supplemental emergency package.

Finally, let's recognize the connection between these disasters and cli-

mate change. California is leading the way and preparing for increasing wildfires, but the Federal Government needs to do its part. Natural disasters from fires to hurricanes, to floods do not discriminate by region or by party. We must help each other when these travesties hit, but also we must prepare for the future.

In closing, I would suggest and urge our colleagues to pass the supplemental bill and future emergency resources, ensure that Federal agencies deliver prompt help on the ground, and pass the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, just as the Senator from California has outlined the needs of her State, having been hit by a natural disaster, so, too, natural disasters, not wildfires—although we have had plenty in Florida—but hurricanes have hit other States.

Yesterday, this Senator spoke at length about the effects on a particular industry, the citrus industry. I showed pictures of 75 percent to 90 percent of the fruit on the ground. This Senator made a unanimous consent request to include a bipartisan amendment to get money for agriculture, not just in Florida but Texas, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the wildfires in California into the package—specifically, about \$3 billion for agriculture. The losses in Florida's agriculture are \$2.5 billion, of which three-fourths of a billion is just losses to citrus growers.

That is all the bad news because the unanimous consent request was rejected. The good news is, although the White House rejected it, they made a promise to put it in a continuing supplemental emergency appropriations in November for all these natural disasters and get that funding in there for agriculture. Some of us on both sides of this aisle, in order to make sure that promise is kept, have put a hold on the nominee for Deputy Budget Director. I will take the White House at its word, and this ought to all be worked out in November. That was the subject of my address to the Senate yesterday, along with my colleague Senator RUBIO from Florida, as we talked about the losses particularly to agriculture.

Today I want to talk about how a month after the hurricane in Puerto Rico and 2 months after the hurricane in Florida, the aftermath is not going so swimmingly because people are not getting the assistance they need. Mind you, this is 2 months after the hurricanes. People lost all the food in their freezer because they didn't have any power. They are supposed to get assistance in order to be able to buy food. If you are living paycheck to paycheck and you don't have a paycheck, you don't have any money to buy food. Therefore, you should get financial assistance from FEMA and the USDA.

Yet you ought to see the lines in Miami, in Orlando, in Tampa, and in Belle Glade, and then they are cutting off the lines. The people who are getting cut out are going without food. So we have a long way to go.

The USDA's Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, called D-SNAP, is supposed to help all of our people recover from losses incurred by Irma by making short-term assistance available. It is especially important for families who are low income, who don't have income, or they are not getting a paycheck. Now they are saddled with unexpected repairs like a storm-damaged roof. They spent money evacuating or they lost wages during the storm, or they lost power and lost all the food in their freezer. Some people buy food in bulk because they can get it cheaper and store it in the freezer. Then, bam. It is all gone because there is no power.

There were 50,000 people waiting at a center in South Florida, and many were turned away after waiting in the heat for hours and hours. The next day it was the same story in another city I didn't mention, Delray Beach. The people are getting desperate.

I thank FEMA for everything it has done. I thank the Congress for doing the first supplemental in September that was intended originally for Harvey in Texas but along came Irma in Florida. I thank the Congress for the additional supplemental we just passed last night, but the administration of all these programs for assistance to people is not going so well.

Let's take another example. You get on the phone and you call FEMA. You are supposed to get a FEMA representative, and you have to wait. If that is because FEMA needs more people on a short-term basis to handle the amount of calls, well, FEMA, let's get it going.

What happens if you are calling because you need to have a FEMA representative come to your house to inspect your house so you can then get the necessary individual assistance to help you? You are waiting for assistance as to when a housing inspector can come and visit the home. Once you get through on the telephone, the last time we checked, the expected wait time to get a housing inspector is 45 days. That is too long for families to wait for an inspector to come because these Floridians are stuck living in damaged homes. Their homes have gotten wet, and, therefore, the mold and the mildew has built up, and they don't have any place else to go. They don't have any income to go down to one of the air-conditioned hotels, and they are still waiting for the FEMA inspector to come and inspect their home so they can get qualified to get the assistance that, in fact, they are due under the law. Our people can't access certain forms of FEMA assistance until the inspection is complete. I am told that

FEMA has indeed increased the number of housing inspectors on the ground, but this process has to be expedited.

This isn't the only delay that is causing a very serious threat to health and to safety in Florida. FEMA has been very slow to bring in manufactured homes, mobile homes. Why? Because a lot of people's homes and/or mobile homes were so damaged, they can't go back and live there, so they get temporary assistance. They go into, hopefully, some air-conditioned place, such as an existing apartment complex or, per chance, a hotel. But what if you are in the Florida Keys? What if you are in the Keys, where there are not enough hotels and motels? In fact, there are not a lot of apartments.

By the way, the service industry is necessary to revive the tourism industry in the Keys, as an example, because that is the lifeblood of the economy, and the service industry has no place in which to live because their trailers are history.

I wish I had a picture here to show you of a mobile home park just north of Big Pine Key that I went to. There was not one mobile home that was upright. They were either all on their side, or they were upside down. It is not unusual because these are the Keys. The hurricane came right off the water, a category 4. But FEMA isn't getting those mobile homes, those manufactured homes, in as temporary assistance.

Understand, the example I gave is of the Florida Keys. There is one way in and one way out. But you have to compensate for that. In the meantime, people are suffering, and people are hurting.

The redtape should not stop anyone in this country from having a safe place to live. I urge FEMA to expedite the transporting of these units all over Florida, to Florida communities, and filling them up so that Floridians have a place to live that is safe and clean.

I say to my friend from New Jersey, if what is going on in Florida isn't bad enough, what about Puerto Rico? Right now, more than a month after the hurricane, 80 percent of the island still doesn't have power. I didn't go into the urbanized parts of San Juan, although I was there and did look around; I flew into the mountains, into the little town of Utuado. For 2½ weeks, they were cut off. They didn't have a road to get up there for 2½ weeks.

I say to my friend from Washington, in Puerto Rico, would you believe that over a month after the hurricane, 30 percent still do not have potable water? In Utuado, in the mountains, I saw them going up to a pipe to get water that was flowing down through the mountains. This wasn't necessarily potable water, but it was the only thing they had. They were lining up with their plastic jars and plastic buckets.

Hospitals in Puerto Rico are rationing services. They are forgoing optional operations. They are making difficult decisions on prioritizing patients because of limited medication, and limited facilities, fuel, communications, and power. Dialysis centers are desperate to get clean enough water so that they can process the dialysis for kidney patients.

Clearly, more needs to be done to help the people of Puerto Rico in addition to the people in Florida and all the other States.

I urge my colleagues to remember the plight of Americans trying to put their lives together after a major disaster.

We have heard the Senator from California make a plea about the wildfires. You have heard this Senator make a plea for Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. We have heard the Texas delegation make a plea for Texas. We all have to come together in this time of need and pass a robust and comprehensive aid bill. We hope the White House will be true to its promise that the additional aid, particularly for agriculture, will be put in the November emergency supplement. There should be absolutely no ambiguity that the Federal Government intends to provide all the necessary assistance to make our people whole.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

As we speak, millions of Americans are working to put their lives back together after what has been an especially devastating series of disasters, from hurricanes that caused unprecedented flooding, which the Senator from Florida just spoke about, the catastrophic damage there, to deadly wildfires that have scorched communities across the West. From Santa Rosa to San Juan, there are countless families who need a hand up right now, and we have to be there for them, including our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico, where a vast majority of families on the island are still without power or access to clean water, as we just heard.

I am glad we will soon take up a relief package to send resources to help our neighbors in need, many of whom have lost everything. I am glad, as you will hear from many of our colleagues on the floor today, that this is not the end of our commitment to those affected by these recent disasters but, rather, a downpayment on what we know will be a very long road to recovery for many devastated regions. But I challenge my colleagues to do one better. Not only could we address the longstanding fisheries disaster that continues to cause hardship for the men and women of our fishing industry and our Tribal communities, we could also fix the flawed way this country fights wildfires.

For far too long, the U.S. Forest Service has been forced to use up its budget fighting wildfires every season, only to have no funds left over to work on preventing them. This is a very dangerous cycle and a disservice to so many communities in the West. It has only gotten worse as climate change takes hold, which means our wildfires have grown more massive in size and intensity in recent years. I urge my colleagues to treat wildfires like the disaster they are.

I hope we all take this moment to acknowledge all of our neighbors affected by disaster, even if they don't make the front page of the paper. Let's use this opportunity to get the policy right and help out all our neighbors in need.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I am grateful to be joining with a lot of my colleagues today to talk about the urgency and the importance of what has happened in the aftermath of horrific hurricanes—Hurricane Harvey more than 2 months ago and Hurricane Irma and Hurricane Maria over a month ago. They have wreaked havoc on millions of lives. They have destroyed billions of dollars of property. They have created pain, suffering, and loss—loss of life everywhere from Texas, to Florida, to Puerto Rico, to the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Right now, too many of our citizens are still living in not just unacceptable conditions for an American, but they are really living on the brink of homelessness—food and water insecurity, scarcity, and facing the ravages of poverty, where you have lost everything and you are in a dependent state, dependent upon relief aid, dependent upon your neighbors.

Thousands of families have lost everything, and I believe they have yet to receive the kind of support they deserve from their government. Governments were formed in this country. This Nation was founded on this ideal of common defense. It is literally written into our founding documents, this idea that we are coming together for the protection and the strength of our communities. Right now, we are not doing enough, and that is not the American way.

I have seen it. During the storm that hit New Jersey, Superstorm Sandy, I still remember seeing us at our best, seeing neighbors open their homes, reaching out to one another. They were Americans standing up for Americans and not worrying about what their political parties were, not worrying about the risk there might be to themselves.

In fact, I still remember, as the storm was still raging, driving around my city in an SUV, checking in. I was coming up a hill, and I got a call from the President of the United States

checking in on Newark. As the hurricane was beginning to leave, as the superstorm was beginning to leave, I got a call right after that from Governor Chris Christie expressing the same empathy, the same concern, checking in to see how I was doing.

I remember coming up on a hill, and just as I was finishing the last of those two conversations—talking to the most powerful person on the planet, the President, and the most powerful person in our State, the Governor; two different parties, two different backgrounds, but they are Americans—I remember coming up to a street corner where a massive tree had fallen, had torn down lines, and I saw a person in a raincoat standing there by the lines trying to wave me by to make sure my SUV didn't hit what could have been a live wire. I pulled the car over to the side in the wind and the rain, and I saw that it was an elderly man standing there in the streets feeling as if it was his obligation to protect his community. I stood there in the rain and looked at this elderly, African-American man who was standing there trying to protect people who were driving through and thought to myself: I talked to the most powerful guy in the country. I talked to the most powerful person in my State. But the true power that I saw was in an American who was working to take care of his community in a time of trial.

That was the spirit that stayed with me and lifted me during this crisis when I was staying up day after day—seeing his commitment to his community.

Martin Luther King said so eloquently that the ultimate measure of a man—and I would like to expand that and change that for a second—the ultimate measure of a person is not where they stand in moments of comfort and convenience but where they stand at times of challenge and controversy. That is where we are right now.

Tens of millions of us are very comfortable right now. This is a time of comfort and convenience for many. I got up this morning, I turned on my shower, and hot water came out. When I opened my fridge, there was food there. But how can we sit idly by while there is an urgency going on of epic proportions?

Let me tell you about Puerto Rico. As my friend from Florida said, 80 percent of their island remains without power. I saw firsthand what 1 week without power did in my community. It literally led to the deaths of people—not the storm itself, but the lack of power was directly related to the deaths in the city of which I was mayor. There are people who don't have access to things we take for granted, whether it be a bank account or food. It was profoundly stated by my colleague that just access to clean water—right now, there are people who

are falling ill and dying in Puerto Rico because of a lack of access to clean water. Sanitation systems, water, roads, bridges, electric grids—all of these urgently need Federal investment.

One of my staffers has a son who is a medic in the Puerto Rico National Guard, and he has told her that people in hospitals have died. The loss of life, the loss of American lives—our fellow citizens have died because of their lack of access to electricity and the lack of access to oxygen.

We are Americans. I know our character. I know our spirit. But right now, there are hundreds of thousands of people in our country who are suffering. They may not be proximate to us in geography; they may not be next to us in sight. But the spirit we need right now is the spirit of that man standing in the storm, watching over his neighbors, watching over people passing through, being there for their own.

We have work to do. We have an urgency. Where children are suffering without the basics, where schools are closed, where crops have been destroyed, where access to food has been destroyed, we have work to do. So my sense of urgency right now is believing that, as a first step, we must have a comprehensive aid package—not just to help our fellow Americans in Florida and Texas where there are urgent crises still going on. The gravity of the pain and suffering in the Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico right now is unimaginable for those of us who are not experiencing it, and it is unacceptable for us, as Americans, not to be there for our fellow citizens.

We are just 5 days away from the fifth anniversary of the storm that hit New Jersey, and we have made great strides in New Jersey over the past 5 years. But the reality is that today in New Jersey, we are still recovering from that storm.

This is going to be a long process, an urgent process. It is going to be a process that necessitates resilience, necessitates endurance, and necessitates persistence. But it starts with this body, the Congress of the United States of America, putting together an aid package that includes direct grant funding for rebuilding our country. For Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, it must include making sure the island is strong enough. From telecommunications, to energy sources, to schools, we must make sure that the aid package includes all that is necessary for these islands to stand up again and get to work for the many months and years to come of rebuilding.

I support my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I am encouraged by the spirit I encountered that night, having a Democratic President and Republican Governor call me as concerned Americans. But the spirit I call on tonight is that of the elderly Black guy on a

street in a storm who said: The storms may howl; the rain may come; the water may rise. But when it comes to my country, I will stand for America and stand for Americans.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria have left a path of destruction along the Texas gulf coast, Florida, and Puerto Rico. The damage caused by these storms will be felt for many years to come.

This emergency supplemental is another step forward to recovery for the millions of Americans who call these places home. But I want to remind my colleagues that there is still an ongoing natural disaster in the West that is leaving families displaced, costing taxpayers billions of dollars, destroying structures, and taking human lives.

As of today, 5,000 firefighters are still battling more than a quarter of a million acres of wildfires burning across the West.

In my home State of Montana, despite an early snowfall, families this last weekend in Musselshell County were forced to evacuate after a fire ripped through a dry landscape and put their homes and livelihoods at risk.

In California, more than 8,000 structures have been lost to wildfires this year alone, and with temperatures expected to be in the 90s all week, there doesn't seem to be any end in sight.

Across the country, in total, fires have burned nearly 9 million acres—significantly more than the yearly average—and 1.2 million of those acres are in Montana. These fires have cost the taxpayers nearly \$3 billion to date.

Quite frankly, these wildfires have been devastating in Montana and in States across the West. It is critically important that we take quick action to mitigate the damage caused by these fires and get communities back on their feet.

The funds in this emergency package will reimburse the Forest Service for the funds borrowed to fight wildfires. When the Forest Service has to borrow from its nonfire accounts to cover firefighting on the ground, we lose out on critical maintenance, mitigation, and restoration work. This funding will pay back those accounts and support the work needed to recover after a record-breaking fire season. This funding can help restore the trails and roads that were lost in fires, as well as keep our fishing streams clean and clear from runoff this spring. It will get folks back in the woods, thinning, cutting, and removing debris. It can provide the Forest Service with the resources to quickly salvage the dead and dying trees that are still usable and get that timber into our local mills.

Unfortunately, though, this bill fails to provide a long-term budget fix to

pay to fight wildfires. Fire seasons are getting longer and more intense, which is quickly transforming the Forest Service from a forest management agency into a forest firefighting agency.

Folks, our climate is changing. History is telling us that our fire seasons are becoming more intense and they are becoming longer. Longer fire seasons will mean more borrowing from the Forest Service to fight these wildfires. We need a long-term fix.

Fires are burning a hole through the Forest Service budget, which too often leaves our forests unmanaged and at further risk for more catastrophic fires in the future. Money that should be used to curb the fire risks, maintain and improve forest health, research and develop better forest policies, and fund the work that must get done to make our forests more resilient is borrowed to fight wildfires. We must change the way we are paying for fighting wildfires.

The bipartisan Wildfire Disaster Funding Act is one step toward that fix. We must keep pressing forward to get this bill signed into law. Then we need to adjust the disaster budget cap to make sure this is truly a long-term fix.

As I said, this bill doesn't contain all of the answers we need to reduce wildfires, but it is no doubt a step in the right direction. It lets the Forest Service treat wildfires just like other natural disasters. This means more reliable support for forest management projects and emergency funding for catastrophic wildfire seasons.

These important wildfire and forest resources, combined with providing the necessary FEMA, flood insurance, and food assistance to those displaced by hurricanes, will take us a major step forward after a series of devastating natural disasters. But I want to underscore that we aren't at the finish line yet, and I will work with Chairman BOOZMAN on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee to ensure that all Montanans and all Americans impacted by natural disasters aren't left waiting for Congress to act.

Folks from both parties are going to have to work together to ensure that every community impacted by hurricanes, floods, and fires will have the resources to recover and turn the page. Americans directly impacted by these natural disasters continue to wake up each morning displaced, hungry, without power, and surrounded by destruction. Congress must remain diligent and ensure these communities have the support that they need and that they deserve.

Finally, I will just say this: We are here today talking about the disaster funding bill. We are talking about the disaster funding bill because disasters are becoming more and more common. It is not going to change. We need to

address the root cause of this, which is an ever-changing climate. Until we do, we are going to continue to see taxpayer dollars go out the door for disasters year after year.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GAO CLIMATE CHANGE REPORT

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to talk about a GAO report, or a Government Accountability Office report, that is being released today, which says that the cost and impact to the Federal Government of climate change is in the billions of dollars. In fact, it is in the hundreds of billions of dollars over the next 5 years, and, over the next decade-plus, it is in the trillions of dollars.

Why is this so astounding? It is astounding because we have not had the Government Accountability Office outline for us before what the impacts of climate costs the U.S. taxpayers, what it costs the Federal Government, and that we are paying an astronomical cost. Right now we are discussing the supplemental, and we can see the costs of the damage we have experienced from storms, damage from wildfires, and damages from other kinds of events and how much it costs the Federal Government. The GAO took the last 2 years to develop this report after receiving a letter from me and Senator COLLINS of Maine to say that we wanted to understand these costs.

Why did we do this? The Senator from Maine and I have long been advocates of looking at issues of adaptation and mitigation. We can debate all we want about what people think the impacts are of climate and what drives it. What we are here today to say is that we know that it is costing billions of dollars, and, as stewards of the taxpayers' money, we ought to do a better job at adaptation and mitigation. That is why we sent the letter, and that is why, probably 7 or 8 years ago, she and I started working to try to encourage various agencies that are most impacted by this to do a better job at adaptation and mitigation.

For us in the Pacific Northwest, we got to this point because we saw a shellfish industry almost devastated by the level of ocean acidification caused by changes in temperature. It was so much so that we had to help the shellfish industry with science and research. If we wanted to keep a shellfish industry, we had to look at the science behind the seeding and do it at specific times when there was the right chemistry balance in the water. This incredible economy is enjoyed by so many

Americans. The Washington shellfish industry that we have—five generations, six generations of families in that industry—was almost lost because of these changes.

Also, as a State that has a great deal of hydropower and very cost-efficient electricity, a 1-degree temperature change means a lot too in terms of snowpack—20 percent less snowpack. It means a lot to us for the challenges we face in keeping affordable electricity rates.

When it comes to fire, we have certainly taken it on the chin with two unbelievable back-to-back fire years, with unfortunate loss of life and billions of dollars of economic loss impacting both the Federal Government and to local communities.

What we are saying is that we can do better. We need to recognize these costs and the impact and do a better job of planning for them in the future. That is why one of the things that I have done with my colleagues—Senator MURRAY from Washington, Senators RISCH and CRAPO from Idaho, and Senators MERKLEY and WYDEN from Oregon—was to introduce a bill to help reduce our risk when it comes to fire seasons and what we can do to better protect our communities. That is the kind of planning and adaptation that we think we need to address.

Today's report cannot be ignored. It cannot be ignored that the Federal Government is going to have to spend this much money dealing with the impacts of climate. That is what the Government Accountability Office is saying. It says we need a better plan. We need to reduce costs. We need to look at these impacts and make sure that we as a nation are putting every resource into this. Otherwise, we really will be spending trillions of dollars.

That trajectory is real. That is what the GAO report says—hundreds of billions of dollars now and trillions in the future, but if we would simply recognize these impacts and start addressing them by having agencies recognize climate and plan for it, both in terms of adaptation and mitigation, I guarantee you that we can save the taxpayers money.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will heed this report. This report is saying that climate is impacting us, the Federal Government. It is costing us a great deal of money. I guarantee you that it is money we would rather have to focus on whatever issues my colleagues would like to focus on—whether it is education, job training, or any of the other issues that someone might want to address, such as healthcare. We cannot afford to continue to pay this kind of money while not dealing with climate.

Impacts and costs are only going to accelerate. That is the scary thing. The GAO report says these numbers are going to increase for the future. Can we

at least sit down at the table and talk about the ways—just like on fire, just like on flooding, just like on drought—to plan strategies for how we can work together to mitigate these impacts? I guarantee you, if we don't, this bill is going to continue to rise and the conflicts are going to get worse.

If you look at this year alone—even though I am saying it is \$600 billion over the next 5 to 10 years and trillions over the next 20—we will probably see \$300 billion in economic impacts in Texas, Florida, and Puerto Rico.

What is the conclusion I am drawing? I think the report is very clear. The research is very clear. One thing that is happening, as the climate changes, is that there are more intense weather events. These intense weather events are presenting challenges like we have never seen before. These challenges and the devastation that caused them are something that we need to take into consideration in the future.

Certainly, we need better science. We shouldn't rely on the European weather agency to give us the best, most accurate information about storms and weather. We should do that ourselves. We should use the great research that is being done at the labs in Tennessee on climate and what we can do to best prepare our Nation. We need to come to the table when it comes to the issues of drought and plan for strategies that work and work successfully now, not wait another 20 years and have the cost be even more astronomical.

I thank my colleague from Maine for joining this effort of getting this documentation by the Government Accountability Office. We need to take their accounting very seriously and start doing things that will help us reduce the risk, lower the cost, better protect our communities, and give the taxpayers a sense that we are not leaving them to devastation and storms every year but that we are coming up with better strategies to save lives and to save dollars.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague and friend Senator CANTWELL to discuss a new GAO report on the cost of climate change.

As our Nation begins to recover and rebuild from the devastation of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Maria, and Nate, as well as from the wildfires that are sweeping across the West, we cannot ignore the impact of climate change on our public health, our environment,

and our economy. Most of the past focus of the impact of climate change has been on public health and the environment—important to be sure—but there has not been nearly enough analysis of the consequences for our economy and for the Federal budget, in particular.

In 2007, I first became interested in the cost of climate change when Senator Joe Lieberman and I headed the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. We commissioned a report by the GAO to look at the fiscal risk of climate change for both the Flood Insurance Program and the Federal Crop Insurance Program. Our request was an attempt to sound the alarm that there were very significant fiscal consequences to the Federal Government for failing to take action.

The report found that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Homeland Security can and should do better jobs of assessing the fiscal impacts that unchecked global warming will have on the taxpayer-funded Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the National Flood Insurance Program. In addition, the report revealed that insurance programs had not developed a long-term strategy to deal with the effects of global climate change, putting them far behind private insurers that have incorporated these risks into their overall assessments.

According to a 2014 GAO report, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, and the Risk Management Agency commissioned some climate change studies in order to better prepare for potential climate effects.

To build upon this important work, 2 years ago, Senator CANTWELL and I asked the GAO to conduct a comprehensive study on the costs and risks to the U.S. Government from climate change and to evaluate policy actions that could be taken by the Federal Government to address these financial consequences. After 2 years of indepth, nonpartisan analysis, the GAO publicly released the results of its findings this morning, and they are astonishing. The GAO estimates that, by the year 2039, climate change will cost U.S. taxpayers more than \$1 trillion. In just this past year alone, the economic losses will, almost certainly, exceed \$300 billion.

In Maine, our economy is inextricably linked to the environment. We are experiencing a real change in sea life, which has serious implications for the livelihoods of many people in our State, including those who work in our iconic lobster industry. With warming waters, lobsters are migrating into deeper waters, which poses more risks to our lobstermen and lobsterwomen. Additionally, Casco Bay, which is where Portland is located, has experienced an invasion of green crabs, which are not native to Maine and are devastating some of our other sea life population. This change in the Maine

waters could be detrimental to our State's economy.

I am also very concerned about the excessively high rate of asthma in my State. According to public health physicians, this is due to air pollution that comes into our State. Now, Maine is not a coal-burning State, but the emissions from other States are causing the changes in sea life and are also contributing to the public health epidemic of a very high rate of asthma. The fact is, Maine is located at the end of our Nation's tailpipe, and we get emissions blown in from other States, which affects our economy and the health of our citizens.

The Federal Government cannot afford the billions of dollars in additional funding that is going to be needed if we do not take into account and start acting on the serious consequences of climate change. Spending more than \$300 billion each year, in response to severe weather events that are connected to warming waters and producing stronger hurricanes, is simply not a solution.

I hope the release of this new GAO analysis will encourage all of us to think more broadly about this issue, take a harder look at the economic consequences of climate change, and then use this analysis to inform Federal policy. We need to support practices and policies that promote resilience and reduce risk and exposure to weather-related losses for the Federal Government, for States, and for local communities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, soon the Senate will pass a supplemental appropriations bill that provides much needed relief for folks across the country who are recovering from hurricane and wildfire devastation. While some of these resources will impact Texans who are recovering from Hurricane Harvey, I stress that much more will be needed in my State.

I will make one point abundantly clear, which is that Harvey has not been permanently handled in Texas. It is not over and done with, and it is not time to just move on. There was the storm, and now there is the storm after the storm.

Nearly 2 months after the hurricane—the most extreme rain event in U.S. history—many Texans are still waiting for normalcy to return to their debris-littered lawns and their torn-up living rooms, to their daily routines, their workplaces, their children's schools. The waters may have receded, but their troubles have not.

I have read, for example, about people having to wait 2, 3, or 4 hours before they can actually even speak to Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, representatives, who themselves are overwhelmed with requests that are related not only to Hurricane

Harvey but to Hurricane Irma's devastation in Florida and to Maria's flooding in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Never before do I remember a series of natural disasters hitting our Nation in such quick succession.

Yet I know, even as the inspectors are still evaluating damaged properties—moving as quickly as they can—FEMA is hiring hundreds of additional staff in the next few weeks to help with the backlog. I am hopeful this will help my fellow Texans, who have grown frustrated and discouraged by the procedural hurdles. As of Sunday, three shelters remain open in Texas, and over 60,000 people are living in hotels because their homes—reeking of mold—are still not ready, and they will not be for months.

A teacher I heard about is living on a cot in her classroom while her house undergoes repairs. The mayor of Rockport, one of the most devastated communities along the gulf coast, has said that perhaps one-third of the destroyed areas in his town may never be rebuilt. Hundreds of businesses have yet to reopen, and if they don't, it will make matters much tougher on local residents than they already are. The number of houses yet to be repaired is even larger than the number of businesses. The mayor of Port Aransas says that 75 percent of the homes in his community—three-quarters, just imagine—were severely damaged or destroyed. These are just a few of the reasons the situation demands ongoing attention, as well as the full extent of government resources.

Last month Congress got started—that was before subsequent hurricanes occurred—and the first wave of disaster relief was \$15.25 billion. Then the House passed the second wave, a \$36.5 billion disaster relief package to replenish FEMA's nearly depleted coffers and to address the National Flood Insurance Program, which should help pay some Texas claims.

Here in the Senate, the cloture vote on this second wave was yesterday, and I am glad we moved to end debate. It is clear to me that Texas will need significant additional Federal assistance for our recovery efforts. As I have told folks back home, we don't expect to be treated any better than anyone else, but we are not going to be treated any worse.

Last week, I spoke with President Trump and OMB Director Rick Mulvaney, and they made a commitment to me that there would be another funding request coming over in mid-November that would include Texas-specific hurricane relief. I realize that the folks impacted by Irma and Maria are also reeling, as well, and we want to make sure that we are locking arms with all of our colleagues who represent the areas hit by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, and also those hit by the wildfires out West. We are working together.

I appreciate the President's pledge, and I will continue to work with Senator CRUZ and with Governor Abbott to make sure that Texas has what it needs, not only to make a full recovery but a timely one as well.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, at lunch, the President of the United States will be joining us to discuss a different but very important topic, and that is Federal tax reform. We want to make sure that hard-working Americans get to keep more of what they earn in their paycheck and that we can help them improve their standard of living by reducing their tax burden.

We passed a budget resolution last week that was step one to getting where we need to be. So I am excited the President is joining us today, and I look forward to hearing his ideas. It is important that we all pull together to accomplish this joint goal. We appreciate his engagement on the issue, which has been clear from day one.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to bring up one additional matter that we will be voting on soon, and that is the repeal of the recent Consumer Financial Protection Bureau rule, which governs how community banks, among others, resolve disputes with consumers. This rule that the CFPB issued bans using arbitration. Arbitration is a widely accepted method of resolving disputes between consumers and banks and other financial institutions, and it actually increases the benefit that flows to the consumer, as opposed to the alternatives, which are class action lawsuits that enrich lawyers, whereas consumers get pennies on the dollar.

The CFPB's own data shows that the rule would transfer hundreds of millions of dollars from businesses to plaintiffs' lawyers over the next 5 years. According to a recent Treasury report, the rule could generate 3,000 additional class action lawsuits over the next 5 years, costing businesses \$500 million in defense fees alone and obviously enriching those who would benefit more than the consumers themselves; that is, their lawyers.

The CFPB data itself shows that the vast majority of class action lawsuits delivered next to no relief to the class in question—consumers. And the Treasury report found that the agency, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, failed to consider much less onerous alternatives, like increased disclosure or a more limited ban.

I have been around long enough to remember that back in the eighties there was a movement called alternative dispute resolution, led by the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, who pointed out that while access to courts was absolutely critical, unfortunately, because of the delay and expense of litigation, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms could actually benefit

consumers more if they chose to resort to those alternative dispute mechanisms, and that is exactly what arbitration is. I believe that the CFPB has gone above and beyond its authority in eliminating this very meaningful way for consumers to get compensated when they get involved in disputes with their bank or other financial institutions, and there is no reason for us to enrich a class of lawyers who bring these lawsuits and see consumers end up with pennies on the dollar, which is what the status quo would permit.

Thankfully, we have the power of the Congressional Review Act to overturn the rule, as the House has already done. I urge my colleagues to repeal the CFPB arbitration rule so that we can get rid of this harmful regulation, which imposes obvious costs and offers invisible benefits.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I want to begin by paying tribute to the people of Puerto Rico, who have been through unimaginable disaster—a natural disaster not of their making and a financial disaster that is not any more their fault than the hurricane they have endured. They have persevered and, indeed, now are surviving and even thriving, despite the hurdles placed in their way by the humongous storm that destroyed parts of their island. In fact, even now, at least a quarter of their water is undrinkable, more than 80 percent of their electricity is down, many of their roads are unpassable, their schools are largely closed, and their island is paralyzed or, at least, largely paralyzed as far as economic progress and job creation are concerned.

They don't deserve this fate. They are Americans. They fought in our wars. I have been privileged to spend time with the Borinqueneers and led the effort to award them a Congressional Gold Medal as a sign of their patriotism and their dedication to our country.

They are not only Americans; they are patriotic Americans. So, too, are the first responders, military, and others from States around the country who have gone to Puerto Rico to help with relief. I want to recognize their courage, sacrifice, and service to our Nation.

The National Guard from Connecticut has gone to the island to help with National Guard from at least 13 States. There are thousands of them now, and they are working with men and women on the ground from FEMA, the Department of Energy, the Department of Homeland Security generally, and our military. They deserve our thanks. Yet, for all that heroic work, this Nation is failing Puerto Rico. Americans are on the verge of failing fellow Americans.

Puerto Rico has a population of about 3.4 million people, roughly the size of Connecticut. If the humanitarian crisis now ongoing in Puerto Rico had occurred in Connecticut, there would be an outcry and outrage of unprecedented proportion, comparable to a public surge of criticism unseen before. Yet the people of Puerto Rico endure this humanitarian crisis seemingly without response.

The President of the United States gives himself a 10. I agree. He deserves a 10 if the grading scale is 1 to 100 because barely one-tenth—in fact, less than one-tenth of what this Nation owes to Puerto Rico—has been done for them.

I flew over the island of Puerto Rico in a Sikorsky Black Hawk during a recent bipartisan trip and saw out of the side of that Black Hawk the devastation and destruction I never thought I would see in America. Whole towns were flattened, homes razed to the ground, community centers destroyed, power lines dangling and down. I heard from the Corps of Engineers that there is no timetable to repair those lines, to restore electricity, which is the lifeblood of civilization and essential to bare economic functioning, let alone progress going forward, which is what the island needs. From what I hear, which families have told me, the shortages of food, water, and medicine persist. The hospitals depend on generators that are sometimes nonfunctional, and medicine is lacking in those hospitals.

What is at stake in Puerto Rico is really our humanity. In the midst of this humanitarian crisis, what is challenged is our humanity, not just the legality or the protocols but our basic instinct to help fellow Americans when they need it.

This Nation should not have a double standard for disaster relief. The Americans of Puerto Rico deserve what Connecticut would receive. I have stood in Connecticut with our Puerto Rican community. We are proud of the fact that we have more Puerto Ricans per capita than any other State in the country. That community has given back to Connecticut and has contributed to our quality of life. And we are proud of all of our Puerto Ricans who came from the island in past generations or recently. I stood with Gladys Rivera, who lived in Connecticut, went to Puerto Rico, and has just come back; with the Bermudez family, who have deep ties and family there and here; with Jason Ortiz, who is in charge of the Puerto Rican Agenda. And I could list many others. They have given me a picture of the humanitarian crisis in Puerto Rico that speaks to my heart—families who continue to suffer and endure these hardships.

The measure we are passing today is a tiny downpayment on what is needed for Puerto Rico. It is a short-term,

very small sign of what we owe. It is a downpayment that must be followed by a much bigger long-term commitment, a Marshall Plan that will enable the island to not just repair the power lines or the roads but to rebuild with different kinds of power—renewables and solar—and not be dependent on diesel or coal. It will enable them to build stronger, more resilient structures, whether homes or commercial buildings, that can withstand future hurricanes. What is needed in Puerto Rico is not just repair but true rebuilding and recovery—and not just the physical structures but the sense of financial stability and pride.

So the pittance in this supplemental for Puerto Rico is the least we can do. In fact, it is less than the least we can do because it actually adds to the debt Puerto Rico now has. It adds \$5 billion to the \$74 billion that is owed by Puerto Rico. It does nothing about the bankruptcy of PREPA, the power company. It in no way alleviates the financial burdens of debt; in fact, it adds to it.

Instinctively, we in this Chamber know we have an obligation to do more. There have been enough reports to fill this RECORD today about the courage of Puerto Rico and about the burdens it has to endure. We have seen and heard enough to know that a longer term plan is necessary, a Marshall Plan. Stronger leadership is necessary. Leadership has been lacking.

I have proposed a disaster relief czar who can cut through the redtape and the bureaucratic lack of cohesion and get this job done, someone who can tell the Corps of Engineers what the deadlines are and bring together the leadership of Puerto Rico and give them the empowering authority in resources, not just in words.

I also call for the CDC to be engaged more actively and effectively because Puerto Rico now faces a potential epidemic of mosquito-borne diseases: Dengue fever, Zika, chikungunya. The standing pools of water throughout the island—and I have seen them—pose a real public health threat at a time when the island is ill-equipped to deal with it.

I have begun working with my colleagues on a longer term plan because this measure must be followed by stronger, more robust steps. The damage done to the island was in the range of \$100 billion. That is a rough estimate. That \$100 billion must not only be reinvested, it must be used to provide resilience—real investment, real rebuilding. That is what is necessary for Puerto Rico.

I hope to return and visit again shortly, but in the meantime, the voices and faces of our fellow Americans there come to us clearly through my friends and neighbors in Connecticut who have joined with me in this call for real action and real rebuilding and real investment much

more than this short-term downpayment which will shortchange the island if we do no more. It must be simply a first step that we owe our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I don't need to tell anyone that middle-class Americans have had a rough time in recent years. Stagnant wages and a lack of opportunities have left many American families stretched thin. Sending the kids to college, a secure retirement, putting something away for a rainy day—for too many families, these hallmarks of the American dream have started to seem more and more doubtful.

A recent survey found that 50 percent of people in this country consider themselves to be living paycheck to paycheck. And about one-third of people in this country say they are just \$400 away from a financial crisis. If anyone wants to know why we are taking up tax reform, this is why. We are taking up tax reform because it is not acceptable that 50 percent of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck and because it is not acceptable that one-third of voters are one unexpected car repair away from a financial crisis.

How is tax reform going to help? For starters, our tax reform bill is going to make sure that hard-working Americans are taking home more money from every paycheck. We are going to cut income tax rates. We are going to double the standard deduction—the amount of Americans' income that is not subject to any income tax—and we are going to significantly increase the child tax credit. All these things mean that American families are going to see an increase in their take-home pay. They are going to get to keep more of their hard-earned money. We are also going to simplify and streamline the Tax Code so that it is easier for Americans to figure out what benefits they qualify for, so they don't have to spend a lot of time and money filling out their tax returns.

But we are not going to stop with reforming the individual side of the Tax Code. Another key part of improving Americans' financial situation is reforming the business side of the Tax Code so that we can give Americans access to the kinds of jobs, wages, and opportunities that will set them up for a secure future.

In order for individual Americans to thrive economically, we need American

businesses to thrive. Thriving businesses create jobs. They provide opportunities, and they increase wages and invest in their workers.

Right now, though, our Tax Code is not helping businesses thrive. Instead, it is strangling businesses large and small with high tax rates. Our Nation has the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world. It is at least 10 percentage points higher than the majority of our international competitors.

It doesn't take an economist to realize that high tax rates leave businesses with less money to invest in their workers, with less money to spend on wages, and with less money to create new and better paying jobs. This situation is compounded when you are an American business with international competitors that are paying a lot less in taxes than you are.

It is no surprise that American businesses that are struggling to stay competitive in the global economy don't have a lot of resources to devote to creating new jobs and increasing wages.

A study from the White House Council of Economic Advisers estimates that reducing the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 20 percent would increase average household income by \$4,000 annually. That is a significant pay raise for hard-working American families.

Another study shows a similar pay increase. Boston University professor and well-known public finance expert Larry Kotlikoff recently issued a study that concluded that lowering the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 20 percent would increase household income by \$3,500 per year on average. Specifically, the study concluded that depending on the year considered, the new Republican tax plan raises GDP by between 3 and 5 percent and real wages by between 4 and 7 percent. This translates into roughly \$3,500 annually, on average, per American household.

On top of our high business tax rates, there is another major problem with our Tax Code that is decreasing American jobs, and that is our outdated worldwide tax system. What does it mean to have a worldwide tax system like we have here in the United States? It means that American companies pay U.S. taxes on the profits they make here at home as well as on part of the profits they make abroad once they bring that money back home to the United States.

The problem with this is that most other major world economies have shifted from a worldwide tax system to what is called a territorial tax system. In a territorial tax system, you pay taxes on the money you earn where you make it and only there. You aren't taxed again when you bring money back to your home country, like what happens here in the United States today.

Most of American companies' foreign competitors have been operating under a territorial tax system for years. They are paying a lot less in taxes on the money they make abroad than American companies are, and that leaves American companies at a disadvantage. These foreign companies can underbid American companies for new business simply because they don't have to add as much in taxes into the price of the products or services they sell.

When foreign companies beat out American companies for new business, it is not just American companies that suffer. It is American workers. That is why a key part of the Republicans' tax plan involves lowering our massive corporate tax rate and transitioning our tax system from a worldwide tax system, like we have in America today, to a territorial tax system, like all of our competitors have.

By making American businesses more competitive in the global economy, we can improve the playing field for American workers. So 57 percent of the manufacturers that took part in a recent survey from the National Association of Manufacturers reported that they would be more likely to hire additional workers if comprehensive tax reform becomes law, and 52 percent reported that they would be more likely to increase employee wages and benefits. That would be a tremendous, tremendous boost for American workers.

Comprehensive tax reform will allow us to see the same kind of results in other industries.

The other part of improving the playing field for American workers is lifting the tax burdens facing small businesses. Small businesses are incredibly important to new job creation. Like larger businesses, right now small businesses are being strangled by high tax rates and, at times, even exceeding those paid by some of the largest corporations in our country. Well, that can make it difficult for small businesses to even survive, much less thrive and grow their businesses. Every dollar that we save small businesses by lowering their tax rates is a dollar a small business owner can use to expand the business, add another worker, or give employees a raise.

We can also help small businesses increase wages and create jobs by allowing them to recover their investments in things like inventory and machinery more quickly. Right now, it can take small businesses years, or in some cases even decades, to recover the cost of their investments in equipment and facilities. That can leave them extremely cash poor in the meantime. Cash-poor businesses don't expand, they don't hire new workers, and they don't increase wages.

Allowing small businesses to recover their investments more quickly will mean more jobs and more opportunities for American workers.

The American people had a rough few years, but economic stress doesn't have to become the status quo for the long term. We can start turning things around right now. Comprehensive tax reform along the lines of what is envisioned by the plan that has been put forward in the Republican framework will put more money in Americans' pockets. It will give Americans access to new jobs and more opportunities, and it will increase American families' wages.

I look forward to passing our comprehensive tax reform bill in the near future and to giving the American people the relief they have been waiting for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the Congressional Review Act resolution repealing the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's forced arbitration rule. At a time when millions of Americans are suffering the consequences of abusive practices by major financial institutions—including the massive consumer fraud by Wells Fargo and the exposure of up to half of the national population's personal information due to inadequate cyber security by Equifax—it is simply wrong to give immunity to bad corporate actors against lawsuits by the very customers they harmed.

I urge my colleagues to think about the millions of Americans who still don't know all the facts about whether they are victims of one of these or other major banking scandals. They deserve the chance to gather the facts and hold the responsible parties accountable. This anticonsumer resolution strips away those victims' constitutional first line of defense against lending fraud and permits corporations more opportunities to take advantage of consumers.

We have known for years that forced arbitration clauses harm the financial security of those who are most vulnerable to lending scams. Companies slip these clauses into the fine print of contracts for everything from loan applications to purchases on a smartphone. Let's be clear. Even if every American had the time to read and understand the fine print of every contract they sign, most of these contracts by major financial institutions are one-sided, and the consumer has no power to bargain the terms in the fine print.

With these in place, consumers who learn their bank or lender has overcharged or defrauded them also learn quickly that they have signed away their right to take the corporation to court. Instead, they must choose between dropping their claim or going it alone in an arbitration process that is clearly and notoriously stacked in favor of the corporation.

Forced arbitration makes it easier for predatory lenders to avoid the consequences for taking advantage of consumers. This reality is even more outrageous when we consider the fact that predatory lenders view servicemembers, military families, and veterans as prime targets for financial scams. The CFPB has noted that servicemembers are attractive targets because, among other things, they are required to maintain good finances, their pay is consistent, they often relocate, and many are just starting to make significant financial decisions. The Department of Defense is also well aware that military bases draw predatory lenders selling bad or illegal loans, which is one reason why the Department of Defense recently issued new rules banning forced arbitration for many loans covered by the Military Lending Act. But these rules still don't cover the full range of financial products that may be used to take advantage of military consumers and their families. That is why I have worked for years with Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM on legislation to ban forced arbitration clauses that waive or limit rights under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. The CFPB rule bans many of these and other forced arbitration clauses that disproportionately harm servicemembers and their families.

While the CFPB has provided data to support the arbitration rule's positive effects for servicemembers, we should also listen to the servicemember community. Their strong support for this rule speaks volumes. The CFPB rule's supporters include the Military Coalition, which consists of 32 military advocacy groups, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and associations representing the interests of members of the Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Moreover, in August, the National Convention of the American Legion adopted a resolution opposing legislation to repeal the CFPB forced arbitration rule because, among other reasons, it "is extremely unfair to bar servicemembers, veterans, and other consumers from joining together to enforce statutory and constitutional protections in court." Simply put, servicemembers and veterans don't want this CRA, and they are watching this vote closely.

Mr. President, forced arbitration is the prime example of a rigged system whereby powerful corporations and interests play by different sets of rules than average Americans. When a normal person defrauds another person, that person is entitled to seek a resolution in court. It is wrong for us to allow major corporations to create their own justice system that serves their own interests at the expense of American consumers, families, servicemembers, and veterans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and to permit the CFPB arbitration rule to go into effect.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOEVEN).

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, we currently have a \$20 trillion debt.

Now, we might ask ourselves, whose fault is it, Republicans or Democrats? The easy answer is both. Both parties are equally responsible, equally culpable, and equally guilty of ignoring the debt, ignoring the spending problem, and really I think allowing our country to rot from the inside out.

This year, the deficit will be \$700 billion, for just 1 year for our country, \$700 billion. We borrow about \$1 million a minute. Under George W. Bush, the debt went from \$5 trillion to \$10 trillion. Under President Obama, it went from \$10 trillion to \$20 trillion. It is doubling under Republicans and Democrats.

Right now, we are in the midst of another spending frenzy. People will say: Well, we are spending the money for something good. We are going to help those in Puerto Rico, in Texas, and in Florida. My point is, if we are going to spend money to help someone in need, maybe we should take it from another area of spending that is less in need. I think that just simply borrowing it—even for something you can argue is compassionate—is really foolhardy and may make us weaker as a nation.

Admiral Mullen put it this way. He said: The No. 1 threat to our national security is our debt. In fact, most people who follow world politics—while we do have problems around the world—don't really see us being invaded anytime soon by an army or an armada, but people do see the burden of debt.

So what we have before us is a bill, \$36 billion, much of it going to Puerto Rico, Texas, and Florida. My request is very simple: We should pay for it.

About 1 month ago, we had \$15 billion for the same purposes. We are set, in all likelihood, to have over \$100 billion spent on these hurricanes. I simply ask that we take it from some spending

item that seems to be less pressing. We could go through a list of hundreds and hundreds of items.

One thing I think we could start with is why don't we quit sending money to countries that burn our flag? If you are a country saying: "Death to America," burning the American flag, maybe we shouldn't give you any money. We give money to Pakistan, we trade and sell arms with most of the Middle East, which does not like us, and we do this with borrowed money. We don't even have the money we are sending, but we can make the burden a little less if we say: Let's not give any money to countries that hate us, to any country burning our flag.

In Pakistan, there is a Christian woman by the name of Asia Bibi. She has been on death row for 5 years for being a Christian. She went to the well to draw water, and the women of the village began chanting, "Death. Death to the Christian." As she was being beaten and pummeled on the ground and thought she was going to die, the police finally showed up. She thought they were there to rescue her. They were there to imprison her. They took her off to prison. That was 5 years ago. It is not easy being Christian in the Middle East.

In Pakistan, there was a doctor who helped us get bin Laden. His name is Afridi. He also has been in jail now for about 5, 6 years. He helped get us information that helped us to target bin Laden and finally get this great enemy of our country. The Pakistanis put him in jail for helping us.

The Pakistanis help us one day and stab us in the back the next day. When the Taliban was defeated under President Obama, when he put 100,000 troops in there, they scurried off into Pakistan, they had a sanctuary, and then they came back. I think we ought to think twice about sending money to countries that burn our flag, sending money to countries that persecute Christians, sending money to countries that, frankly, don't even like us.

We spend about \$30 billion helping other countries. If you were going to help your neighbor, if your neighbor was without food, would you first feed your children, and if you have a little money left over, help the children next door? That is what most people would do. If you are going to give money to your church or synagogue, would you go to the bank and borrow the money to give to somebody? Would that be compassionate or foolhardy? Is it compassionate to borrow money to give it to someone else?

People here will say they have great compassion, and they want to help the people of Puerto Rico and the people of Texas and the people of Florida, but notice they have great compassion with someone else's money. Ask them if they are giving any money to Puerto Rico. Ask them if they are giving

money to Texas. Ask them what they are doing to help their fellow man. You will find often it is easy to be compassionate with somebody else's money, but it is not only that. It is not only compassion with someone else's money, it is compassion with money that doesn't even exist, money that is borrowed. Of the \$20 trillion we owe, China holds \$1 trillion of that.

All this might be said, and you might say: We just have to help people. You are worrying too much. Do you have to talk about details? Really, all the money is being well spent. If you look back at money that has been spent before on disasters, guess what—people replace everything, including things that weren't broken.

I remember, in Katrina, a family who was holed up in a beachside resort for weeks with taxpayer money. They could have put them up across the street for about \$60 or \$50 a night. They were staying in a \$400-a-night beachside resort with government money, with FEMA money.

I think we have to look at how well government spends money. Do you want an example of how well government spends money? Last year, we had some great science. There was a lot of great taxpayer-funded science going on. They wanted to study whether Neil Armstrong, when he set foot on the Moon, said: "One small step for mankind" or whether he said: "One small step for a man." So it was either "One small step for man" or "One small step for a man." They wanted to know if the article "a" was in there. So they took money that was actually intended for a good purpose—to study autism—and they studied Neil Armstrong's statement when he landed on the Moon, \$700,000.

In the NIH last year, they spent \$2 million studying whether, if someone in front of you in the buffet line sneezes on the food, are you more or less likely to eat the food that has been sneezed on? I think we could have polled the audience on that one.

They spent \$300,000 studying whether Japanese quail are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine. I think we could probably just assume yes.

This kind of stuff goes on year after year. You think: Oh, those are aberrations. That is new.

William Proxmire was a Senator—a conservative Democrat back in the day—and he used to do something called the Golden Fleece Award. He would put out these awards. They sound exactly the same as the stuff we are finding now.

We spent money studying the gambling habits of Ugandans. We have studied how to prepare the Philippines for climate change. You name it, we are studying it around the world, with money we don't have.

If you want to make the argument: We are running a surplus, we are a

great country, we are going to help all the other countries of the world—I would actually listen to you if we were running a surplus, but we are not. We are running a \$700 billion deficit. We borrow \$1 million a minute.

We have a lot of rich people here. We ought to ask these rich Senators: What have you given to Puerto Rico? What are you giving to Texas? Instead, they are giving your money. They are really not even giving your money. They are giving money they borrowed.

So what am I asking? Not that we not do this. What I am asking is: Why don't we take it from something we shouldn't be doing or why don't we try to conserve? So if you decided you want to help the people next door, you might say: I am not going to the movie theater. I am not going to go to the Broadway play. I am not going to the NFL game. I am going to save money by cutting back on my expenses so I can help the people next door who are struggling, the father and mother out of work, and they need my help—but you wouldn't go to the bank and ask for a loan to help people. That is not the way it works, unless you are a government. Then common sense goes out the window, and you just spend money right and left because you are compassionate, you have a big heart, because you have the ability of the Federal Reserve just to print out more money.

There are ultimately ramifications to profligate spending. We are approaching that day. Some say you get there when your debt is at 100 percent of your GDP. We have now surpassed that. We have about a \$17 trillion, \$18 trillion economy, and we have a \$20 trillion debt. Is it getting any better? Have we planned on fixing it at all? No, there is no fixing. Is one party better than the other? No, they are equally bad. They are terrible. One side is at least honest. They don't care about the debt. The other side is just hypocrites because they say: We are going to win the election by saying we are conservative, we care about the debt, but they don't. The debt gets worse under both parties. Voters need to scratch their head and say: Maybe they are both equally bad with regard to the debt.

Most of the debt is driven by this. It is driven by mandatory spending. What is mandatory spending? These are the entitlements, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, Social Security. This is driving the debt. It is on autopilot. So when we talk about a budget, nobody is talking about doing anything about the spending on autopilot. Why? It is risky to talk about reforming entitlements because everybody is getting one. If we don't, though, we are consigned to more and more debt, and ultimately I think we are consigned to resign to a time in which the currency may well be destroyed and the country could be eaten from the inside out through this massive debt.

Last week, we voted on a budget. From appearances, you would say: Well, the Republicans put forth a conservative budget. It had \$6 trillion worth of entitlement savings. In the first year, it had \$96 billion worth of entitlement savings.

But ask one Republican, ask any Republican in Congress "Where is your \$96 billion worth of entitlement spending coming from?" and most of them wouldn't even know it was in the budget. It is in the budget to make it look good and look as if it balances over 10 years. Yet there is no plan to do anything to entitlement spending. There is no plan to do any entitlement savings. There is no bill in committee and no bill to come forward.

I introduced an amendment to the budget. I said: Well, if you are going to cut or save or somehow transform the entitlements into responsible spending, where we spend what comes in and we don't borrow, why don't we put rules or reconciliation instructions into the budget to tell people that, yes, we are honest, we are sincere, and we are actually going to cut spending? Do you know how many people voted for it? There are 52 Republicans; we had 5. They say they are for spending cuts, but they are not really because nobody will vote to give the instructions to actually do the spending cuts.

The budget we typically vote on is called discretionary spending. This is the military and nonmilitary. If you were to eliminate all of that, you still wouldn't balance the budget. That is one-third of the budget. You can't even balance the budget by eliminating one-third of it. You have to tackle the entitlements. Yet nobody has the wherewithal, the guts, or the intestinal fortitude to actually do it.

We did have a big fix once upon a time on Social Security. In 1983, President Reagan and Tip O'Neill—Republican and Democrat—came together to say that we were out of money, and we gradually raised the age of Social Security to 67. Is anybody happy to do that? Is anybody jumping up and down, saying: Oh, I want to wait longer to get Social Security. No, nobody is, but if we don't do it, there will be no Social Security because we are destroying the system.

Social Security pays out more than it brings in. Once upon a time, it was the other way around. We used to have about 16 workers for every retiree. Now we have a little bit less than three workers for every retiree. Families got smaller.

People ask me: Why are Social Security and Medicare running a deficit? Whose fault is it—Republicans or Democrats? Really, it is a little bit of both, but it is also the fault of your grandparents for having too many kids. A whole bunch of baby boomers were born, and they are all retiring, but the baby boomers had fewer kids, and the

baby boomers' kids had even fewer kids, so it is a demographic shift.

If we put our heads in the sand and do nothing, the debt will continue to accumulate. We are accumulating debt by the billions of dollars every year. This year, it is \$700 billion, and it is estimated that it will be close to or may exceed \$1 trillion next year. During President Obama's tenure, we had deficits of over \$1 trillion in several years. Over an 8-year period, we actually increased the debt over \$1 trillion a year. There was about a \$10 trillion increase in the debt in the 8 years of President Obama.

If we look at whose fault it is, Republicans or Democrats, it is both. But I will tell you the way it works around here. People say that it is noble, that you are enlightened if you compromise. So here is the compromise you get. You heard that four of our brave young men died in Niger the other day. Most of the people here didn't even know we were there, to the tune of 1,000 soldiers. Once they heard about it—the hawks—they said: Oh, we need more. They didn't know 1,000 were there, but they said that we need more there, that we need more people in Niger.

No one has bothered to have a debate over what the war in Niger is about, whether we should be there, and whether we should send our brave, young men and women there. Our Founding Fathers said that was the first principle—the first principle of going to war. The initiation of war, the declaration of war, is to be done by Congress. They specifically took that power away from the President. It is not just about funding, although that is another way we control war, but the primary way we control whether we enter into war is the declaration of war. It is under article I, section 8. This is where the congressional powers are laid out. People say: Oh, that is an anachronism; we don't obey that anymore. They certainly don't. But it was never removed from the Constitution; they just quit and began ignoring this.

How important was this to our Founding Fathers? Madison wrote this. Madison said that the executive is the branch of government most prone to war; therefore, the Constitution, with studied care, granted the power of war to the legislature. It wasn't just Madison who said this; it was Jefferson, Washington, Adams. The whole panoply of Founding Fathers said that war was to be initiated by Congress.

We have had no vote, no debate, and most of the Members didn't know we were in this part of Africa. Yet here we are. But the knee-jerk reaction by those on the right typically, but some on the left, is that we need more, that we wouldn't have lost those 4 lives had we had 10,000 troops in a country in which none of us knew we were going to be at war. None of us fully debated who the parties are to the war. Yet we

are going to be at war there now. So the knee-jerk reaction is that we are to expand our role in this war in Africa.

I had my staff ask a question: How many troops do we have in Africa? Nobody here knows. We looked it up, and we found out it is 6,000. We have 6,000 troops in Africa. We knew we were at war in Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, and Libya, but we didn't really know we had 6,000 troops in Africa. That would include Libya. Six thousand troops are in Africa.

The point is, when you get back to the debate we are talking about—the budget—there are a great deal of expenditures to have troops in a hundred-some-odd countries. So we literally have troops in over 100 countries. We currently have 6,000 troops in Africa. It is expensive. How do you convince the other side of the aisle to pay for it?

Typically, the Republican side of the aisle says: "Katy, bar the door." We will spend whatever it takes, and then some, on the military.

The Democrats say: Well, what about welfare? We need more welfare.

Then they tell you that to compromise is noble, to be enlightened, to be pragmatic, that to compromise is what we should shoot for, that we should work with the other side. So that is what happens.

There has been a bipartisan consensus for maybe 50, 60, 70 years now, and that is to fund everything. If the right wants warfare, the left says we must get more welfare. If the left wants welfare, the right says we have to have more money for warfare. So it is guns and butter. It began in an aggressive way during the Vietnam war, but it has proceeded apace. We continue to spend money as if there is no tomorrow, but both parties are guilty. It is the right and the left. It is compromise that is killing this country. It is the compromise to spend money on everything, for everyone, whether you are from the right or the left.

But there could be another form of compromise. We could say that we wish to compromise in the reverse direction. We wish to say that, look, maybe for the Republicans, national defense is more important than welfare, and maybe for the Democrats, welfare is more important than warfare, but maybe the compromise could be, you know what, we don't have enough money for either one. Maybe the compromise could be that we will spend a little bit less on each.

You know what. We did that recently. When I first came up here, I was elected in this tea party tidal wave that was concerned about debt. Something called a sequester was passed. Guess who hated it. All the big-spending Republicans and all the big-spending Democrats. They couldn't pass out their goodies and favors enough because there was some restraint.

You say: Well, I heard the sequester was terrible. I saw people at school and

I saw people in my town saying that the sequester wasn't giving them enough money.

The sequester was actually a slowdown in the rate of growth of spending. This is why you have to understand newspeak. We talk about newspeak and how people change the meaning of words to make them meaningless or even to make them mean the opposite. You hear all the time—when we were having the debate on repealing ObamaCare, we were talking about capping the rate of growth of Medicaid. You heard all the squawking on the left saying we were going to cut Medicaid. No. We were going to cut the rate of growth of Medicaid.

So we had a sequester, and it was evenly divided between military and nonmilitary, between Republican interests and Democratic interests. It did not cut; it slowed down the rate of growth of spending over 10 years. It was actually working to a certain degree. We got it because people who were concerned about the debt fought and fought and said: We need to be concerned about the debt. We are hollowing out the country from the inside out.

Who destroyed the sequester? Really, the voices were louder on the Republican side than the Democratic side, but both parties were complicit. The sequester has essentially been gutted and destroyed, and the spending caps have become somewhat meaningless.

We have before us today \$36 billion. It will exceed the spending caps. We have a sequester in place, but there are all these exemptions, so it is exempt. Anytime you say it is an emergency, it is an exemption. Within the \$36 billion, though, there is \$16 billion because we run a terrible government-run flood program that is \$16 billion in the hole. So we are going to bail it out by letting it wipe out all of its debt. That sounds like long-term mismanagement in a badly run program rather than an emergency. Yet it is going to be stuck in an emergency bill so it can exceed the caps.

What am I asking for today? I am asking that we obey our own rules. We set these rules. We set these spending caps. We set the sequester. Let's obey them. The other side will say: Oh, we are obeying the rules; we are just not counting this money. That is the problem. We have this dishonest accounting where people say: Oh yeah, we are obeying the rules. But we are not.

There are a couple of ways you could pay for this. The first way, I tried a couple of weeks ago. We had a \$15 billion bill, and I said: Why don't we pay for it with the foreign aid, the welfare we give to other countries? Why don't we say: You know what, it is time we looked at America first. It is time that we took care of our own. It is time that we spend money taking care of those in Texas, Florida, and Puerto Rico, but

let's spend money that we were going to send in the form of welfare to other countries. Maybe we should take care of our own.

Instead, though, the Senate voted otherwise. I forced the issue. They weren't too happy with the amendment. I only got the vote because I was persistent and I threatened to delay things, and I was able to get a vote. Do you know how many Senators voted for this? No Democrats. No Democrats wanted to offset any spending, and 10 Republicans did. I think the vote was 87 to 10. Eighty-seven Senators voted to keep spending money without any offsets, to basically just borrow the money.

Now we are having the same debate again. I have an amendment to offset the \$36 billion. In all likelihood, I am not going to get an amendment vote because they don't have time. It would take 15 minutes, and God forbid we spend 15 minutes talking about how we are being eaten alive by a \$20 trillion debt. God forbid we talk about how a \$20 trillion debt is an anchor around the neck of the country. God forbid. God forbid we offer an amendment and at least take 15 minutes to have an offset, to say we should pay for this money we are going to send to Puerto Rico, Texas, and Florida, pay for it by taking it from some other element in the budget.

Last time, I offered foreign welfare. This time, what I put on the table is something that is very similar to a bill that has been put forward and offered for several years called the Penny Plan. The Penny Plan is this. There is a great illustration of this—if you want to look at this on YouTube—of a guy with a bunch of pennies stacked and showing sort of in a visual way what it would be like to cut one penny out of every dollar. That is what we are talking about. A 1-percent cut across the board would pay for this \$36 billion bill. It is actually a little bit less than 1 percent. One percent of a \$4 trillion budget would be \$40 billion. We need \$36 billion, so it is less than 1 percent. Just cut the budget less than 1 percent.

Do you think there might be 1 percent waste in every department, including even departments of government you might like? Do you think any American families ever had to deal with a 1-percent cut? Government is so wasteful at every level that we could probably cut several percentage points of every division and department of government, and you wouldn't know it was gone. I mean, the waste is astounding. When we looked at where money is spent, we looked at some of the money that was being shipped overseas not too long ago, and one of the programs that we found was a televised cricket league for Afghanistan. All right, self-esteem is really important, and you are going to pay for it. So we are going to pay for television so that the Afghans

can feel better about themselves by watching cricket on TV.

The first problem is that we don't have the money. We have to borrow it. The second problem is that they don't have televisions in Afghanistan. Well, some do, but the 1 in 1,000 people who have a television, I guess, are going to feel better about the Americans paying so that they can watch cricket on TV. It is one thing after another. We paid \$1 million for a variety program to put little songs and skits on their televisions. Once again, most of them do not have a TV to watch.

In the war effort in Afghanistan, we spent trillions and trillions of dollars on the war effort. We have defeated the Taliban many times, and I am sure that we could defeat them again, but that just means that they will go across the border, hide in caves, and go back when we are tired.

We spent \$45 million on a gas station in Afghanistan. This is an interesting gas station. It serves up natural gas. You might say that is great because we are lessening the carbon footprint in Afghanistan, except that it is completely absurd. They do not have any cars that run on natural gas in Afghanistan.

So they built a \$45 million plant. The original estimate was that it was going to cost about \$500,000. It was like 46 times the cost of overruns, and it ended up costing \$45 million. It serves up natural gas, but nobody has a car that runs on natural gas.

We said whoops, and we immediately bought them 24 cars that run on natural gas so they could go to the \$45 million gas station to get their natural gas. But that was not enough. We had natural gas cars for them, but they had no money with which to buy the natural gas. So we bought them all credit cards. We bought them natural-gas-burning cars, we gave them a natural-gas gas station, and we bought them credit cards to reduce the carbon footprint of those who are living in Afghanistan. This is absurd.

When we look at the budget and when we look at accounting, a lot of the money that has been spent overseas in the Iraq war, the Afghanistan war, the Syria war, the Niger war, the Libya war, the Somalia war, and the Chad war is not really budgeted. A lot of this money is actually done as an off-budget thing. It is called the overseas contingency operations. It is really a way of cheating, a way of being dishonest in your accounting. It is a way of evading spending caps, but it has also gone a long way toward making it easier to keep spending money without restraint. We tried to put restraints on military and nonmilitary, and they were exceeded by this slush fund. They call it OCO funding, or overseas contingency operations. When we had the budget vote recently, I put forward an amendment and simply said

that we should not spend above our caps. If we put these caps in place, this is what we should spend. I think that we got maybe 15 or 20 votes on that, but this is the problem.

Ultimately, we have to decide as a country this: Are we going to obey the Constitution? Are we going to go to war only when we declare war, when Congress does its job and declares war, or are we going to go to war anytime, anywhere? That is sort of what we do now. We go to war anytime, anywhere on the face of the planet, and it is not for free.

Not only is it expensive in dollars, but it is expensive in the lives of the young men and women who are sent to these wars. Yet no one has ever voted on them. We lost a soldier in Yemen 3 or 4 months ago. For his family, it was devastating, but America pays little attention because America is, basically, not fighting the war. A very small percentage of America—brave young men and women who are often from rural parts of our country—is fighting our wars, but the mass of America is not fighting. You could say that they are volunteers—that is great, and I think that is the best kind of army to have—but I hate it that we do not show the responsibility and care of actually doing our job and of taking the time to debate it.

Should we be at war in Yemen or not? Should we be at war in Niger? Should we be at war in Libya? Should we be at war in Chad? Should we be at war in Somalia, in Djibouti, in Pakistan, in Afghanistan? We have troops in probably 20 or 30 nations in which there is conflict going on, and we are actively involved in the midst of conflict in at least 6 or 7. It is very expensive in human lives and dollars.

We need to ask ourselves this: Will we do this forever?

The Sunnis have been fighting the Shia for about 1,000 years.

People say: Well, we are going after ISIS in Africa.

ISIS is basically a name for radical jihadist Islam, and it is all over the planet. Are we going to go everywhere and kill every one of them? Is there a possibility that, when we kill 1 that 10 more will pop up? Is the Whac-A-Mole strategy for killing every terrorist on the planet or every radical on the planet the way that we are going to win?

We went into Yemen on a manned raid in January or February of this year, and we lost one brave Navy SEAL. They say that we got information, but they will not exactly tell me what information they got. They claim that it was this great information that is going to make the war on terror so much easier. I have my doubts. In the raid, though, which was a manned raid in the middle of Yemen, women and children died. I do not blame our soldiers. I have members of my family who are Active Duty. They do what

they are told. They take orders. It is tough being put in a situation like that. You are dropped in the middle of nowhere in a village. Maybe the women and children are shooting at you as well. You have to defend yourself and complete your mission.

Yet I wonder whether or not the policymakers should be more involved with making the decision as to whether we should be in Yemen and whether or not the people who live in the surrounding area to that village will, for 100 years or more, recite through oral tradition the day that the Americans came, and whether or not we will have actually killed more terrorists than will have been created by the oral tradition of when the Americans came.

We are also aiding and abetting Saudi Arabia in this horrific war in Yemen. There are 17 million people who live on the edge of starvation in Yemen, and the war is exacerbating that. Yemen is a very poor country to begin with. They import about 80 percent of their food. Currently, the Saudis have a blockade. So no food is getting in. They say that it is to prevent arms, and I am sure it is, but one of the consequences is no food. There are a half million people with cholera right now. It is sort of a bad form of dysentery, and in poor countries, you die from cholera. There are a half million people with cholera. It goes along with no food and no clean water.

The Saudis are blockading Yemen, and the Saudis are bombing Yemen. We are selling the Saudis the weapons. We are refueling the planes and helping the Saudis pick the targets. One of the Saudi targets about 1 year ago was a funeral procession. This was a funeral procession of a Houthi leader or rebel. There were 500 people—civilians—who were wounded in that procession, and there were 150 who were killed by a Saudi bomb on civilians.

Do you think they are going to soon forget that? Do you think that by killing 150 people in a funeral procession and wounding 500, you killed more terrorists that day than you created?

I would say that that day will live on in oral history for 1,000 years. The day the Saudis came with American bombs and bombed an unarmed funeral procession will live on for 1,000 years, and hundreds—if not thousands—of people will be motivated to become suicide bombers because of the day that the Saudis bombed a funeral procession.

It is incredibly expensive in lives—their lives, our lives. When you look at the cause of famine around the globe and when you look at it extensively and study the causes of famine, it is war probably 6 or 7 times out of 10. War is a terrible thing, and we must acknowledge that and try to think of ways that we can make war the last resort instead of the first resort.

I mean, for goodness sake, the people on television this Sunday did not know

how many troops were in Niger. Yet their immediate response was that we should have had more—that we need more troops over there in Africa—in a place that most Americans have not heard of and have no idea who is fighting whom or whether or not it is an achievable goal. They say that 1,000 was not enough, that if we had had 10,000 in air support and all of this, we would have prevented these deaths. That is one lesson you could learn. The other lesson you could learn is that maybe we should not have been there at all.

You see, people have to stand up for themselves. There is this idea of sort of self-rule and independence, but if people are coddled and not sort of forced into the position of defending themselves, they will not.

We have been in Afghanistan for 16 years. In the 16 years we have been there, what have we found? We have found that about 60,000 to 80,000 Afghans have come over here. We have to help these translators. Well, they speak English, and they are pro-West. So they need to stay in Afghanistan and create a country. The best people left.

It is the same in Iraq. We won the war in Iraq, and all of the good people came over here. I have nothing personally against those who came other than that I am disappointed that there were not enough people who were heroic enough to stay in their country to help build a new country.

Who fights over there? Some of the Afghans fight. Some people join their army to shoot us. We have this green on green, where their soldiers are shooting our soldiers because they come in and intentionally are there to kill our soldiers. Yet the question is, How come, after 15, 16 years, the Afghans cannot fight to preserve their nation?

Now everybody says: Oh, if America comes home, the Taliban will take over. The Taliban is not quite ISIS. It is also not quite the same international sort of jihadist. They did harbor bin Laden once upon a time. Most of those people are dead if not all of them.

If you look at how terrorism ended when the IRA ended in England and in Ireland, it ended up being a negotiation. So many say that they will never negotiate with the enemy. If you never negotiate with the Taliban—they are, unfortunately, pretty popular in Afghanistan, and they are going to be there forever—can we kill them all? No. It is just like the radicals throughout these Islamic countries. I think there are too many to kill. The question is, Do you create more than you kill?

If you put this in context and say that we have to be able to defend ourselves and that our country needs to be strong to defend itself, I could not

agree more, but do you know what? We become weaker every day as we run up this debt. We are \$20 trillion in debt—\$700 billion this year. We borrow \$1 million a minute. Realize that predicament, and then realize that the powers that be do not want to allow amendments to offset spending.

I am proposing, if we spend money on Puerto Rico and Texas and Florida, that we offset it by taking it from something that is less of a priority, from something else in the budget. If we were to cut 1 percent of the rest of the budget, we would have more than enough to pay for this. Would anybody notice 1 percent? Sure. One would have to push things around a little bit, but they would all survive.

We have looked at spending, and to show you how bad spending in the Federal Government is, it gets faster each month as you get toward the end of the year. When there is only 1 month left, these bureaucrats say: Oh, my goodness, we might not be able to spend the money fast enough. So spending in the last month of the year is, actually, five times faster than in any other month of the year. In fact, in the last month of the fiscal year, not only is it five times faster, but each progressive day it gets faster. The last month of the fiscal year is September. On September 1, they spend the money like this. On September 2, it is like this. On September 3, it is like this. On September 4, it is like this. It goes up every day because they are trying to shovel the money out as fast as they can. If they do not spend it all, they are afraid they will not get it next year. The common parlance is “use it or lose it.”

When you get all the way to the last day of the fiscal year, spending actually increases and goes with the rising and setting Sun. So it is 8 o'clock, earlier here than it is in California. As the Sun rises, we begin spending money in the East. We are shoveling it out as fast as we can. As the Sun progresses towards sunset, the spending shifts to the west coast. They are shoveling it out at 5 o'clock Pacific time in their trying to get rid of the money.

If you look at when most conferences are, when most government employees go to a conference in Las Vegas, it is in the last months of the year. They found that they have some money. What is a million bucks? You don't mind spending a million bucks, right? You want these government employees to have a good time. So there was a group—I think it was the General Services Administration—a couple of years ago, and you saw those pictures of the head of the GSA and his wife in a big Las Vegas hot tub, drinking champagne. I think that was a million-dollar event—it was either at that conference or at another one—in which they decided that it would be good and instructive for their employees if they actually had a Star Trek reenactment. So they hired Star Trek reenactors.

With that, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

PROTECTING OUR DEMOCRACY

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to address a matter that has been very much on my mind. At a moment when it seems that our democracy is more defined by our discord and our dysfunction than by our own values and principles, let me begin by noting a somewhat obvious point that these offices that we hold are not ours indefinitely. We are not here simply to mark time. Sustained incumbency is certainly not the point of seeking office, and there are times when we must risk our careers in favor of our principles. Now is such a time.

It must also be said that I rise today with no small measure of regret—regret because of the state of our disunion, regret because of the disrepair and destructiveness of our politics, regret because of the indecency of our discourse, regret because of the coarseness of our leadership, regret for the compromise of our moral authority, and by “our,” I mean all of our complicity in this alarming and dangerous state of affairs.

It is time for our complicity and our accommodation of the unacceptable to end. In this century, a new phrase has entered the language to describe the accommodation of a new and undesirable order, that phrase being the “new normal.” But we must never adjust to the present coarseness of our national dialogue with the tone set at the top. We must never regard as normal the regular and casual undermining of our democratic norms and ideals. We must never meekly accept the daily sun-drawing of our country, the personal attacks, the threats against principles, freedoms, and institutions, the flagrant disregard for truth and decency, the reckless provocations, most often for the pettiest and most personal reasons, reasons having nothing whatsoever to do with the fortunes of the people whom we have been elected to serve. None of these appalling features of our current politics should ever be regarded as normal. We must never allow ourselves to lapse into thinking that is just the way things are now. If we simply become inured to this condition, thinking that it is just politics as usual, then Heaven help us.

Without fear of the consequences and without consideration of the rules of what is politically safe or palatable, we must stop pretending that the degradation of our politics and the conduct of some in our executive branch are normal. They are not normal. Reckless, outrageous, and undignified behavior has become excused and countenanced as “telling it like it is” when it is actually just reckless, outrageous, and undignified.

When such behavior emanates from the top of our government, it is some-

thing else. It is dangerous to a democracy. Such behavior does not project strength, because our strength comes from our values. It instead projects a corruption of the spirit and weakness.

It is often said that children are watching. Well, they are. And what are we going to do about that? When the next generation asks us “Why didn't you do something? Why didn't you speak up?” what are we going to say? Mr. President, I rise today to say “enough.”

We must dedicate ourselves to making sure that the anomalous never becomes the normal. With respect and humility, I must say that we have fooled ourselves for long enough that a pivot to governing is right around the corner, a return to civility and stability right behind it. We know better than that. By now, we all know better than that.

Here, today, I stand to say that we would better serve the country and better fulfill the obligations under the Constitution by adhering to our article I “old normal”—Mr. Madison's doctrine of the separation of powers. This genius innovation, which affirms Madison's status as a true visionary and for which Madison argued in Federalist 51, held that the equal branches of our government would balance and counteract each other when necessary. “Ambition counteracts ambition,” he wrote. But what happens if ambition fails to counteract ambition? What happens if stability fails to assert itself in the face of chaos and instability or if decency fails to call out indecency?

Were the shoe on the other foot, would we Republicans meekly accept such behavior on display from dominant Democrats? Of course we wouldn't, and we would be wrong if we did.

When we remain silent and fail to act when we know that silence and inaction are the wrong things to do because of political considerations, because we might make enemies, because we might alienate the base, because we might provoke a primary challenge, because ad infinitum, ad nauseam, when we succumb to those considerations in spite of what should be greater considerations and imperatives in defense of our institutions and our liberty, we dishonor our principles and forsake our obligations. Those things are far more important than politics.

I am aware that more politically savvy people than I will caution against such talk. I am aware that there is a segment of my party that believes anything short of complete and unquestioning loyalty to a President who belongs to my party is unacceptable and suspect. If I have been critical, it is not because I relish criticizing the behavior of the President of the United States. If I have been critical, it is because I believe it is my obligation to do so as a matter of duty of conscience.

The notion that one should stay silent as the norms and values that keep America strong are undermined and as the alliances and agreements that ensure the stability of the entire world are routinely threatened by the level of thought that goes into 140 characters, the notion that we should say or do nothing in the face of such mercurial behavior is ahistoric and, I believe, profoundly misguided.

A Republican President named Roosevelt had this to say about the President and a citizen's relationship to the office:

The President is merely the most important among a large number of public servants. He should be supported or opposed exactly to the degree which is warranted by his good conduct or bad conduct, his efficiency or inefficiency in rendering loyal, able, and disinterested service to the Nation as a whole.

Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that there should be full liberty to tell the truth about his acts, and this means that it is exactly as necessary to blame him when he does wrong as to praise him when he does right. Any other attitude in an American citizen is both base and servile.

President Roosevelt continued:

To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by a President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public.

Acting on conscience and principle is the manner in which we express our moral selves, and, as such, loyalty to conscience and principle should supersede loyalty to any man or party.

We can all be forgiven for failing in that measure from time to time. I certainly put myself at the top of the list of those who fall short in this regard. I am holier than none.

But too often, we rush not to salvage principle but to forgive and excuse our failures so that we might accommodate them and go right on failing until the accommodation itself becomes our principle.

In that way and over time, we can justify almost any behavior and sacrifice any principle. I am afraid this is where we now find ourselves.

When a leader correctly identifies real hurt and insecurity in our country, and instead of addressing it goes to look for someone to blame, there is perhaps nothing more devastating to a pluralistic society. Leadership knows that most often a good place to start in assigning blame is to look somewhat closer to home. Leadership knows where the buck stops, humility helps, and character counts.

Leadership does not knowingly encourage or feed ugly or debased appetites in us. Leadership lives by the American creed, "E Pluribus Unum"—"From many, one." American leadership looks to the world, and just as Lincoln did, sees the family of man. Humanity is not a zero-sum game. When we have been at our most pros-

perous, we have been at our most principled, and when we do well, the rest of the world does well.

These articles of civic faith have been critical to the American identity for as long as we have been alive. They are our birthright and our obligation. We must guard them jealously and pass them on for as long as the calendar has days. To betray them or to be unserious in their defense is a betrayal of the fundamental obligations of American leadership, and to behave as if they don't matter is simply not who we are.

Now the efficacy of American leadership around the globe has come into question. When the United States emerged from World War II, we contributed about half of the world's economic activity. It would have been easy to secure our dominance, keeping those countries that had been defeated or greatly weakened during the war in their place. We didn't do that. It would have been easy to focus inward. We resisted those impulses. Instead, we financed reconstruction of shattered countries and created international organizations and institutions that have helped provide security and foster prosperity around the world for more than 70 years.

Now, it seems that we, the architects of this visionary, rules-based world order that has brought so much freedom and prosperity, are the ones most eager to abandon it. The implications of this abandonment are profound, and the beneficiaries of this rather radical departure in the American approach to the world are the ideological enemies of our values.

Despotism loves a vacuum, and our allies are now looking elsewhere for leadership. Why are they doing this? None of this is normal. What do we, as U.S. Senators, have to say about it? The principles that underlie our politics, the values of our founding, are too vital to our identity and to our survival to allow them to be compromised by the requirements of politics because politics can make us silent when we should speak, and silence can equal complicity.

I have children and grandchildren to answer to, and so I will not be complicit or silent. I have decided I will be better able to represent the people of Arizona and to better serve my country and my conscience by freeing myself of the political considerations that consume far too much bandwidth and would cause me to compromise far too many principles.

To that end, I am announcing today that my service in the Senate will conclude at the end of my term in early January 2019. It is clear, at this moment, that a traditional conservative who believes in limited government and free markets, who is devoted to free trade, who is pro-immigration has a narrower and narrower path to nomi-

nation in the Republican Party—the party that has so long defined itself by its belief in those things.

It is also clear to me, for the moment, that we have given up on the core principles in favor of a more viscerally satisfying anger and resentment. To be clear, the anger and resentment that the people feel at the royal mess we have created are justified, but anger and resentment are not a governing philosophy.

There is an undeniable potency to a populist appeal, but mischaracterizing or misunderstanding our problems and giving in to the impulse to scapegoat and belittle threatens to turn us into a fearful, backward-looking people. In the case of the Republican Party, those things also threaten to turn us into a fearful, backward-looking minority party.

We were not made great as a country by indulging in or even exalting our worst impulses, turning against ourselves, glorifying in the things that divide us, and calling fake things true and true things fake, and we did not become the beacon of freedom in the darkest corners of the world by flouting our institutions and failing to understand just how hard-won and vulnerable they are.

This spell will eventually break. That is my belief. We will return to ourselves once more, and I say, the sooner the better because to have a healthy government, we must also have healthy and functioning parties. We must respect each other again in an atmosphere of shared facts and shared values, comity, and good faith. We must argue our positions fervently and never be afraid to compromise. We must assume the best of our fellow man and always look for the good. Until that day comes, we must be unafraid to stand up and speak out as if our country depends on it because it does.

I plan to spend the remaining 14 months of my Senate term doing just that. The graveyard is full of indispensable men and women. None of us here is indispensable, nor were even the great figures of history who toiled at these very desks in this very Chamber to shape the country we have inherited. What is indispensable are the values they consecrated in Philadelphia and in this place—values which have endured and will endure for so long as men and women wish to remain free. What is indispensable is what we do here in defense of those values. A political career does not mean much if we are complicit in undermining these values.

I thank my colleagues for indulging me here today. I will close by borrowing the words of President Lincoln, who knew more about healthy enmity and preserving our founding values than any other American who has ever

lived. His words from his first inaugural were a prayer in his time and are no less in ours:

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break the bonds of our affection. The mystic chords of memory will swell when again touched, as surely as they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM ARIZONA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, colleagues, we regret to hear that our friend from Arizona will conclude his Senate service at the end of his 6-year term.

I would like to say, on behalf of myself and I think many of my colleagues, we just witnessed a speech from a very fine man—a man who clearly brings high principles to the office every day and does what he believes is in the best interest of Arizona and the country.

I am grateful the Senator from Arizona will be here for another year and a half. We have big things to try to accomplish for the American people. From my perspective, the Senator from Arizona has been a great team player, always trying to get a constructive outcome no matter what the issue before us.

So I thank the Senator from Arizona for his service, which will continue, thankfully, for another year and a half, and for the opportunity to listen to his remarks today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is very hard for me to add to the eloquence of my dear friend from Arizona, but I do want to say it has been one of the great honors of my life to have the opportunity to serve with a man of integrity, of honor, decency, and commitment to not only Arizona but the United States of America.

I have seen JEFF FLAKE stand up for what he believes in, knowing full well that there would be a political price to pay. I have seen him stand up for his family. I have seen him stand up for his forbearers who were the early settlers of the State of Arizona. In fact, there is a place called Snowflake, AZ, and obviously the “Flake” part comes from his direct predecessor.

It is the Flake family and families like them who came and worked and slaved and raised families and made Arizona what it is, and it has never had a more deserving son than JEFF FLAKE and his beautiful wife Cheryl and children.

So I would just like to say, JEFF, I have known you now for a number of years. I know you have served Arizona and the country, and there is one thing I am absolutely sure of, and that is you will continue that service, which is

part of your family. It is part of your view of America. It is part of your willingness and desire to serve Arizona. One of the great privileges of my life has been to have the opportunity to know you and serve with you.

As we look, all of us, at some point at our time that we have spent here—whether it be short or whether it be long—we look back and we think about what we could have done, what we should have done, what we might have done, the mistakes we made, and the things we are proud of. Well, when the Flake service to this country in this Senate is reviewed, it will be one of honor, of brilliance and patriotism and love of country.

I thank you. God bless you and your family.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, all postcloture time now be considered expired, all pending motions and amendments be withdrawn, except for the motion to concur, and that Senator PAUL be recognized to speak for up to 5 minutes and then make a budget point of order; that myself or my designee be recognized to make a motion to waive; that following disposition of the motion to waive, the Senate vote on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266; and that if the motion is agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

Under the previous order, the motion to concur with amendment is withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, there have been many who have said, including Admiral Mullen, among others, that the greatest threat to our national security is our debt. We have a \$20 trillion debt. This year, the debt for 1 year will be about \$700 billion. We borrow \$1 million a minute. What we have before us is a bill that will exceed our spending caps.

We will be told that this is an emergency and we must do it. Yet I think the true compassion comes from helping those but also making sure we don't add to our debt. I think the truly compassionate person helps their neighbor by giving part of their surplus to their neighbor but not going to the bank and borrowing money to give it to their neighbor.

We are \$700 billion short in the budget, and we are simply going to print more money and send it to Puerto Rico, Texas, and Florida. What I ask is, if you are going to help people, why

don't we set our priorities? Why don't we take money from other areas of the budget where it is not needed?

What I propose is that we cut 1 percent or a little bit less than that across the board. I think there is not a department of government that couldn't deal with 1 percent less, and we would take that money and we could spend it on the emergencies in Puerto Rico and Texas.

I think if we think somehow that it is compassionate to go ahead and just borrow more money and continue doing this, I think we are fooling ourselves. I think our country becomes weaker each day we add to the debt, and I think it is time we become honest with ourselves.

If you look at whose fault this is, there is enough blame to go around, frankly. The debt doubled under George W. Bush from \$5 trillion to \$10 trillion. The debt then doubled again from \$10 trillion to \$20 trillion under President Obama.

We are on course to add, some estimate, another \$10 to \$15 trillion over the next 8 years. This is a real problem for our country. So I think, as we look toward helping those who suffer from the hurricanes, we should look toward taking it away from less pressing priorities.

There is also \$16 billion in here for the flood program that continues to pay people to build in flood zones. We do it year after year after year. We continue to rebuild in flood zones, and then the taxpayers are left on the hook. So we are wiping out \$16 billion in debt for the flood program, and we are also then spending money we don't have.

At this point, what I would like to do is raise a point of order that has to do with us exceeding the spending caps. I think, if we are going to be honest with ourselves—we are in the midst of talking about a large tax cut, which I favor, but how can we be the party or the people who cut taxes at the same time we continue to borrow more? So what I am asking, through this budget point of order, is that we actually adhere to our rule to not exceed our spending caps and try to slow down the accumulation of debt.

With that, I raise the section 314(e) point of order, pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, against sections 304, 306, 308, and 309 of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act of 2017.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purpose of H.R. 2266, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 247 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gardner	Nelson
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Booker	Grassley	Reed
Boozman	Harris	Roberts
Brown	Hassan	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Cantwell	Heinrich	Sanders
Capito	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cardin	Heller	Schumer
Carper	Hirono	Scott
Casey	Hoeven	Shaheen
Cassidy	Isakson	Stabenow
Cochran	Kaine	Sullivan
Collins	Kennedy	Tester
Coons	King	Tillis
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Udall
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Van Hollen
Cruz	Manchin	Warner
Daines	Markley	Warren
Donnelly	McCain	Whitehouse
Duckworth	McCaskill	Wicker
Durbin	McConnell	Wyden
Ernst	Merkley	Young
Feinstein	Murkowski	

NAYS—19

Barrasso	Johnson	Sasse
Corker	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Strange
Crapo	Moran	Thune
Enzi	Paul	Toomey
Flake	Perdue	
Inhofe	Risch	

NOT VOTING—1

Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). On this vote, the yeas are 80, the nays are 19.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The point of order falls.

MOTION TO CONCUR

The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Alexander	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Booker	Harris	Roberts
Boozman	Hassan	Rounds
Brown	Hatch	Rubio
Burr	Heinrich	Sanders
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Schatz
Capito	Heller	Schumer
Cardin	Hirono	Scott
Carper	Hoeven	Shaheen
Casey	Isakson	Stabenow
Cassidy	Kaine	Sullivan
Cochran	Kennedy	Tester
Collins	King	Thune
Coons	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cornyn	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Cruz	Markley	Warner
Daines	McCain	Warren
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Duckworth	McConnell	Wicker
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Ernst	Moran	Young
Feinstein	Murkowski	
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—17

Barrasso	Inhofe	Risch
Corker	Johnson	Sasse
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Strange
Enzi	Paul	Toomey
Flake	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—1

Menendez

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table with respect to the prior vote.

The Senator from Idaho.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 111.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 111, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Arbitration Agreements."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 111) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Arbitration Agreements."

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, what Congress is trying to do today, this evening, as long as it takes, as long as the arms are twisted, is frankly outrageous. Our job is to look out for the people whom we serve, not to look out for Wells Fargo, not to look out for Equifax, not to look out for Wall Street banks, not to look out for corporations who scam consumers.

Forced arbitration, pure and simple, takes power away from ordinary people. It gives it to the big banks, it gives it to Equifax, it gives it to Wells Fargo, it gives it to Wall Street companies that already have an unfair advantage. We know the White House increasingly looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives. I would hope the Senate wouldn't follow suit.

Look at Equifax. In early September, we learned it compromised the personal data of more than 145 million Americans—5 million in my State, probably twice that in the Presiding Officer's State—names, dates of birth, addresses, Social Security numbers, driver's licenses, more than half the adult population of the United States of America.

So how did Equifax respond? By immediately trying to trick customers—their consumers, their customers—into signing away their rights to access the court system in exchange for credit monitoring.

So here is what Equifax did in simple terms. Equifax said: Oh, we will give you a free year of credit monitoring; sign right here. Oh, yeah, when you sign right here, the fine print says: but you can't ever sue us. You have to go through this forced arbitration, which of course almost nobody does, almost nobody understands, and almost no consumer ever wins. Only after Senators and consumer groups led a public outcry did they back down.

We sat in the Banking Committee and listened to the just-retired CEO of Equifax and then the next week listened to the trade association where the CEO of the trade association, who wasn't paid the tens of millions of dollars, I assume, that the retired CEO of Equifax was—the recently retired because he didn't do his job, even though he was getting all kinds of compensation. There is more on that later.

They backed down from this idea of forced arbitration because the public said: You basically have to be kidding. You are going to defraud 145 million

people, and then they are going to sign something and the fine print says: Sorry, nah, nah, nah, nah, nah, you can't sue us. So they backed down. Great.

Then he said he was going to give up his bonus. That was really generous when he made in 2016 and 2017—as Senator CRAPO and I in the Banking Committee talked about today—he made about \$140 million in those 2 years, which is not real difficult math. There were 145 million people scammed, and the CEO, not doing his job, made \$140 million, so that is about a dollar per “scamee.” I know that is not a word, but it sort of fits.

You would think after public shaming, Equifax would have learned its lesson. So last week Equifax again was just abusing the public trust. You wonder why people are cynical or people are skeptical. People are so frustrated about Wall Street and about financial services in this country because you have these multigazillionaires—again, in 2 years, he made \$140 million. Well, you have these very wealthy executives who think they are doing us a favor because they are giving back their bonus. They already have \$100 million in their pocket, and that is just in the last 2 years. Who knows how far it goes back.

So they sent a representative to testify in front of the Banking Committee. Do you know what he said when we asked him—I asked him and others asked him—he still thinks it is appropriate for Equifax and the other credit bureaus to use forced arbitration clauses that prevent Americans they have hurt from having their day in court. He seemed to learn nothing from this. Even after the huge harm Equifax has caused 145 million Americans, 5 million Ohioans, they still defend their use of forced arbitration clauses.

Why do they like them so much? Why are they willing to stand strong and to hold on to their right to forced arbitration? Because they make so much money from forced arbitration because it keeps that power relationship. When Wall Street has all the power and 145 million consumers have almost no power—that is why they like forced arbitration and that is why they are turning the heat up on all of my colleagues here to stand strong for the banks, for Wall Street, for Equifax, for Wells Fargo, for forced arbitration. That is Equifax.

Let's take a look at Wells Fargo. In 2013, they used a forced arbitration clause to silence a customer who had accused the company of opening fake accounts in his name. OK. I will say that again. They used a forced arbitration clause to silence a customer who had accused the company of opening fake accounts in his name. Well, it turns out this customer was not just right, but we found out Wells Fargo opened 3.5 million of these fake accounts. Think about that. You have a

relationship with a bank, and it happens to be Wells Fargo, which used to have a really good reputation as one of America's largest Wall Street banks—and neighborhood banks too. There are 6 million, if I am right, 6 million community banks, as they like to say. There are 6 million little branch offices in everybody's neighborhood.

So this bank took relationships they had with their customers, and they opened accounts pretty much for 3.5 million of their customers—accounts they never approved. Say you had a checking account with them. They went and opened another checking account in your name and didn't tell you. That is what they did.

So then they subjected their employees who opened those accounts to harsh sales goals. That is what they did—harsh sales goals. They threatened to fire anyone who didn't keep up. Here is the forced arbitration. Because Wells Fargo had the power of the forced arbitration clause, they were able to sweep this 2013 lawsuit under the rug, allowing the scandal to continue for years.

So go back to that. In 2013, if that customer didn't have that forced arbitration—which that customer didn't even know he or she signed. When they wanted to sue, they found out they couldn't sue because they had signed, in the really small print that almost nobody reads—I am not a lawyer, and I don't know if I could understand that small print. I know many Americans can't. So that person couldn't sue.

Imagine if that person had been able to sue in an open court and then in discovery they had found out: Oh, my gosh. Wells Fargo opened 3.5 million of these accounts. Maybe we ought to do something about it. Instead, because of forced arbitration, the public didn't find out about what Wells Fargo had done until about 3 years later. So think of the damage. Maybe it wasn't 3.5 million cases—maybe they didn't open 3.5 million in 2013. Maybe it was only a million there, but every month they opened more and more and more fake accounts, false accounts, because nobody could sue because they were forced into arbitration, and arbitration always happens in a back room somewhere. Nobody really knows it is going on.

Again, think how much damage could have been prevented if that customer was allowed to take Wells Fargo to open court 4 years ago. When the scandal was finally brought to light, customers found out that forced arbitration was such a powerful tool for Wells Fargo and others and that it was all without their consent.

The Economic Policy Institute studied people who went into arbitration with Wells Fargo. They found out, on average—now, most people don't even try with arbitration. They just give up because it is only a few dollars, but those courageous souls or angry cus-

tomers who actually went into arbitration, ended up—they didn't just lose and not win any money from Wells Fargo, they, on the average, had to pay Wells Fargo—maybe we would call it, in layman's terms, a countersuit in some sense—they had to pay Wells Fargo an average of \$11,000.

So they can't sue under Federal law. They have lost their day in court, under Federal law, because of this forced arbitration law. So they went to arbitration, and Wells Fargo, with their very smart, very well-paid lawyer—keep in mind, their CEO made about \$20 million. Their really well-paid legal team does very well. So that well-paid legal team went to work, and the average customer, who had no legal team on her side or on his side, ended up paying Wells Fargo, on the average, \$11,000. No wonder they love this forced arbitration law.

You heard that right, the customers ended up paying the bank. So the same bank that cheated customers into opening false accounts—they cheated, they deceived into opening false accounts and that doesn't even talk about the car insurance they made them buy down the road. That is another story. The same bank that cheated customers into opening false accounts, the customers ended up having to pay Wells Fargo for the privilege of getting scammed. Congratulations.

No wonder people don't trust Wall Street. No wonder people are mad at Wells Fargo and Equifax and these companies that scam the public and these banks that—I live in Cleveland, OH, in ZIP Code 44105. My ZIP Code had more foreclosures in 2007 than any ZIP Code in the United States of America, and I see what these banks did to my neighborhood, and I see what they do to Wells Fargo account holders, and I see what they are doing to the 145 million whom Equifax has scammed.

Studies show that Wall Street and other big companies win 93 percent of the time in arbitration. Ninety-three percent of the time in arbitration the companies win. No wonder they are fighting like hell. No wonder they have lobbied this place like we have never seen. No wonder every Wall Street firm is down here begging their Senators to stand strong with Wall Street and pass this CRA, pass this resolution to undo the rule stopping forced arbitration.

So Wells Fargo's multidecamillionaire CEO came and testified in front of the Banking Committee early this month on an entirely new scandal. This is another Wells Fargo scandal, a scandal the last CEO in front of us didn't disclose. There was a new scandal he knew about and didn't tell us about. He said that Wells Fargo plans to keep using forced arbitration. It is amazing that bank that has hurt so many Americans would continue to crusade against consumers' right to a day in court.

This vote is all about a consumer's right to a day in court, pure and simple. These forced arbitration clauses are powerful. They are everywhere. They are in student loans. They are in credit card agreements. They are in nursing home agreements, even in employment contracts.

Gretchen Carlson, the well-known FOX News anchor, was prevented from suing her employer for sexual harassment by a forced arbitration clause in her employment contract. She has been urging Senators today to vote against the repeal of the consumer bureau's rule. In her words, forced arbitration "has silenced millions of women who otherwise may have come forward." With all the other things about forced arbitration, think about what she said. She says forced arbitration "has silenced millions of women who otherwise may have come forward."

Forced arbitration is about the biggest companies in the country, the biggest Wall Street firms and silencing customers, silencing victims. It is about giving more power to corporations. If you ask Americans if they think corporations have too much power, resoundingly, they say yes. This gives more power to those corporations that already have too much power in the lives of working Americans.

Let me tell you a story about an Ohioan. I will use only his first name, George. George is from Mentor, OH, a community east of Cleveland in Lake County. George's wife suffered physical and mental abuse in a nursing home. Guess what. The nursing home had an arbitration clause. It denied him and his family their day in court. This nursing home could physically and mentally abuse his wife, who was helpless in this nursing home. She couldn't really fight back. She couldn't really do much herself to stop it. They couldn't go to court because they had signed a forced arbitration clause. George didn't know what a forced arbitration clause was, I assume, until that happened.

Forced arbitration clauses were so powerful and so effective that when George went to a lawyer, his lawyer said: You don't stand a chance fighting against it because they are going to put you into forced arbitration. They are not going to give you a free day in court.

Veterans and servicemembers have a lot of experience with this issue. A big Wall Street bank called Santander was illegally repossessing cars from servicemembers all over the country several years ago. When servicemembers spoke up about their rights—special protections they earned by serving our country—Santander used forced arbitration to keep them out of court.

We talk a good game about veterans here. We are always saying how we are on the side of veterans. I have served in the Veterans' Affairs Committee longer

than any Ohio Senator ever. I pay a lot of attention to these issues, and I hear all of my colleagues mouth wonderful words about how we love veterans and ought to take care of veterans. The American Legion held its national convention in August and adopted a resolution supporting the consumer bureau's rule and opposing today's attempt to repeal it. The assistant director of the American Legion's veterans employment and education division said: "Our membership has stated unequivocally that we will not accept a future where our military veterans' financial protections are chipped away to increase the margins of the financial sector."

These arbitration rules go after families of people in nursing homes. They go after customers who they get to sign up for things they didn't know they were signing up for. They go after people whose credit has been hacked and whose credit rating has been dinged, and they go after soldiers, airmen, sailors, and Coast Guard members. How will Members of this body look those servicemembers in the eye and explain that they chose to stand with Wall Street over our military members?

Forced arbitration hurts the 3.5 million people who had bank accounts fraudulently opened by Wells Fargo. Forced arbitration hurts the 145 million Americans who had their personal data put at risk by Equifax. It hurts employees who have been hurt by their employers. It hurts students who have been cheated by for-profit colleges. It hurts family members in nursing homes. It hurts America's veterans. Forced arbitration hurts millions of Americans with student loan debt and credit cards. Damn near everybody in the country is potentially vulnerable to forced arbitration.

Who does forced arbitration help? We know that it is Wall Street banks and huge corporations that never pay the price for cheating working people. Those CEOs who make \$20 million and, then, generously give up their bonuses, will not give up forced arbitration because they know that will help their bottom line. That will help their stock bounce back. That will help their dividend. That will help their compensation.

I urge my friends on the other side to ask themselves: Whose side are we on—the people we serve who get hurt by forced arbitration or Wall Street CEOs who cash in? I ask my colleagues: Choose to side with the people we serve. Vote against repeal of the consumer bureau's rule. Give some power back to regular Americans.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

MR. CRAPO. Mr. President, we are having a very interesting and, obviously, intense debate tonight about ar-

bitration clauses in financial contracts. Those who oppose the resolution that is on the floor tonight would have you think that the battle is over whether or not to stop what they call forced arbitration clauses in contracts.

The real issue is whether we will try to force the resolution of disputes in financial resolution into class action lawsuits. This is a question about whether we should force dispute resolution mechanisms into class actions. In fact, let me read the actual language of the rule that we are debating. It doesn't say anything about forced arbitration clauses. In fact, the rule doesn't stop arbitration clauses in contracts. It stops protections in arbitration clauses against class action litigation. Let's read what the actual rule says: The CFPB rule prohibits a company from relying in any way on a predispute arbitration agreement with respect to any aspect of a class action that concerns any consumer financial product or service.

In other words, the entire purpose of this rule is to promote class action litigation and to stop arbitration resolution when there is a dispute. Specifically, the rule requires any predispute arbitration agreement to include this specific language. In other words, people and companies are required to put this language into their agreements. This tells you what the dispute is about.

The language mandated by this rule is this: We agree that neither we nor anyone else will rely on this agreement to stop you from being part of a class action case in a court. You may file a class action in court or you may be a member of a class action filed by someone else.

It is about as clear as it could be. The issue here is this: Do we force the resolution of disagreements or disputes in financial transactions into class action litigation?

This is a rule to benefit the plaintiff's bar.

The rule also requires that companies that go through arbitration must submit records of arbitration cases to the CFPB within 60 days of those records.

Some have raised the argument that arbitration agreements gag consumers, including, as was suggested, saying that, were it not for arbitration agreements, the Wells Fargo fake accounts scandal would have been discovered earlier. The only thing confidential in arbitration is what is brought as specific evidence in that arbitration proceeding. The clauses in the law permit people to discuss the claims they are bringing and the company and the individual, if they choose to discuss them.

Nothing stopped anyone from talking publically about what was going on at Wells Fargo. Arbitration keeps evidence confidential for the protection of consumers, but it does not keep them from speaking out about it.

Further, if judges believe that clauses do that, they often find them unconstitutional, as they stop consumers from speaking out. In fact, if you think about it, what generated the public understanding of the Wells Fargo circumstance, if I recall correctly, was a Los Angeles Times news article. It was the CFPB itself that failed, apparently, to read the news and understand what was going on at Wells Fargo. That was the reason that we saw it take so long for any action to take place—not an arbitration agreement.

In addition, those who are attacking arbitration agreements seem to make the case that arbitration agreements stop consumers from having options. The CFPB's own study said: The clear majority of arbitration clauses within our review specifically recognize and allow access to small claims court as an alternative to arbitration.

Let's just be clear. Arbitration clauses don't gag consumers. They don't stop them from speaking out about what they see going wrong. They don't force them out of the courts if they want to go into a small claims court. The only thing they do that is being objected to here is that they try to force them to not agree to go into a class action lawsuit. It is literally that question that is the biggest issue that we are dealing with here.

Mr. MERKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CRAPO. I haven't finished yet.

Mr. MERKLEY. I am sorry.

Mr. CRAPO. I am looking for more pages.

Mr. MERKLEY. While he is looking, will the Senator perhaps yield for a question?

Mr. CRAPO. I will yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. The thing that confused me about the Senator's commentary is that the Senator referred to people, through this regulation, being forced into court, but in reality, they would still have a choice of arbitration or court, as opposed to being locked into arbitration.

Are you familiar that under this rule people would still have the option of arbitration, if they thought that was good?

Mr. CRAPO. I am familiar that they would still have the option of arbitration.

That is why, when those who criticize our effort to reject this rule say we are trying to stop forced arbitration, the rule itself still allows arbitration agreements. What it stops is allowing the company to reach an agreement with the consumer to avoid class action litigation.

Mr. MERKLEY. I could possibly clarify that. My understanding is that, cur-

rently, when you have an arbitration clause, you have one option, and that is to go into arbitration.

Mr. CRAPO. That is not true.

Mr. MERKLEY. In this rule you have the ability to go to court or the ability to go to arbitration.

Mr. CRAPO. Let me reclaim my time, and the Senator can respond on his own time.

Let me clarify. As I indicated, even the CFPB, in its own study, said that most of the contracts—not all companies use the same contract—already allow two actions: No. 1, to go to small claims court or, No. 2, to go to arbitration. What the agreements don't allow is class action litigation. The specific and only restriction of the rule we are debating tonight is about whether class action litigation should be incentivized by taking out the ability of companies to insist that not be an alternative.

There is one restriction that we are debating here, and that is whether it is appropriate to allow companies to negotiate away class action litigation.

On July 10, the CFPB finalized its rule, as I have said, specifically prohibiting the use of predispute arbitration agreements that prevent consumers from participating in class action lawsuits.

The Dodd-Frank Act—the statute under which the CFPB was created—also set forth when the CFPB was authorized to prohibit, impose conditions upon, or limit the use of such agreements; namely, if the CFPB finds—and this is what they are required by law to find—that any such action was, No. 1, in the public interest and for the protection of consumers and, No. 2, consistent with the CFPB study's findings.

It is clear that the CFPB failed the legal requirements on both counts. In 2015 the CFPB released its final study and report on predispute arbitration to Congress. To say that the study was flawed is an understatement. It was panned for its questionable analysis, data, and conclusions by the public, by academics, by consumers, by businesses, by Federal regulators, and by Members of Congress who noted that it could make consumers worse off by removing access to an important dispute resolution tool.

I will spend a few minutes delineating some of the valid criticisms, since the study was the basis and the legal requirement for the final rule. First, the study only compared class action settlements with arbitration awards. By only looking at arbitration awards and not consumer recovery in arbitration settlements that occur before awards, the CFPB ignored substantial evidence of arbitration agreements benefiting consumers.

The analogy that comes to mind is thinking about how much money you have in the bank by looking at your checking account, while ignoring what is in your savings account. Given this

methodological flaw, it is difficult to make apples-to-apples comparisons about class action versus arbitration, but the Wall Street Journal's editorial board made a helpful observation: "Of the 562 class actions the CFPB studied, none went to trial." Let me read that again: "None went to trial." Most were dismissed by a judge or withdrawn by the plaintiffs or settled out of class.

The putative class victims received benefits in fewer than 20 percent of the cases, and the average cash recovery was—wait for it—\$32. Lawyers took an average 24 percent cut of the cash payments, about \$424 million in cases that settled.

Meanwhile, consumers were awarded relief in 32 of the 158 arbitration disputes the bureau examined—

These are arbitration results now—

and rewards averaged \$5,389—or about 57 percent of every dollar claimed. Consumers who used arbitration received relief on average in two months after filing their claim. Class-action members had to wait two years.

Clearly, the CFPB cherry-picked the information it liked and omitted what it did not like. The CFPB and its advocates of the rule also argue that the rule restores a consumer's day in court. But, again, the CFPB's study explicitly states that no class actions filed during the time period that the CFPB studied from 2010 to 2012 even went to trial.

The study added that most arbitration agreements in consumer financial contracts contain a "small claims court carve-out," which provides the parties with a contractual right to pursue a claim in small claims court.

The CFPB claims that the rule will deter companies from bad behavior in the face of an increase in class action lawsuits. Yet there is no evidence to that effect.

A report released by the Treasury Department this week notes that "after years of study, the Bureau has identified no evidence indicating that firms that do not use arbitration clauses treat their customers better or have higher levels of compliance with the law."

The truth is, rather than deterring companies from bad behavior, this rule will encourage frivolous lawsuits that companies feel compelled to settle, shifting hundreds of millions of dollars from businesses to plaintiff attorneys.

Many Members of Congress have weighed in on both the CFPB's arbitration study and how the final rule was developed. In 2015, 86 Members of the House and Senate wrote to Director Cordray asking that he reopen the arbitration study due to concerns about the Bureau's process. In 2016, 140 Members of the House and Senate again wrote to Director Cordray, raising concerns about the CFPB's proposed rule and asking the Bureau to reexamine their approach to arbitration. Unfortunately, the final rule was still issued without addressing any of the concerns identified.

Federal financial regulators have raised a number of concerns with the assumptions used in the development of the rule and the lack of consideration for alternative approaches. Recently, the Treasury Department issued an analysis that concluded that the CFPB did not sufficiently substantiate with any quantitative assessment its assumption that the current level of compliance in consumer financial markets is “generally sub-optimal,” which means that the CFPB has not adequately demonstrated the rule will solve the assumed problem it set out to fix.

Treasury also noted the CFPB could have considered less costly alternatives, including more effectively informing consumers, clearer disclosure, or more targeted regulation. However, it failed to do so, opting instead for an all-or-nothing approach, which, again, is specifically designed to generate a phenomenal increase in class action litigation.

The Acting Comptroller of the Currency has also raised serious concerns with the rule and asked for the opportunity to review the CFPB’s data and analysis to determine the potential impact of the rule. According to a recent letter by the Acting Comptroller of the Currency:

Eliminating the use of this tool could result in less effective consumer protection and remedies, while simply enriching class-action lawyers.

At the same time, the proposal may potentially decrease the products and services offered to their consumers, while increasing their costs.

The CFPB attempted to estimate the increase in costs, albeit incompletely, that are associated with this final rule and that could be passed onto consumers. The CFPB estimates in its final rule that the companies will incur \$2.6 billion of additional fees and settlements over the next 5 years, \$330 million of which will go directly to plaintiff lawyers. As astounding as these numbers are, the estimate includes only Federal court cases and fails to include State court cases.

Treasury’s analysis also notes that the CFPB appears to understate the share of class actions dismissed by the courts, thus failing to adequately consider the costs of meritless cases. According to Treasury, assuming that just 10 percent of class action cases are meritless, “the Rule would have to reduce harm to consumers by \$500 million per year to demonstrate any net benefit to society. The Rule does not come close to making that showing.”

The OCC recently shed more light on how the CFPB’s final rule could impact the cost of consumer credit. While the CFPB said that it could not identify any evidence to that effect, it did concede that “this does not mean that no pass-through [to consumers] occurred; it only means that the analysis did not provide evidence of it” and that “most

providers will pass through at least portions of some of the costs.”

Using the same data, the OCC conducted its own analysis and found “a strong probability of a significant increase in the cost of credit cards as a result of eliminating arbitration clauses.”

In fact, the OCC found an 88-percent chance that the total cost of credit will increase and a 56-percent chance that costs will increase by at least 3 percent.

As Acting Comptroller Noreika noted, that means that a consumer, living week to week, could see credit card rates jump from an average of 12.5 percent to nearly 16 percent. He correctly added that “to the extent the CFPB’s arbitration rule is being undermined, it is undermined by the CFPB’s own data and the working paper on which the CFPB relied.”

Community banks and credit unions across this Nation are raising concerns with the rule. The Independent Community Bankers Association opposes the arbitration rule because:

Community banks are relationship lenders, many of which have served their communities for multiple generations. A reputation for fair dealing is essential for their success, and abusive consumer practices have absolutely no place in their business model. Community banks invest heavily in resolving customer complaints amicably and on a timely basis.

In addition, the Credit Union National Administration, or CUNA, opposes the arbitration rule because “[a]mong the many consumer protections associated with the mission of credit unions is the high-quality service they provide to their members, which has prompted a successful system for quickly and amicably resolving disputes in the limited instances where they arise.”

While the CFPB claims that many community banks and credit unions do not even have these clauses, I have heard from many small financial institutions that this rule would have a significant impact on their operations.

On July 25, by a vote of 231 to 190, the House voted to overturn this rule. The administration weighed in on the House’s efforts, saying: “This legislation would protect consumer choices by eliminating a costly and burdensome regulation and reining in the bureaucracy and inadvisable regulatory actions of the CFPB.”

It is alarming that the CFPB moved forward with a final rule in this manner, especially in light of the numerous concerns expressed. The CFPB could have made recommendations to improve the arbitration process or arbitration clauses if it identified concerns.

Aside from the substantive concerns about this specific rule, it brings the CFPB’s own structure and accountability into focus. The CFPB is unlike any other Federal agency. Since its

creation, we have argued that far too much power is invested in the CFPB Director without any effective checks or balances.

Last year, the DC Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the CFPB, as it is currently structured, is unconstitutional. The ruling stated that Congress erred in creating a far-reaching agency that is led by a single Director. In particular, the ruling noted that “the CFPB’s concentration of enormous executive power in a single, unaccountable, unchecked Director not only departs from subtle historical practice, but also poses a far greater risk to arbitrary decision-making and abuse of power.”

The Director is further insulated by being able to automatically withdraw funds from the Federal Reserve, rather than being required to justify the CFPB’s annual funding needs to Congress.

The court’s decision mirrored arguments from Members of Congress that the Director has wide-ranging power with little oversight and is a gross departure from the settled historical practice of having multimember commissions at agencies to keep them in check. In fact, the Senate repeatedly urged the prior administration to impose checks on the CFPB.

In 2011, 44 Senators wrote to the administration expressing concern about the lack of accountability in the structure of the CFPB. In 2013, 43 Senators wrote to the administration once again. In each instance, we advocated for the establishment of proper checks and balances for the agency, which, had they been imposed, almost certainly would have avoided this crisis rule that we see coming out.

Some of the specific checks and balances for which we advocated included replacing the single Director with a bipartisan commission to run the CFPB, subjecting the CFPB to congressional appropriations, and establishing safety-and-soundness checks for prudential regulators. Nevertheless, despite our efforts, this agency remains just as powerful and unaccountable today, and this rule is just the most recent demonstration of its continued lack of accountability.

Now the Senate has the opportunity to take another step toward holding this agency accountable. The CFPB failed to demonstrate that consumers will fare better in light of its arbitration rule. In fact, they may be worse off.

I urge my colleagues to help ensure that consumers maintain access to quick, inexpensive, and efficient mechanisms of dispute resolution by overturning this rule.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I couldn’t disagree more with my colleague from Idaho. He gave a very studious presentation that missed all the

key facts. He made a big point out of the fact that we would lose a dispute resolution tool, but, in fact, access to small claims and access to arbitration remain in place, so it is simply wrong.

He noted that small claims is a great option, but, of course, what we are talking about are provisions in which credit card companies and cell phone companies and broadband companies put charges on your bill that are unjustified, but they are small amounts. They are little amounts. It is \$5 here, slammed there; it is \$10 there, jammed on your bill there. You discover it, and you call them up, and they say: Well, you can come to arbitration. Of course, arbitration means they choose the decision maker; they pay the decision maker, and that decision maker comes to them for future business. So it is completely rigged.

If anyone wanted to see an example of the swamp at work here in DC, we have it on the floor tonight. This is Big Business taking justice and ripping it out of the hands of consumers across our Nation.

It costs fees to go to small claims; you can't go to small claims for \$10 or \$5 or \$20. This is well understood.

My colleague made a big point about the fact that a lot of companies settle. These companies have the best lawyers that money can buy. They settle only when they have cheated the consumer and they know there is a chance they are going to get a worse verdict if it goes to trial. It is smart for them, and it saves money for them not to continue to adjudicate a case in which, clearly, they are wrong. So, of course, they will settle. This is not an argument against consumer rights; it is an argument for consumer rights.

My colleague made the argument that 25 percent of the fees go to the lawyers, but he didn't point out that means 75 percent goes to the consumers. Why is that a fair deal? Because consumers can't afford to go to court for \$10 or \$20 or \$15, so they are awfully happy to be able to get 75 percent of what they are owed.

Again, he didn't begin to mention the fact that the whole point is deterrence. These companies are given a right to cheat because there is no way for a customer to get a fair adjudication. In arbitration, the company chooses the judge; the company pays the judge. And these judges come back time and again for case after case after case, finding for the companies time after time after time. So if you want a rigged system, if you want an example of a swamp flooding this room right here, this is it, right here, right now.

Deterring companies from cheating individuals makes a lot of sense. It adds a lot of value to our society. Credit card customers, nursing home residents, students with loans, veterans—veterans weigh in heavily against the abusive practice of a rigged system—

certainly customers of cell phone companies and broadband.

I have had this experience myself. I looked at a bill, and I said: Wait, what is this charge on here that I have never seen before? I called up the company. Of course, you go through a phone tree, and you spend an hour trying to talk to some real person who is way overseas somewhere. They say: Well, we just added it to your bill 6 months ago, and you should have protested it the first month it was on your bill. Well, I don't look at the details every single month to see if the company tried to cheat me. And if they did it to me, they did it to thousands and thousands of others. They were willing to reimburse 1 month of this, but not the first 5 months. At \$10 a month, that is \$50. You can't go to small claims for \$50. You can't go to court for \$50. The only fair thing is to have the full range of options, and that is taken away by arbitration.

I would bet none of my colleagues here, not a one—and if any colleague would like to stand up and say they disagree, I would like to hear it—not a one would agree to have a serious dispute settled in which the opponent chooses the judge, pays the judge, and that judge gets business from them all the time. That is rigged and that is wrong, and that is why I encourage my colleagues to vote against this resolution tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Wells Fargo creates 3.5 million fake accounts, charging customers fees and ruining credit scores. Equifax lets hackers steal personal information on 145 million Americans, putting nearly 60 percent of American adults at risk of identity theft. And somehow we are about to vote on a Republican proposal that makes it harder for consumers to hold companies like Wells Fargo and Equifax accountable. I know it sounds nuts, but it is true.

Here is the issue: If you have a checking account, credit card, private student loan, or any number of financial products, there is a good chance you have given up your right to go to court if that financial firm cheats you. That is because tens of millions of consumer financial contracts include a forced arbitration clause that says that if this financial company cheated you, you can't join with other consumers in court; you have to go to arbitration by yourself. Tens of millions of consumers, including around 80 million credit card customers, can't go to court if their banks cheat them.

Think about what this means in the real world. You wake up in the morning and find a mysterious \$30 fee on your account statement. You call the bank and say: I didn't agree to this. The bank tells you to pound sand. So what are your options? Well, if there is

no forced arbitration clause in your contract, you have a choice: You can go to court, or, if your bank offers it, you can pursue arbitration.

Here is what you want to think about. Chances are pretty good that if the bank cheated you with a \$30 unauthorized fee, there are other customers in the same boat. That means, if you want, you can join a class action lawsuit against the bank for free. A class action gives you a chance to get some money back, and it doesn't cost you anything. A class action also means the bank might have to cough up some real money and think twice before hitting you and their other customers with hidden fees the next time around.

Now think about what happens if there is a forced arbitration clause. You can't join with other customers in court. Your only option is to file a solo arbitration claim, which will cost you \$200 or more just to get started. Who is going to pay \$200 up front to try to get back a \$30 fee? No one. That is exactly what the banks are counting on. They can get away with nickel and diming you forever.

But say the bank steals a bigger amount and you just can't stand it anymore, so you decide to be one of the roughly 400 consumers a year who go before an arbitrator. If you don't like the result, there is no appeal. Even worse, the banks are allowed to swipe your wallet in secret. The records of these proceedings are not public, so the regulators and the American people don't get to know what their banks are up to. Does that sound like justice in America?

Earlier this year, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau put a stop to that. They issued a new rule that prohibits financial companies from forcing you to give up your right to join other customers in court and hold your bank accountable. House Republicans already voted to reverse that rule. The Senate will soon decide whether to follow suit and take away American families' freedom to choose to go to court if they are cheated by their bank.

Make no mistake—anyone who votes to reverse this rule is saying loud and clear that they stand with banks instead of their constituents, because bank lobbyists are the only people asking Congress to reverse this rule. Every other organization—all the ones that represent actual human beings, not banks—every one of them wants this rule to be saved. Let me tell you about some of them.

The Military Coalition, which represents more than 5.5 million veterans and servicemembers, supports the CFPB rule because "our nation's veterans should not be deprived of the Constitutional rights and freedoms that they put their lives on the line to protect, including the right to have their claims heard in a trial." The coalition says that "[f]orced arbitration is

an un-American system wherein servicemembers' claims against a corporation are funneled into a rigged, secretive system in which all the rules, including the choice of arbitrator, are picked by the corporation," and they warn that "the catastrophic consequences these [forced arbitration] clauses pose for our all-voluntary military fighting force's morale and our national security are vital reasons" to preserve the rule. That is from the Military Coalition.

The AARP, which represents nearly 40 million seniors, says that the CFPB rule should be preserved because it "is a critical step in restoring consumers' access to legal remedies that have been undermined by the widespread use of forced arbitration for many years." Older consumers are often at increased risk of financial scams, so the "AARP supports the availability of a full range of enforcement tools, including the right to class action litigation to prevent harm to the financial security of older people posed by unfair and illegal practices." That is the AARP, which represents seniors across the country.

The Main Street Alliance, which represents thousands of small businesses, says that the CFPB rule will help small businesses fight against big financial firms that try to drive up their fees. Since almost "20% of [small] business owners rely on credit cards as a source of investment capital—many of which contain arbitration clauses—forced arbitration makes it nearly impossible for small businesses and consumers alike to protest hidden fees, illegal debt collection, and other deceptive practices." That is from the Main Street Alliance.

So there it is. Veterans, servicemembers, seniors, small businesses, and consumers are all lining up to support the CFPB rule. But that is not all. Let Freedom Ring, an organization that proudly touts itself as "supporting the conservative agenda," likes the CFPB rule, too, saying it is "in keeping with our Framers' concerns that without appropriate protections, civil proceedings can be used as a means to oppress the powerless."

That is the thing you have to understand. The effort to reverse the CFPB rule isn't about promoting a conservative agenda, and it sure as heck is not about promoting a working people's agenda or a small business agenda. It is about advancing the banks' agenda, period.

The banks and their lobbyists actually have the gall to claim that they want to kill the rule because it is bad for their customers. That claim is just plain laughable. According to a rigorous, 3-year-long CFPB study, consumers recovered an average of \$540 million annually from class action settlements, while receiving less than \$1 million annually in the arbitration cases the agency reviewed. It is not

even close. Even if there are instances in which arbitration is a better option for consumers than a class action lawsuit, the CFPB rule doesn't stop consumers from choosing arbitration. The rule simply says that consumers—consumers—should also have the freedom to go to court if that is what they prefer.

I will tell you one thing: When it comes to what is right for consumers, I listen to servicemembers, veterans, seniors, consumers, and small businesses. I don't listen to bank lobbyists. When a bunch of bank lobbyists tell you they know what is best for consumers, hang on to your wallet.

Millions of Americans of all political parties think the game in Washington is rigged against them, and this vote is exhibit A. Companies like Equifax and Wells Fargo have hurt millions of consumers and then turn around and try to escape accountability, using forced arbitration clauses. The Republican Congress hasn't done a thing to help the people hurt by Wells Fargo. The Republican Congress hasn't done a thing to help the people hurt by Equifax. Instead, tonight they are actually taking away one of the few legal tools to hold companies like Wells Fargo and Equifax accountable.

This is shameful, and I mean that. Any Senator who votes against our servicemembers and our veterans in order to shield big banks from accountability should be ashamed. We should vote down this proposal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, the resolution we are debating today demonstrates the lengths Donald Trump and the Republican Party will go to protect the special interests that contribute billions of dollars to their political campaigns.

Earlier this year, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, issued a rule to prevent certain financial service companies from forcing consumers to sign predispute arbitration clauses that block class action lawsuits. This might sound like a boring, technical change, but it is not. At stake is nothing less than the right of millions of Americans to be heard in a court of law.

Contracts mandating forced arbitration can be found in virtually every contract someone signs these days. Every time you agree to an update to the iTunes terms of service, purchase a Fitbit, or open a credit card, you are signing away your right to join together with others to sue in a court of law if something goes wrong.

In 2010, President Obama and Democrats in Congress created the CFPB to protect the American people from predatory business practices by consumer finance companies. And while the CFPB can't do anything about the

iTunes terms or service, it can protect you, through the rule we are debating today, from companies that sell products and services related to consumer credit, automobile leasing, debt management, credit scores, payment processing, check cashing, and debt collection—industries that serve some of our most vulnerable communities.

The resolution we are debating today would eliminate these protections and expose millions to the tyranny of forced arbitration. This is particularly relevant in light of two major news stories this year in which the negligence, fraud, and malfeasance of major financial institutions harmed consumers across the country. This rule, for example, would protect the 805 Hawaii residents who had fake bank accounts opened in their names by Wells Fargo. These people suffered real and material harm, but the fine print in their agreements explicitly prevents them from banding together in a class action lawsuit. This rule would prevent banks like Wells Fargo from doing this now and in the future.

In the wake of the massive Equifax data breach, the company initially forced consumers who registered for credit monitoring to forgo their right to join a class action and instead force them into private arbitration. These are high-profile examples of the problem but aren't the only ones. Hundreds of Hawaii residents have filed complaints with the CFPB about problems with credit reporting agencies and credit report errors that can increase the cost of a loan or result in the denial of credit.

Under a recent class action settlement, Hawaii customers falsely matched with someone on the terrorist watch list can receive over \$7,000 from TransUnion. Is it really any wonder why TransUnion and other credit bureaus have fought so hard to block class action lawsuits with forced arbitration?

This rule would also protect consumers from predatory payday lenders that are extorting over \$3 million in fees a year from Hawaii consumers alone. Over 98 percent of storefront payday lenders use forced arbitration clauses in their contracts.

Hawaii is home to more than tens of thousands of Active-Duty servicemembers, reservists, and veterans. This rule protects them too. In 2016, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency fined Wells Fargo millions of dollars after they illegally foreclosed on homes or repossessed cars in violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. Without the CFPB rules, similarly affected servicemembers would be restricted from banding together to sue. It is why the American Legion, in announcing their support for the CFPB's rule and opposition to this resolution, said it

would be “extremely unfair to bar servicemembers, veterans, and other consumers from joining together to enforce statutory and constitutional protections in court.” It isn’t difficult to understand why. Big banks and megacorporations want to force their customers to adjudicate disputes through arbitration.

According to the CFPB, companies win claims in arbitration 91 percent of the time. The deck is stacked against the consumer in these forced arbitration situations, and after these judgments, consumers were forced to pay an average of over \$7,000 to companies to even engage in the proceedings. Talk about a major imbalance of power.

Director Cordray and the entire CFPB spent years developing this essential consumer protection regulation, but I am not at all surprised that the President and his allies in Congress desperately want to eliminate this consumer protection rule. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this vote really gives the U.S. Senate a choice. On one side, we have the biggest banks in America, financial institutions, which are arguing that you as a consumer, as someone who uses their banks, should be basically signing an arbitration clause that denies you the freedom to go to court. On the other side, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has argued these financial institutions are misusing this power, denying people access to courts, and it should come to an end. That is the choice.

I think I know who is going to win. I am not sure if the party on the other side of the aisle would have called this issue if they didn’t already have it lined up for the financial institutions. I know many on the other side, maybe most, hate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau like the devil hates holy water. The notion that this agency is going to stand up for consumers across America is something they find repugnant, something they would like to end tomorrow. I say thank goodness they are there.

There ought to be one agency in the Federal Government, at least just one, that speaks up for the little guy when it comes to these transactions. Think about the 3½ million people defrauded by Wells Fargo. These were people who had their identities stolen, had their Social Security numbers purloined for opening credit card and bank accounts that they never asked for—3½ million of them.

Let me tell you the story of one of them. It is a pretty interesting story. Her name is Tracy Kilgore. She is from New Mexico. She was not even a customer of Wells Fargo Bank, but she went in because she was the treasurer

of a local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. She went to the Wells Fargo branch one day in 2011 to have the names on the organization’s existing account changed. A few weeks later, she received a rejection letter for a Wells Fargo credit card that she had never applied for.

It turns out the bank teller at Wells Fargo had taken the information she had given and submitted a credit card application on her behalf without her knowing it. The application was rejected and hurt Ms. Kilgore’s credit score for a credit card she never asked for. Ms. Kilgore is fighting for her right to hold Wells Fargo accountable in court and to join with millions like her who have been victims of Wells Fargo’s misconduct.

The Republicans tonight are saying they feel sorry for Wells Fargo. They really do. To think that this company manufactured and created 3½ million phony credit card and bank accounts at the expense of customers like Tracy Kilgore doesn’t seem to move them at all. Instead, they want to stand by Wells Fargo, which put in that credit card application an arbitration clause which said: Tracy Kilgore, you can’t go to court. You can’t have your day in court. You have given it up. You signed it away to Wells Fargo.

Would Tracy go to court anyway? Let’s say she had to file a new credit report and it cost her \$100. Is she likely to file a lawsuit against Wells Fargo? Probably not. Multiply that times 3½ million people who were defrauded by this bank, and you understand how a class action suit can finally hold Wells Fargo’s feet to the fire, hold them accountable for literally cheating this woman and millions just like her.

The Republicans are arguing tonight that we ought to feel sorry for Wells Fargo. I don’t. I don’t feel sorry for them. I feel sorry for Tracy Kilgore, who, because of the arbitration clause, lost her opportunity to go to court and ask for simple justice from a judge or jury.

How about Equifax? If you think 3½ million people defrauded by Wells Fargo is a pretty awful situation, here is one dramatically worse. One hundred forty-five million—let me see. Right off the top of my head, that is about half of the people in this country. One hundred forty-five million Americans—five and one-half million who live in my State, that is almost half of our State population—had their personal data exposed in a massive Equifax data breach. In other words, if you had filed in the distant past, and there was a credit report on you, Equifax had all the information about you and your family, your banks, your Social Security numbers, and all the rest of it, Equifax ended up with a massive breach. Somebody hacked into their computer and stole your personal identity information, to the tune of 145 million Americans.

Equifax really felt bad about this. Here is what they said. Equifax, in response to this data breach, initially offered a free credit monitoring service for any customer who signed up, out of the 145 million. In other words, we will monitor to see if somebody stole your identity, they are misusing it, and hurting your credit status, but they added something: as long as the customer signed a forced arbitration clause in fine print that prohibited them from joining a class action. Equifax wants to help you, even though they initially hurt you, as long as you will guarantee that you will never hold them accountable in court. How about that for a deal?

That is what the Republicans are defending tonight, exactly what I just described. They feel sorry for Equifax. They feel sorry for Wells Fargo. They want to make sure these banks and these credit companies really have a friend in the U.S. Senate.

We don’t know if Equifax, which now claims it will no longer impose this forced arbitration on victims, will stand by that if they are ever challenged in court. We ought to ask ourselves why major groups across the United States standing up for just ordinary Americans find this Republican strategy on the floor tonight so reprehensible.

Listen to the groups that oppose this effort: the American Legion, the Consumer Federation of America, the NAACP, the United Automobile Workers, and many other consumer groups. They are saying: Why won’t somebody in Washington speak up for the average American who is being defrauded by these banks, defrauded by these credit agencies? Why won’t somebody in the Senate stand up for the agency that finally said enough and finally said that these financial institutions have had their way long enough?

Many of these financial institutions are hiding behind your local hometown banks. You know the ones I am talking about. I have them in my hometown of Springfield, IL. They are saying that this is all about your local community banks and your credit unions. We don’t want to hurt them.

Here are the facts. Ninety percent of your community banks and credit unions do not have these arbitration clauses in their agreements. Do you know who does? The big banks. Sixty percent of the big Wall Street banks have these clauses, and they are the ones who are really behind this fight, the Wells Fargo and the other ones who want to maintain this ability to stop consumers from going to court to protect themselves when they have been defrauded by banks and credit and financial institutions.

This is a classic illustration of power in Washington. Is there any power in the hands of consumers and ordinary Americans? We will find out in the vote

tonight. I am afraid it wouldn't be called on the other side of the aisle unless they figured the banks were going to win, again. It is unfortunate. We ought to live in a society where consumers have a fighting chance, and the system is not rigged against them. An arbitration clause is a way to rig a contract so a consumer is going to lose twice: lose when the bank takes advantage of them and lose when they try to go to court and they are stopped by the arbitration clause.

Consumers in this country have a battle on every single day to make a living and to get by. This is an effort to take away one of your freedoms to go to court with a group of people who have been aggrieved just like you, have your day in court, win or lose. The Republicans want to take that away and so do the banks. I hope they don't prevail.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, something truly outrageous is happening today on the floor of the Senate. The resolution we will consider today signals to the American people, in no uncertain terms, that they do not deserve the right to seek justice when big banks or other financial service providers rip them off, leave their personal information exposed to hackers, or engage in discrimination. The resolution of disapproval before us today will strip Americans of their rights in court and will ensure that corporate wrongdoing can remain shrouded in secrecy—all to protect powerful companies like Wells Fargo and Equifax.

Access to our court system is a fundamental principle in American society. It ensures that all those who wrong others, no matter how powerful, are equal in the eyes of the law and can be held accountable. That may no longer be the case. Access to our courts is under assault by companies that slip forced arbitration clauses into the fine print of agreements for basic services like checking accounts and credit cards. For some of these companies, like Equifax, consumers are not even their customers. They sell consumers' financial information to other companies. They have little incentive to protect consumers or even treat them fairly. That is how Equifax can actually make significant profits after it carelessly allowed the personal information of half of the adult population in the United States to be compromised. This is wrong.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, rightly put some commonsense limitations on the abuse of forced arbitration clauses. The rule provides that financial services companies cannot force consumers to sign away their right to join a class action lawsuit. The rule also requires more transparency when arbitration is used to ensure that wrongdoing cannot be hidden by powerful companies to keep

consumers in the dark. Protecting consumers in this way should not be controversial.

With the blunt instrument of a resolution of disapproval, the majority is seeking to strike the CFPB's rule and prevent it from ever implementing a similar rule in the future. This action, through a simple majority vote, would slam the courthouse door shut on every American who is ever ripped off by a company like Wells Fargo or has their sensitive personal information carelessly left unprotected by a company like Equifax. If we go down the path of striking this rule, consumers will only be left with the same empty, meaningless apologies we always hear from these companies when they are finally caught red-handed.

I hope the American people are following this vote today. If they want to know whether their Senator stands with them or stands with corporate abusers, they will certainly find out. Whose side will the Senate be on when the rollover is taken on this key vote? The American people, and their rights as citizens and as consumers? Or the powerful corporate interests who are pushing to repeal this protective rule? We shall soon see.

This should not be a partisan issue. We all represent the American people. It is time we act like it. The Vermonters I represent are watching. They know what is at stake by repealing this rule. I urge every Senator who shared my outrage at Wells Fargo and Equifax to take a stand and reject this shameful resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, while we have a little bit of open time in between speakers, I thought I might respond to some of the things that have been said.

Those who are opposing this resolution tonight continue to put it as though this were a case of trying to stop consumers from having an adequate way to access dispute resolution and make it look like it is the big guys against the little guys. First of all, this rule we are talking about only applies to financial institutions. It doesn't apply in all the other kinds of cases that have been thrown out here tonight. If you want to look at the financial institutions that are the most concerned about this rule, it is the little guys. It is the credit unions. It is the local community banks that are pleading with us to stop this abusive rule. I just think that part of the record needs to be set straight.

Again, I am going to lay out what this debate is really about. This debate is not about trying to help facilitate banks and credit card companies and others in cramming down some solution on consumers. It is about trying to facilitate pushing dispute resolution into class action litigation. This is a very clear move to drive our dispute resolution in this country into class litigation.

I am going to give a little bit of history, but before I do that, I want to again read to the folks who are listening in on this debate what this rule exactly does. You would think from all of the debate that it stops consumers from going to court or that it forces consumers to use an abusive arbitration process. It is very clear. This rule prohibits a company from relying in any way on a predispute arbitration agreement with respect to any aspect of a class action that concerns any consumer financial product or service.

The rule goes further. Remember that the ones that are the most worried about this are the credit unions and the small banks. Every agreement they enter into has to contain this language. This tells you what the fight is about.

We agree that neither we nor anyone else will rely on this agreement to stop you from being part of a class action case in court.

That is the rule we are talking about. You may file a class action in court or you may be a member of a class action filed by someone else. Are we fighting against a mandate—basically, a rule that is going to drive decisions and dispute resolutions into class action litigation? Yes, we are. We are fighting to protect the current system, which is one that has worked for years and years. I am going to get into that system. In fact, I will get into it right now. Let's compare class action litigation with arbitration as one of the alternatives.

In fact, before I make that comparison, let me point out that the CFPB's own study shows that the clear majority of arbitration clauses they studied allow access to small claims court as an alternative to arbitration. There is no effort to say to the consumer, if you want to, you can go to small claims court. In the United States, the limit in small claims is different in each State. It ranges from \$3,000 to \$15,000, but I would say the most common level is about \$10,000 of a claim. So a consumer who has any kind of a claim up to about \$10,000 can go to a small claims court.

Let's compare arbitration with class action litigation.

How much does the consumer recover? In a class action, the average is \$32 per person. In arbitration, the average is \$5,389 per person.

How long does it take to get the recovery? In a class action, it is 23

months, on average. In arbitration, it is 5 months, on average.

How many of them actually go to trial? Now, this is interesting because you think of a class action as your day in court. Remember that those who argued earlier tonight were telling consumers they were not going to get their day in court. The number of class action lawsuits that went to court were zero. Class action litigation is a mechanism to drive settlements. As for the number of arbitration suits that went to court, 32 percent reached a decision on the merits. That was not an actual court case, but it was a resolution by a decision maker. With regard to settlements, 12 percent classwide are made. In arbitration, 57 achieve settlement.

Here is one of the striking ones. How much is paid in attorneys' fees? In a class action, according to this study, which is the CFPB's study, \$424 million goes to attorneys' fees. There were no attorneys' fees under the arbitration. There were some arbitration fees, and I will get to that in a minute, but they were nowhere close. By the way, this number, the \$424 million that went into attorneys' fees, is the reason we are having our debate tonight. This rule seeks to drive this decision-making model into this zone.

As for estimated additional class action costs for covered companies, it is \$2.6 billion for class actions and none for arbitration.

Some have said this is just an example of the Republicans trying to help Wells Fargo out. First of all, I am the chairman of the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. We have held hearings on the Wells Fargo situation and continue to look at it very closely. Senators from both parties take it very seriously and are working to find a resolution, but when it comes to the question of whether Wells Fargo used arbitration agreements to avoid liability, these are the facts.

Wells Fargo, which was found to have opened millions of unauthorized accounts in the names of its consumers, agreed to settle this for \$142 million—twice as much as the projected consumer loss. They made that agreement because arbitrating them in individual disputes would have cost much more. The argument that Wells Fargo is the example of what we are working to try to facilitate here is just not true.

As I said, let's talk a little bit about arbitration. On the floor tonight, arbitration has been characterized as this terrible, devilish idea that has been designed by Big Business in America to try to push the little guy out of a fair chance at recovery in a dispute. The Acting Comptroller of the Currency, who heads the independent Bureau of the Treasury, which is in charge of supervising and regulating national banks, has raised serious concerns.

In his recent letter, he indicates that arbitration can be an effective alter-

native dispute resolution mechanism that can provide better outcomes for consumers and financial service providers without the high costs associated with litigation.

That is key. In fact, if you look at history, nearly a century ago, Congress made private agreements to resolve disputes through arbitration valid, irrevocable, and enforceable under a Federal law, which is called the Federal Arbitration Act. This was a decision by this Congress nearly 100 years ago that said we have to find a way that is fair to resolve disputes that is not so expensive as the current dispute resolution models we have, namely, litigation. This longstanding Federal policy in favor of private dispute resolution serves the twin purposes of economic efficiency and freedom of contract.

Some have said this just lets banks get away with cheating their customers, but the opposite is true. Eliminating the use of this tool could result in less effective consumer protection and fewer remedies while simply enriching class action lawyers. At the same time, the proposal may potentially decrease the products and services offered to consumers while increasing their costs.

The Wall Street Journal's editorial board similarly noted that arbitration has allowed consumers to easily resolve disputes by phone or online without their having an attorney.

As I have said, virtually every consumer who does not like this solution has the alternative to go to small claims court. The question here is whether we will facilitate pushing consumers out of the choice of arbitration. If the law is changed, which is what this rule seeks to do, then the disincentive for financial institutions to rely on arbitration will be seriously injured. The worry we have—and the intent of this rule—is that it will drive dispute resolution into class action litigation. That is what this whole dispute here tonight is about.

One of my colleagues tried to characterize arbitration as this system in which this company hires these decision makers, these arbitration judges, and that the judges are going to be biased because the judges are bought by the companies that use them for the arbitration. That is not an accurate description of what arbitration is.

There is actually a Federal law, which I have already referenced, which sets up the parameters in which arbitration operates, and there is an American Arbitration Association that administers it. When a person chooses to go into arbitration, what happens is that the whole system that takes over is administered not by the company but by the AAA, and under the American Arbitration Association's procedures, it appoints an arbitrator. The implication made earlier was that the arbitrator always rules for the com-

pany because that is the company that hires him.

Here is the truth. In the appointments of 1,847 disputes that the CFPB studied, arbitrators were appointed in 975 that involved 477 different arbitrators. In 704 of those disputes, the AAA appointed arbitrators who had also been in other financial disputes. Some of these arbitrators get picked a couple of times, but they are not picked by the company, and they are not beholden to the company. That is one of the reasons we set up the Federal arbitration system the way it is.

My point is, the effort to try to characterize this as some devious system that has been created to try to stop consumers from having access to fairness is simply false. We have a very fair system that has been working for over 100 years in this country. It has been litigated and litigated because those who want litigation to be the norm hate it. They do not want arbitration to work, but the reality is, it has worked wonderfully, and it has survived the litigation assaults.

Now those who want to drive decision making more into the courts and more into class action litigation have been able to get a willing, listening ear in the Director of the CFPB, who, as I have said earlier, has no accountability to Congress, who does not even look to Congress for his budget, and is obviously on the side of the litigation bar, which wants to, once again, drive our decision-making system into a litigation mode.

That is the debate we are having. That is the argument tonight. Anyone who tries to say this is an effort by your local credit union, your local community bank, or your large credit card company to try to stop consumers from having adequate access to dispute resolution is mischaracterizing what the debate tonight is about.

I encourage all of my colleagues to reject this inappropriate and, frankly, expensive and dangerous rule.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MR. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about the battle between the jury system and a system in which regular Americans are forced into arbitration, which has a terrible record.

I can remember years ago, when I was attorney general, the attorneys general shut down one of the arbitration systems because it was so corrupted and was throwing decisions to big corporate interests, and you cannot really understand that unless you understand the importance of the role of the jury in our country.

For centuries, the jury has served as a last sanctuary within our constitutional structure for people who seek justice and fair treatment under the law. It was designed for a specific purpose. When Big Interests control our

executive officials, as the Founding Fathers knew they could, when lobbyists have the legislatures tied in knots, as our Founding Fathers knew they could, and when media outlets steer public opinion against individuals, as our Founding Fathers saw that they could, the hard, square corners of the jury box stand firm against that tide of influence and money.

There is a lot of history here. It was the earliest American settlers who brought the jury to our country as precious cargo from England.

The Virginia Colony established the jury in 1624, roughly a year before the Dutch even settled the island of Manhattan. Early Americans created juries in 1628 in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in 1677 in the Colony of West New Jersey, and in 1682 in Pennsylvania. Indeed, in our Declaration of Independence, our colonists put forward a list of grievances and admonished King George III for—and I quote them in the Declaration of Independence—“depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury.”

When the original Constitution was silent on the jury, Americans sounded the alarm, and the Seventh Amendment was sent to the States in the Bill of Rights.

Alexander Hamilton, a famous Revolutionary-era Founder, stated in *Federalist No. 83*: “The friends and adversaries in the plan of the convention, if they agree in nothing else, concur at least in the value they set upon the trial by jury; or, if there is any difference between them, it consists in this: the former regard it as a valuable safeguard to liberty; the latter represent it as the very palladium of free government.”

Going on to the mid-19th century, when Alexis de Tocqueville wrote his famous “*Democracy in America*,” he observed that the jury should be understood in America as a “political institution” and “one form of the sovereignty of the people.” What did he mean? How does the jury protect the sovereignty of the people? Well, in two ways, as Sir William Blackstone explained.

Sir William Blackstone was probably the most cited source in those early days of the founding of our Republic and in the early days of the development of our laws. Sir William Blackstone explained that trial by jury “preserves in the hands of the people that share which they ought to have in the administration of public justice, and prevents the encroachments of the more powerful and wealthy citizens.”

Those are two separate thoughts. First, the civil jury devolves a share of government power—power which they ought to have—directly to the people. But second and uniquely, in a Constitution otherwise devoted to protecting the individual against the power of the State, the civil jury is designed to pro-

tect the individual against other individuals—more specifically, against other more powerful and wealthy individuals.

Even former Chief Justice William Rehnquist observed about this era that “the Founders of our Nation considered the right of trial by jury in civil cases an important bulwark against tyranny and corruption, a safeguard too precious to be left to the whim of the sovereign.”

That is at heart what this fight is about. Remember Blackstone’s words: The jury “prevents the encroachments of the more powerful and wealthy” citizens. That means the jury is intended to be a thorn in the side of the powerful and wealthy. It is intended to make the powerful and wealthy stand equal—annoyingly equal to them—before the law with everyone else. The jury is intended to be the little branch of government that the wealthy and powerful can’t get to, can’t fix, can’t control. That is why jury panels are new every time. If you had a permanent panel of the same jurors over and over, the powerful and wealthy would tend to influence the institution. The jury stands against all that tide of influence. That is what it is there for. That is how it was designed. Who is more powerful and wealthy today than mighty corporations and big special interests? And guess what—big corporations and special interests hate the jury. The small institution has big enemies.

It would astound the Founding Fathers to see how far we have fallen from the popular affection and loyalty for the jury trial in 1776. Juries are indeed about dispute resolution and about making sure that everybody can get a fair shake and that powerful and wealthy interests can’t put the fix in, but more than that, the civil jury helps check power.

The American system of government is built on the premise that divided government and separated powers—checks and balances—will best protect individual liberty. The civil jury distributes authority of the State directly to citizens, giving them direct power to resolve disputes—sometimes very important disputes—and it gives them this power in a way that makes it very hard for special interests to control.

Well, if we look around today, the influence of wealth and power suffuses the legislative and executive branches. Corporate lobbying and corporate and billionaire election spending are at unprecedented levels. In our political debate, dark money dollars drown out the voices of average citizens in what has been called “a tsunami of slime,” and all that money is not spent for nothing.

Powerful interests love a game that is rigged in their favor—always have, always will. It is a tale as old as time. Well, rigging the game doesn’t go over

well in the jury box. Special interests may seek special influence with legislators and regulators all of the time. It is their constant activity, licensed and regulated by lobbying and campaign finance laws. Their every waking moment is devoted to tampering with the legislative and executive branches, but tampering with a jury is a crime, and it is a crime for a reason.

In a world where so many feel powerless, juries give regular citizens real authority. In a world of fractious partisanship, juries make citizens work together and decide together. And in a world in which injustices pile up against barricades of well-kept indifference, a jury can blow the status quo to smithereens. This is the vital constitutional role of the civil jury. This is what mandatory arbitration is designed to attack—to remove the access of regular citizens to this institution of our government which was so important to our Founding Fathers because it is an institution that the wealthy and powerful cannot control. They can control mandatory arbitration. Over and over again, it has been shown to be subject to corporate favoritism and control. There is a reason that the big and powerful special interests want to get rid of access to a jury and want to force people into mandatory arbitration. They are not doing it for the sake of having their adversaries and opponents get better access to justice; they are doing it to shut off access to the civil jury. They want everybody forced into rigged games.

We ought to be fighting to preserve and enhance the civil jury as an element of the uniquely American system of self-government. Our forefathers fought and bled and died to create and preserve this system of government in which the civil jury has a vital role. From Alexander Hamilton to Alexis de Tocqueville, to William Blackstone, to William Rehnquist—you can go on and on in our history with people who have pointed out the vital role of our jury. Squelching it is the task of the wealthy and powerful, mighty corporations that seek to squelch it and force everybody into corporate-friendly, mandatory arbitration.

We should think on this question in the long view—not who gets the immediate benefit of not having to face trained lawyers, not having to face people in an open forum, not having to be before a free and independent jury. We should think of the message of our Founding Fathers, who put the need for a civil jury right into the Declaration of Independence, who demanded it as part of our Bill of Rights, and who saw it as an essential element of our liberty.

With that, I yield.

I see my distinguished colleague from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to start by thanking my friend and colleague from Rhode Island for pointing out why we have a jury system, a system of our peers who can listen to all sides of an argument in a fair way and render justice.

What this resolution does is prohibits many consumers around the country from having the choice of going before a jury as part of a group of people who have been wronged.

For months, the American people had been hearing stories of how big banks, big financial institutions, have engaged in various schemes that harmed consumers and cheated consumers out of millions and millions of dollars. The most notorious recently, of course, was the case of Wells Fargo, which opened up a lot of fake accounts—meaning they opened accounts without consumers asking them to open accounts—and then charged consumers for those accounts. It is a fact that Wells Fargo in many cases tried to use forced arbitration to prevent those people who had been wronged from getting access to justice, from being compensated for their harm.

We also heard about the Equifax case. Equifax is a credit reporting agency. They collect gobs of information on all of us—on over 170 million Americans—without our permission. We don't say: Equifax, go out and dig up as much information about us as you can and put it on your computer system. They go out and do it. We all know that they were subjected to a massive hack and that very confidential, highly personal information on over 100 million Americans has now been compromised.

One of the things Equifax did after that was they said to consumers: You know what, we know that your information may have been compromised because of this hack on our system, and we want to help protect you, but if you want our protection, you have to sign away your rights to be part of a class action lawsuit against us.

That was their original plan and their original instinct. Well, there was a big public outcry about that, and they backed off. But the former CEO of Equifax, in a Banking Committee hearing just a few weeks ago, said they backed off in response to the public outcry, but if they had done business as usual, they would have prevented those consumers from getting compensation for wrongs through the court system.

Even after we hear about Equifax and that scandal and the Wells Fargo banking scandal, we are here on the floor of the Senate not to help even the playing field for consumers but to take away a right that consumers now have to help even the playing field against these big banks and financial institutions. It is entirely backward.

I want to read from the statement that was issued by the Consumer Fi-

nancial Protection Bureau, the CFPB, on July 10 of this year when they issued their new rule. Here was the headline: "CFPB issues rule to ban companies from using arbitration clauses to deny groups of people their day in court." Simple as that. It went on to say that financial companies can no longer block consumers from joining together to sue over wrongdoing. It pointed out that companies use mandatory arbitration clauses to deny groups of people their day in court. They went on to say that many consumer financial products, like credit cards and bank accounts, have arbitration clauses in their contracts that prevent consumers from joining together to sue their bank or financial company for wrongdoing. That is right. We all know that in the fine print of a lot of credit card applications, in the fine print that consumers get from a lot of big financial institutions, and in the fine print of auto loans, they have buried these provisions that compel those consumers to give up their rights.

This is not a question—I have heard conversations on the floor today—about whether arbitration in and of itself is a good or a bad way to resolve disputes. If I have been wronged or you have been wronged and you agree voluntarily to enter into an arbitration dispute mechanism, fine. Do it voluntarily. That is not what this is about. It is not what it is about at all.

This is about forcing arbitration. We listened to the CEO of Wells Fargo. We listened to the former CEO of Equifax. They all say they value their consumers. They want to make sure they do right by their consumers, but it turns out they don't trust their consumers at all because they want to take away from those same consumers the right to seek justice through the court system if that is what those consumers choose to do. That is exactly why the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau took the action it did to protect consumers and to make sure that they could not be compelled into arbitration. If they chose it after they had been wronged, that is their decision, but this is about mandatory arbitration and forcing consumers to give up their rights.

We have heard a lot about the Washington swamp. This resolution to overturn this consumer protection provision is the Washington swamp at its muckiest and at its smelliest.

Now, I have a letter I received today from the American Legion, people who have represented men and women who have served our country. Here is what it says. This is from the legislative director at the American Legion:

Dear friends and colleagues, I write to reiterate the American Legion's strong support for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau arbitration rule in light of reports that the Senate could vote on the matter as early as this evening.

The alarm bells went up at the American Legion and other places.

You may recall that I emailed you about this on October 2. That email is below, but today I want to share a couple of additional points.

Point No. 1 is in bold.

A vote to overturn the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau arbitration rule is a vote against our military and veterans.

That is from the American Legion.

I want to read some of the other veterans organizations that are against this action that the Senate is headed toward tonight: Blue Star Families, Military Order of the Purple Heart, the National Guard Association of the United States, National Military Family Association, Reserve Officers Association, and the list goes on and on. They are joined by consumer protection groups.

Here is what the American Legion said in their October letter to every Member of the Senate. It says that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rule on arbitration agreements addresses the widespread harm of forced arbitration by restoring the ability of servicemembers, veterans, and other consumers to join together and seek relief in class action lawsuits when financial institutions break the law.

The American Legion summed it up just perfectly here. They pointed out that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau put forward a rule that said that veterans who have been wronged or cheated can join together to seek justice in the court system and that other consumer groups can as well. I have heard a lot of talk today about people saying: You know what, we actually passed this law a little while ago that would protect servicemembers and that would allow servicemembers to band together to seek justice.

Well, I have two points. One is the American Legion and all of these veterans groups, they don't think that was good enough, and they are appalled at what the Senate is thinking about doing tonight.

The second question is this. Yes, we should protect our veterans, but why shouldn't we also be protecting all of the other consumers around the United States of America? Why shouldn't they be able to seek justice? Why should they be compelled to go to arbitration when they would rather choose to go through the court system?

We have heard fellow Members talk about why the deck is stacked against individuals. Just think about it. You get cheated by your bank. Maybe it is 100 bucks, or maybe it is 500 bucks. You get on the phone, and you know you are put on there forever. You are put on hold. You are put on hold, and you finally get through. You get somebody. Maybe they pass you to somebody else or maybe you get dropped in the process. But at the end of the day, in order

for you to get your money back when they have been wronged, under this provision, the old provision, you would have to go to arbitration and you would have to shell out a lot of money, and the big banks know that. So what they fear is that all of us, as consumers who have been cheated, we have a chance to get together. It is a class action. It is when everyone who has been wronged can get together and actually have a little bit of power and leverage against a big bank, whether it is Wells Fargo or Equifax or whoever it may be. That is the whole idea of a class action. People get to band together, and that is what the American Legion is asking the Senate to do—to let veterans band together but also just to let American consumers band together to seek justice.

I just want to share with the Senate a story about one of my Maryland constituents and what happened to one of my Maryland constituents because I think a lot of people can relate. This is a pretty extraordinary story, but they can relate to how one individual feels like when they are fighting against a big organization. This was a story that was reported on NPR, and the Maryland constituents' name is Michael Feifer.

Here is what happened. One morning in February, Michael Feifer was heading off to his job in Maryland at a company that builds guitars. He walked to the spot where he parked his car. His car wasn't there, and so he called the police. He called the police. He said: I was livid. I thought someone stole my car.

Well, somebody had made off with Feifer's car, but it wasn't a car thief. It was Wells Fargo Bank. The police informed him of this when he called them up, and Michael Feifer said: That is when I found out my car was repossessed.

Now, he had no idea why Wells Fargo wanted to repossess his car. He says his payments were automatically taken out of his checking account—his car payments. So he called Wells Fargo, and he found out that the bank had put another insurance policy on his car. Lenders sometimes do this when a borrower doesn't have insurance. Wells Fargo calls it collateral protection insurance, CPI. Now, sometimes there is nothing wrong with that, but Wells Fargo imposed this insurance on nearly half a million people who already had bought insurance. They were already covered. Wells Fargo just decided to put another insurance plan on them and—guess what—started charging them for it.

So that is why right after Feifer's car got repossessed, Wells Fargo told him that he had been marked delinquent for not paying his insurance. Now, this again was insurance he didn't want and he didn't need. Well, they said: Too bad, you owe us \$1,500.

Now, Michael Feifer then showed up at the bank with his bank statements and showed all the payments he had made for the vehicle. He showed proof of insurance showing that he never had a lapse in his insurance, and he says the people at the bank said: Well, you shouldn't owe anything; it is not your fault. He said: They were just as confused as I was.

Well, then, he said the branch employees tried to be helpful. They called up the Wells Fargo department that dealt with the details of car repossessions to find out what was going on, and they kept putting them on hold. So this is the Wells Fargo department putting their own Wells Fargo's branch folks on hold. He was there 2½ hours, and then it turns out they told him to call back a couple of days later.

Well, he called back a couple of days later, and they said there was no prior record of his calls to the bank. He said they were very rude to him. Then, while he was arguing with the bank, they said: We have repossessed your car. If you don't pay us 600 bucks, we are going to sell it off. So he paid them 600 bucks. Then he found out that he wasn't alone and that Wells Fargo had also engaged in this scheme to sell people car insurance as part of their car loans when they already had insurance.

So this is a very simple issue. The issue is whether or not consumers who have been wronged by big banks or other financial institutions can choose to band together with others to seek justice. What the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau did was to say that consumers have that right. They have the right to choose how to go about getting justice.

What this Senate resolution does is to take that right away from consumers and says: If you want to seek justice, you can only go through forced arbitration, where we know the deck is stacked against the lonely consumer and stacked in favor of the big banks and the big financial institutions.

Let's not do that. Let's vote down this resolution. Let's protect the consumer protections that are in place today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Mr. President, for the recognition this evening.

Mr. President, I rise to support the Consumer Financial Protection Board's arbitration rule that has been spoken about this evening very eloquently by my colleagues here on the Democratic side.

The new rule protects consumers from predatory financial practices. These consumers are our everyday constituents. They are servicemembers and veterans, moms and dads, the elderly, students, and working people. It protects these folks by limiting binding arbitration clauses.

Now, what is a binding arbitration clause? These clauses take away con-

sumers' rights to seek relief in court when they are wronged. This rule puts money in the pockets of consumers who have been taken advantage of.

The Consumer Financial Protection Board estimates that the rule will mean \$342 million per year in compensation to consumers. Repealing the rule would take that money, which should go to consumers, and give it to some of the wealthiest corporations in this Nation.

When millions of consumers are scammed, what is the most logical remedy? When millions of consumers are scammed, what is the logical remedy—millions of separate cases before arbiters selected by the corporation or a class action case before an impartial judge and jury?

The right to go to court before a jury of your peers is enshrined in the Constitution. The Seventh Amendment states:

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved. . . .

Now, let's talk about the Seventh Amendment and what one of our Founders said. James Madison wrote:

Trial by jury in civil cases is as essential to secure the liberty of the people as any one of the pre-existent rights of nature.

This rule guarantees access to our impartial courts. It is always good to have the spirit of the Constitution and the Founders on your side.

I stand with the supporters of this rule. Who are they? There are many. For example, there is the American Legion. Just today, its legislative director wrote in no uncertain terms:

A vote to overturn the CFPB arbitration rule is a vote against the military and veterans.

The Military Coalition, representing 5.5 million servicemembers, also supports this rule. In July, they wrote: "Forced arbitration is an un-American system wherein servicemembers' claims against a corporation are funneled into a rigged, secretive system in which all the rules, including the choice of the arbitrator, are picked by the corporation."

These are incredibly strong statements of opposition from military and veterans groups. Also in July, over 300 consumer, civil rights, labor, and small business groups wrote: "The rule . . . is a significant step forward in the ongoing fight to curb predatory practices in consumer financial products and services and to make these markets fairer and safer."

Signers of this letter include the AFL-CIO, the American Federation of Teachers, Consumers Union, the NAACP, LULAC, and dozens of other organizations.

Conservatives also support this rule. One of the early tea party activists, Mr. Judson Phillips, wrote an op-ed in the Washington Times. He said: "This

time, the CFPB is right and the Republicans should stand on the side of American citizens and protect the Constitution and the Seventh Amendment.”

Where are our Republican friends? They are not here on the floor talking about this rule.

Finally, the American people broadly support this rule. A recent poll showed 67 percent supported the rule; only 13 percent opposed it. So who opposes this rule and who is behind this resolution to repeal it? Corporations that want to avoid penalties in court when they abuse their customers and big financial industry trade associations and lobbyists.

It would allow credit card, student loan, and payday lending firms—which would see big benefits if this resolution passes—to keep forcing consumers to sign contracts that take away their right to go to court.

Wells Fargo, one of the largest banks in America, spent years creating millions of fake accounts, just to bill their own customers more fees. They eventually admitted a complete and total fraud of epic proportions. Equifax, one of the largest credit bureaus in America, allowed over half of all American consumers' personal information to be hacked. These companies should not be able to use binding arbitration to avoid the legal consequences of their actions. Today's debate is a perfect example of how policymaking in Washington is broken.

A Federal agency did what is required. It undertook an exhaustive study and created a rule to protect consumers from abusive contracts. Now the affected industry is spending millions on lobbying and public relations to repeal the consumer protection rule—to protect their bottom line at all costs.

This vote will decide the fate of \$342 million per year. Should it go to consumers who were wronged? Of course, it should. Or should it stay with the corporations that committed those wrongs? Of course, it should not.

Congress is not popular these days. Americans overwhelmingly believe special interests and lobbyists have too much power compared to the regular people. Today, we can take a step to repair our reputation. We should side with our constituents on this important vote and reject this resolution. I urge a “no” vote.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Rounds). The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I come today to speak out in opposition of this misguided effort to overturn the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's arbitration rule, which protects the rights of consumers and protects our brave servicemembers and veterans from being taken advantage of by unscrupulous financial institutions.

It was only a couple of weeks ago that we had the CEO of Equifax here on Capitol Hill, testifying about how his company had failed to protect Americans' private financial information and put more than 140 million consumers at risk of fraud or worse. That wasn't too long after we had the CEO of Wells Fargo here, testifying about how his company had defrauded millions of consumers by forcing them into accounts and fees they had never signed up for and, certainly, had not agreed to.

The American people were outraged by these scandals, and with good reason. Both of these companies had committed serious wrongdoings, and they admitted it. But that still didn't stop either from trying to shield themselves from the legal liability their own actions had risked.

Both of these companies tried to prevent the people they had taken advantage of from holding them accountable in court by using what is known as forced arbitration clauses. They thought—and it seems they were right—that if they could stop people from suing them for their wrongdoing and, instead, force them into private arbitration that heavily favored megabusineses at the expense of consumers, they would have a better shot at saving money for their company. They didn't care about consumer rights or even justice. They just wanted to make as much money as they could—legally or illegally—and then get out of Dodge as cleanly as possible.

But because the American people were so outraged by these scandals, we noticed what they were trying to do. The actions of both companies caused an uproar that ultimately led them to back down and ensure that American consumers didn't have to give up their right to a day in court just for doing business with these companies. Those sorts of forced arbitration clauses were exactly what the CFPB was trying to stop when it implemented the rule my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to repeal tonight. Wells Fargo's and Equifax's attempts to force consumers into mandatory arbitration clauses should have been a lesson, but I guess those working to reverse this rule here tonight didn't learn it.

It is common to hear stories throughout my State of Illinois—and throughout the military community—of servicemembers being taken advantage of through predatory loans, scams, abuses, and fraud. That is because Active-Duty servicemembers are particularly vulnerable consumers, especially when they are deployed. They get a guaranteed paycheck, but they also have limited time to read their credit card statements and keep up with security breaches to see if their identities have been stolen. They are too busy carrying out their mission.

Servicemembers are also frequently on the move between deployments and

base relocations, often separated from their spouses and their families for long periods of time. Despite that, they still need to wire money when emergencies happen. They still need to pay bills, and their focus isn't always on whether a loan they took out has hidden fees or if a company is charging them a higher rate than they are supposed to. What they are focused on, and rightly so, is carrying out their mission, often in places like Afghanistan.

Corporations and scam artists know this, and they take advantage of it. The CFPB's forced arbitration rule could help protect our servicemembers from this sort of abuse. It seems that a few of my colleagues want to make it harder for military families to get by, and that is a shame.

Abusive corporate practices, left unchecked, not only cause incredible financial difficulty for servicemembers and their families, but they also have national security implications, directly impacting military readiness. In the military, bad credit can affect your security clearance and advancement. When the DOD loses qualified servicemembers because of financial instability, they also lose mission capability and the significant investments made in that person's training. This is an expensive loss. DOD estimates that each separation from service costs taxpayers more than \$57,000.

Corporate abuse also causes personal difficulties. When someone is deployed, the last thing they should have to worry about is whether their house is going to be foreclosed on or their car is going to be repossessed because they were a victim of a scam. When they are going to battle or heading out on a mission, the last thing our troops should be thinking about is how a company took advantage of the fact that they were out of the country—and how there is so very little they can do about it.

Unfortunately, this isn't a hypothetical issue. Servicemembers get taken advantage of all the time, and we have seen countless times how their ability to file lawsuits holds bad actors accountable. Not too long ago, the banks Santander and Wells Fargo paid tens of millions to resolve lawsuits that were filed because they were illegally repossessing servicemembers' cars. JPMorgan Chase paid \$27 million to settle a lawsuit from servicemembers who were being overcharged for mortgages. And student loan servicer Navient paid 78,000 servicemembers \$60 million after overcharging them on their student loans. In each of these instances, servicemembers, sometimes with the help of government, filed a lawsuit to get relief and hold these financial actors accountable. When companies force our servicemembers—or any consumer—into arbitration, military families lose the right to hold wrongdoers accountable.

That is what happened to Archie Hudson, a disabled veteran, father of two, and husband from Waynesboro, MS. A few years ago, Archie requested a loan from Wells Fargo to replace his home's windows. Instead, he received a Wells Fargo credit card along with sky-high interest rates and a forced arbitration clause hidden in the fine print. He didn't realize it at the time, like the millions of others that Wells Fargo scammed, but it ultimately helped to ruin his credit. When Archie tried to get his day in court, he was, instead, forced into an arbitration proceeding that favors lenders over consumers. He is not alone. The vast majority of people who have been forced into arbitration could tell you that the system is rigged.

When the CFPB first looked into this issue, they found that when consumers file an arbitration claim against a company that takes advantage of them, they have to pay an average of \$161 in filing fees, and they almost always lose.

Companies, on the other hand, won a whopping 91 percent of the time that they go into arbitration against consumers. On average, the consumer then had to pay \$7,725 in damages to further pad corporate profits.

Banks sometimes try to defend these clauses by saying that the reduced legal liability helps them reduce costs for consumers, but there is absolutely no evidence that is true. In fact, when companies have added these forced arbitration clauses in the past, the evidence suggests that they never reduce costs for consumers. These clauses simply mean bigger profit margins for those banks that break the law.

There is a reason so many military veterans service organizations like the American Legion, the Air Force Association, the Marine Corps League, the National Guard Association, the Vietnam Veterans of America, and groups like the AARP oppose this effort. Remember, arbitration isn't about saving lawyers' fees or decreasing costs to consumers. It is there to protect the interests of banks over consumers.

Look, I am not naive. I get that companies—especially banks—are in the business of making money. It makes sense that they would want to force all their customers into arbitration because that saves them money. But why on Earth would my colleagues in the Senate go along and help them rob servicemembers and consumers of their rights to go to court? Why would we allow bad actors to get off scot-free?

If they believe that our servicemembers are unfairly getting rich off suing companies that wrong them, they should say that. If they believe companies that break the law should be shielded from having to answer for their illegal actions in court, they should say that. We shouldn't let them hide behind cutting regulations. I am

all for cutting needless redtape, but the arbitration rule is an example of a regulation that actually helps Americans. It helps our servicemembers and our military families.

A vote to overturn the arbitration rule is a vote against our military and against those who wake up every single day to serve and protect the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth.

Thank you.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks of no more than 2 minutes, Senator FRANKEN follow me, and then Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I just want to make an observation after listening to the words of my friend Senator DUCKWORTH, who speaks, as Holly Petraeus and so many others have spoken, about the importance of this rule to veterans in this country.

It is not just consumers. It is not just women who have been abused in the workplace. It is not just people who sign up for credit cards. It is veterans in this country who are the losers if this vote passes tonight.

I would first like to read the number of Democrats who have been on the floor in opposition to this motion in support of the rule. I started, then Senator MERKLEY, Senator WARREN, Senator HIRONO, Senator DURBIN, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator VAN HOLLEN, Senator UDALL, Senator DUCKWORTH, soon after, Senator FRANKEN, and Senator BLUMENTHAL.

On the other side there has been one Senator. Senator CRAPO is a good friend of mine. He is chairman of the committee. I am the ranking member. He is doing his duty and defending his position well. But no other Republican Senator, no supporter of this resolution—nobody wants to come down here and speak. Why? Because they don't want to be seen as defenders of Wall Street. They don't want to be seen as defenders of the most powerful people in this country. So they stay back in their offices quietly.

They will come down here meekly on the floor, and they will vote yes, and they will go home and hope nobody knows about it. But they are not willing—again, Senator CRAPO, whom I admire and respect greatly, knows those aren't just words. I mean it. He is doing his duty as chairman of the Banking Committee. None of the rest of them want to join him. I think that tells you a whole lot.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's recently finalized rule

to limit the use of predispute, forced arbitration clauses in contracts for financial services and products. I strongly oppose the Congressional Review Act resolution to dismantle this vital consumer protection.

Forced arbitration clauses force individuals to sign away their right to go to court as a condition of buying a product or a service, and they allow corporate America to take advantage of a shadow justice system that is inherently biased toward the corporation and offers no meaningful appeals process. To put it bluntly, these clauses serve one purpose and one purpose alone, to help make sure the giant corporations still come out on top if they have wronged consumers.

Thankfully, we started to make some progress in addressing forced arbitration. Five years ago, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau began an intensive study of forced arbitration clauses in consumer financial services contracts for things like credit cards, savings accounts, and private student loans. The study confirmed that forced arbitration stacks the deck against consumers and in favor of powerful corporations. Of the 341 reviewed cases of forced arbitration in which consumers made claims against financial institutions, the CFPB found that consumers obtained relief in just 32 disputes. That is 32 out of 341—9 percent of the time.

By contrast, of the 244 cases of forced arbitration in which companies made claims against their customers, the companies obtained relief in 227 of them or 93 percent of the time. For the consumers who did obtain relief, the CFPB found they won far less than they had claimed, while the companies that obtained relief recovered nearly the entirety of their claim.

The study also demonstrated how giant financial institutions have learned to pair forced arbitration clauses with class action bans to shutter the courtroom doors on groups of individuals with small claims. Once blocked from going to court as a class, most people drop their claims entirely because they lack the financial means or will to fight a corporation in arbitration as an individual, where outcomes are seemingly predetermined in favor of the corporation.

Although millions of financial consumers are covered by forced arbitration clauses and class action waivers, the CFPB found, on average, that only 25 consumers with claims of less than \$1,000 pursue arbitration annually. Think about it. That is just license for corporations to rip you off \$20, \$30 at a time. It is license.

Finally, forced arbitration is shrouded in secrecy, which shortchanges current and prospective customers of information that may affect their financial decisions. Between confidentiality requirements contained in many forced

arbitration agreements and the secretive nature of the arbitration proceeding itself, financial institutions use force arbitration agreements to shield themselves from accountability to the courts and to the public eye.

Let's take the Wells Fargo scandal. Just last year, the public was shocked to learn that over the course of 5 years, Wells Fargo employees had been incentivized to open millions of sham accounts in the names of Wells Fargo customers, including over 31,000 in my State of Minnesota. Then the bank charged the customers for those accounts without their permission. One reason this fraudulent practice was able to continue for so many years is because Wells Fargo's customer account agreement included and continues to include, yes, a forced arbitration clause.

When customers discovered and attempted to sue Wells Fargo for the sham accounts, the company forced them into arbitration, having successfully argued that any dispute arising from the sham account was covered by the arbitration clause in the agreement for the real account.

Let me say that again. Wells Fargo successfully argued that any dispute arising from the sham account was covered by the arbitration clause in the agreement for the real account. That is what we are voting on here.

If these claims—some of which date back to 2013—had been able to proceed to court rather than in private, forced arbitration, other Wells Fargo customers would have been alerted to the wrongdoing and may have been able to save themselves and thousands of others from being ripped off and prevented damage to their credit. That really matters to people. A bad credit score can mean the difference between getting a mortgage and not getting a mortgage, getting a car loan or not, or even getting a job or not.

Fortunately, a few months ago, the CFPB issued a rule to ban financial institutions from preventing their customers from banding together to seek justice in a public court of law. This is good news for consumers who have been scammed by payday lenders, debt relief companies, or big banks like Wells Fargo; it is good news for our servicemembers and veterans who wish to vindicate their rights under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act; and it is good news for small businesses, community banks, and credit unions that have been forced to compete with powerful corporations that are pocketing billions in stolen money from consumers.

Let's be very clear about what the rule doesn't do because I think there has been some misinformation put out there. The rule is not about banning arbitration altogether, and the rule does not prevent a consumer from pursuing arbitration if he or she wants to,

assuming the corporation also wants to go to arbitration. Instead, the rule simply takes the "forced" out of "forced arbitration" and gives the consumers a real choice again to pursue a claim of wrongdoing in arbitration or band together with similarly harmed consumers to seek justice in a public court of law.

Now the big banks and financial institutions—including Equifax, the massive credit bureau that put 143 million Americans' private information at risk—are trying to kill the rule, and they are far too close to getting their way.

As long as I have been in the Senate, I have been fighting to end forced arbitration. I have always said my efforts are about reopening the courtroom doors because they should never have been closed in the first place.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to see the CFPB's rule for exactly what it is, a commonsense way to restore transparency and accountability in our Nation's financial system and to level the field between Wall Street and consumers. We must allow the CFPB to move forward in implementing this critical consumer protection.

I ask you to please join me in showing strong support for the CFPB's rule, knowing what is in the rule, knowing what this is about, and then opposing the special interests that are attempting to take this rule away.

Thank you.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my colleague from Minnesota, who has made many of the same arguments very eloquently that my colleagues have made as we approach a vote literally in the dead of night. There is a reason for the timing of this vote.

My Republican colleagues would much rather have it done past the deadline for the newspapers, out of the public eye, because most Americans would be repulsed by the idea that they are losing fundamental rights, and what could be more fundamental than the right to go to court. That is the right that will be lost to countless Americans if this vote in favor of S. J. Res. 47 succeeds tonight. It would literally repeal the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's arbitration rule using the Congressional Review Act.

Most Americans will discover this repugnant step when they go to their lawyer's office, and they state their grievance, their harm, their cause of action, and their lawyer looks at a contract or some other piece of paper, which has in fine print a forced arbitration clause. That forced arbitration clause, in effect, blocks the courthouse door. It denies them their day in court.

It compels them to go before a group of people—often, the majority selected by the big company they want to sue. At best, the result is to give them less to remedy the wrong against them than they suffered in harm.

Often, the lawyer will say: You know, this effort is going to cost you more than you will gain. In good consciousness, I must tell you that you will not recover as much as you have to pay me, and that is because those consumers cannot join together in arbitration as they can in a class action. Often, it is because the cost of going to court individually, even if they win, will be more than they would gain in arbitration. It is done in secret, when their case is arbitrated, so others cannot be warned about a similar harm in a product or a service they are about to purchase and suffer the same harm or wrong.

A vote in favor of this resolution is a vote in favor of predatory lending. It is a vote in favor of wage theft. It is a vote in favor of sexual harassment. It is a vote in favor of medical malpractice. It is a vote in favor of denying millions of Americans a fundamental right to a day in court.

Without the promise of justice from the courts, few consumers can even think about undertaking the cost of an attorney or take on the tremendous effort of bringing those individual actions against service providers.

The harm falls, tragically, particularly on our veterans. I commend and thank Holly Petraeus for her profoundly significant work to alert our veterans and all of us to those harms. These abusive practices harm our veterans more than others because they trust the abusive pitches that come at them as they are about to leave Active Duty or sometimes while they are on Active Duty or shortly after they leave. They have no control over where they are deployed or even where they are based, but the con artists and big corporations can come after them. They know where they are. They are targets of opportunity.

In one stunning example—just to give one—documented by the New York Times not long ago, a sergeant in the Army National Guard who was serving in Iraq said that men came to his house and improperly repossessed his car, threatening his wife with jail time if she didn't give them the keys. Appallingly, this sergeant received no restitution. His case was discarded because his contract with the auto lender included a forced arbitration clause. That is the practical harm resulting from these causes.

Wells Fargo has been mentioned as an example of how contracts, in effect, are forced on people without their knowledge for accounts, contracts for insurance that were put on their loans without their knowledge.

Equifax, in the height of arrogance—the remedy offered to consumers had a

forced arbitration clause as part of their acceptance of a remedy for the harm done by Equifax itself. You can't make this stuff up. You cannot create the fiction that matches this reality for abuse and harm to consumers.

Repealing this rule strips consumers of one of their only avenues of relief from careless negligence or a slow response to harm. In the case of Equifax, unfortunately, it probably will not be the last.

The CFPB rule draws a line in the sand. It puts consumers on a level playing field. It eliminates a provision that in law school was often identified as a contract of adhesion, where one side has such power over the other that they can dictate the terms, inherently unfairly, to the consumer. It demands that those consumers be treated fairly.

Repealing this rule would allow companies like Equifax and Wells Fargo to have their run of the contracts in America, repeat the harms that have caused such widespread consumer harm, and let them off the hook. I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous rollback of rights. It may be welcomed by some corporations, but in their hearts, as well as their minds, the vast majority of companies want to do the right thing. The outliers are the ones supporting this rule.

It would not eliminate arbitration where both sides feel it is in their mutual interests; it would simply eliminate that fine print that enables those rip-off clauses that harm our veterans—people who fight for our fundamental rights. One of those fundamental rights—access to justice—is barred by this resolution.

I hope my colleagues will reject it, enable consumers to hold financial institutions accountable, and continue the work of the CFPB in making sure that consumers really receive a fair shake when they enter into a contract.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I was just going to ask whether my colleague would yield for a question.

My distinguished colleague from Connecticut is an extraordinarily experienced and able lawyer. He was U.S. attorney in Connecticut; for a long time, he was his State's attorney general, and I think he has argued more before the U.S. Supreme Court than perhaps anybody in modern history now in the Senate. One of his passions and one of the things he focused on in law enforcement was consumer protection, bringing to justice big entities that had done wrong to consumers.

My question for him, if I may ask one, would be, are there circumstances—do you have experience of circumstances in which very big and powerful entities, corporations, or industries engaged in misconduct, even

fraud, in which the individual harm to each of the consumers was not very big—a bogus \$30 fee, a bogus \$100 surcharge, something like that—but multiplied by thousands or tens of thousands of customers, it became an enormously lucrative fraud for the institution involved? Is that a situation that happens in real life, in your view, I ask my distinguished colleague?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I thank my colleague from Rhode Island for that very pertinent question. Before I answer it, I thank him for his service as his State's attorney general and his State's U.S. attorney. He has as much experience as I do, and I know he appreciates that there are countless examples of exactly the kind of predicament he has so well described.

The harm to each individual may be measured in tens of dollars, but the harm nationally to consumers may be measured in millions of dollars. If each of those consumers is forced to arbitrate, the result at best would be a few dollars to each of them, and most of them will abandon the claim because the services of an attorney or even the time they have to take to appear before a panel of arbitrators simply won't be worth it.

The harm is not only to them, as my friend and colleague from Rhode Island has implied so well, it is to the consumers of the future because without public knowledge of the defective product or the predatory lending or the sexual harassment, that same harm will happen again and again.

To take the topic of the day, sexual harassment, many of those employment clauses had the forced arbitration requirement that led to settlements and secrecy. For years and years, that harm was repeated to women who suffered because they were unaware of the harm about to befall them.

It is a human tragedy, not just a financial tragedy, that often befalls consumers because of those fine-print arbitration clauses that consumers very often never even consider because at the time they sign the contract, they are not thinking about what can go wrong; they are buying a car or a product that seems just fine, or they are entering into a new job, or, as in the case of a veteran, they are signing up for a for-profit college, and they scarcely expect they will be, in effect, victims of these forced arbitration clauses.

So the answer to my colleague's question, as he knows because he himself is such an expert in consumer protection, is a resounding yes. This rule is necessary to protect consumers against those kinds of harms, which, when added nationally, can be tremendously costly to our Nation as a whole.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. If I may ask if the Senator will yield for another question.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. As I understand from the Senator's response to my last question, if you force the victims of low-dollar but multi-victim fraud to have arbitration as their only remedy, you are way less likely to get consumers asserting their rights, and ultimately you may have low-dollar, multi-consumer frauds that remain very remunerative for the crooked outfit conducting the massive fraud.

I get the Senator's point that the incentives are such that it is very hard for an individual consumer to be willing to pursue that claim. If there is no way to aggregate themselves together into a class action, then there is really no way to pursue that claim.

But my second question goes to a further point, which is that the power of a court in a matter like that includes the power not just to award damages but to provide other relief: to direct the company to quit the fraud, to give orders to people to clean up their act, to promise never to do it again, and so forth. I am not aware of any arbitration panel that has ever been given that authority or has ever used their limited power as arbiters or arbitrators to try to influence the behavior of the corporation.

Is there not also a significant difference between an individual consumer being forced to go to an often stacked arbitration panel to pursue a claim that is so small, it is not worth their money, and the simple power to provide the real remedy the public seeks, as the Senator so wisely said, to protect the next consumer? It is not just about the people who got their pockets picked, who paid their unreasonable fee, who got defrauded; it is about stopping it so the future consumer is protected. I am not familiar with arbitration panels having that power.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I appreciate my colleague's question. That is absolutely right. Arbitration panels do not have the power to issue injunctions—it is that simple. They do not have the power to grant injunctive relief even in the worst of circumstances. That is one of the reasons forced arbitration clauses exist: There is no danger of a court ordering increased disclosure or fairer terms going forward or an end to deceptive and misleading practices.

I see we have been joined by another of our colleagues, Senator CORNYN of Texas, who served as attorney general before he began his distinguished career here, and he knows well that, as attorneys general, we often insisted on injunctive relief because we wanted to protect people going forward. That is a remedy that arbitration panels simply cannot award, and it is enormously consequential.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. And not infrequent in class action cases?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. That is exactly right. It is not infrequent in class action cases and not infrequent in individual cases where a plaintiff is willing to persist and takes it, as a matter of principle, that he will go to the nth degree legally and spend whatever it takes, if he or she has the resources, and some have done it as a matter of conviction and conscience to vindicate individual consumer rights, even though their ultimate payback in monetary terms may not have actually been worth it. But injunctive relief is often the key to fairness and justice.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. In conclusion, is it fair to say that the measure we are about to vote on will indisputably have the effect of shifting enormous power from consumers to corporations that engage in high-volume but low-dollar fraud?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Exactly right. I think that is the essence of what the effect will be today of this vote if it is to roll back this rule and, in effect, enhance the overweening power of companies and corporations that force consumers to engage in arbitration that they do not know will be the result and cannot change because it is a fixed term, even though it is in the fine print, and eventually rips them off.

I thank my colleague for those extraordinarily insightful questions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to first thank my colleagues, particularly SHERROD BROWN, our ranking member of the committee, Senators WHITEHOUSE, BLUMENTHAL, FRANKEN, and so many others who have spoken so eloquently on this issue. I don't think it is a coincidence that many Members on our side have spoken and very few on the other side. Once again, it is one of those instances where the powerful will get more powerful. Everyone knows it, and people are not out there beating their breasts about this if they are trying to support it, and maybe there is a little bit of being ashamed.

This is what has happened here. We finally have an agency to protect the consumers against large institutions, most of which are good institutions, but some of which typically take advantage of the average person. They do it in a whole variety of ways. We saw with Equifax the idea that they didn't have to protect people's information and were almost nonchalant about it. We saw it with Wells Fargo, where people came up with a scheme. We see it all the time. The average consumer doesn't have the lawyers, the time, and the ability to study what is happening. They don't understand the long contracts where they sign away their rights to go to court. They need a bank account. They need a car loan. They need something, and, yes, their only recourse in this case may be a class ac-

tion suit, particularly if it is \$20 or \$30. You are not going to go to court individually, but if it is thousands of people, a trial lawyer will make some money, yes, to protect those people. How horrible that people might have the ability to come together and hire a lawyer.

What is happening in the last 9 months is that—we have a lot of people who are disaffected. Many of the campaigns, including President Trump's campaign, understood that. But when President Trump campaigned, he campaigned as a populist against the powerful institutions, against the Washington lobbyists, and said: Let's do something for average people. But once he got into office, he embraced the hard right, whose goal in most cases is to just protect the powerful. They got this sort of drumbeat going on: Poor innocent people have too much power, and big banks and big corporations don't have enough. Let's go after unions, even though incomes are down and only 6 percent of private America is unionized. Let's go after them. They are too powerful. They make these big corporations squirm or pay a little more money to people or pay a benefit or pay some healthcare—how horrible. Let's go after the trial lawyers. I don't always agree with their tactics. I voted against them on occasion. But let's go after them, even though they are one of the few recourses that average people have. That is hardly as reprehensible as an Equifax or a Wells Fargo in doing what they do. But people on the other side somehow have this mythology because of the hard right and its machine and their think tanks and their media messaging—FOX News—that somehow the powerful are getting a bad break in America and the average person has too much power.

What is wrong?

I will say this. It is going to lead to people being even more disillusioned, more angry, more sour, and we will move further away from what the American dream, ideal, and optimism are.

Our colleagues on the other side, my dear friends—I like them, I really do—wittingly or unwittingly are part of this movement, and it is a shame. It is a shame.

Community banks aren't beleaguered by these cases. They don't usually do this stuff. When I talked to community bankers who lobbied me on this, they basically said to me: No, we are with the whole banking association. The big banks want this.

This is not little banks. These are the Wells Fargos and the Equifaxes. We shouldn't do it. We shouldn't do it.

I worry about this country. I love this country. It has been so good to me, my family, and my people. I still believe to this day that it is what the Founding Fathers called it when they left Constitution Hall—God's noble experiment.

We are one nation under God, noble. We are a noble country. No one has had the ideals we have had for hundreds of years. We are an experiment. We keep evolving, changing, and adapting, as we should. But when I see what has gone on in the last 9 months—a combination of the President's appeal to lower instincts of people, to divisive instincts, and the hard right machine, which has too much power on the other side of the aisle—I worry. I worry. I worry about the country. I worry about our standards of decency and honor.

Everyone heard Senator FLAKE speak today. It moved all of us. It is a shame he is leaving this body because he has been a voice and a beacon. I didn't agree with him on most issues, as is pretty obvious by our voting records, but he stood for the right thing. I say to my colleagues, somehow we are doing too many wrong things around here. We are trying to take away people's healthcare. We say we want better healthcare at lower costs. That is what the President says, but we put a bill on the floor that does the opposite. We know it. We are doing it on taxes. We say we want to help the middle class, and the tax bill dominantly helps the wealthy.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are afraid to say they are helping the wealthiest because they think that is the way to create jobs because they know that Americans don't believe it—nor should they.

Most recently, the great Kansas experiment, the Koch brothers' own laboratory, totally flopped.

They say unions have too much power, and yet incomes in the middle class have declined. There are abuses. There are abuses everywhere, but middle-class incomes decline, fewer people have bargaining power, more people are paid lower, and there are 7 million fewer good-paying jobs in America today than 15 years ago. In part, that is because we don't have unions and because the hard right has learned through legal tactics to destroy them, and now with government legal tactics on the absurd argument that the First Amendment says you don't have to join a union or pay dues to a union.

This is just one of many issues where once again we are helping the powerful against the powerless. There is a political benefit, I understand. There is a fear if you go against these hard-right forces. I have heard it from my colleagues, but it is wrong for the country. I wish that maybe a bell would ring. There are lots of issues we don't agree on, but some of these issues don't have a basis in fact. That is why the floor is empty on the other side.

I respect my dear friend. He is a good, good man, in the Flake mold. He has to be here all night and defend it. He doesn't have too many others backing him up, and I think I know why, because deep down they know it is wrong.

They can figure out that there is an abuse of trial lawyers, but they still know it is wrong. They still know it is wrong.

To sum it up, a “yes” vote is handing a “get out of jail free” card or the equivalent to Wells Fargo and Equifax. It is that simple. A “yes” vote is saying you believe that Americans who get taken advantage of don’t have the right to seek recourse. A “yes” vote tells rapacious financial institutions that they can continue to hose consumers without any serious consequences or accountability, because we all know that average folks don’t have the ability to go to court on their own to sue. We know that. Everyone knows that.

If there are abuses, let’s fix them, but don’t totally denude people who don’t have much power from the little power they might have through going to court. I hope that maybe there is somebody, because the vote is close. It took a long time to bring this resolution to the floor because there were some people who wanted to stand up, but they got ground down by this hard right machine that always wants its way.

They are doing great. Corporate America is making more money than ever before. Financial institutions are healthier than ever before, but it is not good enough. More—we want more. The “more” is fine if it didn’t come at the expense of average folks when somebody is abusive.

The CRA is a meat-cleaver approach. Those who have issues with this should try to address them with a scalpel, not a bludgeon. I urge my colleagues one final time, those on the other side of the aisle, to vote no on this disapproval resolution on behalf of our constituents, who deserve to have more rights when standing up to the powerful when they are right, not less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know, for people watching this debate, it is easy to be confused. You hear the Democratic leader claiming that this is about the people who have no power, fighting against the most powerful institutions this country has to offer in their, somehow, trying to disadvantage them when, in fact, the opposite is true.

In situations like this, it is frequently a good thing to follow the money. The reason the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau wants to ban arbitration as a means of alternative dispute resolution is that the

trial lawyers, who benefit from the huge attorneys’ fees awards, do not like the idea that they are, basically, being boxed out of that dispute resolution system; whereas, we know from the studies that have been done that consumers actually benefit from a cheaper, more efficient, more timely way of resolving disputes with financial institutions with which they may have disagreements.

Back in the eighties, I still remember when I was a district judge in San Antonio, TX. Warren Burger, the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, made the point that it was so expensive and so time-consuming for individual citizens to resolve their disputes in courts of law that we needed what we all called an alternative dispute resolution system that was able to resolve these disputes in a more timely, more cost-effective sort of way, recognizing that very few people could afford to pay a lawyer an hourly fee or even a contingent fee for protracted civil litigation. Basically, ordinary consumers were frozen out of the dispute resolution process and were denied their day in court.

That system actually worked pretty well, including arbitration, which, according to a Federal statute—the Federal Arbitration Act—is an impartial tribunal that, basically, decides these disputes in an efficient, cost-effective sort of way. In fact, we know from the studies that have been done that consumers actually benefit more from arbitration than they do as members of a class in class action lawsuits, where consumers typically get pennies on the dollar and the class counsel, the lawyers involved, are, perhaps, awarded millions of dollars.

You have to ask the question: Whose benefit is that for? Is it really for the consumers or is it for the lawyers? I think the answer is pretty clear. It is not for the consumers. So, when I hear our friend across the aisle, the distinguished Democratic leader, cry crocodile tears for consumers, really, those are for the class action lawyers who are not part of the arbitration process.

I think it is really important to make that point, which is that every single study that has been done shows that consumers actually benefit from arbitration compared to ordinary litigation. Not everybody can afford to be O.J. Simpson and hire the very best lawyers in America and try a case for weeks on end at a cost of millions of dollars. It just, simply, does not work that way for most people. So this is a very efficient, cost-effective, fair way to resolve those disputes in a way that consumers benefit.

I do not understand, honestly, our colleagues across the aisle, except for their desire to demonize banks and large financial institutions, but it is not just large banks and financial institutions; it is community banks. We

are talking about contractual arbitration provisions, which allow consumers to benefit from a means to resolve disputes with their local community banks, and they do not often involve huge amounts of money. Typically, lawyers are not going to be interested in a claim that do not involve much money, which is why most often, when one does get litigated, it is in the context of a class action, in which they aggregate all of these claims for thousands of people. Then, as we know, typically, it ends in some sort of settlement from which the consumers get coupons—frequently, no money—and the class lawyers reap millions of dollars.

Our colleagues across the aisle act as if they have the better part of this argument when, actually, they are arguing on behalf of one of the narrowest, wealthiest special interests in America today, and that is the trial lawyers. They act as if they are the friend of the consumer when they are actually arguing to the detriment of the consumer, because the consumer benefits from this less expensive, more efficient, more timely resolution of disputes with financial institutions, which is through contractual arbitration.

There is the fact that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is sort of an anomaly in our system, is accountable to no one and not susceptible to oversight by Congress because of the way it was created. It is not even funded by appropriations of Congress as other government agencies are. It is really a rogue agency in so many ways—not accountable to the American people, not subject to the oversight of Congress, not dependent upon Congress for the appropriations to, basically, do its work. So, when it overreaches like this and essentially outlaws this efficient, cost-effective, impartial way of resolving civil disputes, this is, perhaps, the greatest demonstration of the abuse that was wrought by the creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau in the first place.

When consumers benefit and trial lawyers do not, I don’t know how you can justify the arguments on the other side, except to say that they are the party of the trial bar and that they really don’t care about the consumers because they realize that consumers will end up with pennies on the dollar and that they would actually be better off in using the arbitration provisions in these contracts that are subject to the Federal Arbitration Act. Actually, this is a Federal law that mandates the procedures by which these arbitration panels are created. It is not as if the banks get to choose who sits on the arbitration panels. It is not as if they get to pick the judges in the cases. These are nonpartisan arbitrators who will decide the facts in law and let the chips fall where they may.

I, for one, am not buying the crocodile tears of our friends across the aisle. They are not arguing in favor of the consumer; they are arguing on behalf of the trial bar, which gets rich on these cases.

It is not just the fact that this handful of cases from which the lawyers get rich solves the problem, because there are many people who have legitimate disputes that need to be resolved from which the lawyers just simply turn away and say that that case will not get me enough money to justify my involvement. So guess what. You are out of luck. Good luck in finding a lawyer to litigate your case for \$100 or \$200. You are just not going to get a chance to do that. If a class action lawyer will not take the case, you are out of luck. I guess our friends across the aisle do not care.

As for the fact that consumers could get recourse through arbitration in their using the Federal Arbitration Act—from an impartial panel that will decide what the facts are and grant awards without having to go to the expense and time associated with ordinary litigation—they, simply, do not really care about that.

I would say, notwithstanding the dystopian view of our friends across the aisle that, somehow, this is a great conspiracy against the forgotten man and woman in our country, the opposite is actually true. What they are trying to do is advocate for the rich and the powerful—the trial lawyers in America—and against the best interests of the consumer, who benefits from this contractual arbitration provision.

I hope that our colleagues will not be persuaded by the arguments on the other side, because there is just, simply, no factual basis for them. I hope that in a little while here, when we vote on this congressional resolution of disapproval, we will have a solid vote in the disapproving of this ban on the use of alternative dispute resolution to resolve disputes, because a “no” vote, basically, is a vote on behalf of the rich and the powerful—the trial lawyers in America—who get enriched by the status quo in the absence of an alternative dispute resolution system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Thank you, Mr. President. Tonight we are on the verge of passing a Republican resolution to make it easier for financial institutions to cheat people. Earlier this year, the Consumer Financial Protection Board issued a rule that prohibits financial companies from forcing you to sign an arbitration clause that makes you forfeit your right to take a bank to court. So if this proposal passes, that rule will just disappear.

Now, there are no real human beings who think it should be easier for financial institutions to steal money from

you and get away with it. Bank lobbyists are the only people asking Congress to reverse this rule, but let's face it, the Wall Street Journal is pretty powerful around here. The question the American people should be asking right now is, Are they powerful enough to win tonight?

The reason this vote is happening so late at night is because we were right on the verge of blocking it. The American people have watched as Wells Fargo cheated its customers and then used arbitration clauses to try to escape liability. They watched as Equifax negligently allowed hackers to steal personal financial information of more than half of all American adults and then used arbitration clauses to try to escape accountability. Politicians have been watching it too. While many of their eyes might be blinded by dollar signs, it may not be enough.

There is bipartisan opposition in the Senate to turning financial institutions loose to swindle their own customers. Right now our best guess is that it is 50 to 50. That means that Vice President MIKE PENCE is on his way to the Senate to cast a tie-breaking vote. If we can't peel off one more Republican, MIKE PENCE will decide whether consumers can hold banks like Wells Fargo accountable when they cheat their customers.

Now, everyone assumes MIKE PENCE will side with the big banks, and I have just one simple question: Why?

President Trump, MIKE PENCE works for you. His job is to cast his vote the way you tell him to cast it. We spent more than a year listening to you, first as a candidate and then as a President, and you have gone on and on and on about how strong you are, how tough you are, and about how you are going to stand up to Wall Street.

Well, this bill is a giant, wet kiss to Wall Street. Bank lobbyists are crawling all over this place begging Congress to vote and make it easier for them to cheat their customers. President Trump, are you really going to let MIKE PENCE cast a tie-breaking vote to hand big banks their biggest win in Congress since they crashed the economy 9 years ago?

You know, I followed a news story about how tough you are, Mr. President—standing up to MITCH MCCONNELL, PAUL RYAN, and the Republican Party. Well, this is a top priority for them, Mr. President. So do you work for MITCH MCCONNELL now? Is that the deal? Are you going to roll over and hurt millions of people in this country because MITCH MCCONNELL tells you to?

I keep hearing that you and Steve Bannon are going to remake the Republican Party into a party that stands up to Wall Street. Steve Bannon works with the White supremacists, but, hey, he says he is going to help you drain the swamp, right?

Well, where is the all-powerful Steve Bannon now? Where is he to tell MIKE PENCE and Donald Trump that they don't work for MITCH MCCONNELL?

Every organization—all the ones that represent actual human beings, not banks—want this rule to be saved, none more than the organizations that represent our veterans and our servicemembers. Do you know why that is, Mr. President? It is because they are sick and tired of being cheated by banks. They are sick and tired of politicians who say “thank you for your service” and then turn around and vote to make it harder for them to build a future for themselves and their families.

The Military Coalition, which represents more than 5.5 million veterans and servicemembers, supports the CFPB rule because “our Nation's veterans should not be deprived of the constitutional rights and freedoms that they put their lives on the line to protect, including the right to have their claims heard in a trial.” The Coalition says that “[f]orced arbitration is an un-American system wherein servicemembers' claims against a corporation are funneled into a rigged, secretive system in which all the rules, including the choice of arbitrator, are picked by the corporation.” They go on to warn that “the catastrophic consequences these [forced arbitration] clauses pose for our all-voluntary military fighting force's morale and our national security are vital reasons” to preserve this rule.

We have seen all the tweets, Mr. President. We have seen you go on and on about how disrespectful it is of our veterans and their families that some football players don't want to stand for the national anthem. Well, all three of my brothers served in the military, Mr. President. Do you know what is disrespectful of our veterans and their families? Passing laws that hurt our veterans and their families. Casting tie-breaking votes for laws that are opposed by the American Legion, by the Military Coalition, by the Vietnam Veterans of America, by AMVETS, by the Association of the United States Navy, by the Military Order of the Purple Heart, by the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, by the Military Child Education Coalition, by the Military Veterans Coalition of Indiana, by the National Association of Black Veterans, by the National Guard Association of the United States, by the National Military Family Association, by the Noncommissioned Officers Association, by the Reserve Officers Association, by the Retired Enlisted Association, by the Veterans for Common Sense, by the Veterans Education Success, by Veterans Legal Institute, by VETJOBS and by Vets First.

President Trump, this is up to you. Don't do this. Don't let MIKE PENCE cast the deciding vote to hand a huge

victory to Wall Street. If you do, you should be prepared for the consequences. Veterans know when a politician is all talk. They know the difference between a cheap pat on the back and a real punch to the gut. They will not forget what happens here today.

And for Steve Bannon—if this really happens today and MIKE PENCE casts the deciding vote to make it easier for financial institutions to cheat people, do you want to remake the Republican Party in your image? Do you want to watch primary challenges against Republicans who roll over to Wall Street? Do you want to go after the weak and spineless, the DC-Wall Street swamp, the politicians who will not stand up to MITCH MCCONNELL, and all the globalists who think cash matters more than people? If MIKE PENCE votes for this monstrosity, why don't you primary Donald Trump, and when you are finished with him, why don't you go after MIKE PENCE?

Steve Bannon, put your fat wad of billionaire Mercer money where your mouth is or stop pretending that you are anything other than what you are.

With the remainder of my time, I would like to read letters and op-eds from veterans begging Congress not to repeal this rule.

The first is from Col. Lee F. Lange, U.S. Marine, Retired, with 30 years of service, now serving as Arizona chapter president of the Military Officers Association of America. He titles his letter, "I Served to Protect Our Rights; Don't Let Equifax Take Them Away."

As a career Marine, I served to protect the rights of Americans as guaranteed by the Constitution and its amendments. Among them is the 7th Amendment right to trial by jury in civil cases, a right dismissed by companies like Equifax and now under siege in Congress.

Forced arbitration "ripoff clauses" buried in the fine-print of bank accounts, auto loans and other contracts strip servicemembers and veterans of their day in court when big banks and other financial institutions violate the law. Instead, people must face companies alone and cannot join together in a rigged, secretive process where the banks and lenders often choose the arbitrator.

Men and women in uniform are surely among the 145.5 million people impacted by the massive data breach of sensitive personal information held by the credit reporting agency Equifax—and among those whose access to the courts was stripped in Equifax's fine print until the company had to relent. Servicemembers from Sergeant Charles Beard to Army soldier Prentice Martin-Bowen have also had their rights limited by forced arbitration.

Wells Fargo continues to use forced arbitration to deny victims of the fake account scandal access to the justice system. Arizona and Southern California were the epicenter of the Wells Fargo scandal and Wells Fargo is Arizona's largest bank. Some of the state's more than 500,000 veterans were certainly caught up in its effects. Wells Fargo has been caught but it is likely not the only financial institution guilty of illegal practices.

The Department of Defense has long pushed for servicemembers full legal re-

course against unscrupulous lenders, and members now have some protection against forced arbitration clauses through the Military Lending Act. But the MLA protections don't apply to auto loans, to rights under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, to bank account fraud like the Wells Fargo scandal, or to veterans.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) and its Office of Servicemember Affairs have worked to protect those who serve by issuing a rule restoring our 7th Amendment rights and limiting the use of forced arbitration. The CFPB rule enhances military consumer protections in the MLA, restoring the right of servicemembers and veterans to seek civil justice, including class action suits, for illegal acts.

For that reason, The Military Coalition, a national consortium of uninformed services and veterans organizations representing 5.5 million current and former servicemembers and their families and survivors, urged Congress to let the CFPB rule go into effect. The American Legion has done the same. The general public—including 64 percent of Republicans and 74 percent of Democrats—also supports the rule to restore our day in court.

But, despite this outpouring of support, the U.S. House of Representatives has voted to block the rule from going into effect. Wall Street lobbyists are pushing Congress to leave forced arbitration as the only solution, severely limiting the recourse of servicemembers and all Americans. For example, only four arbitrations have been filed against Wells Fargo in Arizona despite up to 178,972 or more fake accounts in the state.

That is 4 arbitrations against 178,972 or more fake accounts in the State.

We can't allow forced arbitration to be used as a tool to block accountability.

The Senate, armed with lessons learned from the Equifax and Wells Fargo scandals, can still reverse course. Our Senators must put the interests of active-duty servicemembers, veterans, and American consumers ahead of Wall Street lobbyists and reject efforts to take away our day in court.

That was from Col. Lee Lange, U.S. Marine Corps, Retired, chapter president of the Arizona Chapter of the Military Officers Association of America and president of the Southwest Veterans Chamber of Commerce.

There is another one that I would like to read, and this is from the chairman of the Alaska Veterans Foundation. It is titled "Forced arbitration and a right worth fighting for," by Ric Davidge.

As a veteran, I am proud to have helped protect the freedoms so zealously guarded for us by our Founders. Another guarantor of those liberties is the right to our day in court—one especially vital to today's servicemembers who are so often taken advantage of by financial institutions.

Today, the right to our day in court is endangered because of actions under consideration by the United States Senate on the issue of powerful banks and forced arbitration.

James Madison, one of the principal drafters of the Bill of Rights, wrote that "trial by jury in civil cases is as essential to secure the liberty of the people as any one of the pre-existent rights of nature." The Founders saw this right to be heard before a jury of our peers as so vital that they enshrined it in the Seventh Amendment.

This right is not only, in Winston Churchill's words, "a safeguard from arbitrary per-

version of the law," but also a means to ensure equal access to justice for the powerful and the powerless alike, and for citizens to signal and set acceptable standards of conduct in our society.

Why bring this all up now? Because the U.S. Senate is considering legislation to roll back a rule recently finalized by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) to limit forced arbitration clauses buried deep in consumer financial agreements. These forced arbitration agreements are found in the fine print of financial agreements signed by tens of millions of everyday Americans with the Wall Street banks, covering everything from credit cards and checking accounts to prepaid cards and payday loans. And they require consumers to take disputes over bank wrongdoing not to courts overseen by judges, but to arbitrators chosen by the financial institutions—under their own rules.

Arbitration hearings are held in private with no public record, no meaningful rules, not even a requirement that arbitrators enforce state and federal laws. And of course, no jury.

Perhaps most significant of all, Big Banks have leveraged arbitration to block class action suits, where the ability of consumers to band together helps balance the extraordinary legal and financial resources at banks' disposal.

The Wells Fargo scandals—yes, there's more than one—offer a prime example of how financial institutions use forced arbitration to rip off consumers.

The bank, with 48 branches in Alaska, opened nearly 6,000 of its infamous fake accounts here on the Last Frontier.

A California judge ordered the financial giant to repay customers more than \$200 million for manipulating accounts to generate overdraft fees—another activity repeated here.

Recently, nearly a quarter million Wells Fargo car loan customers were dinged for nonpayment of insurance policies illegally taken out for them—and almost 25,000 had vehicles repossessed.

Most infuriating, Wells Fargo has been fined millions for foreclosing on servicemembers or repossessing their cars in violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

In every case, Wells has used arbitration to shield itself from accountability. Since 2009, only 215 consumers nationwide have filed arbitrations against Wells Fargo—but not one in Alaska. The reason: arbitration is often too expensive for a single consumer with a small claim.

That's why the CFPB rule is so important—and why the Big Banks' Washington lobbyists are working overtime to have it overturned. The regulation will ensure all Alaskans retain the right to their day in court as part of class actions—and uphold the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to protect the legal rights of the men and women fighting for this country.

As Congress considers whether to preserve this critical protection for everyday consumers, and especially for our servicemembers, our Alaska Republican Senators, Lisa Murkowski and Dan Sullivan, need to remember that equal access to justice is not a Republican or a Democratic idea. It is an American right, as old as our Republic itself, and it's worth fighting for.

Ric Davidge serves as chairman of the Alaska Veterans Foundation.

From Robert Mitchell, a Marine Corps veteran: "Forced arbitration is un-American." This is from the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette.

I am a proud Marine Corps veteran. Abroad, I joined with my fellow Marines in united pursuit of justice and rights. At home, I fight for them and other U.S. military members to be treated fairly and with dignity in their financial affairs. I'm disappointed by the actions of my U.S. Sen. Tom Cotton, who is seeking to roll back a recent rule that restores servicemembers' and other Americans' legal rights in the financial marketplace.

So often, military members are unfairly targeted by aggressive lenders, abusive debt collectors, reckless credit-reporting bureaus, and discriminating employers. So I devote my time to help them enforce their rights under federal and state laws that grant them remedies and other ways to hold bad actors accountable when they flout these laws.

He goes on to talk about what happens in the fine print in these contracts and how it is that veterans and Active-Duty servicemembers are repeatedly cheated.

His closing remarks are as follows:

Unfortunately, although the rule restores the rights of active-duty servicemembers and American civilians, it has become controversial in Washington because the financial-services industry opposes it. For several years now, financial institutions have been able to use their strict terms to wipe away individuals' rights and essentially ignore legal complaints.

But Senator Cotton and our representatives in Congress must take the opportunity to look beyond the lobbyists and toward the experiences of our military members and the U.S. Constitution. They should support, not abandon, a rule that simply restores our traditions.

I will just reference a letter from The Military Coalition, a consortium of uniform services and veterans organizations representing more than 5½ million current and former servicemembers and their families and survivors who also wrote in strong support of protecting the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau arbitration rule. They conclude:

Our nation's veterans should not be deprived of the Constitutional rights and freedoms that they put their lives on the line to protect, including the right to have their claims heard in a trial by a jury when their rights are violated. The catastrophic consequences these clauses pose for our all-voluntary military fighting force's morale and our national security are vital reasons for this rule to take effect immediately.

We also have a resolution passed by the Ninety-Ninth National Convention of the American Legion asking Congress not to roll back the arbitration rule put forward by the CFPB, and we have a letter from more than 30 veterans associations begging this Congress to please not get rid of the forced arbitration clause that has been put forward by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these letters and resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILITARY COALITION,
Alexandria, VA, July 25, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. RYAN, REP. PELOSI, SEN. MCCONNELL, AND SEN. SCHUMER: The Military Coalition (TMC), a consortium of uniformed services and veterans organizations representing more than 5.5 million current and former servicemembers and their families and survivors writes today in strong support of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) final rule on Arbitration Agreements (Docket No. CFPB-2016-0020; RIN 3170-AA51). The final rule addresses the widespread harm of forced arbitration by preserving the ability of service members and other consumers to band together to seek relief through the civil justice system when financial institutions have broken the law. We applaud the CFPB for moving forward on this rule that recognizes the detrimental effects of forced arbitration and class action waivers on our brave men and women in uniform.

Forced arbitration is an un-American system wherein service members' claims against a corporation are funneled into a rigged, secretive system in which all the rules, including the choice of the arbitrator, are picked by the corporation. Found in almost every financial services contract, forced arbitration clauses systematically include a provision banning the rights of consumers to band together to hold a corporation accountable. Given the exponential and expansive use of these clauses by financial institutions in contracts with service members, prohibiting the practice of forcing service members to surrender fundamental Constitutional and statutory rights through the use of pre-dispute forced arbitration clauses is now more critical than ever.

Our service members protect our nation against both foreign and domestic threats. The sacrifices and logistical undertakings they and their families make in order to serve are compelling reasons alone to ensure they are not only shielded from predatory financial practices and unscrupulous lenders, but are also able to enforce their congressionally mandated rights through our civil justice system if and when violations arise.

However, class action waivers work against these rights. They are particularly abusive when enforced against service members, who may not be in a position to individually challenge a financial institution's illegal or unfair practices because of limited resources or frequent relocations or deployment. Furthermore, for those service members on active duty and serving overseas, it is critical to retain the ability to get justice without having to interrupt their service and distract their attention from the mission at hand. Since these types of service members cannot participate full time in pursuing an individual claim, being able to enforce their rights through the class action mechanism is essential. Thus service members should receive the benefits of participating in a class action despite their inability to shoulder the burden of bringing a claim alone.

Our nation's veterans should not be deprived of the Constitutional rights and free-

doms that they put their lives on the line to protect, including the right to have their claims heard in a trial by a jury when their rights are violated. The catastrophic consequences these clauses pose for our all-voluntary military fighting force's morale and our national security are vital reasons for this rule to take effect immediately.

Sincerely,

THE MILITARY COALITION.

NINETY-NINTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE
AMERICAN LEGION—RENO, NEVADA, AUGUST
22, 23, 24, 2017

Resolution No. 83: Protect Veteran and Servicemember Rights to Fair Consumer Arbitration

Origin: Convention Committee on Veterans Employment & Education

Submitted by: Convention Committee on Veterans Employment & Education

Whereas, The American Legion is a national organization of veterans who have dedicated themselves to the service of the community, state and nation; and

Whereas, The U.S. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) rule on Arbitration Agreements (Docket No. CFPB-2016-0020; RIN 3170-AA51) addresses the widespread harm of forced arbitration by restoring the ability of servicemembers, veterans and other consumers to join together and seek relief in class action lawsuits when financial institutions break the law; and

Whereas, Congress enacted the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA), 50 U.S.C. app. 501 et seq., to strengthen and expedite national defense by granting servicemembers certain protections in civil actions against default judgments, foreclosures and repossessions, enforceable in a court of law; and

Whereas, In some cases, financial institutions violate SCRA or other statutory or constitutional protections in their interactions with servicemembers; and

Whereas, Many financial institutions include pre-dispute mandatory arbitration clauses in contracts of adhesion that bar servicemembers and others from bringing a legal action in court or banding together in a class action lawsuit to seek relief under federal or state law; and

Whereas, Class action waivers are particularly burdensome to servicemembers, who may not be able to challenge a financial institution's illegal or unfair practices individually due to limited resources, deployment or frequent relocations; and

Whereas, The Department of Defense concluded in 2006 that "Servicemembers should maintain full legal recourse against unscrupulous lenders. Loan contracts to servicemembers should not include mandatory arbitration clauses or onerous notice provisions, and should not require the servicemember to waive his or her right of recourse, such as the right to participate in a plaintiff class"; and

Whereas, This is extremely unfair to bar servicemembers, veterans and other consumers from joining together to enforce statutory and constitutional protections in court, placing an extreme hardship on the individual; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Reno, Nevada, August 22, 23, 24, 2017, That The American Legion oppose legislation to repeal the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rule on arbitration agreements and bar servicemembers, veterans and other consumers from joining together in court against unscrupulous financial institutions.

MAY 3, 2017.

Sen. MIKE CRAPO,
*Chair, Committee on Banking, Housing, and
 Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate.*

Rep. JEB HENSARLING,
*Chair, Committee on Financial Services,
 House of Representatives.*

Sen. SHERROD BROWN,
*Ranking Member, Committee on Banking, Hous-
 ing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate.*

Rep. MAXINE WATERS,
*Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Serv-
 ices, House of Representatives.*

DEAR CHAIRMEN CRAPO AND HENSARLING & RANKING MEMBERS BROWN AND WATERS: We, the undersigned representatives of organizations who advocate for our nation's military servicemembers, veterans, survivors, and military families, write to urge you respectfully to ensure that important laws and regulations that protect against financial deception and abuse are not watered down or eliminated. We hope that bipartisan agreement is possible in order to protect America's military heroes and their families by resisting proposals that would curtail the effectiveness of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB).

CFPB's Office of Servicemember Affairs—launched by Mrs. Holly Petraeus—has produced tangible results for military families across the country. Military leaders nationwide have lauded the work of the consumer agency and its dedicated military unit. For these reasons, we urge you to resist any proposals that would limit the CFPB's ability to work on behalf of servicemembers through changes to its authorities, structure, or independent funding.

The CFPB's work to protect, assist, and educate military families in the financial sphere is paying dividends for our nation's military personnel readiness. We urge you to continue to support the work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and its dedicated military office.

The enclosure to this letter summarizes the many ways that the CFPB supports the Defense Department's key asset, its men and women in uniform and their families.

Sincerely,

AMVETS, American Legion Post 122, Association of the United States Navy, Blue Star Families, Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association, Code of Support Foundation, Fleet Reserve Association, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Ivy League Veterans Council, Military Child Education Coalition, Military Order of the Purple Heart, The Military / Veterans Coalition of Indiana, National Association of Black Veterans, National Guard Association of the United States.

National Military Family Association, Non-Commissioned Officers Association, Public Law Center, Operation Veterans Re-Entry, Reserve Officers Association, Swords to Plowshares, The Retired Enlisted Association, Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors, Veterans for Common Sense, Veterans Education Success, Veterans Legal Clinic of the University of San Diego, Veterans Legal Institute, Veterans Student Loan Relief Fund, VetJobs, VetsFirst, a program of United Spinal Association, Vietnam Veterans of America.

THE VALUE OF THE CFPB TO NATIONAL
 SECURITY

MILITARY FAMILY FINANCIAL READINESS

At the direction of Congress, the Department of Defense (DOD) produced a report outlining its concerns with harmful financial

practices. The report noted that “predatory lending undermines military readiness, harms the morale of troops and their families, and adds to the cost of fielding an all volunteer fighting force.”

According to Department of Defense analysis of involuntary separations that were due to legal or standard-of-conduct issues—an average of 19,893 per year—the Department estimates that approximately half are attributable to a loss of security clearance, and, of these, 80 percent are due to financial distress. The Department estimates that each of these separations costs taxpayers over \$57,000. Addressing financial misconduct by bad actors that target military families can both contribute to overall military readiness and reduce the costs to taxpayers of involuntary separations.

Senior enlisted leadership vigorously praised the work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and its Office of Servicemember Affairs in a February 14, 2017, hearing by the Senate Armed Services Committee, Military Personnel Subcommittee. For example, Sergeant Major of the Army Daniel A. Dailey stated, “I see value in that organization and I know they have done great things for our servicemembers.”

‘DOLLAR SIGNS IN UNIFORM’

In an op-ed in the *The New York Times*, Mrs. Petraeus describes how certain industry actors build their business models on revenue from servicemembers, veterans, and their families. While we welcome and celebrate businesses that serve our community in an honorable, trustworthy manner, some bad actors see us as nothing more than “dollar signs in uniform.”

In the last decade, we have seen financial companies engage in foreclosure activity, auto lending, and payday lending that violated laws and regulations protecting consumers and servicemembers. There is a clear need for the CFPB to provide both prevention and protection against harmful financial practices.

THE CFPB'S STRONG RECORD

The CFPB engages in a number of activities that benefit military families including monitoring of complaints, enforcement, outreach and education, and consumer protection initiatives.

Consumer Complaints. Military families have submitted 70,000 complaints; the agency's military unit closely analyzes these complaints to better understand the challenges that servicemembers face and how to address them. These complaints often lead to significant monetary relief for families who have been harmed by wrongful practices.

Education and Outreach. The CFPB has brought new leadership and emphasis on service member issues by actively reaching out to listen to and engage with servicemembers and has developed a variety of resources.

Military installation visits: Nineteen visits in 2015 where the OSA held Town halls and listened to servicemembers directly.

Briefings, Outreach, and Community Collaborations: Over 60 events in 2015 delivered consumer resources directly to servicemembers.

Veterans Outreach: Sixteen events were held in 2015 with the aim of collaborating with other veteran support organizations promoting consumer protection.

Digital Engagement: Financial resources delivered through social media, and social media town halls with federal and non-profit partners, as well as offering online training for military financial educators.

On-Demand Virtual Forums: The forums provide servicemembers and military financial educators with virtual training on topics ranging from debt collection to the CFPB's complaint process.

Direct-to-Consumer Education Materials: The materials provide information on common issues facing the clients of the military legal assistance community, including protecting your credit while you are away from home, knowing your rights when a debt collector calls, and minimizing student loan payments.

Between October 1, 2011 and December 31, 2016, OSA delivered consumer financial educational information and materials to more than 26,000 servicemembers through live events. This included interacting with active-duty servicemembers and National Guard personnel through leadership roundtables and town-hall-style listening sessions at 145 military installations/units.

Supervision and Enforcement. The CFPB has placed a high priority on holding financial companies that may be harming military families accountable.

Before the CFPB was created, no federal agency routinely examined or supervised non-bank businesses offering consumer financial products. The Federal Trade Commission had enforcement authority under the Federal Trade Commission Act against unfair and deceptive practices and to enforce federal credit laws with non-bank financial services companies, but did not have supervision authority. The CFPB's new supervision authority coupled with its authority to enforce the Military Lending Act and its focus on listening to servicemembers has allowed for enforcement actions that would not have happened without the CFPB.

For example, the CFPB cited Cash America for violating the Military Lending Act after routine examination exposed compliance problems. The agency took action against USA Discounters and other retail creditors abusing military allotment systems. Other enforcement actions that also impacted servicemembers include:

Rome Finance where, in conjunction with 13 state attorneys general, CFPB provided \$92 million in debt relief for 17,000 U.S. servicemembers and other consumers;

Suits against closed proprietary colleges ITT and Corinthian Colleges, Inc. for predatory lending with debt relief for Corinthian students of \$480 million ultimately secured.

Common-Sense Rules of the Road. The consumer agency has also pursued consumer protection initiatives that will strongly benefit military families.

Debt Collection: Over 46% of complaints received from servicemembers in 2015 concerned debt collection. And according to a 2015 report, servicemembers were nearly twice as likely to submit debt collection complaints as the general population who also submitted complaints. The CFPB has outlined proposals to increase consumer protections from debt collectors to address the industry's most abusive practices.

Forced Arbitration: The CFPB's proposed rule to rein in the widespread harm of forced arbitration by preserving the ability of servicemembers and other consumers to join together in court when financial institutions break the law. Compliance with the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act has been a particular problem. Class action bans, which take away the right to collective action, are particularly abusive, as they prevent courts from ordering widespread relief when thousands or millions of servicemembers are harmed. Class action bans also prevent

servicemembers from banding together when they are not in a position to individually challenge a financial institution's illegal or unfair practices due to limited resources or frequent relocations or deployment. The Military Coalition, representing 5.5 million servicemembers and their families, recently sent a letter to the CFPB in support of this proposal.

CONCLUSION

As noted by the Military Officers Association of America, in a recent letter to the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, it is "vitally important to the military community and readiness that the work of the Office of Servicemember Affairs continues."

Ms. WARREN. It really comes down to this: We have heard from veterans groups, from individual veterans, Active-Duty military, and from banks, and the banks are the ones saying: Roll back this rule, and the veterans and Active-Duty military are asking us not to.

The decision hangs in the balance tonight, and I urge my colleagues: Just once, don't stand up with the big banks; stand up with the veterans.

I urge the President of the United States: Show us what you are made of. Stand up with America's veterans. Stand up to Wall Street; don't just roll over for Wall Street. Be there for the people who count on you. Be there for our veterans and Active-Duty military.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, just for everybody's information, I am going to speak for just 2 or 3 minutes and then yield back our time, and then Senator BROWN will do the same, and then we will proceed to a vote.

I just want to make clear what we are talking about here. You have heard a lot of talk tonight about how this is trying to stop the forced arbitration. You have heard that word a lot. Let's make it really clear what the debate is about.

Using the CFPB's own study—I am quoting the CFPB now—"the clear majority of the arbitration clauses within our review specifically recognize—and allow—access to small claims courts as an alternative to arbitration." So this notion that we are here fighting tonight about whether people who have small claims don't have any outlet except arbitration is simply false. That is a false orchestration of what the argument is.

What is the argument? Well, why don't we look at the rule and see what the rule says again? And now I am quoting specifically from the CFPB rule. It prohibits a company from relying "in any way"—it doesn't say forced arbitration—from relying "in any way on a pre-dispute arbitration agreement . . . with respect to any aspect of a class action."

It goes on, and the rule actually states specific language that people

have to put in their contracts. What is that language? This rule requires people to "agree that neither we nor anyone else will rely on this agreement to stop you from being part of a class action case in court."

So the issue here, Mr. President, is not forced arbitration. Even existing arbitration clauses allow alternatives. The issue here is the CFPB's effort to force dispute resolution into class action litigation.

Some have talked here tonight about how we are trying to stop access to the courtroom. Well, first of all, I think that argument is belied again by the CFPB's own study that explicitly states that no class actions filed during the time period that the CFPB studied even went to trial. So this argument falls on its own face.

Meanwhile, let's look again at what the difference between arbitration and forced class actions does. In arbitration, a decision on the merits was reached in 32 percent of the disputes filed, where, as I indicated, zero of the class action cases even went to trial. In addition, according to the CFPB's own study, most arbitration agreements and consumer financial contracts contain a small claims court carve-out.

Given the methodological flaws in the CFPB's study, it is difficult to make apples-to-apples comparisons about class action versus arbitration, but the Wall Street Journal's editorial board made this observation:

Of the 562 class actions the CFPB studied, none went to trial. Most were dismissed by a judge, withdrawn by the plaintiffs or settled out of class.

I will conclude with just the numbers that we have already talked about many times tonight.

What is the comparison between arbitration and class action litigation? That is the issue tonight. What is the comparison? The average recovery for the consumer in a class action case is \$32. The average recovery in an arbitration is \$5,389. It takes 2 years for the class action to take place; 5 months for the arbitration. In 12 percent of the class action matters did they even reach settlements. In 60 percent, they reached them in arbitration. Attorneys' fees: \$424 million in class action cases; virtually no attorneys' fees in arbitration cases.

The point here is exactly this: The debate tonight is not, as many would have you believe, over whether we are forcing arbitration. Even the arbitration clause in the current system creates options for consumers to go into small claims courts. The vote here tonight is whether to force dispute resolution into class action litigation, and that is what we need to decide with tonight's vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States is here.

Looks like Equifax and Wall Street and Wells Fargo will win again. The Vice President only shows up in this body when the rich and the powerful need him. It is pretty clear tonight that Wall Street needs him. This vote will make the rich richer. It will make the powerful more powerful.

Forced arbitration hurts the 3.5 million people who were defrauded by Wells Fargo. Forced arbitration hurts the 145 million Americans who were wronged by Equifax, 5 million in Ohio alone. It hurts employees who have been hurt by their employers. It hurts students who have been cheated by for-profit colleges. It hurts family members in nursing homes. It hurts the millions of Americans with student loan debt and credit cards.

I will close with this. I want every voting Member of the Senate to look into the eyes of the American Legion veterans who say a vote to overturn the CFPB arbitration rule is a vote against our military and against our veterans. Vote no.

I yield back the time on our side.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I also yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. BURR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 249 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Cortez Masto	Heinrich
Bennet	Donnelly	Heitkamp
Blumenthal	Duckworth	Hirono
Booker	Durbin	Kaine
Brown	Feinstein	Kennedy
Cantwell	Franken	King
Cardin	Gillibrand	Klobuchar
Carper	Graham	Leahy
Casey	Harris	Manchin
Coons	Hassan	Markey

McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Peters

Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester

Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50. The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 111, is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 247, on the motion to waive the budget point of order with respect to the House message to accompany H.R. 2266, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall No. 248, on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

GAO OPINION LETTER ON 2016 TONGASS PLAN AMENDMENT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO, dated October 23, 2017, be printed in the RECORD.

The letter provides notification that the 2016 Amendment to the Tongass Land and Resource Management Plan, USDA, Forest Service, Tongass Land and Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, R10-MB-769I, Washington, D.C.: December 9, 2016, is a rule subject to the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. §801 et seq.

I wrote to GAO on February 13, 2017, asking it to determine whether the 2016 Tongass plan amendment constitutes a rule subject to the CRA. In response, as communicated in its letter of October 23, GAO determined that the plan amendment is a rule and does not fall within any of the exceptions provided in the CRA. Accordingly, with this GAO opinion and its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the rule will be subject to a congressional joint resolution of disapproval.

The letter I am now submitting to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

is the original document provided by GAO to my office. I will also provide a copy of the GAO letter to the Parliamentarian's office.

For those who may be interested, the 2016 Tongass Plan Amendment can be found online at <https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/tongass/landmanagement/?cid=stelprd3801708>. GAO's determination can be accessed at <http://www.gao.gov/products/B-238859>.

I look forward to debating the future of this rule in the weeks and months to come.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,

Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Subject: Tongass National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Amendment.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate.

This is in response to your letter requesting our opinion on whether the 2016 Amendment to the Tongass Land and Resource Management Plan (2016 Tongass Amendment or Amendment), approved by the Tongass Forest Supervisor on December 9, 2016, is a rule under the Congressional Review Act (CRA). For the reasons discussed in more detail below, we conclude that the 2016 Tongass Amendment is a rule under CRA.

BACKGROUND

Tongass National Forest

The Tongass National Forest is the largest of the 154 national forests. It comprises 78 percent of the land base in southeast Alaska. Of its approximate 16.7 million acres, about 10 million acres are forested. Of the forested acres, the Forest Service classifies approximately 5.5 million acres as being "productive forest." As a national forest, the Tongass is managed by the Forest Service within the Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Since inception, the Tongass timber program has been based on harvesting old-growth trees—in the context of the Tongass, generally meaning trees more than 150 years old—that can be a source of high-quality lumber. The Forest Service began offering timber sales on the Tongass in the early 1900s. Although timber harvest increased substantially in the 1950s through 1970s, harvest has since declined significantly.

A number of laws and regulations have reduced the number of acres where timber harvest is allowed on national forests, both nationwide and on the Tongass. Specifically, according to statistics provided by Forest Service officials, of the approximately 5.5 million acres of productive forest in the Tongass, approximately 2.4 million acres are not available for harvest because of statutory provisions, such as wilderness designations, and another 1.8 million acres are not available for harvest because of other factors, such as USDA adopting the roadless rule.

National Forest Planning Process

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA), as amended, requires the Forest Service to "develop, maintain, and, as appropriate, revise land and resource management plans for units of the National Forest systems." Plans are to provide for "the multiple use and sustained yield of the products and services obtained from [the national forests] . . . and, in particular, include coordination of outdoor recreation, range, tim-

ber, watershed, wildlife and fish, and wilderness." Thus, the Forest Service must "balance competing demands on national forests, including timber harvesting, recreational use, and environmental preservation."

Forest plans identify the uses that may occur in each area of the forest. The Forest Service is required to update forest plans at least every 15 years and may amend a plan more frequently to adapt to new information or changing conditions. Resource plans and permits, contracts, and other instruments for the use of national forests must be consistent with the applicable plans. When a plan is revised, these instruments are to be revised as soon as practicable to be made consistent with the revised plan, but only subject to valid existing legal rights. The Forest Service is required to promulgate and follow certain procedures set forth in regulation for the development, amendment, and revision of forest plans. The decision to adopt a forest plan and the rationale for making that decision are made public in a Record of Decision (ROD) issued pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). For timber harvest activities, forest plans typically identify areas where timber harvest is permitted to occur and set a limit on the amount of timber that may be harvested from the forest.

The Tongass forest plan allocates defined areas of the forest to various Land Use Designations (LUDs). In general, the plan allocates all areas of the forest to LUDs as part of the forest planning process. Some LUDs implement statutory land designations, such as wilderness, and areas allocated to those LUDs must be managed in accordance with the statutory requirements applicable to those land designations. Other LUD allocations are for development of resources, such as timber production, and the Forest Service manages these areas in accordance with LUD direction, such as by allowing roads to be built and commercial timber to be harvested.

The descriptions of the uses allowed by the plan within a LUD and the corresponding permissible activities are management prescriptions. Each management prescription gives general direction on what may occur within areas allocated to the corresponding LUD, the standards for accomplishing each activity, and the guidelines on how to go about accomplishing the standards. While a forest plan may allocate certain areas to a timber LUD, that allocation does not itself authorize third parties to harvest timber. If the applicable management prescription allows timber harvesting within a given LUD, additional steps are required before the contractual right to harvest timber is created. The Forest Service will identify a sale area, conduct the required environmental analyses, appraise the timber, and solicit bids from buyers interested in purchasing the timber. The Forest Service then prepares the timber sale contract and marks the sale boundary and the trees to be cut or left. The purchaser is responsible for cutting and removing the timber, with the Forest Service monitoring the harvest operations. These sales or projects are to be conducted consistent with the applicable forest plan, but plans generally do not require any specific sale or project to be undertaken.

Tongass National Forest Planning

In 1979, the Tongass National Forest was the first to complete a forest plan under NFMA. The plan was amended in 1986 and 1991. In 1997 USDA approved a Revised Forest Plan, which was then amended in 2008.

In 2010, USDA announced its intent to transition the Tongass timber program to

one based predominantly on the harvest of young growth—generally consisting of trees that have regrown after the harvest of old growth—in part to help conserve the remaining old-growth forest. A 2013 memorandum from the Secretary of Agriculture stated that within 10 to 15 years, the “vast majority” of timber harvested in the Tongass would be young growth. The memorandum also stated that the transition must be done in a manner that “preserves a viable timber industry” in southeast Alaska. The Forest Service announced in May 2014 that it would amend the forest plan for the Tongass to accomplish the transition. As part of the decision-making process for the amendment, in November 2015 the Forest Service released for public comment its proposed forest plan amendment and accompanying environmental analyses.

The substantive changes in the 2016 Tongass Amendment are set out in Chapter 5 of the Amendment. As compared to the 2008 plan, the 2016 Tongass Amendment generally reduced the areas potentially open to old-growth harvest while allowing young growth harvest in some areas previously unavailable for any type of harvest. Specifically, the 2016 Tongass Amendment makes the following changes to the 2008 Tongass Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP):

Allows old-growth harvest only within the portion of the Tongass National Forest included in the first phase of a timber sale program adaptive management strategy set forth in a 2008 Tongass LRMP Amendment Record of Decision;

Allows young-growth harvest in all phases of the 2008 timber sale program adaptive management strategy, but only outside of roadless areas identified in the 2001 Roadless Rule;

Allows young-growth management in development LUDs and in the Old-Growth Habitat LUD, beach and estuary fringe, and riparian management areas outside of stream buffers, subject to certain conditions and for a specified period of time;

Establishes direction to protect priority watersheds;

Modifies the network of old-growth reserves to maintain their effectiveness; and

Includes new management direction to facilitate renewable energy production.

USDA describes the other changes resulting from the 2016 Tongass Amendment as simply clarifications, corrections of typographical errors, and updates of references to law, regulation, and other mandatory policy direction to reflect the current version of the provisions that have changed since 2008.

Congressional Review Act

CRA, enacted in 1996 to strengthen congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, requires all federal agencies, including independent regulatory agencies, to submit a report on each new rule to both Houses of Congress and to the Comptroller General before it can take effect. The report must contain a copy of the rule, “a concise general statement relating to the rule,” and the rule’s proposed effective date. In addition, the agency must submit to the Comptroller General a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, and information concerning the agency’s actions relevant to specific procedural rulemaking requirements set forth in various statutes and executive orders governing the regulatory process. CRA also established special expedited procedures under which Congress may pass a joint resolution of disapproval that, if enacted into law, overturns the rule.

USDA has not sent a report on the 2016 Tongass Amendment. In its response to us,

USDA stated that “it is the position of the Department of Agriculture that the 2016 Tongass Amendment is not subject to CRA. Accordingly, the amendment will not be submitted pursuant to CRA.”

ANALYSIS

In 1997, we decided whether the Tongass National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan issued May 23, 1997, was a rule under CRA. In that decision, we reviewed CRA’s definition of a rule, found that the Plan fit within that definition, and concluded that it was a rule for CRA purposes. As explained below, we reach the same conclusion with regard to the 2016 Tongass Amendment.

CRA incorporates by reference the definition of “rule” found in section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) which provides, in relevant part:

“‘rule’ means the whole or a part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency”

However, under CRA, the term “rule” does not include:

“(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefor, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

“(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

“(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.”

Consequently, the first step in analyzing whether the 2016 Tongass Amendment is a rule under CRA is to determine whether it meets the definition in section 551 of APA.

The definition has three key components. A rule must (1) be an agency statement, (2) have future effect, and (3) be designed to either implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describe the agency’s organization, procedure, or practice requirements. First, in order to be a rule, the statement must be made by an agency. USDA, the issuer of the 2016 Tongass Amendment, is an agency. The 2016 Tongass Amendment therefore meets the first component of the definition.

Second, the agency statement must have future effect. The 2016 Tongass Amendment is a guide for future forest management activities and establishes a prospective management direction. The text of the Amendment specifically notes that all future plans and activities will be based on this Forest Plan. We therefore conclude that the 2016 Tongass Amendment also meets the second component of the definition.

Third, the statement must be designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describe the agency’s organization, procedure, or practice requirements. The purpose of the 2016 Tongass Amendment, like all forest plans, is to implement the provisions of NFMA and other applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. The Amendment also implements USDA’s policy to transition the Tongass timber program to one based predominantly on the harvest of young growth. It thus meets the third component of the definition and falls within the definition of the term “rule” in section 551 of APA.

USDA argues that the Amendment is not a rule because it does not provide final author-

ization for any activity and does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. It points out that implementing the Amendment necessarily requires additional actions by the Forest Service, and that the Amendment itself neither creates nor takes away any party’s rights or obligations. However, APA does not require that an agency statement provide final authorization for any activity, or that it substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties, to qualify as a rule. Indeed, “the impact of an agency statement upon private parties is relevant only to whether it is the sort of rule that is a rule of procedure . . . not to whether it is a rule at all.” The APA sets forth only the three requirements described above, each of which is met in this instance.

Our analysis now turns to whether the Amendment falls under any of the CRA exceptions. In its response to us, USDA presents alternative arguments that the 2016 Tongass Amendment is a rule of particular applicability or, alternatively, a rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

Rules of Particular Applicability

USDA argues that the 2016 Tongass Amendment is a rule of particular applicability because it applies to a single national forest and, thus, is not a rule for purposes of CRA pursuant to the exception in section 804(3)(a). According to the legislative history of CRA:

“Most rules or other agency actions that grant an approval, license, registration, or similar authority to a particular person or particular entities, or grant or recognize an exemption or relieve a restriction for a particular person or particular entities, or permit new or improved applications of technology for a particular person or particular entities, or allow the manufacture, distribution, sale, or use of a substance or product are exempted under subsection 804(3)(A) from the definition of a rule.”

The legislative history also provides examples of rules of particular applicability such as import and export licenses, individual rate and tariff approvals, wetlands permits, grazing permits, plant licenses or permits, drug and medical device approvals, new source review permits, hunting and fishing take limits, incidental take permits, broadcast licenses, and product approvals. The legislative history of CRA also offers IRS private letter rulings as an example of a rule of particular applicability. In addition to being addressed to a specific person or entity, private letter rulings differ from other IRS guidance and Treasury rules in that the agency is not bound to follow them in its dealings with others even on facts that are analogous. Other IRS guidance and Treasury regulations have legal force in all instances and are binding on the agency in all cases; private letter rules have legal force only with regard to a particular person or entity.

The 2016 Tongass Amendment is not an approval, license, or registration to a particular person or entity. Nor does it grant or recognize an exemption or relieve a restriction for a particular person or entity. While the plan does only apply to the Tongass National Forest and not to other national forests, it applies to “all natural resource management activities;” to all projects approved to take place in the forest; and to all persons or entities that engage in uses permitted by those projects. For instance, every person or entity bidding on or engaged in permitted timber harvesting will be doing so in accordance with the plan. The Amendment applies

to all persons or entities using the forest—not just a particular person or entity. It is binding on agency action in all cases, not with respect to one person or entity.

While there is no case law on the question of general versus particular applicability for purposes of CRA, there is analogous case law interpreting these terms under APA in which courts have held rate setting “addressed to and served upon named persons in accordance with law” to be a type of rule of particular applicability. However, the 2016 Tongass Amendment does not solely set rates and it does not apply to a single entity. It states: “All future plans and activities will be based on this Forest Plan.” Additionally, in our prior decision on the Tongass National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan issued in 1997, we concluded that the Plan was of general applicability since it affected many parties. We therefore conclude that this rule does not fall within the exception for rules of particular applicability.

Rules of Organization, Practice, or Procedure That Do Not Substantially Affect the Rights or Obligations of Non-Agency Parties

USDA maintains that the 2016 Tongass Amendment is exempt from the requirements of CRA as a rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. The Amendment governs where old-growth and young-growth timber harvests are allowed in Tongass. USDA states that the Amendment is narrowly focused on accelerating the transition from a primarily old-growth timber program to a primarily young-growth program and, in doing so, “provides limited modifications to the Tongass LRMP to guide the Tongass National Forest’s procedures and practices going forward.” These changes, it asserts, involve agency procedure and practice relating to the Forest Service’s management of the Tongass National Forest.

The CRA legislative history discussion of this exception is limited, but states that it was modeled on APA, which excludes “rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice” from the requirement that a notice of proposed rulemaking be published in the Federal Register. Courts have applied the APA exception by distinguishing between procedural and substantive rules. A rule is substantive when it “encodes a substantive value judgment or puts a stamp of approval or disapproval on a given type of behavior.” In these cases, courts have focused on whether the agency action has substantive impacts on the regulated community.

For example, the Fifth Circuit in *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Johnson*, held that the proper test of whether a rule is procedural or substantive is whether a “regulation of general applicability has a substantial impact on the regulated industry, or an important class of the members or the products of that industry.” *Phillips Petroleum* concerned oil and gas royalties owed under leases for federal lands administered by the Minerals Management Service (MMS). The court held that an agency Procedure Paper changing the criteria for valuing natural gas liquid products, used to calculate royalties, was a substantive rule subject to APA notice-and-comment rulemaking requirements. The agency argued that the Procedure Paper was a rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice. However, the court rejected this argument, stating: “Although the Procedure Paper would appear to fall squarely within this exemption, for the change effected by the Procedure Paper plainly relates to the internal

practices of MMA procedure, the mere fact that it may guide MMS procedures does not mean that the Procedure Paper is a ‘procedural’ rule for purpose of APA.”

The 2016 Tongass Amendment implements an agency policy to transition from old-growth to new-growth timber harvesting. In doing so, it encodes the agency’s substantive value judgement in favor of this transition and has a substantial impact on the local timber industry. Even accepting USDA’s characterization of the Amendment as involving agency procedure and practice relating to the Forest Service, under the reasoning of *Phillips Petroleum*, the Amendment is not a procedural rule since it has a substantial effect on the regulated industry. Therefore, we conclude that it is not a rule of agency procedure. This is consistent with our prior decision on the Tongass National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan issued in 1997, in which we concluded that the Plan was not a rule of agency procedure due to its substantial effects on non-agency parties.

Relying primarily on the Supreme Court’s decision in *Ohio Forestry Ass’n v. Sierra Club*, USDA specifically argues that the procedural rule exception applies because the 2016 Tongass Amendment does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. At issue in *Ohio Forestry Ass’n* was a Sierra Club challenge to a Land Resource Management Plan for Ohio’s Wayne National Forest on the ground that the plan permitted too much logging and clearcutting. The question decided was whether the rights asserted by the Sierra Club in challenging the plan were ripe for judicial review. The Court explained that the purpose of the ripeness doctrine is:

“to prevent the courts, through avoidance of premature adjudication, from entangling themselves in abstract disagreements over administrative policies, and also to protect the agencies from judicial interference until an administrative decision has been formalized and its effects felt in a concrete way by the challenging parties.”

The court held that the rights asserted by the Sierra Club were not yet ripe for review, and that there would be later stages in the forest management process when plaintiffs could assert those rights to challenge the Forest Service’s decisions.

The issue we decide here, however, is not whether rights asserted by a party to challenge the Amendment are ripe for judicial review. The question here is whether the 2016 Tongass Amendment has a substantial impact on the regulated community such that it is a substantive rather than a procedural rule for purposes of CRA. We have concluded that it has such an impact and thus is a substantive rule. The Supreme Court’s decision is inapposite for CRA purposes, since it is Congress’ exercise of the review procedures in CRA that is in issue, not the ripeness of a party’s right to bring suit challenging administrative action.

CONCLUSION

The 2016 Tongass Amendment is a rule for CRA purposes as it meets the definition of the term “rule” under APA, and none of the CRA exceptions apply.

If you have any questions about this opinion, please contact Robert Cramer, Associate General Counsel, at (202) 512-7227.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN A. POLING,
General Counsel.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

GUNNERS MATE THIRD CLASS JOSEPH GUIO, JR.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Joseph Guio, Jr., a hero who made the ultimate sacrifice saving the lives of his fellow crewmembers aboard the USS *Monaghan* during World War II.

Gunners Mate Third Class Guio was one of the hundreds of men who were lost at sea during Typhoon Cobra, which struck Task Force-38 in December of 1944. Task Force-38 consisted of 7 fleet carriers, 6 escort carriers, 8 battleships, 15 cruisers, and 50 destroyers that had been operating in the Philippine Sea conducting air raids against Japanese airfields.

Survivors of the event reported that Joe freed a raft from the sinking ship and was injured in the process. Regardless, he continued to pull his fellow men to the safety of the raft and saved many lives. Aboard the raft, his grateful comrades tried to comfort Joe in his last moments, and he thanked them for doing so before he passed on.

When the *Monaghan* sank, 256 crewmembers were lost. Twenty held on to the raft for some time, but after days at sea, exhausted, injured, and struggling against 50-foot waves, that number dwindled to six. The USS *Brown* rescued the six survivors 3 days later.

Joe’s body was never recovered, but his name is inscribed on the Tablets of the Missing at the American Cemetery and Memorial in Manila, Philippines. He was 25 years old.

Born in Hollidays Cove in beautiful Hancock County, WV, no one would have expected less from Joe. He died as he lived, helping others with the utmost respect for our home State and our Nation.

West Virginia is great because our people are great—Mountaineers who will always be free. In fact, when visitors come to West Virginia, I jump at the chance to tell them about our wonderful State. We have more veterans per capita than most any State in the Nation. We have fought in more wars, shed more blood, and lost more lives for the cause of freedom than most any State. We have always done the heavy lifting and never complained. We have mined the coal and forged the steel that built the guns, ships, and factories that have protected and continue to protect our country. I am so deeply proud of what our citizens have accomplished and what they will continue to accomplish in the days and years ahead. It is with utmost gratitude that I recognize Joseph Guio, Jr., and all the servicemembers of today and yesterday.

Additionally, I am honored to recognize Joe’s family who have kept his legacy alive—his nephew, Gary Guio, his great-nephews, Mark and David, and the entire family, the Northern Panhandle community, and the surviving crewmembers who have never

forgotten Joe's legacy of service and heroism.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, in recognition of National Forest Products Week, I would like to commend the more than 27,000 men and women who work in the forest products sector in my home State of Michigan.

Taken together, Michigan is home to nearly 200 forest products facilities that run the gamut, from furniture manufacturing to paper mills. With yearly salaries of over \$1.4 billion, these facilities represent one of our State's most significant manufacturing sectors.

Paper and forest products play a vital role in our domestic economy and benefit every American as they go about their daily lives. Additionally, wood construction is an innovative form of climate protection because wood oftentimes replaces competing building materials that require sizeable amounts of fossil fuels to produce. Moreover, wood lowers a building's carbon footprint because it continues to hold carbon absorbed during the growth of the tree, keeping that pollution out of the atmosphere for the life expectancy of the building. As we look to reduce carbon emissions and green our building stock, we ought to look at greater use of innovative wood products in commercial structures.

Similarly, paper and packaging products help all Americans to communicate with each other, teach our kids, and learn new things ourselves. These products preserve and deliver our food, medicine, and other manufactured goods. Whether it is a marriage certificate or a young child's finger painting, these paper products capture some of the most important moments in a person's life. For these reasons and others, I am proud to be a cochair of the Senate's Paper and Packaging Caucus.

I urge all of my Senate colleagues to join me in celebrating National Forest Products Week and to consider the variety of ways this sustainable resource benefits us in our lives. Thank you for the opportunity to recognize the forest products industry's dedicated professionals who work and reside in the great State of Michigan.

REMEMBERING FLOYD MCKINLEY SAYRE, JR.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a friend and colleague, Floyd McKinley Sayre, Jr., who recently departed this life. I came to know Floyd many years ago and interacted with him while serving in the West Virginia House of Delegates, U.S. House of Representatives, and the U.S. Senate. Recent testimonies to his life state that he was "a good man by

all accounts and lived his life in a pursuit of endeavors he felt were right, good and virtuous." Throughout my friendship with Floyd, I found this to be true.

Floyd was born in Beckley, WV, on July 17, 1930. He graduated from Woodrow Wilson High School before going on to West Virginia University, where he was an active member in the Sigma Nu fraternity. After college, he had a successful military career where he served in the Berlin Brigade in Germany, guarding West Berlin during the Cold War. Upon his return, Floyd started a professional career with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that eventually brought him home to West Virginia.

Floyd owned and managed Floyd Sayre's Management Consultants and was the first certified professional executive in West Virginia. He worked hard to bring a certification program to the State and mentored many future executives. As a student of West Virginia politics, he understood how to navigate the halls of the State legislature, where he is remembered as a gentleman and forceful advocate for a better West Virginia.

In 1960, Floyd married his wife, Ruth Ellen Thomas, who was his staunch supporter and companion for his entire career, and together they had three sons, Floyd, Richard, and David. Floyd loved spending time with his family and friends, gardening, bird watching, and rooting for his beloved West Virginia Mountaineers. Floyd was a Rotarian, as well as a Paul Harris Fellow and past president of the Southern Pines, NC, Rotary Club. Floyd was also a member of the church I attend, another community in which he will be sorely missed.

I am honored to have known Floyd and his wife, Ruth, and my thoughts and prayers are with his family. West Virginia owes him a debt of gratitude for his service to the State. I am proud to have called him a friend and fellow Mountaineer.

REMEMBERING JEREMY SHULL

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I would like to honor and pay tribute to my former staffer Jeremy Shull. Jeremy came to my office in 2004 as a fellow. He quickly advanced and became the deputy military legislative assistant in a short period of time. Jeremy was full of life, always had a big smile on his face, and brought a lot of joy into my office. I would like to share a bit about Jeremy's life and family and then about his time in my office.

At the age of only 35, Jeremy fell into the arms of Jesus, doing what he loved: climbing Capitol Peak in Aspen, CO, on August 6. He was the loving husband of 7 years to Jamie and the proud father of 2-month-old, Jack. Jeremy was born in Cincinnati, OH, on March 9, 1982, to his parents, Bob and Linda

Shull, and was raised alongside his two brothers, Ben and Josh. From an early age, Jeremy's love of the outdoors and his leadership skills were apparent to all. He went on to graduate from Perrysburg High School, in Ohio, and Grove City College, in Pennsylvania, where he discovered his love of rugby and international travel.

After college, he made his way to Washington, DC, where he was involved in the Falls Church Fellows Program and worked on Capitol Hill in my office. During this time he met the love of his life, Jamie, at Summer's Best Two Weeks, a Christian sports camp in Boswell, PA, and the two were married in 2010. As a couple, Jeremy and Jamie lived and worked in Washington, DC, Uganda, and went to graduate school at Geneva College in Pennsylvania. In 2014, Jeremy earned his master's degree in counseling and eventually went on to earn his LAC and LPC licenses with concentrations in trauma and addictions.

Shortly after earning their degrees, Jeremy and Jamie moved out west to Parker, CO, to pursue their adventurous dreams. Jeremy worked at a crisis stabilization unit and in other settings where he counseled clients in their worst moments, helping them to create vision and hope for their futures. To quote Jeremy, he served others, "to sustain the weary and help clients overcome internal walls between them and a thriving life." This past May, they welcomed their beautiful son, Jack Ellis, into their family.

Jeremy is remembered by his wife, Jamie, and their 2-month-old son, Jack. He is survived by Bob and Linda Shull of Fairlawn, OH, brother Ben and his wife Emily Shull, and nieces Piper and Scout Shull of Cincinnati, OH, brother Josh Shull of Washington, DC, grandparents Norma Hissong of Bath, OH, Ken and Meg Shull of Seneca, South Carolina, numerous aunts, uncles, and cousins in Ohio and South Carolina, mother and father-in-law Mike and Teri Maurer and brother-in-law Justin Maurer of Washington, DC.

In 2007, Jeremy traveled with me on a CODEL to Ireland, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, France, and Italy. The CODEL was en route to Africa when we had a required crew stop. The stop happened to be only about 45 miles away from where my daughter Molly was teaching and staying with her family. We only had about 24 hours on the ground, and it was meant for a time for us to adjust from jet lag, but Jeremy and I, along with my son-in-law and grandson, drove to the base of Mt. Grappa, which is close to sea level. Four hours later, we reached the top, which was 5,800 feet in elevation. We walked to the World War I monuments at the top of Mt. Grappa and hiked back down.

Later in the trip, when we had a break from our meetings, the delegation divided up and some of my staff

decided to do a little sightseeing in Venice but Jeremy chose to stay back and play soccer with my daughter's kids. In doing so, he gave the rest of the delegation a real gift. Jeremy had been to Venice a few years before and had hidden a €100 note behind a brick in a wall hanging over one of the many canals. He gave us a list of clues as we went to Venice. Instead of sightseeing, we spent the time following the clues Jeremy gave to us and finally discovered the location. When our military escort pulled the brick out of the canal wall, he found the €100 note laying behind it. We took a photo of the note and then placed it back in the wall. We were careful to make sure that nobody saw us replace it. It was a very clever set of clues, and it became the most memorable times to visit Venice. Afterwards, we asked Jeremy why he hid this money in Venice and also in a couple other European cities. He said that one day he wanted to bring his future wife to Europe and take her on a treasure hunt. That was Jeremy. He was overflowing with adventure and very intentional in how he lived out his life of adventure.

Jeremy had a strong faith in Jesus Christ and lived his life to the full. Jeremy was best known for his adventurous spirit, curious nature, intentional relationships, and servant-heart. He was a volunteer firefighter and was devoted to his growing family. He put others first, and in a culture and generation that is more me focused, Jeremy was the opposite, always putting others before himself. I loved Jeremy—his steadfastness, his love for Jesus, and his desire to enjoy the outdoors that God created. He will be missed by everyone who was close to him and who he touched. He will also be missed by me and my office.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GLORIA TANNER

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wish to honor the remarkable life of Senator Gloria Tanner.

Throughout her career, Senator Tanner has excelled in the face of adversity and carried out her work with integrity, strength, grace, and humility. All of these qualities are rooted in a unique authenticity that she possesses, something that is seemingly lacking in today's politics.

Born in Atlanta, GA, in 1934, Senator Tanner witnessed the growth of the civil rights movement firsthand. She rose to become the first African-American woman to serve as a Colorado State senator and the second African American to be elected to a leadership position in the Colorado House of Representatives, where she served for five terms and as the chair of the minority caucus.

In 1974, Senator Tanner received a B.A. in political science and graduated magna cum laude from Metro State University of Denver. She subsequently received a master of arts in urban affairs at the University of Colorado in 1976 and graduated from the American Management Association Program for Women in Top Managerial Positions. She also graduated from the Women in Leadership Program at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and the Leadership College, Executive Education, Keenan-Flagler Business School at University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Senator Tanner became active in politics when she moved to Colorado in 1960 in unison with John F. Kennedy's election. She has served many roles in government, ranging from an administrative assistant to the Office of Hearings and Appeals at the U.S. Department of Interior, the executive assistant to Colorado Lieutenant Governor George L. Brown, to an elected member of the Colorado House of Representatives. In the Colorado House, she has served as chair of the minority caucus. She was also elected president of the National Organization of Black Elected Legislative-Women and served as an executive board member and chairperson of the finance committee of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators. She has also served on the Colorado Black Round Table, as a member of the Women's Forum of Colorado, and finally, as a Colorado State senator.

Senator Tanner succeeded Regis Groff in 1994 and held a seat until 2000. Within her 6 years of service as a Colorado State senator, Senator Tanner sponsored legislation on key issues such as marital discrimination in the workplace and worked tirelessly for civil rights for women and minorities and parental rights for adoptive parents. She was one of six legislators selected to serve on the powerful joint budget committee. In serving on the JBC, Senator Tanner secured a quarter of a million dollars to help restore the town of Dearfield, CO, which was originally created to assist former slaves and their families. She was a strong legislative advocate for women and children throughout her service as a senator.

In retirement, Senator Tanner continues to serve the public. In 2001, she established the Senator Gloria Tanner Leadership and Training Institute for Future Black Women Leaders of Colorado, FBWLOC. Senator Tanner believes the institute is "essential to the well-being and growth of our community" to identify, prepare, educate, and encourage Black women to take on leadership roles in the public and private sectors.

Senator Tanner's contributions to our community and State are abundant and unprecedented. Through all of her life experiences, she has continued to

serve the American people with unwavering integrity and grace. A recipient of the Martin Luther King Humanitarian Award, her success is immeasurable.

We all owe a debt of gratitude and deep respect to Senator Gloria Travis Tanner for her life achievements and service to the people of Colorado. I thank her for her service to Colorado, our Nation, and I wish her the best in her future endeavors.●

2017 IDAHO HOMETOWN HERO MEDALISTS

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the 2017 Idaho Hometown Hero Medalists.

Members of Idaho communities nominate their fellow community members for the Idaho Hometown Hero Medal. The medal honors individuals who are extraordinarily dedicated to hard work, self-improvement, and community service. Drs. Fahim and Naeem Rahim established the Idaho Hometown Hero Medal in 2011 to recognize outstanding Idahoans working for the betterment of our communities.

Ten Idahoans working in various fields are 2017 Hometown Hero Medal recipients, and I understand that this year special emphasis is being placed on those who "Overcome Adversity" as the 2017 theme of the awards. Century High School principal Sheryl Brockett, of Pocatello, is being honored for her two decades of dedicated service to educating youth in which she also led her school to excel in providing educational opportunities. Dr. Jacob DeLaRosa, a cardiothoracic surgeon from Pocatello, overcame significant injuries from a car accident to walk again, continue providing surgical care, and significantly contribute to the community by expanding area surgical operations. Lee Hammett, president of the board of directors for the Community Dinner Table, is being recognized for his extensive work to reduce hunger and loneliness and helping to bridge cultural and religious differences in Bingham County. Owner of Barrie's Ski and Sports Store Barrie Bennett Hunt, of Pocatello, received the medal for helping to provide others with quality access to the outdoors, inspiring active lifestyles, and giving considerably to his community, while also overcoming serious health challenges.

Executive director of the Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence Kelly Miller, of Boise, is a statewide leader in ending violence and has made a considerable difference in assisting Idaho families. Manager of Morgan Construction Matt Morgan, of Idaho Falls, is honored for his courageous voice in helping advance awareness of the sexual abuse of children and his support of others who have faced child abuse, such as he did. His efforts

include founding “Building Hope Today.” World War II veteran Anton Newman served in the U.S. Army, assisting with recovery after the Hiroshima bombing, has farmed in Cambridge, and continues to be actively involved in the community encouraging and inspiring others while overcoming considerable health challenges. Retired U.S. Army COL Craig W. Nickisch, of Chubbuck, served our Nation with distinction in Central America, Europe, and Southeast Asia and continues to serve others in various roles locally and internationally. Shoshone-Bannock Tribe member and the Tribe’s public affairs manager Randy’L Teton overcame adversity to reach educational goals and has encouraged Native American education, helping educate others about the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe’s history, culture, government, and economic projects. Eric Thomas, of Fremont County, has not let his disability and multiple health concerns stand in the way of him assisting others as an active member of Fremont County Search and Rescue for the past nearly 30 years.

These 10 remarkable Idahoans are now counted among the 66 Idahoans recognized through the Hometown Hero Award since its inception and the countless service-focused Idahoans who have not yet been honored but give immeasurably every day. I thank the Rahims, the award’s committee members, the cosponsors, volunteers, and other organizations supporting this honor for their work to shine a spotlight on exceptionalism in our communities.

Joining in recognizing the good works of Idaho’s Hometown Heroes is an honor. I also thank the award recipients for leading by example in our communities. You may never know how many others you inspire to go above and beyond in assisting others and improving our communities, but there is no doubt you are leaving a lasting, positive mark in many lives. Congratulations to the 2017 Hometown Hero Award recipients on your achievements, and thank you for your efforts to better our communities.●

TRIBUTE TO RUSTY TALBOT

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, this month, I am proud to recognize Rusty Talbot, of Sugar Hill, NH, as our Granite Stater of the Month for his dedication to supporting our vibrant North Country communities.

As the founder and owner of the North Country Climbing Center, Rusty and his wife have built a small business that has been described as an “inclusive community,” where he strives to create a welcoming environment for both experienced climbers and beginners. He has worked diligently to engage with various organizations throughout the community, like the

Adaptive Sports Partners of the North Country, which empowers individuals who experience disabilities to experience rock climbing.

Rusty is also involved with local business and entrepreneurship groups, including the Franconia Notch Regional Chamber of Commerce, the North of the Notch Young Professionals Network, the Littleton Rotary Club, and the Bethlehem Colonial Theatre. His commitment to supporting the local economy and other small businesses, in addition to his own successful climbing center, earned him Stay Work Play’s Young Professional of the Year award. As New Hampshire continues to work to attract young people, his nominator noted that Rusty has “reminded us why we chose to live and play in northern New Hampshire.”

In addition to running his business, Rusty also dedicates his time to the Sugar Hill Fire Department, where he is a volunteer firefighter, and the Pemigewasset Valley Search and Rescue Team, for which he is a lieutenant. Earlier this year, Rusty participated in the successful search and rescue effort for a hiker who had been missing in the White Mountain National Forest for days before he was found. In describing his motivation for volunteering for these critical public safety entities, Rusty says, “In this community, people help each other. Not because it’s required or because it’s our job to do so, but because we are all in this together.” That pervasive sense of selflessness and community solidarity is what makes the Granite State unique.

Throughout New Hampshire, citizens just like Rusty give back to their community, look out for their neighbors, and do what they can to help make our beautiful State a stronger place so we can all grow and thrive together. Rusty embodies the all-hands-on-deck spirit that we all strive to fulfill, and I am honored to recognize him as our Granite Stater of the Month for October.●

REMEMBERING FREDERICK AND AMY CAMPBELL

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor two titans of military and community service, who will be laid to rest forever in Arlington National Cemetery.

Frederick Hollister Campbell and Amy Strohm Campbell were, together, a force to be reckoned with.

Fred served the United States in the Marine Corps during World War II, the Korean war and the Vietnam war—one of only 46,000 Americans to fight in three wars. Fred was a member of the American Legion Post 27 in Missoula, MT.

Amy earned a master’s degree and began a teaching career during a time when few women did either. She became active in the Navy-Marine Corps Wives, Daughters of the American Rev-

olution, and the Philanthropic Educational Organization and was a life member of both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and American Legion Auxiliaries.

At the Battle of Iwo Jima, Fred dug trenches while taking heavy Japanese fire from the mountains above. His bravery saved the lives of 250 of his fellow marines and earned him the Navy Commendation Medal. He fought in the Battle of Okinawa and was a part of the reconstruction effort in Japan after the war ended. Fred picked up the language and enjoyed friendships with the locals, spurred on by a shared love of stamp collecting.

During law school, Fred was selected for officer’s candidate school. His transition from private to officer earned him the informal title of a mustang in military circles. Fred reenlisted for Active Duty to serve in the Korean war.

It was during this period of service that he met Amy on a blind date at a square dance.

They danced through life together for 61 years. The life they built brought them a treasured daughter, Susan, and many trips to Europe and one voyage through the Panama Canal.

Fred continued his career as an attorney for the Marine Corps, and his service culminated with a third enlistment during which he served in Vietnam. He retired from the U.S. Marines as a lieutenant colonel after 25 years, 2 months, and 17 days. Amy and Susan were able to fill a large shadowbox of Fred’s medals as a gift for his 85th birthday.

Fred and Amy didn’t slow down once they hit retirement. Fred earned a Ph.D. in American history at the age of 73. He taught at Colorado College and the University of Colorado for 13 years. Amy continued her involvement in service and military organizations in Colorado, Montana, and California.

Fred and Amy enriched the lives of friends, family, and strangers alike. Now, they will rest forever in Arlington near the statue commemorating the battle of Iwo Jima, where Fred proved his mettle by saving 250 fellow marines’ lives 72 years ago.

It is my honor to present their story today.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I commend Lt. Col. Frederick Hollister Campbell and Amy Strohm Campbell for their lives of service to our Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. JONATHAN L. WEAVER

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate Rev. Dr. Jonathan L. Weaver, pastor of the Greater Mt. Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church, on his 30th pastoral anniversary. Since 1988, Reverend Weaver has served with vision and distinction and has dedicated

himself to empowering his parishioners and people throughout our community.

Reverend Weaver is an outstanding example of what it means to be engaged in a community. Under his leadership, the Greater Mt. Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church has initiated numerous innovative programs on critical issues, including domestic violence prevention, economic empowerment, and anti-hunger. In addition, Reverend Weaver's sense of community transcends the borders of the United States. He has led mission trips to Africa, engaging in medical mission projects in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Reverend Weaver currently serves as national president of the Collective Empowerment Group, Inc., CEG, an ecumenical association comprised of nearly 500 churches across the country. CEG engages in economic empowerment initiatives focused on financial literacy, education, healthcare, homeownership preservation, and public safety through partnerships with banks and other businesses in their communities.

In 2015, Reverend Weaver became board chairman of Industrial Bank, an organization that has been recognized for its contributions to the growth and development of the greater Washington, DC, metropolitan area since 1934. He holds a bachelor's degree in business administration from Washington University in St. Louis, MO, and an MBA from Harvard University. Reverend Weaver has been married to Pamela Weaver for 30 years and has two children, Jamie Davis and Megan Holland, and four grandchildren.

Over the last 30 years, Reverend Weaver has personified the Greater Mt. Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church's traditions of service and leadership. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest gratitude and appreciation to Reverend Weaver for his 30 years of service to the Greater Mt. Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church and to our community.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:54 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 504. An act to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3328. An act to require a study regarding security measures and equipment at Cuba's airports, require the standardization of Federal Air Marshal Service agreements, require efforts to raise international aviation security standards, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3551. An act to amend the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 to reauthorize the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4010. An act to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States and title 28, United States Code, to enhance compliance with requests for information pursuant to legislative power under Article I of the Constitution, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4038. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reassert article I authorities over the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 190. An act to provide for consideration of the extension under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of nonapplication of No-Load Mode energy efficiency standards to certain security or life safety alarms or surveillance systems, and for other purposes.

S. 585. An act to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

S. 920. An act to establish a National Clinical Care Commission.

S. 1617. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 77 North in Sarita, Texas, as the "Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint".

H.R. 1616. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2989. An act to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3328. An act to require a study regarding security measures and equipment at Cuba's airports, require the standardization of Federal Air Marshal Service agreements, require efforts to raise international aviation security standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 3551. An act to amend the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 to reauthorize the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4010. An act to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States and title 28, United States Code, to enhance compliance with requests for information pursuant to legislative power under Article I of the Constitution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4038. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reassert article I authorities over the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 24, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 190. An act to provide for consideration of the extension under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of nonapplication of No-Load Mode energy efficiency standards to certain security or life safety alarms or surveillance systems, and for other purposes.

S. 585. An act to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

S. 920. An act to establish a National Clinical Care Commission.

S. 1617. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 77 North in Sarita, Texas, as the "Javier Vega, Jr. Border Patrol Checkpoint".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3233. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Cheyenne, WY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3234. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace, Soldotna, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9588)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3235. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mineral Point,

WI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0181)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3236. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; New Bern, NC" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0230)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3237. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hot Springs, VA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9453)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3238. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wellsboro, PA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0289)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3239. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Windsor Locks, CT" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-0398)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3240. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ellendale, ND" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0646)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3241. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wellington, KS" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0177)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3242. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lemoore NAS, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0219)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3243. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Columbia, MS"

((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0277)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3244. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Brainerd, MN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0188)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3245. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wayne, NE" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0287)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3246. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Midland, TX and Establishment of Class E Airspace, Odessa, TX and Midland, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9481)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3247. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Louisiana Towns; Leesville, LA; and Patterson, LA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0183)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3248. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Temporary Restricted Area R-5602; Fort Sill, OK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9591)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3249. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Restricted Area R-2306F; Yuma Proving Ground, AZ" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-7055)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3250. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Restricted Areas R-3004A and R-3004B and Establishment of R-3004C; Fort Gordon, GA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0886)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3251. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. 31156)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3252. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Minimum Sound Requirements for Hybrid and Electric Vehicles" (RIN2127-AK93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3253. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Subsistence Taking of Northern Fur Seals on the Pribilof Islands; Final Annual Subsistence Harvest Levels for 2017-2019" (RIN0648-BG71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3254. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Student Loan Ombudsman; to the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3255. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wool Products Labeling; Fur Products Labeling; Textile Fiber Products Identification" ((RIN3084-AB29) (RIN3084-AB27)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3256. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment of Transactions in which Federal Financial Assistance is Provided" (RIN1545-BJ08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3257. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017 National Pool" (Rev. Proc. 2017-54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3258. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program" (RIN1840-AD19) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3259. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation

Crowdfunding and Regulation A Relief and Assistance for Victims of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria" (17 CFR Part 227) (17 CFR Part 230)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3260. A communication from the Executive Director of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Advisory Committee's Annual Report on Institutional Quality and Integrity for Fiscal Year 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3261. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3262. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3263. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3264. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3265. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of AB-CHMINACA, AB-PINACA and THJ-221 Into Schedule I" (Docket No. DEA-402) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 20, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3266. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Removal of Naldemedine From Control" (Docket No. DEA-402) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 20, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-122. A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Marquette County, Michigan opposing slashing federal funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-123. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to a federal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

*Jeffrey Gerrish, of Maryland, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and Industrial Competitiveness), with the rank of Ambassador.

*Gregory Doud, of Kansas, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.

*Jason Kearns, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring December 16, 2024.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 1995. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1996. A bill to require Federal agencies to address environmental justice, to require consideration of cumulative impacts in certain permitting decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1997. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to protect privacy rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 1998. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to reduce county yield disparities for agriculture risk coverage; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1999. A bill to provide for further comprehensive research at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke on unruptured intracranial aneurysms; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 2000. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to improve transparency under the national primary drinking water regulations for lead and copper, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 2001. A bill to establish a State public option through Medicaid to provide Americans with the choice of a high-quality, low-cost health insurance plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 2002. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide whistleblower protections for employees of contractors of elements of the intelligence community, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. Res. 301. A resolution designating the week beginning on October 22, 2017, as "National Chemistry Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHELBY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 302. A resolution authorizing limited still photography of the Senate Wing of the United States Capitol and authorizing the release of preexisting photographs of the Senate Chamber and Senate Wing of the United States Capitol for a book on the history of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 221

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 221, a bill to allow a State to submit a declaration of intent to the Secretary of Education to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of students.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 998

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 998, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to protect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes.

S. 1042

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1042, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude Segal Americorps Education Awards and related awards from income.

S. 1110

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Min-

nesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1110, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes.

S. 1113

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1152

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1152, a bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 1400

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes.

S. 1558

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1558, a bill to amend section 203 of Public Law 94-305 to ensure proper authority for the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1559

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1559, a bill to ensure a complete analysis of the potential impacts of rules on small entities.

S. 1706

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1706, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1756

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1756, a bill to improve the processes by which environmental documents are prepared and permits and applications are processed and regulated by Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1764

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1764, a bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana.

S. 1808

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1808, a bill to extend temporarily the Federal Perkins Loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 1850

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1850, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1893, a bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes.

S. 1927

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1927, a bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness.

S. 1960

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1960, a bill to repeal the amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016.

S. 1979

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1979, a bill to block the implementation of certain presidential actions that restrict individuals from certain countries from entering the United States.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 211

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 211, a resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

S. RES. 245

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 245, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 291

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 291, a resolution affirming the historical connection of the Jewish people to the ancient and sacred city of Jerusalem and condemning efforts at the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to deny Judaism's millennia-old historical, religious, and cultural ties to Jerusalem.

AMENDMENT NO. 1576

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1576 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2266, a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 301—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 22, 2017, AS “NATIONAL CHEMISTRY WEEK”

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 301

Whereas chemistry is the science of basic units of matter and, consequently, plays a role in every aspect of human life;

Whereas chemistry has broad applications, including food science, soil science, water quality, energy, sustainability, medicine, and electronics;

Whereas the science of chemistry is vital to improving the quality of human life and plays an important role in addressing critical global challenges;

Whereas innovations in chemistry continue to spur economic growth and job creation and have applications for a wide range of industries;

Whereas National Chemistry Week is part of a broader vision to improve human life through chemistry and to advance the chemistry enterprise and the practitioners of that enterprise for the benefit of communities and the environment;

Whereas the purpose of National Chemistry Week is to reach the public with educational messages about chemistry in order to foster greater understanding of and appreciation for the applications and benefits of chemistry;

Whereas National Chemistry Week strives to stimulate the interest of young people, including women and underrepresented groups, in enthusiastically studying science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and in pursuing science-related careers that lead to innovations and major scientific breakthroughs;

Whereas National Chemistry Week highlights many of the everyday uses of chemistry, including in food, dyes and pigments, plastics, soaps and detergents, health products, and energy technologies;

Whereas the theme of the 30th annual National Chemistry Week is “Chemistry Rocks!”; and

Whereas students who participate in National Chemistry Week deserve recognition and support for their efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 22, 2017, as “National Chemistry Week”;

(2) supports the goals of and welcomes the participants in the 30th annual National Chemistry Week;

(3) recognizes the need to promote the fields of science, including chemistry, technology, engineering, and mathematics and to encourage youth to pursue careers in these fields; and

(4) commends the American Chemical Society and the partners of that society for organizing and convening events and activities surrounding National Chemistry Week each year.

SENATE RESOLUTION 302—AUTHORIZING LIMITED STILL PHOTOGRAPHY OF THE SENATE WING OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL AND AUTHORIZING THE RELEASE OF PREEXISTING PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE SENATE CHAMBER AND SENATE WING OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL FOR A BOOK ON THE HISTORY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHELBY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 302

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF TAKING OF STILL PHOTOGRAPHY OF THE SENATE WING AND AUTHORIZING THE RELEASE OF PREEXISTING PHOTOGRAPHS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—During the period beginning on the date of adoption of this resolution and ending on January 31, 2018, with respect to an individual or entity entering into a memorandum of understanding described in subsection (d), and subject to such memorandum—

(1) paragraph 1 of rule IV of the Rules for the Regulation of the Senate Wing of the

United States Capitol and Senate Office Buildings (prohibiting the taking of pictures in the Senate Chamber) is temporarily suspended for the release of a limited number of preexisting photographs of the Senate Chamber; and

(2) taking a limited number of pictures shall be permitted in the Senate Wing of the United States Capitol and in Senate Office Buildings.

(b) **LIMITATION ON USE OF IMAGES.**—The pictures taken under subsection (a) may only be used for production of a book on the history of the Senate.

(c) **ARRANGEMENTS.**—The Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol shall, as appropriate, make the necessary arrangements to carry out this resolution, including such arrangements as are necessary to ensure that the taking of pictures under this resolution does not disrupt any proceeding of the Senate.

(d) **PRODUCTION AGREEMENT.**—The Majority Leader of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the Senate, and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly enter into a memorandum of understanding with an individual or entity seeking to take photographs and make use of preexisting photographs for a book on the history of the Senate to formalize an agreement on conditions, locations, and times for taking such photographs and the use of the photographs taken under this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1577. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. FRANKEN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 304, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services.

SA 1578. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mrs. ERNST) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 234, recognizing the Sailors and Marines who sacrificed their lives for ship and shipmates while fighting the devastating 1967 fire onboard USS Forrestal and, during the week of the 50th anniversary of the tragic event, commemorating the efforts of those who survived.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1577. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. FRANKEN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 304, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Patient Access to Emergency Medications Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

“(j) **EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES THAT ADMINISTER CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.**—

“(1) **REGISTRATION.**—For the purpose of enabling emergency medical services professionals to administer controlled substances

in schedule II, III, IV, or V to ultimate users receiving emergency medical services in accordance with the requirements of this subsection, the Attorney General—

“(A) shall register an emergency medical services agency if the agency submits an application demonstrating it is authorized to conduct such activity under the laws of each State in which the agency practices; and

“(B) may deny an application for such registration if the Attorney General determines that the issuance of such registration would be inconsistent with the requirements of this subsection or the public interest based on the factors listed in subsection (f).

“(2) OPTION FOR SINGLE REGISTRATION.—In registering an emergency medical services agency pursuant to paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall allow such agency the option of a single registration in each State where the agency administers controlled substances in lieu of requiring a separate registration for each location of the emergency medical services agency.

“(3) HOSPITAL-BASED AGENCY.—If a hospital-based emergency medical services agency is registered under subsection (f), the agency may use the registration of the hospital to administer controlled substances in accordance with this subsection without being registered under this subsection.

“(4) ADMINISTRATION OUTSIDE PHYSICAL PRESENCE OF MEDICAL DIRECTOR OR AUTHORIZING MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL.—Emergency medical services professionals of a registered emergency medical services agency may administer controlled substances in schedule II, III, IV, or V outside the physical presence of a medical director or authorizing medical professional in the course of providing emergency medical services if the administration is—

“(A) authorized by the law of the State in which it occurs; and

“(B) pursuant to—

“(i) a standing order that is issued and adopted by one or more medical directors of the agency, including any such order that may be developed by a specific State authority; or

“(ii) a verbal order that is—

“(I) issued in accordance with a policy of the agency; and

“(II) provided by a medical director or authorizing medical professional in response to a request by the emergency medical services professional with respect to a specific patient—

“(aa) in the case of a mass casualty incident; or

“(bb) to ensure the proper care and treatment of a specific patient.

“(5) DELIVERY.—A registered emergency medical services agency may deliver controlled substances from a registered location of the agency to an unregistered location of the agency only if the agency—

“(A) designates the unregistered location for such delivery; and

“(B) notifies the Attorney General at least 30 days prior to first delivering controlled substances to the unregistered location.

“(6) STORAGE.—A registered emergency medical services agency may store controlled substances—

“(A) at a registered location of the agency;

“(B) at any designated location of the agency or in an emergency services vehicle situated at a registered or designated location of the agency; or

“(C) in an emergency medical services vehicle used by the agency that is—

“(i) traveling from, or returning to, a registered or designated location of the agency

in the course of responding to an emergency; or

“(ii) otherwise actively in use by the agency under circumstances that provide for security of the controlled substances consistent with the requirements established by regulations of the Attorney General.

“(7) NO TREATMENT AS DISTRIBUTION.—The delivery of controlled substances by a registered emergency medical services agency pursuant to this subsection shall not be treated as distribution for purposes of section 308.

“(8) RESTOCKING OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES VEHICLES AT A HOSPITAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (13)(J), a registered emergency medical services agency may receive controlled substances from a hospital for purposes of restocking an emergency medical services vehicle following an emergency response, and without being subject to the requirements of section 308, provided all of the following conditions are satisfied:

“(A) The registered or designated location of the agency where the vehicle is primarily situated maintains a record of such receipt in accordance with paragraph (9).

“(B) The hospital maintains a record of such delivery to the agency in accordance with section 307.

“(C) If the vehicle is primarily situated at a designated location, such location notifies the registered location of the agency within 72 hours of the vehicle receiving the controlled substances.

“(9) MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A registered emergency medical services agency shall maintain records in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of section 307 of all controlled substances that are received, administered, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to the agency's registration, without regard to subsection 307(c)(1)(B).

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Such records—

“(i) shall include records of deliveries of controlled substances between all locations of the agency; and

“(ii) shall be maintained, whether electronically or otherwise, at each registered and designated location of the agency where the controlled substances involved are received, administered, or otherwise disposed of.

“(10) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—A registered emergency medical services agency, under the supervision of a medical director, shall be responsible for ensuring that—

“(A) all emergency medical services professionals who administer controlled substances using the agency's registration act in accordance with the requirements of this subsection;

“(B) the recordkeeping requirements of paragraph (9) are met with respect to a registered location and each designated location of the agency;

“(C) the applicable physical security requirements established by regulation of the Attorney General are complied with wherever controlled substances are stored by the agency in accordance with paragraph (6); and

“(D) the agency maintains, at a registered location of the agency, a record of the standing orders issued or adopted in accordance with paragraph (9).

“(11) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General may issue regulations—

“(A) specifying, with regard to delivery of controlled substances under paragraph (5)—

“(i) the types of locations that may be designated under such paragraph; and

“(ii) the manner in which a notification under paragraph (5)(B) must be made;

“(B) specifying, with regard to the storage of controlled substances under paragraph (6), the manner in which such substances must be stored at registered and designated locations, including in emergency medical service vehicles; and

“(C) addressing the ability of hospitals, emergency medical services agencies, registered locations, and designated locations to deliver controlled substances to each other in the event of—

“(i) shortages of such substances;

“(ii) a public health emergency; or

“(iii) a mass casualty event.

“(12) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

“(A) to limit the authority vested in the Attorney General by other provisions of this title to take measures to prevent diversion of controlled substances; or

“(B) to override the authority of any State to regulate the provision of emergency medical services consistent with this subsection.

“(13) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(A) The term ‘authorizing medical professional’ means an emergency or other physician, or another medical professional (including an advanced practice registered nurse or physician assistant)—

“(i) who is registered under this Act;

“(ii) who is acting within the scope of the registration; and

“(iii) whose scope of practice under a State license or certification includes the ability to provide verbal orders.

“(B) The term ‘designated location’ means a location designated by an emergency medical services agency under paragraph (5).

“(C) The term ‘emergency medical services’ means emergency medical response and emergency mobile medical services provided outside of a fixed medical facility.

“(D) The term ‘emergency medical services agency’ means an organization providing emergency medical services, including such an organization that—

“(i) is governmental (including fire-based and hospital-based agencies), nongovernmental (including hospital-based agencies), private, or volunteer-based;

“(ii) provides emergency medical services by ground, air, or otherwise; and

“(iii) is authorized by the State in which the organization is providing such services to provide emergency medical care, including the administering of controlled substances, to members of the general public on an emergency basis.

“(E) The term ‘emergency medical services professional’ means a health care professional (including a nurse, paramedic, or emergency medical technician) licensed or certified by the State in which the professional practices and credentialed by a medical director of the respective emergency medical services agency to provide emergency medical services within the scope of the professional's State license or certification.

“(F) The term ‘emergency medical services vehicle’ means an ambulance, fire apparatus, supervisor truck, or other vehicle used by an emergency medical services agency for the purpose of providing or facilitating emergency medical care and transport or transporting controlled substances to and from the registered and designated locations.

“(G) The term ‘hospital-based’ means, with respect to an agency, owned or operated by a hospital.

“(H) The term ‘medical director’ means a physician who is registered under subsection (f) and provides medical oversight for an emergency medical services agency.

“(I) The term ‘medical oversight’ means supervision of the provision of medical care by an emergency medical services agency.

“(J) The term ‘registered emergency medical services agency’ means—

“(i) an emergency medical services agency that is registered pursuant to this subsection; or

“(ii) a hospital-based emergency medical services agency that is covered by the registration of the hospital under subsection (f).

“(K) The term ‘registered location’ means a location that appears on the certificate of registration issued to an emergency medical services agency under this subsection or subsection (f), which shall be where the agency receives controlled substances from distributors.

“(L) The term ‘specific State authority’ means a governmental agency or other such authority, including a regional oversight and coordinating body, that, pursuant to State law or regulation, develops clinical protocols regarding the delivery of emergency medical services in the geographic jurisdiction of such agency or authority within the State that may be adopted by medical directors.

“(M) The term ‘standing order’ means a written medical protocol in which a medical director determines in advance the medical criteria that must be met before administering controlled substances to individuals in need of emergency medical services.

“(N) The term ‘verbal order’ means an oral directive that is given through any method of communication including by radio or telephone, directly to an emergency medical services professional, to contemporaneously administer a controlled substance to individuals in need of emergency medical services outside the physical presence of the medical director or authorizing medical professional.”.

SA 1578. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mrs. ERNST) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 234, recognizing the Sailors and Marines who sacrificed their lives for ship and shipmates while fighting the devastating 1967 fire on-board USS *Forrestal* and, during the week of the 50th anniversary of the tragic event, commemorating the efforts of those who survived; as follows:

In paragraph (2) of the seventh whereas clause, strike “more than”.

Strike the third whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas, on July 28, 1967, during an underway replenishment, the crew of USS *Forrestal* unloaded deteriorated bombs, which were more vulnerable to explosion at high temperatures;

Whereas, on July 29, 1967, the ordnance load for the strike was changed at the request of the crew of USS *Forrestal* to expend the inventory of the newly unloaded older bombs as soon as possible;

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 24, 2017, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: David J. Ryder, of New Jersey, to be Director of the United States Mint, Department of the Treasury, and Hester Maria Peirce, of Ohio, and Robert J. Jackson, Jr., of New York, both to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 24, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 to consider nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 24, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 to consider nominations of: Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 24, 2017, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Assessing U.S. Policy towards Burma: Geopolitical, Economic, and Humanitarian Considerations.”

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 24, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-219 to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND COAST GUARD

The Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 24, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 to conduct a hearing entitled “Reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act: Fisheries Science”.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, and Public Law 106-292, reappoints and appoints the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: the Honorable ORRIN G. HATCH of Utah, the Honorable MARCO RUBIO of Florida, and the Honorable TIM SCOTT of South Carolina.

The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to the provi-

sions of Public Law 114-323, appoints the following individuals to serve as members of the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission: Juan S. Gonzalez of the District of Columbia and Douglas M. Fraser of Florida.

EXCLUDING POWER SUPPLY CIRCUITS, DRIVERS, AND DEVICES FROM ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR EXTERNAL POWER SUPPLIES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 97, S. 226.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 226) to exclude power supply circuits, drivers, and devices designed to be connected to, and power, light-emitting diodes or organic light-emitting diodes providing illumination or ceiling fans using direct current motors from energy conservation standards for external power supplies.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 226) was passed, as follows:

S. 226

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPLICATION OF ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS TO CERTAIN EXTERNAL POWER SUPPLIES.

(a) DEFINITION OF EXTERNAL POWER SUPPLY.—Section 321(36)(A) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291(36)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph designation and all that follows through “The term” and inserting the following:

“(A) EXTERNAL POWER SUPPLY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘external power supply’ does not include a power supply circuit, driver, or device that is designed exclusively to be connected to, and power—

“(I) light-emitting diodes providing illumination;

“(II) organic light-emitting diodes providing illumination; or

“(III) ceiling fans using direct current motors.”.

(b) STANDARDS FOR LIGHTING POWER SUPPLY CIRCUITS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 340(2)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6311(2)(B)) is amended by striking clause (v) and inserting the following:

“(v) electric lights and lighting power supply circuits;”.

(2) **ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARD FOR CERTAIN EQUIPMENT.**—Section 342 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6313) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **LIGHTING POWER SUPPLY CIRCUITS.**—If the Secretary, acting pursuant to section 341(b), includes as a covered equipment solid state lighting power supply circuits, drivers, or devices described in section 321(36)(A)(ii), the Secretary may prescribe under this part, not earlier than 1 year after the date on which a test procedure has been prescribed, an energy conservation standard for such equipment.”.

(c) **TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**—

(1) Section 321(6)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291(6)(B)) is amended by striking “(19)” and inserting “(20)”.

(2) Section 324 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294) is amended by striking “(19)” each place it appears in each of subsections (a)(3), (b)(1)(B), (b)(3), and (b)(5) and inserting “(20)”.

(3) Section 325(l) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(l)) is amended by striking “paragraph (19)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraph (20)”.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING PATIENT ACCESS TO EMERGENCY MEDICATIONS ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 304 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 304) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Cassidy substitute amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1577) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 304), as amended, was passed.

RECOGNIZING THE SAILORS AND MARINES WHO SACRIFICED THEIR LIVES WHILE FIGHTING THE DEVASTATING 1967 FIRE ONBOARD USS FORRESTAL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 234.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 234) recognizing the Sailors and Marines who sacrificed their lives for ship and shipmates while fighting the devastating 1967 fire onboard USS Forrestal and, during the week of the 50th anniversary of the tragic event, commemorating the efforts of those who survived.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the Ernst amendment to the preamble be considered and agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 234) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1578) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

In paragraph (2) of the seventh whereas clause, strike “more than”.

Strike the third whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas, on July 28, 1967, during an underway replenishment, the crew of USS Forrestal unloaded deteriorated bombs, which were more vulnerable to explosion at high temperatures;

Whereas, on July 29, 1967, the ordnance load for the strike was changed at the request of the crew of USS Forrestal to expend the inventory of the newly unloaded older bombs as soon as possible;

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 234

Whereas in 1967, the ongoing naval bombing campaign against North Vietnam from Yankee Station in the Gulf of Tonkin was the most intense and sustained air attack operation in the history of the United States Navy;

Whereas in June 1967, USS Forrestal and Carrier Air Wing Seventeen departed Norfolk, Virginia, for duty in the Gulf of Tonkin;

Whereas, on July 28, 1967, during an underway replenishment, the crew of USS Forrestal unloaded deteriorated bombs, which were more vulnerable to explosion at high temperatures;

Whereas, on July 29, 1967, the ordnance load for the strike was changed at the request of the crew of USS Forrestal to expend the inventory of the newly unloaded older bombs as soon as possible;

Whereas despite safety precautions taken by the crew, a devastating fire erupted on USS Forrestal after—

(1) an electrical surge in a parked aircraft caused the aircraft to fire a Zuni rocket that ruptured a fuel tank on another aircraft; and

(2) the burning fuel ignited a chain reaction of 9 bomb explosions on the flight deck;

Whereas the explosions destroyed multiple aircraft and tore massive holes in the armored flight deck of USS Forrestal, and burning fuel dripped into the living quarters of the crew and the below-decks aircraft hangar;

Whereas for 18 hours, Sailors and Marines on USS Forrestal, assisted by others from accompanying destroyers, fought to bring the fire under control while hospital corpsmen navigated the mangled flight deck and tended to the wounded; and

Whereas the fire onboard USS Forrestal ultimately—

(1) left 134 men dead and 161 men severely injured;

(2) destroyed 21 aircraft; and

(3) caused USS Forrestal to terminate its support to the fight in Vietnam and return to Norfolk, Virginia, for repairs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that—

(A) if not for the heroic actions of the crew of USS Forrestal, the consequences of the fire would have been far more devastating to the Sailors and Marines onboard and the aircraft carrier itself; and

(B) the selfless sacrifices of those who came to the rescue of fellow shipmates and USS Forrestal represent, and are consistent with, the highest traditions of the United States Navy;

(2) commemorates the 50th anniversary of the USS Forrestal fire; and

(3) expresses gratitude to the Sailors and Marines who served aboard USS Forrestal for their faithful service.

NATIONAL CHEMISTRY WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 301, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 301) designating the week beginning October 22, 2017, as “National Chemistry Week.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 301) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AUTHORIZING LIMITED STILL PHOTOGRAPHY OF THE SENATE WING OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 302, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 302) authorizing limited still photography of the Senate Wing of the United States Capitol and authorizing the release of preexisting photographs of the Senate Chamber and Senate Wing of the United States Capitol for a book on the history of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 302) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 25; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of Proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Palk nomination, with the time until the cloture vote equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator FRANKEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota.

REMEMBERING PAUL WELLSTONE

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to remember and celebrate the

life of my friend, Senator Paul Wellstone.

Paul led a lot of fights in the Senate on behalf of working families and those without a voice. He didn't back down even when a fight seemed unwinnable. He told voters exactly what he believed even when it wasn't popular. It was by taking such positions that Minnesotans, whether they agreed with him or not, always knew where he stood.

In the final days of the 2002 campaign, he told Minnesotans:

I don't represent the big oil companies, I don't represent the big pharmaceutical companies . . . they already have great representation in Washington. It's the rest of the people that need it. I represent the people of Minnesota.

But Paul also knew full well that standing up to powerful interests could have steep political costs. His career in the Senate was bookended by votes on going to war in Iraq. Both of his votes were unpopular, but Paul stood on principle, not on politics. His maiden speech, the first speech he gave as a Senator, was in opposition to the first Gulf war, and one of the last Senate votes he cast was against the second war in Iraq.

He was facing a tough reelection challenge at the time of his vote, and he knew it might cost him his seat, and he told friends so. But to have voted otherwise, he said, would have violated the principles that guided his career. So he voted his conscience and put political considerations aside, just as he did throughout his time in public office.

Then, just 11 days before election day, his plane went down, taking not only Paul and Sheila, his wife, but their daughter Marcia, campaign staffers Tom Lapic, Mary McEvoy, and Will McLaughlin, as well as pilots Richard Conry and Michael Guess.

Since coming to the Senate, I have learned how well regarded Paul was around the Capitol, not only by Senators from both sides of the aisle but also by Capitol police officers, whom he knew by name, and the elevator operators, for whom he always made time.

Paul's legislative work continues to make a profound difference in the lives of millions of Americans. Among his accomplishments are his pioneering efforts, along with Republican Senator Pete Domenici of New Mexico, on mental health parity, which ensures that copays and deductibles for addiction and mental health services are on par with payments for other medical services. The law was jointly named for Paul and Senator Domenici, and it passed in late 2008, 6 years after Paul's death.

After I was seated in 2009, one of the first things I did was to work with Paul's son David on getting the final rules written to implement Wellstone-Domenici. That work inspired me to

later push for investments in school mental health services, to help students and their families who need those services.

Paul also led the David-and-Goliath effort to stop bankruptcy legislation that favored big banks and credit card companies over working families. Despite going up against a wide range of special interests with huge lobbying power and lots of money, he successfully held off passage of the bill during his lifetime.

He also took on special interests when he stood against oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. He believed, like I do, that the long-term consequences of endangering the home of indigenous people and a pristine habitat for wildlife far outweighed "a short-term speculative supply of oil that will not . . . help consumers." Because of Paul and others in the Senate, the Wildlife Refuge, at least for now, remains pristine.

Paul also had an amazing and special relationship with Sheila, who became an important partner in his Senate work. She became a leading advocate for survivors of domestic violence, spending years raising awareness about the issue and the need to address its causes. Former Senator and Vice President Joe Biden said Sheila deserves as much credit as any lawmaker for passage of the landmark Violence Against Women Act. Since the law's enactment, incidents of domestic violence have been reduced significantly. It was a landmark achievement.

My constituents remember Paul fondly. They leave notes and mementos for him at the quiet memorial site honoring him just off of Highway 53, near Eveleth, MN. They leave them for his wife Sheila, too, and for the others who died with them exactly 15 years ago tomorrow, when their plane tragically crashed just miles from the Eveleth-Virginia Municipal Airport.

I have been to the memorial site, and I have seen how deeply and personally Paul touched people in Minnesota and across the country. He inspired them not only as a U.S. Senator for 12 years but also as a Carleton College professor who encouraged a generation of students to take action in their communities. He did so as a fiery organizer who stood up for Minnesota farmers and for working families and insisted on giving them a voice and a seat at the table. He never lost the tenacious spirit that led him to be a collegiate wrestling champion—he is in the college wrestling hall of fame—and he brought that same approach to standing up for Minnesotans. He stood strong against injustice, even when it twice meant being arrested. It wasn't because he wanted to break the law, but because he thought it was necessary to bring about change for the better.

He also had a special way of connecting with people. Former Senator

Tom Harkin said at a memorial service for Paul that he “made a miner up in the Iron Range know he was as important . . . as the president of the United States.” That is how Paul voted in the Senate, too, putting ordinary Minnesotans ahead of politics, money, and influence.

The last time I saw Paul was at a 2002 campaign event in St. Paul, just weeks before he died. He was locked in a bitter struggle for reelection. Despite being in a grueling fight for his political life, the first thing he said to me was, “How’s your mom?” That was Paul.

I had just come from my mom’s nursing home in Minneapolis, where she had a picture of Paul on her wall that said: “Phoebe, keep fighting.” She wasn’t doing very well. I told Paul that she had dementia—some sporadic dementia—and that day I couldn’t have a conversation with her. He put his hand on my shoulder and said: “Touch means so much. Touch means so much.”

The next day, I went to the nursing home, and I took my mom out into the garden, in a wheelchair. She was having a bad day again, but I put my arm around her as we sat. It was a beautiful

day. I don’t know if it meant anything to her, but it sure meant everything to me.

Paul’s life and his work meant a lot to me too. His examples as a tireless, passionate champion for working families, for veterans, for farmers, and for those who simply needed a voice have inspired my own time in the Senate. I keep Paul’s picture and his Senate name plate in my office behind me as a reminder at my desk every day. Every day I serve, I think back to Paul’s words. This is what Paul said:

Politics is not about power. Politics is not about money. Politics is not about winning for the sake of winning. Politics is about the improvement of people’s lives.

While Paul isn’t here with us today, his legacy lives on in so many ways. It lives on in the generations of students and activists he trained and inspired in Minnesota. It lives on in the policies he fought for here in the Senate, for access to mental health care, for a clean environment, and for making sure that working families get a fair shot. It lives on in the countless lives that he touched, like mine and my mom’s.

Paul made us all better, and I hope his legacy will continue to inspire us well into the future.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:28 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

LEONARD WOLFSON, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE ERIKA LIZABETH MORITSUGU.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

WILLIAM BEACH, OF KANSAS, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ERICA LYNN GROSHEN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TARA SWEENEY, OF ALASKA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE KEVIN K. WASHBURN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROBERT M. WEAVER, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE YVETTE ROUBIDEAUX, TERM EXPIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING A.T. STILL UNIVERSITY—KIRKSVILLE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize A.T. Still University—Kirkville College of Medicine on their 125th Anniversary. Since 1892, this fine institution of higher learning has been producing quality graduates who greatly enrich our society with the knowledge and values that have been instilled in them.

Founded in 1892 in Kirksville, Missouri by Andrew Taylor Still, ATSU—KCOM is the birthplace of osteopathic medicine. Originally known as the American School of Osteopathic Medicine, ATSU was the first school of osteopathy in the world. The first Doctors of Osteopathic Medicine, or DO's, graduated from ATSU—KCOM in 1894 and over 18,000 graduates later, they have practiced in every state and around the world in a variety of medical specialties. While staying true to their osteopathic principles, students at ATSU receive the most comprehensive medical education while training on state of the art equipment. With a focus on rural healthcare, ATSU is a vitally important medical training institution, now more than ever.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing the rich 125 year history of A.T. Still University—Kirkville College of Osteopathic Medicine. This elite school has impacted the world with the osteopathic physicians and health professionals it has produced. I commend ATSU President Craig M. Phelps, DO, ATSU—KCOM Dean Margaret Wilson, DO, and the faculty, staff, students and alumni as the school continues to train and produce highly qualified professionals to serve in the medical field for generations to come. I am extremely honored to represent this fine institution in the United States Congress.

IN HONOR OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL (RET) SAMUEL MILTON SELBY ROLLINSON

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a respected public servant, outstanding citizen, and hero to his community, Lieutenant Colonel (Ret) Samuel Milton Selby Rollinson. Sadly, Lt. Col. Rollinson passed away on Friday, September 22, 2017. A memorial service will be held on Saturday,

October 28, 2017 at the Fort Benning Infantry Chapel at 2:00 p.m.

A native of Jacksonville, Florida, Samuel was born to Sam and Ruth Rollinson, as the fourth of five sons. After graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, in 1982, he was commissioned as a ranger and later promoted to an infantry lieutenant, where he received his Airborne badge.

Following his retirement from the Army as a Lieutenant Colonel, Samuel served as a government civilian by becoming Fort Benning's first Protocol Officer. He then served as the Civilian Deputy Chief of Staff, and ultimately, the Deputy TRADOC Capability Manager for the Stryker Brigade Combat Team. His co-workers and fellow servicemen cherished his seasoned wisdom and passion for reveling in the beauties of life.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind him distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." Although his passing was tragic and before his time, Lt. Col. Rollinson proved to us all what it truly meant to be a hero. He left this world doing what he loved most—serving the people of Fort Benning and Columbus, Georgia. His impression on this earth extends beyond himself to the very wellbeing of his community, and for that he will be remembered for time to come.

For his outstanding selflessness to the Columbus community, he was awarded the Rotary Club Mary Reed Award. Beyond this achievement and the respect held for him by servicemen and civilians, he was an honorable human being who loved deeply and, in return, was deeply loved.

Lt. Col. Rollinson is survived by his mother, Ruth; wife of 32 years, Sarah; children, Sam, Michelle, and Zack; daughter-in-law, Katherine; brothers, Jon Martin, Matt and Jim; and a host of friends and those whose lives he has impacted.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, the nearly 730,000 people in Georgia's 2nd Congressional District, and all Americans, in extending our sincerest appreciation to Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Milton Selby Rollinson, for his dedicated service to our nation and to his community. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Lieutenant Colonel Rollinson's family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, October 10th through October 12th, I was absent due to activities in my District related to wildfires and was unable to cast my vote for Roll Calls 558 through 568. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call No. 558 YES—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office;

Roll Call No. 559 YES—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office;

Roll Call No. 560 NAY—On Ordering the Previous Question;

Roll Call No. 561 NAY—Providing for consideration of S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017; providing for proceedings during the period from October 16, 2017, through October 20, 2017; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules;

Roll Call No. 562 YES—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office;

Roll Call No. 563 YES—FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017;

Roll Call No. 564 YES—On Motion to Instruct Conferees;

Roll Call No. 565 YES—On Closing Portions of the Conference;

Roll Call No. 566 YES—Providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2266, with an amendment;

Roll Call No. 567 YES—On Motion to Recommit with Instructions; and

Roll Call No. 568 YES—Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes 569, 570, and 571 on Monday, October 23, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 569 and 570, and Nay on Roll Call vote 571.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING CAMERON GARRETT
BRIZENDINE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Cameron Garrett Brizendine. Cameron is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Cameron has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Cameron has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Cameron has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Cameron refurbished signs at the entrance and in the parking lot of Our Lady of Mercy in Liberty, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Cameron Garrett Brizendine for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE 2017 FAIRFAX
COUNTY VOLUNTEER SERVICE
AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Volunteer Fairfax and express my sincere appreciation to recipients of the 25th Annual Fairfax County Volunteer Service Awards.

Established more than 40 years ago, Volunteer Fairfax matches the skills and interests of thousands of volunteers with the needs of local non-profit organizations. The success of this model and its impact on delivery of needed services is beyond question; Volunteer Fairfax has been rated as one of the most effective community service organizations in the nation.

Last year alone, over 15,000 individuals volunteered directly through Volunteer Fairfax; an additional 1,700 employees volunteered through their employer's BusinessLink program and the value of volunteer services provided exceeded \$4.5 million.

Each year, Volunteer Fairfax selects a few exceptional individuals, groups, or organizations to receive special recognition. It is my great pleasure to include in the RECORD the following names of the 2017 Fairfax County Volunteer Service Awards honorees:

Community Champions:
Braddock District: David Curtis
Dranesville District: Penny Halpern
Hunter Mill District: Raul and Maria Garza-Chapa
Lee District: Michel Margosis

Mason District: Gail Coleman
Mount Vernon District: Whitney Minnich
Providence District: Friends of Oakton Library

Springfield District: John Pellegrin
Sully District: Karrie Delaney
At-Large: John K. Wood
Adult Volunteer 250 Hours & Over: Gary Pan

Adult Volunteer 250 Hours & Under: Kate Walter

Adult Volunteer Group: Friends of Huntley Meadows

Corporate Volunteer Program: Deloitte LLP

Fairfax County Volunteer: Karla Jamir

Fairfax County Volunteer Program: CERT

Family Volunteer: Young Family

Integrate Individual: Carolina Calderon

Lifetime Achievement: Marie Monsen

Rising Star: Shannon Dart

RSVP Northern Virginia: Denise Mackey-Smith

Senior Volunteer: Bard Jackson

Volunteer Program: Wolf Trap First Time Campers Program

Youth Volunteer: Emma Houston

Youth Volunteer Group: Stony Brook Jr. Volunteers

In addition, Benchmark Honors will be awarded in four different categories to commend those who have contributed 100, 250, 500, or 1,000 hours of volunteer time to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending Volunteer Fairfax for its decades of outstanding community service. I congratulate the recipients of the 2017 Fairfax County Volunteer Service Awards and thank them and the thousands of other local volunteers for their incredible contributions to our community. Their selfless dedication is worthy of our highest praise and is one of the main reasons that our community is often ranked as one of the best places in the country to work, and raise a family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, due to extenuating circumstances, my flight did not arrive on time and I was unable to make votes on October 23, 2017.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 569, YEA on Roll Call No. 570, and YEA on Roll Call No. 571.

HONORING ISAAC DAVID CONNER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Isaac David Conner. Isaac is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active

part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 495, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Isaac has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Isaac has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Isaac has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Isaac David Conner for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 569, YEA on Roll Call No. 570, and NAY on Roll Call No. 571.

RECOGNIZING THE 2017 LORDS AND
LADIES FAIRFAX

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a truly exceptional group of men and women who are being recognized as the 2017 Lords and Ladies Fairfax. Every year, each member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors selects two people from his or her district who have demonstrated outstanding volunteer service, heroism, or other exceptional contributions to our community. Since the program's inception in 1984, approximately 600 individuals have earned the honor of being named a Lord or Lady Fairfax by his or her representative on the Board of Supervisors.

This year, the recipients of the Lord and Lady Fairfax awards will be recognized at the celebration of the 275th anniversary of Fairfax County. We are especially honored to welcome Lord Nicholas Fairfax, 14th Lord Fairfax of Cameron and his wife Lady Annabel Fairfax who have traveled from the United Kingdom to join in this celebration. Lord Nicholas shares a common lineage with Lord Thomas Fairfax, 6th Lord Fairfax of Cameron after whom Fairfax County and the City of Fairfax are named and who lived much of his life in Virginia.

The Lord and Lady Fairfax awards recognize those individuals who have made tremendous impacts through their support of our public schools, parks, youth sports leagues, arts community, public safety, and human service programs. It is nearly impossible to fully describe the diversity of accomplishments of the honorees. Their efforts contribute greatly to the quality of life for the residents of Fairfax County and are worthy of our praise and sincere appreciation.

It is my honor to include in the RECORD the names of the 2017 Lords and Ladies Fairfax: At-Large: Lady Jane Miscavage and Lord John J. "Jeff" Lisanick

Braddock District: Lady Mary Drake Cortina and Lord Kevin Morse

Dranesville District: Lady Sally Horn and Lord Gary George Pan

Hunter Mill District: Lady Therese Martin and Lord Jerry Poje

Lee District: Lady Michelle Duell and Lord Richard J. Knapp

Mason District: Lady Rose Chu and Lord Daniel H. Aminoff

Mount Vernon District: Lady Mattie Lewis Palmore and Lord Dale S. Rumberger

Providence District: Lady Sue Kovach Shuman and Lord Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner

Springfield District: Lady Nancy-jo Manney and Lord Michael W. Thompson, Jr.

Sully District: Lady Trudy Harsh and Lord Michael R. Frey

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the 2017 Lords and Ladies Fairfax and in expressing our gratitude to these men and women who have dedicated themselves to the betterment of our community. Their efforts provide immeasurable benefits to Fairfax County and its residents, and are truly worthy of our highest praise.

HONORING MASON THOMAS LEWIS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Mason Thomas Lewis. Mason is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Mason has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Mason has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Mason has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Mason rebuilt and stained a bridge at Immacolata Manor in Liberty, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Mason Thomas Lewis for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote yesterday on the passage of H.R. 3551, the C-TPAT Reauthor-

ization Act of 2017 (Roll Call No. 569), I would have voted "aye." This legislation would reauthorize a program at U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) that encourages cargo importers, carriers, and other entities involved in international trade to cooperate with CBP to strengthen global supply chain security.

Had I been present for the vote on the passage of S. 504, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Business Travel Cards Act of 2017 (Roll Call No. 570), I would have voted "aye." This bill would permanently authorize CBP's ability to issue travel cards that provide U.S. business leaders and government officials with short-term entry to APEC countries.

Had I been present for the vote on approving the Journal (Roll Call No. 571), I also would have voted "aye."

CELEBRATING THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF REV. JONATHAN L. WEAVER AS PASTOR OF THE GREATER MT. NEBO AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Rev. Jonathan Leslie Weaver on his thirtieth pastoral anniversary with the Greater Mt. Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church in Bowie, Maryland. Throughout the past three decades, Rev. Weaver has been ministering to a growing community of worshippers in Bowie and the greater Washington metro area. I've been honored to know him, to call him a friend, and to work closely with him to strengthen our communities in Maryland's Fifth District.

Since 1988, Rev. Weaver has overseen both the expansion of his church and a plethora of charitable endeavors through more than fifty ministries serving its members and the wider community. These have included programs to prevent domestic violence, to empower families through economic literacy, and to combat hunger. Under his guidance, Greater Mt. Nebo A.M.E. Church members have participated in Christmas in April, Tools for School, and other social service projects. Rev. Weaver has also carried his ministry across the ocean, visiting Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Benin to engage in mission projects there for more than a quarter century.

As National President of the Collective Empowerment Group, Rev. Weaver has helped build a network of churches across seven states and the District of Columbia that host financial literacy seminars, educational programs, health care screenings, and homeownership clinics. The Collective Empowerment Group also partners with banks and local businesses to facilitate wider access to economic opportunities for those living in their communities. I have participated in a number of Collective Empowerment Group programs, and I can attest to the wonderful work the organization performs to help families reach for the American Dream.

Rev. Weaver holds degrees from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri; St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore, Maryland; and Harvard Business School in Cambridge, Massachusetts. When he arrived at Greater Mt. Nebo A.M.E., the church had 100 members; today, he has overseen its growth to more than 1,600 members. It is a testament to his vision, his inspiration, and his faith. Rev. Weaver also has overseen the construction of the community's present church building as well as its Christian Academy school and Family Life and Wellness Intergenerational Center assisted-living facility.

I hope all my colleagues will join me in congratulating Rev. Weaver and his wife, Pamela Lynn Weaver—who have two daughters and four grandchildren—on reaching this milestone. I thank them both for their work and spiritual guidance to so many in Maryland's Fifth District and for their friendship over the years.

HONORING LUCIANO VARELA

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Luciano "Lucky" Varela, a hard-working New Mexican who fought for New Mexico families in the state Legislature. Luciano represented Santa Fe in the New Mexico House of Representatives from 1987 to 2016.

Rep. Varela was known for his expertise in government finance and his unwavering support for the employees who deliver services to New Mexicans. He always treated constituents with the utmost dignity and worked for New Mexico families.

Prior to serving in the New Mexico House of Representatives, he was the Director of the State Personnel Office, Chairman of the Board of the Public Employee's Retirement Association, and served on the House Appropriations Committee, in addition to the Legislative Finance Committee.

Rep. Varela was an advocate for fair wages and policies to support low-income families in New Mexico. In 1998, he sponsored legislation to expand the low-income comprehensive tax rebate.

Years later, in 2007, he sponsored a bill for public employee salary increases, which would increase the salaries of public employees including police officers, teachers, and higher education employees.

I will always remember Lucky as someone who was tough and transparent, but always fair. New Mexicans know that he worked hard to provide support for working families. He devoted his career to public service, for which, we are all grateful.

HONORING ZACHARY SCOTT
LINARD

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Zachary Scott Linard. Zachary is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 495, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Zachary has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Zachary has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Zachary has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Zachary Scott Linard for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT Q. KREIDER

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize President Robert Kreider and his over 20 years of dedication to Devereux Advanced Behavioral Health. President Kreider has been a successful and honorable servant for Devereux in a variety of capacities since joining the company in the mid 90's; first as a consultant and eventually rising to become its President and Chief Executive Officer in 2004. Over this time, Mr. Kreider has worked selflessly to expand the business in a manner consistent with its mission—changing lives by unlocking and nurturing human potential for people living with emotional, behavioral or cognitive differences.

Under his leadership, Devereux survived the most serious economic recession since the Great Depression, experienced \$310 million growth in annual revenue, and has increasingly become a nationally influential company. The work its employees do impact the lives of countless individuals across the United States and I commend President Kreider for positioning the company in a place where they can do the most good.

Mr. Kreider has always been dedicated to both the field and to the employees who advance it. He even facilitates the learning of others through lectures he presents at health care institutes like the National Health Lawyers Association and the Leonard Davis Institute of the University of Pennsylvania.

The United States remains a hot bed for innovation and progress through the hard work and dedication of individuals like Robert Kreider. I thank him for his years of service and wish him well in his next endeavor.

RECOGNIZING THE AWARD RECIPIENTS OF THE 2017 CENTREVILLE IMMIGRATION FORUM ANNUAL DINNER

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Centreville Immigration Forum on the occasion of its 3rd Annual Dinner. The theme of this year's gala is "Celebrating Our Global Community" and will recognize the rich diversity of cultures in Northern Virginia.

Northern Virginia is blessed by its diversity. In Fairfax County, nearly 1 in 4 residents is foreign born. More than 100 languages are spoken in our schools, and we are home to more minority-owned technology firms than anywhere else in the nation. Our variety of cultures and heritages do not divide us; they make us stronger.

Three exceptional individuals will be honored during this gala who have gone above and beyond in ensuring that everyone, regardless of their country of origin, has full access to the benefits and opportunities this community and our nation provide. I am pleased to include in the RECORD the names of the following 2017 Annual Dinner honorees:

Ms. Diana Katz—Ms. Katz is a co-founder of the Giving Circle of Hope which provides grants to area non-profits with budgets below \$2 million. She also co-founded NoVIE, a member driven, CEO-level forum that brings together ideas, knowledge and support to benefit the health and viability of social good organizations. She was the driving force behind the NV Rides program that provides transportation for the elderly, and has recently co-founded the Latino Engagement and Achievement Fund under the umbrella of the Community Foundation of Northern Virginia. The Latino Engagement and Achievement Fund will be awarding its first grant this year.

Mr. Mukit Hossain (posthumously)—Mr. Hossain was a telecommunications executive in northern Virginia who became a grass-roots activist following the September 11 terrorist attacks. He was instrumental in encouraging fellow Muslims to become more politically engaged through his role as president of the Virginia Muslim Political Action Committee. In 2006, he joined with Jewish leaders to push successfully for a Virginia state law that made it illegal to falsely label kosher and halal foods. He started Food Source, an organization to feed the homeless in Fairfax, and used his organizing skills on behalf of undocumented workers—particularly as immigration became a defining political issue in Prince William and Loudoun counties. Prior to his sudden death in 2010 he was named Herndon Citizen of the Year and recognized for his community efforts in a joint resolution from the Virginia General Assembly.

Mr. Kofi Dennis—A Master Teaching Artist with Wolf Trap Institute for Early Learning through Arts since 1998, Mr. Dennis has shared his skills in drumming and story-telling with children and adults of all ages. He provides Arts integrated classroom residencies and professional development workshops in

music and creative drama for early childhood educators locally, nationally and internationally. He has also brought drumming and story-telling to juveniles and prisoners in area jails. This past summer, he was part of a team of Wolf Trap master teaching artists and administrators who spent three weeks in Singapore. In collaboration with the National Arts Council and Early Childhood Development Agency (ECDA), this team led programs to train, facilitate workshops, and conduct STEM residencies in arts integration for teachers, administrators and artists.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of these individuals are noteworthy not only because they are rooted in an appreciation for our region's cultural and ethnic diversity, but also because they help to strengthen the bonds of friendship and cooperation in our community. I congratulate them on their awards and ask my colleagues to join me in commending them for their service to the Northern Virginia region.

HONORING JEREMIAH JOSEPH
MORGAN, JR.

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jeremiah Joseph Morgan, Jr. Jeremiah is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1417, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jeremiah has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jeremiah has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jeremiah has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Jeremiah built a maintenance shed that houses lawn-care and other equipment that will be used to help maintain the grounds of the Eight Witches Monument in Liberty, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jeremiah Joseph Morgan, Jr. for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
RONALD A. RUSSO

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Ronald A. Russo, a dedicated father, husband, brother, and grandpa who passed away on Friday, October 20, 2017.

Ron was born on June 16, 1953, in Youngstown, Ohio to Rucco and Anna (Sikusha) Russo. He graduated from Chaney High

School in 1971 and worked for the Youngstown Fire Department for the past 37 years. He was currently serving as Battalion Chief. Prior to becoming a chief, he spent the majority of his career on Squad 33. Ron earned several lifesaving valor and crew awards during his career, and he was always willing to help anyone in need. He was a member of I.A.F.F., O.A.P.F.F., and Y.P.F.F. Local No. 312. He especially enjoyed working with his father and former Youngstown Fire Chief Rocco Russo, and his twin brother, retired Youngstown Fire Department Battalion Chief Rich Russo.

Outside of work, Ron spent a great deal of time watching his son coach hockey. As soon as Ron found out he was going to be a grandfather, he put a swimming pool in his backyard. He had devoted the last eight years of his life to his grandchildren. Everything from family vacations, crabbing on the beach, teaching them to cook, and that every animal says "moo." He also enjoyed cooking and hosting family gatherings with his loving wife Joann. Their home was always open to everyone. The family motto was "La Familia E'Tutto," family is everything.

He will always be remembered lovingly by his wife, the former Joann Booher, whom he married Dec. 31, 2004; four children, Rocco Russo (Melissa Singleton), Margaret (Michael) DeNiro, Marie (Jared) Rupert, and Melissa Russo; two stepchildren, Tristan (Kolt) Codner, and Justine (Corey) Keller; twin brother, Richard (Janet) Russo; brother Robert (Debbie) Russo; seven grandchildren, Gavin and Logan Rupert, Dominic, Carmen, Julianna DeNiro, Gianna Russo, and Andrew Codner; and numerous nieces, nephews, and cousins.

Ron's life will be celebrated on Thursday, October 26, 2017 at the Rossi Brothers and Lellio Funeral Home in Boardman, Ohio, followed by a funeral service at the Poland United Methodist Church, where he was a member. Ron will be greatly missed both by the community and his family. I extend my deepest condolences to his family and friends.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT T. SCOTT OF ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Mr. Robert T. Scott of St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute. Throughout his 47 year career at St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute, Mr. Scott has served in numerous roles. He joined the faculty as a Religion and History Teacher in 1971, served as Vice Principal for Student Affairs for twenty years before becoming Principal, and—since 2004—has been the school's first lay President.

In each role, Mr. Scott's countless contributions and genuine care for the St. Joe's community impacted thousands of young men and their families. He is present every day, all day, and is simply an institution who has personally guided our school's mission for decades. His tireless fundraising efforts remain focused on

student financial aid to ensure that a St. Joe's education is affordable and accessible.

Since the beginning of his tenure, Mr. Scott has lived the Lasallian Mission in the footsteps of the Founder of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, St. John Baptist de La Salle. He has completed the Buttner Institute of Lasallian Studies, the Lasallian Leadership Institute, and held numerous leadership positions throughout the Christian Brothers network in the United States. As a testament to his life of service, he became an Affiliated Member of the Brothers in June 2001—the order's high honor.

In 2009, his leadership of the school's capital campaign, entitled *Pride in our Past . . . Faith in our Future*, generated more than \$13 million to construct a state-of-the-art Science Facility, a modern Athletic Complex, and a new residence for the Christian Brothers. After an overwhelming response to the campaign, the Board of Trustees unanimously voted to name the athletic complex in Mr. Scott's honor.

With his constant support and encouragement, notable innovations in both curriculum and physical space have taken place. Recently, the library was converted into a digital learning space and course offerings in the STEM fields continue to increase. Currently, an acquired building adjacent to campus is being converted into an Innovation Center.

His greatest influence, however, has been on the young men who passed through the halls. During the last four decades, St. Joe's students' lives have been deeply influenced, shaped, and cared for by Mr. Scott.

After attending Catholic grammar and high school in Western New York, Mr. Scott received a Bachelor of Arts in History from Marist College in Poughkeepsie, NY. He began graduate studies in Hebrew and the Old Testament at the University of Dayton before serving for two years in United States Army. He finished his Master's Degree in Religious Studies at Canisius College in 1975.

Today, Mr. Scott serves as a member of the Board of Trustees for Christian Brothers Academy in Syracuse and the Elmwood Franklin School in Buffalo. He is a past member of the Board of Trustees of Mt. St. Mary Academy, Holy Angels Academy, and the Nativity Miguel School.

Mr. Scott has been married to his wife, Michelle, for 49 years. He is the proud parent of Jason and Tracy, and grandparent of Tracy's children, Noah and Sarah.

Mr. Speaker, I honor and recognize Mr. Scott for his selfless service to the young men of St. Joe's and the community of Western New York.

RECOGNIZING THE 2017 LITERACY VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA— PRINCE WILLIAM AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Incorporated, and their 26 years of service to the adult learners residing in the Greater Prince William Area.

Founded in June 1991, by beloved librarian, Dana M. Swanson, Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Inc. is one of 1200 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations affiliated with ProLiteracy America, a nationwide organization dedicated to empowering, educating, and connecting adults through the establishment of a safer, stronger, and sustainable society.

Since its inception, Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Inc. has served over 8500 adults and positively impacted the social and economic wellbeing of 35,000 family members. Last year, the organization served over 700 adult learners with the assistance of more than 220 trained volunteer tutors. Community volunteers are trained to become tutors and are matched based on the needs of adults seeking to improve their literacy or English language skills. Provided services include small and large classroom tutoring, one-on-one tutoring, pre-GED and GED classes, basic literacy for English speakers and English as a second language learners, conversation classes, Naturalization test preparation, and job readiness training.

Each year, the dedicated staff reviews the progress of each student and asks tutors and students to provide feedback. This year, 93 percent of students have met a personal development goal. Feedback generally aligns with the organization's mission statement to teach adults the life-changing skills of reading, writing and speaking English that will enable them to confidently participate and prosper in society. I have the distinct pleasure of including in the RECORD the 2017 Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Inc.

STUDENT OF THE YEAR: NORIS QUINTANILLA

Born and raised in El Salvador, Noris has lived in the United States of America for the past 17 years and is a U.S. citizen. In 2012, Noris obtained her GED certificate and sought the assistance of Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William to further her education and transition into a career in office administration. Today, Noris volunteers at Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Inc. where she never misses the opportunity to learn something new. Her commitment to instruction and volunteerism has helped Noris hone her language skills, build her confidence, and inspire her peers.

TUTOR OF THE YEAR: AMY FEINBERG

Amy has volunteered with Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Inc. for the past six years where she has tutored in both classroom and individual settings. Over the past year, Amy has taught more than 100 students and provided more than 250 volunteer hours to the program. Amy inspires students with her kindness, patience, and compassion. As an active community volunteer, Amy takes great pride in helping others to succeed and in her role in building a stronger, more vibrant community.

TUTOR OF THE YEAR: ALISON PREVOST

Alison has served as a volunteer with Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Inc. for the past 4 years. She has provided classroom tutoring to more than 100 students and has donated over 300 volunteer hours to adult literacy over the past year. Alison takes

great pride in helping adults improve their literacy skills and become self-sufficient and active members of the community through Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Inc. and other community-based organizations.

VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR: PATTI J. BEATTIE

For the past 15 years, Patti has shared her time and service with Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Inc. and its adult learners through multiple capacities as a volunteer tutor, dedicated member of the Board of Directors, tutor trainer, employee, and literacy advocate. In honor of her tireless efforts to our community, the Volunteer of the Year Award has been renamed in her honor. Patti is an active community volunteer, serving in multiple service organizations donating hundreds of hours each year to serve our local community. It is my honor to recognize Patti as the inaugural recipient of the Patti J. Beattie Volunteer of the Year Award recipient.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending the 2017 Literacy Volunteers of America—Prince William, Incorporated honorees and in thanking all students, tutors, volunteers, Board of Directors, and staff for their dedication, generosity, and commitment to adult literacy and its lasting impact on the Greater Prince William Area.

HONORING LUKE ANDREW MOYES

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Luke Andrew Moyes. Luke is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 495, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Luke has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Luke has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Luke has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Luke Andrew Moyes for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. IRMA MITCHELL WORKS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I extend my sincere congratulations to Golden Soror Irma Mitchell Works of the Gamma Tau Omega Chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. for fifty years of service to this great sisterhood. A reception

will be held in her honor on Sunday, November 12, 2017 at the Green Island Country Club in Columbus, Georgia.

A native of Pittsview, Alabama, Irma Jean Mitchell was born to the late Jessie and Bertha Williams, as the thirteenth of fourteen children. She was a product of the Russell County School System and graduated from Glenville High School. After graduation, she attended Alabama A&M College (University), where she obtained her bachelor's degree in Vocational Home Economics. It was here that she discovered her calling to become a member of one of the finest reflections of womanhood, and on April 22, 1967, she was initiated into the Gamma Mu Chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated. She also received masters degrees from the University of Georgia and Georgia State University, and an Educational Specialist Certificate in Administration and Supervision from Troy State University.

Mrs. Works has been a member of Benevolent Grove Missionary Baptist Church for fifty-nine years and currently serves as a Sunday School teacher, an adult choir member, a mentor for women of all ages, and a sponsor for the church's mini clothing bank.

Former Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm once said, "Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth." Irma has continued her service within the sorority and throughout the community by joining Gamma Tau Omega Chapter and serving on committees such as: AKA Connections, Fundraising, Budget, the Pink and Green Breakfast, and serving two-terms as the founding Vice President of SISTERS, Incorporated's Board of Directors, which is the foundation of Gamma Tau Omega Chapter. She also transitioned to the Advisory Board and is presently serving a second term on the Board of Directors. She has received numerous awards and commendations from Alpha Kappa Alpha, Incorporated including 2000 Woman of Achievement; Women Helping Women; Outstanding Services to Youth; Finer Womanhood; Outstanding Community Service and Distinguished Woman; she also received recognition from the Muscogee Rotary Club; Phi Delta Kappa Professional Education Fraternity; Network for Professionals and Executives; National Education Association; Muscogee Education Association and Georgia Association of Educational Leaders among others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to an outstanding citizen and woman of faith, Mrs. Irma Mitchell Works, as she is honored for her fifty years of dedicated service to Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. and her community.

HONORING LAWRENCE BACA

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lawrence Baca, a local artist in Santa Fe, for his outstanding work. Lawrence is well known for his beautiful silver creations and his award

winning jewelry. He pulls from historic and cultural roots when making the jewelry.

Born and raised in Santa Fe, Lawrence is inspired by the strong Native American and Hispanic cultures that run deep in our state. He celebrates long-lasting traditions and keeps history alive by creating jewelry that uses metals and stones that were once used by our ancestors in New Mexico.

Collectors and fans from all over the world travel to the Spanish Market in Santa Fe to buy jewelry from Lawrence and other local artists. In 2015, he was awarded the Master's Award for Lifetime Achievement at the Spanish Market and Museum of Spanish Colonial Art.

The Spanish Colonial art features authentic artistic traditions which can be traced back over 400 years. Skilled artists, like Lawrence, create breathtaking expressions of a living tradition, and many of them count their art as their only source of income.

My hope is that Lawrence will continue to use his talent to honor the Spanish and Native American history in New Mexico, and will inspire future artists to do the same.

HONORING JAMES STUBBERS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize James Stubbers. James is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 10, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

James has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years James has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, James has become a Brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow and earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-o-Say. James has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. James designed, and coordinated the construction of two computer tables and a white board for the Valley Park Elementary School in Leawood, Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending James Stubbers for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 569, YEA on Roll Call No. 570, and YEA on Roll Call No. 571.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Fairfax County Health Department. Through a century of continuous service the department has distinguished itself as a national leader and a model public health department working to protect, promote and improve the quality of life for all its residents.

The origins of the Fairfax County Health Department can be traced back to April 1917, when the county launched a campaign for better health in the very same week that the United States would enter World War I. When the first public health physician and his successor were sent off to war, it left only one public health nurse to provide services for the entire county. Shortly after war's end the staff consisted of a full time health officer, one full time sanitation officer, one full time nurse and a part-time clerk, with funding provided by the Virginia State Health Department, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, the County Chapter of the Red Cross, the Tuberculosis Association, and donations from private citizens.

In the early years, the Health Department was primarily concerned with the spread of infectious diseases like diphtheria, smallpox, tuberculosis and typhoid fever. With better sanitation, education, and immunization practices, many of these threats began to wane and the department's services began to expand to accommodate the county's growing population.

With more facilities and staff, the department was able to offer maternal and child health clinics, home health care, speech and hearing, dental, and school health services. At the same time, a systematic program of environmental health was developed to include sewage disposal, protection of water supplies, fly and mosquito control, and general cleanliness of dwellings, tourist places and food establishments.

Due to its long history of financial and leadership support for public health, in 1995 Fairfax County sought and was granted the authority to operate its own health department by an act of the Virginia General Assembly. Since that change in legislative authority more than 20 years ago, the Fairfax County Health Department has become more efficient, effective, and responsive.

Throughout its history, the Health Department has been a leader in the prevention and control of communicable diseases. During the polio epidemic of the 1950s, Fairfax County participated in the Salk vaccine trials and became the first county in the United States to provide polio vaccine to its grade school children. In 1960s, it was the first department in the nation to participate in a mass measles vaccination trial program. And in 1989, when there was an outbreak of Ebola virus in monkeys at a laboratory in Reston, Virginia—an event dramatized in Richard Preston's book "The Hot Zone"—Fairfax County Health De-

partment was once again on the front lines of an emerging disease threat.

While the emphasis on communicable disease control and prevention has not changed, the Health Department has dedicated more of its resources to population-based health services that address disparities within its increasingly diverse community. The Health Department's Adult Day Health Care, Community Health Care Network, Skin Deep Tattoo Removal Program, HIV case management program, and Homeless Health Care program have been a model for other departments in Virginia and around the country. Research on newer and better methods of onsite sewage disposal have often originated in Fairfax County. The department's laboratory is the largest local public health laboratory in the Commonwealth, performing more than 200,000 scientific tests annually.

Since the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001, the Health Department has assumed a first responder role with significant responsibility for a wide range of disaster planning and response activities. In response to lessons learned from the anthrax crisis, the Health Department organized a Medical Reserve Corps (MRC) unit, a cadre of trained volunteers, to augment surge capacity during public health emergencies. In the years since, the Health Department has activated its Incident Management Team and the MRC in response to natural disasters such as floods and hurricanes, H1N1 influenza pandemic, Ebola virus, Zika virus and other outbreak investigations.

The Fairfax County Health Department has achieved and sustained a well-earned reputation for excellence due in part to the dedication and compassion of its well-trained workforce, the quality and innovation of its programs and services, and the commitment of its leadership to continuous quality improvement. That commitment was demonstrated again in 2016 when the department achieved national accreditation by the Public Health Accreditation Board.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Fairfax County Health Department for a century of protecting, promoting and improving the health and quality of life for all in Fairfax County. Their selfless efforts, made on behalf of all citizens of our community are truly worthy of our highest praise.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PEDRO RAMÍREZ DAVIS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you on this day to recognize Mr. Pedro Ramirez Davis for his dedication to organized labor and the progressive political community in Tucson, Arizona and Pima County. Regrettably, he passed away on October 9, 2017 after dedicating over forty years of service to his fellow man. He was a life-long member of the Laborers' International Union Local No. 479 and the Teamsters local in Tucson.

Pedro R. Davis exemplified the highest ideals of the labor movement. He worked ar-

duously to further the common goals of the working man to earn better wages, safer working conditions, the right to collective bargaining and the ability to call for a strike when the circumstances warranted it. He fought for benefits and financial aid for workers who were injured or retired.

Pedro understood the importance of union organizing as a way of empowering people and changing lives. He understood the need to be proactive in advocating policies and legislation to bring about necessary change. He was a true supporter of the Democratic Party because he believed it championed the interest of the working class. He supported local leaders and candidates he believed advocated for the struggles of the lower and middle classes. He worked tirelessly for those candidates, going door-to-door, encouraging folks to join the cause, putting up signs, collecting signatures, attending rallies and pitching in wherever help was needed.

Pedro was born in Nogales, Sonora Mexico in 1928. His parents struggled hard to support their family of twelve children. At an early age, Pedro learned the value of hard work when he had to do his part to help provide for his younger siblings. He would often share stories of his family all huddled around a single kerosene burner and a wood-burning stove trying to keep out the chill of the frigid winters in their hillside Nogales home. In his household, there were times when there was not enough food, blankets and warm beds.

His father's work often took him away from home and that would leave Pedro and his brother Samuel to step up, as the men of the house, to provide for the family in their fathers absence. This, no doubt, contributed to Pedro's kind and generous nature throughout his life. On one occasion, a fine gentleman wrote a letter to the editor about a Good Samaritan, who carried him across a flooded street refused to provide his name and rejected any monetary compensation for the rescue. The Good Samaritan was Pedro.

At the age of 18, along with his peers, Pedro was drafted into military service. After completing his duty, like his father and grandfather before him, he worked as a carpenter. He moved to California to work for some time and upon his return to Nogales he met Enedina Luque. He fell in love with Enedina, and married her soon thereafter. They moved to Tucson in 1950 and Pedro began working in construction.

Throughout the years, his construction job led him to work on many of the major industrial projects that transformed Tucson including the missile silos and copper mines in the surrounding the area. He joined Tucson's Local No. 479 of the International Laborers' Union and the local Teamsters' Union in their formative years and remained actively involved in their collective bargaining efforts throughout his working life.

He took part in strikes against unfair labor practices when it became necessary, which was always a difficult thing, since he was unable to collect a wage for his family during those walkouts. Enedina always supported his decisions because they both saw it as a way for construction workers to obtain decent wages, health benefits, safe working conditions and retirement pensions. Pedro stood

firm and worked extremely hard to make change possible for labor workers. His efforts were recognized by the leaders he worked to get elected which includes successful candidates such as: President Bill Clinton, Congressman Ed Pastor and myself, among others. Pedro would often receive invitations to dinners and other special events, to the surprise of many, including his family. Those were proud moments for him, indeed.

Pedro and Enedina raised six children and he always impressed upon them the value of an education. He felt that an education was the best job security anyone could hope to have. Even though he only had a sixth-grade education himself, Pedro was a learned man, always reading newspapers and magazines in both English and Spanish. He could engage in informed discussions on current events around the world. He knew about world leaders as well as his local representatives and had a profound interest in politics at home and abroad. Pedro and Enedina voted without fail as soon as they became naturalized United States citizens. He also instilled in his children and grandchildren the importance of registering to vote and engaged them in discussions on the important issues of the day.

In the early 80's, Pedro was asked to assist in the remodeling of an office building that had been made available to a candidate as the campaign headquarters. He was so inspired by the candidate that soon afterwards, he was out collecting signatures and walking door-to-door registering people to vote. He campaigned tirelessly for human rights and for candidates he respected. Pedro's car was always full of campaign signs and handouts. He eagerly shared his campaign experiences with his family. Pedro loved his country of origin, but he was proud to be an American. He loved and respected what this country stood for and wanted to make it better for the present and future generations.

When Enedina passed away in 2007, Pedro seemed to have lost a skip in his step. He found comfort by staying active in the political sphere and through his love for guitar. He was a self-taught guitarist and amassed a collection of Mexican classic songbooks. After retiring from construction, Pedro kept himself busy working as a school crossing guard for the Tucson Unified School District, which is a job that he took very seriously. The safety of the schoolchildren made him happy and he always had a supply of Jolly Ranchers to pass out to them. One of his greatest joys came when he received a large bundle of handmade birthday cards from the kids at Safford Primary School. The students at the school made him feel proud and happy.

After retiring as a crossing guard, Pedro could dedicate more time to his first love, the guitar. He would travel across town to meet with his friends in the guitar group. Together, they would polish their versions of the classic Mexican love ballads, even as he modestly repeated that he was not learning anything new.

I close by saying that Pedro Ramirez Davis was a hard-working and decent man from very humble origins. Pedro, like so many immigrants, came to this country to work hard and build upon the character and values of our nation. He did so with pride and purpose. He lived a life worthy of recognition, honor and re-

spect. His lifetime of involvement on behalf of the working people and the less fortunate in his community has not gone unnoticed. Pedro Ramirez Davis will be sorely missed.

HONORING TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Truman State University on their 150th Anniversary. Since 1867, this fine institution of higher learning has been producing quality graduates who greatly enrich our society with the knowledge and values that have been instilled in them.

Founded on September 2, 1867, in Kirksville, Missouri, by Joseph Baldwin, the school was originally known as the North Missouri Normal School and Commercial College and existed to train teachers to serve in public schools. It received several name and mission changes over the years and today, it is known as Truman State University. Building on a tradition of academic excellence, Truman State became the state's only public liberal arts and sciences university in 1985 at the direction of the Missouri Legislature. The recipient of multiple national accolades, the school continues to successfully embody their mission of providing affordable education to exemplary students. Highly selective in the students they accept, Truman State University boasts both the highest retention rate of freshman to sophomore students among public universities in Missouri and the highest public university graduation rate in the state.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing the rich 150 year history of Truman State University. This elite public, liberal arts university in rural Northeast Missouri has educated generations of students who have made an exemplary impact both at home and abroad. I commend President Dr. Sue Thomas and the faculty and staff—past, present and future—for their commitment to providing the next generation with a quality education. I am extremely honored to represent this fine institution in the United States Congress.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ARNOLD PARK

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Army veteran, community leader, and my constituent, Arnold Park of Streator, Illinois.

Mr. Park served his country for two years in Germany before returning home to Streator to run the Lutheran Brotherhood Insurance Agency for the next thirty-five years. In this capacity, he was a trusted community member and able to provide peace of mind to thousands of my constituents. He also served his commu-

nity as a member and President of the Streator School Board and as a council officer at St. Paul's Lutheran Church.

His dedication to his community and his neighbors continued throughout his life, with Mr. Park most recently dedicating his time and efforts to the Ramp Builders for St. Paul, an organization he founded which constructs and installs wheelchair ramps to help individuals with handicaps and senior citizens access their homes. The Ramp Builders have built hundreds of ramps since 1987 and it now serves people in nearby communities such as Ottawa, Marseilles, and Seneca.

Without question, Arnold Park positively impacted not only his family and loved ones, but also the entire Streator community. His commitment to his profession, his family, his community, and his faith should serve as an example to all of us.

Sadly, Mr. Park passed away on October 9, 2017. I offer my condolences to his widow, children, and grandchildren. Each of them should know how grateful his community and his country are for all he achieved during his life. It is truly an honor to represent an area of Illinois in which people like Arnold Park are making a difference in others' lives each and every day.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE VOLUNTEER SERVICE OF THE BAY ORAL SURGERY & IMPLANT CENTER AND ORAL & MAXILLOFACIAL SURGEONS-BAYCARE CLINIC

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the volunteer service of the Bay Oral Surgery & Implant Center and Oral & Maxillofacial Surgeons-BayCare Clinic. Since September 2014, these two groups have taken turns each week volunteering their professional services at the N.E.W. Community Clinic, a federally qualified health center in northeastern Wisconsin.

Over the last three years, these groups have provided expert care on a volunteer basis to over 1,200 patients and completed more than 3,300 surgical procedures. The patients these oral surgeons continue to serve are among the most vulnerable members of society, including those who are disabled, in wheelchairs, are cognitively delayed, have Alzheimer's or other severe forms of mental illness.

Without this volunteer service at the N.E.W. Community Clinic, many of these patients would not have access to the necessary oral procedures they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of this body to join me in commending the humanitarian work of the Bay Oral Surgery & Implant Center and Oral & Maxillofacial Surgeons-BayCare Clinic, and thank them for their ongoing commitment to serving those in need across northeastern Wisconsin.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHESTERFIELD COUNTY'S HISTORIC COURTHOUSE

HON. DAVE BRAT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the centennial of Chesterfield County's historic courthouse. This building is a point of pride for the county of Chesterfield and is an official Historic Landmark for Chesterfield and the commonwealth of Virginia.

The Chesterfield Courthouse sits where the original 1749 colonial courthouse once stood. It took only a mere eight months to build the 1917 Courthouse and began hearing cases shortly after construction. The bell from the 1749 Colonial courthouse has been carefully preserved and is the oldest historic artifact in Chesterfield County. It currently stands on display at the Chesterfield County Museum. The bell is, in fact, three years older than the great Liberty Bell.

The Courthouse is more than a well-preserved Landmark, it is a symbol of our great history. When it was built in 1917, it was one of the first preservation struggles in our nation. It was the place where WWI draftees camped out as they waited to ship out to training camps. It has and will continue to represent the critical third branch of government where it still hears cases to this day, 100 years later.

A centennial anniversary is a great accomplishment and is worth recognition and appreciation. It is necessary for our culture and history to be preserved and remembered; whether that be in the abstract of our ideals and principles, or in the physical; such as the Chesterfield Courthouse. Behind the physical buildings is where our principles and values lie. For this reason, I want to recognize the 100 year anniversary of the historic courthouse in Chesterfield, Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN T. FARINELLA

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me as I pay tribute to the recipient of the 2017 New Jersey Principal of the Year Award, Mr. John T. Farinella of Rahway High School.

Mr. Farinella is a lifelong South Plainfield resident and a graduate of South Plainfield High School. After high school, he went on to earn a dual bachelor's degree in economics and mathematics from Pennsylvania State University. He later received his Master's in Education Administration and Supervision from Saint Peter's College in Jersey City, New Jersey, followed by his Juris Doctor from Seton Hall University's School of Law. Mr. Farinella has worked in the New Jersey public school system for more than 20 years, and he has served the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association (NJPSA) as a member of its Council, Legislative Committee, and Constitution Review Committee.

During his time as Principal of Rahway High School, Mr. Farinella has coordinated two key programs that have dramatically helped the students of Rahway High School: the Freshman Transition Program and the Rutgers Future Scholars Program. The Freshman Transition Program provides a support system for Rahway High School's incoming freshmen as they acclimate to the differences between middle school and high school. It helps them begin to plan their lives beyond high school. The Rutgers Future Scholars program recognizes and mentors eighth grade students whose parents have not graduated from college. Fifteen students who perform to the satisfaction of Rahway High School and the Rutgers Future Scholars Program are invited each year, free of charge, to attend Rutgers University.

Mr. Farinella and his staff have dedicated much of their time and effort over the past six years to creating a more comprehensive and complete learning environment for the children of Rahway High School. Through his work at Rahway High School, Mr. Farinella has shown students the value of a college degree and created a college-going mentality throughout his school. Mr. Farinella has shown passion through his leadership and vision for Rahway High School. The Tenth District of New Jersey is proud and honored to have Mr. John T. Farinella investing in the futures of the students of Rahway High School.

RECOGNIZING BRIGADIER GENERAL STEVEN P. BULLARD FOR HIS MILITARY SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, we rise to recognize the distinguished military service and retirement of Brigadier General Steven P. Bullard of the United States Air Force and the Kentucky Air National Guard. General Bullard was commissioned as an officer in the United States Air Force and earned his wings as a navigator in the C-130 Hercules aircraft in 1985. Since that time, General Bullard quickly rose to vital leadership positions including: Chief of Staff of the Kentucky Air National Guard; Deputy Chief of the Joint Staff, Joint Force Headquarters-Kentucky National Guard; and a member of the Joint Air Component Coordination Element (JACCE) staff for the Commander, 7th Air Force, Osan Air Base, South Korea.

Over his many years of service, General Bullard worked hard to establish meaningful and trustworthy relationships with Members of Congress to effectively communicate the policies and concerns of the Kentucky Adjutant Generals Office. Through his leadership, General Bullard helped improve the lives of U.S. service members and strengthened the national security of the United States of America. We honor his military service and sacrifice that have led to the betterment of our nation.

HONORING 1 OCTOBER FIRST RESPONDERS

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the on-call and off-duty first responders whose training, instincts, and valor saved lives and prevented further tragedy on October 1st in Las Vegas.

Southern Nevada's police, firefighters, and medical professionals rushed into gunfire, suppressed an active shooter, and prepared the community for its recovery. As bullets rained down and innocent victims lay in need of assistance, crews from Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, and Clark County entered a situation without hesitation, despite knowing few details about the scope of the attack. Off-duty officials who attended the concert went from enjoying a night of music to selflessly acting under fire.

Amid the report of firearms, the whiz of bullets, and the screams of horror, first responders risked their lives to shield the helpless, provide medical assistance, and secure an area that was the target of an unspeakable event.

Their service did not stop after the shooting. Many went home for a few minutes to change their blood-soaked clothes and hug their family members. Then they returned to a grieving community. Not all of Las Vegas' heroes were lucky enough to go back to their families. Some, like Las Vegas Metro Police Officer Charles Hartfield, lost their lives. Others left the scene with gunshot wounds and various injuries. They were all Nevada's Guardian Angels that night. Those heroes and their family members cannot be thanked enough for their service and sacrifices.

Likewise, our ambulance services, American Medical Response and Community Ambulance, not only assisted the injured on the scene but rapidly transported hundreds to local hospitals. Our two trauma centers, designed to accommodate a fraction of the patients they received in the hours after the shooting, were able to treat a nonstop flow of victims. Our charities immediately set up blood drives and other donation centers to meet the needs of victims. On their own accord, good Samaritans opened their car doors to fleeing concertgoers, turned their belts into tourniquets, and imparted countless acts of kindness in the hours and days following the tragedy.

Through it all we were guided by the leadership of LVMPD Sheriff Joe Lombardo, LVMPD Undersheriff Kevin McMahon, Clark County Fire Chief Greg Cassell, University Medical Center CEO Mason VanHouweling, Sunrise Hospital CEO Todd Sklamberg, and Special Agent Aaron Rouse of the Las Vegas FBI.

These were among the first Nevadans to take action on October 1st. They have had sleepless nights, skipped meals, and borne the weight of the world on their shoulders. Thanks to their guidance and sacrifice, the community has been able to mourn and recuperate in peace. On behalf of Nevada's First Congressional District, I want to thank these

leaders and all the local heroes who jeopardized their own lives to make sure that so many in Southern Nevada would be able to face a new day.

They made Las Vegas Strong.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded because I was absent due to travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 569, YEA on Roll Call No. 570, and NAY on Roll Call No. 571.

RECOGNIZING THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF EMERALD COAST CRIME STOPPERS

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the twentieth anniversary of the Emerald Coast Crime Stoppers. This organization is celebrating 20 years of partnering with the community and local law enforcement.

Twenty years ago, a small group of community leaders and citizens attended and formed the nonprofit organization known as Emerald Coast Crime Stoppers.

Launched in 1997, the concept has developed into a combination of efforts by local media, businesses, civic and social clubs, law enforcement agencies, and the public. Donations of airtime, newspaper space, and reward monies have established Crime Stoppers as an effective tool to fight crime in our area. Crime Stoppers provides a method for local law enforcement to receive information on crimes. These efforts increase tips, which in turn increase arrests in our community.

A unique quality of this organization is that it is not a branch of any law enforcement agency or local government, but is run by community members who graciously volunteer to serve on the Board of Directors.

I would like to extend my gratitude to all who have served in any capacity with this very successful organization. The work that has been done by this group has proved to be invaluable to our communities.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to congratulate Emerald Coast Crime Stoppers on their 20th Anniversary.

HONORING DONOVAN SMITH

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize

Mr. Donovan Smith, who is a young entrepreneur and philanthropist, who has made a positive impact in our community through his soap making business.

Donovan came to New Mexico in 2011 with his mother, Ms. Casey Smith, after falling upon hard times. Ms. Smith, a Navy veteran, had lost her job, and was unable to find employment due to health problems. They were able to find a place to stay at the Henderson House in Albuquerque, which provides shelter for female veterans. After overcoming this experience, Donovan has dedicated himself to helping others.

In 2014, Donovan was able to learn soap-making from his mother as a part of his math and science education. At the age of 11 he started his bath product business at a local market held every weekend. He soon began selling online specialty soaps made from ingredients such as goat's milk and aloe vera. He generously donated a portion of his profits to help fight homelessness.

Donovan has also donated thousands of bars of soap to St. Martin's Hospitality Center, where the soap can be distributed to people in need. In light of his philanthropic work, TV personality Mike Rowe reached out to Donovan as part of his Facebook show, "Returning the Favor," and set him up with a storefront in Downtown Albuquerque to continue his business and charitable work.

In addition to his work to fight homelessness, Donovan has been a vocal advocate against child abuse in New Mexico. He received the McDonald's 365Black Community Choice Award, as well as the Good Samaritan Award by the City of Albuquerque.

Donovan's story is inspiring and proves that with determination, amazing things can be achieved. I look forward to seeing Donovan's success grow as well as his continued efforts to make a difference in our community.

RECOGNIZING THE 2017 BEST OF BRADDOCK AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the annual Best of Braddock Awards. These awards are the result of collaboration between the Braddock District Council and Braddock District Supervisor and are presented to individuals and organizations whose extraordinary efforts make our community a better place.

I have been proud to represent this community since my days as Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. The level of civic engagement celebrated by these awards is a testament to the community spirit of Braddock District. I have often said that civic engagement is a key indicator of a healthy community and tonight's event proves that Braddock District is one of the healthiest communities in all of Northern Virginia. That is due in no small part to the actions of those honored here this evening. I extend my congratulations to all of tonight's honorees and commend them for their efforts on behalf of others and

in making our community one of the best places in the country in which to live, work and raise a family.

It is my honor to include in the RECORD the following recipients of the 2017 Best of Braddock Award.

Katie Pope—This Annandale High School student has an impressive record of community service to a number of civic, church and charitable organizations.

The Friends of Lake Accotink Park (FLAP)—This organization takes responsibility for supporting all of the numerous upkeep activities necessary to maintain a 493 acre park.

Meghan Walker—The organizer and manager of all of the FLAP activities in support of the Park.

Kiley Foster—This energetic first grader (one of the youngest Honorees ever) has started on an exemplary path of community service through her contributions to her church, charitable organizations, and other service groups such as "Girls on the Run."

Irene Merrill—Nominated by the Briarwood Court Condo Association, Irene has continuously improved and produced the Association newsletter for over 10 years.

Jeremiah Bethea—This All-Conference, All-Regional, and All-State pole vault competitor also finds time outside of athletics to earn service awards from his neighborhood, write for the student newspaper, participate in student Government, and qualify for Math and Social Studies Honor Societies.

Suzanne Metz—This physical education teacher is the organizer of "Walk to School" and "Bike to School" days. She has also been instrumental working with the PTA to establish a summer camp.

Norene Gerstner—This avid gardener has served the Braddock District for 21 years as a volunteer working in and around the Kings Park Library. She has been a leader in conceptualizing and implementing the unique garden surrounding the library along with her "Gardening Friends of Kings Park Library" Group.

Morton Berger—The first posthumous honoree, he volunteered thousands of hours with VIPS (Volunteers in Police Service) to memorialize through photograph numerous police activities for the Fairfax County Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2017 Best of Braddock honorees for their tremendous contributions to Fairfax County and Northern Virginia. I also wish to extend special recognition to George Klein, the chair of the Braddock District Council, for his work in organizing this event and for his tireless efforts on behalf of others in our community.

INTRODUCING RESOLUTION ON COMMEMORATING INTERNATIONAL DAY OF RURAL WOMEN ON OCTOBER 15, 2017

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, the world celebrated International Day of Rural

Women and the invaluable contribution of women farmers.

To do our part in expressing solidarity, I rise to introduce this Resolution to commemorate this every important day.

According to the U.N., rural women makeup over one-quarter of the total population and represent 43 percent of the agricultural workforce. They play a critical role in agricultural production, food security and economic stability.

Women serve as the bedrock of society. They feed the world's families. They feed our neighbors, and our countrymen. They are important role models for younger generations. Unfortunately, despite this, they still face many societal and economic limitations both here and abroad.

This Resolution shines a light on women farmers and empowers them to succeed as entrepreneurs. It calls on the people of the U.S. and the world to recognize their critical contribution and to recommit to reducing these barriers and limitations.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

HONORING QUARRIER COOK

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Quarrier "Q" B. Cook who represented the best of our great state of New Mexico. She was a loving wife, mother, and grandmother, a loyal friend to many, a philanthropist, and a dedicated advocate for the rights of women, and the environment.

Q was born in Wheeling, West Virginia to Nancy Fulton and Thomas Moffat Bloch on April 7, 1935. She graduated from the Wheeling Country Day School, the Ethel Walker School, and Vassar College where she earned a degree in political science that served her well through years of political activism. Q gained a passion for activism by observing her parents, who were involved in civic and public service.

Q began her philanthropic career as a board member of the Santa Fe Community Foundation. Not long after, she founded Santa Fe Style, a southwestern home furnishings boutique in Georgetown, Washington, D.C. Q helped to run the business for 11 years as store purchaser.

During her time in Santa Fe, Q worked to support nonprofit groups, and cultural organizations, including the Santa Fe Community Foundation and the Santa Fe Chamber Music Festival. Q joined the board of the Santa Fe Chamber Music Festival in 1987 and served as board president from 2002 to 2005.

Among their many successes, Q and her husband, Philip Cook, were granted the Santa Fe Community Foundation's Philanthropic Leadership Award in 2016.

Q married the love of her life, Philip Cook, in Santa Fe on March 11, 1991. They recently celebrated 25 years together, marked with joy and travel among family and friends.

On May 4, 2017, Q passed away at age 82. She was surrounded by family at her home in

Santa Fe after a yearlong struggle with breast cancer. She was survived by her husband, Philip, and three children, Thomas McKittrick Jones, Nancy Jones Carter, and Clarke Fitzgerald Jones, as well as her seven grandchildren.

Q was truly a fighter of justice and we will all miss her dearly. I treasure all of the wonderful contributions she has made to our state. Her memory and legacy is a blessing to us all.

THE BICENTENNIAL BIRTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAHAI FAITH

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 200th anniversary of the birth of Baha'u'llah, the founder of the Baha'i Faith. The message from the Baha'i faith has been that of justice, unity, and peace. I am proud to join my Baha'i constituents in Kansas and those around the world to recognize the occasion of the Bicentennial Birth Anniversary of the Baha'i faith.

The Baha'i Faith first arrived in the U.S. over 120 years ago and now the Baha'is live not only in my state of Kansas, but in every state of our union. Wherever they may live, Baha'is champion the principles of their faith and strive to build a better world by being good citizens, serving their communities, as well as working side by side with others to promote the common good.

Our world would do well to follow the example of Baha'u'llah, as he was known for his charity, service to others, and known as a father to the poor. I am grateful for this opportunity to wish the entire Baha'i community the very best as they continue to be an example of common respect and service to their fellow man.

RECOGNIZING THE 2017 INSTITUTE FOR EXCELLENCE IN SALES AND DEVELOPMENT AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2017 recipients of the Lifetime Achievement Award and the Woman in Sales Leadership Award presented by the Institute for Excellence in Sales & Business Development (IES).

IES was created to foster excellence in business sales and development practices and to help sales professionals and organizations maximize their efforts. IES conducts a variety of workshops and programs designed to provide the knowledge and tools necessary to advance the careers and growth of those who attend. Each year, IES recognizes individuals, teams, and organizations throughout the United States who demonstrate exemplary performance through leadership, risk taking, innovation, vision, and customer development.

Awards are presented in categories including Excellence in Sales Innovation, Excellence in Sales Training, Excellence in Sales Management, Excellence in Customer Partnering, and Excellence in Strategic Alliances. In addition, Lifetime Achievement Awards are bestowed to a select few who have demonstrated continued success and have made significant contributions in their fields.

The recipient of the 2017 Lifetime Achievement Awards is Mr. Paul Smith, Senior Vice President and General Manager of Public Sector for Red Hat, North America. In this capacity, Mr. Smith manages the Red Hat portfolio across the entire federal government, as well as the state and local marketplaces as it relates to education. Prior to joining Red Hat, Mr. Smith enjoyed successful careers at VERITAS, Netscape Communication and Oracle.

The recipient of the inaugural Woman in Sales Leadership Award is Ms. Mary Beth Cockerham, Vice-President of Sales for Deltek. In this capacity, Ms. Cockerham manages all sales personnel related to Deltek's GovWinIQ program, which provides business intelligence to companies that are pursuing public sector sales. Prior to joining Deltek, Ms. Cockerham spent 20 years with Sun Microsystems in a variety of data-related sales roles.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Paul Smith and Mary Beth Cockerham for their innovative and effective leadership and in congratulating them on receiving the 2017 IES Lifetime Achievement Award and Woman in Sales Leadership Award.

EXTENDING FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Congress to address the imminent financial crisis that is facing our nation's community health centers.

Last week, when I was back home in my district, I had the opportunity to visit the Institute for Family Health Center for Counseling in the Bronx. This is just one of New York's 29 Federally Qualified Health Centers operated by the Institute for Family Health, which is committed to improving access to high-quality, patient-centered primary health care targeted to the needs of medically underserved communities. The Center for Counseling highlights the importance of integrated behavioral health as part of the primary care continuum for all Americans, regardless of where they live.

My visit was a reminder of the important role community health centers play in our nation's health care system. They are driven by a commitment to reduce health disparities and assure every American has access to high-quality health care. Congress must not stand in the way of this vital role.

However, this Republican-led Congress has championed partisan gridlock that threatens the vitality of our community and teaching

health centers. As of today, we have watched 24 days go by since federal funding for the Affordable Care Act's (ACA) Community Health Center Fund expired at the end of September. These federal health programs have steadfast bipartisan support, yet the majority's partisan approach is holding up the essential federal funding these centers rely on.

Within a package to extend federal funding for community and teaching health centers as well as the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), Republicans proposed several problematic offsets that would ultimately set our health care system back. For example, certain changes to Medicaid would inhibit access to pediatric providers, and cuts to the ACA's Public Health and Prevention Fund would undermine the value of preventive services delivered at community health centers. Furthermore, the package would lead to higher premiums for certain seniors receiving Medicare benefits and shorter grace periods for individuals who receive their health coverage through the individual market. In other words, this package would slash benefits and protections for one group of beneficiaries to extend services for another.

Democrats will not stand for any packages that would rob Peter to pay Paul. I urge my Republican colleagues to drop this partisan exercise and work with us on a compromise to extend these long-standing, successful, bipartisan federal health programs. The job of our nation's 10,400 community health centers is much too important to bear the brunt of needless political games.

CONGRATULATING BRIGADIER
GENERAL MICHAEL HAYES ON
HIS RETIREMENT AS MANAGING
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MILITARY
AND FEDERAL AFFAIRS, MARY-
LAND DEPARTMENT OF COM-
MERCE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud that Maryland is home to some of the finest military installations in the country, where our nation's most dedicated service-members and civilian defense employees work to keep our country safe. Over the last eighteen years, they and their families and the communities that support our installations have had an outstanding advocate in Brigadier General Michael Hayes USMC (Ret.). Since August, 1999, after his retirement from a distinguished career as a decorated Marine Corps officer, Mike has led the State of Maryland's Office of Military and Federal Affairs as its first Director.

Under Mike's leadership, the Office of Military and Federal Affairs and the Maryland Military Installation Council have overseen efforts to bring community, academic, and military—as well as federal, state, and local—resources together to promote regional development and economic growth. I've had the pleasure of working closely with him over the years to ensure that Fifth District military installations—Patuxent River, Webster Field, and Indian

Head—can continue to grow, serve our national defense, and bring jobs and opportunities to surrounding communities. Mike has played a pivotal role in these efforts, which have earned him accolades, including being named one of two national 'Public Officials of the Year' by the Association of Defense Communities (ADC) in 2007 and becoming a member of the ADC Board of Directors in 2011.

Mike's service to the State of Maryland caps a long career as a Marine officer. He served on active duty during the Vietnam War, commanding artillery batteries during two tours. Later, he went on to command Marine units based in the United States, Japan, and Panama before serving as Chief of Staff to the II Marine Expeditionary Force during Operation Desert Storm. Following his return home, Mike served as Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Facilities and Services at the Marine Corps headquarters before his retirement from thirty-three years of commissioned service in 1999.

A native of Wisconsin, Mike obtained his B.S. in Economics from the University of Wisconsin, and he holds degrees as well from the Naval War College and the National War College. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in thanking Mike for his long career of service to our nation and to the State of Maryland. I wish him and his wife Barbara, as well as their two children and three grandchildren, all the best.

RECOGNIZING THE 2017 BLACK AND
GOLD SCHOLARSHIP BALL
AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Joyce-Gillespie-Harrington Charitable and Educational Foundation and the Zeta Upsilon Lambda Chapter of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity on the occasion of their 37th annual Black and Gold Scholarship Ball.

Since 1980, these two organizations have made tremendous contributions to promoting academic opportunities for youth in Northern Virginia and in the greater Washington, D.C., metropolitan region.

The programs offered by the foundation are vital to the success of our students. This year's Black and Gold Scholarship Ball will support scholarships for ten college-bound high school students. During the last nineteen years, one-hundred students have received scholarships awarded by the foundation and have attended some of the top colleges and universities in the country. With the typical college graduate's debt averaging about \$30,000, the foundation's continued support of these students is absolutely crucial.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD the following names of the 2017 scholarship winners:

Jordyn Bingham (Westfield HS)
Ibrahim Eltahir (Falls Church HS)
Nathanial Herbert (Dominion HS)
Morgan Hobson (Fairfax HS)
Kevin Lacey (Rock Ridge HS)
Andrew Lewis (Riverside HS)

Nicole Monlyn (Rock Ridge HS)
Justin Shelby (South Lakes HS)
Elijah Williamson (Herndon HS)
Mathewos Yiheyis (Hayfield SS)

Mr. Speaker, these students represent our country's next generation of gifted leaders who will have great impact on our society and future. I thank the Joyce-Gillespie-Harrington Charitable and Education Foundation and the Zeta Upsilon Lambda Chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity for their dedicated commitment to fostering success in our youth and commend all of the scholarship winners for their academic excellence. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating these talented students and wishing them great success in all their future endeavors.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
OFFICER JUSTIN A. LEO

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Officer Justin A. Leo, 31, of Girard, who passed away on Saturday, October 21, 2017, at St. Elizabeth Hospital in Youngstown, Ohio, following an injury sustained in the line of duty. Officer Leo, a five-year-veteran of the Girard Police Department, was responding to a domestic dispute call when he was fatally ambushed by the suspect, who was then shot and killed by Leo's partner.

Justin was born January 9, 1986, in Youngstown, Ohio, to David and Patricia (Carson) Leo. He was a 2004 graduate of Girard High School and had attended the University of Toledo and Youngstown State University before graduating from the YSU Police Academy in June 2009. Justin worked for the Mahoning County Sheriff's Department and the Vienna Police Department prior to his appointment to the Girard Police Department on July 6, 2012.

Justin was a member of the Girard High School State Champion Cross Country Team in 2000, the Girard F.O.P. Lodge No. 52, the Girard Alumni Association, and St. Rose Church. Outside of work, Justin loved golfing with his dad and his old friends from the senior tees. He also umpired for the Girard baseball leagues and coached in the 4–6 youth basketball league.

Justin will always be remembered by his parents of Girard; his aunt, Denise Mitchell of Girard; his great-uncle, John (Mimi) Baglier of Canfield; great-aunts, Edith Paz of Sun City Center, Florida and Josephine Berezo, of Parkland, Florida and many cousins. He is preceded in death by his grandparents, Jennie Ellen Leo and John and Lila Carson and his uncle, Donald Leo.

Public calling hours will be held on Saturday, October 28, from 2:00 to 6:00 p.m. at the gymnasium. A funeral mass will be held on Sunday, October 29, 2:00 p.m. at Girard High School gymnasium, officiated by the Rev. Msgr. John Zuraw. Justin will be laid to rest at Tod Homestead Cemetery, following a private committal service.

My heart breaks for Officer Leo's family and friends in this tragedy. They have not only my thoughts and prayers, but the prayers of a community grateful for his selfless service. I extend my deepest condolences.

IN RECOGNITION OF MISS PHENIX
CITY 2018—STELLA KONTOS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize Miss Phenix City 2018, Stella Kontos.

Stella is a junior at Auburn University majoring in Chemical Engineering and minoring in Business. She is vice president of the College of Engineering and on the university's Dean's List. Stella is also a member of Omicron Delta Kappa, Cardinal Key, Lambda Sigma Honors Society, Phi Eta Sigma Honor Society, National Society of Collegiate Scholars and Alpha Gamma Delta Sorority.

Seven years ago, Stella founded her personal platform S.T.A.G.E. (Science, Technology, And Girls in Engineering). Stella works to increase female student participation in Engineering. She's the student liaison to the "100 Women Strong" organization and has spent 1,200 hours speaking to over 5,000 students in 25 different classrooms and conference settings.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Miss Phenix City 2018, Stella Kontos.

RECOGNIZING THE 2017 ABOVE AND
BEYOND BREAKFAST FIRST RE-
SPONDER AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of individuals in Northern Virginia. These individuals have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety and to their community and are being recognized by the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce at their annual Above and Beyond Breakfast.

This event recognizes first responders in the Greater Springfield area who better their community by quietly volunteering personal time, energy, and financial support to fill a need outside of their day-to-day duties. In addition to honoring first responders, a portion of the proceeds raised at the Above and Beyond Breakfast are donated to charitable organizations designated by the honorees.

This year, three members of the public safety community are being honored by the Chamber. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the names of the following individuals.

Private First Class Tom Black, Fairfax County Sheriff's Office, for his work with seniors, Camp Sunshine and World Vision

Private First Class Anthony Capizzi, Fairfax County Police Department, for his work with the Boy Scouts of America

Mr. John "JJ" Jackson, Greater Springfield Volunteer Fire Department, for his faithful operation of Canteen 422, Fire Station 12

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the 2017 Above and Beyond Breakfast first responder award recipients, and thank each of the men and women who serve in the Fairfax County Sheriff's Office, Fairfax County Police Department and the Greater Springfield Volunteer Fire Department. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of our community, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding this group of remarkable citizens and in thanking them for their dedication to the safety and protection of our residents, businesses, and properties.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Ms. TITUS Mr. Speaker, I was absent October 2, 2017 through October 10, 2017 due to the horrific I October tragedy that occurred in my district. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Roll no. 544—H.R. 1547—On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill: YEA

Roll no. 545—H.R. 965—On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended: YEA

Roll no. 546—H. Res. 548—On ordering the previous question: NAY

Roll no. 547—H. Res. 548—On agreeing to the resolution: NAY

Roll no. 548—H.R. 36—On motion to recommit with instructions: YEA

Roll no. 549—H.R. 36—On passage: NAY

Roll no. 550—S. 782—On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended: YEA

Roll no. 551—H. Res. 553—On ordering the previous question: NAY

Roll no. 552—H. Res. 553—On agreeing to the resolution: NAY

Roll no. 553—H. Con. Res. 71—On agreeing to the amendment: YEA

Roll no. 554—H. Con. Res. 71—On agreeing to the amendment: YEA

Roll no. 555—H. Con. Res. 71—On agreeing to the amendment: NAY

Roll no. 556—H. Con. Res. 71—On agreeing to the amendment: YEA

Roll no. 557—H. Con. Res. 71—On agreeing to the resolution: NAY

Roll no. 55—H.R. 1858—On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill: YEA

Roll no. 559—H.R. 2464—On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill: YEA

HONORING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DELTA SIGMA
THETA SORORITY'S NEWPORT
NEWS ALUMNAE CHAPTER

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 80th anniversary of Delta

Sigma Theta Sorority's Newport News Alumnae Chapter.

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority was founded in 1913 by 22 students attending Howard University. These women all saw education and community service as the key to pushing forward the cause of civil rights and progress for the African American community, and that mission remains strong to this day. Today, Delta Sigma Theta has grown to an organization with over 250,000 members and over 940 local chapters operating all over the United States and the world.

The Newport News Alumnae Chapter was originally chartered in 1937 as the Beta Kappa Chapter. It was then changed to the Gamma Iota Sigma Chapter in 1947 before officially becoming the Newport News Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority in 1960. The Chapter was dutifully led in these early years by Charter members Marian Palmer Capps, Clara Pannell, Ethel Pannell, Sallie Watkins Roberts, Dorothy Roles Watkins, Olivia Williamson, and Christine Jefferson Haynes.

The women of the Newport News Alumnae Chapter are committed to the same honored tradition of community service that has driven all of Delta Sigma Theta's members since its inception. Delta Sigma Theta's sisterhood has always been guided by the sorority's Five-Point Programmatic Thrust of Economic Development, Education Development, International Awareness and Involvement, Physical and Mental Health, and Political Awareness and Involvement. It is with these principles in mind that the Newport News Alumnae Chapter established the programs that continue to serve their local community to this day.

Delta Sigma Theta's unwavering commitment to serving the needs of African Americans has been truly reflected through the good work pursued by the Newport News Alumnae Chapter over the years. The Dr. Betty Shabazz Delta Academy provides young girls between 11 and 14 years old with the opportunity to pursue their interests in math, science, and technology. The Delta GEMS program offers college and career planning to at-risk teenage girls who may otherwise not understand the opportunities available to them. The EMBODI program addresses the challenges facing African-American boys by providing middle and high schoolers with counseling and support in subject areas such as fostering healthy relationships, fiscal management, physical and mental health, self-efficacy, and more. These programs provide an invaluable service to the youth of Newport News.

Mr. Speaker, as the Newport News Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority celebrates this exciting milestone, its members can feel affirmed that these past 80 years of fellowship and outreach have left the Newport News community stronger and more united than it otherwise would have been. I would like to congratulate Chapter President Joyce Melvin-Jones and all of the members of the Newport News sisterhood on this special occasion.

RECOGNIZING THE 275TH ANNIVERSARY OF FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a momentous anniversary. This year marks the 275th anniversary of Fairfax County, which I am proud to represent in this chamber and which I represented prior to my election to this body for 14 years on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, including five years as Chairman.

In 1737, Lord Thomas Fairfax of Cameron took possession of a piece of land that included all of what is now Loudoun, Arlington and Fairfax Counties in addition to the cities of Falls Church, Fairfax and Alexandria. At the time, all of this land was part of Prince William County. Installing his cousin William as the managing agent for that land, Lord Fairfax departed back to England to cement his claim. In 1742, William arranged for that piece of land to be officially designated as Fairfax County.

This new county was home to many Americans who would have an impact on our country, most notably future President George Washington. In addition, Fairfax was home to the man who many credit with the creation of the Bill of Rights, George Mason. Working with a member of Virginia's congressional district (and future President himself) James Madison, Mason argued for the creation of amendments to the newly-created U.S. Constitution to protect individual freedoms. Indeed, Mason was one of only three delegates to the Constitutional Convention to refuse to sign the new document because of his concerns that the federal government would be abusive of its authority absent a document like the Bill of Rights.

Fairfax County also played a role in another pivotal time on our Nation's history, the Civil War. The courthouse in Fairfax City served as a headquarters for the U.S. Army and the remains of several forts can still be found throughout the county today. The founder of the Red Cross, Clara Barton, treated wounded soldiers at St. Mary's Church in Fairfax Station, an experience that would eventually lead her to found that organization. While the County was largely spared from major battles (with the exception of the Battle of Ox Hill in 1862), raids and skirmishes between Union and Confederate forces were frequent and portions of the County changed hands several times over the course of the war.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Fairfax County is intimately intertwined with the history of the United States. Although the founders of this County could not have known the future that awaited their holdings, I suspect the evolution from a rural farming community to today's suburban community of over 1 million would please them greatly. Fairfax County has consistently been rated among the best places in the country in which to live, work, raise a family and start a business. Indeed, it stands as an example of a community that consistently sees beyond the years. I was proud to serve it on the Board of Supervisors and have been

proud to represent it in this body. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Fairfax County on this important anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO TAMMY SMITH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tammy Smith as the 2017 Taco John's International Manager of the Year.

Tammy's leadership has helped the team at the Creston Taco John's achieve record-setting sales levels by providing great service and a friendly smile. Tammy was quoted in the Creston News Advertiser as saying "It isn't just me. It's everybody in this store that makes something like that happen. You have to be doing everything right. There's no way I could come in and do it myself."

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Tammy in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great State of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her for earning this outstanding award and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO MARCIA SHOWALTER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Marcia Showalter, from the Mount Ayr Medical Clinic in Mount Ayr, Iowa. Marcia was awarded the 2017 DAISY Award at a ceremony earlier this year.

This award was created to express the public's profound gratitude to nurses for the work they do on a daily basis. Through Marcia's skilled and compassionate care she delivers an outstanding service to her patients and their families. Gordon Winkler, CEO of Ringgold County Hospital, stated, "Marcia epitomizes the exceptional people who provide exceptional care at the clinic and the hospital."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Marcia for receiving this award and for providing excellent patient care to her fellow Iowans. I am proud to represent her and all the members of the Mount Ayr Medical Clinic in the United States Congress and I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Marcia on this outstanding achievement and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO JOKAYE AND RONNIE SHIELDS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate JoKaye and Ronnie Shields on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. The couple married on September 22, 1957 and resides in Mount Ayr, Iowa.

JoKaye and Ronnie's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa's values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend JoKaye and Ronnie on their 60 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO MARILYN AND JAMES SAVILLE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Marilyn and James Saville on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. The couple married on August 19, 1967 and resides in Mount Ayr, Iowa.

Marilyn and James' lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa's values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Marilyn and James on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT HUNTER BECKER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Hunter Becker of Urbandale, Iowa for earning the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout designation is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Approximately two percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that

have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. For his project, Hunter raised \$1,750 and led 31 volunteers in 70 hours of service to prepare the Timberline Soccer Complex in Waukegan for the season, including preparing the goals and building or refurbishing six picnic tables. The work ethic Hunter has shown not only in his Eagle Scout Project but through his many accomplishments during his scouting career speaks volumes about his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family and community demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Hunter and his family in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS AND BILL JAY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Lois and Bill Jay on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. The couple resides in Creston, Iowa.

Lois and Bill's lifelong commitment to each other and their children and grandchildren truly embodies Iowa's values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Lois and Bill on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO BERT AND EDDIE
EHM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bert and Eddie Ehm on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. The couple resides on a farm outside of Arispe, Iowa.

Bert and Eddie's lifelong commitment to each other, their three children and four grandchildren truly embodies Iowa's values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Bert and Eddie on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO ZOLA AND BRUCE
WESTPHAL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Zola and Bruce Westphal on the very special occasion of their 70th wedding anniversary. The couple was married on September 12, 1947, and resides in Greenfield, Iowa.

Zola and Bruce's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 70th wedding anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 70th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Zola and Bruce on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO BEVERLY KEMERY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Beverly Thornton Kemery, of Bedford, Iowa for being awarded the Volunteer of the Year Award from the Bedford Area Chamber.

Beverly has been a lifelong resident of Bedford and has raised a family of four sons, 15 grandchildren and 8 great grandchildren. She held offices with the Bedford Lioness Club, has been a sponsor for the Young Mothers at Heart, and was a Sunday school teacher. Beverly is also a member of the Red Hat Society and the Bedford Northside Apartments.

Mr. Speaker, Beverly's efforts embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent her, and constituents like her, in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Beverly for this outstanding achievement and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY TRIBOLET

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Nancy Tribolet, of Bedford, Iowa for being named the 2017 Iowa Mother of the Year by American Mothers Inc. American Mothers Inc. is celebrating its 82nd year of nationally honoring motherhood.

Nancy was selected because she excels in her role as a mother and a community leader. In 1971, she married her high school sweetheart and they were blessed with three children and five grandchildren. Nancy's love of children has been the foundation of her career in childcare. Over the course of her 45 year career, she has worked with more than 150 children in her community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Nancy in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Nancy for earning this outstanding award and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 25, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERRY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 25, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT PERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HEAD START AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 35 years ago, President Ronald Reagan first proclaimed October as Head Start Awareness Month, and, proudly, we continue to raise awareness about Head Start and the benefits it brings to America's children.

Since its inception 50 years ago, Head Start has improved the lives of more than 32 million children and their families. Head Start gives every child, regardless of circumstances at birth, a chance to succeed in school and in life.

When Head Start was first launched in 1965, the idea of providing comprehensive health, nutrition, and education services to children in poverty was groundbreaking. The Head Start model, developed over the decades, has become one that has been built now on evidence-based practices and is constantly evolving, using the best available science and teaching techniques to meet the needs of local communities.

Head Start takes a comprehensive approach to meeting the needs of young children across four major areas of development, including education. Head Start provides a variety of learning experiences to help children grow intellectually, socially, developmentally, and emotionally.

Health: Head Start offers health services such as immunizations, dental, medical, and mental health and nutritional services and early identification of health problems.

Parent involvement: Head Start involves parents in the planning and implementation of activities. Parents serve on policy councils and committees that make administrative decisions, participate in classes and workshops and child development, and volunteer in the program.

Social services: Head Start also provides outreach to families to determine what services they need.

Mr. Speaker, Head Start focuses on the whole child and the whole family. Research has suggested that educating children in their earliest years plays an important role in inspiring lifelong learning, school readiness, and preparing students before they begin kindergarten as an essential part of Head Start, and it is especially important for some of the most vulnerable among us to ensure access to quality education and the outcomes that can be derived from it.

Head Start and the Early Head Start programs are in small towns and big cities alike. They bring together parents, teachers, volunteers, and community leaders to create a quality program that truly does give lower income children a head start in life.

Studies have shown that students who have had access to Head Start were more likely to graduate from high school and attend college. They are less likely to commit a crime or become a teen parent. Head Start gives children equal footing from the start and allows them every opportunity to be successful, thanks to an early education.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Head Start programs in the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and throughout the Nation for helping to break the intergenerational cycle of poverty. So many Americans from all walks of life were offered a fair start in life thanks to Head Start.

EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise, yet again, because Americans are dying each and every day. The epidemic of gun violence has ended too many futures before they have begun, left too many empty seats at the dinner table, torn too many families apart, and left too many communities asking: How many more before Congress acts?

Mr. Speaker, I can't blame them. With 90 Americans dying from guns every day, this House and this Speaker continue to turn a blind eye to this epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, one man carried out this Nation's worst mass shooting in history in just 11 minutes, leaving 58 Americans dead. These are mothers and friends, sons and brothers, people just trying to enjoy some country music.

Instead of going home to their loving families, instead of going home and being greeted at the door by their toddler, they were carried away in bags. They are now another tragic statistic, another empty seat at Christmas dinner—lives taken, not lost—lives with such potential, lives that were doing amazing things, lives that were raising families and serving their community—lives taken, not lost—lives surrounded by hundreds of other lives that will never, never be the same.

Each life taken is a tragedy, but the hundreds of other lives impacted forever in those 11 minutes are, equally, now made tragic.

489 people were injured. Mr. Speaker, let me say that again, because we often focus on those killed but forget about the hundreds fighting for their lives in the intensive care unit. We forget about those who will need to learn to walk again or will never walk again. We forget about the mom who will never hold her baby again because her arms are paralyzed, the other grandfather who will never see his grandchildren again because he has been blinded.

Mr. Speaker, while Las Vegas marked that largest mass shooting in U.S. history, just 477 days earlier, the largest mass shooting was a preventable tragedy at Pulse nightclub in Orlando that took 49 lives and wounded 58.

How can you say there isn't a problem with gun violence when it takes less than 500 days for one horrific mass shooting to eclipse another as the deadliest in American history?

How can you say there is nothing we can do, as Americans die, as kids get shot and are never the same?

How is one man able to be so destructive in such a short amount of time?

The answer is in an after-market modification called the bump stock that turns an assault weapon into a machine gun, something outlawed by this House during the days of Al Capone. Yet it is still possible to walk into a gun store, purchase this device, and, within minutes, have a gun of war in your hands.

Mr. Speaker, how did we let this happen? More importantly, how are we still letting this happen? Why haven't we acted to outlaw these devices that allow people to make machines in their backyard?

There is a commonsense bipartisan bill awaiting action. Why haven't you called it to the floor? Is it because the NRA changed its mind and now opposes the bill?

Crickets—that is what I thought.

How can we keep our families safe when this House and this majority is beholden to the gun lobby dedicated to profits over people?

REFORM AND REAUTHORIZE FAA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning because the House must continue its work to reform and reauthorize the FAA. We have got to pass H.R. 2997, the 21st Century AIRR Act.

Thirty years ago—30 years ago—the FAA identified the need to modernize or upgrade the Nation's antiquated World War II era air traffic control system. This is a system, at the time, that used radar technology and paper strips for communications between controllers. They literally would take these paper slips and hand them from one controller to the next controller to the next controller as aircraft not only moved through the airwaves, but were moving through the airport systems.

Now, over the last 30 years, Canada, Australia, and many in the EU have changed to this GPS system. We have got countries all across the globe going to GPS, or decades ago have already switched. It is when they go through our airspace, we still use this old radar technology.

Now, during this time, we have upgraded GPS systems. We all carry around handheld devices that use GPS: the Wave app, Google app. There are many different mapping platforms that allow you to get through cities, towns, the countryside. If there is an accident, there is a delay, it allows you to get around it and move through so that we can actually have greater efficiencies on the road.

But 30 years have gone by, and today, after spending \$7 billion, the FAA still uses this outdated radar technology, moving from beacon to beacon, getting passed along as you travel across the

United States. And, yes, our air traffic control system still passes these little pieces of paper from one to the next to the next. Oftentimes, if you travel around, you will go through areas where you are not captured by the radar at all, while other countries continue with this GPS system.

This outdated air traffic control system negatively impacts the entire flying public. An outdated ATC means route inefficiencies, which means higher costs, which yields more congestion in our skies and sitting on our tarmacs.

I would like to see a system where you don't leave the gate to go sit on the runway until you know that you actually have a slot and are moving into the air and have a direct flight to your point. But today, you will see many airlines that will sit you out on the tarmac waiting for a slot.

More congestion is a direct factor of flight delays and canceled flights. The reforms in this bill will provide more on-time departures and arrivals and less canceled flights.

This bill is for the average flier. It doesn't matter which airline you take, we ought to have an air traffic control system that serves them all with a GPS system that allows you to get from point A to point B without the time delays.

This also has the Air Improvement Program fully funded, which actually increases the Airport Improvement Program from \$3.3 billion to \$4 billion. It has the ability to upgrade our airports.

Mr. Speaker, I also served my country in the Air Force for 16 years. As a veteran, I know that national security comes first. The 21st Century AIRR Act does not jeopardize the interaction between the Department of Defense and air traffic control; in fact, it strengthens it. The Federal Government retains exclusive sovereignty and control of the airspace, and the President maintains critical authority to assume control of the airspace during emergencies in times of war.

The time to bring up the bill, H.R. 3997, the 21st Century AIRR Act, is now. The public has waited way too long. We have been bypassed by other countries. If we can identify it 30 years ago that we had World War II technology, we ought to recognize it today and stop passing these little pieces of paper back and forth through our air traffic control systems.

Let's upgrade our systems, let's create efficiencies, and let's get people moving across this country in an efficient manner where they are not sitting on tarmacs waiting for flight delays.

DEMAND ACTION FOR VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise, once again, to honor, mourn, and demand action for victims of gun violence.

On October 1, a gunman armed with semiautomatic weapons equipped with bump stocks fired hundreds of rounds in a matter of minutes at concert goers in my Las Vegas congressional district, killing 58 and injuring 489 others in attendance.

During my tenure in Congress, I have stood for too many moments of silence on this House floor to remember lives lost to senseless gun violence.

Many of my colleagues and I know all too well about the senseless loss of life in our streets, movie theaters, schools, and, now, concert venues. We have pleaded, we have watched, we have mourned as more and more victims suffer, and we have seen nothing from congressional Republicans.

This just can't go on. We can't ignore the lives lost due to gun violence in my district or in any other for any longer, and if we don't act soon, we will just be here doing it again.

So I want to call the names, say the names, remember the names of the 58 casualties who lost their lives in my district. Let us honor their memory, and let these 58 names give the Republicans 58 more reasons why we must take action now.

Hannah Ahlers; Heather Alvarado; Dorene Anderson; Carrie Barnette; Jack Beaton; Steve Berger; Candice Bowers; Denise Burditus; Sandy Casey; Andrea Castilla; Denise Cohen; Austin Davis; Thomas Day, Jr.; Christiana Duarte; Stacey Etcheber; Brian Fraser; Keri Galvan; Dana Gardner; Angela Gomez; Rocio Guillen Rocha; Charleston Hartfield, a police officer off duty; Chris Hazencomb; Jennifer Topaz Irvine; Teresa Nicol Kimura; Jessica Klymchuk; Carly Kreibaum; Rhonda LeRocque; Victor Link; Jordan McIlldoon; Kelsey Meadows; Calla-Marie Medig; James "Sonny" Melton; Patricia Mestas; Austin Meyer; Adrian Murfitt; Rachael Parker; Jenny Parks; Carrie Parsons; Lisa Patterson; John Phippen; Melissa Ramirez; Jordyn Rivera; Quinton Robbins; Cameron Robinson; Tara Roe; Lisa Romero-Muniz; Chris Roybal; Brett Schwanbeck; Bailey Schweitzer; Laura Shipp; Erick Silva; Susan Smith; Brennan Stewart; Derrick "Bo" Taylor; Neysa Tonks; Michelle Vo; Kurt von Tillow; and Bill Wolfe.

These are the 58 people who lost their lives from gun violence in my district in Nevada; 58 more reasons why we shouldn't stand silent, but we need to take action now.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION'S AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the critical and lifesaving work being done by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Aircraft Operations Center.

On September 23, I had a front row seat flying into the eye of Hurricane Maria as it headed toward Puerto Rico and the coastal United States. I rode through the hurricane aboard a NOAA P-3 Orion operated by the highly specialized workforce of the NOAA Commissioned Officer Corps, civilian technicians, meteorologists from NOAA, and others, who have safely navigated these hurricanes for decades.

The P-3's instruments collect and transmit realtime weather data from storms far out to the sea back to the mainland. This data is critical for hurricane forecasters used by the American public and emergency managers.

Providing the most accurate forecasts of hurricane track and intensity, as early as possible, is the focus of these flights. Whether a strong hurricane directly hits a major U.S. city or weakens and spins out to sea with minimal impacts is a question that can impact billions of dollars and thousands of lives. These flights are vital to protect our Nation's lives and property.

In addition to the P-3 hurricane hunter I flew in, NOAA also has a G-IV jet that goes high above the storm. The specialized instrumentation on NOAA hurricane aircraft provides critical storm data. The dual-channel tail doppler radars provide three-dimensional views of the storm.

These advanced technology tools make NOAA's fleet a critical resource to safeguard lives and property when hurricanes threaten our shores. There is no doubt that this has been a challenging hurricane season for the country, with Hurricane Harvey's flooding in Louisiana and Texas, Hurricane Irma impacting Florida, and Hurricane Maria devastating Puerto Rico. NOAA's aircraft have performed tirelessly throughout these events. Over a 4-week period, two NOAA hurricane aircraft flew over 300 hours and dropped over 500 weather probes into these storms.

After the hurricanes pass, NOAA's work is not done. NOAA's fleet of light aircraft perform poststorm damage assessments, taking high resolution images that enable limited emergency response resources to be delivered to the most critical areas.

NOAA's King Air aircraft emergency response efforts to Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria have resulted in more than 1.7 billion requests for damage assessment images. In total, more than 65,000 images were collected, covering more than 24,000 square kilometers of impacted areas. Think about that.

These images allow emergency managers and the general public to be able to flee quickly, to react quickly, and to assess quickly in these impacted areas.

NOAA's light survey aircraft also perform a diverse set of missions, including river and snow pack surveys essential for flood forecasts and water management; coastal mapping required for safe maritime navigation by commercial, military, and recreational sectors; and fisheries assessments.

NOAA's aircraft are responsive and flexible, able to deploy at a moment's notice in support of national disaster response. NOAA aircraft provided critical data and support on scene following the Deepwater Horizon event and over the skies of New York after Hurricane Sandy. NOAA aircraft provide data critical for public safety, economic, and national security.

The NOAA aircraft fleet, the NOAA Commissioned Corps, and NOAA civilians are an invaluable natural resource, and it is one that we have a duty to maintain. These crews and aircraft require regular updates, readiness training, and technology enhancements that directly benefit us and our country.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and the President to ensure that NOAA aircraft fleet has all of the resources they need to safeguard lives and property for decades to come.

PUERTO RICO NEEDS HELP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, imagine waking up with no lights, imagine waking up with no running water, you cannot bathe yourself, you cannot feed your children, you get so desperate that you break into chemically contaminated water, into untreated sewage water, you are on dialysis, Mr. Speaker, and there is still no electricity, or you are running out of medication and supplies in hospitals that are very low.

What I am describing to you, Mr. Speaker, is not a dream. It is a living nightmare, and it has been a living nightmare in Puerto Rico for over a month. For over 4 weeks, while we now begin to focus and speak about tax reform and how this Congress attempts to assist the 1 percent—the wealthiest, the well-heeled—with a handsome tax break, with the elimination of the estate tax, when we attempt to shelve, to forget, to turn our head on this nightmare unfolded in Puerto Rico, it continues to be a living nightmare.

That doesn't stop there, Mr. Speaker. Puerto Rico could lose funding also for thousands of low-income housing units if power to the island isn't restored soon. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, which subsidizes

203 housing projects on the island, is prohibited by law from providing Section 8 assistance to buildings that are not decent, safe, and sanitary.

Every day that Puerto Rico goes without resources, potable water, medication, and electricity, the situation becomes more dangerous and the death tolls continue to go up. This has now become, Mr. Speaker, our Caribbean Katrina.

The official death toll reported by the government increased today to 49 deaths, but many folks fear that it is much higher than that, after confirming a death due to leptospirosis. According to the CDC, leptospirosis is a bacterial disease that affects humans and animals. Without treatment, this disease can lead to kidney damage, meningitis, liver failure, respiratory distress, and even death. To date, the island has reported 76 possible cases of the disease. Investigative reporting from various sources have tallied up deaths to potentially north of 450 people. As of Friday, October 6, at least 14 people have committed suicide in Puerto Rico. They are traumatized and in distress. This is our Caribbean Katrina. A list of 113 people remain missing after Maria's passage.

I was just in Puerto Rico for the second time this past week with Congressman LUIS GUTIÉRREZ. The Congressman and I helped distribute supplies and necessities to Comerio, a small town in a remote part of Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico continues to need help. It needs to be woken up from this living nightmare. S.O.S. S.O.S. Get resources to them now. It is our Caribbean Katrina. Let's own it. Let's resolve it.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, the world is an ugly place right now. It seems that at every turn there is another crisis—another barrier to peace and prosperity, another obstacle to fight, or another cross to bear. More of our citizens, women, children, and grandkids are turning to something—anything—to mute the pain and create a false sense of peace. Society has been infected by drug addiction, a disease fueled by a loss of hope.

We see it on the news, we watch it online, we feel loss in our communities. This disease is killing our friends and neighbors. Last year alone, over 64,000 lives were lost. That is more casualties in a year than we saw during the height of the Vietnam war.

And this is a war, too—a war being fought in the streets and in our homes. And we are losing. Mothers, sons, daughters, and fathers are dying—from the cold streets of major cities to the quiet fields of rural America—we are

all feeling the effects of the opioid crisis.

What can be done? That is a question I have asked countless law enforcement officials, doctors, nurses, addiction treatment professionals, and community leaders. There is no one solution to stopping the opioid epidemic in this country.

This is a man-made disaster. We must face it head on with education and awareness, addiction and recovery services, funding, prescription drug monitoring programs, and prevention. We need to prevent our loved ones from being dragged into the abyss of addiction and hopelessness.

According to the CDC, three out of four new heroin users report abusing prescription opioids before using heroin. There is an easy step each of us can take to help with prevention. We can get rid of our old opioid prescriptions at home. Why chance someone taking them? Why chance your loved one being a statistic?

This year alone, 153 individuals in St. Louis County have already died of an overdose. How many of them started with prescribed opioids? How many started by taking prescriptions from a parent or a family member? If we could have saved just one of these lives by throwing away old prescriptions, then isn't it worth it?

This Saturday, October 28, local law enforcement and the Drug Enforcement Agency will be set up all around the country and in our neighborhoods for National Prescription Drug Take Back Day. They are providing safe and easy locations for you to throw away unused prescription drugs.

I have no idea how many people can, and will, be saved by this one simple act. But multiply this one act times thousands, and now we are getting something done. Mr. Speaker, this is an epidemic this Nation has never seen. This is a disease of our own making.

This week, there is something we all can do. Think about your household. Go into your hidden cupboards and see if you have old prescriptions. I bet you do. Take them. Find your nearest drug take back location and throw them away.

We need to restore hope in this fight, and it won't happen overnight. It will take work, prayer, patience, and vigilance. Hope can be restored. If and when we band together to fight this epidemic, it will happen.

So let's restore a little hope this week. Let's all join the fight to end the opioid epidemic.

□ 1030

THE WHITEFISH ENERGY DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, there is something fishy about the Whitefish

Energy deal that was reported in The Washington Post.

Whitefish Energy, based in Whitefish, Montana, was awarded a \$300 million contract to repair and replace the electrical grid in Puerto Rico. We learned that the company is 2 years old and, as of about 6 weeks ago, had just two employees. It does not have a track record of working on massive projects, certainly not one as massive as rebuilding the power grid in Puerto Rico after a once-in-a-century storm like Hurricane Maria.

The Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority did not solicit bids for this contract. They did not do what most power utilities do under these circumstances, which is rely on mutual assistant relationships with other power companies.

In Florida and in Texas—and in Illinois, for that matter—after a big storm, power companies from around the country send linemen and other workers to assist the local company. But that is not happening here. The Florida Power and Light Company brought in 20,000 workers after Irma and, apparently, was willing to send workers to Puerto Rico and help, but the request for help never came.

So what is going on here?

A tiny company that does not have a track record gets one of the biggest contracts to help rebuild Puerto Rico in a no-bid, out-of-the-ordinary contracting procedure.

That is why I wrote yesterday to Attorney General Jeff Sessions and FBI Director Christopher Wray, because I want them to investigate this deal, how it was awarded, why this company got the contract, and whether there is any evidence of it being a sweetheart, corrupt deal to boost business allies and political allies of the President and members of his Cabinet.

I also plan to bring this issue up to the Oversight Committees in this body.

On the surface, the Whitefish Energy deal looks fishy, but when you look a little deeper, the Whitefish Energy deal looks corrupt.

Whitefish Energy is based in Whitefish, Montana. Guess what. That is the hometown of Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, who used to represent Montana in this body. His son even worked for the company. The chief executive of Whitefish Energy, Andy Techmanski, knows Secretary Zinke; but as a spokesperson for the Interior Department said yesterday, in Whitefish, "everybody knows everybody."

Guess what. That doesn't make me feel any better about the deal.

Go a little deeper and you find out that Whitefish Energy is financed by HBC Investments, which is a private equity firm founded by Joe Colonnetta, who holds the title of general partner.

The Daily Beast reported that Colonnetta gave \$20,000 to the Trump Victory PAC, maxed out on contributions to Trump for his Presidential

campaign in the primaries and general elections, about \$32,000, then another \$30,000 that he gave to the Republican National Committee. Kimberly Colonnetta, his wife, was also a maximum donor, meaning she gave the maximum allowed by law during the 2016 election to Trump and his various committees.

Now, please look here, and the pictures are right off the Internet. They certainly add additional evidence to the idea that Whitefish and the Colonnettas are pretty chummy with our President and his Cabinet. Right here is Mr. Colonnetta with the President of the United States, the two Colonnettas at the inauguration, and a picture of Mrs. Colonnetta with Ben Carson, one of the President's Cabinet members.

Don't forget, all you kids out there watching at home on C-SPAN, what you post on Facebook stays there forever.

Now, I know that not everything that looks corruption is in fact corruption. Sometimes what looks fishy on the surface turns out to be legit, but most of the time, you know what, it turns out to be corruption.

The reason this matters so much is that, without electricity, we can't get water restored to the people of Puerto Rico. Water doesn't flow uphill without pumps, and those pumps need power. You cannot live without water; you die. Dialysis machines, electrical wheelchairs, refrigeration for baby formula, insulin for diabetics, chemotherapy for those with cancer all require electricity. It is a matter of life and death.

I was just there and saw the suffering of the people in the villages and towns across the island of Puerto Rico. Without electricity, we cannot get Puerto Ricans back to work rebuilding their island and beginning to end the suffering.

Look, the last thing we and the people of Puerto Rico need right now is a fat cat lining his pockets with money because they are well connected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. That money should be saving lives, not ending them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. That is why I demand the FBI and the Attorney General investigate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

INNOVATIVE APPRENTICESHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the PARTNERS

Act, legislation I am introducing this morning with my friend, Representative BONAMICI from Oregon.

Our bill would establish a grant program to support the creation and expansion of innovative apprenticeships that prepare our workers for 21st century careers.

In the Third District of Georgia, the CEC in Newnan has led Georgia by implementing an apprenticeship model, and since then, we have seen apprenticeships continue to expand across our great State.

I, along with Ms. BONAMICI, are introducing the PARTNERS Act today to bring more programs like this to students and workers across the Nation.

By funding this grant with already existing H1-B visa fees, which are collected from foreign visa applicants, we are ensuring that workers can receive immediate work-based training at no cost to the American taxpayer.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND WORK-BASED LEARNING PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be on the floor this morning to introduce bipartisan legislation with my colleague on the Education and Workforce Committee, Congressman DREW FERGUSON from Georgia.

Our bill, Promoting Apprenticeships Through Regional Training Networks for Employers' Required Skills Act, or PARTNERS Act, will help close the skills gap by increasing opportunities for small- and medium-sized businesses to establish apprenticeships and work-based learning programs.

When I visit communities in northwest Oregon, I hear from many Oregonians who still feel left behind because they don't have the skills they need to compete in today's economy. They are not alone. Many jobs today do not require a 4-year degree, but do require more than a high school diploma. In fact, those jobs make up about 53 percent of today's labor market, but only 43 percent of today's workers are trained at this level.

This creates a skills gap, leaving businesses struggling to find workers with appropriate skills, and workers without meaningful pathways to better paying jobs.

I hear from employers and workforce organizations about the importance of a qualified workforce. They want to identify new opportunities to strengthen skills training.

Apprenticeships and work-based learning programs are a win-win. They provide individuals with paid, on-the-job training and classroom instruction. Employers can align training with the skills they need at their workplaces, and workers can learn while they earn.

Unfortunately, small- and medium-sized businesses often lack the infra-

structure and resources to establish apprenticeships or work-based learning programs on their own. So the PARTNERS Act addresses this by establishing a grant program to support the creation and expansion of industry and sector partnerships that will help small- and medium-sized businesses develop work-based learning programs and provide support programs for workers.

Industry and sector partnerships will bring together employers, education, training, labor, and community-based organizations to develop work-based learning programs that benefit workers and the economy as a whole.

In Oregon, these partnerships could address, for example, workforce development needs in rapidly growing sectors like healthcare and technology.

Under the PARTNERS Act, the partnerships would use grant funds to recruit workers, develop training curriculum, and provide workers with access to tools, work attire, transportation, childcare services, and mentorship support. These support services help businesses retain employees and help workers balance caring for and providing for their families.

Importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill results in no additional cost to taxpayers because it authorizes the use of 50 percent of the funds deposited in the H1-B nonimmigrant petition account, and these will be used by the Department of Labor for the partnership grants. This funding source was suggested by the administration in a June 2017 executive order on apprenticeships.

Through stronger investments and work-based learning programs, we can build pathways to get more people back to work, to provide our Nation's businesses with the workforce that will improve productivity and efficiency.

I thank Mr. FERGUSON for his leadership, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bipartisan legislation that will help people in our districts across the country access good jobs.

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today we will begin a journey that has been represented to be a lifeline for the American people in long awaited tax reform.

Sad to say that this is not a bipartisan bill. In addition, it is a bill that will cause a great deal of challenge to the American people.

For example, in moving firms across the ocean, overseas, the American people should know that those companies, in the construct of this bill, will cause them to be exempt from taxes forever.

In a discussion this morning, I heard that it will not boost the economy. The

American people should know that it will destroy, undermine, crush the economy.

The representation of the level of growth is a misnomer. Take, for example, in 1986, in the tax reform, there was no surge in job creation after the Reagan tax cuts. There was no high numbers of blossoming jobs. Many in my congressional district need jobs.

It will be borrowing from the future and it will be a burden on our children, our children's children, and their children. But the most devastating part is the bill that we will be paying, the actual dollars to pay down the deficit.

Of course, it should be known that we have examples that no jobs will be created. In 2004, for example, when there was a repatriation from companies regarding their taxes, there was no creation of jobs that we can even recognize. Most of the money went for stock buybacks.

Now, I know that sounds completely technical, but let me be very clear. The question has to be: What will the middle class working families get?

I can assure you, it will be close to zero.

There are 2 million households, for example, in the State of Texas that will be impacted by not allowing the exemption of State and local taxes. We don't know whether mortgage deductions will be allowed, charitable tax credits. So if you have in some way been deducting, for example, those State and local taxes, you will not be able to do them anymore. That will be a great burden on the working families of America.

So my caution to the business community as well as the small businesses, families: Be very careful what you buy into. We will have discussions to provide you with that detailed analysis. The key is a distribution table. What and whom will get the most money.

As the bill is presently written, middle class working families, don't look for relief in the Ryan-McConnell tax bill. It will all go to the top 1 percent. They will relish while, you might not be jealous, but you will certainly be poorer for it.

OPIOID CRISIS

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to also entertain the questions about the pending opioid announcement of this White House. I want to bring to the attention the article in The New Yorker on the empire of pain. I am working on these issues, but I realize that this has to be a comprehensive approach to opioid abuse.

The Purdue company launched OxyContin with a marketing campaign that attempted to counter this attitude and change the prescribing habits of doctors.

□ 1045

Many people know OxyContin. The company funded research and paid doctors to make the case that concerns

about opioid addiction were overblown and that OxyContin would safely treat an ever-wider range of maladies. Sales representatives marketed OxyContin as a product to start with and to stay with. Remember that. A product to start with and to stay with.

Millions of patients found the drug to be a vital salve for excruciating pain, but many others grew so hooked on it, that between doses they experienced debilitating withdrawal.

If we are going to do real opioid reform, this must be a standup of the pharmaceutical companies, and they cannot be defended.

In addition, we have to understand that those languishing in jail that have suffered from criminal penalties for crack cocaine—crack—there now should be a compromise for their release. Opioid reform must include all of the neighborhoods of America, not just some.

JENNIFER KEPNER WAS MOST COURAGEOUS AND INSPIRING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of a wonderful person, an incredible wife, loving mother, exceptional citizen, and one of our Nation's finest servicemembers, Jennifer Kepner.

Jennifer passed away on October 18, 2017, at the young age of 39. She lived in my congressional district in Cathedral City, California. My heart breaks for her family and loved ones. She is, by far, one of the most courageous and inspiring people I have ever met. She put family, country, and community before self.

At 23, Jennifer answered the call to serve our Nation as a medic and a staff sergeant in the United States Air Force. She served for 6 years, from 2001 to 2007, and helped save countless lives on the battlefield.

After being honorably discharged at the rank of staff sergeant, Jenn continued her life of service, helping patients in our local communities as a radiology technician at Desert Regional Medical Center in Palm Springs.

She led a healthy and full life in so many ways. Her many hobbies included CrossFit, hiking, camping with her family, quilting, and even painting.

All who met her remember her love of country, her determined spirit, her passion for serving others, and her devotion to family.

Despite her healthy lifestyle and no other risks, in 2016, Jennifer was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer, a terrifying diagnosis for anyone, let alone a young mother.

After exhaustive work to investigate the potential causes of her cancer, her oncologist linked Jennifer's exposure to burn pits in Iraq as the only identifiable and plausible risk for her cancer.

Burn pits are commonly used by the military to eliminate waste in Iraq and Afghanistan. The large burn pit at Balad Air Base in Iraq, where Jennifer was stationed for 6 months in 2006, covered 10 acres and burned over 240 tons of trash each day, including everything from computer parts, medical waste, plastics, and chemicals; some items we wouldn't allow to be burned in open air in our neighborhoods here in the United States. Yet, in a crowded camp of thousands, our men and women in uniform are exposed to giant plumes of black smoke.

After learning of the potential link between her exposure while she served our great Nation and her cancer, she went to the VA seeking answers and help. After being denied medical assistance and benefits from the VA initially, Jennifer reached out to the advocacy group Burn Pits 360 and my office.

Along with others, and as a team, we helped her navigate the complicated VA process, cut through the red tape, and get her the benefits that she had earned.

I visited Jennifer at her home. During our kitchen table talk, she told me about her daily struggle raising two small children while battling pancreatic cancer. She was brave and had an optimistic attitude.

She told me what it was like living every day in Iraq right next to the burn pits—the smoke, the smell, the irritated cough, and the sickness that followed.

Her main concern was to ensure her husband and children were going to be okay after she passed. Her second concern was for her fellow veterans who, like her, were exposed to burn pits. She wanted to bring awareness to what she called “the Agent Orange of our generation.” Imagine that. During the toughest battle of her life against an aggressive cancer, she elevated her family and fellow veterans above herself. Her advocacy was for us to prevent future exposure to burn pits and serve veterans who have already been exposed.

That is why we are here, to honor Jennifer and fight for her, her family, and fellow veterans. We must find a solution. Unfortunately, it is too late for Jennifer, but we can fight in her honor.

I was there with Jenn; her husband, Ben; children, Aida and Wyatt, at her bedside hours before she passed away, and I am honored to call Ben my friend.

On behalf of my wife, Monica, the 36th Congressional District, and our entire Nation, we join together as a community to grieve with you, Ben, little Aida and Wyatt, and to honor your wife, your mother, and the life of Jennifer Kepner. We are awed and humbled by Jennifer's life of patriotism and service, and her life and her love of family.

Jennifer, we thank you for your service and sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, Jennifer's memory will never be forgotten.

A CIRCUIT BREAKER IS NEEDED FOR PROPOSED TAX CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the exercise my Republican friends are going through with their budget and tax cut proposal would be amusing if the consequences were not so serious.

Coming to Congress, I worked hard to earn a position on the House Ways and Means Committee, which has been the focal point for critical decisions in the past dealing with tax reform, with Social Security. I respected its historic role and the way that its members worked together in a thoughtful and bipartisan basis.

Unfortunately, unlike what has happened for other major tax reform efforts, currently there has been no effort for laying the groundwork, working with people in both parties, dealing with the hard decisions that are necessary for tax reform that will move our country forward. My Republican friends refuse to deal with the heavy legislative lifting necessary for true reform.

In fact, my Republican friends now have given up on tax reform. They are rushing through, in a matter of days, not reform but as big a tax cut as they can possibly get, predicated on strong-arming their Members with narrow control in Congress and disregarding the fundamentals of responsible budgeting.

The budget resolution that the House will soon be considering by the Republicans to enact their tax cut via the process known as reconciliation is a fantasy. Read it carefully. It is predicated on increasing our national debt \$1.5 trillion, when previously they promised that their tax reform would be budget neutral.

It is predicated on \$4 trillion of unspecified budget cuts that will be concentrated on Medicare, Medicaid, and the other programs that Americans care the most deeply about.

The proof for this fantasy is the fact that even though Republicans have an ironclad grip on the appropriations process in both the House and the Senate and they don't have to worry about filibusters, they don't need any Democratic votes at all, but they still cannot summon the courage of their convictions to implement the beginning of this strategy.

It doesn't have to wait for 2 or 4 or 10 years. They could start now with the budget cutting that they are relying upon for this fantasy budget, but they know that the American people won't

stand for it and their own Members wouldn't vote for those cuts now even though there is nothing stopping them.

That is why it is absolutely essential that, even if they are modestly successful with this reckless agenda, that we take steps to prevent the resulting fiscal train wreck, because we have seen deficits explode in the past where rosy projections about economic growth and stern budget cuts fail to materialize.

The landmark 1986 tax reform legislation, the last time we had real tax reform, by the way, predicated on bipartisan cooperation and a lot of hard work, had no discernible impact on economic growth, even though it was, in fact, worth it.

As a result, I will be offering standalone legislation and amendments in the Ways and Means Committee to establish a circuit breaker that will suspend the tax cuts if the rosy projections fail to materialize. If deficits explode and budgets are not cut according to their plan, then the American people should be spared the economic chaos by calling a timeout and rolling back these reckless proposals, allowing us to catch our breath and hopefully develop better policy based on bipartisanship and facts, not fantasy.

America deserves a far-better vision than the Republican budget fantasy and the reckless tax cuts that they are pushing so hard to enact. At a minimum, we should have a circuit breaker to stop it if they can't follow through on their promises.

AMRO FABRICATING CELEBRATES 40 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 40th anniversary of AMRO Fabricating Corporation, whose Riverside manufacturing facility is adjacent to the March Air Reserve Base in my district.

AMRO is a small business manufacturer that plays an important role in supporting NASA, the Department of Defense, and our community.

Under the guidance of CEO Michael E. Riley, the grandson of founders Michael K. and Thora A. Riley, this family company is helping to develop a strong and skilled workforce in southern California.

AMRO is partnering with the State and Federal Government on projects that place high school and college students in internships and apprenticeships, which prepare them for a successful future and support our local economy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the AMRO team on this milestone, and I am proud to represent this terrific small business that is doing such great work for our community and for our Nation.

THE BIG BANKS ARE MAKING BIG BUCKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am honored to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America, although I am sad to bring the news that I shall share with you.

I am saddened by something that has happened in this Congress. The big banks are making big bucks. They are doing very well, and they just received a big bonus from Congress.

The big bonus is this: if you do business with them, you will have to participate in arbitration, and you won't be allowed to sue them to resolve your dispute by way of litigation. Congress has decided that the big banks making the big bucks can force you to go to arbitration, and you will have to pay a fee to negotiate your way through the arbitration process. I think that there is something wrong with this picture.

There is something wrong with this picture when we realize that one bank—and I will just single one out, I won't go through all of the entirety of the industry, but one bank, Wells Fargo, one bank, opened 3.5 million accounts in the names of persons without their consent. In the names of customers, 3.5 million accounts without the consent of customers.

□ 1100

This one bank, Wells Fargo, paid \$185 million as a part of the resolution. This one bank, Wells Fargo, paid \$80 million for enrolling customers into auto insurance that they didn't need. One bank, Wells Fargo, paid \$2.8 million in refunds to customers. One bank, Wells Fargo, in 2012, illegally foreclosed on servicemembers' homes and autos—one bank, Wells Fargo—and for this, they paid \$311 million. This was about \$125,000 per servicemember.

So we find ourselves in a circumstance where banks that do these ugly things to customers won't have to go to court. They won't have to face a jury. They will simply require the customer to negotiate with them. I find this quite shocking, to be quite frank with you, and I am very saddened by it, because I know that, if you take from the bank, you will go to court. But, apparently, Congress has concluded that, if the bank takes from you, you go to the bank and negotiate.

It is a sad state of affairs.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Christopher Girata, Saint Michael and All Angels Episcopal Church, Dallas, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we thank You for the gift of this life and ask Your blessing upon the world You have made. Have compassion on those who suffer from any grief or trouble.

Give to the people of our country a zeal for justice and the strength of forbearance that we may use our liberty in accordance with Your gracious will. Guide all who govern and hold authority in this Nation, and kindle in every heart that true love of peace.

Make our lives a sign of Your love to this broken world, that unity may overcome estrangement, forgiveness, heal guilt, and joy conquer despair. Grant that the bonds of our common humanity, by which all Your children are united one to another, may be so transformed by Your grace that Your will may be done on Earth as it is in heaven.

All this, we ask in the name of God, our creator, redeemer, and sustainer.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR.
CHRISTOPHER D. GIRATA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my true honor to introduce and recognize our guest chaplain today, Father Chris Girata. I am honored because he is my rector, the rector of Saint Michael and All Angels Episcopal Church in Dallas, Texas, where my family and I have worshipped for over 20 years.

Although he has been our rector for only a little over a year, Father Girata has brought a renewed spirituality and passion to our parish. His enthusiasm for God's Word and will is infectious to us all. His sense of humor always brightens our day, and he leads by example.

As one parishioner put it, Mr. Speaker: "He is a true voice for the powerless and poor and is constantly challenging us to even better walk as Christ did." And whether it is through our service at the Jubilee Park and Community Center in South Dallas, the millions in charity provided through the St. Michael's Woman's Exchange, or any of the other ministries or outreach projects of our parish, under Father Chris Girata, Saint Michael is more humbly and effectively serving God's children.

And as we do, Father Girata leads us not to just serve our neighbors' physical needs, but to serve their spiritual needs as well. I am grateful that his prayer and his example could be shared with the House today.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 25, 2017, at 9:07 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 226.

That the Senate passed S. 1766.

That the Senate concur in the House of Representatives amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2266.

That the Senate agree to without amendment H.J. Res. 111.

Appointments:

United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

LIBERATION OF MARAWI,
PHILIPPINES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, sadly, radical Islamic terrorists continue their assault on innocent victims across the world.

This month, there were ISIS-inspired knife attacks in France and Canada, as well as the surprise attack in Niger, with mass murders of worshippers at mosques in Kabul.

Gratefully, there are victories over the terrorists, such as the recent liberation of Raqqa, Syria, and now in the Philippines.

Congratulations to the people of the Philippines, successfully led by President Rodrigo Duterte and their courageous military, on the recent liberation of Marawi from ISIS militants.

Marawi is the capital city of over 200,000 citizens in the province of Lanao del Sur on the island of Mindanao, which has been under ISIS control since the end of May. Innocent families were persecuted in this murderous occupation.

While liberating Marawi from ISIS control is a milestone in combatting global terrorism, this fight is far from finished. We must be successful to defeat the terrorists overseas to protect American families at home.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

URGE IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF
THE DREAM ACT

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the immediate passage of the Dream Act to bring certainty to the more than 10,000 DREAMers in Oregon and DREAMers across the country.

I have met with DREAMers in my State of Oregon, and tearing them away from their lives would be a tremendous loss for our communities. DREAMers like Daniel, a dedicated second grade teacher, DACA allowed him to come out of the shadows and give back to his community.

But with President Trump ending DACA, Daniel is rightly anxious about his future. He worries about the effect on his students if he is forced to leave abruptly in the middle of the school year.

When we threaten DREAMers, we put their futures at risk, but we also risk harming the many people who rely on them, like Daniel's students.

Mr. Speaker, we must work together and pass the Dream Act immediately. We just pledged, "with liberty and justice for all." Let's bring justice to the DREAMers and pass the Dream Act.

PREVENTING TAX-FREE BONDS
FROM GOING TO ABORTION PROVIDERS

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the No Abortion Bonds Act, to end Federal tax-exempt bonds that support abortion providers.

Under a loophole in the current law, cities, counties, and States can issue Federal tax-free bonds to finance construction of abortion clinics.

In 2012, the New York City government issued a tax-free \$15 million bond for a \$30 million renovation of Planned Parenthood's national headquarters, which was subsequently sold 3 years later for \$60 million. In 2007, Sarasota County, Florida, floated an \$8 million tax-free bond to pay for a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic.

These tax-free bonds are intended to finance schools, hospitals, infrastructure—not abortion clinics.

The No Abortion Bonds Act has over 30 bipartisan cosponsors and is endorsed by Americans United for Life, Susan B. Anthony List, National Right to Life, March for Life, the Family Policy Alliance, and the Eagle Forum.

Please join me today in applying the spirit of the Hyde amendment to the Tax Code by preventing tax-free bonds from going to abortion providers.

MEDICARE BUY-IN OPTION

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is the best public option that already exists to improve the Affordable Care Act and to provide immediate relief to Americans on the individual market.

Next week, the Nation's State insurance commissioners will make public insurers' price gouging increases for next year, including a 60 percent increase in Georgia, a 50 percent increase in Florida, and the remaining States up to a 50 percent 1-year increase.

A Medicare buy-in option for younger Americans is the only hedge against these price spikes that every American will look to Congress for relief from. Congress has been negligent in their 7-year near obsession with repeal and replace. You can no longer blame ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of Congress to support the Medicare Buy-in and Healthcare Stabilization Act and Medicare X legislation. It is time to unleash the market power of Medicare to lower costs, improve quality, and push back on private insurers' aggressive pricing.

HONORING DONALD GILLEN, CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL RECIPIENT

(Mr. BOST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of one of my constituents, Donald Gillen, who is in Washington, D.C., today to receive the Congressional Gold Medal for his service to our Nation during World War II.

Donald joined the Army on July 26, 1945. He was stationed at Camp O'Donnell in the Philippines from November 1946 through June 1947. As part of the 12th Philippine Scout Division, he became a company commander in the 57th Infantry Regiment.

Donald moved to Belleville, Illinois, with his college sweetheart, Marilyn, to be close to his family, including four grandchildren. Now he is a guest staffer for the Belleville News-Democrat and supports his wife's singing in their church choir.

I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Donald to our Nation's Capitol and thanking him for his service. We are forever grateful.

RECOGNITION OF LOS BANOS POLICE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the men and the women of the Los Banos Police Department as Heroes and Heroines of the Month for California's 16th Congressional District, part of the people whom I have the honor and pride to represent.

These men and women tirelessly serve our community and truly are remarkable in embodying their motto: Pride in Service, Integrity in Action—Pride in Service, Integrity in Action.

But the pursuit of excellence is not without cost. We know that they risk their lives every day on a 24/7 basis.

Earlier this summer, two Los Banos police officers, Kristifer Hew and Aaron Pinon, were shot in the line of duty. I am happy to report that both officers are making spirited recoveries, but the risk police officers face every day to keep us safe cannot be overstated. So we salute them and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Los Banos Police Department Heroes and Hero-

ines of the Month for California's 16th Congressional District, as well as recognizing all of America's law enforcement officers. We can never ever thank them enough for their dedicated service as they protect all of America throughout our Nation.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join 1.3 million fellow Mainers in celebrating National Forest Products Week.

Mr. Speaker, our great State is 90 percent covered by healthy, sustainable forests which support more than 30,000 good-paying jobs. Now, nationally, our working forests support 930,000 hardworking Americans who manage the forests, who harvest the trees, and who transport the wood to paper mills and energy plants across our great Nation.

Every day, products like paper and lumber and pet food bags and toothpicks and pencils make our lives better. And the best part, Mr. Speaker, is that these trees grow back after we cut them, so this entire green, sustainable industry creates good-paying jobs generation after generation.

Now, Democrats and Republicans must do everything humanly possible to help make sure our forest products industry is healthy and thrives. And to that end, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank everybody in this Chamber to make sure that we continue to treat biomass fairly in our regulations, make sure biomass is carbon neutral. This will avoid unnecessary and costly regulations being imposed on our mills, factories, and energy plants.

□ 1215

HEALTH INSURANCE OPEN ENROLLMENT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are one week away from the open enrollment period—an opportunity for Americans to purchase health insurance for 2018.

President Trump ended the cost sharing reduction—the CSR—payments, which reduce out-of-pocket costs for low-income working families.

A Congressional Budget Office analysis says ending these payments would likely increase premiums by 20 percent next year and by 25 percent by 2020.

In the Senate, there is a bipartisan agreement, led by Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY, to stabilize the marketplaces by funding the CSR payments

and increase resources for open enrollment outreach.

Last night, unfortunately, a couple of the Members in the majority added partisan objectives to the bill, cutting mandates, which will keep costs low, and adding anti-abortion restrictions to CSR payments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the majority to drop the poison pills and work with Democrats to bring the Alexander-Murray bill to the floor as soon as possible to stabilize markets and lower costs for American families. The failure to fix the health reform will cause millions of Americans to lose healthcare, and, that is, “No Care TrumpCare.”

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SUNBELT AG EXPO

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Sunbelt Agricultural Exposition.

Last week, I had the pleasure in attending the expo with a few of my colleagues. Known as North America's Premier Farm Show, this annual event in Moultrie, Georgia, attracts visitors from across the Nation to showcase farming technology, research, and equipment. More than 1,200 exhibitors participated to display the latest and greatest agricultural technology and innovation.

Agriculture is the largest and oldest industry in the State of Georgia, and it is only fitting that an event that celebrates and encourages the success of agriculture be held in Georgia's Eighth Congressional District.

American agriculture depends on strong and tireless advocates, and I commend the participants for creating an opportunity to educate the public on the importance of strengthening our farmers.

As the world's agricultural leader, the expo recognizes the tireless work of American farmers and their role in providing a safe and affordable food supply. I could not be more delighted to stand here today and honor a truly spectacular event and look forward to its continued success.

CONGRATULATING REVEREND DR. JONATHAN L. WEAVER

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Reverend Dr. Jonathan L. Weaver on his 30th pastoral anniversary.

As the pastor of the Greater Mt. Nebo African Methodist Episcopal Church, which was founded 140 years ago, Reverend Weaver provides outstanding

spiritual leadership in Maryland's Fourth Congressional District and the entire region.

Pastor Weaver has a deep and active faith, and lives that faith not just with words, but with deeds. He has committed his life to lifting up people—to feeding the hungry and caring for the poor, comforting the afflicted and making peace—where there is strife. He has overseen not only the church's growth, but the charitable works of more than 50 ministries that serve its members and the wider community.

Pastor Weaver has led missions to Africa, serves as national president of a 500-church ecumenical association, and board chairman of the oldest and largest African-American community bank in the national capital region.

Mr. Speaker, as Reverend Weaver continues his service to our community, I am confident that he will continue “to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with our God.”

SPARTA, NORTH CAROLINA

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Forbes magazine recently discovered something many of us have known for a long time, which is that Sparta, North Carolina, is a wonderful place to live and work.

Sparta, located in Alleghany County, is a wonderful community made up of people with vision, strong work ethic, big hearts, and dreams.

Forbes encouraged young entrepreneurs to move to seven locations around the country—and, in particular, to Sparta—for the high-speed fiber internet and relatively low cost of living. This would allow innovators and job creators to live affordably and work globally.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great reason to move to Sparta, but it is not the only reason. I urge entrepreneurs and families to live in Sparta for the wonderful quality of life, sense of community, and incredible heart that makes this town a wonderful place to call home.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with millions of middle class Americans, to oppose the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support tax reform. Unfortunately, this budget resolution is a partisan tax reform package. I support tax reform, which will help lower taxes for low-income Americans, I support tax reform that will rebuild our middle class, and I support tax reform that simplifies the Tax Code for small businesses. I will not support

a tax plan that disproportionately gives advantages to the rich.

But, Mr. Speaker, this tax plan will raise our deficit by \$2.4 trillion over the next decade. Mr. Speaker, this tax plan will take away critical dollars from an infrastructure bill that our Nation so desperately needs.

We still have time. Let's work together to do what is right for all Americans. Let's work together and do what is right for our country.

RECOGNIZING ANTHONY SMITH

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago, I had the privilege of presenting a Purple Heart to Mr. Anthony Smith of Warsaw, Illinois, in my congressional district.

During the Vietnam war, Anthony served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. In 1968, on a particular bad day for our troops, Anthony was able to single-handedly take out several enemy machine gun units, protecting his fellow soldiers from harm and death.

Anthony's bravery on that day was rewarded with a Bronze Star with Valor, and with a Purple Heart, although he was not given a physical Purple Heart medal at the time. Almost 50 years later, our office worked to help correct this, and it was one of the highest honors of my time in office to present Anthony Smith with this well-deserved medal in front of a crowd of his friends and family in Warsaw last Tuesday, October 17.

I want to thank Anthony Smith for his bravery and service to our country, his dedication and commitment to our military, and to the entire Warsaw community for coming out to support this true American hero. We are indebted to his service, and we honor him today.

TRIBUTE TO GAIL KEMLER

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an inspiring woman in my district, Mrs. Gail Kemler. Gail is celebrating her 100th birthday this month on October 28.

Gail has lived in Rochester, Michigan, since 1931, and has been an integral part of the city—through her steadfast volunteerism with the Rochester Board of Education; Daughters of the American Revolution, Stoney Creek Chapter; Rochester-Avon Historical Society; Rochester Lions Club; and Questers Organization.

Gail's longest tenure as a volunteer was with the Rochester Area Neighbor-

hood House, an organization that she has helped from its inception. She remained a dedicated volunteer with the organization for over 50 years.

An active supporter of the Rochester Community Schools, Gail also served as a room mother and scout leader, and was one of the original PTA founders. She has been a member of the First Congregational Church in Rochester for over 85 years, and has served on the building committee, pastoral search committee, and board of trustees.

Gail and her late husband, Donald Kemler, have four children, nine grandchildren, four great-grandchildren, and four great-great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have such a selfless, giving, and inspirational woman in my district. Thank you, Mrs. Gail Kemler, for your service to the entire Rochester community, and happy 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING BRUCE HARBACH

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the head coach of the Lancaster Catholic High School football team, Bruce Harbach, who has recently announced his retirement.

Coach Harbach has been coaching for a remarkable 41 years and has spent the last 16 years of that career leading the Crusaders. His accomplishments at Lancaster Catholic are too many to mention, but let me provide just a few highlights: two State championships, eight section championships, nine district playoff appearances, six district championship appearances, and a perfect 16-0 season in 2011.

In fact, I was glad to host Coach Harbach and the team at the Pennsylvania State Capitol following their State championships in 2009, and then again in 2011. Our coaches for our youth, it is not only about the scores and about their winning, but they are responsible as a role model—their players look up to them—and the most successful coaches also practice what they preach. We want our coaches to instill integrity in our kids and to show them the value of teamwork, commitment, and perseverance.

That is exactly what Coach Harbach has done for these many years. I know the Crusader community joins me in thanking Coach Harbach for his 16 years leading their team from the sidelines.

WILDFIRES IN THE WEST

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the wildfires in the West have been very devastating for a lot of

people, a lot of property, and a lot of habitat.

One of the subjects this week in the Natural Resources Committee was a sage-grouse habitat that has affected so many western States, including my own district in northern California, and my friend in Nevada as well. We worked very hard to have a good sage-grouse plan, except what is the common bond in all this and the inability to have a successful recovery of this species as well as use of the land? The Federal Government.

In the past, its involvement has been to merely slow down a process or say no to wise management practices. Cattle graze is a very effective tool, when prescribed correctly, to help make this habitat better and more sustainable long-term.

We need more cooperation, we need the Federal Government to be more bold in putting out the type of policy that will help the grazing be an effective tool in that and not cower every time an environmental organization may come along and wish to threaten the entanglement of lawsuits that are stopping good management like that. It is hurting the habitat, it is hurting the sage-grouse population, it is hurting western lands, and western economy.

Mr. Speaker, we need solutions coming from Washington, D.C., not impediments.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 71, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 580 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 580

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is budget day. I don't know if you were as excited about that when you got out of bed this morning as I was, but, to be fair, I sit on the Budget Committee.

I have the great honor of serving on the Rules Committee, and that is why I have the great honor of bringing this rule to the floor today. But I serve on the Rules Committee by night. By day, I serve on the Budget Committee with my friend Mr. PASCRELL and others, and we have been working since January to produce a budget for the United States of America.

I have got to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we produced a whale of a budget coming out of the House Rules Committee. You remember that budget, you supported that budget. We did a fantastic collaborative job bringing that budget to the floor, and then it went to the United States Senate.

Now, you know how this happens, Mr. Speaker. We all grew up watching, "I am just a bill sitting here on Capitol Hill. Well, it is a long, long journey to the capital city, it is a long, long wait while I am sitting in committee." We all know the song from our childhood.

It is a long process to move a bill through, and nine times out of ten, it comes back differently from the United States Senate than the way we sent it over there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity today by concurring with the Senate amendment, and if we pass this rule, that is what we will have an opportunity to do. If we pass this rule, we will have an opportunity to have the debate, concur in the Senate amendment, and bring a unified budget to the floor.

Now, what does that mean, Mr. Speaker?

We have already been working on appropriations bills this cycle, and for the uninitiated, that is the bulk of the Federal spending that goes on. All of the mandatory spending that you and I both know about, Mr. Speaker, Medicare, Social Security, those important income support programs on which so many Americans depend, that money is already going out the door.

So today what we have an opportunity to do in passing this budget is to

create what they call reconciliation instructions, because contained inside this unified budget of which the House and the Senate agree are reconciliation instructions that allow us to bring what I believe will be the most comprehensive, fundamental reform of our Tax Code since Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan did it in 1986.

Since 1986, 4 decades ago, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity today to do something that no other Congress has been able to do since I have been an adult, and I am excited about that opportunity.

Now, to be fair, we are going to have a lot of disagreement about how to get that done. That is not the debate we are having today. For any of my colleagues or anybody back home, Mr. Speaker, who is worried that right here in this debate on a Wednesday, we are going to sort out our entire Tax Code, fear not, fear not. That is not the debate we are having today.

The debate we are having today, Mr. Speaker, is will we or will we not take on the challenge of reforming our Tax Code. I believe that we will.

The debate that we are going to have today is will we or will we not confront the fact that America has one of the least competitive tax codes in the world, but Americans deserve one of the most competitive tax codes in the world.

The debate we are going to have today, Mr. Speaker, is not about the details of tax reform, but about the premise of can we do better for the American people or can we not.

I have the great benefit, Mr. Speaker, of not having to learn what I know about this Chamber from watching it on TV or reading it in the headlines. I consider myself very blessed to have the opportunity to serve among these men and women. If I just had to read about them in the headlines, I would have a very low opinion of them. I confess, I would have a low opinion. But because I get to work with these men and women, Mr. Speaker, I get to see the real commitment to their constituencies, the real commitment to their home States, the real desire to deliver on behalf of their constituencies and on behalf of the United States of America.

We may have a divisive debate today. We sometimes do. But my prediction here in hour one, Mr. Speaker, is that by the time we leave this floor, we are going to have an agreement to take on one of the challenges that no party has been able to take on since Democrats and Republicans came together in 1986 to get it done.

It is my great hope that we will use that model, that we will repeat that model, that we will improve upon that model, and that we will produce something that all of our constituency can be proud of. I know that America is hungry for tax reform, and I believe we can deliver it for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule, support the underlying concurrence in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, my friend Mr. WOODALL, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule. Today, House Republicans are pushing a job-killing budget so they can use fast-track reconciliation procedures to steamroll through their billionaires-first tax plan.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be the people's House. We ought to have the people's budget, a budget that helps the millions of Americans who sent us here to Congress, not a budget that helps only a few, the well-connected and the well-off.

I disagree with Mr. WOODALL. This is not a time to celebrate. This is a terrible budget. This budget will devastate America's investments in good paying jobs, it threatens growing wages and the bedrock promise of a secure and healthy retirement. It makes cuts across the board that would hurt seniors, children, veterans, and the hardworking people across this country who are already struggling to get by.

Why are Republicans doing this?

Well, it is all in the name of fast-tracking the Ryan-McConnell tax plan, which explodes the deficit by \$1.5 trillion, and then provides multitrillion-dollar tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. We Democrats think this is a horrible idea.

What is particularly astonishing is the blatant hypocrisy of Republican leaders pushing this deficit-busting budget. Republicans are always telling us how much they care about the deficit, but when it comes to giving their beloved tax cuts to their billionaire friends, they suddenly develop a convenient case of amnesia. They say: What deficit? Don't worry. These tax breaks will pay for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this is absurd. In this Republican-controlled Congress, we can now say with certainty that the deficit and debt no longer matter. All of the talk by Republicans, well, they didn't really mean it.

If Republicans really cared about the deficit, they would in no way imaginable bring up a bill, a budget that is as reckless as this to the floor. This kind of shows what they truly believe, where their values are, where their priorities are.

How many times have Republicans talked about the importance of a balanced budget?

The Speaker called for a deficit-neutral tax plan in his Better Way agenda. Well, I guess this debt-creating budget

is the "Somewhat Less Better Way" plan.

Your budget chair took to Twitter just 2 weeks ago to chastise Senate Republicans for not pursuing a balanced budget, yet now she is fully in support of their budget, which adds \$1.5 trillion to the deficit with no way to pay for it.

Now, let me spell this out for my Republican friends. This is not a balanced budget. Clearly, Republicans desperately need a refresher on basic arithmetic.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing balanced about hitting middle class families and millions of hardworking Americans with cuts while giving billionaires and corporations tax cuts they simply do not need. Billionaires aren't knocking down our door asking for more tax breaks. This is disgusting. This is shameful.

The Republican budget destroys middle class jobs by stealing hundreds of billions of dollars from investments in infrastructure, job training, advanced energy, and research and development. It devastates Medicare and Medicaid. It demands deep cuts to safety net programs like SNAP. I am talking about food for hungry children and hardworking families. It goes after college affordability. It makes college more expensive for working families. It undercuts key supports for veterans and their families.

What is particularly offensive is that Republicans are using this terrible budget as a means of passing tax cuts for the wealthy as quickly as possible regardless of the consequences and without bipartisan support.

The tax reform framework supported by Republicans in Congress will raise taxes on the middle class and cut taxes for the wealthy. Under the Republican plan, the top 1 percent would receive 80 percent of all tax benefits. Let me repeat that. The top 1 percent would receive 80 percent of all tax benefits. Give me a break.

Those making more than \$900,000 a year would receive an average tax cut of more than \$200,000. Think about that. A person working full time in minimum wage makes \$290 a week before taxes. And under this plan, people who make over \$432 an hour, \$900,000 a year, would get a massive tax break. Corporations will receive a tax cut totaling \$2 trillion.

Who loses in this plan, Mr. Speaker?

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, one in three middle class taxpayers earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000 would actually receive a tax increase, and nearly half of middle class families with kids will see their taxes go up.

Can you believe that: raising taxes on the middle class to pay for tax cuts for billionaires and corporations?

This is insane.

To make matters worse, Republicans are planning to steamroll their tax

plan through Congress. We are reading in the press that we might see actual text of their plan next week and maybe a markup and floor consideration a week or two after that.

Really? Don't you think we owe it to our constituents to have thoughtful, open debate on this legislation which will impact every single one of them?

I guess not.

Democrats agree that our tax system needs to be updated, to be more fair, and especially to be more fair to the middle class and to working families. We have always been willing to engage in real bipartisan tax reform, but the Republican tax framework is not tax reform. It is just one more GOP multi-trillion-dollar giveaway to the wealthiest at the expense of the middle class and working Americans.

In all my time in Congress, I have never seen a budget and a tax plan that harms so many just to benefit so few. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule, to vote against this cruel Republican budget, and to oppose a tax plan that puts wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent ahead of hardworking middle class families.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to mention at the beginning that we might be debating the details of the tax reform plan that does not exist today. I see that we are, in fact, going to do that.

There are a lot of studies out there on this tax reform plan that does not yet exist, but let me tell you that we can all agree that we have the single least-competitive Tax Code on the planet today. We can all agree that with the click of a mouse, a company can transfer its assets overseas and grow jobs there instead of growing jobs here.

Let us have the debate that we want to have about who should bear the burden of American taxation. That is a legitimate debate and we should have it. But let us not have the debate about whether foreign workers should benefit or American workers should benefit from American capital, because that answer should be clear in the hearts and minds of every single Member of this Chamber.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to go from worst to first. Now, I confess that I don't actually expect to get all the way to first. I will settle for getting up in the top five and getting out of the bottom five when it comes to being able to lead in this country. But I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, what I think is a source of frustration of constituencies on both sides of the aisle, and that is the us-against-them conversation that goes on day in and day out.

I looked at the chart my friend from Massachusetts brought down to the

House floor. It happened to be in university colors of Georgia's red and black, but I can see that as a representative of all the hardworking families in my district, that chart didn't do anything to inspire me about the impact of tax reform going forward.

My friend quoted the Tax Policy Center. Now, The Wall Street Journal called the Tax Policy Center a shill for those groups that don't want to see any tax reform of any kind, but that is currently. The Tax Policy Center has been doing research for a long time. The research my friend from Massachusetts quoted was a study of a bill that does not yet exist. The research I am going to quote is of historical tax rates in this country.

What my friends at the Tax Policy Center said is that about 30 percent of Americans—one-third of Americans—pay no income taxes today; that the Tax Code, as it exists today, protects them from any tax liability at all.

Now, what we are proposing when we get into fundamental tax reform, Mr. Speaker, is to double the standard deduction. For those families that are already claiming the standard deduction, we are talking about doubling it. Now, the brackets are still in question, the details are still in question, but we are talking about doubling the number of folks who don't have to deal with the IRS at all.

Today, about 30 percent of American families don't pay any income taxes, and that same 30 percent gets a refundable tax credit that rebates to them their entire Social Security and Medicare contribution that they make and the entire Social Security and welfare contribution that their employer makes on their behalf.

Now, these are not my numbers; these are the Tax Policy Center's numbers, that a full third of Americans aren't paying one penny in Federal income tax or Federal payroll tax of any kind.

□ 1245

Now, I am not here to debate the wisdom of that, Mr. Speaker. I am here to tell you that I don't know how much lower I can cut taxes in that group. I don't know how in the world I can lower the tax burden on folks who are not only paying no income taxes, but are having all of their payroll taxes rebated to them also.

Is this a group we should talk about, Mr. Speaker? Should we talk about folks who are grabbing onto the bottom rung of the economic ladder and struggling to climb to the top?

We should, and we do.

Should we talk about how it is that the entitlement system, the benefit system in this country, is trapping people at the bottom of the ladder and not allowing them to climb to the top?

We should.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be misleading to the American

public to suggest that this tax bill is focusing its attention in one direction instead of another direction. The fact simply is that I can't lower taxes any more at the bottom of the spectrum.

We are talking about lowering taxes on corporations. That doesn't inspire many people. I have that conversation regularly: ROB, what in the world are you doing lowering taxes on corporations?

I support the FairTax, and in the spirit of folks who are not particularly enthusiastic about tax reform, I am not in that camp. I am enthusiastic about tax reform. I just thought there was a better way. I couldn't get the votes to have my better way done.

My better way is the FairTax, and what I would say to you is corporations don't pay taxes. Corporations do not pay taxes. They collect taxes from their consumers in the form of higher prices, from their employees in the form of lower wages, or from their shareholders in the form of lower capital—lower capital returns.

Now, lest you think: ROB, you are just a conservative Republican from the Deep South. What do you know about this?

I will again quote the Tax Policy Center, which says that a full 20 percent of the corporate income tax burden falls on workers. Fair enough. If we want to argue about where the tax rates are going to end up and how the cuts are going to look and what the policies are going to be, let's have that debate.

Let us not mislead the American people into believing there is a free lunch anywhere in this Tax Code. We have an opportunity to move from worst to first, and every single American, regardless of their region, regardless of their politics, is going to benefit from that change. They benefited from it when Democrats and Republicans came together to do it in 1986, and they will benefit from it when we come together and get it done today, as I believe that we will. We must.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, boy, I don't even know where to begin after that.

My good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, made reference to the Tax Policy Center, and I have the report from the Tax Policy Center here. In fact, it is their analysis that was the basis for that chart that I held during my opening remarks, which said that the top 1 percent would receive 80 percent of the tax breaks based on the Republican framework.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD excerpts from the Tax Policy Center report.

[From the Urban Institute & Brookings Institution Tax Policy Center Staff, Sept. 29, 2017]

A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF THE UNIFIED FRAMEWORK

ABSTRACT

The Tax Policy Center has produced preliminary estimates of the potential impact of proposals included in the "Unified Framework for Fixing Our Broken Tax Code." We find they would reduce federal revenue by \$2.4 trillion over ten years and \$3.2 trillion over the second decade (not including any dynamic feedback). In 2018, all income groups would see their average taxes fall, but some taxpayers in each group would face tax increases. Those with the very highest incomes would receive the biggest tax cuts. The tax cuts are smaller as a percentage of income in 2027, and taxpayers in the 80th to 95th income percentiles would, on average, experience a tax increase.

The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the Urban Institute, the Brookings Institution or their funders.

ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF PRESENTING CHANGE IN DISTRIBUTION OF TAX BURDENS

BY EXPANDED CASH INCOME PERCENTILE

Expanded cash income percentile, Percent change in after-tax income, Share of total federal tax change (%), Average federal tax change, Dollars, Percent, Share of federal taxes, Change (% points), Under the proposal (%).

Panel A: 2018.

Lowest quintile, 0.5, 1.1, -60, -10.4, 0.0, 0.9; Second quintile, 0.9, 4.1, -290, -9.3, 0.0, 3.8; Middle quintile, 1.2, 8.2, -660, -7.2, 0.2, 10.1; Fourth quintile, 1.2, 11.6, -1,110, -5.5, 0.6, 18.7; Top quintile, 3.3, 74.5, -8,470, -9.6, -0.7, 66.5; All, 2.1, 100.0, -1,570, -8.6, 0.0, 100.0.

Addendum.

80-90, 0.8, 5.1, -1,140, -3.1, 0.9, 15.1; 90-95, 0.7, 3.3, -1,500, -2.6, 0.7, 11.4; 95-99, 2.3, 12.8, -7,620, -6.9, 0.3, 16.4; Top 1 percent, 8.5, 53.3, -129,030, -17.6, -2.6, 23.5; Top 0.1 percent, 10.2, 30.3, -722,510, -20.4, -1.7, 11.1.

Panel B: 2027.

Lowest quintile, 0.2, 0.8, -50, -5.4, 0.0, 1.0; Second quintile, 0.5, 3.0, -230, -5.0, 0.1, 4.1; Middle quintile, 0.5, 4.9, -420, -3.4, 0.4, 10.2; Fourth quintile, 0.4, 4.3, -450, -1.7, 0.9, 17.3; Top quintile, 3.0, 86.6, -10,610, -8.5, -1.3, 67.4; All, 1.7, 100.0, -1,690, -6.7, 0.0, 100.0.

Addendum.

80-90, -0.4, -3.5, 820, 1.8, 1.2, 14.4; 90-95, -0.3, -1.5, 760, 1.1, 0.8, 10.3; 95-99, 1.8, 11.9, -7,640, -5.3, 0.2, 15.4; Top 1 percent, 8.7, 79.7, -207,060, -17.4, -3.5, 27.2; Top 0.1 percent, 9.7, 39.6, -1,022,120, -19.0, -1.8, 12.2.

Source: Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center Microsimulation Model (version 0217-1)

The full report can be found at: http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/sites/default/files/publication/144971/a_preliminary_analysis_of_the_unified_framework_0.pdf

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, where did I get this figure about adding to the deficit by \$1.5 trillion? Did I just make that up?

I will tell the gentleman where I got it from. It is basically the Republican report in the Senate on the budget. Let me read from their report here.

It says: "This title includes two reconciliation instructions to the Senate committees. The first would allow the Finance Committee to reduce revenues and change outlays to increase the deficit by not more than \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years."

These are the words of Republicans in the Senate.

The gentleman wants to know why we are talking about the tax plan. It is because we are presented here with a budget that essentially fast tracks a tax plan. He is right, we don't have all the details yet because it is being negotiated and written in some back room somewhere in this building. I wish I knew where it was so we could maybe try to find out some more details. But what we do know is the framework that the Republicans have put forward, and that is the basis for the analysis that economist after economist have stated that this budget basically is a giveaway to the wealthiest individuals in this country, and it is not somehow a break for the middle class. It is the exact opposite.

This is a gift for billionaires and millionaires, and it does nothing for working families. That is why this is all relevant. This budget puts in place procedures for the Republicans to fast track a tax bill that they are now writing in some back room somewhere that nobody will see probably until the last minute, and basically it will be rushed through here, and it is a big giveaway to the wealthiest individuals in this country. I just wanted to clarify that for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that Republican plans for tax reform would also eliminate the State and local tax deduction, called SALT. This deduction prevents millions of middle class families from being taxed twice on the same income by deducting already-paid State and local taxes from their Federal income tax.

Half the people hit by this tax hike would be middle class families earning a household income of less than \$100,000, and local communities will also feel that pain.

Repealing the SALT deduction, which would effectively make State and local taxes more costly for taxpayers, would put pressure on local governments to lower taxes.

The bipartisan National Governors Association said in a September 22 letter that the SALT deduction, "has contributed to the stability of State revenues that are essential for providing public services." These services include healthcare, police and fire departments, and schools.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter from the National Governors Association.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2017.
Re Tax Reform (State and Local Tax Deduction and Municipal Bonds).

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD NEAL,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways & Means, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER RYAN, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, CHAIRMAN HATCH, RANKING MEMBER WYDEN, CHAIRMAN BRADY, AND RANKING MEMBER NEAL: The nation's governors appreciate congressional efforts to reform and improve federal tax policy. Federal and state tax systems are complex and often interconnected. Therefore, as Congress considers reforms, we urge you to maintain the balance between state and federal tax systems by preserving the income exclusion for municipal bond interest and the deductibility for state and local taxes.

The financing engine that drives U.S. infrastructure is the \$3.8 trillion municipal bond market. Changes to federal laws and regulations should not increase issuance costs to states for municipal bonds or diminish investor demand for them. If federal changes make issuing municipal bonds cost-prohibitive for states and local governments, then fewer projects could be funded, taxes could rise, fewer jobs created, and economic growth will suffer.

Governors also believe that no federal law or regulation should preempt, limit, or interfere with the sovereign rights of states. A mark of sovereignty includes the ability to develop and operate revenue and tax systems. Deductibility of state and local taxes has contributed to the stability of state revenues that are essential for providing public services. We encourage you to avoid changes to the tax code that would undermine the ability of state and local governments to meet the needs of the citizens whom we all serve.

Eliminating state and local tax deductibility, moreover, exposes a higher share of an itemizing taxpayer's income to federal taxation because it adds back mandatory payments of state and local taxes already paid, as taxable income.

Federal tax reform requires an intergovernmental partnership because decisions at the federal level will affect state and local governments profoundly. We look forward to working with Congress on bipartisan tax reform to maintain balance between our systems and modernize the federal tax system to meet the needs of our citizens.

Sincerely,

Gov. BRIAN SANDOVAL,
NGA Chair.
Gov. STEVE BULLOCK,

NGA Vice Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask Members to vote to defeat the previous question; and if we do, I will offer an amendment proposed by Representative SCHNEIDER that would prohibit any legislation from limiting or repealing the State and local tax deduction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss this proposal and to discuss the importance of the State and local tax deduction, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been outspoken on this issue on behalf of States and communities and middle class taxpayers.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, there are some real terrible parts to this budget, but this, to me, is the worst.

This deduction has been part of our tax system before there was an income tax, going back to the Civil War, for the very reasons that my friend from Massachusetts just talked about. It wasn't just picked off the shelf. People count on it. People count on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, the previous question, the budget, the weather, whatever.

We know that this budget resolution paves the way for a tax reform bill done through reconciliation. I am sure that is interesting. Reconciliation on Governor Street in Paterson, New Jersey. I am sure they want to know reconciliation when we are talking about their pocketbooks; a dubious maneuver that blocks us Democrats completely out of the process and allows Republicans to pass a purely partisan, juiced-up bill.

Comprehensive tax reform is a goal we should all share, and lasting tax reform should be bipartisan. My friend from Georgia, I think, believes that, but this ain't it.

While they are cutting deals behind closed doors, what we are pushing is eliminating the State and local tax deduction, and that is in the Senate budget. They wrote it right out, the Capito amendment.

Republicans are so adamant about eliminating this middle class benefit that they added an amendment to that budget before us today, the so-called Capito amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. A vote for this rule is a vote for the budget, is a vote to repeal the State and local deduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues representing New Jersey, New York, Illinois, California, Minnesota, and so many other States, including Georgia, including Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, better think long and hard about their vote today.

The American people are watching to see if they vote to raise their taxes. This amendment, the Capito amendment, in the budget falsely claims that the SALT only benefits high-income taxpayers. Let's take a look at that.

The fact is that repealing it would hurt the middle class and working families. At the same time, how do you justify—through the Speaker, how do you justify keeping the deduction still viable for corporations? They can deduct the State and local taxes, but the families of America can't? How can you justify that?

I want to hear your justification of that. That is going to be a good one.

Forty percent of taxpayers with incomes between \$50,000 and \$75,000, more than 70 percent of those making \$100,000 to \$200,000, claim the State and local tax deduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I will make it short, but I could stay here all afternoon on this because I feel it in my bone marrow.

We are talking about tax cuts. We are increasing the tax burden on the middle class, and you cannot deny it. There is no place in that budget that you can deny it. None whatsoever. You could say: Well, we are going to do this over here and this.

Look, I am tired of that walnut trick. Okay? Have you figured out which it is under?

Groups representing realtors, mayors, teachers, firefighters, sheriffs, et cetera, all support retaining the State and local tax deduction. It is bad policy, plain and simple.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you, we have enough ammunition. We don't need this ammunition for next year. Let's think about the budget of the American people in a nonpartisan way.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if you have wondered what kind of passion we have on the Budget Committee, I will just once again recognize how much I enjoy serving with my friend from New Jersey on the Budget Committee. Everything you just heard from him was from the heart. I get to hear it in committee day in and day out, and I will tell you, we end up with a better product as a result of that. It is a legitimate debate to have about the State and local tax deduction. It is perfectly legitimate.

There are those from low-tax jurisdictions that ask: Why would the Fed-

eral Government and the Federal taxpayer want to subsidize those States that are higher-tax jurisdictions? There are those jurisdictions that are low-tax jurisdictions.

Because the gentleman's constituency in New Jersey makes so much money, they pay so much more in Federal income taxes. And States like mine in Georgia, States like Alabama, States like Mississippi are the beneficiary of those dollars as the Federal Government distributes them. Undeniably, there is a case to be made on both sides of this issue.

The falsehood, Mr. Speaker, is to suggest that we are deciding that issue today. We are not. We are not.

I don't blame any of my colleagues for fighting for their constituency at the height of their ability, at the highest vocal point of their capability, because issues are, at their core, local and personal to each and every one of us.

We are going to have to have this conversation and we are going to have to sort it out, and I believe it is not going to be a partisan conversation. In fact, I know it is not going to be a partisan conversation.

I know Republicans who share my friend from New Jersey's opinion, and I know Democrats who share SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO's opinion on the Senate side. We know this to be true. We are going to sort this issue out, Mr. Speaker.

What I fear, though, is that emotions are going to run so high that we are going to miss an opportunity to figure these things out. For example, to conflate personal deductions with business deductions is to create confusion where there needn't be any.

Every business in America can deduct the meals that they serve throughout their day as a business expense. I will share with the gentleman that my family cannot deduct our meals from our income taxes.

Every business out there that has rented an apartment somewhere in order to conduct business, they can deduct that rent from their income taxes as a business expense. I will share with my friend, in the great State of Georgia, I am unable to deduct my rent as a business expense from my income tax.

There is just a fundamental difference between families and businesses, and that fundamental difference goes back to what I said at the very beginning, and that is there is only one taxpayer in this country. It is not Walmart, it is not Apple, it is not Microsoft. It is the American consumer. We are the only ones. At the end of the day, the buck stops with each and every American family.

The debate over how to structure a corporate income Tax Code, Mr. Speaker, is perfectly legitimate. To suggest that the fact that the personal code

and the business code look different and that is somehow nefarious is to deny what is just now over 100 years of income tax policy in this country.

□ 1300

Mr. PASCRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. So, now that you have agreed to the fact the families are going to get shafted but corporations will continue to be able to deduct their local and State taxes, this is pertinent to the budget, my friend, through the Speaker.

Right in the bill, the budget bill we are talking about right now, the rule, previous question, related to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include reducing the Federal deduction such as this—this is right from the budget. Why do you say we are not discussing this?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my friend, Mr. Speaker, what you hear is absolutely right. I want to make that clear. Everybody is entitled to their own opinion; they are not entitled to their own facts. The words my friend is reading are absolutely accurate. What they are not are absolutely binding. That is what they are not.

What this is is such a personal and important issue to folks on both sides of it that it got its own personal line out of the United States Senate.

I can't even get nominations out of the United States Senate, Mr. Speaker. I am sitting here trying to staff out region four down in the great State of Georgia. Folks are delaying debate. Folks won't let me get my people in place.

This is so important to the United States Senate that it came with its own line.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to diminish the importance of this issue on either side. What I do want to insist upon, though, is that it will not be decided during this hour today; and I want to insist, Mr. Speaker, that it will not be decided on partisan lines.

I would just ask of you, Mr. Speaker, and of my friends here on the floor, we have two things we can do with our voices: we can either sow consensus, or we can sow discontent.

I know that we are passionate about these things in which we believe, but to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to come together and sort it out and do the very best we can for Americans is to sell this institution short and is to further the misunderstanding, the misimpression, the misinformation that the media sends out about us every day. I know we are better than that, and I am proud to be a voice saying that here on the floor today, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) to respond.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, families in my friend's State, the great State of Georgia, will lose a tax deduction of \$9,000, those families, on average. I think you are concerned about that. You cannot fib that you are not.

And the fact of the matter is you used the words—through the Speaker, you used the words that your States are subsidizing the donor States? Well, let me give you an idea of New Jersey.

States like West Virginia, the average SALT deduction claim is \$9,463 per household; in Ohio, it is \$10,445; in Wisconsin, it is \$11,653.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds, and this will probably have to be it because, unfortunately, we have so many speakers over here. I wish I could enjoy the loneliness that my colleague from Georgia enjoys that nobody wants to speak to defend this budget.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, 48th, 49th State, that is where New Jersey is in getting back the money we send down to Washington. Who subsidizes whom?

And Mnuchin, go back and tell the Secretary of the Treasury he doesn't know what he is talking about. He says New Jersey is being subsidized? Not these numbers; the numbers don't show that.

You can't defend this. You can't defend it under any circumstances whatsoever, and you have admitted that we are talking facts here today.

I rest my case.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the underlying rule that would allow for consideration of the Senate-passed Republican Budget. If passed, this budget would allow Republicans to fast-track their tax plan through Congress without Democratic support.

Now, I stand in support of a tax plan to help the middle class, but that is not the tax plan we are seeing proposed by Republicans. Instead, we see that 80 percent of the benefits will go to the richest 1 percent in this country. The problem? Somebody has to pay for it, and it looks like it could be the middle class.

I have heard from workers worried that cuts of contributions to their 401(k) plans will ruin their retirement. I have heard from seniors worried that losing homeowners' incentives will make it harder for them to stay in their homes. And I have heard from families worried that a repeal of the State and local tax deduction will increase their tax burden.

In fact, we know that one-third of the middle class will see their taxes in-

crease under this plan. And the numbers show that, as our constituents begin to learn more, they are realizing that this plan only cuts taxes for the wealthy and corporate interests and leaves middle class families behind. That is why a Reuters poll released yesterday found that fewer than a third of Americans support the Republican tax plan at all.

This tax plan for the rich will increase the deficit by \$2.2 trillion. And who will pay for it? Your children and their grandchildren. They will have to suffer from the cuts made down along the line to education, to Medicaid, to Medicare.

And for what? To make the rich richer? To line the pockets of Washington special interests? That is not right.

Reject this budget. Most importantly, reject this tax plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard a lot about the distributional analysis of tax reform, and, as I have suggested, it is hard to do. Folks who make a whole lot of money, like my friend from New Jersey's constituency, they pay a whole lot more in taxes. I hope that one day my constituency makes as much money as my friend from New Jersey's constituency, and if we can stimulate the economy the way that I believe that this tax proposal will, we are going to have a shot at getting that done.

But we have to have these conversations about limiting tax deductions for the wealthiest Americans if we are going to solve the issues that my friends have raised. And reading right out of that Senate budget report, the whole purpose of considering the State and local tax deduction and considering modifying it, capping it, eliminating it, whatever you want to insert there, Mr. Speaker, is designed around limiting those tax deductions that only benefit the wealthiest among us—that only benefit the wealthiest among us. That is the conversation that folks are trying to have.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there is so much more that we agree on than that we disagree on in this Chamber. But it appears, time and time again, we come to the House floor and focus, in the most shrill voices, on the 20 percent of those things that divide us instead of the 80 percent of those things that we could come together and deliver on for our constituency.

Tax reform doesn't have to pass with 51 votes in the Senate. We move reconciliation bills through the Senate with 60 votes. We have moved them through the Senate with 70 votes. We have moved them through the Senate with 80 votes.

Growing the American economy, Mr. Speaker, is a commonsense goal that is shared in every single region and in every single political quarter. Let's not make this about us here. Let's make

this about our bosses back home. We can, and we should, and I believe that we will.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the ranking member on the Tax Policy Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is truly about one thing and one thing only. It is about lavishing tax breaks on Donald Trump personally, his family, and all of his billionaire buddies. It is about lavishing tax breaks and incentives on the very same giant multinational corporations that have shipped away so many American jobs, that have refused to pay their fair share of our national security by hiding their profits in offshore island tax havens.

It is about doing all that and hoping that, at this time of the year, here at Halloween, that they can trick American middle-class families into believing that a little of those tax benefits will trickle down to them. Because if they can do that, if they can pass this bill, they will treat themselves, the billionaires, and the job exporters, to tax benefits of almost astronomical proportions.

To suggest that there is anything bipartisan about this bill or anything bipartisan about the tax proposal that Republicans will unveil next week is truly a farce. There is no bipartisanship here.

They learned nothing from their failed healthcare repeal efforts. No, they plan to use surprise, jack-in-the-box tactics to pop out a bill at the last minute, force it through this House, through our Ways and Means Committee, and foist it off on the American people.

With Halloween coming, there is a simple "trick or treat" test that you, as an American family, can use. If you are in the top 1 percent, you get 80 percent of the individual benefits out of this bill.

So just look at your income. If you are not up there in the \$700,000 or \$900,000 range, don't count on getting much benefit out of this bill. In fact, a number of studies show your taxes may actually go up while others see a significant decline in the revenue the richest few are asked to pay to finance our country.

And what about the idea of growing jobs? After all, growing our economy is what we should all be about and what is claimed for this bill. Well, I turned to that objective source, Goldman Sachs, the home of the Treasury Secretary and top economic advisers. Goldman Sachs, within the last month, has advised its own investors: Don't expect much out of this tax bill because any momentary growth at the beginning will be offset by the trillions of dollars of additional debt from the

same people who have been telling us for years we can't afford another dollar for abused children, and we can't afford dollars for children's healthcare because we are so very worried about the national debt.

Well, there is reason to be worried about the national debt and not to explode it by trillions of dollars with this giant unpaid tax bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. A zombie of supply-side economics is returning from the dead. We know it didn't work for President Bush. We know it didn't work in the Reagan era. They are bringing it back again, saying, if you just give a little more to those who have so much already, it will benefit everyone else. The data does not show that.

This is a tax bill that needs to be rejected because it is so unfair and inequitable to the American people. This is much worse than the healthcare repeal because its ramifications in leading to cutting Medicare and Social Security will be far-reaching. There will not be a family in America that goes untouched.

Reject this budget. Reject this awful tax bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to agree with some of what my friend had to say.

There will be absolutely no family that goes untouched. If you would like to go to the Council of Economic Advisers web page, Mr. Speaker, you can see their most recent report, which suggests, on average, \$4,000 in additional wages for every wage earner in this country, every family in this country, making a difference for economic growth.

We all know that economic growth matters. More jobs mean more pressure on labor. More pressure on labor means higher wages. Higher wages mean more income for the Federal Government in taxes and more income for families to put into their pocket.

We are hearing about zombies and surprises and tricks. You can tell that Halloween is right around the corner, and scaring folks is kind of the tagline of Halloween, Mr. Speaker; and, sadly, that is what we see going on here today.

I promise you, you have not heard a single bipartisan word about this tax plan from my friends on the other side, so I am going to provide those words for my friends. I will read from yesterday's Wall Street Journal, Mr. Speaker: "In 2012, President Obama and his advisers proposed lowering the corporate tax rate because it 'creates good jobs and good wages for the middle class folks who work at those businesses.'"

□ 1315

We can argue about what the tax reform ought to look like. What we can't argue about is the benefit for American families of tax reform.

In 2013, Lawrence Summers, President Clinton's Treasury Secretary and Chairman of President Obama's Economic Council, argued that the tax on corporate profit creates a burden without commensurate revenues for the government, and that changing it is as close to a free lunch for the American taxpayer as reformers will ever get. That was President Obama's Treasury Secretary.

Again, we can argue about what it looks like. What we can't argue about is what it is intended to do and what leading experts believe it will do. In 2015, Democrat CHUCK SCHUMER and Republican ROB PORTMAN cosponsored a Senate bill to reduce the top corporate tax rate, which is the highest of the 35 countries in the OECD today.

As CHUCK SCHUMER says: "Our international tax system creates incentives to send jobs and stash profits overseas, rather than creating jobs and economic growth here in the United States." We can fix that together, and we will fix that together.

Bill Clinton, in 2016, said he regretted raising the corporate tax rate to its current level for exactly those reasons.

Who is advantaged by trying to persuade the American people that something nefarious is going on here? Who is advantaged by that? I don't know about my friend's constituencies, Mr. Speaker, but my constituency wants to believe we are making things work together. My constituency wants to believe in rolling up our sleeves and sorting things out together. My constituency wants to believe that we are united in making a difference for them together.

We have this opportunity. If we pass this rule and we concur in the underlying Senate amendment, we will move forward on tax reform that will leave no American family behind.

The best government program we have in this country is the program that allows jobs to develop so folks can have one. The best program we have in this country, Mr. Speaker, is one that allows wages to rise so that folks can earn more. My constituency is not looking for anything from the other side of the aisle except cooperation on freeing up the marketplace so that my constituency can go to work, so that folks can go and make their own pathway and future forward. We can do it in ways we haven't done together since 1986, Mr. Speaker.

Who is advantaged by convincing folks that cooperation, consensus, making a different together is dead? I don't believe anyone. In fact, I would tell you that not just the debate but the body politic is damaged by those concerns, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will join together and refute those. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say to the gentleman from Georgia, we don't need lectures on cooperation and bipartisanship. We have offered to work with Republicans on tax reform. We have offered to work with Republicans on improving the Affordable Care Act. Every time the Republicans talk about rolling up their sleeves, we are not there. We are not invited.

So if you want bipartisanship, open up this process. Go back to regular order. Hold hearings. Listen to our ideas. Don't write bills in the back room and rush them to the floor and force the Members up here to vote up or down on them. Yes, we want cooperation. We want bipartisanship, but we don't need any lectures from anybody on the other side of the aisle.

This has been the most closed Congress in history. We don't need any lectures on the importance of cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because I rise in opposition to the underlying budget—a budget which is really a budget buster that could be before the full House for consideration tomorrow.

It calls for an additional \$1.5 trillion worth of debt accumulated over the next 10 years. They call for that, I fear, in order to clear the path for unpaid-for tax cuts. There is a bipartisan path to move forward on tax reform. It has been 31 years since we have taken a serious run at the Federal code. It is long overdue. It is one that would simplify the code, that would broaden the base and lower the rates and make us more competitive at home, but especially abroad, in light of what the rest of the world has done.

That can also help promote economic growth, but I fear that that is not the direction that the opposing party is taking with their tax reform proposal. I say fear because we haven't seen the details yet. So we can't say with certainty just what exactly will be offered over the next couple of weeks. But if history is any guide, there is a proclivity to pass large tax cuts that are not paid for.

If history is a guide, we have been down this road before, in the 1981 tax cuts, the 2001, the 2003, that promised to bring a boon of economic growth that would offset and pay for the lost revenue. It didn't materialize. Instead, we had huge budget deficits. Unfortunately, today, we don't have the luxury of time to help us recover from a huge fiscal mistake. Because today, 70 million baby boomers are beginning their

massive retirement and joining Social Security and Medicare—10,000 a day.

If we go down this route of going with massive tax breaks that aren't paid for, we are going to jeopardize the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare at exactly the wrong moment in our Nation's history. The folks back home tell me they would like to see tax reform along the lines that I just described, but they are not telling me that they are more interested in trickle-down economics where the predominant relief goes to the most wealthy, hoping that it somehow benefits everyone else.

Now, they would like to see it a little fairer for working families, for small businesses, for family farmers so that they can share in the economic growth and the prosperity that could be offered if we do this the correct way in a bipartisan fashion.

But instead, I fear that we are going to be witnessing history repeat itself. But unlike the time of the past, we don't have the luxury of time going forward without jeopardizing Social Security and Medicare, and without leaving a legacy of debt once again for our children and grandchildren to inherit.

So let's regroup. Let's do a budget that makes sense for the long-term fiscal solvency of important programs, but especially our children's future. This budget doesn't get us there.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to reject the rule and reject the budget if it comes up tomorrow.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I actually want to associate myself to my friend from Wisconsin's comments. I can't disagree with a word he said right up until it got to the end where he said to vote against the budget. Right up until there, we were on the same page.

There is so much that we could do together. My friend spoke out on behalf of small businesses and family farmers. As the Tax Code exists today, when you see my friends put up charts about tax benefits going to the top 1 percent, they are talking about those small business and family farmers. They are talking about that small business in my district that has plowed every single penny back into the business—back into the business for new technology to make their employees more productive, back into the business to open up a new facility, back into the business to add more distribution, because they have got 350 families who depend on them to make that business successful so that those 350 families can put food on their table.

But when the Tax Code is analyzed, Mr. Speaker, when the IRS sends back the statistics, that small business in my district that sends every single penny back into the business, they look rich. They look like they are the

wealthiest, and they are not. They are those small family farmers. They are those small family businesses that are trying to make a difference.

I want to say, because my friend from Wisconsin had a very significant concern about blowing holes in deficits, Mr. Speaker, as you know from your experience, one cannot pass tax reform that is permanent through reconciliation if it adds to deficits in the out years. That is what is so wonderful about this process, Mr. Speaker. I support what my friend from Wisconsin said about keeping an eye on deficits. I support what my friend said about making sure Medicare and Social Security are growing, which they do when people go back to work and when folks earn more money.

I don't want to be in the business of lecturing my colleagues, Mr. Speaker. I want to be in the business of working with my colleagues. But folks have a choice when they show up to work every day. Are we going to make this a day about arguing with one another? Are we going to tear something down today? Are we going to build something up today? I stand for building something today, Mr. Speaker. Unabashedly, let's build something together today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tax Policy.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, certainly, my constituents in Texas would like to see the same spirit of togetherness that we have just heard about. How has that been handled in our Ways and Means Committee, and why do I call the claims of bipartisanship here a farce?

Well, people in Texas would like to know: What is the effect of being taxed on our payment of property taxes? People in Michigan want to know: What is the effect of putting a cap on how much we can contribute to our retirement savings? Other people were concerned about adding \$0.20 and a border adjustment tax to every purchase made from Mexico, or Canada, or elsewhere.

Since May, I have been asking for hearings on these matters. I have been asking for one single Trump administration official to have the courage to come in front of our committee and answer questions about their proposal and the great gap between what President Trump says one day, and what they do the next.

They have refused every day. We have been here all of September. We have been here all of October. They have refused to have a single hearing with a single Trump official because they plan to jam through—while they yell “kumbaya,” they plan to jam through a gift to the superrich and the

multinationals that keep shipping these jobs offshore. And they don't want any accountability for it.

They don't want any public involvement either. They want the public to know as little about the details of their sham as possible. That is why they will have it introduced next week, passed in committee the following week, forced onto this floor and into the Senate, and the American people have to understand and speak up and say “no.”

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say I don't want to sneak anything past anybody. I want to claim full and total credit for what we are about to do together. I don't want anybody to be confused about whose fault it is. It is my fault.

When we get tax reform and get this economy growing again, blame me. When we can see wages rising in this country again, blame me. When we have an opportunity to go from worst to first in the international business community, blame me.

I don't want anybody to believe there is anybody hiding here, Mr. Speaker.

I share with my friend from Massachusetts that I do not have any speakers remaining, and I am prepared to close when he is. Truth needs no defense, I would say to my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a budget that will basically pave the way so we can bring up a massive tax cut for billionaires. Again, the gentleman from Georgia mentioned the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center in his opening remarks, and this chart is based on their analysis. Basically, let me repeat, the top 1 percent get 80 percent of all the benefits.

If you think that that is fair, if you think that that is representing your constituents, then go ahead and vote for this budget, because it is paving the way for a tax cut that will do just this.

I don't think it is fair. I don't think anybody on the Democratic side of the aisle thinks it is fair, and I am hoping that there are some on the Republican side of the aisle who think that that is not fair as well.

The gentleman from Georgia talks about cooperation and about we need to get along. I mean, who disagrees with that? But actions speak louder than words. You can't talk about open, transparent processes and then, as we just heard from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), have the Ways and Means Committee which is writing this tax bill behind closed doors without any help from the Democrats, but having no hearings—not allowing any administration official to come up and testify.

How is that an open and transparent process? How does that encourage the spirit of cooperation and bipartisanship? I mean, I thought my friends

would have learned from their terrible experience with their repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act what happens when you write bills behind closed doors without bipartisan input, without even the committees of jurisdiction, by the way, in that case, deliberating on what the final product should be.

I thought you would have learned from that process, and you ended up failing at the end of the day. I hope that this effort that my Republican friends are now undertaking for tax cuts for wealthy people in this country, I hope that that fails as well.

A lousy process usually leads to a lousy product. My friends on the other side of the aisle have mastered the art of lousy processes. In the Rules Committee, almost virtually everything is closed. Everything is shut down. Germane amendments routinely deny the ability for Members to offer them on the House floor because the Republicans don't want to deal with them. They are afraid they might lose. They don't want to have the debate.

If you want cooperation, if you want a bipartisan tax reform bill, then you just can't say it; you have to do something. In 1986, the last time Congress did a comprehensive tax reform, we had 30 days of full committee hearings spanning over a year. There were 26 days of markup between September and December. This time, the timelines being reported in the press are maybe just a week, or a little bit more, if that.

□ 1330

Again, if recent history is any indication, we might not even get that. A bill might just miraculously appear one day and be rushed to the floor so that no one has time to read it or analyze it and so that none of our constituents have time to understand what is really happening here.

So I go back to that chart. One percent—1 percent—of the wealthiest interests in this country get 80 percent of the tax breaks.

If you think that that is fair, then vote for this budget, because this budget paves the way for that tax bill to move forward.

If you care about a balanced budget and if you care about deficits and debt, please vote "no" on this budget, because this allows us to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion.

Whatever happened to deficits matter? I guess it is inconvenient because tax cuts for billionaires matter more than deficits and passing on that debt to our kids.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, to vote "no" on the rule, to vote "no" on this budget, and to fight like hell against this horrendous tax cut plan that my friends on the Republican side are pushing. This is bad policy. This is bad

for our country. This is bad for middle class families. This is bad for not only my constituents, I would argue it is bad for your constituents.

It is about time that the people's House starts enacting legislation that benefits the people of this country, not just a few who are well off and well connected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wish I could bring school groups down here onto the House floor just to help the next generation understand why we face some of the challenges that we face. We are down here today confronted with a tax bill that folks are certain is going to give away everything to everybody whom they don't want it to go to, and we are down here confronted with the fact that there is no tax bill whatsoever to look at and it is going to get sprung on folks with absolutely no notice and no ability to read it.

Now, either one of those things could be true. It happens to be that neither of those things is true. But how in the world do folks listening to this debate think that we are advancing the cause of reform?

Deficits do matter, to my friend's point. They do matter, and the strangest hold that the Obama regulatory economy created here in America on economic growth reduced economic GDP growth by a full one-third—by a full one-third.

For every 0.1 percent of GDP growth, we talk about 200 billion additional dollars coming in to the Treasury over the 10-year window. So a full percentage point that we have lost is \$2 trillion coming in to the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, if we had Bush-era growth instead of Obama-era growth over these last 5 years, the budget would be balanced today. But we are where we are, and the question is: Can we do better tomorrow? We can.

Now, before I talk about that, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize some of the folks who helped to get us here. My friend from Massachusetts and I come down here and carry the debate, but the work goes on behind every single one of these doors and in every single one of these committee rooms.

I serve on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, and our staff director over there, Rick May, has done an amazing job shepherding this process, standing up for the House's work product.

Jenna Speelman, Andy Morton, Tim Flynn, Robert Cogan, Patrick Louis Knudsen, Jim Bates, Mary Popadiuk, Jonathan Romito, and Elise Anderson are all working day and night—and weekends, many times—to get this product to the floor.

Steve Gonzalez, Eric Davis, Robert Yeakel, Ellen Johnson, Emily Goff,

Brad Watson, Brittany Madni, and Steve Waskiewicz are folks, Mr. Speaker, who don't come here because they have political passion; they come here because they have policy passion. They want to do those things that matter. They could go anywhere they want to in town and make more money, but they stay here working for the American people because they believe they can make a difference, and they are right.

Mr. Speaker, they are right. They can make a difference. We can make a difference. This rule—this rule—if we pass it today, Mr. Speaker, will allow us to concur in the Senate amendment. Concurring in the Senate amendment does not bind us to the Senate process, but it enables us to move a bill that direction that they can process.

We have seen the holdups in the Senate, Mr. Speaker. I am not happy about that. That is just the way Senate process is. We can do better. Reconciliation allows us to do better, and passing this rule enables us to do better.

Vote "yes," Mr. Speaker. Vote "yes" on this rule, and vote "yes" on the underlying budget and open yourself up to doing together what has not been done together in 31 years. I don't just believe we can, I believe that we will. I am excited about it, I am proud of it, and I am ready to get to it, Mr. Speaker.

Vote "yes."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Budget Committee, I rise in strong opposition to Rule governing debate on the Senate Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018, and the underlying resolution.

Let us be very clear and direct: the resolution before us is not intended to reconcile tax and spending priorities to reflect the priorities of the American people or to reduce the deficit and national debt or to put our fiscal house on a sustainable path to economic growth.

Rather the sole purpose of Republicans bringing this job-killing budget to the floor today is to fast-track their "Billionaires First" tax plan, which will cause significant harm to working and middle class families, especially to my constituents in the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas.

The McConnell-Ryan tax plan, which this budget resolution is designed to grease the skids for, would raise taxes on about 1.5 million Texas households, or 12.4 percent of households next year.

On average, families earning up to \$86,000 annually would see a \$794 increase in their tax liability, a significant burden on families struggling to afford child care and balance their checkbook.

An estimated 2.8 million Texas households deduct state and local taxes with an average deduction of \$7,823 in 2015.

The McConnell-Ryan plan eliminates this deduction, which would lower home values and put pressure on states and towns to collect revenues they depend on to fund schools, roads, and vital public resources.

The proposed elimination of the personal exemption will harm millions of Texans by taking away the \$4,050 deduction for each taxpayer and claimed dependent; in 2015, roughly 9.3 million dependent exemptions were claimed in the Lone Star State.

Equally terrible is that the McConnell-Ryan tax plan drastically reduces the Earned Income Tax Credit, which encourages work for 2.7 million low-income individuals in Texas, helping them make ends meet with an average credit of \$2,689.

The EITC and the Child Tax Credit lift about 1.2 million Texans, including 663,000 children, out of poverty each year.

This reckless and irresponsible GOP tax plan is made all the more obscene by the fact that 80 percent of the GOP's tax cuts go to the wealthiest 1 percent.

To achieve this goal of giving more and more to the haves and the "have mores," the GOP budget betrays seniors, children, the most vulnerable, and needy, and working and middle-class families.

For example, the Republican budget steals hundreds of billions of dollars from critical job-creating investments in infrastructure, job training, clean energy and research and development.

It devastates Medicare and Medicaid by cutting \$500 billion from Medicare and \$1.3 trillion from Medicaid, hurting veterans, seniors with long-term care needs, children and rural communities.

The GOP budget's steep cuts in program investments fall most heavily on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

This Republican budget adopts Trumpcare but does even more damage because in addition to depriving more than 20 million Americans of healthcare, denying protection to persons with preexisting conditions, and raising costs for older and low-income adults, cuts more than \$1.8 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare.

This Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee and calls for replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with fixed payments for the purchase of health insurance, shifting costs and financial risks onto seniors and disabled workers; this represents a \$500 billion cut to Medicare over ten years.

Mr. Speaker, the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of our values and priorities as a nation.

The values expressed by this Republican budget are not the values of my constituents, the people of Texas, or the American people as a whole.

For these reasons, I oppose the Rule and the underlying budget resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 580 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to

consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows: At the end of the Senate amendment, add the following new section:

"SEC. _____. **POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT RAISES TAXES ON MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES BY ELIMINATING OR LIMITING THE STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the State and Local Tax Deduction (26 U.S.C. 164).

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) **WAIVER IN THE HOUSE.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). As disposition of a point of order under this subsection, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order, as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused,

the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

YEAS—229

Abraham	Arrington	Barletta
Aderholt	Babin	Barr
Allen	Bacon	Barton
Amash	Banks (IN)	Bergman

Biggs	Guthrie	Paulsen	Esty (CT)	Lieu, Ted	Roybal-Allard	Coffman	Hunter	Reichert
Bilirakis	Handel	Pearce	Evans	Lipinski	Ruiz	Cole	Hurd	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Perry	Foster	Loeb	Ruppersberger	Collins (GA)	Issa	Rice (SC)
Black	Harris	Pittenger	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Rush	Collins (NY)	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Blackburn	Hartzler	Poe (TX)	Fudge	Lowe	Ryan (OH)	Comer	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Blum	Hensarling	Poliquin	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham, M.	Sánchez	Comstock	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Posey	Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray	Sarbanes	Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe	Garamendi	Lynch	Schakowsky	Cook	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Brat	Higgins (LA)	Reed	Gomez	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Schiff	Costello (PA)	Jordan	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Hill	Reichert	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Schneider	Cramer	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Renacci	Gottheimer	Matsui	Schrader	Crawford	Katko	Rooney, Thomas J.
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)	Green, Al	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Culberson	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Hudson	Roby	Green, Gene	McEeachin	Scott, David	Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Bucshon	Huizenga	Roe (TN)	Grijalva	McGovern	Serrano	Davidson	King (IA)	Ross
Budd	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)	Hanabusa	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Rothfus
Burgess	Hunter	Rogers (KY)	Hastings	Meeks	Shea-Porter	Denham	Kinzing	Rouzer
Byrne	Hurd	Rohrabacher	Heck	Meng	Sherman	Dent	Knight	Royce (CA)
Calvert	Issa	Rokita	Higgins (NY)	Moore	Sinema	DeSantis	Kustoff (TN)	Russell
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Thomas J.	Himes	Moulton	Sires	DesJarlais	Labrador	Rutherford
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter	Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Sanford
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Roskam	Huffman	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Donovan	LaMalfa	Scalise
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Ross	Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Soto	Duffy	Lamborn	Schweikert
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus	Jayapal	Neal	Speier	Duncan (SC)	Lance	Scott, Austin
Cole	Jordan	Rouzer	Jeffries	Nolan	Suozi	Dunn	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Royce (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)	Emmer	Lewis (MN)	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Katko	Russell	Johnson, E. B.	O'Halleran	Takano	Estes (KS)	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford	Jones	O'Rourke	Tsogang	Farenthold	Love	Shuster
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Scalise	Kaptur	Pallone	Vargas	Faso	Lucas	Simpson
Conaway	King (IA)	Schweikert	Keating	Panetta	Veasey	Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Cook	King (NY)	Scott, Austin	Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Vela	Fitzpatrick	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
Costello (PA)	Kinzing	Sensenbrenner	Kennedy	Payne	Velázquez	Fleischmann	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Knight	Sessions	Khanna	Pelosi	Visclosky	Flores	Marino	Smucker
Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus	Kihuen	Perlmutter	Walz	Fortenberry	Massie	Stefanik
Culberson	Labrador	Shuster	Kildee	Peters	Wasserman	Fox	Mast	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	LaHood	Simpson	Kilmer	Peterson	Schultz	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy	Stivers
Davidson	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)	Kind	Pingree	Gaetz	Frelinghuysen	McCaul	Taylor
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)	Krishnamoorthi	Pocan	Gallagher	Garrett	McClintock	Tenney
Denham	Lance	Smith (TX)	Kuster (NH)	Polis	Garrett	Gianforte	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Dent	Latta	Smucker	Langevin	Price (NC)	Gibbs	Gibbs	McKinley	Thornberry
DeSantis	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik	Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Gohmert	Gohmert	McMorris	Tiberi
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Stewart	Lawrence	Raskin	Goodlatte	Gosar	Rodgers	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Stivers	Lawson (FL)	Rice (NY)	Gosar	Gowdy	McSally	Trott
Donovan	Love	Taylor	Lee	Rosen	Granger	Meehan	Meadows	Turner
Duffy	Lucas	Tenney	Levin		Graves (GA)	Messer	Upton	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)	Lewis (GA)		Graves (LA)	Mitchell	Waladeo	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	MacArthur	Thornberry			Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Walberg	Walden
Dunn	Marchant	Tiberi			Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walker	Walorski
Emmer	Marino	Tipton			Grothman	Newhouse	Walorski	Walters, Mimi
Estes (KS)	Marshall	Trott			Guthrie	Noem	Weber (TX)	Wenstrup
Farenthold	Massie	Turner			Handel	Norman	Nunes	Westerman
Faso	Mast	Upton			Harper	Nunes	Olson	Williams
Ferguson	McCarthy	Valadao			Harris	Palazzo	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
Fitzpatrick	McCauley	Wagner			Hartzler	Palmer	Paulsen	Wittman
Fleischmann	McClintock	Walberg			Hensarling	Pearce	Perry	Womack
Flores	McHenry	Walden			Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger	Poe (TX)	Woodall
Fortenberry	McKinley	Walker			Higgins (LA)	Poe (TX)	Poliquin	Yoder
Fox	McMorris	Walorski			Hill	Poliquin	Yoho	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi			Holding	Yoder	Yoder	Young (IA)
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Weber (TX)			Hollingsworth	Young (IA)	Zeldin	
Gaetz	Meadows	Wenstrup			Hudson			
Gallagher	Meehan	Westerman			Huizenga			
Gianforte	Messer	Williams			Hultgren			
Gibbs	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)						
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Wittman						
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Womack						
Gosar	Mullin	Woodall						
Gowdy	Newhouse	Yoder						
Granger	Noem	Yoho						
Graves (GA)	Norman	Young (AK)						
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Young (IA)						
Graves (MO)	Olson	Zeldin						
Griffith	Palazzo							
Grothman	Palmer							

NAYS—188

Adams	Cárdenas	Crowley
Aguilar	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Barragán	Cartwright	Cummings
Bass	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bera	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Beyer	Cicilline	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Blunt Rochester	Clay	DelBene
Bonamici	Cleaver	Demings
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Deutch
Brown (MD)	Connolly	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Doggett
Bustos	Cooper	Doyle, Michael F.
Butterfield	Correa	Ellison
Capuano	Costa	Engel
Carbajal	Courtney	Eshoo
	Crist	

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1357

Mr. MESSER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—233

Abraham	Bergman	Brooks (IN)
Aderholt	Biggs	Buchanan
Allen	Bilirakis	Buck
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Bucshon
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Budd
Arrington	Black	Burgess
Babin	Blackburn	Byrne
Bacon	Blum	Calvert
Banks (IN)	Boast	Carter (GA)
Baretta	Brady (TX)	Carter (TX)
Barr	Brat	Chabot
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Cheney

NOES—188

Adams	Cicilline	Deutch
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Barragán	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bass	Clay	Doyle, Michael F.
Beatty	Cleaver	Ellison
Bera	Clyburn	Engel
Beyer	Cohen	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Españat
Blumenauer	Conyers	Esty (CT)
Blunt Rochester	Cooper	Evans
Bonamici	Correa	Foster
Boyle, Brendan F.	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Brady (PA)	Courtney	Fudge
Brown (MD)	Crist	Gabbard
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Gallego
Bustos	Cuellar	Garamendi
Butterfield	Cummings	Gomez
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Carbajal	Davis, Danny	Gottheimer
Cárdenas	DeFazio	Green, Al
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Green, Gene
Cartwright	Delaney	Grijalva
Castor (FL)	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Castro (TX)	Demings	Hanabusa
Chu, Judy	DeSaulnier	Hastings

Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Langevin
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Españal
Estes (KS)
Evans
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman

Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Cueilar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Engel
Eshoo
Españal
Estes (KS)
Evans
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman

Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascarell
Pearce

Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Bridenstine
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Long

Lowenthal
Richmond
Schrader
Smith (NE)

Thompson (CA)
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1405

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 180, answered "present" 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

YEAS—230

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr

Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Budd
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright

Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Capuano
Carbajal

NAYS—180

Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Cheney
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis

Díaz-Balart
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Ellison
Esty (CT)
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Gutiérrez
Hartzler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (NY)
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
LaHood
Lance
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey

Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Mitchell
Moore
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
Pallone
Panetta
Paulsen
Payne
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)
Raskin
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rosen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smucker
Soto
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Peterson
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rice (SC) Tonko

NOT VOTING—20

Bishop (GA)
Bridenstine
DeLauro
Farenthold
Frelinghuysen
Gohmert
Grijalva

Larson (CT)
Long
Lowenthal
Meng
Quigley
Richmond
Rooney, Francis

Ros-Lehtinen
Ruppersberger
Smith (NE)
Thompson (CA)
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1410

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR UNVEILING OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION CHAIR OF HONOR

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of the American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) Chair of Honor, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 26

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR UNVEILING OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION (POW/MIA) CHAIR OF HONOR.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on November 8, 2017, to unveil the American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) Chair of Honor.

(b) **PREPARATIONS.**—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 25, 2017, at 11:47 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 304.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 85.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

IRAN BALLISTIC MISSILES AND INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1698) to expand sanctions against Iran with respect to the

ballistic missile program of Iran, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows

H.R. 1698

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act”.

SEC. 2. SANCTIONS RELATING TO EFFORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN WITH RESPECT TO BALLISTIC MISSILE-RELATED GOODS, SERVICES, AND TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015)—

(A) calls upon Iran “not to undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches using such ballistic missile technology”; and

(B) requires member states to “take the necessary measures to prevent, except as decided otherwise by the UN Security Council in advance on a case-by-case basis, the supply, sale, or transfer of arms or related materiel from Iran”.

(2) The United States maintains bilateral sanctions against Iran for its efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer or use ballistic missiles or ballistic missile launch technology, and its acquisition of destabilizing types and amounts of conventional weapons.

(3) According to the 2016 Worldwide Threat Assessment, the United States intelligence community judges “that Tehran would choose ballistic missiles as its preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons, if it builds them. Iran’s ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering [weapons of mass destruction], and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East. Iran’s progress on space launch vehicles—along with its desire to deter the United States and its allies—provides Tehran with the means and motivation to develop longer-range missiles, including ICBMs.”.

(4) Since the passage of United Nations Security Council 2231, Iran has conducted numerous tests of ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, and has acquired destabilizing types of conventional weapons.

(5) Iran has pursued the ability to indigenously produce ballistic missile and cruise missile goods, services, and technologies.

(b) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States to prevent Iran from undertaking any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches using such ballistic missile technology.

(c) **REPORT ON SUPPLY CHAIN OF IRAN’S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the following:

(A) An analysis of the foreign supply chain and domestic supply chain in Iran that directly or indirectly significantly facilitates, supports, or otherwise aids the Government of Iran’s ballistic missile program.

(B) A description of the geographic distribution of the foreign and domestic supply chain described in subparagraph (A).

(C) An assessment of the Government of Iran’s ability to indigenously manufacture or otherwise produce the goods, services, or technology necessary to support its ballistic missile program.

(D) An identification of foreign persons that have, based on credible information, directly or indirectly facilitated or supported the development of the Government of Iran’s ballistic missile program, including the foreign and domestic supply chain described in subparagraph (A).

(E) A determination with respect to each foreign person identified under subparagraph (D) as to whether the foreign person meets the criteria for designation under—

(i) paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by this section;

(ii) section 104 of the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44); or

(iii) Executive Order 13382 (2005).

(2) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) **SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.**—Paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “EXPORTS, TRANSFERS, AND TRANSHIPMENTS” and inserting “WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION; BALLISTIC MISSILES; CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS”; and

(2) by striking “Except as” and inserting the following:

“(A) WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—Except as”;

(3) by striking “(A) on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012” and inserting the following:

“(i)(I) on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act”;

(4) by striking “(B) knew” and inserting the following:

“(II) knew”;

(5) by striking “(i) the export” and inserting the following:

“(aa) the export”;

(6) by striking “would likely” and inserting “may”;

(7) by striking “(ii) the export” and inserting the following:

“(bb) the export”;

(8) by striking “(I) acquire” and inserting the following:

“(AA) acquire”;

(9) by striking “; or” at the end of subparagraph (A)(i)(II)(bb)(AA) (as so redesignated);

(10) by inserting after subparagraph (A)(ii)(II)(bb)(AA) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(BB) acquire or develop ballistic missiles or ballistic missile launch technologies; or”;

(11) by striking “(II) acquire” and inserting the following:

“(CC) acquire”;

(12) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (A)(ii)(II)(bb)(CC) (as so redesignated) and inserting “; or”;

(13) by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following:

“(ii) knowingly exports or transfers, or permits or otherwise facilitates the transshipment or re-export of, goods, services, technology, or other items to Iran that materially supports Iran’s efforts to—

“(I) acquire or develop ballistic missiles or ballistic missile launch technologies; or

“(II) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional

weapons (as such term is defined in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1608 of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992).”.

(e) **SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO BALLISTIC MISSILES.**—Paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by subsection (e), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **ADDITIONAL BALLISTIC MISSILE-RELATED GOODS, SERVICES, AND TECHNOLOGY.**—

“(i) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in paragraph (8), (10), or (12) of section 6(a), as the case may be, with respect to—

“(I) an agency or instrumentality of the Government of Iran if the President determines that the agency or instrumentality, on or after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, knowingly seeks to develop, procure, or acquire goods, services, or technology that materially supports efforts by the Government of Iran with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies as described in clause (iii);

“(II) a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if the President determines that the person or agency or instrumentality knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, provides significant material support to the Government of Iran that supports efforts by the Government of Iran with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies as described in clause (iii); and

“(III) a foreign person that the President determines knowingly engages in a significant transaction or transactions with, or provides significant financial services for, a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in subclause (I) or (II) with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies as described in clause (iii).

“(ii) **DETERMINATION AND REPORT ON BALLISTIC MISSILE TESTS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President determines that the Government of Iran has conducted a test of a ballistic missile that fails to comply with, violates, or is in defiance of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies each senior official of the Government of Iran that the President determines is responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing the missile test.

“(II) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by subclause (I) should include available information on the ballistic missile or the generic class of ballistic missile or space rocket that was launched; the trajectory, duration, range, and altitude of the missile flight; the duration, range, and altitude of the flight of each stage of the missile; the location of the launch point and impact point; the payload; and other technical information that is available.

“(III) **FORM.**—The report required by subclause (I) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

“(iii) **EFFORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN WITH RESPECT TO BALLISTIC MISSILE-RELATED GOODS, SERVICES, AND TECHNOLOGIES DESCRIBED.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of clause (i), and except as provided in subclause (II) of this clause, efforts by the Government of Iran with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies described in this subsection are efforts by the Government of Iran to manufacture, acquire, pos-

sess, develop, transport, transfer, test or use ballistic missiles or associated goods, services, or technology by the Government of Iran, including efforts by the Government of Iran to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, purchase—

“(aa) goods, services, or technology listed on the Missile Technology Control Regime Equipment and Technology Annex of October 8, 2015, and subsequent revisions that have been acquired outside of the Procurement Working Group or not otherwise approved by the United Nations Security Council; or

“(bb) goods, services, or technology not described in the matter preceding item (aa) or item (aa) but which nevertheless the President determines would be, if such goods, services, or technology were United States goods, services, or technology, prohibited for export to Iran because of their potential to materially support the development of ballistic missile systems or ballistic missile launch technologies.

“(II) **EXCEPTION.**—Subclause (I) shall not apply with respect to efforts by the Government of Iran with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies that have been approved under paragraph 4 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

“(iv) **PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP DEFINED.**—In clause (iii)(I), the term ‘procurement working group’ means the Procurement Working Group of the Joint Commission established under Annex IV of the applicable provisions in Annex A of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

“(v) **ADDITIONAL REPORT ON BALLISTIC MISSILE TESTS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the President should submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that specifies the number and generic class of ballistic missiles and space rockets launched by Iran during the preceding calendar year and the dates of each missile launch and the type of missile launched on each relevant date. The report should include definitions used for classifying the generic classes of missiles.

“(II) **FORM.**—The report required by subclause (I) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.”.

(f) **SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS.**—Paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by subsections (e) and (f), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in paragraph (8) or (12) of section 6(a), as the case may be, with respect to a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if the President determines that the person or agency or instrumentality knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, imports, exports, or re-exports to, into, or from Iran, whether directly or indirectly, any significant arms or related materiel prohibited under paragraph (5) or (6) of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).”.

(g) **EXCEPTION AND DEFINITIONS.**—Paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by subsections (e), (f), and (g), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **EXCEPTION.**—The President may not impose sanctions under subparagraph (B) or

(C) with respect to a foreign person or a United States person if the President determines that the person has exercised due diligence in establishing and enforcing official policies, procedures, and controls to ensure that the person does not sell, supply, or transfer to or from Iran materials the sale, supply, or transfer of which would subject a person to the imposition of sanctions under subparagraph (B) or (C), as the case may be, or conduct or facilitate a financial transaction for such a sale, supply, or transfer.

“(E) **DEFINITIONS.**—In subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this paragraph:

“(i) **AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY.**—The term ‘agency or instrumentality’ has the meaning given such term in section 1603(b) of title 28, United States Code.

“(ii) **FOREIGN STATE.**—The term ‘foreign state’ has the meaning given such term in section 1603(a) of title 28, United States Code.

“(iii) **GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.**—The term ‘Government of Iran’ has the meaning given such term in section 560.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on January 1, 2016.

“(iv) **SIGNIFICANT TRANSACTION OR TRANSACTIONS; SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL SERVICES.**—The terms ‘significant transaction or transactions’ and ‘significant financial services’ shall be determined in accordance with section 561.404 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section 561.404 was in effect on January 1, 2016.”.

(h) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—Section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:

“(10) **INADMISSIBILITY TO UNITED STATES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States and, if the individual has been issued a visa or other documentation, revoke, in accordance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) the visa or other documentation of any alien that—

“(i) is designated pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 5(b)(1); or

“(ii) the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, a sanctioned person.

“(B) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.**—Sanctions under subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (13); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) **EXPORT SANCTION.**—In the case of an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, no item on the United States Munitions List or Commerce Munitions List may be exported to that foreign state for a period of two years.”.

(i) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The sanctions that are required to be imposed under this section and the amendments made by this section are in addition to other similar or related sanctions that are required to be imposed under any other provision of law.

(j) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out any amendments made by this section.

(k) **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to implement—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by this section; and

(2) section 104 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44).

(1) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) apply with respect to an activity described in subsection (b) of section 5 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this section, that is commenced on or after such date of enactment.

(2) **APPLICABILITY TO ONGOING ACTIVITIES RELATING TO CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.**—A person that, before the date of the enactment of this Act, commenced an activity described in section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as in effect on the day before such date of enactment, and continues the activity on or after such date of enactment, shall be subject to the provisions of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed three years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the following information:

(1) Any credible information regarding Iran's attempts to develop, procure, or acquire goods, services, or technology with respect to which sanctions may be imposed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 5(b)(1) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as added by section 2 of this Act.

(2) Any credible information regarding Iran's acquisition or attempted acquisition of significant arms and related material in violation of paragraph 5 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(3) Any credible information regarding Iran's export or attempted export of significant arms and related material in violation of paragraph 6 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(4) Any approval granted by the United Nations Security Council for the export of significant arms and related material identified under paragraphs 5 or 6 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(5) Any credible information regarding violations of travel restrictions described in paragraph 6 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(6) Any approval granted by the United Nations Security Council for exemptions to the travel restrictions described in paragraph 6 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(b) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS FOR THE SALE OR TRANSFER OF DESTABILIZING TYPES AND AMOUNTS OF CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) **NOTIFICATION OF SALES AND TRANSFERS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the President receives credible information that destabilizing numbers and types of conventional weapons have been sold or transferred to Iran, the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the sale or transfer.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS WITH RESPECT TO SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the President notifies the appropriate congressional committees of a sale or transfer under subsection (a), the President shall—

(A) determine whether such sale or transfer meets the requirements to impose sanctions under each provision of law specified in subsection (c); and

(B)(i) if the determination is that the sale or transfer is subject to any such sanctions, the President shall—

(I) make a determination whether to impose or waive such sanctions with respect to such sale or transfer; and

(II) submit that determination to the appropriate congressional committees; or

(ii) if the determination is that the sale or transfer is not subject to any such sanctions, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the determination and the specific reasons for the determination.

(2) **FORM.**—The determination in paragraph (1) shall be provided in an unclassified form, and may contain a classified annex.

(c) **PROVISIONS OF LAW SPECIFIED.**—The provisions of law specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Section 5(b)(1) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by section 2 of this Act.

(2) The Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) The Iran, North Korea, and Syria Non-proliferation Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons”—

(1) has the meaning given the terms “advanced conventional weapons” and “cruise missile” as defined in paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, of section 1608 of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); and

(2) includes the S-300 and S-400 missile defense systems and air superiority fighters.

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION ON USE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN OF COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT AND RELATED SERVICES FOR ILLICIT MILITARY OR OTHER ACTIVITIES.

(a) **DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for three years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a determination on use by the Government of Iran of commercial passenger aircraft and related services for illicit military or other activities on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF DETERMINATION.**—The determination required under subsection (a) shall include a description of the extent to which—

(1) commercial passenger aircraft in Iran are being used to transport—

(A) arms or related materiel, including defense articles, defense services, or technical

data that are controlled on the United States Munitions List established under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778);

(B) any item that is, or would be, if located in the United States, controlled by Export Control Classification Number 600 series listed on the Commerce Control List maintained under Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of the Export Administration Regulations;

(C) items used to facilitate the development or production of a chemical or biological weapon or other weapon of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including ballistic missiles and cruise missiles; or

(D) any foreign person that facilitates the transfer of any of the articles described in subparagraphs (A) through (C);

(2) commercial passenger aircraft licensed by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury are being used for activities described in paragraph (1); and

(3) foreign governments and persons have facilitated the activities described in paragraph (1), including allowing the use of airports, services, or other resources.

(c) **FORM OF DETERMINATION.**—The determination required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT.**—The term “commercial passenger aircraft” includes—

(A) an aircraft of United States origin and that is classified under Export Control Classification Number (ECCN) 9A991 on the Commerce Control List maintained under Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of the Export Administration Regulations; or

(B) an aircraft not of United States origin of which United States-controlled content constitutes 10 percent or more of the total value of the aircraft and that is—

(i) classified under Export Control Classification Number (ECCN) 9A991 on the Commerce Control List maintained under Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of the Export Administration Regulations; and

(ii) is registered in a jurisdiction other than the United States.

(2) **EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS.**—The term “Export Administration Regulations” means subchapter C of chapter VII of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) **RELATED SERVICES.**—The term “related services”, with respect to a commercial passenger aircraft, includes—

(A) the export, re-export, sale, lease, or transfer to Iran of spare parts and components; and

(B) warranty, maintenance, and repair services.

SEC. 6. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—Not less than 10 days before the promulgation of regulations under subsection (a), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) **CREDIBLE INFORMATION.**—The term “credible information” has the meaning given such term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) **GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.**—The term “Government of Iran” has the meaning given such term in section 560.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on January 1, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1415

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, due to the technical issues in the Chamber, I ask to withdraw the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1431

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PALMER) at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

IRAN BALLISTIC MISSILES AND INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1698) to expand sanc-

tions against Iran with respect to the ballistic missile program of Iran, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1698

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act”.

SEC. 2. SANCTIONS RELATING TO EFFORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN WITH RESPECT TO BALLISTIC MISSILE-RELATED GOODS, SERVICES, AND TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015)—

(A) calls upon Iran “not to undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches using such ballistic missile technology”; and

(B) requires member states to “take the necessary measures to prevent, except as decided otherwise by the UN Security Council in advance on a case-by-case basis, the supply, sale, or transfer of arms or related material from Iran”.

(2) The United States maintains bilateral sanctions against Iran for its efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer or use ballistic missiles or ballistic missile launch technology, and its acquisition of destabilizing types and amounts of conventional weapons.

(3) According to the 2016 Worldwide Threat Assessment, the United States intelligence community judges “that Tehran would choose ballistic missiles as its preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons, if it builds them. Iran’s ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering [weapons of mass destruction], and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East. Iran’s progress on space launch vehicles—along with its desire to deter the United States and its allies—provides Tehran with the means and motivation to develop longer-range missiles, including ICBMs.”.

(4) Since the passage of United Nations Security Council 2231, Iran has conducted numerous tests of ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, and has acquired destabilizing types of conventional weapons.

(5) Iran has pursued the ability to indigenously produce ballistic missile and cruise missile goods, services, and technologies.

(b) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States to prevent Iran from undertaking any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches using such ballistic missile technology.

(c) **REPORT ON SUPPLY CHAIN OF IRAN’S BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the following:

(A) An analysis of the foreign supply chain and domestic supply chain in Iran that directly or indirectly significantly facilitates, supports, or otherwise aids the Government of Iran’s ballistic missile program.

(B) A description of the geographic distribution of the foreign and domestic supply chain described in subparagraph (A).

(C) An assessment of the Government of Iran’s ability to indigenously manufacture or otherwise produce the goods, services, or technology necessary to support its ballistic missile program.

(D) An identification of foreign persons that have, based on credible information, directly or indirectly facilitated or supported the development of the Government of Iran’s ballistic missile program, including the foreign and domestic supply chain described in subparagraph (A).

(E) A determination with respect to each foreign person identified under subparagraph (D) as to whether the foreign person meets the criteria for designation under—

(i) paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by this section;

(ii) section 104 of the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44); or

(iii) Executive Order 13382 (2005).

(2) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) **SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.**—Paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “EXPORTS, TRANSFERS, AND TRANSHIPMENTS” and inserting “WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION; BALLISTIC MISSILES; CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS”; and

(2) by striking “Except as” and inserting the following:

“(A) WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—Except as”;

(3) by striking “(A) on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012” and inserting the following:

“(i)(I) on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act”;

(4) by striking “(B) knew” and inserting the following:

“(II) knew”;

(5) by striking “(i) the export” and inserting the following:

“(aa) the export”;

(6) by striking “would likely” and inserting “may”;

(7) by striking “(ii) the export” and inserting the following:

“(bb) the export”;

(8) by striking “(I) acquire” and inserting the following:

“(AA) acquire”;

(9) by striking “; or” at the end of subparagraph (A)(ii)(II)(bb)(AA) (as so redesignated);

(10) by inserting after subparagraph (A)(ii)(II)(bb)(AA) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(BB) acquire or develop ballistic missiles or ballistic missile launch technologies; or”;

(11) by striking “(II) acquire” and inserting the following:

“(CC) acquire”;

(12) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (A)(ii)(II)(bb)(CC) (as so redesignated) and inserting “; or”; and

(13) by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following:

“(ii) knowingly exports or transfers, or permits or otherwise facilitates the transshipment or re-export of, goods, services, technology, or other items to Iran that materially supports Iran’s efforts to—

“(I) acquire or develop ballistic missiles or ballistic missile launch technologies; or

“(II) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons (as such term is defined in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1608 of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992).”.

(e) **SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO BALLISTIC MISSILES.**—Paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by subsection (e), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **ADDITIONAL BALLISTIC MISSILE-RELATED GOODS, SERVICES, AND TECHNOLOGY.**—

“(i) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in paragraph (8), (10), or (12) of section 6(a), as the case may be, with respect to—

“(I) an agency or instrumentality of the Government of Iran if the President determines that the agency or instrumentality, on or after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, knowingly seeks to develop, procure, or acquire goods, services, or technology that materially supports efforts by the Government of Iran with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies as described in clause (iii);

“(II) a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if the President determines that the person or agency or instrumentality knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, provides significant material support to the Government of Iran that supports efforts by the Government of Iran with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies as described in clause (iii); and

“(III) a foreign person that the President determines knowingly engages in a significant transaction or transactions with, or provides significant financial services for, a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in subclause (I) or (II) with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies as described in clause (iii).

“(ii) **DETERMINATION AND REPORT ON BALLISTIC MISSILE TESTS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President determines that the Government of Iran has conducted a test of a ballistic missile that fails to comply with, violates, or is in defiance of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies each senior official of the Government of Iran that the President determines is responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing the missile test.

“(II) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by subclause (I) should include available information on the ballistic missile or the generic class of ballistic missile or space rocket that was launched; the trajectory, duration, range, and altitude of the missile flight; the duration, range, and altitude of the flight of each stage of the missile; the location of the launch point and impact point; the payload; and other technical information that is available.

“(III) **FORM.**—The report required by subclause (I) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

“(iii) **EFFORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN WITH RESPECT TO BALLISTIC MISSILE-RELATED GOODS, SERVICES, AND TECHNOLOGIES DESCRIBED.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of clause (i), and except as provided in subclause (II) of this clause, efforts by the Government of Iran with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies described

in this subsection are efforts by the Government of Iran to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, test or use ballistic missiles or associated goods, services, or technology by the Government of Iran, including efforts by the Government of Iran to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, purchase—

“(aa) goods, services, or technology listed on the Missile Technology Control Regime Equipment and Technology Annex of October 8, 2015, and subsequent revisions that have been acquired outside of the Procurement Working Group or not otherwise approved by the United Nations Security Council; or

“(bb) goods, services, or technology not described in the matter preceding item (aa) or item (aa) but which nevertheless the President determines would be, if such goods, services, or technology were United States goods, services, or technology, prohibited for export to Iran because of their potential to materially support the development of ballistic missile systems or ballistic missile launch technologies.

“(II) **EXCEPTION.**—Subclause (I) shall not apply with respect to efforts by the Government of Iran with respect to ballistic missile-related goods, services, and technologies that have been approved under paragraph 4 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

“(iv) **PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP DEFINED.**—In clause (iii)(I), the term ‘procurement working group’ means the Procurement Working Group of the Joint Commission established under Annex IV of the applicable provisions in Annex A of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

“(v) **ADDITIONAL REPORT ON BALLISTIC MISSILE TESTS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the President should submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that specifies the number and generic class of ballistic missiles and space rockets launched by Iran during the preceding calendar year and the dates of each missile launch and the type of missile launched on each relevant date. The report should include definitions used for classifying the generic classes of missiles.

“(II) **FORM.**—The report required by subclause (I) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.”.

(f) **SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS.**—Paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by subsections (e) and (f), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS.**—The President shall impose the sanctions described in paragraph (8) or (12) of section 6(a), as the case may be, with respect to a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if the President determines that the person or agency or instrumentality knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, imports, exports, or re-exports to, into, or from Iran, whether directly or indirectly, any significant arms or related materiel prohibited under paragraph (5) or (6) of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).”.

(g) **EXCEPTION AND DEFINITIONS.**—Paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by subsections (e), (f), and (g), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **EXCEPTION.**—The President may not impose sanctions under subparagraph (B) or (C) with respect to a foreign person or a United States person if the President determines that the person has exercised due diligence in establishing and enforcing official policies, procedures, and controls to ensure that the person does not sell, supply, or transfer to or from Iran materials the sale, supply, or transfer of which would subject a person to the imposition of sanctions under subparagraph (B) or (C), as the case may be, or conduct or facilitate a financial transaction for such a sale, supply, or transfer.

“(E) **DEFINITIONS.**—In subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this paragraph:

“(i) **AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY.**—The term ‘agency or instrumentality’ has the meaning given such term in section 1603(b) of title 28, United States Code.

“(ii) **FOREIGN STATE.**—The term ‘foreign state’ has the meaning given such term in section 1603(a) of title 28, United States Code.

“(iii) **GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.**—The term ‘Government of Iran’ has the meaning given such term in section 560.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on January 1, 2016.

“(iv) **SIGNIFICANT TRANSACTION OR TRANSACTIONS; SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL SERVICES.**—The terms ‘significant transaction or transactions’ and ‘significant financial services’ shall be determined in accordance with section 561.404 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section 561.404 was in effect on January 1, 2016.”.

(h) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—Section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:

“(10) **INADMISSIBILITY TO UNITED STATES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States and, if the individual has been issued a visa or other documentation, revoke, in accordance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) the visa or other documentation of any alien that—

“(i) is designated pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 5(b)(1); or

“(ii) the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, a sanctioned person.

“(B) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.**—Sanctions under subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.”.

(2) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (13); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) **EXPORT SANCTION.**—In the case of an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, no item on the United States Munitions List or Commerce Munitions List may be exported to that foreign state for a period of two years.”.

(i) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The sanctions that are required to be imposed under this section and the amendments made by this

section are in addition to other similar or related sanctions that are required to be imposed under any other provision of law.

(j) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out any amendments made by this section.

(k) **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to implement—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by this section; and

(2) section 104 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44).

(l) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) apply with respect to an activity described in subsection (b) of section 5 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this section, that is commenced on or after such date of enactment.

(2) **APPLICABILITY TO ONGOING ACTIVITIES RELATING TO CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.**—A person that, before the date of the enactment of this Act, commenced an activity described in section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as in effect on the day before such date of enactment, and continues the activity on or after such date of enactment, shall be subject to the provisions of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed three years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the following information:

(1) Any credible information regarding Iran's attempts to develop, procure, or acquire goods, services, or technology with respect to which sanctions may be imposed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 5(b)(1) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as added by section 2 of this Act.

(2) Any credible information regarding Iran's acquisition or attempted acquisition of significant arms and related material in violation of paragraph 5 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(3) Any credible information regarding Iran's export or attempted export of significant arms and related material in violation of paragraph 6 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(4) Any approval granted by the United Nations Security Council for the export of significant arms and related material identified under paragraphs 5 or 6 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(5) Any credible information regarding violations of travel restrictions described in paragraph 6 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(6) Any approval granted by the United Nations Security Council for exemptions to the travel restrictions described in paragraph 6 of Annex B of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(b) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS FOR THE SALE OR TRANSFER OF DESTABILIZING TYPES AND AMOUNTS OF CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) **NOTIFICATION OF SALES AND TRANSFERS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the President receives credible information that destabilizing numbers and types of conventional weapons have been sold or transferred to Iran, the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the sale or transfer.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS WITH RESPECT TO SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the President notifies the appropriate congressional committees of a sale or transfer under subsection (a), the President shall—

(A) determine whether such sale or transfer meets the requirements to impose sanctions under each provision of law specified in subsection (c); and

(B)(i) if the determination is that the sale or transfer is subject to any such sanctions, the President shall—

(I) make a determination whether to impose or waive such sanctions with respect to such sale or transfer; and

(II) submit that determination to the appropriate congressional committees; or

(ii) if the determination is that the sale or transfer is not subject to any such sanctions, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the determination and the specific reasons for the determination.

(2) **FORM.**—The determination in paragraph (1) shall be provided in an unclassified form, and may contain a classified annex.

(c) **PROVISIONS OF LAW SPECIFIED.**—The provisions of law specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Section 5(b)(1) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by section 2 of this Act.

(2) The Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) The Iran, North Korea, and Syria Non-proliferation Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons”—

(1) has the meaning given the terms “advanced conventional weapons” and “cruise missile” as defined in paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, of section 1608 of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); and

(2) includes the S-300 and S-400 missile defense systems and air superiority fighters.

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION ON USE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN OF COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT AND RELATED SERVICES FOR ILLICIT MILITARY OR OTHER ACTIVITIES.

(a) **DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for three years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a determination on use by the Government of Iran of commercial passenger aircraft and related services for illicit military or other activities on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF DETERMINATION.**—The determination required under subsection (a) shall include a description of the extent to which—

(1) commercial passenger aircraft in Iran are being used to transport—

(A) arms or related materiel, including defense articles, defense services, or technical data that are controlled on the United States Munitions List established under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778);

(B) any item that is, or would be, if located in the United States, controlled by Export Control Classification Number 600 series listed on the Commerce Control List maintained under Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of the Export Administration Regulations;

(C) items used to facilitate the development or production of a chemical or biological weapon or other weapon of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including ballistic missiles and cruise missiles; or

(D) any foreign person that facilitates the transfer of any of the articles described in subparagraphs (A) through (C);

(2) commercial passenger aircraft licensed by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury are being used for activities described in paragraph (1); and

(3) foreign governments and persons have facilitated the activities described in paragraph (1), including allowing the use of airports, services, or other resources.

(c) **FORM OF DETERMINATION.**—The determination required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT.**—The term “commercial passenger aircraft” includes—

(A) an aircraft of United States origin and that is classified under Export Control Classification Number (ECCN) 9A991 on the Commerce Control List maintained under Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of the Export Administration Regulations; or

(B) an aircraft not of United States origin of which United States-controlled content constitutes 10 percent or more of the total value of the aircraft and that is—

(i) classified under Export Control Classification Number (ECCN) 9A991 on the Commerce Control List maintained under Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of the Export Administration Regulations; and

(ii) is registered in a jurisdiction other than the United States.

(2) **EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS.**—The term “Export Administration Regulations” means subchapter C of chapter VII of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) **RELATED SERVICES.**—The term “related services”, with respect to a commercial passenger aircraft, includes—

(A) the export, re-export, sale, lease, or transfer to Iran of spare parts and components; and

(B) warranty, maintenance, and repair services.

SEC. 6. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—Not less than 10 days before the promulgation of regulations under subsection (a), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) CREDIBLE INFORMATION.—The term “credible information” has the meaning given such term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.—The term “Government of Iran” has the meaning given such term in section 560.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on January 1, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives here considers four measures that we have worked on in a bipartisan way, four measures that are consistent with the President's call for an approach to Iran that addresses the full range of threats that it possesses to not just the United States, but to our allies, to our partners as well.

This legislation, which I have authored along with my colleague, ELIOT ENGEL, I am proud to say we now have 323 cosponsors to this bill. This is the bipartisan Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act.

What this does is respond to the regime's continued pursuit of intercontinental ballistic missiles and to dangerous conventional weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I will begin by thanking my good friend, Mr. ENGEL, for his hard work, his collaboration, along with Mr. STENY HOYER and Mr. MCCARTHY, in bringing this important legislation to this floor.

Iran has already developed an arsenal of short- and medium-range ballistic missiles, and those missiles put our allies, our partners, as well as U.S. forces in range.

Now Iran is working on intercontinental ballistic missiles. I think to get the point across, I would just quote our former Secretary of Defense, Ash Carter, because he testified before Congress on this issue. What he conveyed to us is: “. . . the I in ICBM stands for intercontinental, which means having the capability from flying from Iran to the United States, and we don't want that.”

That was the way he explained this.

One of the reasons that we don't want that is that intercontinental ballistic missiles are inherently capable of carrying nuclear weapons. In fact, as one expert told the Foreign Affairs Committee, “no country that has not aspired to possess nuclear weapons has ever opted to sustain” a lengthy and expensive missile program.

I would take issue with that. I do know of one exception to that rule. That exception was South Africa under the apartheid regime, which did develop the atomic weapon. It is an example of how sanctions can be successful, because when we passed sanctions here, the consequence was they made a decision to turn that weapon back over to the IAEA, as well as to allow Nelson Mandela to leave jail, and they held elections. That is the exception I know of.

So whether you supported the nuclear deal or whether you opposed that nuclear deal, this other issue should concern you either way. By developing the delivery system, Iran is keeping its options open.

So from those who worked on the deal, one of the architects, Jake Sullivan of the former administration, made it clear to us—and this was 2 weeks ago—that imposing costs on Iran for its continued pursuit of ballistic missiles and other destabilizing activity is “not only necessary, but justified.”

That is one of the architects of the agreement itself.

That is what this bill does. It requires a comprehensive investigation to identify and designate the companies, the banks, the individuals inside and outside of Iran which supply the regime's missiles and supply their conventional weapons programs, and it sanctions them. In doing so, it shuts out Iranian and foreign companies involved in Iran's missile program. It also shuts out the banks that back them. It shuts them out from the global financial system.

This bill expands Iran sanctions that we passed and were signed into law in August with H.R. 3364, the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act.

For example, while the bill that passed over the summer specifically sanctions those who materially contribute to Iran's ballistic missile program, the bill before us today goes a step further by sanctioning those that

are in the business of financing Iran's efforts.

The conventional weapons prohibition in the bill before us are also stronger, and let me explain why. The August legislation referenced the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, which excludes such items as Russia's recent sale of the S–300 air defense system to Iran. The bill before us ensures that there is no such carve-out.

Mr. Speaker, Members have different views on how to handle Iran's nuclear program, but when it comes to Iran's ballistic missile and conventional weapons programs, all 323 cosponsors of this bill agree: Iran has no business developing or acquiring intercontinental ballistic missiles. That is why it is so important that we pass this bill and give the administration the tools to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 1698, the “Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act,” on which the Committee on Ways and Means was granted an additional referral.

As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1698 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I agree to waive formal consideration of this bill so that it may move expeditiously to the floor. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1698.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1698 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, October 20, 2017.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, as amended.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1698, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1698 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Committee Report and the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to

any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1698 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1698 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOV-
ERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, October 24, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 1698, the "Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act." This bill would expand sanctions against Iran with respect to the ballistic missile program of Iran and contains provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. As a result of your having consulted with me concerning the provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo consideration of the bill so the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1698 at this time we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and we will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of let-

ters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Govern-
ment Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOWDY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1698 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

Let me thank our chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my friend, ED ROYCE from California, for his work moving this bill. I was pleased to join him as the lead Democratic cosponsor when we introduced this bill in March of this year.

I stand by his entire statement that he has just made. We have an absolute meeting of the minds on this bill, and that is why we were able to get 323 cosponsors on both sides of the aisle, because people understand and realize the threat that Iran poses to us, to the world, and to our allies.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has been hard at work this year devising new tools and approaches for dealing with the threat of Iran. There is no doubt that Iran must be one of our major priorities in our foreign policy, the world's most prolific state sponsor of terrorism, a serial abuser of human rights, a lifeline for the murderous Assad regime in Syria, and the challenge we are dealing with today: Iran's illicit development of ballistic missiles.

The chairman and I share the view that when it comes to the nuclear deal, which we both opposed, the best path forward is to enforce the hell out of it even while we work to hold Iran's feet to the fire on all these other harmful activities.

We passed a tough sanctions bill last summer to crack down on Iran, as well as North Korea and Russia. While the bill before us today basically contains very similar provisions which we dealt with then and, as the chairman explained, we go one step further here, I am always eager to find even more ways to dial up pressure on the regime in Tehran, which is a malevolent regime, which is a regime that sponsors terrorism, which is a regime that is hostile to the United States, hostile to our ally Israel, and hostile to our other allies in the Middle East. But I worry that the administration isn't taking this problem seriously.

So far, the White House hasn't fully implemented the previous bill we sent to the President. The White House's approach to the nuclear deal sends a bad message to allies and adversaries around the world that the United States might not live up to its word. Rather than extracting more concessions with Iran, which I believe may be possible by working hard to build a strong multilateral coalition, the course of this may instead push Iran to leave the deal and resume work on a bomb. We can never allow that to happen.

So I am happy that we keep passing the sanctions bills, but Congress' role can only go so far. It is up to the administration to lay out its goals, devise a strategy, and implement the tough sanctions Congress has passed. It is more than 60 days since we passed the sanctions bill, and the President has not implemented it. According to the bill, which the President signed, it was supposed to be implemented within 60 days, so it sends a mixed message.

Talking tough is not enough. Congress sends a bill to the White House, the President signs it, it really should be implemented. So I want to urge the President and the administration to listen to this Congress in a bipartisan way. We passed this bill. It needs to be implemented, and it needs to be passed and implemented again.

In the meantime, I am happy to support this bill. I think this shows that we need to work together when it comes to Iran in a bipartisan way to show that there is really not a shred of difference, that we will not stand for Iran's aggression, we will not stand for the mullahs threatening us, we will not stand for Iran stomping on its own people.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue. I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security. He is a former Federal prosecutor and a senior member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, let me first commend Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for their strong bipartisan work on this very important legislation that sanctions Iran's ballistic missile program and the Iranian-backed terror group Hezbollah.

Over the last several decades, the tyrannical regime in Iran has been racing to develop a nuclear weapons program that could threaten the United States and our allies and potentially spark an arms race in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, the extremely flawed JCPOA kept parts of Iran's nuclear infrastructure in place and strengthened the regime's leader with a windfall of cash. Because this toothless deal failed to address Iran's other malign activities, such as support for terror and their intercontinental ballistic missile program, we must now find other ways to apply new pressure.

Fortunately, the House is taking action today. One of the bills we are considering will require the President to impose additional sanctions on enemies and individuals supporting Iran's development of ballistic missiles. I sincerely hope that we can soon add even more pressure on Iran by designating the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps as a foreign terrorist organization, legislation I pursued in the last two Congresses.

Going after state sponsors is an important part of winning this fight, but we must fight also directly individual terror groups to limit the resources to prevent future attacks. That is why I am pleased that we also are considering measures to target Hezbollah.

This package would direct the President to impose new sanctions on financial institutions and foreign governments that support Hezbollah and affiliated organizations, as well as individual members of the terror groups, that they have used civilians as human shields.

□ 1445

I will say it is Hezbollah that killed so many of our marines in Beirut, Lebanon, let us not forget.

The chairman and ranking member and I recently visited Israel, Prime Minister Netanyahu, who described the Shia Crescent of Iran going into Iraq, into Syria, into Lebanon. He talked to us about the manufacturing plant in Lebanon manufacturing rockets pointed straight at the State of Israel.

These bills, I believe, will take us steps closer toward ridding the world of this terrible threat posed by Islamic terror.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the esteemed majority leader of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time

to me. I want to thank the gentleman for his work as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I stand on this floor thinking of the world and America's place in it. What I desire most is peace. America has no desire to fight those who do not harm us. I would gladly support any international agreement that I thought would bring us to an honorable and enduring peace.

But peace is not based on hope; it is not based on good intentions; and it is not based on pieces of paper signed at well-planned ceremonies. Peace is based on strength. America and our allies will only be at peace if those who hate us fear us. This is where our credibility matters.

When an American President agrees to a deal that is so obviously unequal and untenable, everyone stops fearing us. They start to think they can push us around.

Let me be clear. They may start to push, but no one can knock us down. America will win any fight. Our enemies should know that. But, frankly, I want our enemies to be so afraid of us they don't even want to fight. That saves everyone a great deal of trouble.

When I look back to our nuclear deal with North Korea and our deal with Iran, they aren't just flawed; they are dangerous. The displays of weakness have consequences beyond nuclear weapons.

Our North Korea deal has failed. The Kim regime will soon have nuclear warheads on intercontinental ballistic missiles. These warheads will be capable of hitting our homeland. In the meantime, they have reportedly fired missiles over our allies South Korea and Japan and, almost daily, threatened war.

The deal with Iran is on a path to failure, designed in such a way that, even if it were followed, a regime that chants "death to America"—let me say that again, a regime that chants "death to America"—could have nuclear weapons the day after the deal expires.

Even ignoring the deal, Iran continues to destabilize the region for its own goal, funding terrorism abroad and fueling violence between Shia and Sunni Muslims that is tearing the Middle East apart.

The spread of nuclear weapons is a danger in and of itself. I do not need to explain why enemies of the United States should be stopped from gaining the power to level American cities, but the evil is made worse when our enemies, with any weapons, think they can push America and our allies around.

America will not be weak any longer. Today's sanction on Iran undermines its ballistic missile program and the terrorist warriors of Hezbollah whose pockets are filled with Iranian money, just as their hands are covered with

American blood. This is an important part of our Nation's new Iran strategy.

Yesterday, we passed the most far-reaching sanctions we have ever imposed on North Korea. Those who do business with North Korea support a regime run on slave labor. They support a regime that deprives its citizens of every freedom, even the freedom to think, and they support a regime that tortured and murdered American citizen Otto Warmbier not because he committed a crime or threatened their government in any way, but because he was an American. If you do business with such a regime, there will be severe consequences.

I had the honor of meeting Otto's parents, Cindy and Fred. They told me about Otto's warmth, his joy, his love of life, and the great hopes he had. In everything, he stood as a living example of the good in humanity that the Kim regime seeks to destroy. We renamed that legislation as the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act. It won't bring him back, but it will remind North Korea that evil has consequences.

Otto's murder was a crime we cannot accept, but it is a crime, I fear, our enemies would repeat on a much larger scale if we do not start stopping them now. Let's remind them who they are up against. America will not fail.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, and she is the author of multiple laws addressing the Iranian threat.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE for authoring this bill alongside our good friend Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, the dynamic duo of Foreign Affairs. I want to thank them for their leadership and their continued effort in holding Iran accountable.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill is called the Iran Ballistic Missile and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, authored by our chairman and ranking member. It is a strong and important bill. It sanctions Iranian and foreign persons and entities that support, that facilitate, that finance Iran's ballistic missile program. It is a necessary measure because, as we know, Iran has felt emboldened to continue advancing its missile program since the P5+1 and Iran concluded the weak nuclear deal.

Tehran has taken advantage of this deal and the U.N. Security Council resolution that endorsed the agreement. Despite language that prohibits Iran's ballistic missile testing in U.N. Resolution 2231, Iran has actually increased its missile activities, violating both the spirit and the letter of the resolution.

With the President having made his determination 2 weeks ago that Iran is

not in compliance with its commitments under the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, we now have an opportunity to address the weakness in the nuclear deal and also Iran's illicit activity.

We must continue to press forward on a dual track. We must continue to hold Iran accountable for its non-nuclear illicit activity, while also looking to address our concerns with the nuclear deal. They are not mutually exclusive, Mr. Speaker. Both are extremely important for our national security. This is an important step.

I thank the Members for their great leadership. I support passage of Chairman ROYCE and ELIOT ENGEL's measure.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE). He is the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Iran continues to be one of the two greatest threats to the United States' national security and to global security. The other, of course, is North Korea.

It has become very clear that the Iranian deal has not moderated the regime. Regardless of where people are on whether we should have signed it or not signed it, it hasn't stopped the aggressive activity and belief of the regime.

I believe that they are still developing or trying to develop nuclear weapons. No one denies that Iran is actively working toward developing a delivery capability for a nuclear payload. Iran's ballistic missile program is going to be and already is a menace not only to the United States, but to Europe and other parts of the world.

Iran is working with North Korea to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of reaching our shores. These two nations engage in their activity and belief in hate—hate—of freedom to destroy the United States and our some of our allies. We should understand that this is a reality and the threat is now. We should deal with both of those countries accordingly, not in 10 years.

This legislation, Mr. ROYCE's Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, is very crucial.

We must hold the Ayatollah accountable for threatening the global security and our security.

We must hold the Ayatollah and the IRGC and Hezbollah accountable for the people that have been murdered throughout the world because of their response to hate, their hating of all peoples who don't agree with them.

We must target the entire global supply chain of Iran's ballistic missile pro-

gram. I believe the Ayatollah, Mr. Speaker, when he tells us, on a periodic basis, "Death to America." I believe him when he says that. That is their foreign policy to the United States: "Death to America." Americans should believe this.

Mr. Speaker, we must make sure that he does not have the capability to achieve a delivery system of his nuclear weapons, and I urge voting in favor of H.R. 1698.

Mr. Speaker, I also do want to mention another bill that I think is important that we pass today, Mr. DEUTCH's H.R. 359.

In 2013, the European Union finally came around to designating Hezbollah as a terrorist organization, but for reasons that make absolutely no sense to me, the Europeans only designated Hezbollah's military wing, not the political wing. By distinguishing between a terrorist group's so-called military and political wings, it seems like we have legitimized this group's deadly behavior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Hezbollah is a terrorist organization, and wherever you look in the Middle East and you find trouble, you will find the IRGC and Hezbollah working together. These two agencies from Iran are the gestapo actors for the Iranian Ayatollah, and it is time that we hold them accountable for what they are doing. We must pass these pieces of legislation, and this will go a long way in doing that.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we have shown again and again, and you can tell with all the comments that were made here, there is support on both sides of the aisle for holding Iran accountable for its dangerous behavior.

While today's bill is similar to the bipartisan sanctions Congress passed during the summer, the direction we are moving today with this bill is the right one: going after Iran for something outside the scope of the nuclear deal.

When the nuclear deal was negotiated, we were told very clearly that it would not prevent us, would not stop us from slapping sanctions on Iran for other things, other things like support of terrorism or ballistic missiles, or all the troubling activities that they do.

This is what we are doing today. We are slapping sanctions on Iran for its behavior. We are slapping sanctions on Iran because we are not going to stand for their doing whatever they please and helping terrorism, suppressing rights of its people, and being a general threat to the United States.

□ 1500

So I hope that we can get a strong, bipartisan, overwhelming vote for this bill the way we did in the bill that Chairman ROYCE and I introduced 3 months ago, again, which gave the President 60 days to identify sanctions, which was not done beyond the 60 days, and I hope that the administration forthwith does that now.

So I think this is an important measure. I think it is an important measure to have a strong bipartisan vote because we have to show the Iranians that, while we may disagree on certain things, there is no disagreement on the fact that we regard Iran as the largest state sponsor of terrorism.

It is true of both sides of the aisle that we regard Iran as threatening; that we regard Iran as dangerous in the Middle East; that we regard Iran, unfortunately, as an adversary of the United States. The comments with the rallies that the Ayatollah holds, death to America, death to Israel, is not something that we can countenance in this country, and so we are going to fight it.

I am very proud of what the House is doing today. I urge a “yes” vote. And I want to thank Chairman ROYCE, once again, for his strong leadership on this measure and so many other measures.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit any statements or any material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all our members who worked on this bill. Over the last few years, the Foreign Affairs Committee has conducted dedicated oversight of the threats posed by Iran, and we have had dozens of hearings. And whether the topic was the nuclear program, or the missile program, or Iran's support for terrorism, or the regime's human rights abuses, the conclusion was clear. The United States must respond to the full range of threats, and with this bill and the others before us, that is what we are doing here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1698, and am proud to cosponsor the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enhancement Act because we must do everything in our power to curb, and ultimately put an end to Iran's malign behavior in the Middle East region and across the globe.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231, which governs implementation of the

JCOA, contains travel restrictions for certain Iranian individuals. One such individual is Commander of the IRGC's Quds Force, General Qasem Soleimani. There are troubling reports that General Soleimani has traveled to Russia, and other countries, in violation of UNSCR 2231, yet, the United States and the United Nations have failed to act.

I am pleased my amendment to require a report on any credible information regarding violations of the UN travel restrictions and any exemptions that have been approved by the Security Council is included in this bill. These travel restrictions were put in place for good reason and we deserve to know whether in fact violations have occurred and what the U.S. and UN plan to do in response.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1698.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act. This legislation confirms the United States's mission to prevent Iran its developing their nuclear-capable ballistic missile program.

H.R. 1698 requires the President to impose sanctions on the Iranian government, foreign actors or people who supply technology and material to contribute to the Iranian ballistic missile program, and any party who contributes weapons or related material to Iran. This legislation also directs the President to investigate violations of these sanctions either by Iran or foreign entities and report all violations to Congress. In taking these actions, H.R. 1698 recognizes the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 from 2015 and commits to enforcing it by authorizing investigations of all ballistic missile tests to see if they are in violation of the resolution.

The investigations that this bill authorizes will help us better understand and identify the banks, companies, governments and other foreign entities that contribute in some way to the development of the Iranian ballistic missile program. It is crucially important that we take steps to recognize these key actors and punish them with sanctions. It is for these reasons that I am pleased to support this legislation.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act. I was proud to cosponsor this critical legislation, and support it during consideration by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and would have voted for it on the floor, but had to leave Washington in order to attend a funeral service.

This legislation makes it clear that the United States will not tolerate Iran's development of nuclear-capable ballistic missiles. It authorizes sanctions against Iran for development of these weapons, as well as foreign individuals and entities which provide aid to Iran in the development of such weapons.

Further development of these weapons poses a threat to Israel, to our allies and partners in the Persian Gulf, and threatens to further destabilize the region. Additionally, failure to curb Iran's development of ballistic missiles could undermine the international effort to end Iran's nuclear weapons program under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

I was proud to support this critical bipartisan effort, and would have proudly voted for it had I been present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1698, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SANCTIONING HIZBALLAH'S IL- LICIT USE OF CIVILIANS AS DE- FENSELESS SHIELDS ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3342) to impose sanctions on foreign persons that are responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights by reason of the use by Hizballah of civilians as human shields, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3342

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sanctioning Hizballah's Illicit Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Human shields are civilians, prisoners of war, and other noncombatants whose presence is designed to protect combatants and military objects from attack, and the use of human shields violates international law.

(2) Throughout the 2006 conflict with the State of Israel, Hizballah forces utilized human shields to protect themselves from counterattacks by Israeli forces, including storing weapons inside civilian homes and firing rockets from inside populated civilian areas.

(3) Hizballah has rearmed to include an arsenal of over 150,000 missiles, and other destabilizing weapons provided by the Syrian and Iranian governments, which are concealed in Shiite villages in southern Lebanon, often beneath civilian infrastructure.

(4) Hizballah is legally required to disarm under both United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701 (2006) and the Taif Agreement (1989).

(5) Hizballah maintains an armed military force within Lebanon's sovereign territory in direct violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1559 (2004) and 1680 (2006), thus preventing Lebanon from exerting its lawful control over its internationally recognized borders.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to consider the use of human shields by Hizballah as a gross violation of internationally recognized human rights, to officially and publicly condemn the use of innocent civilians as human shields by Hizballah, and to

take effective action against those that engage in the grave breach of international law through the use of human shields.

SEC. 4. UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL.

The President should direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations Security Council to secure support for a resolution that would impose multilateral sanctions against Hizballah for its use of civilians as human shields.

SEC. 5. IDENTIFICATION OF FOREIGN PERSONS THAT ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR GROSS VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS BY REASON OF USE BY HIZBALLAH OF CIVILIANS AS HUMAN SHIELDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each person on the list required under subsection (b).

(b) LIST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of the following:

(A) Each foreign person that the President determines, based on credible evidence, is a member of Hizballah, or acting on behalf of Hizballah, that is responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the use of civilians as human shields.

(B) Each foreign person, or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, that the President determines has provided, attempted to provide, or significantly facilitated the provision of, material support to a person described in subparagraph (A).

(2) UPDATES.—The President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees an update of the list required under paragraph (1) as new information becomes available.

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions to be imposed on a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state on the list required under subsection (b) are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of the foreign person or of such agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if such property or interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security determines is a foreign person on the list required under subsection (b) is—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any visa or other documentation issued to an alien who is a foreign person on the list required under subsection (b), regardless of when such visa or other documentation was issued, shall be revoked

and such alien shall be denied admission to the United States.

(ii) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under clause (i)—

(I) shall take effect immediately; and

(II) shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or documentation that is in the possession of the alien who is the subject of such revocation.

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that knowingly violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations promulgated to carry out this section to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that knowingly commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of such Act.

(4) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) for purposes of carrying out this section.

(B) ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section.

(C) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than ten days before the promulgation of regulations under subparagraph (B), the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the proposed regulations and the provisions of this section that the regulations are implementing.

(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or any other relevant provision of law.

(d) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section for periods not to exceed 120 days with respect to a foreign person, or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, if the President reports to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

(e) EXEMPTIONS.—Any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or to any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing a determination on whether each person described in subsection (b) meets the criteria described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 5(b)(1).

(b) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The persons described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The Secretary General of Hizballah.

(2) Members of the Hizballah Politburo.

(3) Any other senior members of Hizballah or other associated entities that the President determines to be appropriate.

(4) Any person, or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state that the President determines provides material support to Hizballah that supports its use of civilians as human shields.

(c) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

(1) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of such report shall be made available to the public and posted on the internet website of the Department of State—

(A) in English, Farsi, Arabic, and Azeri; and

(B) in pre-compressed, easily downloadable versions that are made available in all appropriate formats.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admitted” and “alien” have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY OF A FOREIGN STATE.—The term “agency or instrumentality of a foreign state” has the meaning given such term in section 1603(b) of title 28, United States Code.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(4) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means any citizen or national of a foreign country, or any entity not organized solely under the laws of the United States or existing solely in the United States.

(5) FOREIGN STATE.—The term “foreign state” has the meaning given such term in section 1603(a) of title 28, United States Code.

(6) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or any person in the United States.

(7) HIZBALLAH.—The term “Hizballah” means—

(A) the entity known as Hizballah and designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189); or

(B) any person—

(i) the property or interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(ii) who is identified on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury as an agent, instrumentality, or affiliate of Hizballah.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members might have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and

to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising in strong support to this Shields Act, as we call it, which sanctions Hezbollah, sanctions them for their use in southern Lebanon of not only families, but entire villages as human shields; and let me explain this.

As we have discussed today, the Iranian-backed terrorist organization, Hezbollah, has constructed an entire military apparatus in the nation that sits just north of Israel's northern border in Lebanon. It is now complete with missile production facilities that are intended to strike at Israel's civilian centers.

I do want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) for his leadership because he has helped bring this critical attention to us today.

But, in the process, as we talk about Hezbollah, they have placed Israeli and Lebanese civilians directly into the path of the conflict. If you go to that border, as I have done, you can see command post after command post, not manned by the Lebanese Armed Forces. Those flags you see are not Lebanese flags, they are Hezbollah battle flags. And they man those posts, surrounded by antitank and infantry positions, surrounded by underground tunnels and rocket launchers and arms depots. In short, countless Lebanese villages are, in effect, military bases, the ones that are right along that border, financed and equipped by Iran.

No one has the right to sacrifice the lives of innocent women and children, and certainly not those dedicated to the twisted and evil goals of destroying the State of Israel.

When I say I have seen this firsthand, in 2006, I was in Haifa during the war that Hezbollah was conducting with Israel, and Hezbollah forces used human shields extensively in a cowardly effort to protect their rocket launchers from counterattacks by Israeli forces. I watched as those rockets came into civilian populations in Haifa and exploded there, and sent those civilians to the trauma hospital.

In Rambam trauma hospital, as they were bringing people in, I asked for the count that day. There were 600 victims, wounded victims of those attacks, being treated in that hospital—Arab Israelis, Jewish Israelis, Druid Israelis, all of them victims of those Hezbollah attacks.

It seems—and by the way, when you see the devastation, every one of those Iranian-made missiles has 90,000 ball bearings in it, and that is what they

are launching on schools, civilian areas. They attempted to hit the hospital itself.

It seems that Hezbollah and its Iranian backers are willing to fight to the last villager there in their quest to annihilate the people of Israel, yet neither Hezbollah nor Iran has been held to account by responsible nations for these egregious crimes.

While Foreign Minister Zarif of Iran was coddled by the EU, this issue was never raised, not by us, not by the EU. We never raised this with the Iranians as a serious issue. We have to because the willingness to overlook these human rights violations is why we find ourselves in the position that we are in today and why this legislation is critically important.

This bill calls on the U.S. and its partners to hold Hezbollah and Iran accountable through targeted sanctions and appropriate action at the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3342, Sanctioning Hizballah's Illicit Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3342 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 3342, the "Sanctioning Hizballah's Illicit Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act."

As a result of your having consulted with us on this measure, I agree not to seek a sequential referral on this bill so that it may move expeditiously to the floor. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appro-

priately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3342.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request on H.R. 3342, Sanctioning Hizballah's Illicit Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3342 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this measure. Let me start off by thanking Representatives GALLAGHER of Wisconsin and SUOZZI of New York. Mr. SUOZZI is a very valued, new member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I want to thank both of them for their hard work on this bill. And, as always, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership.

This is the first of three measures that we are considering today to crack down on the terrorist group, Hezbollah. I have been focused on this challenge for a long time. More than a decade ago, I wrote a law to get Syria out of Lebanon and, with it, Syria's support for Hezbollah.

But this is a group made up of extremists, and they will always try to find new ways to gather resources and spread their reach, all in aid of its dangerous and violent agenda, which is undermining Lebanon's political independence; supporting Iran's activities, aggressive activities throughout the region; fueling chaos and war in Syria; and threatening our ally, Israel.

We need to do everything in our power to isolate Hezbollah. We need to crack down on its recruiters and financiers. We need to cut off its supply of weapons, and we need to silence its propaganda machine.

The three measures we will now consider will help us meet this challenge. The first is a new sanctions bill aimed at Hezbollah's use of innocent civilians as human shields. It would ban entry into the United States to anyone who uses human shields on behalf of Hezbollah, and it would freeze whatever assets they have in the United States.

This bill would call upon our Ambassador to the U.N. to push for multilateral sanctions for the same behavior, and it would require the administration to keep Congress apprised about whether certain Hezbollah leaders would be caught up in the web of these sanctions.

It is a good bill and a piece of a broader strategy to cut the legs out from under this odious group.

You know, some of our friends in Europe like to say: Well, there are really two parts of Hezbollah. One is the military wing, and one is the humanitarian wing, and the so-called humanitarian wing takes care of people who are in trouble, who need aid, who need help, and that is the way the story goes.

The fact is, a terrorist organization is a terrorist organization. You cannot cut it in half and say one wing is good and the other wing is not. A terrorist organization is not good. A terrorist organization kills innocent people. A terrorist organization doesn't want peace, they want war, they want killing, they want people to continue to suffer. So let us remember, Hezbollah is a terrorist group.

Hezbollah is primarily financed by Iran. Assad was losing the war in Syria on at least two occasions, and, on those times, Syria had an infusion of Hezbollah fighters sent by Iran on the side of the Assad regime to prop up Assad. And after they did it, the Russians came in and propped up Assad.

So let's remember the hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians who have been murdered in Syria in the Syria civil war. That is Hezbollah, a terrorist organization—bombs in Israel against innocent civilians, bombs every place else.

We cannot sit idly by. And so this bill, again, is a piece of a broader strategy to cut the legs out from under this odious group.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support it. I urge everyone to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER). He is a member of the Armed Services and Homeland Security Committees. He is also the author of this bill, along with Mr. TOM SUOZZI of New York.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 3342, the Sanctioning Hizballah's Illicit Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act.

First and foremost, I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their steadfast support of this effort and their broader leadership, not only in the Middle East and as it pertains to rolling back Iran's influence in their terrorist proxies, foremost among them Hezbollah, but also as it pertains to making the case for American leadership in the world, making the case for why American leadership, buttressed by its strong alliances, is a sound investment in our safety here at home.

I would also like to thank my friend and colleague, TOM SUOZZI, for his tireless work to make this bill a reality. He and his staff have been a pleasure to work with every step along the way, and I think he is a perfect example of someone who is here and unafraid to reach across the aisle when it comes to doing what is right for the country.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes at an extremely important time, when Iran and its proxies, such as Hezbollah, are making a concerted push on the ground in the Middle East against the United States, our allies, and our interests.

This isn't a new phenomenon, of course. Since its founding in the early 1980s, Hezbollah has been one of the most dangerous and destructive forces throughout the greater Middle East. With the exception of al-Qaida, no foreign terrorist organization has killed more Americans than Hezbollah.

□ 1515

With the support of the Iranian Government and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, Hezbollah has engaged in a sustained campaign of terrorism and violence, including against the United States and Israel.

Congress, along with the United Nations, has repeatedly documented Hezbollah's numerous violations of international law, including employing human shields throughout the 2006 conflict; concealing an arsenal that has grown to over 150,000 missiles and other destabilizing weapons provided by the Syrian and Iranian Governments in southern Lebanon, often beneath civilian infrastructure; and maintaining an armed military force within Lebanon's sovereign territory in direct violation of numerous U.N. Security Council resolutions, thus preventing Lebanon from exerting its lawful control over its internationally recognized borders.

The State Department designated Hezbollah as a foreign terrorist organization in 1997, leading to the creation of a sanctions regime against the group. Despite these sanctions, Hezbollah has continued to expand its military capabilities due in large part to extensive Iranian financial support. The State Department has continually

expressed alarm at Hezbollah's capabilities and influence, describing the group in 2010 as "the most technically capable terrorist group in the world." In 2013, State Department noted the increasing tempo of Hezbollah's terrorist activities.

Despite its extensive track record of terror, Hezbollah has yet to be specifically sanctioned by the United States for its barbaric practice of using defenseless civilians as human shields. The Shields Act finally changes that and finally punishes Hezbollah for these atrocities.

Just a few of the measures included in the Shields Act include: identifying and sanctioning Hezbollah members and those acting on behalf of Hezbollah who are complicit in or responsible for ordering or directing the use of human shields; identifying and sanctioning foreign persons, agencies, or instrumentalities of foreign states who have provided, attempted to provide, or facilitated provision of material support to identified individuals; and invoking financial penalties blocking real estate transactions, and leveraging powers ascribed by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

In short and in sum, the Shields Act is a vital and bipartisan bill that advances American interest, punishes those who support and enable the barbaric practice of using human shields, and protects our allies in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this critical legislation, and I thank the chairman again for his help and leadership.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, a fellow New Yorker, and one of the new good members of our committee, and co-author of this important bill.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their bipartisan leadership and the model that they show all of us on this committee in the work that they do together, and for their mentorship as well.

I would also like to thank and applaud my colleague and friend, MIKE GALLAGHER, for his leadership on this bill, and for working so closely to get this done. We are very grateful to him for his work here.

The Shields Act that I rise in support of right now will sanction Hezbollah members and their supporters for the use of human shields. It also seeks to punish the governments that enable such war crimes, including their primary supporter, Iran.

This summer, I visited Israel and I stood near Lebanon's southern border, not far from where Hezbollah threatens Israel's security. In the over 30 years since Hezbollah in 1983 killed hundreds

of Americans when it bombed the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, they have become one of the most dangerous terrorist organizations, not only in Lebanon, but across the entire Middle East.

In 2006, it provoked a war with Israel by killing and kidnapping soldiers in cross-border raids, and then for nearly a month rained rockets down on Israel cities, killing dozens of civilians. Journalists and human rights groups found that it fired many of these rockets from populated areas, even from inside private homes and other civilian buildings.

That war ended more than a decade ago, but Hezbollah remains committed to Israel's destruction. It has spent millions to replenish its arsenal, which now includes up to 150,000 missiles scattered across southern Lebanon, much of it concealed in mosques, hospitals, schools, and homes where civilians are used as human shields.

Hezbollah has continued its provocative actions on the border between Lebanon and Israel. It has killed and wounded Israeli soldiers. It has threatened bombings of gas fields and chemical plants. It has tried to smuggle advanced weapons into Lebanon. It has built an expansive network of tunnels through civilian neighborhoods. The civilians caught in its destructive web of terror would have no safe haven if Hezbollah started a war.

Hezbollah has also expanded its nefarious activities regionally, most notably playing a major role in the Syrian civil war, deploying thousands of its own men to prop up Bashar al-Assad's vicious regime. Hezbollah members are fighting alongside a Syrian army that has killed almost half a million of its own people and driven millions more into exile.

In the process, it has trained for its next war with Israel. The Israeli intelligence official have said that the group has learned frightening skills in urban warfare from its years on the ground in Syria. It did all of this, of course, at the behest of its Iran patrons who continue threatening to rain warheads down into Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.

From Iraq to Gaza, from Yemen to Bahrain, Iran's proxies have been at the center of the chaos consuming the Middle East. But Hezbollah remains Iran's oldest and deadliest proxy, and its actions in Syria deserve particular attention.

In town after town, Hezbollah's militants prevented civilians from fleeing the Assad regime artillery. Activists have accused the group of carrying out mass killings and torturing refugees and other civilians. Hezbollah is one of the main reasons Assad's murderous regime continues to stay in power in 2017. Hezbollah is not only a threat to the people beyond Lebanon's border, it is a threat to the Lebanese people. The

U.N. has implicated Hezbollah in the assassination of a Lebanese Prime Minister. Its use of civilians as human shields endangers the Lebanese people every moment of every day.

I applaud the leadership and the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for continuing to find ways to crack down on Hezbollah and Iran.

Today there are four suspension bills on the calendar: H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, which prevents Iran from undertaking any activity related to advancing their ballistic missiles program; H.R. 3329, Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, which restricts Hezbollah's ability to raise money and recruit for their nefarious activities; H. Res. 359, which urges our European allies to drop their false distinction between Hezbollah's political wing and its military wing, and designate them in their entirety as a terrorist organization; and, finally, my and Mr. GALLAGHER's legislation, H.R. 3342, the Shields Act.

We must pass these four bills to continue to reduce the influence of a group and its primary backer, Iran, that have menaced their neighbors and their own people for far too long. By passing H.R. 3342, the bipartisan Shields Act, we will send a strong message that the United States of America will not stand for the use of innocent civilians as pawns in the destructive chess game of Iran's and Hezbollah's effort to destabilize the region and the West.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleague, Congressman GALLAGHER, for his leadership. I am proud to join him in this effort. I ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, you can say that again.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be here with Ranking Member ENGEL and Chairman ROYCE. I want to congratulate both of them on the great work that they are doing on especially Middle East issues. Over and over again, they have been on top of the situation and making sure that America's position and the moral position of the world is declared by this Congress. Today we have four bills that are in keeping with that tradition and the great job that they have already been doing.

First of all, let us just note that this human shield legislation, whatever way Hezbollah acts, it is worth us saying: Look how horrible it is. Look at the horrible tactics they are using. It is worth us having a resolution to draw people's attention to it, but let's just be fair.

What this is today is we are calling for peace in the Middle East. We are pleading with those people who have degenerated to the point that they are using innocent people as shields, where their bodies will be cut apart by shrapnel or by enemy fire. This is how far down those people who would destroy Israel have gone. So it is just and right for us today.

Yes, they point out the human shields, but this is part of a bigger problem. That is, that you have the leadership in the Islamic world, in that part of the world anyway, in the Middle East. The Islamic leaders in that part of the world refuse to recognize Israel and its right to exist. Whether they are using their people as human shields and innocent people as human shields to accomplish their mission, whether they are allied with the mullah regime who chants "death to Israel," no; when those people—and whether it is Iran or Hezbollah or their allies throughout the Middle East—recognize that Israel has a right to exist, a major step forward would happen.

Instead, they play games about the right of return. So how would Israel ever be able to accept the fact that their country is going to be inundated with other people and taken over the minute they make some kind of an agreement to let them do so?

What we are calling out for today is—yes, we are pointing our fingers at the immorality of Hezbollah and their association with both the mullahs and the tyrannical Assad regime in Syria. We point that out, but what we are really asking for is not just a condemnation. We are asking for peace. We are asking for these people to take a look at moral arguments. America is standing for these moral arguments. Please, we are pleading with you through these condemnations of immoral activity, we are pleading with you to reach a peace agreement with Israel and to reach a peace agreement with the other peoples of that region.

I am very proud to stand with Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL, as all of us are, in the bipartisan effort to make sure America stands for truth, justice, and morality.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the bipartisan leadership of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 34th anniversary of the devastating Marine Corps barracks bombing in Lebanon. As the very proud mother of a U.S. marine, this is deeply personal to me. My son returned safely from his tours of service. Not so blessed were the families of 220 marines and 21 other service personnel who were murdered when Hezbollah struck with truck bombs at a Marine Corps compound in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23, 1983.

The marines we lost that day were someone's husband, father, brother, or son. Except for al-Qaida, Hezbollah has killed more Americans than any other terrorist group in the world, and it continues to be a menacing threat to all humanity.

Just look at Syria, the greatest humanitarian crisis of our time: hundreds of thousands of civilians murdered; 5 million have fled as refugees; Hezbollah, a tool of Iran, propping up Assad and fueling the violence.

Their actions don't stop there. Israelis live under the constant shadow of Hezbollah's missile arsenal that is pointed directly at them. In just a decade, they have increased their rocket count from 15,000 to 150,000. They hold the Lebanese people hostage by embedding weapons in their mosques, their hospitals, and their schools.

These bipartisan bills before us that I wholeheartedly support will help America go after the full range of Hezbollah's activities, sanctioning them for utilizing civilians as human shields, targeting Iran's financial support to Hezbollah, and urging the European Union to designate Hezbollah in its entirety as a terrorist organization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of these bills.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROSELETHINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROSELETHINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our dynamic duo once again for this wonderful legislation and for bringing this bill before us this afternoon. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3342, Sanctioning Hizballah's Illicit Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act, authored by our friends, Congressmen GALLAGHER and SUOZZI. I thank the gentleman for their leadership.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I applaud our effort here in the House to take up several measures, as you have heard, that address a variety of threats that Iran and its proxies pose to our national security and the security of those in the region.

The use of human shields is unconscionable, morally unacceptable, and a clear violation of human rights. Yet for terrorist groups such as Iran proxies, Hezbollah, and Hamas, the use of human shields is an acceptable tactic. It is a tactic used because they engage in terror activity and asymmetric warfare. They don't have the same beliefs and morals of the United States or Israel.

□ 1530

It is an attempt to cause innocents to be dragged into their conflict and to cause as many casualties as they can with no regard whatsoever for human life.

Iran and Hezbollah know that if they engage in hostilities with Israel, the world will be quick to blame Israel for civilian deaths despite the great precautions Israel takes to not only save human lives, but to only go against belligerents.

Responsible nations must condemn this tactic by Hezbollah and by all of its state sponsors of terrorism. We must take action to hold anyone who engages in such actions accountable.

Iran and Hezbollah will continue to take advantage of our morality—what they perceive to be a weakness on our part—and they will continue to employ the use of human shields during armed conflicts until the world sends a strong and unified message, and that is what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs and Homeland Security Committees.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL.

Mr. Speaker, today, I think, represents the culmination of a series of wonderful bipartisan efforts that, while on their face to those who are not initiated may seem to deal with disparate subjects insofar as they stem from Iranian ballistic missiles to Hezbollah's use of humans as shields, are, in effect, dealing with the same subject.

Mr. Speaker, one can't separate Hezbollah from Iran. In fact, Hezbollah was born only a few short years after the Iranian Revolution, which brought such heartache that the loss of life in Iran, adjusted for population, mirrors that of the entire loss of life by the United States in combat during the entire Second World War.

These are innocent Iranians killed by their own government, Mr. Speaker. And we see, also, that the Hezbollah forces in Israel, Lebanon, and, indeed, around the world quite literally have continued to use human shields.

My friend and colleague from California, Congressman ROHRBACHER, said that Hezbollah actions had degenerated to the point where they were using human shields. While I hold Mr. ROHRBACHER in great esteem, I would submit that they haven't degenerated, because that implies at some point that Hezbollah didn't engage in such reprehensible behavior.

So the bipartisan actions led by Ranking Member ENGEL and Chairman ROYCE today bring us to where, indeed, we need to be by virtue of the reality of the world in which we live. Hezbollah does not exist but for the largess of Iran and the monies funneled by the Iranian regime.

The Hezbollah missiles, which Member FRANKEL eloquently spoke of, are,

indeed, Iranian missiles, and the ICBMs that Iran is developing that we seek to curtail stem from a failure to include a prohibition on ICBM development in the JCPOA under which this Congress and this administration now labor.

I would note for the RECORD, for the Members, and for those who might be viewing at home that U.N. Security Council Resolution 1929 of 2010, which included signatures from the Russians and the Chinese, said that Iran was forbidden from engaging in missile development. The JCPOA says Iran is asked not to engage in this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, so we then arrive at the point where the good work of Mr. ENGEL and Chairman ROYCE is needed today, and that is what we do. It is with a glad heart that I note the bipartisan nature of these agreements.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time to close the way I always do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides for their hard work on this bill. I want to remind my colleagues that, just a few years ago when the last war was raging in Gaza, the other terrorist group, Hamas, used civilians as human shields. We had a resolution on the floor of this House condemning it, and I was very, very proud that that resolution passed unanimously.

We need to condemn these terrorist groups no matter what they do, but when they use people as human shields—innocent people—and then try to blame the other side for the death, it is not something that we can countenance or stand for at all. I hope that we rise to the occasion this time, as well, because I can think of nothing more despicable than using innocent civilians as human shields.

These bomb factories are built in mosques, they are built in schools, and they are built in playgrounds. They are built where children are. They are built because they are daring Israel and the United States to go after them when we know that there will be human casualties. It is really a despicable position.

Here you have two terrorist groups, Hezbollah and Hamas. One is Shia; one is Sunni. It doesn't matter. They are both out to kill people. They are both out to terrorize people. They are both out to do the opposite of what we try to do in the United States: lifting people up.

They need to be stopped, and this Congress needs to keep sending strong messages with teeth behind them to the world that we will not sit idly by and allow these terrorist activities to happen.

Using civilians as human shields is really the lowest of the low. The fact that Hezbollah would put innocent men, women, and children in harm's way as human shields tells you everything you need to know about this organization. It is a cowardly practice by a gruesome group, and it cannot and shall not be tolerated.

This measure puts us on record again condemning this terrorist group, and it gives the administration more tools to deal with one of Hezbollah's worst tools, more tools to deal with Hezbollah to stop its terrorist activities. So I urge a bipartisan "yes" vote.

I thank Chairman ROYCE again for his collaboration with us on both sides of the aisle. That is one of the great things about the Foreign Affairs Committee because we realize that partisanship stops at the water's edge. When we are talking about terrorist groups and we are talking about anti-democratic groups, they affect us all. It is important that this Congress sends strong bipartisan measures and a strong bipartisan voice to say we will not tolerate these atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote from all my colleagues on both sides, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to say I have had the opportunity to travel extensively with Mr. ENGEL and to observe him and his work here in this House for many years. He has always transcended partisanship in my view, but, more importantly, from my standpoint, he has been a servant of the national interests here and the core values of the United States of America and our attempt to represent those core values around the world.

I want to take this moment, especially given his eloquent statement here about these values as he spoke about Hezbollah. These are values that I think all of us should share.

The Geneva Convention, itself, establishes standards for international law, and it does so for the protection of civilians in a war zone. They specifically prohibit, under that Geneva Convention, of course, the use of civilians as human shields. It is article 58 of the Convention's additional protocols that require parties of any conflict to avoid locating military objectives within or near densely populated areas.

So, to date, Hezbollah's arsenal is well over 100,000. As I shared with you, all of them are manufactured today by Iran. Those rockets and missiles of various ranges today include precision-guided missiles.

I spoke earlier of 2006, the second Lebanon War. That actually should be called the Hezbollah war. At that time, as I talked about the 600 victims that were in the trauma hospital, they were

down to an inventory of 10,000 missiles. Today, they have, in the hands of Hezbollah—again, because of Iran—over 100,000 such rockets and missiles.

So I think, yes, Hezbollah has blatantly violated the well-established laws of armed conflict. It has targeted civilians for more than two decades in both Lebanon and Israel. As a result, both peoples are victims of Hezbollah's—and, frankly, of Iran's—brutality, and it is high time we hold them accountable. This we try to do in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, Mr. ENGEL, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3342, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIZBALLAH INTERNATIONAL FINANCING PREVENTION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3329) to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3329

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PREVENTION OF ACCESS BY HIZBALLAH TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Sec. 101. Mandatory sanctions with respect to fundraising and recruitment activities for Hizballah.

Sec. 102. Modification of report with respect to financial institutions that engage in certain transactions.

Sec. 103. Sanctions against foreign states that support Hizballah.

Sec. 104. Prohibitions and conditions with respect to certain accounts held by foreign financial institutions.

Sec. 105. United States strategy to prevent hostile activities by Iran and disrupt and degrade Hizballah's illicit networks in the Western Hemisphere.

TITLE II—NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH

Sec. 201. Blocking of property of affiliated networks of Hizballah.

Sec. 202. Report on racketeering activities engaged in by Hizballah.

Sec. 203. Modification of report on activities of foreign governments to disrupt global logistics networks and fundraising, financing, and money laundering activities of Hizballah.

Sec. 204. Report on combating the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah and other foreign terrorist organizations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Regulatory authority.

Sec. 302. Implementation; penalties; judicial review; exemptions.

TITLE I—PREVENTION OF ACCESS BY HIZBALLAH TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 101. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FUNDRAISING AND RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES FOR HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FUNDRAISING AND RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES FOR HIZBALLAH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, on or after the date of the enactment of this section, impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person that the President determines knowingly assists, sponsors, or, provides significant financial, material, or technological support for—

"(1) Bayt al-Mal, Jihad al-Bina, the Islamic Resistance Support Association, the Foreign Relations Department of Hizballah, the External Security Organization of Hizballah, or any successor or affiliate thereof;

"(2) al-Manar TV, al Nour Radio, or the Lebanese Media Group, or any successor or affiliate thereof;

"(3) a foreign person determined by the President to be engaged in fundraising or recruitment activities for Hizballah; or

"(4) a foreign person owned or controlled by a foreign person described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

"(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

"(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a foreign person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

"(B) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

"(i) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or designee of one of such Secretaries) determines is subject to subsection (a) is—

"(I) inadmissible to the United States;

“(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

“(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

“(ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien who the President determines is subject to subsection (a), regardless of when issued.

“(II) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under subclause (I) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the alien.

“(2) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under paragraph (1)(A) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

“(d) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the imposition of sanctions under this section with respect to a foreign person or foreign persons if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—

“(A) BEFORE WAIVER EXERCISED.—Before a waiver under paragraph (1) takes effect with respect to a foreign person, the President shall notify and brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the involvement of the foreign person in activities described in subsection (a).

“(B) AFTER WAIVER EXERCISED.—Not later than 90 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to a foreign person, and every 120 days thereafter while the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the involvement of the foreign person in activities described in subsection (a).

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report that lists the foreign persons that the President has credible evidence knowingly assists, sponsors, or provides significant financial, material, or technological support for the foreign persons described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a).

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms ‘admitted’ and ‘alien’ have meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(3) ENTITY.—The term ‘entity’—

“(A) means a partnership, association, corporation, or other organization, group, or subgroup; and

“(B) includes a governmental entity

“(4) FUNDRAISING OR RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES.—The term ‘fundraising or recruitment activities’ includes online fundraising and other online commercial activities, or other means of such fundraising, recruitment, and retention, as determined by the President.

“(5) HIZBALLAH.—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given such term in section 102(f).

“(6) PERSON.—The term ‘person’ means an individual or entity.

“(7) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ means a United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or a person in the United States.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by striking the item relating to section 101 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 101. Mandatory sanctions with respect to fundraising and recruitment activities for Hizballah.”

SEC. 102. MODIFICATION OF REPORT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 102 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) REPORT ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ORGANIZED UNDER THE LAWS OF STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and annually thereafter for a period not to exceed three years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report that—

“(A) identifies each foreign financial institution described in paragraph (2) that the President determines engages in one or more activities described in subsection (a)(2);

“(B) provides a detailed description of each such activity; and

“(C) contains a determination with respect to each such foreign financial institution that is identified under subparagraph (A) as engaging in one or more activities described in subsection (a)(2) as to whether or not such foreign financial institution is in violation of Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism) or section 2339B of title 18, United States Code, by reason of engaging in one or more such activities.

“(2) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION DESCRIBED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign financial institution described in this paragraph is a foreign financial institution—

“(i) that, wherever located, is—

“(I) organized under the laws of a state sponsor of terrorism or any jurisdiction within a state sponsor of terrorism;

“(II) owned or controlled by the government of a state sponsor of terrorism;

“(III) located in the territory of a state sponsor of terrorism; or

“(IV) owned or controlled by a foreign financial institution described in subclause (I), (II), or (III); and

“(ii) the capitalization of which exceeds \$10,000,000.

“(B) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—In this paragraph, the term ‘state sponsor of terrorism’ means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

“(i) section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

“(ii) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

“(iii) section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780); or

“(iv) any other provision of law.”

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) all countries should designate the entirety of Hizballah as a terrorist organization; and

(2) the notion of separate Hizballah political and military “wings” is an artificial construct that attempts to legitimize Hizballah members of parliament and Hizballah cabinet officials who are complicit in Hizballah’s use of violence and coercion against its political opponents.

(c) MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF HIZBALLAH.—Clause (ii) of section 102(f)(1)(E) of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “(I)” and inserting “(I)(aa)”;

(2) by striking “(II)” and inserting “(bb)”;

(3) by striking “of Hizballah.” and inserting “of Hizballah; or”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) who the President determines is an agent or affiliate of, or is owned or controlled by Hizballah.”

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a description of any sanctions described in section 102 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) apply with respect to a foreign financial institution by reason of engaging in an activity described in subsection (a)(2) of such section with a member of the Lebanese parliament or any cabinet official of the Lebanese Republic who is a member of Hizballah or identifies as such.

(2) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be transmitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 103. SANCTIONS AGAINST FOREIGN STATES THAT SUPPORT HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 103. SANCTIONS AGAINST FOREIGN STATES THAT SUPPORT HIZBALLAH.

“(a) SANCTIONS AGAINST CERTAIN AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF FOREIGN STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and as appropriate thereafter, the President shall impose the sanctions described in paragraph (3) with respect to any agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in paragraph (2).

“(2) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY DESCRIBED.—An agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in this paragraph is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state that the President determines has, on or after the date of the enactment of this section, knowingly—

“(A) directly or indirectly conducted combat operations with, or supported combat operations of, Hizballah or an entity owned or controlled by Hizballah; or

“(B) directly or indirectly provided significant financial or material support for, or significant arms or related material to, Hizballah or an entity owned or controlled by Hizballah.

“(3) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this paragraph are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(b) SANCTIONS AGAINST STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state that engages in the activities described in subsection (a) that is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in paragraph (3), the President shall, pursuant to section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)), require a license under the Export Administration Regulations to export or re-export to that foreign state any item designated by the Secretary of Commerce as ‘EAR 99’, other than food, medicine, medical devices, or similarly licensed items.

“(2) AUDITING REQUIREMENTS.—In the case of an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state that engages in the activities described in subsection (a) that is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in paragraph (3), or the Government of the Russian Federation if the President determines such Government is engaged in the activities described in subsection (a), the President shall—

“(A) ensure that United States persons, and foreign persons subject to United States

jurisdiction, exercise enhanced due diligence in the jurisdiction of that foreign state to ensure such persons do not directly or indirectly finance Hizballah or engage in transactions with foreign persons that directly or indirectly finance Hizballah;

“(B) ensure that United States persons, and foreign persons subject to United States jurisdiction, maintain—

“(i) internal controls to prevent such persons from engaging in a transaction or transactions with Hizballah; and

“(ii) full compliance with relevant laws and regulations;

“(C) ensure that United States persons, and foreign persons subject to United States jurisdiction, engage an auditor to perform due diligence to ascertain whether—

“(i) the internal controls of such person are effective; and

“(ii) any transactions of such person are directly or indirectly financing Hizballah; and

“(D) ensure the accuracy of the independent private sector audits and other due diligence processes by providing recommendations for the processes used to carry out such audits, including to—

“(i) improve the accuracy of such audits; and

“(ii) establish standards of best practices.

“(3) FOREIGN STATE DESCRIBED.—A foreign state described in this paragraph is a foreign state that—

“(A) the President determines has, on or after the date of the enactment of this section, knowingly provided significant financial or material support for, or arms or related material to—

“(i) Hizballah; or

“(ii) an entity owned or controlled by Hizballah; and

“(B) is a state sponsor of terrorism.

“(c) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the imposition of sanctions under this section with respect to a foreign state or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—

“(A) BEFORE WAIVER EXERCISED.—Before a waiver under paragraph (1) takes effect with respect to a foreign state or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, the President shall notify and brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the involvement of the foreign state in activities described in subsection (b)(3) or involvement of the agency or instrumentality of a foreign state in activities described in subsection (a)(2), as the case may be.

“(B) AFTER WAIVER EXERCISED.—Not later than 90 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to a foreign state or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, and every 120 days thereafter while the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the involvement of the foreign state in activities described in subsection (b)(3) or involvement of the agency or instrumentality of a foreign state in activities described in subsection (a)(2), as the case may be.

“(d) REPORT ON SUPPLY CHAIN OF HIZBALLAH’S MISSILE PRODUCTION FACILITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall submit to the ap-

propriate congressional committees and the Committee on Appropriations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate on a report that contains the following:

“(A) An analysis of the foreign and domestic supply chain that significantly facilitates, supports, or otherwise aids Hizballah’s acquisition or development of missile production facilities.

“(B) A description of the geographic distribution of the foreign and domestic supply chain described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) An assessment of the provision of goods, services, or technology transferred to Hizballah by the Government of Iran or its affiliates to indigenously manufacture or otherwise produce missiles.

“(D) An identification of foreign persons that have, on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and based on credible evidence—

“(i) knowingly provided significant financial or material support for, or significant arms or related material to, Hizballah or an entity owned or controlled by Hizballah; or

“(ii) knowingly facilitated the transfer of significant arms or related materiel to Hizballah utilizing commercial aircraft or air carriers.

“(E) A description of the steps that the President is taking to disrupt the foreign and domestic supply chain described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY OF A FOREIGN STATE; FOREIGN STATE.—The terms ‘agency or instrumentality of a foreign state’ and ‘foreign state’ have the meanings given those terms in section 1603 of title 28, United States Code.

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

“(3) ARMS OR RELATED MATERIAL.—The term ‘arms or related material’ means—

“(A) nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological weapons or materials or components of such weapons;

“(B) ballistic or cruise missile weapons or materials or components of such weapons;

“(C) destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

“(D) defense articles or defense services, as those terms are defined in paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, of section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794); or

“(E) defense information, as that term is defined in section 644 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2403).

“(4) EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS.—The term ‘Export Administration Regulations’ means subchapter C of chapter VII of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act).

“(5) HIZBALLAH.—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given that term in section 102(f).

“(6) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—In this paragraph, the term ‘state sponsor of terrorism’ means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

“(A) section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

“(B) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

“(C) section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780); or

“(D) any other provision of law.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 102 the following new item:

“Sec. 103. Sanctions against foreign states that support Hizballah.”.

(c) REPORT ON SIGNIFICANT MATERIAL SUPPORT AND ARMS OR RELATED MATERIEL PROVIDED BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO HIZBALLAH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the following:

(A) A description of significant material support and arms or related material that the Government of the Russian Federation has, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, knowingly, directly or indirectly, provided to Hizballah or an entity owned or controlled by Hizballah.

(B) An analysis of the extent to which Russian strategic weapons deployed in Syria, including air defense systems, have provided protection for Hizballah fighters in Syria.

(C) An assessment of whether Russian counter-proliferation safeguards can ensure that any arms or related materiel described in subparagraph (A) will not be used against Israel in the future.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015, as added by this section.

(B) ARMS OR RELATED MATERIEL.—The term “arms or related materiel” has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015, as added by this section.

SEC. 104. PROHIBITIONS AND CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACCOUNTS HELD BY FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Section 104(c)(2)(A)(ii) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting before “or support for acts of international terrorism” the following “, including Hizballah (as defined in section 102(f)(1)(E) of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note)), and any affiliates or successors thereof.”.

SEC. 105. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO PREVENT HOSTILE ACTIVITIES BY IRAN AND DISRUPT AND DEGRADE HIZBALLAH'S ILLICIT NETWORKS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy to prevent hostile activities by Iran and disrupt and degrade Hizballah's illicit networks in the Western Hemisphere that—

(1) identifies Department of State priorities, in coordination with other executive branch agencies, for defining United States policy to protect United States interests from Iranian and Hizballah threats in the Western Hemisphere;

(2) coordinates with other executive branch agencies to ensure that information-sharing, interdictions, arrests, investigations, indictments, sanctions, and designations related to Hizballah individuals or networks in the Western Hemisphere are integrated, coordinated, and publicly communicated by the United States in a manner that supports United States interests;

(3) describes Iranian and Hizballah activities in the Western Hemisphere, their relationships with transnational criminal organizations in the region, their use of the region's commodities trade to engage in illicit activities, and their use of Latin American and Caribbean visas, including through Citizenship by Investment Programs to seek admittance into the United States, as well as a plan to address any security vulnerabilities to the United States;

(4) includes a review of all relevant United States sanctions that relate to Hizballah's activities in Latin America and the Caribbean and an assessment of their use, effectiveness, and any capability gaps;

(5) includes a review of the use of the Department of State's rewards program under section 36 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act (22 U.S.C. 2708) to obtain information related to Latin America-based Hizballah operatives and illicit networks and an assessment of the effectiveness of this program for targeting Hizballah in the Western Hemisphere;

(6) includes a review of all relevant United States sanctions on financial institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean that engage in activities outlined by section 102 of Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) and an assessment of the use of the authorities outlined, their effectiveness, and recommendations for improvement;

(7) describes Hizballah criminal support networks, including country facilitation, in the Western Hemisphere and outlines a United States approach to partners in the region to address those illicit networks and build country capacity to combat the transnational criminal activities of Hizballah; and

(8) includes a review of the actions of governments in the Western Hemisphere to identify, investigate, and prosecute Latin America-based Hizballah operatives, and enforce sanctions either personally or to their business interests of Latin America-based Hizballah operatives as well as recommendations for United States action towards governments who refuse to impose sanctions or who willingly facilitate Latin America-based Hizballah illicit activities.

(b) FORM.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the greatest extent possible but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(d) DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 129 Stat. 2206; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by section 103 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 104. DIPLOMATIC INITIATIVES.

“Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall instruct—

“(1) the Secretary of State to increase cooperation with countries in the Western Hemisphere to assist in strengthening the capacity of governments to prevent hostile activity by Iran and disrupt and degrade Hizballah's illicit networks operating in the region, including diplomatic engagement that involves—

“(A) efforts to target and expose illicit networks, arrest perpetrators, freeze assets, and attack Iran and Hizballah's use of illicit networks using international trade and banking systems;

“(B) efforts to revoke or deny visas from those implicated in Hizballah's activity in the region, including lawyers, accountants, business partners, service providers, and politicians who knowingly facilitate or fail to take measures to counter Hizballah's illicit finance in their own jurisdictions;

“(C) efforts to assist willing nations with the development of counter-organized crime legislation, the strengthening of financial investigative capacity, and a fully-vetted counter-organized crime judicial model in places plagued with corruption; and

“(D) efforts to persuade governments in the region to list Hizballah as a terrorist organization;

“(2) the United States Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States to work to secure support at the Organization of American States for a resolution that would declare Hizballah as a terrorist organization and address Hizballah's illicit networks operating in the region;

“(3) the United States Ambassador to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to work to secure a report on compliance by participating states with OSCE Decision Number 1063, the ‘Consolidated Framework for the Fight Against Terrorism’, in regard to Hizballah, with particular focus on the mandate to ‘suppress the financing of terrorism, including its links with money-laundering and illegal economic activities’, especially as it relates transatlantic relations, including with Latin America and the Caribbean; and

“(4) United States diplomats to work with international forums, including the Financial Action Task Force, to identify government entities within Latin America and the Caribbean that provide support, facilitation, or assistance to individuals affiliated with Hizballah in the Western Hemisphere.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended

by inserting after the item related to section 103 the following new item:

“Sec. 104. Diplomatic initiatives.”.

TITLE II—NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH

SEC. 201. BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF AFFILIATED NETWORKS OF HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 201. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO AFFILIATED NETWORKS OF HIZBALLAH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and as appropriate thereafter, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to affiliated networks of Hizballah, including by reason of significant transnational criminal activities of such networks.

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions applied with respect to a foreign person pursuant to Executive Order 13581 (75 Fed. Reg. 44,757) (as such Executive order was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section).

“(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given such term in section 102(f).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to title II and inserting the following:

“TITLE II—IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO AFFILIATED NETWORKS OF HIZBALLAH AND REPORTS AND BRIEFINGS ON NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH”;

and

(2) by striking the item relating to section 201 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 201. Imposition of sanctions with respect to affiliated networks of Hizballah.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. REPORT ON RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 202. REPORT ON RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY HIZBALLAH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice and the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the heads of other applicable Federal agencies, shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the following:

“(1) Activities that Hizballah, and agents and affiliates of Hizballah, have engaged in that are racketeering activities.

“(2) The extent to which Hizballah, and agents and affiliates of Hizballah, engage in a pattern of such racketeering activities.

“(b) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall be sub-

mitted in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(2) HIZBALLAH.—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given that term in section 102(f).

“(3) RACKETEERING ACTIVITY.—The term ‘racketeering activity’ has the meaning given that term in section 1961(1) of title 18, United States Code.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by striking the item relating to section 202 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 202. Report on racketeering activities engaged in by Hizballah.”.

SEC. 203. MODIFICATION OF REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO DISRUPT GLOBAL LOGISTICS NETWORKS AND FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204(a)(1) of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years”;

(2) in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and free-trade zones.” and inserting “free-trade zones, business partnerships and joint ventures, and other investments in small and medium-sized enterprises;”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a list of provinces, municipalities, and local governments outside of Lebanon that expressly consent to, or with knowledge allow, tolerate, or disregard the use of their territory by Hizballah to carry out terrorist activities, including training, financing, and recruitment;

“(G) a description of the total aggregate revenues and remittances that Hizballah receives from the global logistics networks of Hizballah, including—

“(i) a list of Hizballah’s sources of revenue, including sources of revenue based on illicit activity, revenues from Iran, charities, and other business activities; and

“(ii) a list of Hizballah’s expenditures, including expenditures for ongoing military operations, social networks, and external operations;

“(H) a survey of national and transnational legal measures available to target Hizballah’s financial networks;

“(I) an assessment of Hizballah’s financial operations in areas under its operational or political control in Lebanon and Syria and available measures to target Hizballah’s financial operations in those areas;

“(J) a review of Hizballah’s international operational capabilities, including in the United States; and

“(K) a review of—

“(i) the total number and value of Hizballah-related assets seized and forfeited; and

“(ii) the total number of indictments, prosecutions, and extraditions of Hizballah members or affiliates.”.

(b) REPORT ON ESTIMATED NET WORTH OF AND DETERMINATION WITH RESPECT TO SENIOR HIZBALLAH MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter for the following 2 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains—

(A) the estimated total net worth of each individual described in paragraph (2);

(B) a description of how funds of each individual described in paragraph (2) were acquired, and how such funds have been used or employed; and

(C) a determination of whether each individual described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 1263(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

(2) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—The individuals described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Secretary General of Hizballah.

(B) Members of the Hizballah Politburo.

(C) Any other individual that the President determines is a senior foreign political figure of Hizballah, is associated with Hizballah, or otherwise provides significant support to Hizballah.

(3) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

(A) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of the report required under paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public and posted on the website of the Department of State and all United States Embassy websites.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(B) FUNDS.—The term “funds” means—

(i) cash;

(ii) equity;

(iii) any other intangible asset the value of which is derived from a contractual claim, including bank deposits, bonds, stocks, a security (as defined in section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a))), or a security or an equity security (as those terms are defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))); and

(iv) anything else of value that the President determines to be appropriate.

(C) SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.—The term “senior foreign political figure” has the meaning given that term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

SEC. 204. REPORT ON COMBATING THE ILLICIT TOBACCO TRAFFICKING NETWORKS USED BY HIZBALLAH AND OTHER FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on

combating the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah and other foreign terrorist organizations to finance their operations, as described in the report submitted to Congress in December 2015 by the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Health and Human Services entitled, "The Global Illicit Trade in Tobacco: A Threat to National Security."

(b) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the steps to be taken by Federal agencies to combat the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah, other foreign terrorist organizations, and other illicit actors.

(2) A description of the steps to be taken to engage State and local law enforcement authorities in efforts to combat illicit tobacco trafficking networks operating within the United States.

(3) A description of the steps to be taken to engage foreign government law enforcement and intelligence authorities in efforts to combat illicit tobacco trafficking networks operating outside the United States.

(4) Recommendations for legislative or administrative action needed to address the threat of illicit tobacco trafficking networks.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, prescribe regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 10 days before the prescription of regulations under subsection (a), the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees of the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

SEC. 302. IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES; JUDICIAL REVIEW; EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by sections 103 and 105 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 105. IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES; JUDICIAL REVIEW; EXEMPTIONS; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

"(a) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out sections 101 and 103.

"(b) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed to carry out section 101 or 103 to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

"(c) PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If a finding, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court *ex parte* and *in camera*.

"(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under section 101 or 103 or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding.

"(d) EXEMPTIONS.—The following activities shall be exempt from sections 101 and 103:

"(1) Any authorized intelligence, law enforcement, or national security activities of the United States.

"(2) Any transaction necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United States, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, or under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or any other United States international agreement.

"(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in section 101 or 103 shall be construed to limit the authority of the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or under any other provision of law."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 104, as added by section 105(c) of this Act, the following new item:

"Sec. 105. Implementation; penalties; judicial review; exemptions; rule of construction."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend any remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we will consider legislation targeting Hezbollah, Iran's leading terrorist proxy, with tough, new sanctions.

It was 34 years ago this Monday that a truck bomb filled with explosives detonated outside the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, killing 241 of our servicemen. Between 1982 and 1984, we had 272 marines, soldiers, and sailors from 39 States and Puerto Rico lose their lives while serving as peacekeepers in Beirut. Hezbollah was behind those attacks.

Since that fateful day, Hezbollah has collaborated with Iran to expand terror throughout the region, taking hundreds of thousands of lives if we count the lives of human beings lost in Syria, in Yemen, in Iraq, and in Gaza.

Today, as a leading Iranian proxy, Hezbollah continues to be Iran's front line against Israel. Since its 2006 war with Israel, Hezbollah has dramatically grown its supply of rockets and missiles, allowing it to strike throughout Israel with great precision and force.

It is by putting that military power to very effective use that it has gleaned through what it has learned on the ground in Syria. In Syria, its fighters are key to Tehran and its efforts to prop up the Assad regime, working with the Revolutionary Guard and also working with Russian troops there.

So now Hezbollah and Iran are reportedly working to introduce game-changing weapons into Lebanon and Syria, and that is what brings about this particular bill. What they are trying to do is produce facilities for sophisticated rockets and missiles there on the ground, on the border in Syria, on the border, also, in Lebanon, and that could lead to another war.

It is not a cheap effort to do this. That is why the committee is focused on dismantling Hezbollah's financial networks. In 2015, we led the way to enact the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act to target those that facilitate financial transactions for Hezbollah.

Now this bill builds on that effort to further ramp up pressure on the Iranian proxy, Hezbollah. It sanctions regimes, including Iran and Syria, that provide weapons to Hezbollah—in other words, an attempt to stop the transfer of these weapons. It targets Hezbollah's

innovative fundraising and recruiting efforts, including its attempts to crowdsourcing small donations to support its fighters, which is the latest evolution of Hezbollah's efforts.

□ 1545

Hezbollah launched an online crowdsourcing campaign entitled: "Equip a Mujahid," which calls for donations, large or small, payable in installments or in one sum, to equip suicide bombers and Hezbollah fighters.

This bill recognizes that Hezbollah is no longer only a terrorist group, but is also a global criminal organization, which has developed a global criminal network that profits from drug trafficking, money laundering, counterfeiting, and cigarette smuggling, and it gives the administration the tools to respond accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, for years, this body has led the way in calling for the need to respond to the full range of threats from Iran. Hezbollah, the regime's leading terrorist proxy, ranks among the top of those threats, in terms of what is being encountered right now.

So I urge my colleagues to support this effort to ensure that the United States has the tools to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3329, the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3329 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, October 20, 2017.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 3329, the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, as amended.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services con-

cerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 3329, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3329 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Committee Report and the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3329, the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3329 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 3329, the "Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017."

As a result of your having consulted with us on this measure, I agree not to seek a sequential referral on this bill so that it may move expeditiously to the floor. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appro-

priately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3329.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2017.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request on H.R. 3329, the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3329 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

Let me again thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership and for his hard work on this bill. I am glad to be the lead Democratic cosponsor of this legislation, which builds on a law that ED ROYCE and I wrote in 2015.

One of the best ways to stop Hezbollah's dangerous activity is to cut off its financing, which is what we tried to do 2 years ago. We went after Hezbollah's financial patrons, including Iran. But again, this is a group that, if you block one path forward, they will do what it takes to find another way around.

So with this measure, we are broadening existing law by going after a bigger universe of Hezbollah supporters and enablers. This bill would impose mandatory sanctions on any third parties or governments providing money, equipment, or weapons to Hezbollah.

We know that Iran will again get caught up in this dragnet, and this bill doesn't run afoul of our obligations

under the nuclear deal or any other deal. After all, Iran's support for Hezbollah is outside the scope of the JCPOA.

But it is not just Iran. In recent years, we have seen Moscow step up its support of Hezbollah, particularly on the battlefields of Syria, where Russia has supplied Hezbollah with weapons. It is really outrageous. Russia claims to be fighting so-called terrorists as they bomb schools, hospitals, and marketplaces. Yet Russian weapons are ending up in Hezbollah hands.

Let me be clear: Hezbollah is a terrorist group. It is as simple as that. Chairman ROYCE and I have said this many times. The Russia-Hezbollah relationship threatens to undermine global antiterrorism efforts.

This bill sends a message that any government in cahoots with Hezbollah, anyone who wants to do business with this terrorist group or support its violent aims, is going to face the consequences.

This is a timely bill. Iran is building weapons factories in southern Lebanon that would be buried far underground, out of Israel's reach. The missiles that will come off that assembly line are more precise and have a longer range, putting virtually the whole of Israel in their sights.

Iran's and Hezbollah's presence in Syria, particularly in the south, right on Israel's borders, is a very serious concern. I worry about the deescalation zones the United States helped to establish in southern Syria. We don't want those zones to become hotbeds of Hezbollah.

Several weeks ago, I was in Israel, and we trekked up to the border between Israel and Lebanon. At the border, as far as the eye can see, when you are in Israel and you are looking down at Lebanon, you see a number of flags. Are they the Lebanese flag? No. It is the Hezbollah flag.

Hezbollah has virtually taken over large parts of Lebanon, strangling the Lebanese people as well. The Lebanese people are suffering under a brutal terrorist group that is embedded in a society that disallows them to act as a free and open society.

My heart really goes out to the Lebanese people, who have a terrorist group virtually sitting in their lap, refusing to move, and putting them in all kinds of danger.

These areas have the potential to create a safe haven for Hezbollah and Iranian actors. They will stoke existing tensions and could create a corridor from Tehran to the Mediterranean through Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon. This would present a major shift in the regional balance of power, and it would present threats to Israel that it could not ignore.

If these deescalation zones end up empowering Iran and Hezbollah, then we will have betrayed our ally, Israel,

at the most critical moment. That is why we are passing this bill.

I, again, thank Chairman ROYCE for his continued strong leadership on this issue. I strongly support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the National Defense Authorization conference, and in view of the fact that, from the House side, Mr. ENGEL and I both serve on that conference, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and I ask unanimous consent that she may control that time on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since I, too, will go over to the Senate side, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control the time on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our committee, Mr. ROYCE from California, and the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL from New York, once again for their leadership. They are the dynamic duo of the Foreign Affairs Committee on this issue. This is a very important day, in terms of sanctioning evildoers in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor the bill promoted by Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, H.R. 3329, the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act. This is yet another strong, bipartisan bill that they have authored and brought to the floor, aimed at holding Iran and its proxy, Hezbollah, accountable for their illicit activity.

I was pleased that my amendment to this bill was included to ensure that we identify those Hezbollah parliamentarians and cabinet officials who are subject to the sanctions in this bill and the underlying bill that it amends.

This is important, Mr. Speaker, because Hezbollah members have prominent positions in Lebanon's Government, and we want to ensure that they cannot use government funds to divert to Hezbollah's terror activity, and, if they do, those institutions that help facilitate such activity are held to account.

I was also pleased to see other provisions approved that would allow us to identify and track individuals and entities that are being used by Iran to supply Hezbollah with arms or support for its missile production facilities in Syria.

We know that Iran uses commercial civilian aircraft to fly weapons, arms, and fighters to Syria in support of Hezbollah. We cannot allow Iran to use these civilian aircraft for such activity. This is the first step toward making sure that, once these aircraft are identified, responsible nations will think twice about allowing these Iranian planes to land in their countries.

This bill also addresses Iran's and Hezbollah's ability to finance their illicit activities, which is so important, Mr. Speaker. We must go after those individuals and those institutions that provide financial safe havens to these terror groups, and we have got to disrupt their financial networks.

That is why this bill is so important, and I urge my colleagues to support Chairman ROYCE's and Ranking Member ENGEL's measure before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to be on the floor with my friend and colleague from Florida to speak in support of H.R. 3329, an important bipartisan effort brought forward by Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, an important measure to further combat Hezbollah's terrorist activity.

We made great strides 2 years ago when we passed the Hezbollah International Financing Act, which has already begun to sever the terror group from its funding sources. However, it is clear that more needs to be done.

The new bill will further restrict Hezbollah's ability to recruit and fundraise by targeting foreign state sponsors, including Iran, while also increasing pressure on banks and other international financial institutions that serve Hezbollah.

It is important to remember why it is in America's interest to combat Hezbollah terrorism. Not that anyone here or at home needs a reminder, we all remember, or we have all learned about, the 1983 attacks in Beirut on our Embassy and the Marine Corps barracks that killed hundreds of Americans; the attacks in Argentina on the Israeli Embassy in 1992, and the AMIA Jewish center in 1994 that, in total, killed over 100 more; the 1996 Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia; and more recent attacks in Europe, including the 2012 bus bombing of Israeli tourists in Bulgaria.

But it has been Hezbollah's support for the horrific Assad regime in Syria that has led even Arab governments in the region to acknowledge Hezbollah's dangerous role as an Iranian terror proxy. Last year, the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Arab League took the dynamic step of designating Hezbollah as a terrorist organization.

Yet, even while Hezbollah is focused on the war in Syria, its leader, Hassan Nasrallah, continues to vow Israel's destruction, a threat Israel's leaders

don't take lightly, given two previous wars and intelligence suggesting Hezbollah now has over 150,000 missiles and rockets in Lebanon aimed at every corner of Israel's map.

In a future war, Israeli defense officials fear that Hezbollah will launch over a thousand rockets a day with the capacity to hit civilians in Israel's north, across Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, and even in the southernmost city, Eilat.

This is made all the more troubling by reports that Iran, in addition to transferring advanced precision-guided missiles to Hezbollah, is now helping the terror group set up indigenous missile development facilities in both Syria and Lebanon.

These are unacceptable developments. They underscore the importance of today's legislation: cut off Hezbollah's most critical sources of funding and support, including from its primary sponsor, Iran.

I am proud to support this bipartisan legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for her tireless leadership in standing up for all those pushing back against Iran's influence in the region, Iran's support for Hezbollah, and specifically here, cutting off sources of funding for Hezbollah.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For 30 years, Hezbollah has remained Iran's proxy and Iran remains Hezbollah's primary source of financial support—a cozy relationship.

In April 2015, its leader, Hassan Nasrallah, boasted that, even under sanctions, Iran still funds Hezbollah's terror. He anticipated that “a rich and powerful Iran, which will be open to the world” will be able to do even more.

The Iran nuclear agreement has made it possible for Iran to provide Hezbollah with a windfall. But Tehran is not Hezbollah's only source of income. Since its inception, Hezbollah has developed a broad criminal network involved in a range of illicit activities, from drug trafficking to cigarette smuggling, to money laundering to counterfeiting.

These global terrorists double as global criminals. This is why we must employ a combination of law enforcement, financial, criminal, civil, and regulatory tools to deter, disrupt, and publicly illuminate the global illicit Hezbollah network.

□ 1600

I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for closely collaborating and developing this critical legislation, as well as Senator RUBIO and Senator SHAHEEN in the Senate that have taken the lead on this effort in the Senate. I look forward to continuing to work with them to get this critical legislation signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3329, the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act. This important legislation builds on the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015. I was pleased to have originally introduced this bill in 2014 with my colleague MARK MEADOWS.

Hizballah at the behest and assistance of Iran is active in Syria and has helped Assad maintain regime control. Hizballah fighters are returning to Lebanon more battle-tested and more capable than ever before.

In Lebanon, again with assistance from Iran, Hizballah has been able to amass more than 150,000 rockets—a ten-fold increase compared to 15,000 in 2006.

Iran uses several means to transfer weapons to Hizballah, including by land, sea, and air and is now reportedly building missile production facilities in Lebanon to enable an indigenous rocket-producing capability for Hizballah.

Hizballah is not only a grave threat to our ally Israel, they are a threat to regional security and America's national security interests. Hizballah will be far more dangerous than ever before with an indigenous rocket-producing capability.

That is why I am pleased that an amendment I offered during the full committee markup of H.R. 3329 was included in the bill to ensure the U.S. Government is focused on this urgent threat. My amendment would require the President to report to Congress on the foreign and domestic supply chain that advances Hizballah's domestic missile capabilities. This includes how Iran is able to transfer goods and technology, a list of those who facilitate missile transfers, and the steps being taken to disrupt the supply chain that advances Hizballah's missile capabilities.

The United States cannot stand by while Israel faces such a grave threat on its northern border. We must decisively act and we deserve to know what exactly the U.S. Government is doing to combat this threat.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3329.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 3329, the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017. This is an important piece of legislation strengthening economic and financial sanctions on Hizballah and its enablers, and I am pleased to support it.

Hizballah is an organization based in Lebanon that plays a major role in regional tensions in the Middle East. Based on existing intelligence, it is believed that Hizballah is simply being used as a proxy by foreign governments to fight against Israel and other western influences in the area. In order to prevent the situation from escalating, the first step is to

prevent the group from being able to fund further military actions. H.R. 3329 would direct the President to apply sanctions that would freeze Hizballah's assets, prevent fundraising, and prevent financial institutions from working with the group. Furthermore, this legislation would extend financial sanctions to any foreign entity that provides funding to the group. The bill would also authorize the proper congressional committees to create reports on Hizballah's racketeering and international narcotics trafficking.

This legislation requires the President to report valuable information to Congress regarding the relationships among Iran, other foreign countries, and the Hizballah organization. Opening up this line of communication will help Congress better decide how to apply future sanctions against these state sponsors of terrorism.

With as many military bases as Georgia accommodates, I understand how conflict affects not only our nation, but also the young men and women who will be thrust into a needless international conflict. It is important that we take the necessary steps to prevent an escalation to prevent losing American lives in any conflict, which is why I support H.R. 3329.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3329, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGING EUROPEAN UNION TO DESIGNATE HIZBALLAH AS A TERRORIST ORGANIZATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 359) urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and increase pressure on it and its members, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 359

Whereas in July 2012 a Hizballah terror attack in Bulgaria killed five Israeli tourists and one Bulgarian;

Whereas in March 2013 a Hizballah operative in Cyprus was convicted of planning terror attacks after admitting he was a member of Hizballah, was trained in the use of weapons, and used a dual Swedish-Lebanese passport to travel around Europe on missions as a courier and scout for Hizballah;

Whereas though such Hizballah operative was convicted on criminal-related charges, authorities had to drop terrorism charges against him because Hizballah was not listed as a terrorist organization;

Whereas the European Union (EU) in July 2013 designated Hizballah's so-called “military wing”—but not the organization as a whole—as a terrorist organization;

Whereas despite restrictions put on Hizballah since the designation of its military wing, the group continues to conduct illicit narco-trafficking, money laundering, and weapons trafficking throughout Europe;

Whereas EU designation of Hizballah's military wing has enabled substantial and important cooperation between United States and European authorities aimed at uncovering and thwarting Hizballah's international criminal activities, such as drug trafficking and money laundering, the proceeds of which are used to purchase weapons and advance Hizballah's terrorist aims;

Whereas in December 2015 the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102) was signed into law in the United States, broadening financial sector sanctions against Hizballah to compel foreign financial institutions to refrain from supporting the terrorist group;

Whereas in February 2016 the United States Drug Enforcement Administration and U.S. Customs and Border Protection partnered with counterparts in France, Germany, Italy, and Belgium to arrest top leaders of the European cell of Hizballah's External Security Organization Business Affairs Component—a cell that engages in international money laundering and drug trafficking to support Hizballah's terror activities;

Whereas for many years, the Governments of Iran and Syria have been the prime sponsors of Hizballah, harboring, financing, training, and arming the group;

Whereas Department of Defense officials estimate that Iran provides as much as \$200,000,000 per year to Hizballah in the form of financial and logistical support, weapons, and training;

Whereas Hizballah now has an arsenal of approximately 150,000 missiles and rockets, many of which can reach deep into Israel, at a time when Hizballah Secretary General Hassan Nasrallah is threatening to attack and invade Israel;

Whereas Hizballah fighters have been supporting the Assad regime in Syria, often leading operations in the conflict which has left more than 465,000 dead;

Whereas Russia has established fusion centers in Syria to coordinate with Iran, the Assad regime, and Hizballah, and Russian air cover has given Hizballah an advantage on the battlefield against Syria rebels;

Whereas Hizballah's destabilizing actions in the conflict in Syria has fueled a migrant crisis that has brought nearly 400,000 migrants and refugees to Europe in 2016 and 2017 alone;

Whereas Lebanon continues to be plagued by instability and violence;

Whereas due to Hizballah's actions in Syria, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant has carried out retaliatory terrorist attacks in Beirut;

Whereas the Lebanese Armed Forces, the legitimate security establishment of the country as set forth in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701 (2006), are struggling to control the flow of weapons and Hizballah fighters at its borders;

Whereas Hizballah trains and provides weapons for Shiite militias in Iraq and Yemen, further destabilizing the region and perpetuating violence in those countries;

Whereas in October 2012 Hizballah Deputy Secretary General Naim Qassem stated that "[Hizballah does not] have a military wing and a political one . . . Every element of Hizballah, from commanders to members as well as our various capabilities, are in the service of the resistance";

Whereas the United States, Canada, Israel, and the Netherlands have designated Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization, while Australia and New Zealand have applied the designation to the organization's so-called military wing;

Whereas in March 2016 the Gulf Cooperation Council, the bloc of six Gulf Arab nations, formally branded Hizballah, in its entirety, a terrorist organization, and the League of Arab States shortly thereafter adopted the same designation;

Whereas in April 2016 the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, denounced Hizballah's "terrorist acts" in the Middle East;

Whereas Hizballah Secretary General Nasrallah said in May 2017 that the conflict in Syria had entered a "new and critical phase" in which Damascus, Moscow, Tehran, and Hezbollah were "in more harmony politically and militarily than at any time";

Whereas the United States has designated Hizballah's Foreign Relations Department, which has representatives around the world, as a Specially Designated National, subject to United States primary and secondary sanctions;

Whereas the Department of the Treasury has diligently added persons and entities to the list of Specially Designated Global Terrorists who have provided material support to the Hizballah terrorist organization, thereby hampering its financing and logistical capabilities; and

Whereas in May 2017 the United States and Saudi Arabia sanctioned Hashem Saffiedine, a member of Hizballah's executive council which oversees the organization's political, organizational, social and educational activities, for his involvement in terrorist activity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses appreciation to the European Union (EU) for the progress made in countering Hizballah since the EU designated Hizballah's military wing as a terrorist organization;

(2) applauds and expresses support for the continued, increased cooperation between the United States and the EU in thwarting Hizballah's criminal and terrorist activities;

(3) supports transcontinental efforts within Europe to share intelligence information among police and security services to facilitate greater cooperation in tracking, apprehending, and prosecuting terrorists, foreign fighters, and potential offenders;

(4) encourages the EU to, whenever possible and applicable with due process standards, implement sanctions against Hizballah-affiliated terrorists in tandem with the United States; and

(5) urges the EU to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and increase pressure on the group, including through—

(A) facilitating better cross-border cooperation between EU members in combating Hizballah;

(B) issuing arrest warrants against members and active supporters of Hizballah;

(C) freezing Hizballah's assets in Europe, including those masquerading as charities; and

(D) prohibiting fundraising activities in support of Hizballah.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker and Chairman ROYCE, as well as Congressman ENGEL, the ranking member, for their help in bringing this important resolution to the floor.

I also want to say how proud our committee is of the great work of Ranking Member TED DEUTCH of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, and our Florida colleague, GUS BILIRAKIS, who are the authors of H. Res. 359, urging the European Union to designate Hezbollah in its entirety as a terrorist organization. I thank Mr. DEUTCH for his leadership on this.

This notion, Mr. Speaker, that there can be separate wings of a terrorist organization is as absurd as the notion that Iran can be a responsible member of the international community. There is no distinction between Hezbollah members. Anyone who pledges allegiance to this terror group must be labeled accordingly.

One needn't look further than Hezbollah's activities in Syria or its terror attacks against Israel or even the statements coming out of Iran, its patron, and Hezbollah itself to know that if you are Hezbollah, you support terror activities. Iran is a state sponsor of terrorism, and Hezbollah is its proxy.

There is simply no justification at all for our European friends to try to differentiate between a military wing and a political wing of a terrorist organization. They may justify it by saying it will upset the delicate balance in Lebanon and they worry about the fallout, but the sad reality is that it comes down to money.

They will not take any action against Iran, as we have seen since the JCPOA, because members of the EU have signed lucrative business deals with Iran, and they don't want to damage their economic opportunities. It is as simple as that, because even our Gulf allies have labeled Hezbollah, in its entirety, as a terrorist organization.

The European Union needs to wake up, and we must urge it and its member states to designate the whole of Hezbollah as the terrorists that they are, and it must realize that doing so would be in their best interest and in the best interest of Israel, a nation that shares their values and their ideals, unlike Iran, a regime that benefits by the lack of a full designation of Hezbollah.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 359.

I would first like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on the committee in bringing this resolution forward. I would like to thank my friend from Florida, Congressman BILIRAKIS, for working with me on this resolution. I thank as well Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership on the subcommittee and ensuring that we have the opportunity to move forward together.

Mr. Speaker, in 2013, almost exactly 1 year after a Hezbollah suicide bomber blew up a bus in Bulgaria, killing mostly Israeli tourists, the European Union took action to finally designate Hezbollah a terrorist organization. However, they only designated what they called Hezbollah's military wing as a terror group and not its political wing.

The United States has been clear that this was a false distinction then and it remains a false distinction today. Hezbollah is one unified terrorist organization, and it is led by the terrorist, Hassan Nasrallah. It is one unified Hezbollah that is responsible for the horrific acts of terror against Europeans, Americans, Israelis, and others across the Middle East and around the globe.

It is one unified Hezbollah that has helped prop up the Assad regime, and it is complicit in the death of half a million Syrians and the dissolving of a once thriving nation. So this one unified Hezbollah should be designated as a terrorist organization so we can increase international cooperation to isolate and dismantle this group.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee held a hearing on next steps for our Iran policy. There, I noted that 2 days ago we marked a solemn anniversary, because 34 years ago, on October 23, two Hezbollah suicide bombers blew themselves up at the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, killing over 300 U.S. and French servicemembers, peacekeepers, and civilians. That attack, like so many of Hezbollah's deadly terrorist activities over the past several decades, was sponsored and directed by Iran.

While our Nation built a memorial honoring the victims of that attack, Tehran built a monument honoring the perpetrators of that attack. A full EU designation of Hezbollah now would help demonstrate Europe's commitment to cracking down on Iran's use of proxy terror groups, destabilizing the region, and attacking Western interests.

Now, I understand that the EU has legal concerns about this designation since Hezbollah has infiltrated Leb-

anon's political system. However, I would just offer this observation. The terrorist organization Hamas operates as a political party in Gaza, yet the EU still rightly lists the entirety of Hamas as a terror organization. That has not impacted their ability to support Gaza reconstruction, just as designating Hezbollah would not prevent them from supporting Syrian refugees in Lebanon.

Last year, the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Arab League both designated Hezbollah as a terrorist organization. They made no distinction between the military and political wing, despite Lebanon being a member of the Arab League. I hope the EU took note of that.

I thank the Speaker for bringing this resolution to the floor so that my colleagues can join me in sending an important message to our European friends and allies. More can be done to counter the Iranian proxy Hezbollah, and that begins with calling them what they are, a terrorist organization committed to the destruction of Israel and undermining the values and interests of the United States.

Our EU friends must acknowledge as well the values and interests of Europe. The world knows that Hezbollah is a terrorist group. It is time for the European Union to end its false distinction and join us in designating all of Hezbollah as a terrorist organization. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to send them that message.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so I will wait for Mr. DEUTCH to close on his time. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN, Congressman BILIRAKIS, and to my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee and other Members for their work on the three measures today aimed at curbing the terrorist group Hezbollah.

The measures that we are advancing today represent smart and tough approaches that will respond to Hezbollah and its enablers, and will build stronger international support for this important effort. This measure and the others that we have considered today are a great example of the way that we can work across the aisle to help keep our country safe. I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida, Ranking Member DEUTCH, for authoring this resolution and bringing it to the floor today.

Hezbollah has a single leadership, fungible finances, and a single hostile mission. All branches and operations serve its terrorist activities, and it is a deadly mistake to attempt to distinguish among its arms.

I again want to thank Mr. DEUTCH, Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL for their work on this important resolution, which calls for our European allies to designate all branches of Hezbollah as a terrorist organization. This is a critical step that our partners across the Atlantic must take to protect our citizens and allies from a highly organized, capable, and increasingly battle-trained terror group that operates networks in countries around the world.

We must work together to deprive this organization of its support. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his authorship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and a senior member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Chairman ROYCE, and all the other folks that have worked on a number of bills here today.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 359; H.R. 3329; H.R. 3342; and H.R. 1698, that one, in particular, aims to prevent Iran from acquiring ballistic missiles because they have the capability or soon will have the capability not just to target the Middle East and Europe, but also target us here on our soil right here in the United States if we don't do something about this, with ultimately a nuclear device.

Iran is determined to be the dominant power in the Middle East. The Iranian regime hopes to achieve this by exporting terrorism, destabilizing its neighbors, and promising death to America and to our allies.

Bearing this in mind, Iran's nuclear ambitions and ballistic missiles program are not only a direct threat to the United States and our allies, but they are a direct threat to the peace and stability of the entire world.

When the Iran deal was signed, I said back then and believed back then that this was a bad deal, it would ultimately lead to nuclear weapons, and that they weren't going to meet their commitments. And we are seeing here today the backsliding by Iran to these commitments.

Ten years ago, Russia agreed to sell a number of S-300 surface-to-air missile systems to Iran. The Russians suspended the deal in 2010, but renewed it after the Iran deal, the JCPOA was agreed to. Now Moscow has delivered multiple S-300 systems.

While the S-300 missile platforms strengthens Iran's conventional capabilities, it also fundamentally complicates the United States' strategy for

eliminating a potential nuclear threat against us or against our allies. Iran displayed this surface-to-air missile system to the public late last month, so we know it is there and it is dangerous.

That is exactly why H.R. 1698 is so important. It will help combat Iran's ongoing nuclear ambitions by requiring the President to report on the Iranian ballistic missiles program and to oppose targeted sanctions on Iranian Government entities and foreign actors that aid Iran in its nuclear development.

I also want to speak briefly relative to the threat that Hezbollah poses to the Middle East and the entire world. I, again, want to thank Congressman ROYCE and Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN and Ranking Member ENGEL and many others for their hard work on this.

Hezbollah's mission is to destroy Israel. It is backed by Iran. It poses a constant threat to the Middle East peace. We have designated it as a terrorist organization due to its routine attacks, especially rocket attacks on Israel that have led to war, and its brutal tactics.

□ 1615

For years, Hezbollah has continued to accumulate larger rocket stockpiles, grow their presence, and develop even more unimaginable barbaric strategies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for these, and I urge my colleagues to support these.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Because the gentlewoman from Florida did not close as expected, the gentleman from Florida will, without objection, be allowed to reclaim his time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, that is very kind, but I am happy to yield to my friend from Florida, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is now recognized to close debate.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, with that, I also yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

Let me thank my good friend and colleague from Florida, Representative DEUTCH, the Ranking Member of the Foreign Affairs Middle East Subcommittee, for bringing forward this measure.

This measure represents another part of a good congressional strategy for combatting Hezbollah, and that's rallying support among friends and partners . . . making sure that around the world everyone sees Hezbollah for what it is: a terrorist group.

This has been a bit of a stumbling block with our friends in the European Union. Make no mistake: Hezbollah has waged its campaign of violence in Europe over the years, such as 2012, when a Hezbollah terrorist killed five Israelis in Bulgaria.

Yet in 2013, the EU announced it would consider only the "military wing" of Hezbollah to be a terrorist organization, drawing a distinction with the so-called political wing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a distinction without a difference. Hezbollah is a terrorist organization, and that's all there is to it. The more shades of grey clouding this issue, the harder it's going to be to work with our EU allies to stop Hezbollah's violent activities.

So this measure lays out the facts about Hezbollah's presence in Europe and the other groups that have labeled Hezbollah a terrorist organization. It commends the work we're already doing with our EU allies to push back against Hezbollah. And it says that it's time for the EU to stop the hairsplitting. It calls on the EU to designate all of Hezbollah for what it is: a terrorist organization.

I'm glad to support this measure. It sends such an important signal to our friends across the Atlantic.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 359, which I am proud to co-lead and cosponsor with my colleagues. This important resolution urges the European Union to designate Hezbollah in its entirety as a terrorist organization.

There is no distinction between the military and political wings of Hizballah. They are part and parcel of the same entity, that is a terrorist organization that threatens the United States and our allies, and contributes to instability and violence in the Middle East.

The EU designated Hizballah's military wing as a terrorist organization in 2013, and has made notable progress in countering Hizballah activities, but more must be done. This resolution urges the EU to take practical and tangible steps to reduce the terrorist threat posed to the United States, Europe, Israel, and our other allies in the Middle East by Hizballah. For example, increasing cross-border intelligence sharing, freezing Hizballah assets, prohibiting Hizballah fundraising activities, and issuing arrest warrants for Hizballah members and supporters in Europe would not only send a strong message, but would have a concrete impact inhibiting the ability of Hizballah to operate with impunity.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 359.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 359, legislation urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and increase international pressure on the organization.

Hizballah has demonstrated its commitment as an organization to promoting fear, violence, and terror worldwide for decades through the murder of global citizens. Its 1983 attack on the U.S. Marine Compound in Beirut was the most deadly single-day attack on the United States Marine Corps since the battle of Iwo Jima in World War II. Our nation has condemned Hizballah as a terrorist organization and leveraged significant financial sanctions against it, but we believe more can be accomplished through international cooperation with our friends at the European Union.

With this resolution, we urge the European Union to condemn Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization, rather than condemning its military wing alone, and ask them

to stand with us to fight terrorism internationally. With increased financial pressure and more active international policing, together we can end Hizballah's terrorist activities and create a more peaceful and safer world. Cooperation between the European Union and the United States is crucial in the fight against transnational terrorism, and it is for this reason that I support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 359, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNSHINE FOR REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 469.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 577 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 469.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1621

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 469) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUNCAN from Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be here on H.R. 469. We have had the opportunity, through rule debate yesterday, to discuss this.

What we are coming forward with today is a bill that I have introduced that basically breaks down to what we know is a sue and settlement ban on this part of my bill. There are other parts that we are going to get to as we go forward in this.

But I think I want to start off this debate today by simply stating some of the foundational issues—things that we come here and talk about many times on the floor of the House have to do with bills and discussions. But one of the things I think that has been very disturbing for me—and I know many of our colleagues as we have come up here—is the disturbing trend of moving away from Congress relieving its powers and taking ownership of its Article I authority, and doing the oversight, doing the planning, doing the budgeting, and then sort of moving that more toward the executive branch or letting the judicial system take responsibility.

And I think one of the things that we are starting out with today in these bills, that we have taken up over the past 2 days, is a general discussion to move back toward Article I authority, which Congress is doing the legislating and the oversight that it is supposed to be, and the executive branch is following through in their role of actually executing the laws that are made, judicial, of course, being the interpretive branch.

What we are seeing in this bill—and one of the reasons for our sue and settlement legislation, which is my part of this bill, and I want to start here, and we will continue as we go through this through the other parts as we go—is really a fairness issue. And this is not specific to one party in the executive branch. I stated this yesterday. Sometimes it gets mixed up. But hear me clearly: I don't care the party of the resident at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. I do not care who they may be in the sense of what they do in that job. What I want to know is: Are they fulfilling the executive branch role and not overstepping Congress' role?

What we have seen over previous administrations, including the last one and the previous administration, especially under this area of sue and settlement that increased greatly during the last administration, was this idea of taking a law that we have passed, having the regulatory agency's job to execute that law; but, at the same point in time, being sued by a friendly party, or another party, on a deadline of the bill, or something that they want to, they go into, say, with EPA or another agency, and they discuss this lawsuit. They come to an agreement, and they file the suit. Many times the suit and the consent were filed on the same day.

The consent decree—now, look, consent decrees are good judicial tools. They have been used, and will continue to be used, even under this bill. But

what we don't want to have happen is when the consent decree basically comes at the time of the suit, or just shortly thereafter, where the party that wants to see a specific agenda pushed, along with a willing agency, goes to a judge, is able to get that consent decree, and then turn around and give it to somebody else and say: You now have to live under this without any emphasis or any input from the other party.

So we are simply saying: Let's make this a little fair. You are going to have to publicize notice, you are going to have to actually include others who may have a problem with this consent decree, and you are going to have to do it a little more transparently.

So we are going to start here today, Mr. Chairman. We are going to talk about these issues and coming forward. We can talk about many other things as the day progresses, but, at the end of the day, it is about Congress itself taking control of its Article I authority and saying, "We are going to be the legislative branch that we are called to be," and the executive taking their role and judiciary taking theirs.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 469, an unwarranted and costly intrusion into Congress' powers under Article I of the Constitution that will undermine the enforcement of statutory deadlines.

When passing laws, Congress routinely establishes mandatory deadlines for agency action. These statutory deadlines serve several purposes. They establish congressional priorities, attempt to reduce undue delay in an agency's compliance with the law, and communicate the importance of a legal requirement to the public. But because agency resources are limited, there is widespread noncompliance with statutory deadlines, as the Administrative Conference of the United States has long observed.

Accordingly, a plaintiff with standing may file a lawsuit to complete a schedule for an agency to complete an action required by Congress, often referred to as a "deadline suit." As the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, the GAO, reported earlier this year, "Most deadline suits are resolved through a negotiated settlement agreement because, in the majority of them, it is undisputed that a statutory deadline was missed," and there was no legal defense to the lawsuit.

But proponents of H.R. 469 assert that these settlements undercut applicable administrative law and short-circuit review of new regulations. This premise is based on a report by the Chamber of Commerce that the so-

called sue and settle process is increasingly being used as a technique to shape agencies' regulatory agendas. This concern, however, is unsupported by any independent evidence and has been debunked by the GAO.

In two reports on deadline suits, the GAO has found that, "the settlement agreements did not affect the substantive basis or procedural rule-making requirements," of the agencies it studied.

In its December 2014 report on deadline lawsuits involving the Environmental Protection Agency, the GAO determined that none of the settlements finalized under the Obama administration "included terms that finalized the substantive outcome of a rule." The GAO underscored this point in the title of its report: "Impact of Deadline Suits on EPA's Rulemaking is Limited."

In its February 2017 report on deadline suits involving the Endangered Species Act, the GAO found that "the settlement agreements did not affect the substantive basis or procedural rulemaking requirements the agencies were to follow in completing the actions, such as providing opportunities for public notice and comment on proposed listing rules."

Leading experts have also debunked the Chamber's sue and settle narrative. John Cruden, a senior career official at the Justice Department for more than two decades during two Republican and two Democratic administrations, testified on a substantially identical bill that he was "not aware of any instance of a settlement that could remotely be described as collusive, but that the Justice Department vigorously represented the Federal agency, defending the agency's legal position, and obtaining in any settlement the best possible terms that were consistent with the controlling law."

Other administrative law experts, such as Robert Weissman, the president of Public Citizen, have similarly testified that sue and settlement allegations are patently false.

This bill is also unnecessary because current law and agency practice already restrict the use of settlement policy to shape regulatory priorities. During its exhaustive review of deadline litigation, the GAO found that the Justice Department is guided by the Meese memo of 1986, when litigating deadline suits. This policy, as the GAO noted earlier this year, limits the settlement of a deadline suit to "only include a commitment to perform a mandatory action by an agreed upon schedule and would not otherwise predetermine or prescribe a specific substantive outcome for the actions to be completed by the agencies."

The Meese memo was codified in 1991, in the Code of Federal Regulations, and applies to settlement policy today. The Meese policy primarily restricts agencies from using settlement policy to

contravene the law or congressional intent.

□ 1630

As the majority noted in its report on a substantially identical version of the bill considered last Congress, this policy is grounded in separation of powers concerns. There is no evidence that agencies do not follow this policy, and the majority's witnesses in prior hearings on this proposal have been unable to provide examples of settlements that violate the Meese policies.

H.R. 469 is also wasteful and undermines Congress' powers under Article I of the Constitution. Congress, not agencies, establish regulatory priorities through statutes. Agencies do not have discretion to pick and choose regulatory priorities where Congress has expressly instructed that certain actions be undertaken by a specific date. By imposing a series of onerous procedures that will constrain the use of settlements to resolve a Federal agency's noncompliance with the law, H.R. 469 erodes the constitutional function of the legislative branch.

Finally, the bill is also costly. The Congressional Budget Office notes that this bill greatly lengthens the settlement process, costing millions of dollars and straining the Treasury's Judgment Fund through increased attorney's fees.

In closing, I strongly oppose this measure.

I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), our ranking member, to control.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, our system of government is a tripartite one, with each branch having certain defined functions delegated to it. The Congress is charged with writing the laws, the President with executing the laws, and the judiciary with interpreting them.

The Constitution divides powers between the branches in this manner in order to guard against the abuse of power by any one branch. The separation of powers is at the core of the fundamental premise of our constitutional design that a limited government, divided into three branches exercising enumerated powers, is necessary to protect individual liberty and the rule of law.

Unfortunately, over the last several decades, Congress has allowed its powers to gradually be chipped away at by the other branches. By allowing its powers to be diminished, Congress, especially this House, effectively is permitting the people to be deprived of their most responsive voice in the Federal Government. Through the legislation before us today and other legisla-

tion that the House has actively pursued in recent years, we can begin to reestablish and enforce the limits on the authority of the other two branches.

Although no package of bills by itself can rebuild Congress' institutional strength and restore the Constitution's integrity, it is absolutely necessary that Congress begin reasserting the powers that it has ceded to the other branches. This package of bills promotes the restoration of Congress' Article I powers.

The first bill in the package addresses executive branch negotiated regulatory decrees and settlements. Over the past several decades, consent decrees and settlement agreements increasingly have been used in Federal litigation to allow the executive branch to write new law in ways that give short shrift to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, Regulatory Flexibility Act, and other laws by which Congress has prescribed how agencies must conduct rule-making.

While the executive does have some regulatory authority, these settlements and consent decrees have been used to aggrandize that authority and shift regulatory priorities under the cloak of judicial authority. This subverts the boundaries both the Constitution and Congress have placed on administrative authority.

The Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act limits the ability of the executive branch to collude with plaintiffs to abuse consent decrees and settlement agreements in a manner that allows the executive to thwart laws written by Congress and increases the power of the judiciary beyond its constitutional limits.

The second bill in the package, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act, increases transparency over Federal spending by requiring the Treasury Department to publish data on settlements and court-offered judgments entered against the Federal Government.

One of Congress' core powers is the authority to authorize and appropriate money from the Treasury. In order to properly exercise this power, Congress needs to know how the bill it has appropriated is being spent.

This bill will allow Congress to better scrutinize and understand where Federal taxpayer dollars are going. Only through the transparency this bill provides can Congress make the executive and the judiciary more accountable for the money that comes out of the Judgment Fund.

The final bill in the package, the Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, makes clear Congress' ability to defend and assert its institutional interests in litigation that puts the powers and responsibilities of Congress into question.

Currently, when the executive branch declines to pursue litigation in defense of an act of Congress, it is not required to give Congress notice sufficient to allow the House or Senate to defend the lawsuit before court filing deadlines have expired. In addition, the House of Representatives, unlike the Senate, does not have a statutory right to intervene or file amicus briefs in cases questioning congressional authority. This legislation ensures that both Houses of Congress have adequate time and a right to intervene in litigation that questions congressional authority.

We cannot continue to abdicate our powers and responsibilities to the other branches of government, weakening the separation of powers enshrined in our Constitution and threatening the very liberty divide powers were designed to protect.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to be here to support—well, I don't think it is going to be support. It is really more in opposition to this so-called Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act.

Well, why? Well, because it is anticonsumer.

Well, why? Because it is antienvironment.

Well, why? Because it is antiprivacy.

Not surprisingly, a broad consortium of more than 150 organizations strenuously oppose this bill, including some of our best nonprofits: the National Resources Defense Council, for example; the Sierra Club, for another example; Public Citizen; and a lot of labor organizations and other groups.

Title I of this bill, for example, has one goal: it is to discourage the use of settlement agreements and consent decrees that compel agencies to follow the law.

When enacting new statutes, Congress routinely establishes deadlines for agency action, particularly when it involves urgent public health and safety concerns. When agencies fail to meet these deadlines, a party with standing may file a lawsuit under section 7 of the Administrative Procedure Act to ensure that the agency performs this mandatory, nondiscretionary duty. By delaying the enforcement of statutory deadlines, the bill, however, jeopardizes public health and safety, which explains why the previous Obama administration issued a veto threat to similar legislation considered only last Congress.

Title I imposes nearly impossible hurdles for agencies seeking to resolve the deadline lawsuits and gives opponents of regulation multiple opportunities to stifle agency regulatory actions.

With respect to consent decrees concerning a rulemaking, an agency would

be forced to go through two public comment periods—one for the consent decree, and one for the rulemaking that results from the consent decree—doubling the agency's effort. In addition, it would allow any affected party to intervene in opposition to a proposed settlement agreement or consent decree.

Contrary to the claims of those who support this measure, the Government Accountability Office has found no evidence that these deadline lawsuits are collusive. As the Justice Department, which represents most Federal agencies, acknowledged earlier this year, these agencies are left with few defenses, if any, to these lawsuits.

I am also concerned that H.R. 469 will inevitably generate more litigation that will result in millions of dollars of additional transactional costs, all of which will be borne by you know who—the American taxpayer.

For example, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, in its analysis of the bill's predecessor from the last Congress, concluded:

The measure would impose millions of dollars in additional costs, most of which would be incurred because the litigation involving consent decrees and settlement agreements would probably take longer under the bill, and agencies would face additional administrative requirements.

That is a quotation. In other words, Title I of this bill is a costly solution, again, in search of a problem.

Now, Title II of the bill isn't much better. For instance, Title II overrides the Privacy Act to require publication of sensitive personal information of victims of government abuse or unlawful conduct, which raises serious privacy concerns.

Although proponents of this measure argue it will increase government transparency, its real effect will be to force the Treasury Department to publish, on the Internet, the names of individual victims of government misconduct compensated for their claims by the Judgment Fund, including victims of race and sex discrimination, and so, in effect, revictimizing victims harmed by the Federal Government.

Finally, Title III would facilitate the ability of the House majority to intervene in pending cases where the Justice Department has already determined that it will not defend the constitutionality of a Federal law.

Not only do these provisions raise possible separation of powers concerns, it is unclear why they are even needed.

This measure has not ever been the subject of a single hearing or markup by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. As a result, there has not been any opportunity to consider these critical issues and to analyze the ramifications presented by Title III.

For all of these reasons, I must, accordingly, urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 469.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments, especially of my friend from Rhode Island. I would agree in principle with the Meese amendment as well. The problem is that, through the Clinton administration and through preceding administrations, it has been watered down. I would actually go back to that. The problem is lack of transparency and the lack of a coherent voice here as we go further, but I do appreciate the comments.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in overwhelming and adamant support of H.R. 469, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, which will strengthen Article I powers for Congress.

Let me begin by briefly quoting Article I, Section 8 of our Constitution, the Necessary and Proper Clause: "The Congress shall have the power . . . to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . . in the government," meaning, Congress must continue to respect and reinforce the idea of the separation of powers in our government, but, at the same time, Congress can ultimately decide when, whether, and how to legislate the powers and authority of another branch of government.

□ 1645

Mr. Chairman, this piece of legislation will go a long way in fortifying the balance of powers and reestablishing Congress' authority set forth by James Madison and our Founding Fathers and Article I of the United States Constitution.

Furthermore, we must be sure to use our constitutional authority to effectively guarantee and ensure that government is more efficient, transparent, and accountable to all American citizens of our great Nation, and this bill will do just that.

It is time for Congress to establish procedures for honest regulations, transparency within the Treasury Department, and judicial intervention in unconstitutional court cases.

Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in full support of H.R. 469, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers to make sure this is a government not only of the people, but for the people.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 469, the newly renamed Congressional Article I Power Strengthening Act.

This bill stitches together three unrelated bills, each one problematic in its own way.

Title III of the bill, the Article I Amicus and Intervention Act, would permit as a right the House to intervene as a party where an amicus in a lawsuit with the Department of Justice declines to defend the constitutionality of a law or regulation.

While this proposal may have some merit, it was introduced only last week. It was the subject of no hearing. It has had no markup. We simply do not know the full implications of the measure. If it is a worthy proposal, we should take the time to consider it in committee before moving forward.

Title II of the legislation, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act, would require additional reporting about the funds paid out of the Treasury Department's Judgment Fund by the United States Government to resolve legal claims against it. This legislation raises significant privacy concerns. It would require publishing sensitive, personally identifying information about individual claimants who are the victims of government misconduct, such as medical malpractice, racial discrimination, or sexual harassment.

Our laws should carefully balance the need for public disclosure of government spending with the need to protect the personal privacy of individual citizens. This bill upsets that balance.

By far, the most concerning aspect of this legislation is Title I, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act.

This provision also poses as a transparency measure, but its real aim is to disrupt and delay the process for issuing rules that protect public health and safety.

Congress frequently sets a statutory deadline for an agency to complete a rulemaking, but the agency sometimes misses that deadline. Under current law, private parties can sue the agency to meet its statutory obligations. Since there is little dispute that the agency has failed to do its duty, these lawsuits often end up settling, with the agency agreeing to a new schedule in which to complete the required rulemaking. That is perfectly reasonable.

However, the Republican majority and the businesses that are the subject of such regulation believe these lawsuits have some nefarious purpose. They have concocted an imagined vast conspiracy by which private parties collude with the government to file a lawsuit, and the government happily either settles or enters into a consent decree, supposedly allowing it to impose obligations or rules beyond what it could otherwise do.

Unfortunately for supporters of this bill, there is no evidence of such a conspiracy and no evidence, in fact, of any problem. To solve this nonexistent problem, this bill adds numerous procedural requirements before a settlement or consent decree can be entered into.

The effect of these requirements would be to make any settlements or

consent decrees more difficult and more time-consuming to enter into, with the predictable result that agencies will not even bother to enter into them at all.

Most troubling, the bill would create a special and more permissive rule for virtually any party to involve itself in the case as an intervener. These interveners would do their best to ruin, block, or delay any settlement, including during what should be private negotiations.

That, of course, is the true purpose of this bill. They seek to tie government agencies up in years of litigation so that they are unable to issue rules protecting public health and safety. The real conspiracy here is the Republican plot to destroy the regulatory state. With one hand, we defund the agencies; and with the other hand, we build all sorts of hurdles in the regulatory process so that the agencies have no ability to complete their work.

It is a shameful effort that may save big businesses some money and regulatory compliance, but it will cost our citizens their health, their safety, and possibly their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this terrible legislation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe, as was just stated, that there is a nefarious plot here. It is to get government doing the regulation it should with transparency—and that is what needs to be done—and have Congress do what it should be doing, and that is writing laws and having the regulatory process start from here. That is simply what we are looking at. If that is too much, I understand.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Mr. COLLINS and Chairman GOODLATTE for their work.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say, in listening to this debate, I can't imagine why anyone would oppose this legislation that is entirely designed to create transparency. This is good work that Chairman GOODLATTE and Mr. COLLINS have worked on.

Last week we heard a number of shocking stories about government malfeasance, such as Chairman GOODLATTE's investigation that the government had settled and revealed that the Obama Justice Department had funneled money to politically allied groups. We are grateful for that.

Today we are taking up H.R. 469, and I am thrilled that this legislation includes the text of my bill, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act.

As I said, the purpose of this act is really very simple. Actually, contrary to what has been said, it is to bring simplicity, it is to bring transparency. This bill would go a long way to providing our constituents and taxpayers a better idea of how their tax dollars are spent.

Heaven knows, and for heaven's sake, those of us here certainly know that sometimes the Federal Government makes mistakes. It is not perfect. It is prone to errors and it can cause harm to individuals. And when that happens, especially when these errors are particularly egregious, the government is sued and damages can be awarded.

Early on, in fact, this Congress spent a lot of its time doing nothing but that, sorting through claims and making appropriations to pay those claims. In fact, not even 100 years ago, much of this body's work was consumed only by this topic. It wasn't until 1956 that Congress established the Judgment Fund and gave authority to the Treasury Department to resolve these claims in "a permanent and indefinite appropriation." That has simply been abused.

In keeping with the law, the Treasury Department files a yearly report with Congress and maintains a web page that supposedly can be searched. That sounds good, but it doesn't work that way. It is cryptic and has otherwise limited information related to each payout that has made the data almost entirely worthless. There is no information on what the government did. There is no information on the claimant. We are all familiar with, for example, when the previous administration took \$1.3 billion out of the fund and converted it to cash and delivered it to Iran.

Four years ago, The New York Times reported what was likely an illegal billion-dollar payout to farmers who had never even sued the government. This isn't just unacceptable, it is crazy. It is horrible government. It is what leads people to distrust the Federal Government.

It would require the Treasury to make payment out of this fund public, and it would include very simple things that common sense would simply demand.

This bill would name the agency. It would name the name of the plaintiff and the amount that they were paid, then a brief description of the facts around that claim.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by just saying the Judgment Fund Transparency Act may not prevent bad decisions by all government employees, but it will shine a light on decisions to the American people. It is about helping to increase trust between the American people and government, a government that we have given them reason not to trust. Let's bring in accountability and transparency to that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and the language found within this bill.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to again remind folks that, during the course of this argu-

ment, we have heard this narrative about the problems with the sue and settle, as Mr. NADLER described it, an imagined, concocted vast conspiracy, but without any evidence that it actually exists, a solution in search of a problem.

Just to remind folks, there were two reports done by the GAO—I have them in my hand; they are thick—that, in fact, undermine the suggestion that there is any such problem.

In response to requests from the Republican committee chairs, the Government Accountability Office has twice concluded that agencies cannot and do not circumvent the rulemaking system through settlements relating to statutory deadlines.

Finally, we received testimony earlier this year from Attorney General Jeff Sessions' Justice Department that current agency policy, which was codified in 1991, prohibits circumventing the rulemaking process through deadline lawsuits. We have heard similar testimony from career Justice Department officials in prior administrations.

I ask the question: How is H.R. 469 necessary in light of this complete lack of support for this so-called sue and settle phenomenon and the presence of controls against this from happening in the first instance?

Mr. Chair, again, there is just no evidence to support the necessity for this. I think it has been articulated very well by my colleagues what the dangers are of moving forward with this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 469, the Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act.

This is an important piece of legislation because, as has been noted here, it seeks to increase accountability on the regulatory process by providing greater scrutiny of sue and settle cases. Yes, they do exist.

It requires the Department of Justice to release details of payments made through the Judgment Fund, and it strengthens Congress' ability to intervene on litigation regarding the constitutionality of congressional statutes.

This legislation also includes H.R. 1096, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act, which I am proud to cosponsor. That piece of legislation includes an amendment I offered, which would require the Secretary of the Treasury to clearly display the total expenditures, including the attorney's fees, interest, and all other payments made from the Judgment Fund on an annual basis.

Hardworking taxpayers deserve to know where their tax dollars are being

spent, and Congress must ensure that programs like the Judgment Fund are following the law. The American people must be allowed every available tool to keep their government accountable, and this will be an important tool.

Also, it would ensure a terrorist organization is prohibited from receiving any taxpayer funds from the Judgment Fund by prohibiting any foreign terrorist organization, as defined in section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

That statute clearly classifies a terrorist organization as those who “engage in terrorist activity or terrorism, and the organization threatens the security of the United States nationals or the national security of the United States.”

These terrorist organizations only seek to commit serious harm or potential targets, of course, including Americans, and I believe this prohibition is warranted to be included in this important legislation.

Let me be clear. We should all agree that not a cent of taxpayer dollars should ever go to a state sponsor of terrorism or foreign terrorist organizations. A recent illustration of the need for this ban on funding to state sponsors of terrorism is what we now know about the previous administration. They paid \$1.3 billion from the Judgment Fund to the nation of Iran in a settlement dating back over 30 years. Although all the information surrounding this payment was never made clear to the public, Iran still remains a state sponsor of terrorism, the most notorious one.

Mr. Chair, again, I strongly support H.R. 469. We must never allow taxpayer dollars to be given to violent rogue nations that support terrorists or, obviously, terrorist organizations, and this will ensure a constitutional check on the Judgment Fund. This is about Article I, the authority of this body. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support it, and I encourage our colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I am baffled by the gentleman from Louisiana’s assertion that this legislation improves accountability. It is very hard to imagine how undermining the enforcement of duly enacted legislation by Congress of the United States improves accountability.

This is like the upsidedown world. How does that improve accountability, making it more difficult to enforce the laws passed by Congress of the United States?

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in closing that it is very important to note that my opposition to H.R. 469 is joined by a very broad spectrum of organizations, including the American Federation of Labor and Congress of

Industrial Organizations, or AFL-CIO; the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; Public Citizen; Consumer Federation of America; the National Consumer Law Center; the Natural Resources Defense Council; the Sierra Club; Earthjustice; and People for the American Way; among many others.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is company, which should suggest to my colleagues that this legislation does not benefit the American people, it will undermine the actions of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I just want to say that this is not just something that has been dreamed up, as far as from a bill perspective. And they can point to studies that say this may or may not be a part, but even the outside organization, the Environmental Council of the States, sent a letter and basically did a resolution that said there is a need to reform State participation in EPA consent decrees which settled through citizen lawsuits. I mean, this is an issue because there is not the transparency that is needed. That is why these bills are here.

I would just like to remind everyone why we are considering this bill today, going back to where we first started, and why the House passed the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act and the Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act earlier this week: to help restore and reinforce the powers the people gave Congress in Article I of the Constitution.

Restoring and reinforcing these powers is not some academic issue; this is something that we practice every day. It goes back to as early as our elementary school days dealing with our simple civics, saying this is the way our government is set up.

I have said this before, Mr. Chairman, from this podium, and I will say it again. If the people in agencies down the street would like to make law, then I encourage them to leave their job, run for Congress, and come up here and make law. This is not their job to do it from a cubicle down the street through a lawsuit. We need to do it up here, as it should be properly done.

So, for far too long, Congress has been giving away its power. We want to see that change. We are going to see that. That is why this bill is here. And although this bill alone is certainly not a silver bullet for restoring the power the Congress has ceded, just as powers are gradually lost over time, they will be regained by Congress gradually reasserting itself.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation to reassert

congressional authority and to ensure that individual liberty protected by the powers of separation of powers between the branches is maintained.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 469 the “Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act” of 2017.

H.R. 469 is yet another attempt to undermine the ability of Federal regulators to protect the health and safety of Americans.

This ill-conceived bill imposes numerous new procedural burdens on agencies and courts intended to dissuade them from using consent decrees and settlement agreements to resolve enforcement actions filed to address agency noncompliance with the law.

H.R. 469 targets consent decrees and settlement agreements involving congressionally mandated federal agency actions.

These agency actions in many instances have the purpose of protecting civil rights, health, safety, and the environment.

H.R. 469 prescribes a host of burdensome—and, in some cases, ambiguous—steps for courts and parties relating to such consent decrees and settlements that would favor continued litigation over settlement.

H.R. 469 establishes a prolonged process of publication, intervention, and court-supervised mediation for these types of settlements.

This prolonged process would waste judicial, individuals, and local governments’ resources, while wealthy corporations are empowered to perpetuate violations of federal rules.

Such hurdles to settlements conflict directly with the expressly stated and longstanding policy of the federal judiciary system to favor compromise and the settlement of disputes in order to make the best use of limited resources.

Proponents of this legislation argue that agencies and interest groups collude to “sue and settle” to avoid compliance with the procedures set forth in the Administrative Procedure Act.

These allegations are unfounded in fact.

The consent decrees and settlement agreements at issue do not determine the substance of agency rules.

Rather, such agreements simply seek to enforce mandatory statutory and procedural duties (such as deadlines enacted by Congress).

In fact, a December 2014 Government Accountability Office report surveyed settlements over deadlines for major U.S. Environmental Protection Act rulemakings and found that the settlements did not influence the substantive results.

Furthermore, all public notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act and the individual laws at issue still apply when an agency undertakes the substantive action for which a deadline was missed.

Parties and non-parties alike are provided with numerous opportunities to provide input in advance of the rules being finalized.

H.R. 469 undermines protections for the American people, masqueraded as a measure to prevent undocumented and unfounded allegations of “sue and settle” collusion between public interest plaintiffs and sympathetic federal agencies entering into consent decrees and settlements.

In fact, H.R. 469 favors industry interests at taxpayer expense and promotes regulatory uncertainty by making it virtually impossible to actually enter into consent decrees and settlements that avoid the costly and time consuming alternative of litigation.

But its most serious flaw is that H.R. 469 is really a back door way to derail the rule-making process and undermine federal law, shifting limited agency resources away from the implementation of health and safety protections for the very people that we are supposed to be representing.

What this bill truly targets are the legal rights of citizens to hold government accountable by enforcing laws designed to protect health, safety, and the environment, obligations that the supporters of this bill would prefer to remain unenforced.

A broad coalition of more than 150 civil rights, environmental, consumer protection and other public interest groups opposed the bill in the last Congress.

On Monday, October 23, 2017, I received a letter signed by 86 environmental protection and civil rights groups urging me to oppose this bill.

A bill that attempts to give third parties the power to obstruct and delay the enforcement of federal law; which will harm plaintiff corporations, state and local governments, non-profit groups, and individuals alike, when their interests have been harmed by illegal federal agency actions or inactions.

Consent decrees and settlement agreements are simple, streamlined ways to hold federal agencies accountable when they ignore Congress by failing to commit congressionally mandated actions by a date established in statute.

H.R. 469 is a sad attempt to eliminate vital and broadly supported protections that have improved and saved millions of American lives.

By providing opportunities for industry to subvert or delay the process of redressing injured groups, H.R. 469 effectively makes it more expensive for agencies to do what Congress has mandated, that is to protect the American people and redress any harm to their livelihood.

Some of the unwholesomeness of this bill could have been mitigated had the Jackson Lee amendment to H.R. 469 been made in order.

The Jackson Lee amendment would have excepted consent decrees or settlement agreements that pertain to a reduction in illness or death from exposure to toxic substances in communities that are protected by Executive Order 12898.

Executive Order 12898 directs federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects of agency action on minority and low-income populations.

It is impossible to understand why even conservative Republicans would back legislation that hinders enforcement of the law, requires agencies to waste money in court on cases they believe they cannot win, and would stymie industry and state settlements along with all others.

I urge all members to vote against H.R. 469 and reject this harmful legislation.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-34. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 469

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Congressional Article I Powers Strengthening Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—SUNSHINE FOR REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Consent decree and settlement reform.

Sec. 104. Motions to modify consent decrees.

Sec. 105. Effective date.

TITLE II—JUDGMENT FUND TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Judgment fund transparency.

TITLE III—ARTICLE I AMICUS AND INTERVENTION

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Congressional intervention as of right.

Sec. 303. Intervention and amicus authority for house of representatives.

TITLE I—SUNSHINE FOR REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2017”.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the terms “agency” and “agency action” have the meanings given those terms under section 551 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term “covered civil action” means a civil action—

(A) seeking to compel agency action;

(B) alleging that the agency is unlawfully withholding or unreasonably delaying an agency action relating to a regulatory action that would affect the rights of—

(i) private persons other than the person bringing the action; or

(ii) a State, local, or tribal government; and

(C) brought under—

(i) chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code; or

(ii) any other statute authorizing such an action;

(3) the term “covered consent decree” means—

(A) a consent decree entered into in a covered civil action; and

(B) any other consent decree that requires agency action relating to a regulatory action that affects the rights of—

(i) private persons other than the person bringing the action; or

(ii) a State, local, or tribal government;

(4) the term “covered consent decree or settlement agreement” means a covered consent decree and a covered settlement agreement; and

(5) the term “covered settlement agreement” means—

(A) a settlement agreement entered into in a covered civil action; and

(B) any other settlement agreement that requires agency action relating to a regulatory action that affects the rights of—

(i) private persons other than the person bringing the action; or

(ii) a State, local, or tribal government.

SEC. 103. CONSENT DECREE AND SETTLEMENT REFORM.

(a) **PLEADINGS AND PRELIMINARY MATTERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In any covered civil action, the agency against which the covered civil action is brought shall publish the notice of intent to sue and the complaint in a readily accessible manner, including by making the notice of intent to sue and the complaint available online not later than 15 days after receiving service of the notice of intent to sue or complaint, respectively.

(2) **ENTRY OF A COVERED CONSENT DECREE OR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.**—A party may not make a motion for entry of a covered consent decree or to dismiss a civil action pursuant to a covered settlement agreement until after the end of proceedings in accordance with paragraph (1) and subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) or subsection (d)(3)(A), whichever is later.

(b) **INTERVENTION.**—

(1) **REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.**—In considering a motion to intervene in a covered civil action or a civil action in which a covered consent decree or settlement agreement has been proposed that is filed by a person who alleges that the agency action in dispute would affect the person, the court shall presume, subject to rebuttal, that the interests of the person would not be represented adequately by the existing parties to the action.

(2) **STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.**—In considering a motion to intervene in a covered civil action or a civil action in which a covered consent decree or settlement agreement has been proposed that is filed by a State, local, or tribal government, the court shall take due account of whether the movant—

(A) administers jointly with an agency that is a defendant in the action the statutory provisions that give rise to the regulatory action to which the action relates; or

(B) administers an authority under State, local, or tribal law that would be preempted by the regulatory action to which the action relates.

(c) **SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS.**—Efforts to settle a covered civil action or otherwise reach an agreement on a covered consent decree or settlement agreement shall—

(1) be conducted pursuant to the mediation or alternative dispute resolution program of the court or by a district judge other than the presiding judge, magistrate judge, or special master, as determined appropriate by the presiding judge; and

(2) include any party that intervenes in the action.

(d) **PUBLICATION OF AND COMMENT ON COVERED CONSENT DECREES OR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days before the date on which a covered consent decree or settlement agreement is filed with a court, the agency seeking to enter the covered consent decree or settlement agreement shall publish in the Federal Register and online—

(A) the proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement; and

(B) a statement providing—

(i) the statutory basis for the covered consent decree or settlement agreement; and

(ii) a description of the terms of the covered consent decree or settlement agreement, including whether it provides for the award of attorneys' fees or costs and, if so, the basis for including the award.

(2) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An agency seeking to enter a covered consent decree or settlement agreement shall accept public comment during the period described in paragraph (1) on any issue relating to the matters alleged in the complaint in the applicable civil action or addressed or affected by the proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement.

(B) **RESPONSE TO COMMENTS.**—An agency shall respond to any comment received under subparagraph (A).

(C) **SUBMISSIONS TO COURT.**—When moving that the court enter a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement or for dismissal pursuant to a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement, an agency shall—

(i) inform the court of the statutory basis for the proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement and its terms;

(ii) submit to the court a summary of the comments received under subparagraph (A) and the response of the agency to the comments;

(iii) submit to the court a certified index of the administrative record of the notice and comment proceeding; and

(iv) make the administrative record described in clause (iii) fully accessible to the court.

(D) **INCLUSION IN RECORD.**—The court shall include in the court record for a civil action the certified index of the administrative record submitted by an agency under subparagraph (C)(iii) and any documents listed in the index which any party or amicus curiae appearing before the court in the action submits to the court.

(3) **PUBLIC HEARINGS PERMITTED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—After providing notice in the Federal Register and online, an agency may hold a public hearing regarding whether to enter into a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement.

(B) **RECORD.**—If an agency holds a public hearing under subparagraph (A)—

(i) the agency shall—

(I) submit to the court a summary of the proceedings;

(II) submit to the court a certified index of the hearing record; and

(III) provide access to the hearing record to the court; and

(ii) the full hearing record shall be included in the court record.

(4) **MANDATORY DEADLINES.**—If a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement requires an agency action by a date certain, the agency shall, when moving for entry of the covered consent decree or settlement agreement or dismissal based on the covered consent decree or settlement agreement, inform the court of—

(A) any required regulatory action the agency has not taken that the covered consent decree or settlement agreement does not address;

(B) how the covered consent decree or settlement agreement, if approved, would affect the discharge of the duties described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) why the effects of the covered consent decree or settlement agreement on the manner in which the agency discharges its duties is in the public interest.

(e) **SUBMISSION BY THE GOVERNMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For any proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement that contains a term described in paragraph (2), the Attorney General or, if the matter is being litigated independently by an agency, the head of the agency shall submit to the court a certification

that the Attorney General or head of the agency approves the proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement. The Attorney General or head of the agency shall personally sign any certification submitted under this paragraph.

(2) **TERMS.**—A term described in this paragraph is—

(A) in the case of a covered consent decree, a term that—

(i) converts into a nondiscretionary duty a discretionary authority of an agency to propose, promulgate, revise, or amend regulations;

(ii) commits an agency to expend funds that have not been appropriated and that have not been budgeted for the regulatory action in question;

(iii) commits an agency to seek a particular appropriation or budget authorization;

(iv) divests an agency of discretion committed to the agency by statute or the Constitution of the United States, without regard to whether the discretion was granted to respond to changing circumstances, to make policy or managerial choices, or to protect the rights of third parties; or

(v) otherwise affords relief that the court could not enter under its own authority upon a final judgment in the civil action; or

(B) in the case of a covered settlement agreement, a term—

(i) that provides a remedy for a failure by the agency to comply with the terms of the covered settlement agreement other than the revival of the civil action resolved by the covered settlement agreement; and

(ii) that—

(I) interferes with the authority of an agency to revise, amend, or issue rules under the procedures set forth in chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, or any other statute or Executive order prescribing rulemaking procedures for a rulemaking that is the subject of the covered settlement agreement;

(II) commits the agency to expend funds that have not been appropriated and that have not been budgeted for the regulatory action in question; or

(III) for such a covered settlement agreement that commits the agency to exercise in a particular way discretion which was committed to the agency by statute or the Constitution of the United States to respond to changing circumstances, to make policy or managerial choices, or to protect the rights of third parties.

(f) **REVIEW BY COURT.**—

(1) **AMICUS.**—A court considering a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement shall presume, subject to rebuttal, that it is proper to allow amicus participation relating to the covered consent decree or settlement agreement by any person who filed public comments or participated in a public hearing on the covered consent decree or settlement agreement under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (d).

(2) **REVIEW OF DEADLINES.**—

(A) **PROPOSED COVERED CONSENT DECREES.**—For a proposed covered consent decree, a court shall not approve the covered consent decree unless the proposed covered consent decree allows sufficient time and incorporates adequate procedures for the agency to comply with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and other applicable statutes that govern rulemaking and, unless contrary to the public interest, the provisions of any Executive order that governs rulemaking.

(B) **PROPOSED COVERED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.**—For a proposed covered settlement agreement, a court shall ensure that the covered settlement agreement allows sufficient time and incorporates adequate procedures for the agency to comply with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and other applicable statutes that govern rulemaking and, unless contrary to the public

interest, the provisions of any Executive order that governs rulemaking.

(g) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Each agency shall submit to Congress an annual report that, for the year covered by the report, includes—

(1) the number, identity, and content of covered civil actions brought against and covered consent decrees or settlement agreements entered against or into by the agency; and

(2) a description of the statutory basis for—

(A) each covered consent decree or settlement agreement entered against or into by the agency; and

(B) any award of attorneys fees or costs in a civil action resolved by a covered consent decree or settlement agreement entered against or into by the agency.

SEC. 104. MOTIONS TO MODIFY CONSENT DECREES.

If an agency moves a court to modify a covered consent decree or settlement agreement and the basis of the motion is that the terms of the covered consent decree or settlement agreement are no longer fully in the public interest due to the obligations of the agency to fulfill other duties or due to changed facts and circumstances, the court shall review the motion and the covered consent decree or settlement agreement *de novo*.

SEC. 105. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall apply to—

(1) any covered civil action filed on or after the date of enactment of this title; and

(2) any covered consent decree or settlement agreement proposed to a court on or after the date of enactment of this title.

TITLE II—JUDGMENT FUND TRANSPARENCY

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Judgment Fund Transparency Act of 2017”.

SEC. 202. JUDGMENT FUND TRANSPARENCY.

(a) **TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENT.**—Section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) Unless the disclosure of such information is otherwise prohibited by law or court order, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the public on a website, as soon as practicable, but not later than 30 days after the date on which a payment under this section is tendered on or after January 1, 2016, the following information with regard to that payment:

“(A) The name of the specific agency or entity whose actions gave rise to the claim or judgment.

“(B) The name of the plaintiff or claimant.

“(C) The name of counsel for the plaintiff or claimant.

“(D) The amount paid representing principal liability, and any amounts paid representing any ancillary liability, including attorney fees, costs, and interest.

“(E) A brief description of the facts that gave rise to the claim.

“(F) The name of the agency that submitted the claim.

“(G) Any information available on reports generated by the Judgment Fund Payment Search administered by the Treasury Department.

“(2) In addition to the information described in paragraph (1), if a payment under this section is made to a foreign state on or after January 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the public in accordance with paragraph (1), the following information with regard to that payment:

“(A) A description of the method of payment.

“(B) A description of the currency denominations used for the payment.

“(C) The name and location of each financial institution owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a foreign state or an agent of a foreign state through which the payment passed or

from which the payment was withdrawn, including any financial institution owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a foreign state or an agent of a foreign state that is holding the payment as of the date on which the information is made available.

“(3) Not later than January 1, 2018, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the public on the website described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the total amount paid under this section during the year preceding the date of the report; and

“(B) the amount paid under this section during the year preceding the date of the report—

“(i) for attorney fees;

“(ii) for interest; and

“(iii) for all other payments.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘foreign state’ has the meaning given the term in section 1603 of title 28.

“(e) Except with regard to children under eighteen, the disclosure of information required in this section shall not be considered a ‘clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy’ for purposes of title 5, United States Code.

“(f) No payment may be made under this section to a state sponsor of terrorism, as defined in section 1605A(h) of title 28, or to an organization that has been designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall carry out the amendment made by this section by not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this title.

TITLE III—ARTICLE I AMICUS AND INTERVENTION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Article I Amicus and Intervention Act of 2017”.

SEC. 302. CONGRESSIONAL INTERVENTION AS OF RIGHT.

(a) DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON LIMITATION ON ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS.—Paragraph (2) of section 530D(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) under subsection (a)(1)(B), within such time as will reasonably enable the House of Representatives and the Senate to take action, separately or jointly, to intervene in a timely fashion in the proceeding, but in no event—

“(A) later than 30 days after the making of each determination; and

“(B) later than 21 days before any applicable deadline for filing any pleading necessary—

“(i) to defend or assert the constitutionality of the provision at issue; or

“(ii) to request review of any judicial, administrative, or other determination adversely affecting the constitutionality of such provision;”.

(b) INTERVENTION AS OF RIGHT.—Section 530D of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) INTERVENTION AS OF RIGHT.—The Senate or House of Representatives may intervene as of right in any proceeding referenced in subsection (a)(1)(B) in order to defend or assert the constitutionality of any provision of any Federal statute, rule, regulation, program, policy, or other law, or to appeal or request review of any judicial, administrative, or other determination adversely affecting the constitutionality of any such provision. Notwithstanding any otherwise applicable time limits or other provisions of law to the contrary, if such intervention is filed not later than 21 days after receipt of the notice required by this section the intervention shall be deemed timely and shall preserve the right of the Senate or House of Representatives to advance any applicable legal arguments in favor of the constitutionality of any such provision.”.

SEC. 303. INTERVENTION AND AMICUS AUTHORITY FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Section 101 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2000 (2 U.S.C. 5571), is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following (and redesignating succeeding subsections accordingly):

“(c) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES INTERVENTION AND AMICUS AUTHORITY.—

“(1) ACTIONS OR PROCEEDINGS.—When directed to do so in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives, the General Counsel of the House of Representatives shall intervene or appear as amicus curiae in the name of the House, or in the name of an officer, committee, subcommittee, or chair of a committee or subcommittee of the House, or other entity of the House, in any legal action or proceeding pending in any court of the United States or of a State or political subdivision thereof.

“(2) INTERVENTION OR APPEARANCE AS OF RIGHT.—Intervention as a party or appearance as amicus curiae shall be of right and may be denied by a court only upon an express finding that such intervention or appearance is untimely and would significantly delay the pending action or, in the case of intervention, that standing to intervene is required and has not been established under section 2 of article III of the Constitution of the United States.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to confer standing on any party seeking to bring, or jurisdiction on any court with respect to, any civil or criminal action against Congress, either House of Congress, a Member of Congress, a committee or subcommittee of a House of Congress, any office or agency of Congress, or any officer or employee of a House of Congress or any office or agency of Congress.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 115-363 and the amendment designated in the order of the House of October 24, 2017. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 115-363.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Chairman GOODLATTE, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, line 2, insert after “otherwise prohibited by law” the following: “(other than section 552a of title 5, United States Code)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Treasury’s interpretation of current law prohibits it from making public the names of plaintiffs. My amendment clarifies that these names, which this bill requires to be disclosed, will, in fact, be disclosed.

In January 2016, it was reported that the United States agreed to pay \$1.7 billion to Iran in a settlement arising from an agreement to sell military equipment to Iran prior to the 1979 Iranian Revolution. At the time, it was known that \$400 million in cash had been transferred to Iran, but it was unclear, even after public inquiry, how the remaining \$1.3 billion had been paid.

On August 22, 2016, the New York Sun reported that, while conducting an ongoing but fruitless search of “Iran” as a claimant in the Treasury database, it found 13 payments totaling 13 cents less than \$1.3 billion, as well as an additional payment of just over \$10 million. Without further context, however, the New York Sun could not confirm whether these payments were, in fact, part of the settlement.

It was only after months of increased public scrutiny, long after the money had been disbursed, that the previous administration acknowledges that these payments were indeed part of the Iran settlement.

My amendment will ensure that the public knows about the conduct of its government and the laws that are being faithfully executed and that justice is being served. The information that this bill requires to be disclosed, which, in many cases is already publicly available in court documents, informs Congress and the public in new ways, particularly with regard to systemic government abuse.

Furthermore, any concerns about the disclosure of the plaintiffs’ names are mitigated by the fact that this amendment does not foreclose a court’s ability to protect private information. Indeed, the information required to be made public in title II will not be disclosed if such disclosure is prohibited by a court order. Moreover, Federal judges have ample discretion to allow a plaintiff to proceed under the pseudonym as a “Doe plaintiff” or to seal and redact intimate records.

My amendment is necessary to prevent future government abuse by increasing the overall transparency of the Judgment Fund and, in turn, increasing government accountability.

I urge my colleagues to support this important clarification, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important to say at the

outset this is not about clarifying anything. This is about a major change in policy.

This amendment will permit the publication of a victim's sensitive information, such as the individual's name and case history, on the internet. This overrides the Privacy Act.

So let's be clear about what this is. This is not a clarification. This is a major change in policy.

This amendment will make a bad bill even worse. It specifies that the Privacy Act does not prohibit the publication of a victim's sensitive information, such as his or her name and case history.

Under current law, the Treasury Department cannot, for the purposes of the Judgment Fund, publish the sensitive information of individuals who are victims of government abuse or misconduct, such as a name or case history. This is because the Privacy Act requires an individual's consent prior to publishing their name or other sensitive information.

Although proponents of this amendment may claim that this information is, in some instances, already publicly available, the Supreme Court has recognized that a person's privacy interests and their personal information collected in government records does not automatically dissolve because such information may be available to the public already in some other format. Individuals have the right to control the dissemination of their own personal information. This amendment makes it clear that the bill will infringe on an individual's personal privacy if he or she is compensated from the Judgment Fund.

Moreover, this amendment does not further the public interest in government transparency. Publishing an individual person's name on the internet sheds no significant light on the inner workings of government and has no value; and so, to the contrary, it will result in potentially grave harassment or even intimidation.

Revealing this information is an unwarranted intrusion on personal privacy of individuals harmed by government misconduct, which could include victims of medical malpractice as well as racial and sexual discrimination. In effect, it revictimizes the victims of government misconduct or abuse—a terrible result.

So, therefore, I oppose this amendment which does not do anything to improve the bill and, in fact, makes it considerably worse.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. And if you vote for it, recognize that you will have to go home and tell your constituents that you have agreed to a serious invasion of their personal privacy and that it will allow individuals who are victims of government misconduct to have that personal information put

on the internet and shared with millions of people all over the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, you can also go home and tell them, if they filed a suit, that it is already currently in the PACER system, probably with more information than just that, or they could have filed it under a pseudonym or had their lawyers have this suppressed. This is an issue that is already out there; and as we look at this, this is moving forward. So I would just ask that this amendment be reported favorably.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).
The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 made in order by the order of the House of October 24, 2017.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT OFFERED IN LIEU OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 PRINTED IN PART A OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 115-363 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS OF MICHIGAN

Page 3, line 17, strike "and" and insert "other than an excepted consent decree or settlement agreement;"

Page 4, line 4, strike the period and insert "and";

Page 4, insert after line 4 the following:
(6) the term "excepted consent decree or settlement agreement" means a covered consent decree or covered settlement agreement that prevents or is intended to prevent discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, or any other protected category.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt from H.R. 469 settlement agreements and consent decrees intended to prevent discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, or other protected category.

Given the often systemic nature of discriminatory conduct, settlement agreements and consent decrees provide an invaluable means to provide for general relief for non-identifiable victims and to prevent future discriminatory acts.

In particular, they are instrumental in enforcing critical civil rights protections in a wide variety of cases, including voting rights violations and predatory lending practices based on race. Other examples include the use of consent decrees by the Justice Department to address unconstitutional police pattern or practice activities.

For example, in 2003, the City of Detroit entered into a consent decree with the Justice Department concerning the inappropriate use of force and arrest practices by the city's police department. As a result of this decree, the police department implemented vastly improved practices that have substantially reduced the incidence of fatalities caused by law enforcement activities, a goal that the Judiciary Committee Chairman GOODLATTE and I very much endorse.

According to the department's civil rights division, these decrees facilitate institutional reforms, such as improving systems for supervising officers and holding them accountable for misconduct, as well as ensuring officers have the policy guidance, training, equipment, and other resources necessary for constitutional and effective policing.

Unfortunately, H.R. 469 would make the use of such remedies exceedingly difficult by subjecting them to numerous procedural and potentially meritless court challenges.

A particularly concerning provision of this bill is its broad and ill-defined authorization allowing virtually anyone to intervene with respect to a proposed settlement agreement or consent decree.

For example, imagine a proposed settlement agreement intended to restrict a city's school district from discriminating against Muslims. Under the bill, any anti-Muslim or neo-Nazi organization could petition the court to intervene for the purpose of opposing such agreement on the ground that it "would affect" such person.

This is just one of the many fundamental problems presented by this thoroughly flawed and, I think, harmful measure, and, so, accordingly, I ask my colleagues here to join me in opposing H.R. 469.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, with much respect for my ranking member on my committee—we have served together; we have worked on a lot of issues together, namely, the Police Working Group, and other things, and his work has been very helpful in that regard—I do have to oppose this amendment because, really, what this amendment does is seek less transparency, public participation, and judicial review for consent decrees and settlement agreements for regulations that allegedly will help to protect civil rights.

With all due respect, I believe this has matters backwards. More transparency, public input, and judicial scrutiny will only help to produce regulations that better protect civil rights.

Further, since the bill promotes the participation of regulated entities and State, local, and Tribal entities that may be affected by or help to enforce the regulations, it will promote buy-in from these groups. That will help the regulation to be better and more promptly implemented and not held for years in litigation challenging the rules.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, although H.R. 469 has many flaws, I am particularly concerned that the bill's broad and ill-defined requirements would effectively delay and possibly deter civil enforcement agencies from providing general relief in discrimination cases, discourage courts from enforcing these settlements, and also invite costly and needless litigation.

In response to this problem, my amendment would simply exclude from the bill's burdensome requirements settlement agreements and consent decrees intended to remediate generalized harms in civil rights cases.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment, and I urge my colleagues here to support it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-363.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 17, strike “; and” and insert “, other than an excepted consent decree or settlement agreement;”.

Page 4, line 4, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 4, insert after line 4 the following:

(6) the term “excepted consent decree or settlement agreement” means a covered consent decree or covered settlement agreement pertaining to a deadline established by Congress through the enactment of a Federal statute to—

(A) significantly improve access to affordable, high-speed broadband internet in under-served markets, such as low-income and rural communities; and

(B) facilitate economic development in locations without sufficient access to such service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support my amendment to H.R. 469, and to advocate for rural Georgians and Americans across the country who don't have dependable access to broadband internet services.

We are here today debating H.R. 469, a bill that would require burdensome and unnecessary processes that would delay the enforcement of Federal regulations. H.R. 469 undermines the ability of government agencies to protect public health and safety by prohibiting them from using consent decrees and settlements to enforce the law that we pass by allowing private industry to intervene in opposition to regulations that they deem unfavorable to them. It requires the publishing of the personal data of those who bring complaints against the government, thus deterring complaints.

My amendment would ensure that future actions taken by Congress to increase broadband access in rural areas are not stymied by these excessive regulatory burdens. My amendment would exempt any future legislation, or any future rules that may be enacted to bring this technology to underserved areas from the requirements put in place by H.R. 469.

It shouldn't be groundbreaking news that, in many of our districts, a gap exists between urban and rural communities insofar as broadband connectivity is concerned. The Fourth District of Georgia has some rural pockets that are facing this challenge today.

According to a study done by the Pew Research Center in 2016, rural Americans are still 10 percentage points less likely than average citizens to have broadband access at home. Although we have seen improvements since the 16-point gap in 2007, we have much work to do to ensure that all families have access to what is now a modern necessity.

My home State of Georgia ranks 21st in the Nation in terms of access to 25 megabit per second broadband, according to a report put together by the Georgia House and Senate Study Committee on High Speed Broadband Communications Access for all Georgians. In rural counties where this problem persists, we have seen local development stall without access to telehealth services, educational materials, and other digital resources.

Broadband connectivity brings with it countless learning opportunities and exchanges of information that are not possible in isolated communities without broadband. The issue of broadband access is inextricably linked to the vitality of these rural areas, and it is in our best interest as a Congress to give rural communities all of the modern tools they need to succeed.

The FCC's 2016 Broadband Progress Report identified 24 million rural Americans throughout the country who

don't have a broadband connection—24 million Americans whose access would be delayed even further by the implementation of H.R. 469's elimination of consent decrees.

I hope Congress can agree on the importance of achieving full broadband access, and I hope that this amendment will begin removing this hurdle that is being put in place by my friends on the other side of the aisle who support business as opposed to people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I was just sitting here, Mr. Chairman, and I am excited and welcome my friend from Georgia to the fight for broadband. I have been leading on this fight now for several years, especially in my district, which is rural, which has a company called Windstream that does not provide for its citizens. I am excited to have the acknowledgment that rural broadband is something that we need to be fighting for.

My district has areas in which Windstream was supposed to use its Connect America funds to widen its footprint on rural broadband. Instead, they have shrunk it, only to compete in areas where they are competing against other companies, and only widening it in areas where they already had technology which they could have widened years before.

I think it is really interesting, and I am so glad about this because it also gives me the opportunity to talk about the GO Act, the Gigabyte Opportunity Act, which actually will provide real solutions into these districts for broadband opportunity.

I would encourage my friends from Georgia and from Michigan, and anybody else, to sign on to this bill. It is a good bill that has support across the way in the Senate, and also working with the administration to provide the way for States to actually look at their own States and provide gigabyte opportunity zones so that they can actually make ways and get these companies that are monopolizing the areas and not serving their constituents.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, it is sad because, in some of my districts right now, it has been over really about 6 weeks or so since Irma came through northeast Georgia and knocked out power and delayed broadband, and I still have customers in my district who do not have phone service or broadband this long after that fact.

This is just unacceptable, so I appreciate the concern here. The only problem is, this amendment doesn't help. This amendment is not one that does—again, it just is another amendment,

unfortunately, like the last amendment, that seeks less transparency and public participation. It does not do anything to discourage people from working to find rural broadband solutions.

What this actually does, it just, again, tries to seek less transparency instead of more. But I think there is a positive here. I choose to look at the positive. I disagree with this amendment and would ask that it be voted "no." But I look at the positive to say, as someone from Georgia, we have got a fight we can connect on, and that is rural broadband, because there is no longer a digital divide. There is a hope and dream divide. It is not a digital divide. It is a hope and dream for those students, and those moms, and those dads, and those families in those areas who cannot access the internet.

For me, it was a radio and a book. It took me all over the world. Nowadays, it is the internet and a phone where our students can actually get what they want. Unfortunately, this amendment doesn't do it. I have to oppose this amendment, but I am glad to welcome to the fight another friend against the evils of not being able to expand broadband.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I just enjoyed the contrast between our different styles. The Congressman, my friend from Georgia, is very upbeat and passionate. I am more laid back and kind of reserved. But we both agree on the fact that we want more broadband to be accessible to rural customers. We both agree on that.

We just simply disagree on whether or not we should allow a process whereby a third-party corporation can come in and gum up the regulatory scheme that has been laid out in the rulings that have been made and, thus, delay the availability of broadband to rural customers.

Mr. Chair, I would ask respectfully that my colleagues support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana) assumed the chair.

bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2266. An act making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

SUNSHINE FOR REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2017

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCEACHIN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 115-363.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 17, strike "and" and insert "other than an excepted consent decree or settlement agreement;"

Page 4, line 4, strike the period and insert "and";

Page 4, insert after line 4 the following:

(6) the term "excepted consent decree or settlement agreement" means a covered consent decree or covered settlement agreement pertaining to the improvement or maintenance of air or water quality.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment which seeks to reduce H.R. 469's adverse effects on public health and environmental quality. More specifically, my amendment would exempt from the terms of this bill consent decrees and settlement agreements pertaining to the maintenance or improvement of air and water quality.

Mr. Chairman, litigation empowers our constituents to hold Federal agencies accountable when they fail to take required actions by congressionally mandated deadlines. In many of these cases, agencies' failures are not in serious dispute. A missed deadline is a missed deadline. Litigants' goals are simply to ensure that the law is followed quickly and in full.

In such cases, it is not unusual, and certainly not unreasonable, for lawsuits to conclude with consent decrees or settlement agreements. As reported, this bill would introduce duplicative requirements and unnecessary barriers into the process by which the consent decrees and settlement agreements are reached. As a result, both tools would be used less often and less effectively.

Across the board, that change would be a mistake, but would generally be disastrous with respect to pollution. Air and water quality are matters of public health. When they fail to meet certain levels, people get sick and potentially die. The World Health Organization says that unhealthy environments kill more than 12 million people annually. In the United States, multiple studies have shown that tens of thousands of deaths every year are attributable to air pollution alone. These figures, of course, do not begin to contemplate nonlethal effects of health and quality of life.

We all know that justice delayed is justice denied—and that is especially true when lives are at stake. When regulators fail to take mandated actions to maintain or improve air or water quality, that is an injustice. When they sincerely intend to take those actions, but fail to do so in a timely way, that is also an injustice.

If we make it harder for citizens to hold regulators accountable, if we take away tools that empower Americans to make their voices heard, and hold agencies to account, we are compounding those injuries.

Let me be clear: consent decrees and settlement agreements do make a real difference in people's lives. They do this not by changing the substance of the agencies' actions as a formal rule-making would do, but by ensuring that the planned or required actions are actually taken.

I invite my colleagues to look at the Chesapeake Bay and the settlement agreement in *Fowler v. EPA*. Back in 2010, the EPA was under both congressional and executive mandates to improve water quality in the bay, but the agency was not on track to implement necessary standards within the required timeframe.

Citizens and public interest groups filed suit, and the case concluded in a settlement agreement that established a concrete deadline for actions that the agency was already working towards—notably, the imposition of the total maximum daily load, a binding limit on pollution in the watershed.

The result has been a small but very promising improvement in the health of the bay. Were it not for the agreement, we might still be waiting on the EPA to take the actions necessary.

□ 1730

We would have lost a significant amount of time, and, instead of improving conditions, conditions might have worsened, and the problem we faced would have grown correspondingly greater.

So, again, Mr. Chairman, justice delayed is justice denied; and, again, consent decrees and settlement agreements prevent avoidable, unnecessary delay.

Contrary to what my friends on the other side of the aisle have said, consent decrees and settlements do not

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled

and cannot take the place of formal rulemaking. Existing Federal regulations prevent agencies from using either tool to make commitments in excess of what relevant statutes provide.

The GAO has explored whether deadline litigation affects the substance of agencies' actions; overwhelmingly, they concluded it does not.

So the only function of this bill would be to stymie citizens'—our constituents'—efforts to ensure that our laws are faithfully executed to protect our air and our water, and, therefore, our health, in court.

My amendment would fix that problem in at least one area, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman bringing it forward. Again, we have never said that consent decrees can't be used. The issue here is how they are used in transparency. Justice delayed, as has been said, is not one that is denied, but also transparency not used is also things that are done in the dark and away from the public view which also can have issues that we go forward. Very few of these cases are actually brought by Joe Private Citizen. They are brought by groups with interest.

Even in the Chesapeake Bay, which has an \$18 billion compliance tag, the rushed timeframe did not allow others' input and buy-in from other localities.

So, again, nowhere has abuse of sue and settle tactics been seen so much as in the environmental regulation. In fact, the Judiciary Committee's report on this bill highlights 10 environmental sue and settle regulations from the Obama administration that equaled up to \$125 billion of cost.

Even the Environmental Council, as I stated earlier, in 2013, adopted a resolution calling upon the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to adopt reforms like the ones in this bill.

This amendment would deny reform to precisely the area of regulation that needs it most and, thereby, substantially gut the bill. We can have good environmental regulations without shady, backroom dealing of sue and settle litigation skewing the results and excessively heightening the burden.

I appreciate the gentleman bringing the amendment, but I would oppose it, and I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concerns, but actually having been a trial lawyer and actually having practiced law in the courts of the Commonwealth of Vir-

ginia and elsewhere, there is no more transparent process than the litigation process.

I would submit that the notion that somehow these actions are brought by someone other than our constituents, someone other than citizens of the United States, is not well taken.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by simply asking that my colleagues support this amendment, that we move forward in that regard, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 115-363.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 17, strike “; and” and insert “, other than an excepted consent decree or settlement agreement;”.

Page 4, line 4, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 4, insert after line 4 the following:

(6) the term “excepted consent decree or settlement agreement” means a covered consent decree or covered settlement agreement entered into pursuant to sections 0.160 through 0.163 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly referred to as the “Meese Policy”).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 577, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would create an exception in the legislation for consent decrees or settlement agreements entered into pursuant to the Meese policy.

For those unfamiliar, the Meese policy prohibits the Department of Justice from undertaking a regulatory action through a settlement. More specifically, the Meese policy directs departments and agencies not to enter into a consent decree if it would act as a so-called end run, around the regular rulemaking process or constrain an agency head from exercising its discretionary authority in the future.

Any departure from these rules must be approved by the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, or the Associate Attorney General beforehand.

Edwin Meese, the former Attorney General for the Reagan administration, wrote a memo articulating this policy in 1986, out of a concern for the abuse of settlements by agencies. Now, the Department of Justice later codified it in 1991, in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Simply put, there is a law already on the books that prevents the Department of Justice or other agencies from abusing consent decrees and settlement agreements used by Federal agencies, and it is working.

In February of this year, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, determined that Department officials negotiating settlement terms are covered by the Meese policy. The GAO's report noted that any settlement would only include a commitment to perform an action already mandated by law.

So if you are scoring along at home, what I am saying is this: there is a needless overlap between this bill that we are considering, H.R. 469, and the Meese policy in regard to the scope of settlements. There is also redundancy with existing laws in terms of protecting the interests of third parties.

If I may be so bold, I would like to say that persons with only a nodding acquaintance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure already know that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 allows affected parties to intervene in litigation if they feel their interests are not properly represented in the case.

Moreover, even if a rule was promulgated by a settlement agreement, the Administrative Procedure Act would still mandate notice-and-comment procedures for the rule. Simply put, this is a bill that is a solution in search of a problem, and my amendment underscores that fact.

If I may be so bold, I would like to say that here in America we have actual real problems that merit our attention here in this House, such as why we haven't had an infrastructure bill leading to high-paying American jobs. We need actual solutions to actual problems, not theoretical ones like in this bill. That is why I have offered this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the gentleman bringing in the Meese memo. We discussed this earlier that if we actually went back to the actual intent of the Meese memo which said the Attorney General would be the part, we could

probably agree on that. But let's get some things straight. There has been nothing codified. This is a regulation. It has not been codified. Codification would have to come from actual legislation passed by this body, and it is not.

The amendment would seek to carve out of the bill consent decrees and settlements entered into under Department of Justice regulations ostensibly written to implement this Meese memo.

The Meese memo was a Reagan-era Department policy, issued by Attorney General Meese, that prohibited the Department from entering into specified categories of decrees or settlements—particularly those that allowed the judiciary, through judicial orders, from invading the constitutionally exclusive authority of the executive branch.

Current regulations, however, require less scrutiny by, and less accountability for, such consent decrees on the part of the Attorney General.

What we need is not less Department of Justice accountability for backroom deals that trespass constitutional lines of authority, but more accountability. The bill would restore full accountability consistent with the letter and the spirit of the Meese memo itself.

Further, the amendment would carve out any and all decrees and settlements entered by the approval of officials as low as the Assistant Attorneys General—meaning most of the relevant decrees and settlements entered into by the Department. As a result, the amendment would gut the bill's consent decree and settlement reforms.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, to conclude, H.R. 469's proponents offer no evidence that there actually is a sue and settle problem or that agencies are not currently complying with the Meese memo. The GAO has already said they are. My amendment simply makes clear that this bill is unnecessary, and, as such, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will

now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 115–363 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. MCEACHIN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 231, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]

AYES—185

Adams	DeGette	Kilmer
Aguilar	Delaney	Kind
Barragán	DeLauro	Krishnamoorthi
Bass	DelBene	Kuster (NH)
Beatty	Demings	Langevin
Bera	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Beyer	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Lawrence
Blumenauer	Doggett	Lawson (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Doyle, Michael	Lee
Bonamici	F.	Levin
Boyle, Brendan	Ellison	Lewis (GA)
F.	Engel	Lieu, Ted
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brown (MD)	Espallat	Loeb
Brownley (CA)	Esty (CT)	Lofgren
Bustos	Evans	Lowey
Butterfield	Foster	Lujan Grisham,
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	M.
Carbajal	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Maloney,
Carson (IN)	Gallagher	Carolyn B.
Cartwright	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum
Chu, Judy	Gottheimer	McEachin
Cicilline	Green, Al	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Meeks
Clay	Gutiérrez	Meng
Cleaver	Hanabusa	Moore
Clyburn	Hastings	Moulton
Cohen	Heck	Murphy (FL)
Connolly	Higgins (NY)	Nadler
Conyers	Himes	Napolitano
Cooper	Hoyer	Neal
Correa	Jackson Lee	Nolan
Costa	Jayapal	Norcross
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Crist	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
Crowley	Keating	Pallone
Cuellar	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
Cummings	Kennedy	Pascarella
Davis (CA)	Khanna	Payne
Davis, Danny	Kihuen	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kildee	Perlmutter

Peters	Schiff	Titus
Peterson	Schneider	Tonko
Pingree	Scott (VA)	Torres
Pocan	Scott, David	Tsongas
Polis	Serrano	Vargas
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Quigley	Shea-Porter	Vela
Raskin	Sherman	Velázquez
Rice (NY)	Sinema	Visclosky
Rosen	Sires	Walz
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter	Wasserman
Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Ruppersberger	Soto	Waters, Maxine
Rush	Speier	Watson Coleman
Ryan (OH)	Suozi	Welch
Sánchez	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
Sarbanes	Takano	
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	

NOES—231

Abraham	Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Aderholt	Gohmert	Mullin
Allen	Goodlatte	Newhouse
Amash	Gosar	Noem
Amodei	Gowdy	Norman
Arrington	Granger	Nunes
Babin	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bacon	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Banks (IN)	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Barletta	Griffith	Paulsen
Barr	Grothman	Pearce
Barton	Guthrie	Perry
Bergman	Handel	Pittenger
Biggs	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Harris	Poliquin
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Black	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Blum	Higgins (LA)	Renacci
Bost	Hill	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Holding	Roby
Brat	Hollingsworth	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Buck	Hurd	Rokita
Bucshon	Issa	Rooney, Francis
Budd	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Ross
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Jones	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Royce (CA)
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Russell
Cheney	Katko	Rutherford
Coffman	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Schneider
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Schweikert
Comer	Kinzing	Scott, Austin
Comstock	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Sessions
Cook	Labrador	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Shuster
Cramer	LaMalfa	Simpson
Crawford	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Culberson	Lance	Smith (NJ)
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Smith (TX)
Davidson	Lewis (MN)	Smucker
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Stefanik
Dent	Long	Stewart
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Stivers
DesJarlais	Love	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Tenney
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	MacArthur	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Tipton
Dunn	Marshall	Trott
Emmer	Massie	Turner
Estes (KS)	Mast	Upton
Farenthold	McCarthy	Valadao
Faso	McCaul	Wagner
Ferguson	McClintock	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Walden
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walker
Flores	McMorris	Walorski
Fox	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Wenstrup
Gaetz	Meehan	Westerman
Gallagher	Messer	Williams
Garrett	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Wittman

Womack Yoho
Woodall Young (AK)
Yoder Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—16

Bridenstine Johnson, Sam
Denham Kaptur
Fortenberry Lowenthal
Hudson Lynch
Huffman Webster (FL)
Jeffries Richmond Wilson (FL)

□ 1805

Messrs. BACON, KELLY of Pennsylvania, and ALLEN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. SPEIER, Messrs. KIHUEN, and DOGGETT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCEACHIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 226, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 586]

AYES—187

Adams Cummings Jackson Lee
Aguilar Davis (CA) Jayapal
Barragán Davis, Danny Johnson (GA)
Bass DeFazio Johnson, E. B.
Beatty DeGette Jones
Bera Delaney Kaptur
Beyer DeLauro Keating
Bishop (GA) DelBene Kelly (IL)
Blunt Rochester Demings
Bonamici DeSaulnier Khanna
Boyle, Brendan Deutch Kihuen
F. Dingell
Brady (PA) Doggett Kilmer
Brown (MD) Doyle, Michael Kind
Brownley (CA) F. Krishnamoorthi
Bustos Ellison Kuster (NH)
Butterfield Engel Langevin
Capuano Eshoo Larsen (WA)
Carbajal Espaillat Larson (CT)
Cárdenas Esty (CT) Lawrence
Carson (IN) Evans Lawson (FL)
Cartwright Foster Lee
Castor (FL) Frankel (FL) Levin
Chu, Judy Fudge Lewis (GA)
Cicilline Gabbard Lieu, Ted
Clark (MA) Gallego Lipinski
Clarke (NY) Garamendi LoBiondo
Clay Gomez Loudermilk
Cleaver Gonzalez (TX) Lofgren
Clyburn Gottheimer Lowey
Cohen Green, Al Lujan Grisham,
Connolly Green, Gene M.
Conyers Grijalva Luján, Ben Ray
Cooper Gutiérrez Maloney
Correa Hanabusa Carolyn B.
Costa Hastings Maloney, Sean
Courtney Heck Matsui
Crist Higgins (NY) McCollum
Crowley Himes McEachin
Cuellar Hoyer McGovern

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter

NOES—226

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy

Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOT VOTING—19

Blumenauer
Bridenstine
Castro (TX)
Denham
Fortenberry
Hudson
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson, Sam
Lowenthal
Lynch
Pascrell
Richmond
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Smith (NE)
Thompson (CA)
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1809

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 586.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I was inadvertently delayed on rollcall numbers 585 and 586. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted “yes” on rollcall No. 585 and “yes” on rollcall No. 586.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 232, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

AYES—186

Adams Castro (TX) DeLauro
Aguilar Chu, Judy DelBene
Barragán Cicilline Demings
Bass Clark (MA) DeSaulnier
Beatty Clarke (NY) Deutch
Bera Clay Dingell
Beyer Cleaver Doggett
Bishop (GA) Clyburn Doyle, Michael
Blumenauer Cohen F.
Blunt Rochester Connolly
Bonamici Conyers Ellison
Cooper Cooper Engel
F. Correa Eshoo
Costa Costa Espallat
Courtney Courtney Esty (CT)
Crist Crist Foster
Crownley Crowley Frankel (FL)
Cuellar Cuellar Fudge
Capuano Cummings Gabbard
Carbajal Davis (CA) Gallego
Cárdenas Davis, Danny Garamendi
Carson (IN) DeFazio Gomez
Cartwright DeGette Gonzalez (TX)
Castor (FL) Delaney Gottheimer

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray

Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent

DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Galtz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)

Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi

Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Bridenstine
Fortenberry
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson, Sam

Kuster (NH)
Lowenthal
Richmond
Rooney, Thomas
J.

Ryan (OH)
Smith (NE)
Thompson (CA)
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1814

Mr. MARSHALL changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BUTTERFIELD changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 469) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 577, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 187, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

AYES—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culler
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte

Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)

Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)

NOES—187

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

NOT VOTING—11

Bridenstine
Fortenberry
Jeffries
Johnson, Sam

Lowenthal
Richmond
Rooney, Thomas
J.

Smith (NE)
Thompson (CA)
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1827

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 3941

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following names be removed as cosponsors of the bill, H.R. 3941:

Mr. CARBAJAL of California

Young (IA)
Zeldin

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina
Ms. FUDGE of Ohio
Mr. HUFFMAN of California
Mr. VEASEY of Texas
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California
Mr. CÁRDENAS of California
Mr. LOEBSACK of Iowa
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASO). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?
There was no objection.

□ 1830

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MONTANA EDUCATOR, CRAIG WILSON

(Mr. GIANFORTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an educator who touched the lives of thousands of Montanans with his love for our State as well as his knowledge and passion for Montana politics. As one of Montana's foremost political scientists, Dr. Craig Wilson was well known across the State and across both sides of the aisle.

For 34 years, Professor Wilson spent his days in front of students in a classroom at Montana State University Billings, helping them understand the world in which they lived.

He conducted reliable and respected surveys that engaged Montanans on issues that mattered most to them. His method was honest and straightforward, a welcome approach in today's politics.

Craig was a loving husband to Kristianne, a proud father of Collin and Evan, and a doting grandfather to Blair and Jett.

Dr. Wilson was an educator in and out of the classroom. He was dearly loved and will be missed.

NATIONAL CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is National Cyber Security Awareness Month, and we have a lot of work to do to better secure our Nation's cyberspace, and we cannot underestimate these challenges.

During our district work period last week, I took the opportunity to go on a cybersecurity tour to understand better what Rhode Island's initiatives are. During that time, I visited some of the Ocean State's growing cybersecurity companies, stopping by SecureWorks' Providence campus and speaking on a panel at Carousel Industries' AlwaysOn Technology summit.

I learned about efforts to stem cybercrimes from the Rhode Island

State Police, and I joined Rhode Island Secretary of State Nellie Gorbea at an election security workshop for local officials.

At the Rhode Island Society of CPAs, I encouraged our accountants to advise their clients about cybersecurity risk, and I joined State Senator Lou DiPalma to promote cyber hygiene practices.

Most importantly, I spoke to PTECH students and participants in CyberPatriot about their importance as the next generation of cybersecurity leaders.

Mr. Speaker, cybersecurity may be the national and economic security challenge of the 21st century, but with the talent that we have in Rhode Island, I am confident that we can take it on.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF SAM COKER

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Dr. Sam Coker, who passed away on October 12, 2017, at 87 years of age.

Dr. Coker was an active member of his community, serving as a church leader and board of trustee for 31 years at Young Harris College in Young Harris, Georgia.

First and foremost, he was a Methodist minister, where he served at multiple churches across Georgia. Dr. Coker's dedication is exemplified by his multiple trips to Jerusalem, where he baptized friends and colleagues in the Jordan River.

In 2015, he was awarded the Young Harris College Artemas Lester Award for a lifetime of dedication to Christian service.

Because of his love for education and others, he created the Gene Allison Coker scholarship in honor of his late wife. This scholarship enabled many students to achieve higher education and attend Young Harris College.

Dr. Coker was a generous man, and he will be greatly missed.

TAX REFORM

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, day after day, the President and congressional Republicans have sought to frame their tax proposal as a tax cut for hardworking middle class families and not a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, even going so far as to say it will not add to the deficit. Quite simply, they are trying to sell the American people a dream that will not become a reality.

In New Jersey alone, 25 percent of the residents will see their taxes increase by \$2,400, annually. That means

one in four New Jerseyans are affected by this failed strategy of trickle-down economics.

These aren't the very rich. I am talking about New Jersey's regular working families. These New Jerseyans are a part of the 47 million Americans that will see a tax increase.

This horrific tax reform plan and the rhetoric my Republican colleagues are using to garner support is simply fake news. It is a tax break for the wealthiest Americans.

I refuse to participate in the crippling of the middle class and the working class and the halting of continued growth of the American economy by rubberstamping this billionaires-first tax scheme.

TAX REFORM LISTENING TOUR

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week in Minnesota, I conducted a tax reform listening tour, visiting small businesses in our community about why tax reform is so important. Throughout the tour, it was evident that these small businesses were enthusiastic that tax reform means more jobs, higher wages, and a stronger economy.

Diversified Plastics in Brooklyn Park, an employee-owned company that manufactures and assembles plastic injection products, said that being able to immediately expense new equipment will allow them to invest more in their company and hire more people.

Northstar Balloons in Plymouth, which manufactures and distributes foil party balloons, said that a Tax Code that provides stability and predictability will allow them to invest in their company with confidence.

Mr. Speaker, the message was clear: fixing a broken Tax Code will help small businesses hire more people, give their employees a raise, and create a growing and a more competitive economy.

FILVETS

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, our country is forever grateful for the service and sacrifice of the over 200,000 Filipino and Filipino-American soldiers who bravely served our country during World War II, heroes like Sixto Tabay, the last living Filipino World War II veteran on the Island of Kauai, whom I had the good fortune to meet with recently, people like him who fought bravely and sacrificed greatly.

So many made the ultimate sacrifice alongside our American troops in that

war, yet their service for decades has gone unrecognized by our country.

Because of legislation that we passed, today, a very special day, these warriors were finally receiving the recognition that they earned and deserve, joining the heroic ranks of the likes of the Tuskegee Airmen and Hawaii's own 442nd 100th Infantry Battalion, as we honored them in the U.S. Capitol with the Congressional Gold Medal, our Nation's highest civilian honor.

To Major General Antonio Taguba, the Filipino Veterans Recognition and Education Project, and all of our World War II Filipino veterans and their families who worked so hard and were so patient in making today a reality, "thank you very much to all of you," "maraming salamat sa inyong lahat."

GERMAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, October is German-American Heritage Month. I am co-chair of the Congressional German-American Caucus with Congressman BILL KEATING, and our caucus highlights German contributions to our country.

It is estimated that 50 million Americans have German ancestry, and according to the U.S. Census Bureau, Germans are the largest single ethnic group in the United States.

The caucus works to emphasize the friendship and alliance between the United States and Germany. We do so through an Oktoberfest networking event and through our support for programs like the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange internship program. The caucus also discusses timely topics such as trade, security, and foreign affairs and how they relate to our German counterparts.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we have a proud German heritage. Frederick Muhlenberg, a German immigrant and Lutheran pastor from Pennsylvania, whose family also founded Muhlenberg College, was the first Speaker of the House following the signing of the new Constitution.

The caucus has more than 100 members, and I urge all those who are interested in joining to do so today during German-American Heritage Month.

DENOUNCING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was joined by many of our colleagues to echo the pleas of over 100 women who came dressed as brides here to D.C. to put a face on the brutal murder of Gladys Ricart, a victim of do-

mestic violence who was killed in 1999. Yesterday I said that I was Gladys Ricart and that we were all Gladys Ricart.

While this was happening, Mr. Speaker, I am distressed to inform you that a woman in my district in Inwood was fatally stabbed to death and beaten with a dumbbell by her long-time boyfriend. Police officers found Claudina Cruz dead, with multiple stab wounds to the torso and head trauma.

She is also Gladys Ricart. We are all Gladys Ricart.

I ask my colleagues to join me in denouncing domestic violence for Gladys, Claudina, and every victim of domestic violence across the country. Congress must reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act when it comes before us next year.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MALCOM RANDALL VA MEDICAL CENTER

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Malcom Randall VA Medical Center in Gainesville, Florida.

Named after its first director, who ran the hospital for 30 years, the Malcom Randall VA Center first opened its doors to our Nation's veterans on October 22, 1967. Since then, it has grown from its original staff of 500 to be the centerpiece of our Nation's largest veterans health delivery system.

Today, the Malcom Randall VA Center serves over 140,000 veterans a year, consists of 14 hospitals and clinics, and acts as a teaching hospital in conjunction with the University of Florida medical school and other affiliates.

The services Malcom Randall VA provides to our veterans cannot be overstated, and I am proud to know that this institution is in my hometown.

Once again, congratulations to them for reaching this milestone.

FEMA DENIALS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have often said that, even though the sun is shining after hurricanes and storms, the people are still hurting. Houston is resilient—and I might just say, "Go Astros"—but I think it is important to talk about those who are impacted by Hurricane Harvey.

I rise to help FEMA, because there is a large percentage of denials in my district. I believe that there should be a large promotion, if you will, informational provision to indicate to people

the process for appealing FEMA denials.

FEMA, itself, admits that many times the denials are based upon technical issues, that they should go to disaster recovery centers; but no one knows that if there is not a massive effort of information, number one.

Number two, there are still in the thousands of homes in and around my district and in Texas that are waiting for FEMA inspectors.

I have offered suggestions. Those suggestions should be taken up: college students, using resources of finding temporary employees, people who are already working but may have the skills to spend some hours as a FEMA inspector.

In my phone are so many pictures of homes with garbage outside, people's belongings. It is now garbage. It is their belongings. It is their life out on the front steps of their home. They are waiting for an inspector. The New York Times article says they are waiting for an inspector.

FEMA, let's work together. People are hurting. That should be part of our recovery and our appropriation coming up

NORTH KOREA HAS WON THE TITLE: A STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the saber-rattling rogue regime of North Korea should be back on the state sponsors of terrorism list, and here is why:

This year, the North Korean regime kidnapped, tortured, and killed American citizen Otto Warmbier.

In 2014, North Korea launched a cyber terrorist attack against Sony Pictures. A U.S. court also found, in 2014, that North Korea materially supported terrorist attacks by Hezbollah in Israel.

In 2010, another court found that North Korea provided support for the terrorist organization the Japanese Red Army for their 1972 attack at an Israeli airport.

In 2009 alone, there were three weapons shipments from North Korea to terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas.

U.S. officials have said North Korea aided Assad the Butcher by setting up a nuclear reactor that was destroyed by Israel in 2007.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear, North Korea is a state sponsor of terrorism, so let's let them officially wear the title along with their buddy, Iran.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1845

MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS ARE SICK AND TIRED

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, middle class Americans are sick and tired; sick and tired of footing the bill so that rich-folk millionaires and billionaires can get another tax break.

The Republicans' proposed tax reform plan is nothing but a tax cut for rich folks. It translates to increasing taxes for the poor and middle class families in our country. That means that families already struggling to make ends meet will have a tougher time making that car note, that mortgage, and gaining nothing in return.

As a country, the GOP billionaire tax cut plan steals hundreds of billions of dollars from the U.S. Treasury. That means that we can't make crucial investments in infrastructure, job training, or research and development that would help give people a good-paying job.

Reducing our tax base also translates into cuts to popular programs like Medicare. You know how much everybody likes that.

The American people want tax reform, but not a plan that would literally jeopardize families' livelihoods. We must put middle class families first in this country, and the GOP tax plan fails to do that. We can and must do better for the American people.

LIFE IS WASHABLE PROVIDES FRIENDLY ACCESS SENSORY SAFETY KITS

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Life Is Washable, an organization that provides comfort and support to individuals suffering from sensory processing disorders.

Locally, through their partnership with the Jim and Juli Boeheim Foundation, Life Is Washable provides friendly access sensory safety kits at sporting events and concerts across the region.

Often, guests suffering from a sensory disorder or a medical condition that impacts the senses, including autism or dementia, find it difficult to enjoy loud, brightly lit events.

The tools in these kits range from earmuffs to antiglare glasses, and help ensure that those with sensory needs can enjoy a sporting event or concert comfortably without the usual burdens they experience. This innovative approach has helped improve the quality of these events for those with sensory disorders across the country.

So far, several major venues in New York have begun using these kits, including the Veterans Memorial Arena in Binghamton and the Carrier Dome in Syracuse.

We are grateful to Life Is Washable for the important steps their staff has

taken locally to reduce the burdens on those suffering from a sensory processing disorder.

WE NEED TO BAN BUMP STOCKS

(Mrs. TORRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 1 month since the mass shooting in Las Vegas occurred; 58 dead, more than 500 injured, many from California—the deadliest shooting in our history.

And here we are, 1 month later, and I am ashamed to say that this Congress has not taken a single action to prevent the next shooting.

After the shooting, 64 Republicans signed a letter to ATF, asking ATF to regulate bump stocks. ATF just notified us that it could not act. It could not act. The ball is back in our court.

Will those Members act now? Representative CICILLINE has introduced a commonsense bill to ban bump stocks. If you signed the letter, you should co-sponsor the bill. It is that simple. What are you waiting for?

Mr. Speaker, there are some problems that we cannot solve, but this one is not one of those.

A FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM TO PROVIDE A SAFE HAVEN FOR COMPANION ANIMALS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to shed light on domestic violence during this month of October, I would like to highlight a bill, H.R. 909, the Pet and Women Safety Act.

This necessary bipartisan legislation introduced by my friend Representative KATHERINE CLARK and I will establish a Federal grant program to provide a safe haven for the companion animals of domestic violence victims.

Studies show that almost half of domestic violence survivors do not leave their abusive relationships out of fear of what would happen to their beloved pets. When less than 5 percent of domestic violence shelters are able to house pets, it is no wonder why so many victims choose to stay in these relationships for as long as they do.

Our bill empowers these victims and gives them the necessary resources to help them step out of the shadow of fear and uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, the Pet and Women Safety Act now enjoys the bipartisan support of 237 of our colleagues. I encourage every Member of Congress to add their name to this legislation, and I ask our leadership to bring H.R. 909 for a vote.

THE DEBT BETRAYAL

(Mr. SOTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, Tea Party Republicans were swept into office on a passionate plea to eliminate the deficit, to reduce the national debt, and to not pass on a great fiscal burden to our children.

Upon election, they boldly formed the Freedom Caucus, the fiscal watchdogs of the House. At the time, the national debt, in 2010, was \$13 trillion, and many were deeply concerned about our Nation's fiscal situation, and they made a promise to do everything in their power to rein in wasteful spending and to get government's fiscal House in order.

Now here we are in 2017, after nearly 7 years of a Republican-controlled Congress, and the debt is over \$20 trillion. That is 7 years of a Republican-controlled Congress and \$7 trillion in additional debt.

Now we have a tax giveaway of an additional \$2.5 trillion to pass on to our children. I ask all the so-called fiscal conservatives in this Chamber, all the so-called Freedom Caucus members, where is your big talk about the debt now? Is your desire to claim a victory worth betraying your deepest principles forever?

THE GREATEST ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM IN ALL OF HUMAN HISTORY

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the greatest anti-poverty program in all of human history: the free enterprise system. Maybe the most remarkable achievement in human history is the fact that, over the last 40 years, about 80 percent of the world's worst poverty has been eliminated.

We know the right combination of smart investments in things like research, education, infrastructure, and defense; fewer burdensome regulations; and simpler and fairer taxes creates the perfect environment for growth and innovation.

So far this year, we have secured investments in things like boosting programs for early childhood education and Head Start, and medical research at the NIH. We have done away with job-killing regulations, saving hard-working Americans billions in compliance costs and millions of hours in paperwork.

Now we have the opportunity to reform our Tax Code to help millions of Americans keep more of their hard-earned money, help small businesses create millions of new jobs, and help millions rise out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to act. Let's get tax reform done and get tax relief to those who need it the most.

BRING UP THE DREAM ACT

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there are so many different issues. We are talking about tax reform, but I want to go back to an issue we have talked about for several months now, and that is the DREAMers.

I rise today to call on the House leadership to bring up the Dream Act. The DREAMers who came to this country as children were brought by their parents for a chance to pursue the American Dream.

These young Americans go to our colleges and universities. They are our teachers and doctors and serve in the military, and we cannot afford to upend the lives and dreams of these 800,000 DACA recipients—people like Andres, a DREAMer who lives in my district. He came to this country as a child, and America is the only home he knows. He attends school here, earned his associate's degree, and became a building engineer. He built his personal relationships in our country and contributes every day to our society. His work, his friends and family are all in the United States. It would be a cruel mistake to force him to give all that up and send him back to a country he doesn't know.

Nearly 9 out of 10 Americans support the DACA program. It is our responsibility to the American people and to the hundreds of thousands of young DREAMers in this country to pass the Dream Act now.

Mr. Speaker, we should do so as soon as we can.

THE PRESIDENT'S CORRECT AND NECESSARY DECERTIFICATION OF THE JCPOA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, President Trump decertified the Iran nuclear deal. Tonight,

during this hour, several Members of Congress will be speaking here on the House floor about the President's correct and necessary decertification, and discussing the urgent need to address Iran's problematic nuclear and non-nuclear activities.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, JCPOA, otherwise known as the Iran nuclear deal, is deeply flawed and very one-sided for what is in it, and it is fatally flawed and deeply one-sided for what is not in it.

The so-called deal props up the wrong regime in Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terror, with a jackpot of \$150 billion of sanctions relief.

The United States made a slew of permanent concessions in exchange for temporary concessions on the part of the Iranians—a point that comes into greater focus as the sunset provisions are analyzed.

This deal is not a pathway for how to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, it is a blueprint for exactly how Iran can acquire a nuclear weapon.

We can and must do better. President Obama said this agreement was not built on trust, it was built on verification. I am still waiting for an answer on how you can support a deal based on verification without knowing what the verification regime is.

The verification agreement between the IAEA and Iran still hasn't been submitted to Congress, and Secretary Kerry has admitted that he never read it.

We have learned, though, that Iran collects some of their own soil samples and inspects some of their own nuclear sites. No U.S. inspectors are permitted to participate in any of these inspections at all.

The verification regime must become adequate and transparent, and Americans should know what the verification agreement is.

Since the JCPOA was entered into, Iranian aggression in the Middle East, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere has only increased. These bad activities have only gotten worse since all of the leverage that brought the Iranians to the table was negotiated away in the JCPOA.

Iran has continued to illegally test fire intercontinental ballistic missiles and finance terror. They even seized one of our naval vessels, subsequently holding hostage and publicly embarrassing 10 American sailors.

Iran has committed to wiping Israel off the map, and they chant, "Death to America," in their streets on their holidays, all while unjustly imprisoning American citizens. They call Israel "the little Satan" and America "the great Satan." These are, unfortunately, just a few of Iran's bad activities.

It is so important to note that Iran has not only violated the spirit of the nuclear deal with its nonnuclear bad activities, it has also violated the letter of the deal. For example, Iran spins

more IR6 centrifuges than they are allowed to under the JCPOA. They have assembled more IR8 rotor assemblies than they are allowed to. They have attempted to acquire carbon fiber that they agreed that they wouldn't. They stockpiled more heavy water than they were supposed to under the JCPOA. Iran is also not allowing any inspections at all at any of their military sites. Iran is not only violating the spirit of the deal, but they are also violating the letter of the deal.

President Trump was absolutely correct to decertify the JCPOA. If Iran is serious about helping turn the JCPOA into a truly reasonable agreement, then they should make those intentions clear, both in private conversations with the United States and the other countries of the P5+1, but also in their public rhetoric. Many of Iran's other bad activities will need to cease.

If Iran does not want to save the JCPOA, then the sanctions should immediately ramp up.

Throughout this next hour, we will discuss the President's correct decision to decertify, as well as the urgent need to eliminate Iran's problematic nuclear and nonnuclear activities.

□ 1900

Joining me tonight are Members of Congress from all across our great country who are deeply passionate about America's best interests and supportive of the President's decision to decertify the Iran nuclear deal.

At this time, it is my great pleasure to welcome the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. JOE WILSON, a leader on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and throughout all of Congress, who oftentimes has been to the Middle East, who is a grandson of a veteran, a son of a veteran, and a proud father of four veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ZELDIN for his leadership. We sincerely appreciate his leadership for American families, particularly based on his service in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1983, an otherwise peaceful Sunday morning in Beirut, Lebanon, there was, tragically, a disruption of a suicide truck bomb that crashed into the Marine Corps barracks, killing 241 courageous U.S. Marines. This was the deadliest attack, 21,000 pounds of TNT, since the U.S. Marines were in the Battle of Iwo Jima. Investigators determined that Hezbollah, an Iran-backed terrorist organization that has targeted America and our allies for decades, was responsible for the attack.

The 34th anniversary of the Beirut attack serves as a solemn reminder that we have a responsibility to defeat Hezbollah and radical Islamic terrorists across the globe, many of whom

are financed by Iran, all the way from Niger to the Philippines. It is important that we defeat the terrorists overseas to protect American families at home.

President Donald Trump's decision to decertify the Iranian deal was correct. President Trump is protecting American families. The deal was reckless and dangerous from the start; it never served the interests of American families; and it threatened the safety and security of America and our allies in the region, from Israel to southeastern Europe, Greece, Bulgaria, and Romania.

I am grateful to join Members of the House, especially my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in promoting the fight against global terrorism. This includes tougher sanctions like those being considered by the House that target Hezbollah and its financiers in Tehran, and it includes working together with President Trump's administration that is committed to peace through strength.

I am grateful to thank Congressman LEE ZELDIN from New York, an appreciated Iraq veteran, for his leadership and for being firm with the Iranian regime, which subjugates its extraordinary people.

As the father of four sons who have served our country overseas, I want to say once again: God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman WILSON for his continued leadership.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to bring up a freshman from Tennessee's Eighth Congressional district, DAVID KUSTOFF. Last Congress, I had the privilege of being both the lowest-ranking Jewish Republican in Congress and the highest-ranking Jewish Republican in Congress. But now that we have DAVID KUSTOFF from Tennessee here, we voted for each other to chair the Jewish Republican Caucus of two, and 1 day we may have a minion. These are our dreams that someday may come true.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ZELDIN for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the President's decision to decertify the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or what is known as the Iran deal.

This deeply-flawed Iran deal has failed to prevent the Iranian regime from ballistic missile testing and overall hostility that threatens American national security interests. Quite frankly, this was a bad idea from day one.

Most recently, on September 23, 2017, Iran test-fired a new long-range missile that could carry multiple warheads,

and is the country's third test of a missile with a range of approximately 1,240 miles.

An Iranian news agency further stated how this missile "adds to Israel's misery and will be their nightmare."

As we have seen, Iran continues to be the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, and the IRGC has known connections to Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza.

Over these past few years, we have seen these terrorist proxy groups carry out attacks on American troops and innocent Israeli civilians. In addition, Iran has gained access to over \$100 billion in previously frozen assets, enabling the money to be funneled to various terrorist organizations.

From the frequent ballistic missile tests to supporting terrorism and funding proxies, such as Lebanon, Syria, and Yemen, Iran has escalated its aggressive behavior since the deal was signed just 2 years ago.

Ultimately, this deal temporarily pushes back Iran's ability to build up its nuclear infrastructure and does not cease the Iranian regime's ambition to become nuclear after 15 years. The bad deal, therefore, ushers Iran into a nuclear club, where it can continue to test uranium pathways and pursue illicit nuclear materials, unbeknownst to the IAEA.

President Obama entered that poorly crafted agreement using unilateral executive authority, quite frankly, circumventing the consent of Congress and disregarding the will of the American people. As we have seen, this was clearly a bad deal from day one. It does not stop Iran's path to obtaining a nuclear weapon, but, rather, paves it.

As we work in Congress to implement further sanctions against the Iranian regime, we must work toward a strategy that protects our allies in the Middle East and effectively prevents Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. We must remain vigilant against those who wish to inflict harm on America, and stand united with our allies around the world.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Congressman ZELDIN for his leadership.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KUSTOFF for his important, insightful words.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to introduce the gentleman from Florida's Third Congressional District. He is an important voice on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, very learned on these issues related to Iran and the Middle Eastern region especially, and a great Member here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of Mr. ZELDIN and I appreciate him using that word "learned." It feels good.

You know, this is an interesting thing, because I was there during the

time that John Kerry and the President were negotiating this deal.

Keep in mind, this is a deal that John Kerry and the President agreed to, but nobody signed. We didn't sign it, our Senate never voted on it, and Iran didn't sign it. So this is a deal in paper only that nobody has signed. If you were to do any business transaction in the real world, this piece of paper would be worthless.

I want to mention words of one of our previous Presidents. It has been about 60 years after President Dwight Eisenhower announced that Atoms for Peace Program, and one lesson is clear: "Civilian nuclear programs flourish only through cooperation and openness. Secrecy and isolation typically are signs of a nuclear weapons program."

So here we are. I have in front of me the Institute for Science and International Security, August 31, 2017, and in the introduction, it says: "One of the most serious compliance issues concerns the IAEA's access to military sites and credible verification of Section T, which prohibits key nuclear weapons development activities and controls dual-use equipment potentially usable in such activities. In this report, the issue of verifying Section T is discussed. The absence of credible implementation and verification of Section T undermines the effectiveness of the JCPOA."

My colleague, Mr. ZELDIN, brought up that we know they are using IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges. We know they have the carbon fibers that they are not supposed to have. We also know that they have overproduced heavy water more than two times. The first time, we bought it at the American taxpayers' expense. The other two times, it has gone to Russia. The only reason you would have an excess of heavy water is if you are producing nuclear fissile material.

In addition to that, the heavy water—the inspections that we are supposed to do anytime, anywhere,—John Kerry said this over and over—anytime, anywhere, that we can go, and if they are noncompliant, the sanctions will snap back. They must have used an overstretched rubber band because nothing has ever snapped back.

With the IAEA supposedly being able to inspect anywhere, there are so many places that are off limits. It is only those areas that Iran says that we can go in and inspect. Parchin military site is a place that we know they detonated a nuclear trigger. We have not been able to go in there and check the soil. Yet we have to accept their word that they are checking the soil.

I brought this up in the committee, and I am going to repeat it here. It would be like having a drug addict testing his own urine sample and taking it to the lab. It is just not the way to do business in the 21st century on something that is so important.

During that time, when we negotiated or when the deal was being negotiated, there was an intelligence report—I don't know if you were in the Congress then, but there was an intelligence report that had always had Iran as a state sponsor of terror. The year this deal was done, state sponsor of terror was taken off. And when we questioned about it, they said it was an oversight. This deal just stinks from the beginning.

John Kerry said: No deal is better than a bad deal.

This is a bad deal. The President should decertify it. It does not take us out of the deal, but it allows us to put the pressure back on Iran so that they are fully compliant with the letter of the law.

If we don't hold up people to the letter of the law as we move forward in future negotiations, i.e., North Korea, why should they follow the letter of the law?

So this is high time that we do this. I appreciate it, and I thank the gentleman for doing this.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman YOHO brings up some very important points. The Iran nuclear deal was an unsigned political commitment. Those were the words that were given to us by the administration, and to think that we wouldn't have even asked for a signature on something so important was foolish.

The next speaker tonight in this important Special Order in support of President Trump's decision to decertify the Iran nuclear deal and the need to address Iran's other problematic nuclear and non-nuclear activities is a freshman from my home State of New York, someone I served with in the New York State Legislature, and we are really excited to have her here serving with us in the Halls of Congress. She has hit the ground running and is very passionate about our military, our veterans, and also especially why we are here tonight, the path forward with regards to Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York's 22nd Congressional District (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Congressman ZELDIN. Obviously, we, from New York, all are so proud for his service as an Iraq veteran, and also for his leadership in serving both in the State Senate and also representing our great State in the House of Representatives on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, on October 13, President Trump made the informed decision to decertify the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the JCPOA—or I am going to refer to it as the Iran nuclear deal—and to develop, for the first time, a holistic strategy to address the Iranian menace. I applaud this sound choice, which prioritizes the safety and security of our citizens and the American homeland.

Predictably, the flawed deal with Iran has done nothing to stem that rogue nation's aggression and misbehavior domestically, in the Middle East, and throughout the globe. Quite to the contrary, by front-loading the benefits to Iran, the Iran nuclear deal is funding these destabilizing and dangerous activities.

Human rights abuses continue against the Iranian people as citizens who dare to speak out against the oppressive regime face imprisonment or abuse. Supporters of the Iran nuclear deal told the American people that this deal would lead to a more open Iran, with a renewed acceptance of diverse voices and opinions from within.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, there have been already over 450 executions in Iran this year alone. Obviously, the so-called moderates within the regime with whom we negotiated the Iran nuclear deal either aren't as moderate as we thought or are simply irrelevant in this regime.

The American people were told further that the Iran nuclear deal would bring Iran into the fold and make the nation a more productive, contributing member of the international community.

Sadly, but not surprisingly, Iran's transgressions in the region continue to be appalling. The Iranian regime is expanding its malicious network of control through increased financial and military support for terrorist organizations, including Hezbollah and Hamas.

In Syria, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps has provided fighters and expertise to the brutal Assad regime that gases and brutalizes its own citizens. Iran has shown no signs that it is interested in pursuing peace or even curbing its malevolent behaviors. Chants of "death to America and "death to Israel" continue as Iran rapidly develops its missile program and engages in proxy conflicts with the U.S. and our allies.

I thank the President and my colleagues, as I indicated, especially Congressman LEE ZELDIN from New York, for continuing to shine the light on this important national security issue.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TENNEY for being here, for her remarks this evening, and for her leadership on this important deal.

It is my pleasure at this time to yield to Congressman ANDY BARR, who is a leader on the House Financial Services Committee. He has been very active in the efforts as it relates to sanctions. It is also important to note that it was sanctions that brought the Iranians to the table, and applied an incredible amount of economic pressure.

The Iranian regime that is in charge desperately needed relief in order to get through their next election, and now the Iranians have had an opportunity to experience life with that

sanctions regime and life without it. Chairman BARR is a very important voice here in the Halls of Congress for ensuring the right leverage is on the table to deal with Iran's nuclear and non-nuclear activities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ZELDIN for his leadership on this issue; his voice in criticism of this flawed nuclear deal with Iran; and, of course, for his valiant service to the United States in the military.

I rise tonight in strong support of the President's decision to decertify this deeply flawed JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal under the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I agree with the President's finding that Iran is not transparently, not verifiably, and not fully implementing the agreement. I agree with the President's finding that continued sanctions relief is not in the vital security interest of the United States.

That is because the Obama administration's nuclear deal with Iran was a dangerous and historic mistake. The deal provided the mullahs in Tehran with roughly \$100 billion in upfront sanctions relief in exchange for Iran's promise, future promise, to temporarily pause its enrichment program.

Unfortunately, the agreement contained fatally deficient verification protocols and the International Atomic Energy Agency now concedes that it has no capacity to verify that Tehran is engaged in activities which could contribute to the development of a nuclear explosive device. That is because under the terms of the agreement, the very terms of the JCPOA, international inspectors are barred from accessing Iran's military sites where illicit nuclear activities are most likely taking place.

President Obama's promise that there would be "anytime, anywhere inspections," but that promise was replaced with "managed access" to suspect nuclear sites in which international inspectors must appeal to Iran, Russia, and China in a bureaucratic process that would take days during which Iran could remove anything covert and in violation of the agreement.

As Congressman ZELDIN correctly pointed out, we don't even know what the verification protocols actually are because we haven't been able to access the secret agreement between international inspectors, non-U.S. inspectors, and the leadership in Tehran.

But the most serious concern is not that Iran would cheat. It is that even if Iran is fully complying with this agreement, bad outcomes are guaranteed. First, Iran will be allowed an arsenal of nuclear weapons in as little as 10 years. Under the very terms of this agreement, Iran was not denied a nuclear weapon. The path was paved for Iran to

have an arsenal of nuclear weapons with international sanction.

Iran was not required to dismantle key bomb-making technology. It was permitted to retain vast enrichment capacity, and it was allowed to continue research and development on advanced centrifuges, and it will be allowed to continue to acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles. Intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Why do you need intercontinental ballistic missiles if you have peaceful designs for your nuclear program?

Those of you who are listening at home across America, remember this: an intercontinental ballistic missile is not a missile designed for Tel Aviv. An intercontinental ballistic missile is designed for New York City; for Washington, D.C.; for Atlanta, Georgia; for Los Angeles, California; and for Seattle, Washington; and for Chicago.

Our homeland security has been jeopardized because of this fatally flawed agreement. Iran will receive a sanctions relief jackpot. They have already received upwards of \$100 billion so far. In my capacity as the chairman of the subcommittee that oversees sanctions, oversees the Treasury Department's implementation of sanctions, I can say that we have heard it. We have heard the reporting that, as a result of this agreement, Iran has not become pacified. Iran has actually accelerated its support for terrorist proxies in Lebanon, Gaza, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and Nigeria. Because Iran's neighbors know that this deal reverses a decades-long bipartisan policy blocking Iran's nuclear program, this agreement continues to risk a nuclear arms race in the broader Middle East.

They are apologists. There are defenders of the Iran nuclear deal, and they say it is working. They say there is evidence of dismantling of the nuclear program, but we have the benefit of almost 2 years of implementation of the deal. We have the benefit of hindsight to see if this deal is actually working.

Here are the facts. The facts are that since the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action was implemented in January of 2016, Iran has continued to sponsor Hezbollah and other radical terrorist militias in the region. Its support for the Assad regime alone, including the use of planes to airlift military supplies, has helped claim an estimated 400 lives. Last April, even President Obama suggested that the Iranians were violating the spirit of the deal by engaging in these activities.

Rather than being deterred, in October, Iran sentenced three Americans to long prison terms on bogus charges. In January of this year, the country tested a ballistic missile in violation of U.N. Security Council resolution 2231. In April, just as a commercial airline manufacturer was announcing new sales to Iran as a result of the sanc-

tions relief under the JCPOA, we learned that dozens of Syrian civilians, including at least 11 children, were gassed in an Iranian-supported chemical weapons attack.

Additionally, Iran has stated that it will no longer permit inspections of its military bases. It continues to attempt to intimidate our allies, and is facilitating the imports and exports of arms.

As of February 2017, Iran has fired as many as 14 ballistic missiles, and the leaders of Iran continue to chant "death to America," and pledge to wipe Israel off the face of the planet.

So where do we go from here?

As the chairman of the subcommittee that oversees enforcement of sanctions, we have been working on additional measures that can be taken, including non-nuclear sanctions consistent with the JCPOA to hold Iran accountable for its malign activities.

On April 4, we held a hearing on the effectiveness of non-nuclear sanctions against Iran, where we determined that Iran Air, a state-owned commercial airline, has used its aircraft to transport fighters and weapons throughout the Middle East on behalf of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corp. As a result of these findings, I wrote a letter to Treasury Secretary Mnuchin urging him to ban the sale of commercial aircraft to Iran Air.

Similarly, I supported two appropriations amendments that would prevent the sale of aircraft to Iran and prohibit U.S. firms from financing such a sale.

Finally, I recently drafted a letter to the Treasury Department urging it to identify all entities it believes to have transacted business with the IRGC, a precursor to possible additional secondary sanctions.

These actions are all important and relevant in the aftermath of the President's correct decision to decertify the deal because it invites Congress to step in and offer constructive recommendations on how to address the flaws, the fatal flaws, in the JCPOA. These are some of those recommendations to the administration, and we hope the Treasury Department will respond accordingly.

Going forward, we must do the following to stem Iran's nuclear ambitions: We must designate the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization. We must make permanent the sunset clauses on Iran's nuclear program and testing. This cannot be temporary prohibition of the Iran nuclear program. This must be a permanent ban on Iran ever having nuclear weapons capability and the capability of delivering those weapons.

Finally, we need to do a better job strengthening the agreement, revising the agreement, scrapping the old agreement, and actually getting to anytime, anywhere inspections. That means we have got to work with the P5+1 and our European allies to revise the JCPOA so that we mandate anytime, anywhere

inspections of nuclear facilities, and so that we are guaranteed that the IAEA, that international and U.S. inspectors have access to all suspected sites within the territorial boundaries of Iran.

In conclusion, I want to thank Congressman ZELDIN for the Special Order. I want to thank President Trump and his administration for their leadership on stopping Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons, and for the important national security imperative of revisiting this flawed Iran nuclear deal so that we can actually achieve peace in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we thank Congressman ZELDIN for his leadership in pursuing this very important objective.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. Certainly in the days, the weeks, the months that are ahead, many throughout our country will be leaning on his leadership as we discuss the path forward as far as sanctions and the right way to reestablish the leverage that brought the Iranians to the table in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROKITA is a strong voice in ensuring that America has a strong but effective foreign policy, one that makes sure that our military is always set up for success, our veterans are taken care of when they come home. As I mentioned earlier, as I was introducing Congresswoman TENNEY, part of that effort, certainly is ensuring the right path forward as it relates to Iran.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), from Indiana's Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding and for hosting this Special Order. In my humble opinion, the people of New York are lucky to have a gentleman like him representing them; and I know it is the highest honor of his life as well.

I also want to associate with my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), for the remarks he made. I think he has made an excellent record of not only the premise of the deal, but the effect of the deal so far.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York that Mr. BARR is going to be critical in leading the effort forward in sanctions, whether they are part of the JCPOA or not. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his words tonight as well.

Earlier this month, President Trump set a new direction for the United States, a direction of leadership. He made clear that we would no longer allow the Iranian Government to continue to pursue nuclear weapons, continue funding terrorism, or threaten the very existence of our great friend, Israel, the strongest ally we have in the region.

President Trump made clear that, unlike the previous administration, we

will not reward Iran for chanting "death to America," and we will not allow this terrorist regime to dictate our Nation's foreign policy.

Getting the Iran deal done was the only thing the previous administration cared about. Think about that, just getting the deal done. I think we all remember that sentiment around here: getting the deal done no matter how terrible was the only thing the previous administration cared about. We had to get the deal done. We had to get the deal done, as bad as it was.

□ 1930

It is unlike our current President who has demanded action to hold Iran accountable, guarantee our national security, and protect Israel and our allies across the world night and day. I appreciate the President's leadership on this and other matters.

The United States never should have signed onto the deal in the first place, Mr. Speaker, because it was a bad deal. It gave Iran immediate access to \$150 billion, it allowed the Iranians to continue their ballistic missile research, and it contains a sunset provision that will allow the Iranians to return immediately to enriching uranium without consequence.

Now, even then-Secretary of State John Kerry said: "Some of the \$150 billion will end up in the hands of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps or other entities, some of which are labeled terrorists."

That was our Secretary of State's direct quote admitting that some of this \$150 billion was going to get to terrorists.

There is no situation in which the United States should allow money to get to terrorists. Hoosiers that I represent see this quite clearly. Surely, the Americans that the rest of us represent see the same thing. But then-President Obama and Secretary Kerry allowed this to happen and were cheered on, in fact, by many in this very Chamber and many in the Senate.

This year alone, Iran has tested their ballistic missiles at least three times, and they tested a rocket space launch vehicle. Now, in their most recent test in September, they used a ballistic missile with the potential range to hit Israel, the only stable democracy in the region.

As Mr. BARR pointed out, Mr. Speaker, intercontinental ballistic missiles aren't even meant for Israel. They are meant to come here. They are meant to go to our other allies—a bad deal indeed.

The threats Iran poses are truly extreme: terrorists, a nuclear arms race, and continued threats to America and its neighbors. Unfortunately, we cannot go back in time and stop then-President Obama from signing this disastrous Iran nuclear deal—and, by the way, it is signing in the theoretical

sense because Mr. YOHO is also right, Mr. Speaker, when he said that this was a set of papers that truly had no signatories. It was an executive action by then-President Obama for sure. But, all in all, no matter what the semantics, it was a bad deal.

But we can—we can—move forward by creating tough sanctions like, Mr. Speaker, Mr. BARR was pointing out and making sure Iran is held accountable. That starts tonight with the work that LEE ZELDIN and other Members of Congress are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York again for yielding to me, and I thank him for his leadership. Mr. Speaker, let's get it right this time. Let's make sure Iran doesn't become the threat that the previous administration has allowed it to become.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ROKITA for being here and for his important words as well and for all of the Members who have spoken.

I recognize House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE, Congressman PETE ROSKAM, and former Congressman, now CIA Director, Mike Pompeo. These are some of the voices during the course of these last few years on this very important issue on the need to hold Iran accountable and to fight for the best possible agreement for the United States.

Over the course of tonight, we discussed what was in the JCPOA, and we discussed the JCPOA as far as what wasn't in it and some of the challenges that we have faced since the JCPOA has first been entered into.

We all want to deal with Iran's bad activities. We have to ask ourselves: How are we going to do that? What is the leverage that brought the Iranians to the table to negotiate the Iran nuclear deal? How do we get that leverage back?

Now, some people out there are saying that Iran is abiding by their word and that the United States would somehow be going back on our word by the President decertifying the Iran nuclear deal. We can have a discussion about what violates the spirit of the Iran nuclear deal.

We talked about Iran's other bad activities: their financing of terror, their overthrowing of foreign governments, illegally test-firing intercontinental ballistic missiles, holding Americans hostage, and publicly embarrassing American Navy sailors. We had to pay a ransom to get hostages back in January of 2016. They call Israel the Little Satan, America the Great Satan. They pledge to wipe Israel off the map. They chant "death to America." They are supporting Assad in Syria and Hezbollah.

What do we do to deal with Iran's nonnuclear bad activities? Right now we don't have the leverage to deal with that. We really needed to bring that to the table when we were sitting down

with Iran last time because, when you negotiate away the leverage that brings them to the table, what is left to deal with all of those activities that we would say violate the spirit of the JCPOA?

But people say that if the President decertifies the Iran nuclear deal, then that would mean that we are going back on our word and that Iran has been abiding by the deal. We cannot forget about all of the ways that Iran is violating the letter of the JCPOA.

Why is there no accountability in debate, as we know, that Iran spins more IR-6 centrifuges than they are permitted to under the JCPOA? Why aren't we talking about that?

Why aren't we saying that Iran is not following their word when they assemble more IR-8 rotor assemblies than they are allowed to under the JCPOA?

Why aren't we saying that Iran is not following through with their word as they attempt to purchase carbon fiber that they are not allowed to try to purchase under the JCPOA?

Why are we giving Iran a free pass?

Does the President's opposition despise him so much that they are willing to literally take Iran's side when Iran says that we will never be able to inspect any of their military sites?

Before, during, and after this deal, they said that we will never be able to inspect all their military sites. The Obama administration said we will inspect their military sites. So you have a material disagreement on this JCPOA, this Iran nuclear deal.

We said that sanctions were going to be phased in over time based on compliance. The Iranian regime said sanctions relief was going to be immediate, no suspension. But why are we not holding Iran to their word on the ways that they are violating the letter of the JCPOA?

Why is it that before implementation day when inspectors, the last time they got to Parchin and they found particles in the soil that are consistent with nuclear capability, and then after we discover those particles the Iranians say, "That is it. No more access to Parchin," why are we not saying that Iran is not following their commitments under the JCPOA? This is the letter of the JCPOA.

Now, it would be great if we can have a discussion here about what the verification regime is. I would love to read the deal between the IAEA and Iran. When I was at a House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing with then-Secretary of State John Kerry and I wanted to engage with him, have a conversation about what the verification agreement was, I was shocked that even he said that he hadn't read the verification regime between the IAEA and Iran. It really makes you scratch your head.

I asked the question here on the House floor last Congress while we

were debating the JCPOA. President Obama says that we are entering into the JCPOA not based on trust, but based on verification. So the question that I posed then, and I still haven't gotten an answer today, is: How do you support a deal based on verification without knowing what the verification is?

We are propping up the wrong regime. In 2009, during the Green Revolution, an undemocratic election, millions of Iranians went to the streets. These are people who go to the streets that right now there are people—millions of Iranians today—who would love a free, stable, democratic Iran. After an undemocratic election, they went to the streets. We said that it was none of our business.

Fast-forward years later, we are paying ransom of \$400 million that was disputed for good reason for decades, claims going both ways. There is a reason why that money wasn't paid out. There was a dispute, multiple claims, U.S. to Iran and Iran to the United States, and \$1.3 billion of interest. They said that it wasn't a ransom. \$1.7 billion in cold, hard cash in pallets that had to get delivered at the exact same moment of the American hostages—by the way, not all of them—at the exact same moment of the American hostages being released, and we are saying that that is not ransom.

That was a coincidence that we are signing documents in the middle of January on the same exact day within 24 hours of each other.

Now, after we provided a jackpot of sanctions relief in exchange for this very one-sided deal, there was an election. After that election in Iran, members of the American media and around the world said that this was evidence of progress in Iran that the most moderate candidates were elected.

But do you know what that completely ignores? The 12,000 most moderate candidates not being allowed access to the ballot. We are propping up the wrong regime.

After our American sailors were detained, held hostage, and embarrassed in videos and photography all around the world, we said, "Thank you." That was our response, "Thank you."

After all the concessions that were made as part of the JCPOA, our Secretary of State became president for the Tehran Chamber of Commerce, and here we are. Fast-forward to today, and everyone who wants to see this President fail will stand with Iran before they would stand with the United States. They will ignore Iran's violating the spirit of the JCPOA. They will turn a blind eye with their head in the sand over Iran's violating the letter of the JCPOA.

Mr. Speaker, we gathered here this evening to talk about the President's correct decision to decertify the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear agreement,

and to talk about the need to eliminate Iran's very problematic nuclear and nonnuclear activities. We heard from a half dozen other Members of Congress: Congressman JOE WILSON of South Carolina's 2nd Congressional District, DAVID KUSTOFF of Tennessee's 8th Congressional District, Congressman TED Yoho of Florida's 3rd Congressional District, Congresswoman CLAUDIA TENNEY of New York's 22nd Congressional District, Congressman ANDY BARR of Kentucky's 6th Congressional District, and Congressman TODD ROKITA of Indiana's 4th Congressional District. I thank them, and I thank all of my colleagues for their leadership on this issue.

There is important work ahead. There really should be more Members on both sides of the aisle working together on behalf of the American people putting country first on this issue.

People since the election pledged to entirely oppose and obstruct this President on everything and anything. While the President's hand was on the Bible, the streets of the parade route were lined up with people holding up signs that said "impeach him now"—while his hand was on the Bible.

□ 1945

Last November, Americans all around this country elected a President whose hand was on the Bible, yet people are calling for his impeachment just for the fact he got elected. Every day we are here, we have Members who come to the floor doing whatever they can in any way that day, that minute, to try to tear the President down.

I had disagreements with President Obama, but he was my President. We disagreed on the Iran nuclear deal. That is okay. We can disagree. We should disagree with President Trump, President Obama, President Bush before that, when we have strong philosophical differences on policy. That is what we are elected to do. We are not elected to all just come here and agree with each other.

But for those who are so set politically on trying to bring this President down, so much so that they will take Iran's side in this over the United States' side, I encourage you to rethink that and put country over party, because we need to work together as colleagues representing the greatest country in the world on a better path forward.

It is a privilege for all of us to be able to serve here in the United States Capitol in the United States Congress, because there is so much history on this floor. There is going to be much debate ahead on what challenges lie ahead for us with regard to Iran.

With servicemembers in harm's way, we understand and we reflect that that is what is most important. We should never send our troops into harm's way unless they are sent to win. We send

our troops to win, or we do not send them at all. When they come home, they are treated with the love, dignity, and respect that they deserve on behalf of a very grateful nation; and with a strong, consistent foreign policy and taking care of our vets and setting up our military for success. It is having the right foreign policy with challenges that are in front of us in the Middle East and elsewhere.

That is why we are here for this Special Order hour in support of the President's decision to decertify the Iran nuclear deal. Mr. President, you made the right decision. We stand with you. We stand with the United States. We want to hold Iran accountable. We want the best path forward for our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: AMERICAN IDEALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak. I want to start by saying that my colleague from North Carolina is here, and I know there is going to be a group of Members from North Carolina who are coming to address their constituents. So if you are a North Carolinian looking in on this, you have come to the right place, but you are going to have to hear me first. I am speaking on behalf of the Progressive Caucus.

I don't know if Representative ZELDIN is still in the room. I couldn't quite resist the opportunity to respond to his provocative remarks where he said that it appears there are people in Congress who are so determined to take the President down.

I couldn't really figure out who he was talking about. Then I realized he is probably referring to Republican Senator JOHN MCCAIN from Arizona, or maybe Republican Senator JEFF FLAKE from Arizona, or maybe Republican Senator BOB CORKER from Tennessee, all of whom have blown the whistle this week on the egregious violations of the basic norms of the Presidency by this President, who continues to demonize and vilify U.S. citizens and engage in the pettiest and most juvenile of exchanges with people and generally demonstrate what most Americans now regard as his unfitness for the Presidency.

So it seems like there was an attempt to make it a partisan issue. I think if he has got a partisan problem with what someone is saying about the President, he needs to talk to members of his own party who are the ones who

are screaming the loudest about the outrageous excesses and abuses coming from the White House today.

That is not what I came here to talk about, Mr. Speaker. I just thought it was a little bit beyond my humanity to endure that lecture, especially about impeachment, when the Representative comes from a party that impeached President Clinton over one lie—one lie about sex—and we get a profusion of dozens of lies every single day from the White House, from this President, about matters of public policy, crucial matters of national security, and so on.

That is not even to get into the question of admitted obstruction of justice, bragging about the fact that he had fired the FBI Director because he was involved in the Russia investigation; not even talking about the rampant abuse of power that we see as recent as this week with apparently corrupt dealings in terms of the Puerto Rican rescue, when 80 percent of the island is still without power, and it looks like there are all sorts of sweetheart contracts that are afoot there.

It is not even to go to the question of the domestic Emoluments Clause and the foreign Emoluments Clause, which are defied every single day with the money that is pouring forth from foreign governments directly to the Trump Hotel and Trump Tower and the Trump golf courses all over the world.

I am not going to get into any of that stuff because I want to talk about something hopeful and uplifting tonight. I want to talk about America's responsibilities in the world, something that we used to take really seriously.

I want to talk about what America is and who we are and what debt of responsibility we owe to the rest of the world and how well we are doing today, given what is taking place around the world.

Now, in America, unlike most countries in the world—or at least a lot of countries in the world—we are not defined by virtue of being one race or one ethnicity or one religion or one political party or one system of belief. We are unified just by virtue of the fact that we have one Constitution and one Bill of Rights. We all agree to adhere to it and live under it and struggle for a more perfect union under that umbrella.

Mr. Speaker, every day we get to come to work, and we see the busts and the statues and the portraits of great Americans. We see Frederick Douglass, we see Thomas Jefferson, we see John Adams, we see George Washington.

Mr. Speaker, America was the first Nation on Earth conceived in revolutionary insurgency against a monarchy, an arbitrary political leadership, and the fusion of church and State.

Our forebearers rebelled against centuries of religious warfare between the

Catholics and the Protestants every bit as vicious and bloody as what we see in the Muslim world today between the Sunni and the Shia. They rebelled against the idea that, as Tom Payne put it, the king is law. He said that in the democracies, law would be king.

That was the idea behind America. We would govern ourselves. As Jefferson put in the Declaration of Independence, all men are created equal, all of us are endowed with inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and government is legitimately erected only on the basis of the consent of the governed.

Now I hasten to say that all of those beautiful ideals were not realized at the start of our Nation. Let's not make-believe. Let's not pretend.

We didn't start, in the words of that great Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, as a nation of the people, by the people, and for the people. We started as a slave Republic of White male property owners over the age of 21, where the vast majority of people could not vote and could not participate: indentured servants, slaves, women, and so on.

But still, the idea was there, and those beautiful, tantalizing ideals were inserted by Thomas Jefferson, whose memory was defended recently by a group of hardy and defiant University of Virginia students who surrounded the statue of Thomas Jefferson to defend it against the rampaging mob of racist skinheads and Klansmen who had come to desecrate the memory of Jefferson and everything that he believed in with his ideals and the words that he put in the Declaration of Independence.

Those were the founding ideals of the country, and through successive waves of political and social struggle and constitutional change, we have opened America up. Through the Civil War and the Reconstruction amendments, we opened America up:

The 14th Amendment gave us equal protection and due process. The 13th Amendment abolished slavery. The 15th Amendment said no discrimination on the basis of race in voting. The 17th Amendment shifted the mode of election from the State legislatures to the people. The 19th Amendment gave us woman suffrage. The 23rd Amendment said people here in the District of Columbia could participate in Presidential elections. The 24th Amendment abolished poll taxes. The 26th Amendment lowered the age of voting to 18 all across the whole country.

The whole trajectory of our constitutional development has been towards greater equality and freedom for the American people. That is who we are. We are a nation that united with other nations around the world to defeat fascism, Nazism, Stalinism, communism, and totalitarianism in the last century. We did that.

We stood with Eleanor Roosevelt and the United Nations in proclaiming the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which enshrined the rights of freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press, taking all those rights and freedoms that we fought for in America that are in our Constitution and trying to make them a global ideal so that all of the people of the world could enjoy the fruits and the experience of liberal democracy.

When we stood at our best as a country, we have been on the side of freedom movements. We have been on the side of human rights. We have been on the side of victims of government authoritarianism and persecution. That is who we are as a country.

It is all being forgotten and frittered away with the chaos that has descended not just upon the White House—that is too easy, I would say to my dear friend Mr. ZELDIN—on this institution, on lots of institutions in Washington, D.C. We are forgetting who we are.

Tom Payne said America was a nation conceived as a haven of refuge for people fleeing from religious and political persecution from all over the world. That is why our great symbol has been the Statue of Liberty and not a 14th century wall and barbed wire. That is not the real symbol of America.

Now, we are living in a time of rising authoritarianism and tyranny all over the world, from Russia to Saudi Arabia to Hungary to the Philippines to Venezuela. You name it. Authoritarian states everywhere are cracking down on free speech and free press, jailing enemies of the states and journalists, persecuting citizens for their religious beliefs and denying the essential human rights that are encoded in our national DNA, in our Constitution, and in the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

While the White House and this administration have abandoned U.S. leadership for human rights, the governments of the world are stepping up their authoritarianism. In Burma, in Myanmar, the government is waging brutal ethnic and religious violence against Rohingya Muslims, thousands of whom have been killed and more than 100,000 of whom have fled the country, in terror.

Now, this savage campaign of ethnic cleansing in Burma by the Buddhist-led government is being turned on all Muslims in that country. And what is our government doing? Nothing.

In Turkey, which I will have a little bit more to say about in a moment, there is a vicious crackdown on free speech and free press, and the jailing of journalists and citizens without due process. In Russia, there continues to be outrageous human rights abuses against the personal political enemies

of Vladimir Putin; against the LGBT community, which continues to be reviled and demonized by the government. In Chechnya, there are campaigns against journalists, and so on. In the Philippines, President Duterte has overseen the killing of thousands of people in a brutal war on drugs, with no due process at all, where the police can simply declare that you look like a drug user, you look like a drug dealer, and then they can have you killed.

It is also in Venezuela, where Maduro has consolidated his power and is denying the rule of law at every turn; in Saudi Arabia; in Iran, which was mentioned before, with brutal campaigns against ethnic minorities—one of the leading administrators of capital punishment on Earth, fomenting terror abroad.

□ 2000

Saudi Arabia, which Freedom House calls among the worst of the worst, where torture is present, where women are victims of almost pervasive sex discrimination—I think just a couple of months ago they won a limited right to drive in 2017—and on and on.

And across the world, governments have passed laws against blasphemy, against heresy, against apostasy, against witchcraft, against sorcery, against all kinds of imaginary religious offenses which were wiped off of the books of our State laws centuries ago under the First Amendment, and yet there are people rotting in jail today because they belong to the wrong religious group and they are accused of blasphemy or apostasy in Iran or in Saudi Arabia or Bangladesh, or any other number of countries which use the tools of the state to oppress people because of their religious faith and their religious worship.

What does President Trump do? Well, he personally praised Rodrigo Duterte in the Philippines and invited him to come to America. His first state visit was to Saudi Arabia, where he publicly said that he was not going to take issue with anything that they were doing in terms of human rights, didn't speak about any of the people rotting in jail in Saudi Arabia in a way that completely violates the human rights understandings and norms of the world.

He has praised Erdogan in Turkey. And, of course, we know of his infamous and somewhat inscrutable relationship with Vladimir Putin, certainly has nothing to say about human rights violations taking place against Russians, tens of thousands of whom have summoned up the courage since the President took office to march in the streets against political corruption and for human rights. And our government does nothing to support the people in civil society in Russia who are trying to stand up for the idea of human rights in their country.

Trump says, when he goes to Saudi Arabia: We are not here to lecture. We must seek partners, not perfection.

And he has found those partners all over the world: Duterte in the Philippines, Putin in Russia, Orban in Hungary. On and on down the list, you find a despot, you find a tyrant, you find a kleptocrat and a bully, you have found a newfound buddy of the United States of America.

Now, over the summer, media outlets reported that the State Department wanted to drop the promotion of democracy and human rights from the Department's mission. The State Department has since eliminated the www.humanrights.gov website and moved its content to an alternative and more obscure web address.

In May of 2017, Secretary of State Tillerson reversed decades of bipartisan consensus that human rights and democracy are not only essential components of U.S. foreign policy and national security, but universal values that the U.S. has adopted as a guiding principle of international legitimacy. And, of course, everyone knows of President Trump's attempts to withdraw from treaties and agreements all over the world, including, of course, the Paris accord on climate change.

Now, all of these actions, all of these statements are a betrayal of who we are as a country. We are not defined by race. We are not defined by ideology, unlike other countries around the world. We are not defined by religion. We are defined by an idea of liberal democracy committed to equality and freedom for all. If we give that up and we surrender that, we surrender what is most precious and defining about the United States of America, Mr. Speaker.

And guess what. We have got human rights problems right here at home that we need to be dealing with.

Do you know we have millions of Americans who can't vote and are not represented in Congress? This anomaly was brought home to us in a very sharp way over the last several weeks with the crisis in Puerto Rico, where people still lack access to medicines that they need, where people—a majority of the population still lacks access to clean water, and power is out for four-fifths of the population. Those are our people. Those are our citizens. Those are Americans in Puerto Rico.

But why were they treated differently? Why was there this notorious negligence and lethargy in responding to the plight of people in Puerto Rico? Well, they have no voting representatives in this Chamber or in the United States Senate, so we have got millions of people unrepresented.

Right here in the Nation's Capital, in the District of Columbia, we see the exact same democratic deficit, the exact same discrepancy and discord between our values and our ideals and what the reality of daily practice is. We are the only democratic nation left on Earth where the people of the capital city are disenfranchised in their

national legislature. We are the only one.

I have only been in this body for 10 months, Mr. Speaker, but I have noted how frequently and how joyfully this body will rise to trample the local legislation adopted by people in the District of Columbia who can't fight back because they don't have voting representation in Congress, and so we are very happy to kick them around if they have got a different point of view on death with dignity. Of course, death with dignity in the District of Columbia should be of no concern to us. What should be of concern is life with democracy in the District of Columbia if we are going to be faithful to our ideals.

They get to decide, not us. But as long as they are excluded from representation in the national legislature, they are going to continue to be kicked around on questions of gay rights and whether or not poor women can be given full access to reproductive healthcare in the District of Columbia, another issue where the majority in this body decided to squash the political self-determination of more than 650,000 American citizens who live right here in the Nation's Capital.

We have got millions of people who are disenfranchised. That is a human rights problem. So we have got to deal with that. Maybe if America begins to stand up again for human rights around the world, we will begin to stand up again for human rights in our own country.

So this is not a partisan issue. Of course, one of our great leaders in the advancement of human rights in America was President Abraham Lincoln, a great Republican, and his friend Frederick Douglass, a great Republican. I take pride in that. I take pride in the Republicans who fought for freedom and democracy in America. They are as much a part of my legacy as great Democrats like Franklin D. Roosevelt or President Barack Obama, the people who fought for civil rights and civil liberties in my party. So we should cherish everybody in our history who moved forward the engines of freedom and democratic change in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say these are tough times in America. There is a lot of chaos that has descended upon our country, and, Mr. Speaker, we need all Americans to know, but especially young Americans to know, what we really stand for.

We have a claim, a very strong claim to being the greatest nation on Earth, and it has got nothing to do with the military, and it has got nothing to do with our GDP. It has got to do with the way we were created, what our founding ideals were, and then the commitment of the people always to try to realize those ideals and engender a more perfect Union as we go along.

Let's keep America moving in that direction so we will continue to be a

beacon of light to oppressed people all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GENERAL BAPTIST STATE CONVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize the General Baptist State Convention of North Carolina on the occasion of its 150th anniversary. The story of this great Baptist convention is a testament to its founders, Reverends William Warrick, Edward Eagles, C. Johnson, L.W. Boone, B.B. Spicer, H. Grimes, John Washington, Charles Bryant, Sutton Davis, and R.H. Harper, the visionary men who founded the convention on October 18, 1867.

Since its founding, Mr. Speaker, great men and great women have maintained the convention's strength and viability. The General Baptist State Convention is the oldest convention of African-American Baptists in the United States of America. The General Baptist State Convention consists of more than 500,000 Baptist believers belonging to more than 1,400 churches, including my home church, the Jackson Chapel First Missionary Baptist Church of Wilson.

The convention is subdivided into 58 associations, each presided over by a moderator. Over the last 150 years, the convention has been led by well-trained and spirit-led theologians. The current president and executive board chair is my friend Dr. Nilous M. Avery, II, of Salisbury, North Carolina. He is the 32nd president of the convention.

Mr. Speaker, the current officers of the convention are: First Vice President At Large, Dr. Leonzo Lynch; First Vice President, Dr. Ricky Banks; Second Vice President, Dr. J. Vincent Terry, Sr.; Third Vice President, Reverend O.D. Sykes; Fourth Vice President, Reverend Prince R. Rivers; Recording Secretary, Reverend Curtis O. Donald; Assistant Recording Secretary, Reverend Matthew Rouse, III; Statistician, Dr. Nathan Scovens; Parliamentarian, Reverend Reginald Wells. The Historian is Dr. Harry L. White, and the hardworking Executive Secretary-Treasurer is Dr. Haywood T. Gray.

Mr. Speaker, the Black church in North Carolina did not begin at the end of slavery. It became more pronounced and more transparent at slavery's end, but it existed for many years prior to the end of slavery.

In 1831, the North Carolina General Assembly passed a law making it a crime for any free person of color or slave to preach or exhort in public, or in any manner officiate as a preacher or a teacher in any prayer meeting or other association for worship where slaves of different families were collected together.

Can you imagine?

The punishment for preaching the gospel—beginning in 1831, it was a crime. The punishment for violation was a whipping of up to 39 lashes on the bare back.

Notwithstanding this prohibition against preaching, the Black church existed as a secret association of slaves who worshipped privately. As the antebellum period proceeded, a few of the White churches, at the urging of the North Carolina Baptist State Convention, finally allowed people of color to hold church meetings under the supervision of a White person; and, at times, a member of the White race would conduct the service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Emancipation Proclamation was signed on January 1, 1863, and the 13th Amendment ratified on December 6, 1865, there were 4 million slaves who obtained their freedom; 300,000 of those lived in North Carolina. The former slaves, with assistance from White northerners and the Freedmen's Bureau, began the struggle toward freedom and equality. It was the Black church that led the way. This movement consisted of Black Baptist leaders and Black Methodist leaders and other religious leaders, both Black and White, who understood the importance of the former slaves having the ability to worship and serve their God without fear.

□ 2015

At the end of the Civil War, the former slaves built churches throughout North Carolina. Many were of the Baptist denomination, and they were erected with lightning speed.

In 1867, they came together, Mr. Speaker, at First African Baptist Church in Goldsboro, North Carolina. And I have a picture of it on display. They came together at the First African Baptist Church in Goldsboro to form the General Association of Colored Baptists of North Carolina, which was the original name for the convention. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that my grandfather, Reverend Fred Davis, would, in 1916, become the fourth pastor of this church.

Not only did Black Baptists build churches, but one of their greatest achievements was the establishment and maintenance of historic Shaw University in Raleigh, which will be discussed by my colleagues, Congressman DAVID PRICE and Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS, in just a moment. Shaw University's contribution to African-

American empowerment must be known and understood by all North Carolinians.

Those pioneers, who were trained at Shaw University, went into communities and established institutions and engaged in professions that empowered future generations. They went to all corners of our State. They went to eastern North Carolina; Piedmont, North Carolina; Triad; and the Federal area, which is where our esteemed sergeant at arms grew up in, Ms. Hamlett. Ms. Joyce Hamlett grew up in the Federal area. There were many other areas that were covered by graduates from Shaw University.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to include in the RECORD a list of names of African-American physicians, dentists, pharmacists, lawyers, ministers, and teachers who were also trained at Shaw University.

PRESIDENTS OF THE GENERAL BAPTIST STATE CONVENTION OF NORTH CAROLINA (1867–2018)

William Warrick 1867–1869
A. B. Williams 1869–1872
E. Eagles 1872–1874
L. W. Boon 1874–1875
Joseph Baysmore 1875–1876
Caesar Johnson 1876–1882
Joshua Perry 1882–1884
Caesar Johnson 1884–1885
N. F. Roberts 1885–1889
A. W. Pegues 1889–1895
C. S. Brown 1895–1897
Augustus Shepard 1897–1911
B. D. Griffin 1911–1918
O. S. Bullock 1918–1924
J. S. Brown 1924–1928
R. R. Cartwright 1928–1932
J. T. Hairston 1932–1940
P. A. Bishop 1940–1958
W. H. Davidson 1958–1959
R. M. Pitts 1959–1964
John W. White 1964–1970
Chancy R. Edwards 1970–1974
Joy J. Johnson 1974–1978
John R. Manley 1978–1982
E. Burns Turner 1982–1986
J. B. Humphrey 1986–1990
Willie B. Lewis 1990–1994
Clifford A. Jones, Sr. 1994–1998
John D. Fuller, Sr. 1998–2002
Charles T. Bullock 2002–2006
Gregory K. Moss, Sr. 2006–2010
Howard W. Parker, Jr. 2010–2014
Nilous M. Avery, II 2014–2018

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a former Bennett College professor.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 150th anniversary of the General Baptist State Convention of North Carolina and join my colleagues, Congressman BUTTERFIELD and Congressman PRICE, in congratulating them on their achievements and the appointment of their 32nd president, Dr. Avery.

In North Carolina, the convention partners with Shaw University, the oldest Historically Black University in the South and one of the oldest in the Nation.

As a retired professor, as you heard, of 40 years from Bennett College in

Greensboro, founder of the Congressional Bipartisan HBCU Caucus, and a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee here in the Congress, it gives me great pride to reflect on the general support that the convention gives to Shaw and its students.

I feel a special attachment to Shaw, since that is what became my alma mater. North Carolina A&T State University was located on Shaw's campus during its first year. Its history of leadership, activism, and service is well-documented. The Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, founded on Shaw's campus in 1960, and the Center for Alternative Programs in Education—CAPE—had its beginnings there in 1980.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ADAMS for those enlightening remarks and for her extraordinary leadership not only here in Congress, but for 40 years that she spent in the classroom at Bennett College. She has been a trailblazer for sure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who also is a former college professor, who represents the Fourth Congressional District. I thank him for joining us tonight.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I commend him for taking up this Special Order and giving Representative ADAMS and myself the opportunity to participate and to pay tribute to the General Baptist State Convention.

The mention of Shaw University brings me to my feet because I, too, want to reflect on this significant Baptist institution, which is in the Fourth Congressional District, in downtown Raleigh.

Shaw has also recently celebrated its 150th anniversary, a history that parallels that of the General Baptist State Convention.

I was there last week in historic Estey Hall. I have to say—yes, point out the historic building there on the campus—when I first came to the Congress in the 1980s, my first appropriations earmark was for Estey Hall. Believe me, that was just a little bit of seed money. But Shaw has restored that building in a beautiful way. The acting President of Shaw, Dr. Paulette Dillard, is doing a wonderful job of leading that university.

But the occasion last week was an inaugural lecture. The Adam Clayton Powell-Ella Baker lecture is going to be an annual occasion at Shaw. I was honored to give that lecture to a very lively group of students and faculty. Then we had a luncheon in Estey Hall afterwards and a great discussion, just liberal arts education at its best. I appreciated being part of that occasion, and I certainly, over the years, have come to appreciate what Shaw means:

a Baptist institution. It is tied very, very closely. Shaw University Divinity School is affiliated—an institution that this convention has nurtured and that, in turn, has served thousands of people, and enriched the life of North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman PRICE very much for those words, I thank him for his leadership and his relationship with Shaw University, and I especially thank him for mentioning Estey Hall.

For many of us, who have grown up in North Carolina, we know the relevance and the importance of Shaw University. We know how Shaw University trained many hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals, who came into communities all across North Carolina and made a difference. They came into the classroom, and they taught at elementary schools and high schools all across our State. They went onto college campuses and became college professors. Many of them became lawyers because Shaw University had a law school during those days. Some became physicians and dentists. Some became pharmacists.

Shaw University was a real educational engine not just in North Carolina, but throughout the country, during those very difficult days. And I say all that to say that it was the General Baptist State Convention and its predecessor that helped enable Shaw University to be born. Shaw University has done so much for so many.

I recall, as a child, my parents would tell me that they, too, attended Shaw University. My dad went to Shaw University from 1919 to 1923. My mother attended Shaw University for high school. During those days, African Americans did not have the benefit in most communities of a high school education and so many of the young teens would go to Shaw for high school. It was there at Shaw University that my parents met. My dad was in undergraduate school, my mother was in the high school, and they met right on the porch of Estey Hall back in 1919.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Price and Dr. Adams for raising up Shaw University and just telling the world what the General Baptist State Convention did by creating the environment where Shaw University could thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I thank both of them for coming to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for any concluding remarks.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BUTTERFIELD for yielding.

I just wanted to add that he was almost a Shaw Bear with his parents attending there. Just last year, I had the opportunity to address Founder's Day to all of the students there.

Many firsts Shaw boasts: the first college in the Nation to offer a 4-year

medical program, the first Historically Black College in the Nation to open its doors to women, and the first Historically Black College in North Carolina to be granted an "A" rating by the State Department of Public Instruction.

Over the years, as Mr. BUTTERFIELD has said, many scholarships have been provided to those students. They have encouraged the students to not only attend their divinity school, but we find that many of them have become college presidents: the founder of North Carolina Central, the first President of Elizabeth City State, and North Carolina A&T State University were all Shaw Bears, and we are delighted. So the lives that the General Baptist State Convention has touched throughout its existence is beyond admirable and almost beyond comprehension.

I want to close by saying that W.E.B. Du Bois reminded us that of all the civil rights of which the world has fought for for 500 years, the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental.

So I praise the General Baptist State Convention and its commitment to education, and Shaw University, as well, for their charitable giving and for their dedication to educating young people through these 150 years, a century and five decades.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Very well said, Congresswoman ADAMS.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for any concluding remarks.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for this opportunity.

I would like to conclude by reflecting on some of the outstanding pastors who have led this convention and led the congregations that comprise this convention. I hesitate to name any because there are so many who have served so faithfully and so well.

But I want to share some memories, and I think our listeners in North Carolina will remember these as well. They exemplify what this convention has been all about and the leadership it has offered.

Dr. Charles Ward, for example, long-term pastor of the First Baptist Church in Raleigh, a civil rights leader, a mentor to so many people over the years, and a revered pastor. I remember him so well as I first began to think about running for Congress and sought his counsel. He unfailingly gave wise counsel and encouragement. He, of course, was a leader in the General Baptist State Convention.

Reverend Lorenzo Lynch, from Durham, North Carolina, another former leader of the convention. His son, Leonzo, is now the vice president of the convention. Leonzo Lynch is a powerful prophetic preacher. He had a huge impact on the city of Durham. The Durham Committee on the Affairs of

Black People recently honored his lifetime achievements. And his daughter, former Attorney General Loretta Lynch, returned to Durham to be part of that recognition.

I think of C.R. Edwards, former president of the convention, pastor for so many years at the First Baptist Church of Fayetteville, a long-term leader of the North Carolina General Assembly, and special assistant to North Carolina's Governors. Again, a mentor, a wise man, someone who was a good man and who knew how to bring out the best in others.

I think of W.B. Lewis, who recently passed away, another former president of the convention. He was pastor for a long time of the—I say a long time—decades upon decades of the First Cosmopolitan Baptist Church in Raleigh. He was a pioneer in figuring out how to work with the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development to form a nonprofit corporation to build affordable housing, which, to this day, stands in Raleigh—rental housing for the elderly.

Finally, I think of John R. Manley, 60-plus years as pastor of First Baptist Church in Chapel Hill, a dear friend of mine. Another former president of the convention, by the way. This was a pattern for these leading pastors to offer that kind of State leadership, as they were offering local leadership. John Manley also was a champion of housing. Manley Estates stands right there in that community. I know how hard John Manley worked on that because we worked together. We have this housing in the community because of his vision.

I can go on and on. But this is such an impressive honor roll of leaders—pastors—who have not only led their flocks, but they have led the State and, in many cases, national religious organizations.

The General Baptist State Convention has enabled millions of people over these years to deepen their faith and to express that faith in ministering to those whom Jesus called, "the least of these," and to advance the struggle for justice in this country.

So I am proud to join my colleagues in this tribute tonight. And I say to the General Baptist State Convention of North Carolina that many faithful members of the congregations, the leaders, may you go from strength to strength, and may you continue to approach the gospel powerfully and be a force for good and justice and right in our community.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as I was listening to Congressman PRICE a moment ago recite the names of those great men who have led the General

Baptist State Convention, I could not help but to think that I, too, remember all of them. And then I glanced down at the list of presidents that I am going to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in just a few moments from now, and there have been 32 men who have served as presidents of this great convention, and I have had the privilege of knowing 12 of them.

□ 2030

I did not realize that until I actually pulled out the list and started counting: C.R. Edwards, who Mr. PRICE recognized a moment ago; Joy Johnson; John Manley; E.B. Turner; J.B. Humphrey; W.B. Lewis; Clifford A. Jones, Sr.; John D. Fuller, Sr.; Charles T. Bullock; Gregory K. Moss, Sr.; Howard W. Parker, Jr.; and the current president, Dr. Nilous M. Avery, II.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that of these names that I just mentioned, three of those passed away in this calendar year.

They have been great Baptists and they have been great North Carolinians and great Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues and I want to thank the General Baptist State Convention for 150 years of incredible work in North Carolina, and I thank the men and women of both clergy and laity who keep this convention alive and well.

Mr. Speaker, if I can close by simply using my dear, departed uncle as but one example of a Black preacher who gave his entire life to his ministry.

Reverend F.L. Bullock of Enfield, born 1896, pastored four churches that were one-Sunday-per-month churches. Married to my mother's sister who was a teacher, he was paid very little. Every day of his life, Reverend Bullock would visit the sick and minister to the needs of his community.

After serving as pastor for 64 long years, he was diagnosed with cancer. No health insurance, no life insurance, no pension from any of his churches, he died at age 84, several days after preaching his last sermon.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of pastors have devoted their entire life to the ministry. Many are remembered, but so many of them are not.

Today, the three of us pay tribute to all of them from the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

May God bless the memory of each of them for making our communities a better place to live, and may God continue to bless the General Baptist State Convention of North Carolina and its current leaders as they continue to serve God and his people of all races, creeds, and stations in life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1766. An act to reauthorize the SAFER Act of 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2266. An act making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Arbitration Agreements".

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 504. An act to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 26, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2928. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled "Live Fire Test and Evaluation Management Plan for the T-AO 205 Fleet Replenishment Oiler Program PRE-MDAP-ACAT IC Milestone B/C", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2366(c)(1); Public Law 99-500, Sec. 101(c) (as amended by Public Law 99-591, Sec. 101(c)); (100 Stat. 3341-144); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2929. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final temporary rule — Regulation Crowdfunding and Regulation A Relief and Assistance for Victims of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, and Hurricane Maria [Release No.: 33-10416] received October 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2930. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rules — Wool Products Labeling; Fur Products Labeling; Textile Fiber Products Identification (RIN: 3084-AB29, 3084-AB27, 3084-AB30) received October 20, 2017,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2931. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report covering the period from June 9, 2017 to August 8, 2017 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 1501A-422); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2932. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on the status of the Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 "Joint Communiqué", the treatment by the Government of Cuba of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 "Joint Statement", and the United States-Cuba January 2017 "Joint Statement", together known as the Migration Accords, March 2017 to September 2017, pursuant to Public Law 105-277, Sec. 2245; (112 Stat. 2681-824); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2933. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No.: 02-17, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Sec. 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2934. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period of April 1, 2017 — May 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with Sec. 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2935. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of nomination and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2936. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0555; Product Identifier 2016-NM-183-AD; Amendment 39-19037; AD 2017-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2937. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0623; Product Identifier 2017-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-19038; AD 2017-19-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2938. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0561; Product Identifier 2016-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-19043; AD 2017-19-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2939. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0452; Product Identifier 2017-NE-14-AD; Amendment 39-19050; AD 2017-19-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2940. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Louisiana Towns; Leesville, LA; and Patterson, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0183; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASW-4] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2941. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0639; Product Identifier 2017-CE-016-AD; Amendment 39-19052; AD 2017-19-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2942. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Siemens S.A.S. Smoke Detectors [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0099; Product Identifier 2017-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-19035; AD 2017-19-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2943. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Midland, TX and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Odessa, TX and Midland, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9481; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-18] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2944. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd and Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0140; Product Identifier 2017-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-19048; AD 2017-19-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2945. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Restricted Area R-2306F; Yuma Proving

Ground, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7055; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-11] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2946. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0767; Product Identifier 2017-NE-26-AD; Amendment 39-19049; AD 2017-19-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2947. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wayne, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0287; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ACE-6] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2948. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mineral Point, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0181; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-7] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2949. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Cheyenne, WY [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9473; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ANM-7] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2950. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-3004A and R-3004B and Establishment of R-3004C; Fort Gordon, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0886; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-11] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2951. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lemoore NAS, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0219; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-5] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2952. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Brainerd, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0188; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-8] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2953. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Soldotna, AK [Docket No.: FAA-

2016-9588; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AAL-5] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2954. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9143; Product Identifier 2013-SW-037-AD; Amendment 39-19051; AD 2017-19-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2955. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Record Disclosure and Privacy (RIN: 3245-AG52) received October 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Small Business.

2956. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at Atlantic City International Airport in New Jersey, under this contract will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers and that the screening company is owned and controlled by a citizen of the United States, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d)(1); Public Law 107-71, Sec. 108(a); (115 Stat. 613); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

2957. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA); Fecal Occult Blood (FOB) Testing [CMS-3271-F] (RIN: 0938-AS04) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2936. A bill to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and improve forest management activities on National Forest System lands, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on Tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-370, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2936. A bill to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and improve forest management activities on National Forest System lands, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on Tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes;

with an amendment (Rept. 115-370, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2823. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that retirement investors receive advice in their best interests, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-371, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2936 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2823. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than January 10, 2018.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 4115. A bill to promote registered apprenticeships and other work-based learning programs for small and medium-sized businesses within in-demand industry sectors, through the establishment and support of industry or sector partnerships; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr.

CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 4116. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require reporting by drug manufacturers to increase transparency in drug pricing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr.

CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'Rourke, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4117. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 4118. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 4119. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to develop a plain language disclosure form for borrowers of Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 4120. A bill to provide for a comprehensive interdisciplinary research and development initiative to strengthen the capacity of the electricity sector to neutralize cyber attacks; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 4121. A bill to establish in the United States Agency for International Development an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 4122. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 4123. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report to Congress with respect to North Korea's procurement of engines and technologies from a foreign source, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 4124. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to protect privacy rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Oversight and Government Reform, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 4125. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for comprehensive student achievement information; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 4126. A bill to provide for the accurate reporting of fossil fuel production and emissions from public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow refunds of Federal motor fuel excise taxes on fuels used in mobile mammography vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4128. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States with Exchanges with low-insurer participation to offer a Medicaid buy-in plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 4129. A bill to establish a State public option through Medicaid to provide Americans with the choice of a high-quality, low-cost health insurance plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 4130. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTENGER (for himself, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. WAGNER,

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DUNN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 4131. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose federal taxes on bonds used to provide facilities owned by abortion providers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 4132. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the Health Professionals Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 4133. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare payment option for patients and eligible professionals to freely contract, without penalty, for Medicare fee-for-service items and services, while allowing Medicare beneficiaries to use their Medicare benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 4134. A bill to redesignate the White Clouds Wilderness in the Sawtooth and Challis National Forests in the State of Idaho as the Cecil D. Andrus-White Clouds Wilderness in honor of former Idaho Governor and Secretary of the Interior Cecil D. Andrus; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for educational assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 4136. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen intensive cardiac rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources and the investment credit for certain qualified investment credit facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr.

HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BASS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution condemning the racist and hate-based attacks on our college campuses and reaffirming our support for inclusion and safety in our institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that temporary protected status for Haitian nationals should be extended until that country has demonstrably recovered from the 2010 earthquake, the cholera epidemic, Hurricane Matthew, and other disasters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CRIST, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 586. A resolution recognizing the growth and importance of minority women-owned businesses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. HIMES):

H. Res. 587. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the deduction for State and local taxes is beneficial and should remain intact; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BACON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. COMER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H. Res. 588. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Veterans Small Business Week; to the Committee on Small Business.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 4115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 4116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 4117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 4119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 4120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 4123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 4125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 4126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 4129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 4130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H.R. 4131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based on Congress's power under Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution, which grants Congress power over taxation.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 4132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 4133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Medicare is a health care program under current law that is operated by the federal government. This bill would improve the efficiency, accessibility and fairness of the operations of this federal program, especially the purchase of services and freedom to contract between doctors and Medicare recipients. This bill directly affects interstate commerce, which Congress has the power to regulate under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 4134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to “lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises” in order to “provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 173: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 176: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 233: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 296: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 299: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 392: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 398: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 444: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 495: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 525: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 535: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 545: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 620: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 721: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 747: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 754: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 785: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee and Mr. YOHIO.
H.R. 792: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 801: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 820: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 821: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 846: Mr. POCAN and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 919: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 927: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 991: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 997: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 1038: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1108: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1133: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1148: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1150: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1158: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 1160: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1164: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1175: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1205: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MESSER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DANNY K.

DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1253: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1276: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1298: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1344: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1377: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1384: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1406: Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1421: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1478: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1496: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1552: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1606: Mr. YOHIO.
H.R. 1609: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1636: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1659: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 1733: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1865: Mr. LUCAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 1880: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1953: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1955: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2044: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2077: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2091: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 2152: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2202: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2234: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2259: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 2319: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2320: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 2322: Mr. CORREA and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2339: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2405: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2429: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2431: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 2436: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2492: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2498: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2584: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2601: Mr. YOHIO.
H.R. 2625: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2628: Mr. POCAN and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2633: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2712: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 2717: Mr. CURBEAO of Florida.
H.R. 2723: Mr. LATTI, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2790: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2881: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2901: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2943: Mr. CAPUANO and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2999: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 3117: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 3136: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3179: Mr. MESSER and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 3200: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 3222: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3248: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3275: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 3301: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 3331: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 3349: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3350: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3378: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3415: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3441: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 3523: Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina.
H.R. 3544: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3545: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3548: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 3566: Mr. SOTO and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 3596: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 3606: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3632: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. MENG, Mr. COOK, and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 3641: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CLAY, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3666: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3684: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3692: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 3695: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 3699: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3708: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 3738: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3748: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3759: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3760: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3761: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3767: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3770: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3784: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3792: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 3798: Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3811: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3814: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3826: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3839: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3881: Mr. POLIS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SIREN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3887: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 3897: Mr. KIND, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3918: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 3940: Mr. KNIGHT and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3956: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3966: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3970: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3976: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3979: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 3988: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4006: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 4007: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 4020: Mr. SOTO and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 4035: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 4051: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4052: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4062: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4073: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4079: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4082: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4097: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4098: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4099: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4105: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4112: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4114: Ms. LEE.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. KINZINGER.
H. Con. Res. 43: Ms. MOORE, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 30: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H. Res. 199: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Res. 220: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. DEGETTE.
H. Res. 244: Mr. GOMEZ.
H. Res. 257: Mr. CRIST.
H. Res. 283: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 401: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H. Res. 563: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 571: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 584: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3941: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 25, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the foundation of true wisdom, You extend Your powerful dominion over the universe. Stand by our lawmakers, and protect them with Your might. Lord, refresh them with Your wisdom as You prepare them not only for time but eternity. Lord, we praise You for ethically congruent lawmakers, who, in their inmost beings, are true and honest. Give us more Senators who are as true to duty as the needle to the pole. Give us more legislators who are not afraid to call sin by its right name. Lord, provide us with more patriots who will stand for right regardless of the consequences.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the CHAIR as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Palk nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senate Republicans had a productive discussion with President Trump yesterday about our shared agenda. We were particularly focused on how to bring tax relief, economic growth, and jobs to the middle class through tax reform.

It is clear we share a lot of the same goals. It is clear we are united in an effort to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more in middle-class pockets. It is also clear we are all excited about this once-in-a-generation opportunity to get America going again and growing again.

So we are watching our friends in the House with anticipation as they consider the comprehensive, responsible budget that cleared the Senate last week. We anticipate they will pass it by the end of the week. Once they do, we will have important legislative tools to move tax reform forward. That is something everyone can look forward to. More importantly, that is something the American people deserve, especially after so many years of an economy that failed to reach its potential—an economy that, so often, failed them.

Tax reform represents the single most important thing we can do today to get the economy reaching for its full potential. We are looking forward to taking the next steps very soon to get it done.

Mr. President, on another matter, I would like to again commend Presi-

dent Trump for the outstanding judicial nominees he has sent us this year. So far, every nominee we have brought to the floor has been confirmed by a majority vote in the Senate. In some cases, those majority votes have been bipartisan and massive, like 95 to 1, like 97 to 0. Yet almost every time a judicial nominee is brought to the floor—even nominees with votes like these, nominees whom both parties support—Democrats throw up partisan procedural roadblocks. For what reason? Certainly, it is not to change the outcome. No. Like I said, in many cases, Democrats actually support the nominees. They are just wasting more of the Senate's time because they can. They are doing it again now. Let's take the two judicial nominees who are currently before the Senate.

First, there is Scott Palk. After nearly two decades as a State and Federal prosecutor, Mr. Palk has the legal skill and community support to excel as a U.S. district judge for the Western District of Oklahoma. The Senate Judiciary Committee approved his nomination by a large, bipartisan vote of 17 to 3.

Then there is Trevor McFadden. Mr. McFadden's sterling record of public service makes him an ideal candidate for the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Not a single Member—not one—of either party opposed him.

These nominees should have sailed to confirmation yesterday. Instead, Democrats are forcing us to waste time so we can again arrive at the exact same conclusion, but simply later this week.

This really has to stop.

In President Obama's first year in office, Republicans forced this procedural hurdle for a single judicial nominee, and it was a controversial one.

Let me say that again. In President Obama's first year in office, Republicans forced the procedural hurdle we have had to endure many times for one nominee, and that nominee was controversial.

In President Trump's first year in office, Democrats have forced this procedural hurdle for every single judicial nominee except one, even if they actually supported him or her in the end. This is just the kind of partisan game that Americans are so sick of.

President Trump should be commended for his strong judicial picks. The Senate is going to keep working hard to confirm them, and we are going to succeed. The only question is whether the Democrats are going to keep wasting more of the Senate's time getting there. I hope they won't. I hope

they will end these pointless games so that the Senate can keep its time and focus where it belongs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, good morning.

COMMENDING SENATORS FLAKE AND CORKER

Yesterday we all learned that our colleague Senator FLAKE will be retiring at the end of his term. After Senator CORKER's announcement a few weeks ago, this was another blow to this body. Senators FLAKE and CORKER are both men of principle, decency, and conscience.

In his address here on the floor shortly after his announcement, Senator FLAKE alluded to the great figures of history who toiled at these desks to remind us that our time here is only temporary. He is certainly right. It should comfort him, however, that history will judge Senator FLAKE and Senator CORKER as two men of the greatest conscience to have graced this Chamber on either side of the aisle in a long time. This Senate will be much poorer for their departures.

THE BUDGET AND REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. President, last week the Senate passed one of the worst budgets in our Nation's history. It excuses one of the most massive expansions of the national debt ever—\$1.5 trillion. It directs the committees to take a sledgehammer to Medicaid and Medicare, again to the tune of \$1.5 trillion, and it sets up the same awful, partisan process that Republicans used to try to jam healthcare through for tax cuts.

The budget is now before the House. I hope every House Member is taking a close look at it, and Republican Members who come from States such as New York, New Jersey, Washington, California, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Illinois, and Minnesota should pay particular attention to the issue of State and local deductibility. There is no doubt the elimination of State and local affects States and congressional districts over the entire country.

For instance, one of the States that pays the highest rates and gets the highest tax break from State and local is Utah. Thirty-five percent of Utahns take it because it is such a large percentage tithe, and they don't use the standard deduction. It affects middle-class families in every State. In the State it has the lowest effect on, West Virginia, it will still affect 17 percent

of families. I don't have the numbers in front of me, but my guess is that Kentucky, the home State of our Acting President pro tempore, is probably in the twenties. But in many States, the State and local deduction is claimed by over one-third of taxpayers and amounts to tens of thousands of dollars a year in deductions.

In California, 34 percent of taxpayers take the deduction for an average of \$18,400. In New Jersey, 41 percent of taxpayers claim State and local with an average deduction of \$17,850. Faced with this, some of our colleagues are looking for a compromise. They say: Well, let's just take away the deduction for the people who earn above \$200,000, \$300,000, or even \$400,000. Or they say: You can choose between taking the State and local deduction or the mortgage deduction. That is like saying: Taxpayer, we will chop off your left hand or your right hand, but we will give you the choice.

Even without the mortgage trade, a compromise doesn't work. It doesn't work for a few reasons. No. 1, it is double taxation. You are being taxed on paying tax. No. 2, for States like New York, particularly my upstate colleagues, it chases away businesses. Companies don't want to locate in a place where their top executives are going to pay a lot more, because they can't deduct their taxes. No. 3, it lowers State income so that whether or not you use the State and local deduction, your school board, your road building, your police, and your fire departments will be hurt as they will be creating a huge deficit.

So a compromise doesn't work here. I have named some of my Republican colleagues in New York. One of them got very mad yesterday. All I say is this: In 1986 there was a Democratic tax reform bill led by Senator Bradley and Congressman Gephardt. I had the same conviction and with the same strength and velocity opposed their taking away State and local, even though they were of my own party. We worked hard and we succeeded. Tax reform passed in 1986 with Ronald Reagan's blessing. I supported it. It was real tax reform. We closed loopholes and lowered rates. We did not just give massive tax breaks and let the deficit go up. But State and local was removed, and the bill still passed.

So I would simply ask my Republican colleagues to oppose their party leadership when it hurts their States and constituencies, as I did back in 1986 when I was a fourth-term Member of Congress.

Now a few Members of the New York and New Jersey delegation—a whole bunch in New York—have come out against the elimination of State and local deductibility. I salute them. They have done what they should do. In the eyes of the Founding Fathers, they have represented their States and their

constituents. They have not represented these hard-right, corporate, wealthy interests that just want their taxes reduced. Are the remaining Members of the Republican delegation from New York and New Jersey, as well as Members from Washington State, California, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Minnesota, Illinois, and all the other States going to stand up now because they know this hurts middle-class constituents? This is not a tax break for the rich. The rich have lots of other big tax breaks, and the property taxes that they pay are not that much in terms of their income. I hope they will stand up as some of my courageous colleagues have in New York State and in New Jersey.

Here is another reason we don't want to eliminate the State and local deduction. A recent study by PricewaterhouseCoopers found that under the Republican tax plan, any homeowner with an income of between \$50,000 and \$200,000 would see an annual average increase of \$815.

Here is the amazing part of their study. They say that home prices would fall 10.2 percent in the short term. That makes sense. If you are a new homeowner or buying another home, you calculate: How much is my mortgage? How much are my property taxes? What deductions will I get? If you don't get the deduction, you have less money to pay the mortgage because you are paying higher taxes. So the demand for homes goes down, the price new home buyers are willing to pay is less, and home prices go down.

So my Republican colleagues, particularly those in the House who have to vote on this bill tomorrow, are going to hit their middle-class and upper middle class constituents with a double whammy if they vote for this bill. They will pay more taxes, their home values will go down, and home values are the rock of the middle class. That is what people work for their whole lives. The happiness someone 45 or 50 years old has when they pay off their mortgage and their home is theirs is great. Why delay that? Why impede that? Why impugn that?

Are our Republican colleagues willing to go home and explain to their middle-class constituents why their taxes are going up and their home values are going down? Because if they are not willing to confront that, they shouldn't vote for this bill.

The budget is a betrayal of the middle-class men and women who sent House Members to Congress, who sent all of us to the Senate and the House. For many in the middle class, as I said, it raises taxes and erodes property values. And why? To lavish tax breaks on big corporations and the superrich. Its main focus is to give a tax cut to corporations and the top 1 percent.

I would say to the average American: Is your No. 1 goal reducing taxes on big

corporations and the richest people in America? Well, that is the Republican Party's No. 1 goal. They say they must have tax reform. It is their No. 1 priority. And this bill, the core of it, the *raison d'être* for it, is to cut taxes on big corporations and the wealthiest people.

Again, to the American people: Is your No. 1 goal the same as the Republican Party's here in the Senate and in the House—to cut taxes on the richest corporations, to cut taxes on the wealthiest individuals? I don't think so. Do you, Mr. and Mrs. American, think that is what Congress should be gearing up to do when it has done so little? I don't think so. The Republican Party is making a huge mistake.

It is not that there shouldn't be tax reform. There should be—but real reform. Big corporations pay a real rate of 16 percent. If we were to lower those rates and close loopholes, we would be doing the economy a favor. As I said, I helped pass that in 1986 once they abandoned State and local deductibility. If it is simply to give a huge tax cut to the wealthiest people and biggest corporations, the recent polling data has shown that the vast majority of Americans are against it. A majority of Americans say: If it means a small tax break for me and a big tax break for the wealthiest, I am not for it.

So I am going to challenge my Republican colleagues: Go out there and speak plainly and honestly about your plan. Don't hide behind fake talking points and fake math. It is a massive tax cut for corporations and the wealthy. Defend it, why you think it is a good idea. I know some of you truly believe—the Senator from Pennsylvania, a Republican, has spent his lifetime, when he was at the Club for Growth, advocating that cutting taxes on the biggest corporations and wealthiest individuals fuels the economy. Talk directly about it.

I hear the words “middle class” coming out of our Republican colleagues' mouths but not “wealthy” or “big corporations.” And let me just say it doesn't prove to be true.

The corporate tax rate was much lower than the official tax rate. According to Goldman Sachs, our big corporations have more money than they have ever had and are paying a lower tax rate than they ever have, and they are not creating jobs. Give me one reason why giving them a tax break will now have them starting to create jobs when they are already flush with cash.

How about the example of Kansas, and I say this particularly to my two friends. Both are my friends. When I see them both in the gym—I used to play basketball with one. I would say to my two friends, the Senators from Kansas, look at what happened to your own State, the home of Charles Koch. Big tax breaks, huge tax breaks will make Kansas the growth center of

America. What happened? They gave huge tax breaks. They predicted that income would go up in the Kansas State treasury by \$300 million. It went down by \$700 million. They had to actually consider schools going from 5 to 4 days. And job growth, this great engine of job growth—Kansas grew last year by 0.2 percent. The American economy grew by 1.6 percent. It was a total flop. Kansas not only rejected the proposal by raising taxes after they had cut them so deeply, they also threw out a lot of the more conservative Republicans, and there was a rebellion within the Republican Party itself.

Trading middle-class deductions for a tax cut for the rich is not a fair trade. Raising taxes on so many middle-class people so you can pay for tax cuts for the rich makes no sense, and it makes no sense particularly now that the scales are tipped more in favor of the wealthy and powerful than ever before.

That is why the American people, now that they realize we are getting close here, despite all the distracting issues the President tweets about—by the way, I hear that in the Republican caucus, he talked about no details on the tax plan; he just said get it done. No details. I know why—they are afraid to talk about it. The President may not know the details, but our Republican colleagues do, and they are afraid to talk about the details in public.

The bottom line is that the American people are learning what this plan is about, and they don't like what they see. In a recent Reuters/Ipsos poll, fewer than one-third of all Americans supported it. And just like healthcare, I believe that the more Americans learn about the plan, the less they will like it. The number—low enough as it is—in support of the Trump tax plan will get lower.

Listen to this: In the same poll, nearly two-thirds of Republicans said that deficit reduction was more important than tax cuts for corporations. Two-thirds of Republicans said that deficit reduction was more important than tax cuts for corporations. That is not what the bill says. The poll also showed that three-quarters of Republicans said that deficit reduction was more important than tax cuts for the wealthy. Again, the bill does the opposite.

The Republican plan balloons the deficit by \$1.5 trillion to do those two things—tax cuts for the wealthiest corporations and tax cuts for the rich. The more Republicans find out about the plan, the less they will like it.

In conclusion, as the House debates the Senate budget this week, I urge them to consider first and foremost what the plan would mean for their constituents. I would tell them, should they vote down this budget, there are a large number of Democrats, including the minority leader, who want to sit down with Republicans and come up

with a nice, mainstream plan, not a plan to please the thousand wealthiest families in America who have so much say over the Republican Party and shouldn't. But we want to work with you on a real, bipartisan plan. Defeat this plan, and we will, just as we promised on healthcare, and we have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague and the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, for his statement on this Trump tax plan. I think he really has summarized in his statement the concerns many of us have.

We are concerned that the Trump tax plan will do several things. It will cut funds for education in America at a time when we need it now more than ever to prepare our people for the jobs of the future. It endangers Medicare, a program that for almost 50 million Americans is critical for the healthcare they receive. At the same time, it is going to dramatically increase the deficit. For so long, we have heard from the Republicans that their No. 1 issue was cutting the deficit, and now they come up with a tax plan that will increase the size of our deficit. Finally, of course, all of this is being done to create tax breaks for the wealthy and the biggest corporations in America.

Here are the simple facts: As a percentage of our gross domestic product, corporate profits in America have never been higher. Corporate profits have never been higher. As a percentage of the gross domestic product, corporate Federal taxes paid have never been lower. Profits never higher, taxes never lower, and the Trump tax plan says: Let's cut corporate taxes even more, and then let's cut taxes on the wealthiest people even more. That is not a fair tax plan. It is not a fair tax reform.

The Trump tax plan sadly rewards the biggest corporations and the wealthiest individuals at the cost of cutting education, endangering Medicare, and unfortunately increasing the deficit, to be paid for by our children. The tax break for the wealthiest people in the Trump tax plan doesn't go to the rich. It doesn't even go to the very rich. It goes to the superrich—the superrich. Who am I talking about? The one-tenth of 1 percent. The highest incomes in America—way beyond the rich. It is not a person who drives a big limousine; it is a person who is never going to drive the rest of their lives and owns a big yacht. Those folks—the one-tenth of 1 percent—get 40 percent of all the tax breaks in the Trump tax plan. That may be good news for the President and his colleagues and friends and even his family; it is not good news for working Americans. To

think that we would cut education, endanger Medicare, and increase the deficit to give that level of income, the wealthiest people in our country, such a tax break is hard to imagine.

Sadly, one of the provisions in the Trump tax plan creates an incentive for companies to move jobs overseas, because they will have a lower tax rate if they do. Think about that. A President who has told us over and over again that we want to “make America great again” creates a tax program to incentivize businesses to locate overseas and make their profits overseas. That makes no sense whatsoever, but that is the Trump tax plan. I am glad Senator SCHUMER brought that up.

DACA

Mr. President, let me address the issue of the Dreamers. It is one that I have spoken to many times before, and I would like to address it at this point.

On September 5, about 7 weeks ago today, Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced the Trump administration’s repeal of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, better known as DACA.

DACA provided temporary legal status to immigrant students if they registered with the government, paid a fee, went through a criminal background check and a national security check, and did that on a renewable basis every 2 years.

The young people protected by that Executive order are known as Dreamers. They came to the United States as children, brought here by their parents. They grew up in our schools, singing our “Star-Spangled Banner,” pledging allegiance to the only flag they have ever known. Seven years ago, I asked President Obama, in a letter that I sent with then-Republican-Senator Dick Lugar, to create a program to protect these young people and give them a chance to earn their way into legal status. The President responded to our request, and almost 800,000 have signed up.

Now, with President Trump’s announcement that he is going to eliminate this program, the clock is ticking. By March 5, 2018, every workday for the following 2 years, approximately 1,400 of these Dreamers protected by DACA will lose their work permits and will be subject to deportation. Mr. President, 1,400 a day who signed up for this program, as of March 5 next year, will hear the clock ticking. Teachers will be forced to leave their students, nurses to leave their patients, first responders to leave their posts, and soldiers who are willing to fight for their country will be forced to leave the Army if this happens. It is an outcome that none of us want to see, I hope.

It isn’t just a looming humanitarian crisis; it is economic too. The non-partisan Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy says that DACA-eligible individuals contribute about \$2 bil-

lion a year to our economy. They are working. They are going to school. These are productive people who against the odds have succeeded in life and want to do more.

The Cato Institute—no liberal think tank—estimates that ending DACA and deporting DACA recipients would cost \$60 billion and result in a \$280 billion reduction in economic growth over the next 10 years.

Poll after poll shows overwhelming bipartisan support for the Dreamers. Even FOX News—no liberal media outlet—recently found that 79 percent of Americans support a path to citizenship for Dreamers—79 percent. What percentage of Republicans support it? According to the FOX poll, 63 percent of Donald Trump voters believe that Dreamers should be given a chance at citizenship.

The answer is clear: We need to pass the DREAM Act, and we need to do it before we leave Washington in the next few weeks. It was 16 years ago that I first introduced it. We have had our ups and downs. We have passed it at some time on the floor of the Senate and then again in the House of Representatives but never quite at the same moment so that it became the law of the land.

Over the years, I have told over 100 stories about the Dreamers. This is another one I want to share with you. This is a story about William Medeiros. William was 6 years old when his family moved to the United States from Brazil. He grew up in Boston and then moved to Florida. In high school, he was an honor student. He graduated with a 3.8 GPA. He was an athlete, playing high school soccer and football. He is now a student at the University of Central Florida. He has a 3.5 GPA. He will graduate in the spring of 2019 with a bachelor’s degree in criminal justice.

He is working full time to support himself. Because he is a DACA recipient, he isn’t eligible for any Federal financial assistance to go to college. He has to work his way through school, and he is doing it. His dream is that he wants to be part of America’s military. Then, after serving his country, he wants to be an officer with his local police department. Thanks to DACA, he is on his way.

Last year, he enlisted in the Army through the MAVNI Program. In this photo, he is shown with his recruiter from his enlistment ceremony. The MAVNI Program allows immigrants like him, who are vital to the national interest, to enlist in the Armed Forces. More than 800 DACA recipients with these critical skills have had their dream come true. They have volunteered to serve America in our military.

Some Trump administration officials have claimed that DACA recipients are taking jobs away from Americans. But

William and hundreds more like him have vital skills that our military desperately needs, and they want him to serve our country. William, along with many Dreamers, is now waiting to ship to basic training. He continues his undergraduate studies and is working full time while waiting for his first chance to serve.

He wrote me a letter, and here is what he said: “My desire to serve this nation and help people, to pay back my dues for everything I have received from this great country, and to lead by example by showing my fellow DACA members that anything is possible with hard work, perseverance, and dedication.”

Is there any doubt in anyone’s mind that this young man, William, desperate to serve our country and to be a law enforcement officer, will be an asset to the United States, a source of pride for all of us? Of course not. If DACA goes away and is not replaced, if this young man loses that opportunity, America will lose an important part of its future.

I was at the Phoenix Military Academy, one of six military academies within the Chicago public schools, just last week. I am proud to say that our Chicago public school system hosts the largest ROTC Program in America, with 10,000 cadets from school to school. It turns out that many of them are DACA Dreamers. They want to serve our country just like William. I was joined by COL Daniel Baggio, who runs the Junior ROTC Program. His grandfather was an immigrant who served in the U.S. Army during World War I. Colonel Baggio certainly understands the important role immigrants play in our Armed Forces.

William Medeiros and other Dreamers have so much to give America, but without the Dream Act, William and hundreds of other immigrants with skills that are vital to the national interest will literally be kicked out of the Army. Thousands of Junior ROTC cadets in Chicago will never realize their dream of volunteering to enlist in America’s military. They want to serve. They are willing to risk their lives for our country. How can we let them down?

When we introduced the Dream Act, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, Republican of South Carolina, said: “The moment of reckoning is coming.” It is coming in a manner of days and weeks. I implore my colleagues and both sides of the aisle: Don’t let that young man down. Don’t let down the hundreds of thousands who just want a chance to prove themselves and earn their way into legal status. We can do this.

Many people are skeptical as to whether Congress can get anything done on a bipartisan basis. I am not skeptical. I believe it can. I believe that we can work together. I have sat down with a lot of conservative Republican Senators in my office—Senators I

never dreamed I would be sitting with, discussing this issue, and now we want to make sure we get this job done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2266

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 85, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 2266.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

TAX REFORM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as the Senate irons out the details of our comprehensive tax reform plan to get the American economy back on track, I want to draw attention today to what I believe is one of the greatest obstacles in our path as we pursue 3-percent annual growth. That obstacle I am referring to is our aging national infrastructure: our roads, our bridges, our airports, our water systems, our sewage systems, and our waterways that desperately need dredging, especially in my State.

If our tax plan is going to be pro-growth, then we need to take advantage of this once-in-a-generation chance to use Federal revenues to invest meaningfully in our economy. Allow me to explain what I mean by that. Federal investment in our roads, our bridges, our railways, and our waterways would be a shot in the arm for the American economy. It would pay dividends for decades. Companies need good roads and bridges and shipping channels to transport their products and to ensure that they aren't sitting in traffic for hours—sometimes it seems like days—which eats away at profits and raises costs for our people. But for too long, Washington's spend-

ing priorities have been to grow the Federal bureaucracy instead of growing our capacity for economic expansion and development through infrastructure upgrades. We know the result. Our Department of Transportation now estimates that we have a backlog of construction and repairs that would cost \$926 billion to clear. It would cost nearly a trillion dollars, and that is just the backlog.

I have a simple solution that I would respectfully suggest to get us back on track. According to the Congressional Research Service, \$2.6 trillion in corporate profits made by American companies are parked overseas, and some outside estimates say \$4 or \$5 trillion. This money is overseas, and it will not be brought back to America as long as our antiquated corporate tax system is going to charge those American companies 35 percent in tax just to bring them back.

Congress is already discussing repatriation as a part of the move to a territorial tax system, which would use a competitive tax rate to encourage companies to bring their dollars back to the United States and keep them here and invest them here in American products and American businesses and American employees.

When tax reform passes—and it will—and we get a one-time surge in tax revenue as a result of this \$3 to \$5 trillion being brought back to the United States, we are going to get only one chance to spend that money wisely. Instead of blowing those repatriated dollars on an already bloated Federal bureaucracy, we ought to invest that money solely and exclusively in desperately needed infrastructure upgrades. Even a one-time target investment in clearing the industrial backlog will create jobs and stimulate the economy for decades.

Let's face it, too many of American roads today are axle-breaking insults to the 21st century. They are holding our economy back.

Let me be clear. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars flowing into infrastructure if we just make good use of those repatriated dollars. For example, just in my State of Louisiana, this could mean building a new bridge through Lake Charles. It could mean widening the interstate in Baton Rouge. It could mean closing the gaps in I-49 between Lafayette and Shreveport and New Orleans. We have neglected our highways and bridges for far too long, and this is our chance to use tax reform to catch up, to boost our international competitiveness, to lower costs for consumers, and to put our economy back on track to 3 percent-plus growth, which the American people expect and deserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Marco Rubio, James Lankford, Richard Burr, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 250 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Fischer	Nelson
Baldwin	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Franken	Perdue
Bennet	Gardner	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reed
Brown	Hassan	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Isakson	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Cochran	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Strange
Coons	King	Sullivan
Corker	Klobuchar	Tester
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Udall
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Murray	

NAYS—18

Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Sanders	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Heinrich	Leahy	Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 79, the nays are 18.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the Senate about the nominee that is currently in front of this body and on whom we should vote in the next few hours. We just finished a cloture vote to actually start 30 hours of debate. In the past, we wouldn't have had 30 hours of debate for a district court nominee, especially a district court nominee like this. This would have been something that would have been done by consent. We would have had a vote on this individual, rather than burning up 30 hours of time in debate on a single individual who just passed a cloture vote 79 to 18. This is not a controversial nominee.

Let me introduce you to Scott Palk. Scott Palk was actually reported out of the Judiciary Committee on June 15 of this year. He was nominated by President Trump on May 8. He has been pending since June 15 to get a vote on this floor because of the ongoing delays for each nominee as we go through the process.

Why do I say Scott Palk is not a controversial nominee? It is not just the fact that he passed the cloture vote 79 to 18. Scott Palk, if you remember his name in this body, was also a nominee of President Obama for the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma. He is now a nominee of President Trump for the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma.

There may be five things total that President Obama and President Trump agree on. Scott Palk is one of those five. This is not a controversial nominee, and he will be a great judge for us. He will also be a great judge in Western Oklahoma.

He currently serves as the assistant dean for students and the assistant general counsel at the University of Oklahoma College of Law in Norman, OK, a position he has held since 2011. He has the strong support of the president of the University of Oklahoma, who happens to be former Senator David Boren, a Democratic Senator from this body, who is now leading the University of Oklahoma and has done that with great excellence for the past two decades. He is also strongly behind this nominee as well.

Scott Palk joined the University of Oklahoma College of Law after 19 years of public service as a State and Federal prosecutor. He graduated in 1992 from

the University of Oklahoma College of Law, where he began his legal career as a legal intern for the district attorney's office of district 21, serving in Cleveland, Garvin, and McClain Counties.

After graduating and passing the bar, he became an assistant district attorney for Cleveland County, where he prosecuted a variety of crimes and death penalty cases. In 1994, he became the multicounty drug task force coordinator, initiating and directing the district's first wire-interception drug investigation and coordinating Federal and local resources, culminating in the successful prosecution of a significant multicounty methamphetamine distribution organization.

The Association of Oklahoma Narcotics Enforcers awarded him the Prosecutor of the Year award in 1993. In 1992, he became the first assistant district attorney for district 21 and served in a dual prosecutorial and administrative role.

In 2002, he joined the U.S. attorney's office in the Western District of Oklahoma, where we are pushing him to be a judge now, as an assistant U.S. attorney, prosecuting violent crimes, gangs, and domestic terrorism.

In 2004, he became the deputy criminal chief of the U.S. attorney's office and served in the additional roles of violent crime, national security coordinator, anti-terrorism, advisory council coordinator, and crisis management coordinator.

That same year, in 2004, the Oklahoma Gang Investigators Association awarded him the Prosecutor of the Year award. The Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys awarded him the Director's Award for Superior Performance.

In 2005, the Drug Enforcement Administration awarded him the Certificate of Appreciation for Outstanding Contribution in the Field of Drug Law Enforcement.

In his most recent role at the U.S. attorney's office, he supervised administrative staff and assistant U.S. attorneys, handling a criminal caseload primarily consisting of national security and organized crimes and coordinating efforts with the FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force, the FBI foreign counterintelligence squad, and the National Security Division of the Department of Justice.

His work in national security matters included both traditional criminal investigations, as well as investigations utilizing provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

In 2011, the FBI awarded him the Director's Certificate of Appreciation for Assistance to the Joint Terrorism Task Force.

Scott Palk is eminently qualified for this task. He shouldn't be a controversial nominee, and he should already be a judge. We are missing three judges in the Western District of Oklahoma.

President Trump nominated him on May 8, and it is now the end of October when we can finally get him to the floor to be able to move him.

This delay tactic, this stalling tactic that is out there, this resist movement to try to prevent the President of the United States from getting his staff in every agency and to prevent judges from being able to actually go on the bench is delaying good people who are not controversial to be able to do the job that is needed in each district. He is an individual who passed 79 to 18 on a cloture vote, and I am confident we will not consume the next 30 hours of debate about him. The hours will now expire as we sit in silence on the Senate floor, waiting for us to be able to have a final vote—just delays.

I have made a proposal to my colleagues. It is not a radical proposal. Quite frankly, it was a proposal in 2013, first proposed by a Senator named Harry Reid: to be able to move the nominations time period from 30 hours of just wasted time on the Senate floor to 2 hours—2 hours for district court, 2 hours for the Deputy Assistant Secretary of whatever agency it may be, having 2 hours of debate. These are for individuals who have already gone through committee, already gone through extensive vetting, already moved to the floor, and who most certainly will pass because it is a simple majority to be able to move these individuals based on the change of rules that at that time Senator Reid led.

Let's also do the same rule on time. Instead of 30 hours of wasted time on the floor when we could do other things for the American people, let's go back to the 2-hour agreement that we had in the past. It was a simple rule of 2 hours for individuals like for district courts and other individuals and agencies, 8 hours for higher tier individuals, who may be for a circuit court and such, and 30 hours for Cabinet officials.

I don't think that is an unreasonable request to make. It is a rule that we have done in the past, and it is a rule that we need to go back to. The American people are frustrated with the block in timing on moving people, especially people with wide bipartisan support. No one understands why someone who President Obama nominated and President Trump nominated has to take up 30 hours of time on the floor on debate when no one will really debate him and it is certain what the outcome of these people will be.

The American people are expecting us to debate and to engage on issues. I recommend again to this body: Let's go back to the Harry Reid rule—2 hours of debate for individuals like this in district courts, 8 hours of debate for higher tiered courts, and 30 hours of debate for Cabinet officials and the Supreme Court. We can do that again. We have done that in the past, and I recommend that we move back to that, not just for

a single congressional body but as a change in the rules of the Senate, so that, permanently, we are able to be more functional again. A body that is dysfunctional can be fixed by its own Members, moving us to a functional set of rules. That is what I hope we would achieve in the days ahead.

I look forward to voting for Scott Palk, whenever we finish with a 30-hour clock of time—of wasted time—to be able to move on a nominee and to see wide bipartisan support again for a good nominee. Scott is going to do a great job on the bench. We need him there to be able to get started.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about what my bipartisan healthcare bill with Chairman ALEXANDER means for the people we are all here to serve, what it means for patients and families in my home State of Washington and across the country who are worried about being able to afford the healthcare they need, and what it means for States and communities and hospitals that are administering and providing care.

Negotiations of this magnitude are always tough. There are some things you agree on, and sometimes there is common ground that emerges early, but there is no question that you also find areas of strong disagreement. You have to work your way to each answer step by step.

One issue that Chairman ALEXANDER and I agreed on from the very start of our negotiations, where we worked our hardest, and what we had the most discussions on was the goal of putting patients and families first and that it would be families who would benefit as much as possible from our efforts to restore stability to our markets. That was the crux of our debate. It was our guiding star.

I am very proud to say that our bipartisan bill does just that. Here is what is at stake. Here is what we know. Patients and families across the country are looking ahead to next year. They are rightly worried about their healthcare—premiums, benefits, and coverage—and they are realizing that they are about to pay the price for the uncertainty and partisanship we have seen on healthcare over the last 9 months.

Like all of my colleagues, I have listened and I have talked with many of these families in my home State, at hospitals, schools, roundtables, and in meetings with patients, doctors, providers, and veterans. They have all

made it very clear that enough is enough with playing politics with people's healthcare.

Here is how our bipartisan bill would protect those families and restore certainty to the markets. I will not go into all of the details, of course, but I do want to focus on some really important points.

First of all, this bill would restore the out-of-pocket cost reduction payments that President Trump has announced he will be ending for this year as well as for 2018 and 2019. This means that some serious sabotage—something that experts say would raise premiums by double digits for millions of families—would be off the table.

Second, this bill would make significant investments when it comes to healthcare outreach and enrollment to make sure that families know about their insurance options.

Third, this bill makes some changes to give our States more flexibility when it comes to developing plans and offering options while maintaining essential health benefits, like maternity care and protecting people with pre-existing conditions or protecting the elderly—and all of this while making sure that costs go down for families and preventing insurers from doubledipping and padding their profits with both cost reduction payments and higher premiums.

Put simply, this bill is an important step in the right direction of preventing premium increases, stabilizing healthcare, and pushing back against President Trump's recent actions.

This bill reflects the input of patients, Governors, State commissioners, experts, and advocates, and it has strong support from a majority here in the Senate. So far, 24 Senators—12 Democrats and 12 Republicans—have cosponsored this bill. I know there are a lot of others who agree that we need to act and that we must do so in our working together under regular order, as with our bill, rather than doubling down on partisanship and dysfunction.

I am focused on moving our bill forward as quickly as possible, and I certainly hope that the majority leader will listen to the Members on both sides of the aisle who also want this bill to be brought up for a vote without delay.

Let me be clear. As this bill moves forward, I am certainly open to changes that expand access to quality care, put families ahead of insurers, and maintain those core patient protections that I have been clear all along have to be protected. I am certainly not interested in changing our bipartisan agreement to move healthcare in the wrong direction.

Chairman ALEXANDER and I have a record of seeing tough legislation through to the end together, whether that is K-12 education, FDA user fees,

mental health reform, or opioid use disorders, which is why I am confident that we can do the same with this stabilization bill.

We have negotiated a strong agreement that has the support of 60 Senators, and the support is growing. The President has also expressed his support for our effort, so I see no reason why we should not move this bill through the Senate, get it signed into law, and then continue the bipartisan discussion on healthcare in the country.

I will also take some time to talk about another pressing healthcare challenge, and that is the immediate need to extend Federal funding for the historically bipartisan, expired primary care cliff programs, like the Community Health Center Fund, the National Health Service Corps, and, of course, the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP.

It has now been almost 25 days since the Federal funding of these primary care cliff programs and CHIP were allowed to expire by the Republican majority, and in that time, I have heard from thousands of people in my State and nationwide who are urging Congress to act. Each day that passes is a day that we are failing to meet our commitment to these families and putting the health and well-being of nearly 9 million children, including more than 60,000 children in my home State of Washington and the 25 million patients who, at great harm and great risk, get care from the community health centers.

In Washington State, as in so many other States, notices to families about gaps in their children's healthcare are about to go out as soon as December 1, and in my State, we will run out of Federal funds for CHIP in November.

Let me be clear. Parents in my home State and across the country should not be up at night, worrying about their children's healthcare because Congress cannot get the job done. That is so unacceptable.

There is a bipartisan deal in the Senate right now that was negotiated between the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee that would provide certainty for this vital program. I understand that extreme House Republicans have chosen, instead, to take an irresponsible path in their trying to ram through a partisan bill that will jeopardize the efforts in the Senate and in the House to come to an agreement as soon as possible.

To be clear, this delay has not been without serious consequences, but we can still act. It is up to Republican leaders now to reverse course, come to the table, and join with Democrats to get this done. It should not have to be said, but there should not be any place for partisanship or politics when it comes to protecting the children and families we represent. I hope that we

get this done and get it done quickly, and I hope that all of our Members will move forward on this.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I see the Senator from New Hampshire on the floor. I ask through the Presiding Officer if she is about to speak or if I may speak after her. What I would like to do is to give a brief report on the Congressional Budget Office's report of the Alexander-Murray proposal, of which the Senator from New Hampshire is a cosponsor. I would like to do that either before or after she speaks. Either way would be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, my understanding is that Senator CORNYN was about to come to the floor, but I would be happy to have the Senator give the CBO report on this legislation, which I very enthusiastically support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in respecting Senator CORNYN's prerogative, I will stop when he comes to the floor.

I believe that Senator MURRAY has come to the floor and has reported that the Congressional Budget Office has just finished an evaluation of the Alexander-Murray proposal to the U.S. Senate that would be for the purpose of reducing premiums and avoiding chaos in the individual insurance markets during the years 2018 and 2019.

The Senator from New Hampshire is a strong sponsor of that legislation. It is unusual, in fact, that it has 12 Republican Senators and 12 Democratic Senators. Not many pieces of legislation come to the floor with that support. The reason we accelerated work on it was that President Trump called me and asked me to work with Senator MURRAY to try to develop such a proposal. So now it is being considered by the President, by the House of Representatives, and by other Members of this body.

An important piece of information, as Senator MURRAY has said, is what the Congressional Budget Office writes about the impact of our proposal on the Federal taxpayers and on the consumers across the country.

President Trump has been very clear on one thing he wants, which is that we do not bail out insurance companies if, in 2018, we pay cost-sharing payment reductions, which are payments to pay for deductibles and copays for low-income Americans.

I 100 percent agree with President Trump on that, and Senator MURRAY 100 percent agrees with President Trump on that. We have language in our proposal to make sure that benefits go to consumers and to taxpayers and not to insurance companies. We asked the Congressional Budget Office to review that, and this is what it wrote: "On net, CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimate that implementing the legislation would reduce the deficit by \$3.8 billion over the 2018–2027 period relative to CBO's baseline."

In other words, the Alexander-Murray proposal would reduce Federal spending by \$3.8 billion. Not only does it not cost anything, but it saves the taxpayers money.

They then wrote a second thing, and this is quoting the Congressional Budget Office: "CBO and JCT expect that insurers in almost all areas of the country would be required to issue some form of rebate to individuals and the federal government."

Let me say that again. This is the CBO talking, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, with respect to the Alexander-Murray proposal that has been cosponsored by a total of 24 Senators—12 Republicans, 12 Democrats: "CBO and JCT expect that insurers in almost all areas of the country would be required to issue some form of rebate to individuals and the federal government."

The Congressional Budget Office has found that our proposal benefits taxpayers and consumers, not insurance companies. The specific benefit to the taxpayers is \$3.8 billion. The exact benefit to consumers has not been determined yet because that will be done State by State. Under our proposal, every State would come up with a plan to say, in 2018, because of the cost-sharing payments, premium rates need to be lower than they are already set. Then, in that State, they would be, and as a result, there would be rebates to individuals.

The CBO also found that there is a provision in the law for a catastrophic plan. That is a new insurance plan for people over the age of 29 that would have lower premiums and higher deductibles, but it would allow people to afford an insurance policy so that a medical catastrophe would not turn into a financial catastrophe.

"CBO estimates that making catastrophic plans part of the single risk pool would slightly lower premiums for other nongroup plans, because the people who enroll in catastrophic plans tend to be healthier, on average, than other nongroup market enrollees."

A major objective, I think, of all of us is to attract more young, healthy people into the pool as a way of lowering rates for everybody.

"As a result of the slightly lower estimated premiums, CBO and JCT ex-

pect that federal costs for subsidies for insurance purchased through a marketplace established under the ACA would decline by about \$1.1 billion over the 2019–2027 period."

We have already said what the Congressional Budget Office has reported earlier; that if we don't pass something like the Alexander-Murray proposal, this is what happens: If the cost-sharing payments are not paid, premiums in 2018 will go up an average 20 percent. They are already up. Our proposal will take them down. The Federal debt will increase by \$194 billion over 10 years, if we don't pass our proposal, due to the extra cost of subsidies to pay higher premiums, and up to 16 million Americans may live in counties where they are not able to buy any insurance in individual markets. The 350,000 Tennesseans in individual markets in Tennessee would be terrified by the prospect of not being able to buy any insurance or by the skyrocketing premiums.

I thank Senator CORNYN and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN, for allowing me to interrupt and make a brief statement.

Let me go to the bottom line once more. The President has said repeatedly, Senator MURRAY has said repeatedly, and I have said repeatedly that the Alexander-Murray amendment, the short-term bipartisan plan to reduce premiums and avoid chaos, must not bail out insurance companies. We have written language to make sure it does not, and now the Congressional Budget Office says it does not. It does not bail out insurance companies. It does benefit consumers. It does benefit taxpayers to the tune of \$3.8 billion. That is very important information.

I am encouraged by the President's comment yesterday. He thanked me at the luncheon for working in a bipartisan way on this. I am encouraged that Senator HATCH and KEVIN BRADY have introduced a bill recognizing the importance of continuous cost sharing. The ball is in the hands of the White House right now. They have our recommendations. They made some suggestions. That is the normal legislative process.

I am hopeful that something that has this kind of analysis; that it doesn't bail out insurance companies, that avoids a big increase to the Federal debt, that makes certain that people will be able to buy insurance for the next couple of years, that begins to lower premiums, that almost all Democrats want and that Republicans in the House have all voted for once this year when they voted for their repeal-and-replace bill—something like that sounds like something that might become law before the end of the year, and I believe the sooner the better.

I thank the Presiding Officer, Senators CORNYN and SHAHEEN.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am delighted to follow Senator ALEXANDER and was very pleased to hear the news from the CBO that this Alexander-Murray proposal not only doesn't bail out insurance companies, as we all agree we should not do—we want to make sure savings go to consumers—but it also will save taxpayers \$3.8 billion.

This is a bipartisan agreement. I applaud the work of Senator ALEXANDER and Senator PATTY MURRAY to craft this bipartisan agreement to address the challenges we have in the short term with healthcare. Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY have given us a template for bipartisan negotiations not just on healthcare but on other critical matters that are going to come before this Senate—tax reform, reauthorizing community health centers and the Children's Health Insurance Program, reaching an agreement on the 2018 budget. These are all major issues facing this country and issues we should be working on in a bipartisan way. The Senate is at its best when we observe regular order and we follow the committee process, when we work across the aisle and make principled compromises to get things done for the American people. I believe that is exactly what this health insurance bill does.

In a Senate that is nearly equally divided between Republicans and Democrats, this is the only productive way forward for us to address the challenges that face this country. Too often we have seen people use bipartisan negotiations as a last resort, but bipartisanship should be the Senate's first resort, not the last resort. It should be the foundation of our work in this body. This is how the great majority of Americans want us to conduct the Senate's business.

When I travel around New Hampshire, this is the consistent comment I hear everywhere I go: Why can't you all work together to get things done for this country? This is especially true on matters like healthcare and tax reform, which affect families throughout the country.

I am encouraged that the Alexander-Murray bill has earned strong bipartisan support and, as Senator ALEXANDER said, has 24 original cosponsors. That number is equally divided between Republicans and Democrats. This is a balanced agreement that has been negotiated by both parties over many months, and I think it is our best bet for stabilizing marketplaces in the short run so we can continue to work on long-term issues around healthcare.

I am especially pleased this agreement provides for the continuation of cost-sharing reduction payments for 2 years. These payments are necessary to keep premiums, deductibles, and copayments affordable for working people. Without these payments, the cost of coverage will skyrocket, insurers

will leave the marketplaces, and millions of people will lose their healthcare coverage. I have been working on this issue of cost-saving reduction payments since earlier this year, when I introduced a bill that would permanently appropriate funds for the CSRs.

As the CBO said, the language in the Alexander-Murray bill ensures that these CSRs are not a bailout to insurance companies, but they are a way to help people with the cost of insurance. They are orderly payments that are built into the law that will go directly to keeping premiums, copays, and deductibles affordable for lower income Americans. Both Democrats and Republicans recognize that these payments are an orderly, necessary subsidy that keeps down the cost of health coverage for everyday Americans. As Senator ALEXANDER said, we saw that these payments were in the bill the House voted for around healthcare, and they were also in the Senate bill earlier this year.

In recent months, I have heard from hundreds of people across New Hampshire about the enormous difference healthcare reform has made in their lives. We are a small State; we have just about 1.3 million people. Nearly 94,000 Granite Staters have gotten individual healthcare coverage through the marketplaces. Nearly 50,000 have gotten coverage thanks to the Medicaid expansion program in New Hampshire. That has been a bipartisan effort, with a Republican legislature and a Democratic Governor, to get that program in place, and it continues to enjoy the support of the Republican legislature and the Republican Governor.

Because of the Affordable Care Act's increased access to care, we also have 11,000 Granite Staters who have substance use disorders and who have been able to get treatment for the first time. New Hampshire has the second highest rate of overdose deaths from the heroin and opioid epidemic. Having treatment available through the expanded Medicaid Program has made a difference for thousands of people in New Hampshire and their families. Hundreds of thousands of Granite Staters with preexisting conditions no longer face discrimination resulting in denial or sky-high premiums. These are important achievements, and this legislation will allow us to continue down that road to make sure people have healthcare coverage they can afford.

For people across New Hampshire and across this country, healthcare coverage is often a matter of life or death. It is about being able to take a sick family member to a doctor. It is about knowing that a serious illness will not leave a mountain of debt.

I am very pleased to be able to join in the bipartisan efforts led by Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY to strengthen the parts of the healthcare law that are

working and to fix what is not working. The other provisions in this legislation will allow States more flexibility through the 1332 waiver process. The Alexander-Murray agreement expedites waiver approval so States can implement smart fixes to stabilize their marketplaces, for instance, by establishing a State-based reinsurance program. The agreement also includes a restoration of funding for open enrollment outreach in educational activities, and it protects four protections related to insurance affordability, coverage, and plan comprehensiveness. All of these changes are positive steps forward, steps that I hope will set us on a bipartisan path, strengthening elements of the Affordable Care Act that are working well and fixing elements that need to be changed.

I am hopeful the Alexander-Murray agreement can gain the bipartisan support it needs to pass in Congress, that it can gain the President's signature, and I am encouraged by Senator ALEXANDER's comments about the President's comments yesterday because we need to restore certainty and stability to the marketplaces. Instead of partisan efforts to undermine the law and take health insurance away from people, we should embrace the spirit of the Alexander-Murray agreement. Let's work together in a good-faith, bipartisan effort to build a healthcare system that leaves no American behind.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

SAFER ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know people watching and perhaps reading the newspaper, watching cable TV, and listening to talk radio think nothing ever happens here in Washington, DC, and they would be wrong. Certainly, we can always do better, and I am disappointed we haven't been more successful, but there are some measures we can make in the right direction in important pieces of legislation that make a very profound difference in people's lives.

Today I want to talk about a problem that, thanks to a bill passed by the Senate on Monday, we are helping to solve. This has to do with the untested rape kit backlog in our country.

Years ago, thanks to a courageous woman named Debbie Smith, I became a lot better informed about the nature of this problem: rape kits, the forensic evidence that is taken in sexual assault cases but which remained in evidence lockers in police stations untested or was sent to laboratories and never processed. At one point, it was estimated that there were as many as 400,000 untested rape kits in our country.

As the Presiding Officer knows, this is powerful evidence because of DNA

testing. We can literally almost say with certainty whether there is a match between the DNA of a suspect and that in a rape kit. This forensic evidence is collected following a sexual assault. Similarly, we can decide and determine whether there is no match whatsoever and, frankly, exclude somebody who is a potential suspect from being the guilty party by using this same powerful forensic evidence.

It is also important not just to solve the crime at hand but also to get sexual predators off the streets because we know this type of offender is likely to strike time and time and time again. The experts tell us that when opportunities don't provide themselves for sexual offenders to go after adults, frequently they will even go after children. So this is very important evidence.

As we know, there is typically a statute of limitations that after a period of time a case cannot be prosecuted, but it is really important, as I mentioned, to continue to test as many rape kits as we possibly can to get serial offenders off the streets and to determine whether somebody has been charged or suspected of a crime and is in fact innocent.

Thanks to courageous people like Debbie Smith, for whom we have named the Debbie Smith Act, as well as great bipartisan cooperation in the Senate, we have provided funding for the testing of rape kits at the State and local level, which has been supplemented by the Texas Legislature and other State legislatures.

In Houston a few years ago, our mayor felt so strongly about this that they took this on as a citywide project, with incredible results. They found a number of hits of previously unsolved crimes, and they were able to bring peace of mind to a lot of people who had been living under a cloud of unsolved crime when they processed these unprocessed rape kits.

Nationally, the problem is still big, with as many as 175,000 rape kits that still haven't been analyzed, and this is something we need to continue to attack. It is down from 400,000 at one point, was the estimate, down to 175,000, but that is still unacceptable.

Victims of sexual assault, scarred by painful memories and physical trauma, can't afford to wait for funding that is easier to come by. They need their stories to be heard, the evidence to be tested, and the results expedited. Federal, State, and local officials owe them those things. If we dawdle, those cases go cold, and they are the ones who bear the scars and the pain of these unresolved crimes.

That is why the Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting Act, called the SAFER Act, is so important. That is the bill I mentioned a moment ago that we passed in the Senate on Monday. It reauthorizes a program created

in 2013 that has helped law enforcement reduce the national rape kit backlog. I thank my friend and colleague, Representative TED POE over in the House, for sponsoring the House version.

The original legislation increased the amount of funds spent on untested kits by 35 percent and allowed 5 to 7 percent of them to be used on audits of existing law enforcement programs. These audits, in turn, uncovered tens of thousands of untested kits across the country, each with evidence that could be used to bring an offender to justice. The new bill passed by the Senate this week goes further. It ensures that pediatric forensic nurses are available for training so that, once they complete it, they are better equipped to respond promptly and appropriately to children suffering from abuse.

Finally, the bill extends the sunset provision of the SAFER Program, which will ensure the longevity of a program with a proven history of success.

I am grateful to have a wide range of bipartisan support, including the senior Senator from Minnesota, as well as the senior Senators from Nevada and Colorado, who are original cosponsors. This is a good example of legislation that is bipartisan and that makes progress toward solving a very real problem in our country. But, as so often we find the case, there is not much reporting on it, much attention paid, but it is worth noting here on the Senate floor that bipartisan progress on important legislation that helps people's lives become better is being done here in the Senate.

CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. President, I also want to bring up another important piece of legislation I reintroduced this last week, the Corrections Oversight, Recidivism Reduction, and Eliminating Cost to Taxpayers in Our National System Act. Let me call it the CORRECTIONS Act for short because that is a mouthful. I am grateful to my Democratic cosponsor, the junior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, for joining me on what is, like the SAFER Act, significant bipartisan legislation.

My home State of Texas has a well-deserved reputation for being tough on crime, but we have also learned over time that it is important to be smart on crime too. We successfully implemented statewide criminal justice reforms that help low-risk offenders become productive members of society once they reenter civil society from prison, and the State is focused on the important role rehabilitation can play.

I am not naive enough to think that every person who is imprisoned behind bars, having been convicted of a criminal offense, is going to take advantage of the opportunity to right their path and to get on with their life, but some will, and given the proper assessments and incentives, we have found that this sort of approach works.

The CORRECTIONS Act that Senator WHITEHOUSE and I have introduced builds off of the State models that have worked in Rhode Island, Georgia, Texas, Louisiana, and elsewhere, and it requires the Bureau of Prisons to provide programs that partner with faith-based and community-based organizations to better prepare these men and women to become law-abiding and active members of society. I hope the Senate can follow Texas's lead and implement these commonsense, bipartisan reforms.

This bill achieves a number of objectives, which I will mention briefly.

First, it requires the Department of Justice to develop risk-assessment tools to evaluate the recidivism potential of all eligible offenders.

Second, it refocuses resources on those offenders most likely to commit future crimes and allows lower risk inmates to serve their sentences under less restrictive conditions, thus reducing prison costs, so the taxpayer wins too.

Third, the bill expands programming—such as substance abuse treatment and vocational training—that has been proven to reduce recidivism.

Fourth, it requires the Bureau of Prisons to foster partnerships with faith-based and nonprofit and community-based organizations in order to deliver a broad spectrum of programming to prisoners.

Next, it allows inmates who successfully complete recidivism-reduction programs to earn credit toward time in prerelease custody, while eliminating eligibility for inmates convicted of serious crimes.

Additionally, the bill requires the Department of Justice to implement inmate reentry pilot projects across the country and to study their effects so that we can gain a better understanding of what works and what doesn't work when it comes to offenders' reintegration into society.

Finally, the CORRECTIONS Act creates a national commission to review every aspect of our criminal justice system. The last review of this type was done in 1965. And while I think Congress—certainly this is within our wheelhouse, but we probably don't have the bandwidth to do this, which is why this national commission is so important to be able to report back to Congress and make recommendations to us.

We know one thing for sure: that when people serve their sentence and they are released from prison, they are going to reenter society. Why wouldn't we want to make sure those who are willing to deal with their addiction, to learn a skill, to get a GED, and to otherwise improve their lives—why wouldn't we want to make sure they are better prepared when they reenter civil society? Otherwise, they are left with this turnstile of crime where they

go from prison, to the community, to committing another crime, to another conviction, and back to prison again.

Our focus should be on helping individuals find a productive path as contributing members of society, and that involves making sure returning to prison doesn't happen because there is no alternative. By implementing job training, drug rehabilitation, and mental health treatment, we can focus and save taxpayer dollars, lower crime and incarceration rates, decrease recidivism, and most importantly, we can help people change their own lives for the better.

Joining State and local officials at the forefront of this are groups like Prison Fellowship and the Texas Public Policy Foundation, which create programs for inmates, such as the Prison Entrepreneurship Program—or PEP for short—which teaches prisoners how to start and manage their own businesses when they begin life on the outside. You would be amazed by individuals who started their own businesses through the PEP program and turned their lives around in the process through the mentorship and fellowship that these programs provide.

I hope we can learn from the laboratories of democracy, known as the States, where we implemented successful criminal justice reform programs—this time, in our prison system—where we will all benefit. Taxpayers benefit because we will have to incarcerate fewer people because they won't continue this cycle of release, offend, and reincarceration—at least a certain percentage of them won't. We can help people whose lives are in a tailspin because of drug or alcohol addiction or who feel as though they are on a dead-end street because they simply don't have the job skills or the education in order to compete in the economy.

I hope we can follow the lead of successful experiments in our States, such as Texas, and implement these commonsense, bipartisan reforms in our Federal prison system.

Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that I know the administration is very interested in engaging on criminal justice reform. Last year, we worked on a sentencing and prison reform bill that unfortunately seems to not be going anywhere. While the prison reform component of it seems to have a consensus of support here in the Congress and I think could pass and be signed into law, the sentencing reform piece is a little more controversial and I know divides even the Republican conference, and I am not sure what it does with the Democratic conference. But I believe we ought to start on a step-by-step basis, get what we can get done, and get it to the President for his signature, while providing these tools to inmates who are incarcerated through the Bureau of Prisons, and then keep working on the other parts

on which we perhaps have not yet been able to build consensus.

I hope our colleagues will work with us on this important piece of legislation as we work to reform our criminal justice system in ways that make sense and that save taxpayer dollars.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, yesterday in the middle of the day, the Presiding Officer and I and the Senator from Texas and others had a chance to meet with the President and talk about tax relief. It seemed to me very clear that the President and those of us who are advocating tax cuts right now are on the same wavelength, which is, let's have tax cuts for hard-working families, and let's do the other things we need to do in the Tax Code to ensure that those very same families have better jobs.

As I said on the floor of the Senate last week, there are two ways to increase take-home pay. One is to start taking less out of the paychecks people are getting now, and another one is to give them an even better paycheck in the future. We need to look at both of those ways to increase the opportunity for working families and working individuals.

We are now into the eighth year of almost no economic growth. If there is no economic growth, there is very little incentive for your job to be a better paying job than it was the previous year no matter what has happened to your other costs, and we clearly see that happening.

We are into the first year of this new administration. We are looking at 3 percent annual growth after 8 years in which growth didn't exceed 2 percent. Anytime you begin to talk like an economist, people begin to wonder: Well, what does that have to do with me? Let me just say that for taxpayers generally, for working families generally, the more growth you have, one, the more revenue that comes in that takes care of problems like the deficit. The way you take care of those problems—the best way—is to grow the economy. Two, people are much more focused on keeping the workforce they have, getting the best of the workforce that is coming on board as their workforce moves on for retirement or relocations or does other things.

Three percent economic growth is not good enough. The post-World War II average—that is more than seven decades now of average—is, I think, almost 3½ percent. There are very few economic problems in our country that wouldn't be made substantially better, including our own Federal deficit, if we see growth exceed or even get to the 70-year average. There is no reason to believe that can't happen.

Yesterday, the President was talking about the two ways to immediately re-

lieve pressures on families. One is more take-home pay, and two is a better job that also increases take-home pay. But the first step we can achieve immediately by the kind of tax relief we need.

There have been 8 years of stagnant wages. Half of the families in the country are living paycheck to paycheck. Very few families can face an emergency that is even \$500 without having to restructure what they are doing and how they are doing it. We can do a better job at this. We need more jobs. We need higher wages. And the two principal goals of this tax bill should be to do exactly that—create more wages now, more take-home pay now, and create an environment in which we are going to be more competitive. Simplifying the Tax Code is one way to meet that first impact, having a tax code that people understand better, that they think is fairer.

A tax code where people think they are being treated fairly is much more likely to be complied with than a tax code where people see that somebody else who makes the same amount of money as they make is paying a lot less taxes than they are paying. The American tax system is probably the greatest voluntary compliance. Sure, there are laws that require people to comply, but most people are never impacted by those laws. They know they could be, but the American people have shown a willingness to pay their fair share if they know that their fair share is, in fact, their fair share. A simpler tax system, a more easily understood tax system, a system that has fewer than the seven different tax brackets that people pay today are things we can and should achieve.

Doubling the standard deduction helps a lot when people look at the \$12,000 deduction they have now. For a couple, as they look at that deduction and realize that deduction, that standard deduction, has doubled, suddenly, if you are a couple filing jointly, you are not paying any taxes on the first \$24,000 you earn. If you are a single individual, you are not paying any taxes on the first \$12,000 you earn. Keeping enough of the family-benefiting exemptions helps make the family do what the family would like to do. What if they would like to give to their church and charity? There is no discussion saying we wouldn't keep the standard charitable deduction as a deduction. There is no discussion that we wouldn't keep home mortgage as a deduction so we are encouraging homeownership or looking at how to make the child tax credit bigger rather than smaller.

Many of the early analyses of what this Tax Code would do say that for a family of four, they would pay more than they are paying now up to certain income level. Generally, that will turn out not to be the case—certainly, at the middle-income levels and below if

you factor in the child tax credit, which hasn't been determined yet.

Our tax-writing committee will be looking at that child tax credit as an important addition to the individual exemptions because it costs money to raise kids. The Congress surely should understand that, appreciate that, and factor that into the deductions. Just like we are doubling the deduction for individual earners, we also have to look at what that child tax credit should look like.

Tax policies that benefit homeownership, tax policies that encourage contributing to charities and community activities and church and synagogue and mosque—your religious activities—all would continue to be a part of this Tax Code.

Also, when talking about sending kids to school, one way to not have student debt is to encourage families to have ways to better prepare for what they, in most cases, would hope would be a goal or an expenditure their family would make. We can do things like expanding the Pell grants for poor families, but for families who don't qualify for that, we can do things that allow the deduction early on for putting money in a fund that prepares people to go to school.

Keeping well-paying jobs at home and encouraging more jobs to come here is also an important part of the goal. You can't have the highest corporate rate in the world and expect that you are going to be as competitive as you would be with other countries. A corporate rate of 35 percent, in 1986, was fairly near the middle when that rate was arrived at with President Reagan and others working on it the last time we did a tax rewrite, and right in the middle is about where we should be. However, now the situation is we see that right in the middle is no longer 35 percent; it is about 20 percent. Ireland just revised its 15 percent rate to 8 percent. Great Britain is reducing their rate to a little less than 20 percent. They have been, I think, a little more than 20 percent. We need to be sure the products we make here and the jobs that are created here—that there is a competitive ability to sell that same product anywhere in the world, with the advantage, obviously, of being made by our great workforce but also an advantage where our tax system doesn't work us out of the marketplace, doesn't make us less competitive.

A territorial tax system will be one of the things we are going to hear talked about a lot. For most of us, that doesn't seem to have any impact. We earn our money here, we pay our taxes here, but we also want to be sure that if American companies sell products somewhere else and earn money there, that they can, should, and would bring that money back to the United States to reinvest it in the kinds of things that create jobs here.

I think this doesn't have to be all that complicated. We need to understand what the core principles are. We need to get to those core principles. We need to get this done this year so people are planning, in the first months of next year, on how to take advantage of a new, simpler, fairer, and more competitive Tax Code. This needs to be job one of this Congress for the next few weeks. We need to get that done so job one for the country, beginning at the end of this debate, is what we can do to create more and better jobs and create more take-home pay for hard-working families.

I am joined by some of my colleagues who are going to talk about this same topic, I hope, and others. We need to be focused. I can tell, with the President's comments yesterday, he is focused on this. We are focused on this. This is a job we need to get done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I wanted to reinforce and underscore some of the comments made by my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator LANKFORD, on what is happening in the Senate right now. It is actually really important for the American people to understand what is going on. Maybe we would finally get the press, who sit up there above your chair, Madam President, to write about this topic.

Right now, we are debating a very well-qualified district court judge nominee—a Federal district court judge nominee from Oklahoma. Senator LANKFORD was down here, and he obviously knows the nominee, Scott Palk. He is so qualified that the vote for cloture to move forward on this nominee—who, by the way, was nominated by President Trump for a Federal district court position but was previously nominated by President Obama with fairly bipartisan support—was 79 to 18. That is really strong bipartisan support. It just happened about an hour ago on the Senate floor.

So what are we doing? Well, we are still going to be debating for 30 hours. We are not really debating the nominee because he is well qualified. That is what we are doing in the Senate, supposedly. Anyone watching, you know we are not debating him because he is very well qualified, but we are still going to burn 30 hours. Why is this? Well, this raises a much broader issue of the tactics that are happening on the Senate floor right now. The minority leader and his colleagues will not come down and explain what they are up to.

I gave a speech on this a couple of weeks ago, and I just asked: Come on down. Let the American people understand why we are spending all this time on nominees who are very well qualified and have enormous bipartisan support. Why are we being required to

go an additional 30 hours? Those are the rules, but normally there would be unanimous consent to move forward. What is happening now hasn't been explained, but it definitely hurts the American people, whether you are a Democrat or Republican. What is happening now is, every single nominee from the Trump administration, whether Federal judge or Assistant Secretary for Health and Human Services, is being delayed. Here are the numbers. Eight years ago, President Obama had about 66 percent of his nominees confirmed at this period in the fall of his first term. People were working through them. If you didn't like the nominee, you would just vote against them, but you wouldn't say we are going to burn half the week of the Senate to debate somebody who is not even controversial. This judge, when we finally get through the 30 hours, is going to pass with 80 Senate votes, but we are burning through it anyway. President Obama, 8 years ago, had 66 percent confirmed. The number for President Trump 8 years later is 33 percent. Imagine our friends in the media—the New York Times—if Republicans were doing this to President Obama during his first few months in office. There would be front-page stories every day. The Republican Party is trying to undermine the new President—delaying, delaying, delaying. You don't hear a peep from our national press. They don't write about it.

It is a problem because we have work to do in this country. I have asked the minority leader to just come down and tell the American people why you are doing this. We have had numerous judges, very noncontroversial, very bipartisan, where we essentially spent the whole week “debating” them. We are not debating this judge, but we are going to spend 30 hours on him.

Why are they doing that? And why are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agreeing to it? I asked them to come on down and explain it to the American people, the people watching on TV or in the Gallery. Why are you doing this? Does it help the country? Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, it doesn't help the country. That is the whole point, but nobody wants to come down and explain their delay tactics. The press will not write about it because some of them like it, I think.

Here is the truth. When we are spending all this time all week on this judge who will get voted on—and he will pass because he is very well qualified. Senator LANKFORD laid out his resume. He was previously nominated by President Obama. We are going to vote for him after this 30-hour period, and he will pass with a strong bipartisan vote. What is the challenge? What happens to the other issues we need to address in this country—in this body? We can't get to them, if we wanted to turn to other issues to start moving them.

My colleague from New Hampshire was just on the floor. She talked about all the things we have to do. I agree with her 100 percent: tax reform, healthcare, budget—we never do the budget here anymore—National Defense Authorization Act, growing the economy, as my friend from Missouri talked about, infrastructure, immigration, and the Dreamer issue. We have so much to do, let alone getting Trump administration officials confirmed and judges confirmed. That is a big list, but because we are spending 30 hours on a debate, which really isn't a debate on the judge, and we can't get consent from the other side to actually work on these other issues, this is what we are doing. We are just burning time.

The minority leader will not come down and explain it. I don't know if he can explain it, but that is what we are doing. Again, if the shoe were on the other foot, the press would be going crazy. Right now, they just let it happen. My view is, it would be great if one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle would come down and say: Here is why we are wasting all of this time. Just let us know.

As Senator LANKFORD mentioned, this judge was nominated by the President in May. Now we are going to spend most of the week "debating" him, when that is not what is going on. It is just a delay tactic. My view is, we should just say: OK. You want to play ball like that? We will stay here 24/7 and keep the Senate open 7 days a week. Let's get to work. Let's stay here until Christmas. See if the minority leader and his team keep doing that, keep delaying. I think we should call their bluff.

Right now, the delay tactics—which nobody on the other side wants to explain—in my view, are not defensible, and they are not helping the country. Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, you want to seat the government. You want to get good people working for the American people. Right now, that is not happening.

I just wish the other side would either explain it or stop doing it. Let's get to work for this Nation.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I fully associate myself with the comments just made by the Senator from the great State of Alaska. We have to get to work here.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, I am here to talk about one of the most pressing issues we have to deal with. Yesterday, we had lunch where the President spoke about why tax reform was so critical for healing the economy and really having our Nation rise to its full capabilities in terms of economic performance and global competitiveness. You

read the headlines. The headlines read like: Republicans are for the big guy, for the corporations, not for the little guy.

You will hear them talk about policies that will have us drowning in red ink. You will hear them talk about unsustainable economic policies. I saw all of those headlines before, about 6 years ago, in the North Carolina statehouse when we inherited a disaster for an economy. It was after the 2008 crisis. We had a State that was drowning in red ink, with a \$2.5 billion structural deficit. We had a tax code that was absolutely out of sync with our competition, and we set about to fix it.

This is what we ended up doing. All of the headlines looked exactly the way the headlines looked today, but we had members on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, who recognized that North Carolina should be one of the fastest growing, most competitive States in the Nation. So we went about trying to figure out how to make that happen. We determined, for one thing, that there was an undue burden on individuals and working families. So we had to simplify the tax code, and we had to reduce the tax burden on the individuals. We also recognized that our corporate tax rate was preventing us from getting the job expansion opportunities. The States like South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Virginia were winning time after time after time.

By the time I came in as the speaker of the house, there had been a long time before we had any major economic development opportunity in North Carolina. So we were able to put together a corporate tax cut, an individual income tax cut, and, in our case, even a sales tax cut, which all of the pundits said was going to be a disaster. It ended up engineering and serving as the basis for one of the most significant economic turnarounds of any State for over the past 30 or 40 years. It went from a zero rainy day fund to a \$2 billion rainy day fund, putting more money into education, putting more money into Medicaid, and creating the resources that would allow us to do the other things we wanted to do.

When I was speaker, I had to go look to see what Texas was doing—I see the Senator from Texas is here—and say: What could we do to be more competitive with Texas? We looked at Iowa. What could we do as a matter of tax policy that would make us more competitive with Iowa on, let's say, agriculture? Those were our peer competitors. As a State leader, I am looking at my peer competitors in their States.

For our corporate tax policy, we look at China, at Russia, at Europe, and we look at our competitors and make it very clear that we are out of step. As Senator BLUNT said, years ago we weren't out of step, but we are today. We are not competitive with people

with whom we should be cleaning their clock in terms of economic expansion. You only get that done if you lower the corporate tax rate. If you actually get people who will invest that capital and hire more people, provide more opportunities for working families, and create more demand for jobs so that wages go up, that is how you ultimately get this economy moving to a point where we create the resources to also ultimately pay down the debt. I still consider that to be the single greatest threat to our national security.

Along the way, the reason I know our tax policy was about right where it needed to be was that virtually every lobbyist in Raleigh was mad at me—and I mean all of them.

If you look at 1986, the last time we did meaningful tax reform, virtually every lobbyist on Capitol Hill was mad at the folks who voted for the bill, and that was on a bipartisan basis. So we have to have Members who are willing to go big, who are willing to actually reduce the corporate tax rate, to work on the tax burden for working families, and to recognize that it is on us.

We are in a historic opportunity to turn this economy around and to take advantage of the fact that other countries are not heeding the call. They are heaping more regulations on their businesses. They are adding more taxes in some cases. This is a historic opportunity for us to just blow past the competition and ultimately create the resources to retire our debt and provide the critical resources we need for so many other things that we need to get here, like strengthening our international defense, making sure our homeland is safe, and securing the border. All of these kinds of things can be done, but they can only be done if we have the courage to move forward with tax cuts and tax reform.

I hope that all of my Members, before Thanksgiving, are in this Chamber and have an opportunity to vote for a bold reform package but, more importantly, for the fulfillment of a promise that we made to the American people if we had majorities in the Senate, in the House, and in the White House. We have it, and it is time for us to act.

I don't care what the headlines read because I have seen those headlines before. I don't care what the special interests want in terms of exemptions and exceptions because I have had those meetings in my office before. At the end of the day, every single one of those folks who wanted to pick apart one exception or an exemption have come back into my office and said: You know what; you have protected us from ourselves, because if you had listened to us, you would have done far less than you were capable of doing.

There is nobody who follows State politics that would question what was done in North Carolina. It has been an extraordinary turnaround. Now it is

time to do the same thing for this great Nation.

I hope that all of my colleagues would set aside the distractions, mute the voices of the special interests that will want their special exemption or exception and fulfill the promise that we made to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today at a time of extraordinary opportunity. The American people have entrusted us with something that, historically, is quite rare: a Republican President, Republican control of every executive agency, and Republican majorities in both Houses of Congress. Now it is incumbent on us to stand up and lead, to deliver on the promises we made to do what we told the American people we would do.

We have before us right now an opportunity for historic tax cuts. Just last week, this body voted out a budget resolution that is the vehicle for adopting tax cuts. I urge every Member of this body to come together in support of a strong, bold tax plan that cuts taxes on every working man and women and that brings back jobs and economic growth.

Growth is really fundamental to every other challenge we have in this country. If you look historically, since World War II, our economy has grown on average about 3.3 percent a year. Yet, from 2008 to today, we have grown only 1.2 percent a year—about a third of the historic rate of growth.

If we don't turn that around, none of our other problems are solvable. If you care about the national debt, if you care about the deficit, if you care about rebuilding and strengthening our military, if you care about strengthening and improving Social Security and Medicare so that they are there for the next generations, we have to have growth. With economic growth, every one of those is possible. Without growth—if we stay mired in the stagnant Obama 1- and 2-percent GDP growth, none of those problems are solvable.

Growth is foundational. I would like to lay out three principles and then seven key elements that I think should guide this body in tax reform. No. 1 is growth. When we are adopting tax cuts, we should focus directly on jobs and economic growth and focus on the reforms that produce jobs, that expand economic growth, that grow our economy, that create more opportunity, and that raise wages.

Working men and women in this country are hurting. We need wages going up. We need more jobs. We need young people coming out of school with two, three, four, or five job opportunities. That is what tax cuts are all about. No. 1, we start with growth.

I will point out that we can do this. From 2008 to 2012, the economy grew 0.9

percent a year—less than 1 percent a year on average. If you look back in history to the previous 4-year period when growth averaged less than 1 percent a year, it was 1978 to 1982. It was coming out of the Jimmy Carter administration. It was the same failed economic policies—high taxes, high regulation, high spending, and high debt.

In 1981 Ronald Reagan came into the White House. The Reagan Presidency focused front and center on tax cuts, with major tax cuts in 1981, and then following it up in 1986 with major tax reform.

And what happened? When Reagan came in 1981 with across-the-board tax cuts and tax cuts for everybody, Democrats screamed, the media screamed, and yet the economy took off.

The fourth year of the Reagan Presidency, GDP growth wasn't 3 percent. It wasn't 4 percent. It wasn't 5 percent. It wasn't even 6 percent. It was 7.2 percent in 1984—7.2 percent, those are numbers you hear in the developing world. Those are numbers you hear in China and India.

All of our learned economists who are so world weary and all of our media reporters who are so world weary tell us: No, no, no, that kind of growth is not possible in America anymore. Accept the new normal of 1 and 2 percent of stagnancy, of young people buried in student loans, of people hurting. Accept that as the new normal.

That is nonsense. If we want to see Reagan-style growth, we need a Reagan-style tax cut—an unapologetic, unabashed tax cut that focuses on jobs.

The second big principle is simplicity. There is an old rule, KISS, or "keep it simple, stupid," which is particularly powerful when it comes to tax reform. Bold simplicity has enormous power and, in particular, allowing every American to fill out their taxes on a postcard. I believe that should be an integral element of what we pass. It is what I have been pressing for many years, and what I would continue to urge my colleagues here in the Senate and in the House to do, which is to simplify the Tax Code so that we don't spend millions and millions of hours and paperwork wasted on compliance. Make it a postcard. Make it simple.

Then the third objective is fairness. We want a tax system that is fair, that isn't arbitrary, that isn't Washington picking winners and losers and deciding: OK, this industry we like; so you can do OK. This industry we don't like; so you are going to hurt. We are going to pick between them.

We need to cut everybody's taxes.

Last week, I debated BERNIE SANDERS on CNN on tax reform. BERNIE, to his credit, was very candid. He said he wanted to raise your taxes. If you are a taxpayer, your taxes are going up under BERNIE and the Democrats' vision.

My vision is every bit as simple on the other side. If you are a taxpayer, I want to cut your taxes. That is what we need to do—to cut taxes fairly, across the board for every American, to reduce the burden from Washington, and to create jobs and economic opportunity.

I would note that, in that debate with BERNIE, there was one exchange that I thought was particularly notable. BERNIE, as you know, when he ran in Vermont did not run as a Democrat. Rather, he ran telling the voters he was a socialist. I asked a simple question: What is the difference between a socialist and a Democrat on taxes?

He sat there for several seconds in silence and said: I don't know the answer to that.

My response was: Neither do I.

One side of this Chamber wants to raise your taxes if you are a taxpayer. The other side of this Chamber wants to cut your taxes if you are a taxpayer. That is a simple choice for the American people.

What are the elements that should reflect those principles? There are seven critical elements: No. 1, I believe we should create a simple, low, flat rate. Currently, there are seven individual rates with the top rate at nearly 40 percent. Ideally, what I believe we should have is one simple, low, flat tax.

When I was campaigning for President, I campaigned on a simple, flat tax of 10 percent for every individual and every family in this country, 16 percent as a business flat tax, and to abolish every other Federal tax, to abolish the corporate income tax, to abolish the death tax, to abolish the alternative minimum tax, and to abolish the payroll tax. Everyone pays a simple, flat 10 percent for individuals and 16 percent for businesses. Simplicity has power.

It may be the case that we don't have the votes to go to a simple, flat tax today. If that is where we are, if we don't have the votes to do it today, then the closer we get to that the better. If we can't get to a simple, flat tax, then going from seven brackets to three is an improvement, and going from three to two is even better, and going from two to one would be even better than that. We need to press consistently for a low, simple, flat rate that is fair for everyone.

The second element, which we talked about just a minute ago, is filing your taxes on a postcard. Let me tell you the most wonderful aspect of that simplicity. It is not the billions of hours, it is not the billions of dollars that are saved. The best aspects of filing your taxes on a postcard are actually the physical dimensions of the postcard. It means that Congress can't add a bunch of new things. Even if we tried to put it in four-point font, eventually you will run out of space on the postcard. The reason a postcard is so important is it

imposes a discipline on the Federal Government that it can't carve out a special loophole for every favored or disfavored group because it is simple and flat and fair for everybody.

No. 3, allow immediate expensing. What does expensing mean? It means that if a business makes a capital expenditure, right now, they physically have to amortize it over a number of years. Instead, what we should do is allow full and immediate expensing.

If a farmer in the Presiding Officer's home State of Iowa buys a new tractor, that farmer should be able to expense it immediately, that year. If a steel factory buys new equipment and hires new workers to operate that equipment, that steel factory should be able to expense that new equipment immediately. If a diner buys new kitchen equipment and hires new cooks and waiters and waitresses, the owner of that small business should be able to expense that capital expenditure. And why is that? The reason is the first principle I started with—growth.

If you care about jobs and economic growth, expensing is a powerful engine for jobs and economic growth. It creates millions of new jobs because that capital has to be spent in the United States. It has to be spent here. That tractor is in the United States; that steel equipment is in the United States; that diner with the cooking equipment is in the United States, which means those jobs are in the United States.

I would note, by the way, the people who particularly benefit from immediate expensing are the working men and women of this country—the men and women with callouses on their hands, the men and women, frankly, who gave Donald Trump the victory in November of 2016 or the union workers whom, sadly, the Democratic Party has abandoned.

There was a time when the Democratic Party styled themselves as the party of the working man and woman. That time has been long since forgotten. The Democratic Party now listens to California environmentalist billionaires and ignores the plight of steelworkers, oilfield workers, farmers, ranchers, taxicab drivers, truckdrivers, waiters, and waitresses—the men and women who are working hard for their families. That is who the Republican Party should be fighting for—the working men and women of this country. Immediate expensing impacts working men and women, particularly in heavy manufacturing.

The fourth element is a lower corporate rate. We are seeing, and we have seen over the last 8 years, companies leaving America and moving their headquarters, moving their legal domicile to other countries. Why is that? Because the United States has the highest corporate tax rate of any developed country in the world. We have

created a tax environment that tells American businesses: If you simply get the heck out of Dodge, if you simply move somewhere other than America, immediately your profitability will jump because our corporate tax rate is higher and, in some instances, more than twice as high as our competitors.

Look at Ireland. Ireland used to have high corporate taxes. They cut their corporate tax rate. Then they cut it again, and they are seeing businesses flood into Ireland because of the low corporate tax rate, and they bring with them jobs.

Our focus should be jobs. If we cut the corporate rate so that it is low—so that it is at least as low as our competitors and ideally even lower—we will create an environment where more businesses want to do business in America where there are more jobs.

I am reminded of Hillary Clinton, who said during the Presidential campaign season: Don't let anybody tell you that corporations or businesses create jobs. Even in the world of politics, that was a particularly asinine statement. The last time I checked, you get a job from going to work for a business—unless you start your own business. You either start your own business or you go to work for another business. That is what gives you jobs. We need to create that environment.

In recent years, we have talked about corporate inversions, companies fleeing America. Our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have all these ideas to punish the companies that flee America. Their approach is: We are going to tax you so high that you can't do business in this country, and then, when you try to survive, we are going to punish you on top of that with fines and penalties. It is actually reminiscent of their approach to ObamaCare, where they fine people who can't afford insurance after driving premiums through the roof.

It is a much better idea to cut our corporate tax rate. Let's create a tax and regulatory environment in America so that businesses want to be here and create jobs. It is my hope that 3, 5, 10 years from now, other countries—European countries and Asian countries—are complaining about corporate inversions because their companies are fleeing their countries and coming to America, because there is no place on Earth better to do business than America, because we will have honored our commitment on tax reform and cut taxes and created an environment where businesses can thrive.

No. 5, encourage repatriation. Right now, Federal tax law subjects American businesses to punitive double taxation at the highest rates in the developed world if they bring capital back here from overseas. U.S. companies have roughly \$2.7 trillion in capital overseas, and our tax system inextricably incentivizes them to keep the

money overseas, which means—what do they do with the money overseas? It means they build factories in China, in Mexico, in India, and countries overseas that aren't America, and then they hire people overseas. Why? Because if they bring the capital back here and hire Americans, our tax punishes them. That doesn't make any sense.

I want to see that \$2.7 trillion come back to America. I want to see that money back in this country. I want to see new factories, I want to see new stores, I want to see new businesses, and I want to see new jobs. We need to encourage repatriation, not put a punitive tax on the money coming back. Do you want to talk about patriotism? There is a reason it is called repatriation. It is patriotic to use that money to hire Americans.

Our Democratic friends just want to yell and scream and insult them. That is not the right answer. People are going to respond to rational incentives. If you punish companies for bringing money back to America, they are going to respond rationally by not doing that. Let's change our tax system so we don't punish them for bringing jobs back to America.

The sixth element, end the death tax. The death tax is one of the most unfair aspects of the Federal tax system. The death tax also happens to be the very favorite tax our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle love to demagogue. I have heard over past weeks attack after attack after attack on the death tax—that it is about the superrich.

Here is a secret that the Democrats will never tell you. The superrich don't pay the death tax. By and large, they manage to avoid the tax with remarkable success rates. They hire armies of accountants and lawyers. Do you think George Soros will pay the death tax? Hold your breath, and let me know how that works out. It doesn't impact the superrich.

The death tax actually generates very little revenue for the Federal Government. Who gets hit by the death tax? It is the farmers, it is the ranchers, and it is the small business owners. In the debate last week with BERNIE SANDERS, BERNIE said that this doesn't affect farmers at all.

The Presiding Officer and I have both spoken with an awful lot of farmers in Iowa and in Texas. I have heard farmer after farmer after farmer lament the death tax because of what happens when the patriarch, when the farmer, passes away and passes the farm on to the next generation. Over and over again, the next generation is forced to sell the farm just to pay Uncle Sam. They have already paid taxes once; they pay taxes when they earn their money. The death tax says that for having the temerity to die, we are going to tax you again at a punitive

rate. Death should not be a taxable event. That is not fair. It shouldn't be the case that when you die, the two people you get to see are the undertaker and the taxman.

We see farms that are sold, that are broken up; we see ranches that are sold, that are broken up; we see small businesses that are sold, that are broken up because the next generation that wants to run the small business, wants to keep the jobs, suddenly has a massive Federal tax bill. They don't have the fancy lawyers and accountants who, like the superrich, help them avoid the tax. So they get hit with the full force of the death tax.

If you care about jobs and economic growth, why do you want a small business owner to be forced to sell the factory just to pay the tax bill? This means the employees all get laid off; they lose their jobs. It is much better to have those small businesses growing, to have those farmers prospering, and to have those ranchers prospering.

The final element is that we need to end the alternative minimum tax. The AMT is a totally second set of taxation. Every year, it is growing the number of people who are hit by it, and it just adds complexity to the code.

We should focus on growth, simplicity, and fairness. If we do that, if we focus on bringing back jobs, we have the ability to have a tremendous impact on our country.

Finally, I want to make a plea to the Members of our conference, to the Republicans. We may get some Democrats to support us on tax reform. It is possible. We may get one or two. Sadly, we are in a different world than we used to be. In 1981 and 1986, Democrats actually used to be willing to work with Republicans on taxes.

Tip O'Neill, a Democrat, was Speaker of the House when Reagan passed massive tax cuts. Bill Bradley in this body, a liberal New Jersey Democrat, helped lead the effort for tax reform. There are no Tip O'Neills or Bill Bradleys left. There is not a single Democrat leading the fight for tax reform—not a one.

You may get one or two Democrats at the end of the day who cast a vote after everything is done because they are afraid of the electoral consequences in November. But I will make a prediction right now that if we don't have 50 votes on this side of the aisle, not a single Democrat will provide the 50th vote. They might be the 52nd or 53rd vote, but we ain't getting vote No. 50 from that side of the aisle, which means that for tax reform to happen, our conference has to get our act together. We have 52 Republicans, and we have to get 50 on the same page.

Listen, we are at a time when we are seeing personality battles, and we are seeing nastiness. This is a strange time in politics. Any three Republicans can torpedo tax reform. I am making a plea

to all 52: Don't be selfish and petulant. Don't put personal animosities above the good of the country.

We were elected by the voters to do a job. Let's do the job. Let's honor the promises we made. Let's cut taxes, bring back jobs, bring back economic growth, and demonstrate to the voters there is a reason they elected Republican majorities.

If we don't, if we can't get our act together, then I fear the consequences will be catastrophic, both as a policy matter and a political matter.

I urge my colleagues: Let's do what we said we would do. Let's cut taxes. Let's bring back jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the dire humanitarian situation in Puerto Rico and to challenge this country to end a century of discrimination against the Puerto Rican people.

While the fleeting media attention may have waned, the desperation of the people of Puerto Rico has not. The lackluster response from the Trump administration is an outrage. It has been more than a month since the hurricane, and 80 percent of the island's electricity is still out. Roads and bridges have collapsed. Homes have been destroyed. Of the 67 hospitals that are open, less than half of them are operating with electricity. Families are searching far and wide for clean drinking water, and some have been drinking water from wells at a Superfund site.

This kind of inhumane response would never ever be permitted in a U.S. State. But one doesn't even have to look at other States to evaluate this response; we can look abroad. Within 2 weeks of the earthquake in Haiti, there were 17,000 U.S. military personnel on the ground in that country. Two weeks after Hurricane Maria made landfall in the United States, the United States had deployed only 10,000 troops to respond to the disaster in both Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

News broke yesterday that the state-owned electric company on the island, PREPA, refused to operationalize mutual aid agreements with electric companies on the U.S. mainland. That is a standard step in normal disaster response. Fault lies with PREPA, but how on Earth did FEMA and the Trump administration allow that to happen, leaving millions of Puerto Ricans in the dark and in danger for almost a month? It is beyond comprehension, and it speaks to the failure of the U.S. Government's response.

The truth is that Hurricane Maria exposed far more than just immediate physical damage; the hurricane also laid bare a very simple truth that is plain to every resident of the island

and every Puerto Rican living in my State. The truth is this: The United States has been screwing Puerto Rico for over 100 years, and this is just the latest, most disgusting chapter.

There is an undercurrent in the discourse about Puerto Rico that is as pernicious as it is ahistorical. You will hear people, like President Trump, say that Puerto Ricans are wholly responsible for the financial mess they find themselves in and that Puerto Rico should just pull itself up by its bootstraps. The rewriting of history ignores the fact that the Federal Government and Congress have had our hands tightly wrapped around those very bootstraps since 1898.

The United States acquired Puerto Rico from Spain through the Treaty of Paris in 1898, when the United States defeated Spain in the Spanish American War. Puerto Ricans didn't ask to be part of the United States; we acquired the island. A century ago, Congress extended U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans. In 1950, Congress recognized the island's limited authority over internal governance, and Puerto Rico became formally known as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Being a commonwealth or a territory is permanent second-class status. Without access to the same healthcare reimbursement, the same infrastructure funding, the same education dollars as other States, Puerto Rico starts every single race 50 feet behind the rest of America. These built-in disadvantages are designed to hold Puerto Rico back. They have been in place for 100 years to keep Puerto Rico from being a true economic competitor with the mainland.

Believe me, the Puerto Rican people have done everything they can to overcome this discriminatory treatment. There is an entrepreneurial, never-say-die spirit in Puerto Rico. I know this because no State has a greater percentage of residents with Puerto Rican roots than Connecticut. But despite the strength of the Puerto Rican people, they are stuck because Washington has tied their hands behind their backs by taking away the right to vote in Federal elections, virtually guaranteeing that Puerto Rico's economic disadvantage will never ever be remedied. It is a black hole from which Puerto Rico and the other four U.S. territories can never escape.

Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens—despite the fact that recent polling suggests that half of Americans don't know this—but they can't vote for President. They have no voting representation in Congress. Think about it this way: Americans with a mainland address can vote if they move to Mongolia or Sierra Leone, but if they temporarily take up residence in a U.S. territory like Puerto Rico, they miraculously lose their right to vote.

There are real, practical consequences to this lack of representation. We are watching the most egregious example right now. Do you really think that if Puerto Rico had two U.S. Senators, 80 percent of the island would still be without power a month after the hurricane? By the way, Puerto Rico has more citizens than 21 States that have a total of 42 Senators in this body. Do you think a President would denigrate and insult Puerto Rico the way President Trump has if it had electoral votes?

The botched response to Maria is just the latest attack on the island, perpetuated by a Congress that can afford to ignore a big part of the United States that has no voice in Congress to object.

For over six decades, the U.S. Navy pummeled the island of Vieques, just off Puerto Rico's coast, with ordnance, using it as a bombing range for military exercises. Those weapons allegedly contained uranium, napalm, and Agent Orange. Today, people who live on Vieques are eight times more likely to have cardiovascular disease and seven times more likely to die of diabetes than others in Puerto Rico. Cancer rates on Vieques are much higher.

If you want to know why Puerto Rico has been in a decade-long recession, look no further than Congress. More than 50 years ago, the U.S. Government launched several initiatives to help spur economic growth on the island. It was a good thing. Ironically enough, the initiatives were collectively called Operation Bootstrap. One of the tools that were used to spur economic growth was a tax break to allow U.S. manufacturing companies to avoid corporate income taxes on profits that were made in Puerto Rico. Manufacturers descended on the island in droves, and the entire economy in Puerto Rico became oriented around those companies. But what Congress gives, Congress can take away, especially if the entity you are taking from has no meaningful representation in Congress. In 1996, Congress phased out the tax breaks. Guess what. It sucked the island's tax base away, cratering Puerto Rico's economy for the next two decades.

It is worth noting that Puerto Rico is not blameless for the financial situation that it is in. There definitely has been a fair share of mismanagement on the island. Bad decisions have been made. Saying that Puerto Rico is only a victim of schemes of the mainland is not true. But the same can be said of fiscal mismanagement and bad decisions in other U.S. States. But a century of underinvestment in Puerto Rico has been a big part of the story as to how they arrived at this situation. And unlike all those other U.S. States, Puerto Rico has no way of rectifying the past misdeeds because its toolbox to reckon with its past is limited to what Congress sticks in the toolbox,

and that toolbox doesn't provide access to the Bankruptcy Code.

As a result, Congress passed PROMESA, which created this financial oversight board on the island. Puerto Rican bondholders on Wall Street, who bought the bonds for pennies on the dollar, are now challenging the current oversight board's legitimacy, with the hope of being paid before the island gets relief. These practices of the bondholders, who have been circling the island for years, are made more menacing because they are spending boatloads of money lobbying Congress. Just watch TV at night in Washington, DC, to see their ads. They know that the people of Puerto Rico have no voice here, have no votes here.

Now it looks as though other predators are circling. News came out this week that a small, two-person company in Whitefish, MT, somehow, some way, got a no-bid \$300 million contract to restore power in Puerto Rico from the island's power authority—the same power authority that refused the help of experienced electric companies that actually know how to turn the power back on. How does something like this happen? It turns out that the little town in Montana is the home of the new Secretary of the Interior.

Get ready, because this is just the start. President Trump and his billionaire cronies are going to use this disaster to enrich themselves. The Whitefish power contract given to a friend of the Secretary of Interior—with two people employed at that company—is just a scratch on the surface of what is to come.

Puerto Rico has been getting screwed for decades. None of this is new. None of this is unpredictable. If you think this is just one century-long string of rough luck, you are ignoring the last critical aspect of Puerto Rican history.

Back in 1901, when the U.S. Supreme Court decided that even though residents of the territories lived in the United States, they shouldn't be able to enjoy full constitutional protections, the Supreme Court was pretty explicit about why these citizens in places like Puerto Rico deserved this second-class treatment. Justice Henry Brown, who authored the separate but equal doctrine, held that Puerto Rico and the other territories didn't need to be afforded full rights under the Constitution because the islands were "inhabited by alien races, differing from us in religion, customs, laws, methods of taxation, and modes of thought." That, my friends, is racism defined. And it is both past and present when it comes to the rationale for the historical and continued mistreatment of the people of Puerto Rico.

It is time for that mistreatment to change—not just by doing right by Puerto Rico at this moment, at their hour of need. Yes, it is time for President Trump to command that FEMA

and the U.S. military and the powers that be in Puerto Rico turn the lights back on right now. Congress should give Puerto Rico every cent they need.

I am glad that we came together this week to approve the latest round of emergency aid, but it is long past time that we addressed the second-class treatment we have given the people of Puerto Rico for decades. Even that racist 1901 Supreme Court decision contemplated that the territories' unequal status could only be justified temporarily. It is time to untie the hands of the Puerto Rican people and ensure that they have full economic and political rights.

I hope my colleagues will join me in this conversation in the coming months. It is just as important as the one we are having on emergency response because if anything good can come from the disaster of Hurricane Maria, maybe it is that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, Republicans have spent months trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They knew that tens of millions of Americans would lose their care, they knew it would betray our Federal trust responsibility to Native Americans, and they knew it would throw one-fifth of our economy into chaos. TrumpCare failed because the American people opposed it. Americans spoke out against it in record numbers. TrumpCare failed to pass four times. We hope that now we have put that to bed and we can move on.

But rather than listening to millions of Americans, President Trump has responded by sabotaging the Affordable Care Act. His reckless behavior is already causing chaos in the marketplace. His actions have hyped up the cost of premiums. He has sent out-of-pocket costs through the roof. Instead of helping Americans get better healthcare, he has put it out of reach for millions.

I commend my colleagues Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY. They have found a bipartisan solution to this new healthcare crisis caused by our President. I urge Leader MCCONNELL to put it onto the floor.

The Affordable Care Act isn't the only healthcare program at risk. The President and Republicans are letting funds run dry for other critical health programs. Last month, the Children's Health Insurance Program expired. CHIP insures almost 9 million children across the country, including over 11,000 kids in my home State of New Mexico. The Community Health Centers Program also expired last month.

Republicans failed to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Services. That is one of the most effective health programs

that we have. Without it, more than 1,000 New Mexico parents could miss out on home visits. They will not get crucial information about how to nurse their newborns, recognize healthy behavior in infants, and teach basic skills to their children. The Special Diabetes Program for Indians is also set to expire in December.

I urge Republicans to work with us to reauthorize these critical healthcare programs. We need to act urgently. We can get this done by Thanksgiving or earlier if we work together.

Madam President, I want to talk about CHIP first.

CHIP provides comprehensive health insurance for kids whose families do not quite qualify for Medicaid but who cannot afford private insurance. CHIP covers basic medical care, like immunizations, prescriptions, routine check-ups and dental visits. Thanks to CHIP, the rate of uninsured kids in America has dropped from 14 percent to 4.5 percent.

CHIP has been a lifesaver for some families. This is Colton. He is from the small town of Anthony, NM. Colton was 8 years old when he was diagnosed with cancer. Fortunately, the cancer was treatable, and he was insured by CHIP. So the cost of his treatment and medications were covered. Without CHIP, Colton's family would have had to have paid hundreds of dollars a month for his treatment, which is the cost of a month's rent.

Families should not have to choose between lifesaving care for their children and a roof over their heads.

Colton's father wrote to the Santa Fe New Mexican, and it read:

Watching my son battle for his life was almost more than I could bear. I couldn't imagine dealing with the stress of scraping together everything we had to cover the medical bills if we didn't have coverage. Having [CHIP] allowed us to focus on what was truly important—Colton's future and being there for my family as we went through this life-changing experience.

But, now, States are looking at contingency plans. New Mexico has reserves but only until next spring. Some States will be forced to cover all of the cost in just a few months, and others are preparing to send notices to families that their coverage will end. No parent who is already in crisis because of a sick child should have to go through that. CHIP was a bipartisan success story. I hope that we can get back to working together on this.

The 50-year-old Community Health Centers Program delivers comprehensive healthcare services to some of our Nation's most vulnerable individuals—schoolchildren, people experiencing homelessness, agricultural workers, and our veterans. In New Mexico, 17 of these clinics serve 333,000 patients in 90 underserved and rural communities.

The Community Health Centers are also important to the economy in rural communities. In New Mexico, they em-

ploy almost 3,000 people across the State. These clinics cannot sustain a 70-percent funding cut if Federal support is canceled. Many would be forced to shut their doors.

I recently visited one of these clinics—the De Baca Family Practice Clinic in Fort Sumner, NM. It provides high-quality medical services to over 3,000 patients. Over one-fifth of its patients are children, and another one-fifth are seniors, but if funding runs out, the De Baca Family Practice Clinic will be forced to start laying off essential medical staff and to reduce its hours.

Clinic director Lisa Walraven told me: "You simply cannot reduce funding by 70 percent from a small frontier healthcare facility and expect anything other than a significant loss of access to care."

Both CHIP and community health centers provide preventive care to underserved communities throughout New Mexico. They are supporting our healthcare system to ensure that we don't let any families fall through the cracks.

Indian Country also depends on these programs and others like them to provide vital care to their communities. The Federal Government has a trust and treaty obligation to provide healthcare to Native Americans. Yet the Indian Health Service is severely underfunded. CHIP and similar programs help to supplement care that the Indian Health Service cannot provide. CHIP currently covers more than 1,400 Native American children in New Mexico. Allowing these programs to expire would betray our treaty obligations.

Another program cited that is critical to Indian Country is the Special Diabetes Program for Indians. It provides grants to Native communities for diabetes treatment and prevention. Without proper treatment, diabetes can lead to limb amputation and kidney failure. The disproportionate impact on Native Americans is a public health problem that we cannot ignore.

This program is making real progress. It helps to fund over 300 Native health programs in 35 States, including 29 programs in New Mexico. They help educate communities about how to prevent diabetes and provide care so that Native patients can manage their diabetes more effectively.

It is one of the most effective public health initiatives ever undertaken by the Federal Government. Diabetes-related kidney failure has dropped 54 percent among Native Americans. In some States, like Alaska, leg amputations among Native people with diabetes have decreased more than 68 percent. This program literally saves life and limb.

Program directors across Indian Country tell me that without this funding they will have to start laying off staff and limiting their diabetes

programming. We need to provide funding to Tribal communities so that they can invest in projects that will be more effective in preventing diabetes over time.

Congress must act to allow this successful program to reach its full potential. We cannot allow diabetes to become a death sentence in Indian Country once again.

The failure to fund CHIP, the failure to fund the community health centers, home visiting health services, and the Special Diabetes Program will force families into another health crisis. Every day that we neglect these programs, more people will suffer. These programs have years—sometimes decades—of proven success.

The American people want Congress to work together to come up with bipartisan solutions. Most of these programs were created through bipartisan cooperation. Let's get back to that spirit and work together for the American people again.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, President Trump has been in office now for more than 9 months. For this entire time, Senate Democrats have been trying to obstruct him from doing the very job that he was elected by the American people to do. The President has laid out his agenda to create jobs, to grow the economy, and to help hard-working American taxpayers. Yet Democrats will do everything they can to stop the President from putting his team in place to accomplish these goals.

They have tried to stop the President's legislative agenda because they know that his policies will actually work. When Republican policies become law, Democrats know that the people will see how successful these Republican policies are. I think Democrats are worried that they may never win another election again once we get these policies into place. That is why we have seen a record number of delays and obstructions by the Democrats in the Senate. They have done it on legislation, and they have even blocked the President from filling some of the most basic jobs within his administration.

It started on day one. Normally, on Inauguration Day, the President gets a substantial number of people confirmed to his Cabinet. The idea is to let the President get his team in place so that it can hit the ground running. President Obama had six of his Cabinet Secretaries confirmed on Inauguration

Day, and President Bush had seven Secretaries confirmed on Inauguration Day. These confirmations were by voice vote, but that was not the case with President Trump—just two with rollcall votes on Inauguration Day.

Republicans in the Senate did not do anything to try to block the Cabinet Secretaries for President Obama, for we understood that it was best to give a new President a chance and for all of us to work together when we could. With George W. Bush, it was seven. That is how it usually works, but not anymore—no, not with this group of Democrats in the Senate. They really were never interested in giving President Trump a chance. They really do not seem to be working together. Last January, President Trump had two people confirmed to the Cabinet on Inauguration Day—the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security. They were the only two jobs that the Democrats allowed the President to fill.

In President Trump's first 9 months in office, Democrats have continued to block the way. They have allowed just 185 of his nominees to take their jobs. That is how ridiculous the Democrats have been in trying to keep President Trump from putting his team in place. By this far into the administration at the same time, President Obama had 364 nominees in place. The Democrats have blocked judges, Cabinet Secretaries, and other high-ranking officials.

Now, it is interesting because you have seen this. Many of these nominees even have Democrat support, and they are not controversial at all, but Democrats are doing everything they can to slow down the process. During President Obama's first 9 months, he had 364 confirmed. So President Obama had gotten 2 for every 1 that President Trump has gotten confirmed.

There are 81 of President Trump's nominees who have gone through the committees and another some number today. They are 81 people who have been nominated by the President for positions in the government who are just waiting right now for a vote on the Senate floor. Many of these people got through the nomination process in June but are still waiting and being blocked by Democrats in the Senate. It is outrageous.

Do Democrats really think that these are not important jobs—that they do not need people in those jobs to do the important work that they have been assigned to do?

I believe that we should confirm as many of them as possible today. There are 13 judges waiting for confirmation. There are 8 U.S. attorneys waiting, including the U.S. attorney from my home State of Wyoming. These are important jobs.

We all understand that there is a process that we need to go through to fill these positions—to make sure the

people are vetted and to make sure they are the right people for the jobs. All of these people have followed the process. They have been doing everything they have been asked to do in that they have filled out the paperwork, filled out the disclosures, and have gone through the committees. Now it is time for the Senate to get its work done. I would say let's do it today.

Interestingly enough, in August, the Democrats finally allowed a significant number of people to be confirmed. More than 60 people were confirmed by voice vote on one day. That is the kind of thing that used to be very routine in the Senate—letting a large number of noncontroversial nominees be approved all at once. It is now time to do it again. There is a significant backlog. So I want to get these folks confirmed now. It is time to clear the deck and let these people get to work who have been nominated and vetted, who have gone through the committees and been approved.

We need to move these nominations because we have more nominations on the way. We are going to have to deal with the nominations of two Cabinet Secretaries for positions that are currently vacant. President Trump has nominated Kirstjen Nielsen to be Secretary of Homeland Security. It is an important job, and she is very qualified for it.

Do the Democrats plan to block her confirmation to be Secretary of Homeland Security? Do the Democrats plan to obstruct this qualified woman from doing the important job she has been nominated by President Trump to do?

The President deserves to have his team in place. The Senate has an obligation to get that work done. The Department of Homeland Security deserves to have a Secretary in place to keep us safe. That is how it has worked in the past and how it should be working now.

These people manage major Departments of the government. They manage many career workers. We know that the Washington bureaucracy has grown tremendously over the years and that it is very difficult to eliminate people who aren't doing their jobs properly. We have seen it in the scandals over the years. Remember the Gold King Mine disaster? President Obama's EPA—the group who is supposed to protect the environment—actually dumped 3 million gallons of toxic wastewater in a river in Colorado. Remember the scandals involving bureaucrats in the Department of Veterans Affairs, the IRS, and the General Services Administration during the Obama administration? We need Presidential appointees in place overseeing these Federal workers to make sure that the government of the people is accountable to the American people.

The Senate needs to be involved in providing oversight through our power

of advice and consent. Democrats don't want that to happen. They have been keeping the Senate from providing that oversight, dragging out the process, making sure that the bureaucrats whom they seem to have more faith in are accountable to the American people rather than those whom the American people voted for on election day.

These are important jobs, and we have qualified people ready to do the work. Democrats have delayed for 9 months. It is time to break that logjam today.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WESTERN WILDFIRES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I am coming to the floor to talk about the challenge we have with forest fires that have been raging in the West, in Montana and Idaho and Washington and Oregon and California, and periodically we have devastating fires in Colorado, New Mexico, and Nevada.

We have to figure out how we do a better job in a multitude of ways. First, it is very important that we quit treating terrible fire years, enormous fires, as if they are some ordinary event because there is currently no FEMA-style reaction to terrible forest fires.

We respond with FEMA for tornadoes and for floods and for tidal waves and for hurricanes and for earthquakes but not forest fires. Well, the result is, the Forest Service runs out of funds to fight the fires in a bad year, and then they have to drain all the other programs they are working on, including the programs to prepare for future timber cuts, the programs to thin the forests, the programs to repair the infrastructure in the Federal forests, all these other efforts, and then they can't resume those efforts until we have restored their funding, which can come often far later.

This fire borrowing has to end. That is why we absolutely need to support the bill Senator WYDEN, Senator CRAPO, and others have been working on to say: Let's create a FEMA-like structure for these worst fires so we end this fire-borrowing devastation of the fire accounts. That absolutely needs to happen.

Right now, there are three funding issues we need to address. First, we need to help out the communities that have been impacted economically by these devastating fires. Some have been scorched directly, others have been profoundly affected by the smoke

in the community, others have been affected by highways being shut down, and others have been impacted by tourism dropping dramatically. So it is very important that we send a message to the Department of Agriculture, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to say: Use your emergency programs to assist these communities. We really should make sure they are at the front of the line, along with those who have suffered the disasters in Texas, Florida, and Puerto Rico, for emergency loans and assistance from the Small Business Administration and for an augmented share of community development block grants to assist them in a very flexible fashion.

I had the chance to meet this weekend with leaders in the Rogue Valley to talk about how smoke had affected them, and company after company after company had been dramatically impacted. Some you would say was obvious. If you have a zip line company and tourists aren't coming because the smoke is very thick, you are going to be impacted, but others are a little less obvious; for example, the production of wine and the potential impact of the smoke and the fires directly on the harvest but then also on perhaps tainting the flavor of the wine, which will have an impact down the road.

So we need to make sure we do all we can to assist these communities just as we are assisting the communities that have been devastated by Hurricanes Harvey, Maria, and Irma.

The second thing we need to do is, we need to include \$200 million in the next package, the third tranche of assistance for the disasters this year. We need \$200 million to fund the repair and replacement of infrastructure and trail infrastructure damaged—the buildings and the trails that were damaged by these forest fires. Now, that \$200 million, that goes half to trails and infrastructure that were damaged by the hurricanes and half to those impacted by the fires. Essentially, the damage was roughly equally split. Without this type of funding, the Forest Service will be forced to postpone or cancel projects in fiscal year 2018 to accommodate the recovery. It will compromise the work to remove hazardous trees for public safety, road and trail maintenance, restoring vegetation in watersheds, and rehabilitating wildlife and fish habitat.

The third thing we have to do is seize the moment and invest in fire resilience. Every single time we have a fire season like this—and this season we spent almost twice as much, on average, to fight the fires—people ask: Why don't we do more on the front end to reduce the risk of these fires?

Well, that is such logical thinking to do more on the front end. What do they mean by that? We have millions of acres of second-growth forests. We

clearcut them. Some of them regrew naturally. Others were replanted. We replant virtually everything now. After 10 or 20 years, the trees are very close together. The branches are very close to the ground. This is prime territory for fires. Fires love this. Disease loves this. So it becomes a real problem unless you go in and thin the trees enormously—take out a lot of those trees—and proceed to get rid of the hazardous fuels of branches that accumulate on the ground and so forth. But if you do those two things, those forests become much more resistant to fire.

When you are doing this on a stand that is a bit older—20 or 30 years older—you also get a significant supply of sawlogs for the mills. So this is a real win-win situation. You get a forest that is better in resisting fire, you get a forest that is better in resisting disease, you get a forest that is better for timber stands, and you get a forest that is better in terms of being an ecosystem. With all that winning, we need to do more to make it actually happen.

In my State of Oregon, there are 1.6 million acres that have already gone through the environmental process. They are ready to be thinned and have the hazardous fuels removed. In Washington State, it is at least 400,000 acres. There are probably hundreds of thousands of acres in every State from Montana and Idaho to California, Nevada, and New Mexico.

This picture shows the difference. This road right here had a stand on the left that had not been thinned. If you can make out the colors, these trees are dead. They are all brown—dead trees because of the heat of the fire when it swept through. This side of the road had been treated. The trees had been thinned. The brush had been taken out from below. They often call that mowing. It has had prescriptive fire in it, which means after you have thinned it, you may go 10 or 15 years, and then let fire burn up the shrubs at the base. Therefore, on this side of the road, the forest is undamaged.

In fact, I went out to this area outside of Sisters, OR, this last weekend. It is just remarkable how the area that had been thinned and treated with mowing and prescription fire became very resistant to the fire that was sweeping toward Sisters. It really helped the Forest Service fight the fire because they could easily maneuver through the area that had been thinned, much more than the area that hadn't been thinned. So that Milli fire was stopped before it got to Sisters, thankfully. In other places where the forest hadn't been thinned, the outcome might have been very different.

Let's invest now in this win-win. Let's not succumb to the traditional timber wars of the past. After fires like this, there are those folks who come along and say: We just need to clearcut everything. Let's do a 10,000-square-

foot timber sale with no environmental review and allow everything to be cut. That was the 1950s. In fact, we have a bill in this Chamber that says: Do exactly that, and you can take out the old growth and the big trees. The irony of that is those are the trees that are actually fire resistant. Those are the trees you want to leave.

This is a solution that brings the environmental world and the timber world together and provides a supply of sawlogs for our mills. Let's make that type of vision happen. But to do that, we have to fund the effort. We have to have the funds to be able to go in and do that thinning and mowing and fire prescription. That is why we are asking for about \$600 million to help thin the forests of Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and wherever else there is a forest that has gone through that environmental review. It is ready for action. Let's put Americans to work in those forests in this win-win strategy.

Three things we need to do: Help our communities that are scorched, proceed to invest in emergency repair of the damaged infrastructure on our forest lands, and invest a significant \$500 to \$600 million in thinning the forests that have already gone through environmental review.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, for years, I have been calling on Democrats and Republicans to work together to improve the healthcare law. There are some, like me, who recognize the benefits of the existing healthcare law, as well as the areas that need fixing, and I have proposed that we partner together to strengthen our healthcare system.

For the first time, we have legislation in the Senate that has broad bipartisan support and would improve issues with our healthcare system by stabilizing the individual marketplace and lowering premiums for Americans. This is what I have long pushed for. Today, it is more important than ever that we act to pass this bipartisan legislation. I would like to take a few minutes to explain why.

Beginning next week, on November 1, millions of Americans, including Hooiers, can sign up for healthcare coverage through the individual marketplace. Unfortunately, as consumers prepare to shop for health insurance plans, there is uncertainty and instability in the marketplace and confusion and higher prices for consumers. That wasn't the case earlier this year, as both public and private analyses showed that individual marketplaces were relatively stable and improving.

For the last 10 months, though, the administration has worked to make it harder for Americans to access affordable healthcare and destabilized the

markets. For many months, the administration refused to commit to continuing important cost-sharing reduction payments that reduce costs for consumers and, even worse, played politics with these payments. This culminated with the administration's announcement earlier this month that it would discontinue cost-sharing reduction payments. This decision came only weeks before open enrollment.

There is no disputing a simple fact: The administration's actions created uncertainty for insurers, causing some to significantly raise rates and others to leave the market altogether. As a result, many Americans will be forced to pay more for healthcare plans through the individual marketplace.

For example, CareSource, an insurance company that offers insurance to Hoosiers through the individual marketplace, told me earlier this year that rates would rise 2.2 percent if the Federal Government committed to continuing cost-sharing reduction payments. Because the administration refused to do so, rates for CareSource plans are on average now 20 percent higher for Hoosiers than last year.

Centene, the other insurer offering coverage in the marketplace, will have average rate increases of nearly 36 percent. In addition to higher rates, it will be harder for Hoosiers to find help enrolling in healthcare plans because the administration slashed 82 percent of Navigator Program funding for my home State of Indiana—the deepest cut of any State in the country.

Consumers also have a shorter period to enroll than in past years. The administration plans to do maintenance and shut down HealthCare.gov for 12 hours on all but one Sunday throughout the open enrollment period.

It does not have to be this way. As I have said for years, there is another path—a bipartisan path. We should work in a bipartisan manner to improve our healthcare system, all Americans working together. I have pressed the administration to commit to providing stability for health insurance markets and to working together on bipartisan solutions that reduce healthcare costs and ensure access to quality medical care.

Over the past several months, I have engaged in bipartisan conversations in meetings with my colleagues to discuss ways we can partner together to stabilize our healthcare markets. We have talked to a range of healthcare experts. There has been a good-faith effort to find common ground on steps we can take to lower costs for families. That is what we should be doing.

After participating in this effort, I was pleased that Senators LAMAR ALEXANDER and PATTY MURRAY reached a bipartisan agreement last week. It makes improvements to our healthcare system and helps reduce costs for our families.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation. It continues cost-sharing reduction payments that reduce consumers' deductibles. It also reduces copays for two years and restores funding to help Americans navigate signing up for health insurance. It enables more flexibility for States without undermining essential health benefits or harming people who have preexisting conditions.

If this legislation came to a vote today, I am confident it would receive more than the 60 votes needed to pass in the Senate. It has wide-ranging support from both Democrats and Republicans. It has bipartisan support, not only in the Senate but also from Republican and Democratic Governors all across the country. We have heard from groups, including the American Medical Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and AARP, urging Congress to move forward on this proposal because it is common sense. It benefits families. It helps stabilize the insurance markets.

It is our job to protect families from unnecessary increases in the cost of healthcare, particularly those within our control. We have an opportunity to do that with the bipartisan Alexander-Murray agreement that we achieved by working together.

The healthcare debate should not be a political game. The stakes are way too high for that because healthcare impacts the well-being and the economic security of millions of Americans.

I have said over and over that the American people expect us to work together to try and make life a little bit better. At the very least, we should do no harm. The Alexander-Murray agreement not only provides relief for families, it actually helps put them in a better place. There is no doubt we have more work to do, but this proposal is an important first step. Let's strengthen the healthcare system and make healthcare more affordable with this bipartisan solution.

I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROHINGYA HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Indiana for joining me on the floor today to raise awareness of the ethnic cleansing that has been occurring on the other side of our planet, ethnic cleansing by the Burmese military against the Rohingya Muslim minority.

Just last week, together we sent a letter to U.N. Ambassador Nikki

Haley. It was signed by 21 of our colleagues. It called for "tangible actions against the Burmese government to end the violence, to help the Burmese people and make clear that there will be consequences for those who commit such atrocities against civilians."

I am pleased to partner with my colleague on this. I think he will share some remarks, and then I will follow up with some remarks of my own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his leadership on this issue. It has been a pleasure to lead a subcommittee in the Foreign Relations Committee with Senator MERKLEY. We have always worked in a constructive fashion on some consequential issues and none more consequential than the one before us today.

With respect to the crisis in Burma, we recently met with the lead person on an international NGO who just returned from camps in Bangladesh. He briefed us on some of the horrible circumstances facing these individuals who have been forced out of Burma.

This last Friday, as Senator MERKLEY indicated, we also led a letter to Ambassador Haley regarding the Burma crisis. I would also note that we had an important hearing on this topic yesterday in the full Foreign Relations Committee. I commend our leadership for putting that together.

I want to share some of my thoughts about this crisis. Before I do, I would like to acknowledge folks back home in the State of Indiana. I happen to represent a significant number of Burmese Americans. These are patriotic fellow Hoosiers, who have played an instrumental role helping to educate me and members of my team on this crisis, and I am happy we can be responsive to their concerns.

It is important for all Americans to understand what is happening in America and everything outside our shores. Burma is a country that doesn't typically capture the imagination or attention of people in the United States, but, right now, in light of this humanitarian crisis, it requires all of our attention.

The Burmese military has conducted a deplorable campaign of violence against the Rohingya Muslim minority, including the systematic use of arson, murder, and rape. Our State Department tells us that nearly 300 villages have been either partially or completely destroyed by fire just since August 25 of this year by the Burmese military. That is more than half of the approximately 470 Muslim villages in northern Rakhine State.

Ambassador Haley has indicated that the Burmese military's actions constitute a sustained campaign to cleanse the country of an ethnic minority—

ethnic cleansing. The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights has referred to this situation as a textbook example of ethnic cleansing.

We have seen more than 600,000, who are mostly of the Rohingya ethnic minority, flee the violence in the Rakhine State and seek refuge in Bangladesh. They travel on foot for days, carrying what they can of their belongings, carrying their young children. It is mostly women and children who make this trek. Upon arrival in Bangladesh, we have been briefed that many of them require immediate lifesaving assistance.

To put this severity in some measure of context, yesterday, our Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development characterized the resulting population movement as “almost unprecedented”—almost unprecedented—amidst all of the other challenges we have seen in recent years, including the migrant crisis coming out of the Middle East and across the shores of the Mediterranean. Some research suggests the refugee flow from Burma has been swifter than the exodus from Rwanda in 1994.

Many Americans will say: You know, honestly, we have a lot of challenges in the world. Why should I care about this one? Well, here is why: In Burma, we see a group of people—the Rohingya—being systematically targeted because of their ethnicity. This, of course, runs afoul of our basic values, the principles upon which our country was founded. These principles inform the rules of the international order that has existed for some number of decades now. These rules are the mortar that holds the order together. We simply cannot allow certain rules of international behavior to be violated or that will encourage other bad actors, and they will continue to be undermined, thus, undermining our national interests.

Recent history demonstrates that the systematic violation of fundamental human rights sooner or later engenders security threats to Americans, to our allies, and to our collective interests—think of Tunisia, think of Syria, think of the countries of Yemen or Nigeria. There are almost countless examples just in recent history where we have seen or are seeing right now the depravation of basic human rights. That, in turn, is undermining our values and our national interests.

Let me apply this observation about the linkage between our values and our interests—not just domestically but internationally—to the situation in Burma. We know the past and present Burmese Governments have systematically deprived the Rohingya population of their most fundamental human rights. Not surprisingly, this has compelled a small number to join the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army, ARSA.

The most recent wave of ethnic cleansing began after ARSA conducted a coordinated attack on Burmese security outposts, and the Burmese military responded with disproportionate military actions and deplorable attacks on civilians.

Here is a point the Burmese Government and the Burmese military must understand. By refusing to treat the Rohingyas as full, equal citizens and by attacking their own people who just want to live in peace, the Burmese military is only going to increase the number of Rohingyas who will be radicalized, exacerbating the very problem the Burmese military says it is trying to address. So this is not in Burma's interest. I can't emphasize that enough.

Before the most recent iteration of this crisis, in December 2016, the International Crisis Group—an international nongovernmental organization—issued a report titled “Myanmar: A New Muslim Insurgency in Rakhine State.” The report said a number of things, among them that the “continued use of disproportionate force that has driven tens of thousands from their homes or across the border to Bangladesh . . . could create conditions for further radicalizing sections of the Rohingya population that transnational jihadists could exploit.”

As we saw in Syria—to choose just one comparative example—when the government fails to respect the basic human rights of their citizenry, then conflict ensues. It can lead to far wider radicalization. The conflict becomes a magnet, a magnet for international terrorists. It becomes a factory that creates more international terrorists.

In short, when governments commit systematic and large-scale violence, oppression, and injustice against its own people, it creates a fertile ground for Islamist terrorist recruitment and radicalization. This is contrary to the interests of everyone, including the Burmese Government.

Further, if left unaddressed, the humanitarian and security situation in Burma and Bangladesh will worsen and increasingly threaten regional stability and U.S. national security interests.

The United States must continue to lead. There has to be an international response in Burma. We need other partners to step up and participate in that response, but the United States must continue to lead. Part of leading comes down to clarity. What do we want of the Burmese Government? I see at least four things the Burmese Government must do.

First, the Burmese Government and their military must immediately end its ethnic cleansing campaign against the Rohingyas. Second, the Burmese Government must address the root of this conflict by implementing the recommendations of a U.N. panel, the so-

called Advisory Commission on Rakhine State. Third, the Burmese Government must permit safe access for journalists, for humanitarians, and for a United Nations fact-finding mission and all of their personnel so we can figure out precisely what is going on and who is responsible. Finally, the Burmese Government must facilitate the safe and voluntary return of all these individuals who have been displaced.

When I leave the Senate floor today, I am scheduled to immediately visit with Burma's Ambassador to the United States. The points I just mentioned are points I intend to reiterate directly to that Ambassador.

Moving forward, the United States should lead efforts to document atrocities in Burma however we can so the perpetrators can be held accountable. I also support the administration's announcement yesterday that it is exploring accountability mechanisms that are already available under U.S. law, including the so-called Global Magnitsky targeted sanctions.

I call on countries like China and Russia to support the suspension of all international weapons sales to the Burmese military. They should not be transferring weapons to this murderous regime.

In conclusion, as Senator MERKLEY and I stated in our letter on Friday to Ambassador Haley, now is the time. Now is the time to take bold and effective actions against the Burmese Government to end the violence, not just to help the Burmese people but to help stabilize the region and protect U.S. national security interests. Now is the time to uphold our fundamental values, the values, frankly, of civilized nations. Now is the time to work with this administration and colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make sure we can reach as peaceful and as positive a resolution to this horrible situation as possible.

I want to close by once again acknowledging the tremendous leadership of Senator MERKLEY. I thank him for his partnership in this effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague and the opportunity for us to work together to help shine a light on this moment of great atrocities in the world. A great deal of what we are calling for is for America to do more to shine a light on it and for the world to work together, not just to shine a light on it but to end it and to proceed to have as much healing as can possibly take place.

I thank my colleague from Indiana for being deeply in this conversation. It is a real pleasure to work on the Foreign Relations Committee together.

We must address this situation. According to a report from the U.N. High

Commissioner for Human Rights, “government forces and Buddhist extremists in Burma have carried out ‘a well-organized, coordinated and systematic’ campaign of human rights violations against the Muslim Rohingya in Myanmar’s Rakhine State,” with a strategy to “instill deep and widespread fear and trauma—physical, emotional and psychological—among the Rohingya population.” This comes after the commissioner’s statement that this “security operation,” as they refer to it, in Burma was “a textbook example of ethnic cleansing.”

As we ponder international relations, we see from time to time that one group, somewhere in the world, will respond to deep tribal impulses and prejudices and seek to wipe out another group. These are horrific moments in history, and we have seen this movie—this situation—occur time and again. After such atrocities, the world has said “never again”—“never again,” meaning that we will respond when we see this happening. We will apply great pressure. We will coordinate with the world to make sure it stops, because such effort to wipe out another ethnic group is so unacceptable and it is such a crime against humanity.

But here we are, and it is happening right now in Burma. It is happening with a Buddhist nation.

We normally associate the Buddhist religion with a main emphasis on peaceful conduct. Yet this tribal impulse—these deep prejudices are so powerful that they overcome whatever peaceful impulse there is, and they have resulted in a massive effort to wipe out the Rohingya people. In the course, there have been a massive number of rapes. There have been children killed right in front of their mothers. There have been villages surrounded by soldiers and then the village huts set on fire, and then they have been shot as they flee. This is about as inhumane as it can get.

Something close to 300 villages have burned to the ground. By some estimates, 3,000 civilians have been killed. A few weeks ago, we were talking about 400,000 refugees pouring into Bangladesh. Now, the number is 600,000 Rohingya refugees.

Roughly half the Rohingyas live in Burma, and those refugees include 300,000 children. Think about the type of trauma those children have just experienced and the challenges they will have regaining a foundation to thrive. Then there are those who are internally displaced inside of Burma, who have been driven out of their villages but haven’t been able to make their way to Bangladesh. This is the challenge we face.

There is an area of Bangladesh called Cox’s Bazar. That is where these two main refugee camps are. International aid groups are working to quickly get as many resources as they can into this

area so that people do not starve and so that medical wounds can be addressed. But there is still a significant lack of food, a lack of clean water, and a lack of sanitary bath and toilet facilities. That condition is ripe for spreading disease—diseases like cholera.

When I was home in Oregon, I met with a group of Rohingya refugees who came and settled in Oregon. As we can imagine, they have a very personal connection to what is happening. Some of them have distant relatives still there. Some have immediate family members. They don’t know exactly what has happened to everyone in the middle of this chaos.

We also heard about villages that didn’t get burned down but where the military was blockading people from leaving the village to go to the fields to secure food and blocking them from leaving the fields and going back into the village, probably responding to international outrage over villages being burned and essentially resorting to a strategy of starving out the villages to drive people away. Imagine being trapped in one of those villages, knowing what is happening to village after village after village, knowing children have been slaughtered, women have been raped and often killed, and men have been shot. The desperation is enormous.

I heard firsthand accounts of conditions of refugees from Reza Uddin, who had just returned from a 2-week trip to visit them. He told powerful and moving stories about children who had been brutalized, children who had been separated from their parents, children who might possibly now be orphans because it is not clear if their parents are still alive or, if alive, where they are.

The world collectively has not done enough. The community of nations has not done enough to address this unspeakable brutality. Bangladesh should be complimented for accepting these refugees fleeing for their lives. They have been cooperative. It is a challenge for them, and we should acknowledge that. We should continue to ask them to do everything possible and to give the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and various aid organizations full opportunity, full access, and full authority to be in and assist those in these refugee camps.

The United States, the United Kingdom, and the United Nations have condemned the actions of the Burmese, and that is certainly appropriate, but we haven’t done enough. We have not taken the steps to which my colleague referred to strengthen sanctions or coordinate international countries to all weigh in. The only thing that will make a real difference here is pressure on the Burmese military. They are in charge. We can criticize the civilian government in Burma, and many have, and they have been unable to stop what

is going on and sometimes often reflect the prejudices that contributed to this, but it is the military that makes the decisions.

We had testimony from the State Department yesterday, and one of the officials used the term “vigilantes” for what the vigilantes are doing in this oppression. That is not the right term to use. This is not uncoordinated action. This is action coordinated through the military decision-making process. You don’t surround camps, you don’t have significant planning that goes into it, and have it just be vigilantes. Vigilantes may be involved, but they are not the driving force. They might be assisting the soldiers in some cases, but this is a coordinated act of the military of Burma, and it is important that the community of nations convey to the military how unacceptable this is and that there will be significant consequences.

My colleague has referred to the fact that in this situation no military sales should be made to such a military. That is important, but that takes a conversation among nations, and the United States needs to be deeply engaged in this.

There is a lot of international fundraising going on. There was a donors conference held on Monday to assist the refugees. It raised about \$200 million or a little more in new funds. That is about \$400 per refugee. That is not nearly enough to provide for shelter or care in a situation with complete lack of access to fields or farming or support. It is going to take more than that. We should be involved in working with the United Nations, UNICEF, World Health, UNHCR, or the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, and the World Food Program to step up and assist. I certainly believe it would be very helpful to have President Trump take this issue on and speak from the heart of our Nation to this dark and evil deed that is happening—that we reject it and we will partner with the rest of the world to end it.

I do feel that there is a history in which we have helped lead nations in these situations. We haven’t always been there. I know that President Clinton said that the biggest regret of his administration is that he didn’t respond quickly in Central Africa when the Tutsis and Hutus went to battle against each other, slaughtering each other with machetes. This is a chance for us to really respond—to respond aggressively, to have that moral clarity, and to exercise that leadership in the world. I join my colleague in calling for such action for more assistance, with the aid to both Burma and Bangladesh, for the moral clarity to take action that pressures the Burmese military in a significant and compelling way and to provide assistance in the right of return—the ability of these individuals to be able to return to their villages.

Traditionally, this group has been denied citizenship. Early on, we heard from the civilian government in Burma: We will let them come back if they show they are citizens. No. 1, they have never been granted citizenship. No. 2, after a horrific situation like this, if they did have papers, they wouldn't have papers now. They would have been burned along with the villages. There needs to be a change in attitude, a change of heart among the Burmese civilian leadership, and certainly among the military, to lead an effort in the peaceful tradition, the Buddhist tradition, of embracing this diversity and returning these people to their land.

Former U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan now serves as chairman of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State. He and his team have laid out a report with very specific actions—actions that will help end the cycle of radicalization and the cycle of violence. We need to work to try to make sure those things are implemented, to show oppressive governments and the rest of the world that the world will not stand—that the world will respond, and respond aggressively, in a coordinated, forceful way when ethnic cleansing occurs. That is the best deterrent we could have for future atrocities.

Again, I thank my colleague for being in this dialogue and for his support to shine this light and to take a compelling more forceful action. Like him, I look forward to meeting with the Ambassador from Burma later today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING PAUL AND SHEILA WELLSTONE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to speak this afternoon to honor the memory of Paul and Sheila Wellstone. Today marks 15 years since we lost Paul and Sheila, their daughter Marcia, and staff members Tom Lapic, Mary McEvoy, and Will McLaughlin. Because Paul was such a memorable and incredible person, it is hard to believe that it has been 15 years since we lost all of them.

For me, as for so many Minnesotans, it is impossible to forget the moment that we first heard about their plane going down. It is impossible to forget the wait to get the final news that there were no survivors. That is how much Paul and Sheila meant to the people of our State.

I get my own special reminders every day. First, I get a reminder from the employees at the Capitol who were

around when Paul graced these hallways. They remember him because he treated everyone with dignity. Whether it was the tram operator, the elevator operator, or the police at the front door, he treated them as though they were Senators. I also have the flags in my office from his Senate office. Every day, they are a reminder for me of Paul and all that he did for the people of our State.

Paul and Sheila were always on the move. They were full of joy. They were persistent in their fight against injustices, small and large. During his lifetime as an educator, as an activist, and as a U.S. Senator, Paul Wellstone touched the lives of people throughout Minnesota and across the country. That is because his philosophy was simple. A lot of people, he said, would have people paid to represent them in Washington, but he was going to represent the other people. As he said in one of his famous campaign ads, he wasn't there to represent the Rockefellers; he was there to represent the "little fellers."

If you go to any local mental health group, they remember Paul. If you go to any Somali event in our State, they remember Paul. If you go to any community on the Iron Range in Minnesota, they remember Paul—both the man and then what he did.

Paul was my friend and mentor. He told me that I should run for office, and, as he did with so many others, he taught me that politics should have a purpose.

He also taught me how to campaign on city buses. This is how he would do it. At Nicollet Mall—being from a nearby State, the Presiding Officer is aware of Nicollet Mall in the city of Minneapolis. We would get on a city bus at one end of the mall, and we would work it as though we had just got on the bus: Meet everyone on the bus, go to the end, get off, and then get on another bus going the other way and meet a whole group of people. I have no idea what the busdrivers thought after an hour of this, but that is what we did.

Paul Wellstone worked it bus by bus, block by block, precinct by precinct, and he made a lasting impression on people in a way that made them believe and know that getting involved in politics could make a real difference in their lives. He had an unending sense of optimism—optimism that maybe people he didn't agree with in this Chamber would eventually change their views.

He made a lot of friends here, on both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle. That was the message Paul took to new citizens, new voters, and everyone looking to get involved. He told them that working in public service can make a difference, and he showed them through his actions.

He had many passions. He fought for everything from campaign finance re-

form to improving our rural economies. He fought against veteran homelessness, to protect the environment, and, of course, he fought for the rights of workers.

He truly believed, as he famously said, that "we all do better when we all do better" and that politics is simply about improving people's lives.

Anyone who ever met or talked with Paul found out that he had a special passion for helping those struggling with mental illness. That was shaped by his own family. As a young child, Paul watched his brother Steven's traumatic descent into mental illness. In college, his brother suffered a severe mental breakdown and spent the next 2 years in hospitals. Eventually, he recovered and graduated from college with honors, but it took his immigrant parents years to pay off the hospital bills.

Paul would always talk about how, when he grew up, his house was dark because no one wanted to talk about mental illness back then because it had so much stigma. He wanted to get it out in the sunlight. He knew that there were far too many families going through the same experience, too many devastated by the physical and financial consequences of mental illness. He knew that we could and we should do better. For years as a Senator, he fought for funding for better care, better services, and better representation for the mentally ill, and he fought for mental health parity in health insurance coverage.

Even years after his death, Paul's voice was heard loud and clear. Congressman Ramstad from Minnesota, a Republican Congressman at the time, took up the cause in the House. I helped. Ted Kennedy led the way and, of course, Pete Domenici, who had paired up with Paul on this important bill.

Finally, in 2008, we passed the Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act. The bill requires insurance companies to treat mental health on an equal basis with physical illness. For Paul, this fight was always a matter of civil rights, of justice, and of basic human decency, and that landmark legislation is one fitting way we honor him.

Sheila, of course, also dedicated herself to helping others, especially survivors of violence. I had the opportunity to work closely with Sheila when I served for 8 years as Hennepin County Attorney. She focused on domestic violence and was instrumental in creating and getting the funding for the Hennepin County Domestic Abuse Center. That center is an international model for serving victims of domestic violence by bringing together a full range of services and resources in one central location. Victims of domestic violence don't have to go through the redtape that would be difficult even for a lawyer to figure out.

Of course, one of Paul's greatest legislative achievements was the work he did, along with Vice President Biden and others, to pass the original Violence Against Women Act. It was a team effort, and Sheila was right there on the frontlines with Paul.

Together, they accomplished so much. Their commitment to others never wavered, and neither did they.

It was just a few weeks before that tragic crash that I last saw Sheila and Paul. Sheila and I had been asked to speak to a group of new citizens, immigrants from Russia. It was a very small group, and we were there to talk about our own immigrant experiences, our own relatives. I remember she talked about her relatives in Appalachia, and I talked about my relatives on the Iron Range coming over from Slovenia. The event was winding down. It was a small, small event in a synagogue with these new immigrants, and, all of a sudden, a big surprise—in walked Paul. He wasn't supposed to be there. It was just a few weeks, a month away, from one of the biggest elections he had ever faced in the U.S. Senate. But he had gotten on an early flight and had come home from Washington. There he was—he and a group of immigrants and us—with no press, no TVs, not even a big crowd, all just a few weeks before his election.

He came for two reasons. He loved Sheila, and he wanted to be there to support her. But he was also there because he loved the immigrant experience. He embraced it. His family, like so many Minnesota families, was an example of how you can come to America, succeed in America, and then, in turn, help America succeed.

That is my last memory of Paul as he stood before those immigrants, telling about his own story, embracing them. I will remember him in that way, but I will also remember the joy he felt for politics, how he would run around that green bus of his, with people running alongside him on the parade routes.

In the last year of his life, he told the public he had MS, and he couldn't run like that anymore. So he would stand in the back of the bus with Sheila and wave. What was so amazing about it was that he had energized so many people in those green Wellstone shirts to run around that bus that you didn't even notice he wasn't running. He had given them the energy and the hope to carry on his work, and they were doing it for him.

Now, 15 years after we lost Paul and Sheila, it is our job to carry on and run around that bus. That is organizing, that is politics, and that is the gift of joy in improving people's lives that Paul, Sheila, Marcia, and those other beloved staff members left for us.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the devastation in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands and the need to rebuild the electric grid in a more resilient and sustainable way.

Over the last few months, communities around the country have been devastated by natural disasters. We have had terrible hurricanes in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as tragic wildfires across the West. These communities need immediate help, and that is why the disaster supplemental appropriations bill we passed yesterday is so important. I am glad this bill provides nearly \$19 billion to replenish FEMA's emergency disaster accounts that help communities start to rebuild, but it is just a downpayment. As we know, it will take a lot more Federal assistance.

One thing we need to focus on is the electric grid. Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria demonstrated the risks the electric grid faces from extreme weather. The communities hardest hit in Texas and Florida underwent days—sometimes much longer—without any power, and when this happens, it is a serious risk to the safety and health of everyone in the area.

Now, American citizens in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are facing a major humanitarian crisis, and the Federal Government needs to do everything it can to assist.

More than a month after Hurricane Maria hit, only 25 percent of Puerto Rico has access to electricity, and it will take many months to get power back to those communities. That is completely unacceptable. Without electricity, pumping stations can't supply drinking water to households. In fact, 25 percent of the island still lacks access to potable water. Without electricity, wastewater treatment facilities can't operate, which means raw sewage is contaminating rivers and streams. Without electricity, cell towers cease to function, making communication with first responders difficult. Without a stable electric grid, hospitals have to rely on backup power to keep lifesaving equipment working. That backup power is often diesel generators that require fuel, which is in short supply.

Given the dire situation, it is no surprise that we have already seen tens of thousands of Puerto Ricans leave the island, with nearly 60,000 arriving in Florida alone.

The majority of the transmission and distribution lines were destroyed in

Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. We need to rebuild them, and I think we can all agree they should be rebuilt to withstand the next disaster. So let's rebuild the electric grid in a more resilient and sustainable way that reduces future threats and future costs. I have been talking with my Republican colleagues and members of the administration, and everyone agrees this is a good idea. That is why I want to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to include language in the next supplemental disaster aid package that does exactly this.

I am talking about investing in a more modern and more decentralized grid so that not everyone is relying on a handful of powerplants that can go down. Decentralized energy resources operating in microgrids are more likely to remain functioning during and after storms. There are many instances of distributed energy keeping important facilities online after natural disasters, including the Texas Medical Center, which is the largest medical complex in the world, which has a combined heat and power plant that kept running during Hurricane Harvey. That is because during extreme weather, these technologies can go into island mode or operate independent of the grid.

Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have some of the highest electricity prices in the United States, and that is because they rely on oil, coal, and gas that must be shipped from the mainland. While these islands do not have fossil fuels, do you know what they do have? Lots of Sun. And the rapidly declining costs of distributed clean energy technologies such as solar, wind, energy efficiency, and battery storage, in many instances make them more affordable than existing power generation, which means these clean energy technologies could help reduce prices.

These investments will also save money in the long run. In 2005, the National Institute of Building Sciences completed a study for FEMA that found that every dollar invested in disaster preparedness and resilience saves \$4 in future avoided losses. We know we are going to see more hurricanes and extreme weather events, so let's rebuild in such a way that impacts are not as severe the next time around. Let's protect people and save taxpayer money.

That is my message: Let's protect people, and let's all save taxpayer money and do the thing that makes sense.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is nice to see the distinguished Senator in the chair presiding. I am not sure, in my 183 "Time to Wake Up" speeches, I have yet had the pleasure of speaking while the Senator was presiding.

I am here to once again call for us to wake up to the corporate capture of Congress and this administration—the capture of governance by the fossil fuel industry that keeps us from honestly addressing climate change. There is a saying that "personnel is policy." Well, the Trump personnel for positions at the Environmental Protection Agency reflect a policy to undo the public welfare mission of the Agency and align it with the special interests of the fossil fuel industry.

There is a word for that. It is called corruption, at least as the Founding Fathers knew the meaning of that term. It starts at the top. Trump named Scott Pruitt head of the EPA. Pruitt has a long record of dark money fundraising and long, cozy relationships with Big Energy industry political donors. In effect, he is a tentacle of the fossil fuel climate denial operation, wiggling and wriggling in the Administrator's chair, near his new \$25,000 "cone of silence" secret communications booth that he built so no one would hear him checking in with his masters.

Results are as expected. The New York Times has reported: "How Rollbacks at Scott Pruitt's EPA are a Boon to Oil and Gas." No surprise. In the 4 months that followed his appointment, Pruitt moved to undo, delay, or otherwise block more than 30 environmental rules benefiting his fossil fuel friends. This regulatory rollback, larger in scope than any over so short a time in the Agency's near-half century history, went straight into the pockets of the fossil fuel industry.

Longtime Pruitt benefactor Devon Energy is cashing in dividends on its investment in Scott Pruitt's political career, as Pruitt is working to eliminate rules on the leaking and flaring of methane, and has rescinded requirements for reporting methane emissions. Devon, as you may recall, is that company whose letter to the EPA Pruitt put on his own Oklahoma attorney general letterhead to mask Devon's hand and submit their work as his own official work as attorney general of his State.

So this hand-in-glove relationship between Devon as the hand and Pruitt as the glove goes back a long way. The EPA has career scientists and legal experts who bring decades of experience in environmental law and science to the EPA who are all being cut out as the Administrator takes drastic steps to undo environmental protections. Just this week, EPA scientists were

yanked from a conference in Rhode Island where they were going to talk about climate change. The matter of climate change on Narragansett Bay in Rhode Island is pretty significant. This is the day's Providence Journal, our leading newspaper in Rhode Island. Headline: "Will climate change negate Bay cleanup?" It has a big map of Narragansett Bay with all the facilities at risk of being flooded and overwhelmed. It is front page news.

It is a matter of extreme importance in Rhode Island, and EPA yanked out its scientists. They weren't allowed to come down and talk at an event where they were going to talk about climate change. It is not just yanking the scientists. Here is a New York Times article by Lisa Friedman from October 20. Headline: "EPA scrubs a climate website of 'climate change.'" An EPA website has been scrubbed of scores of links. "About 15 mentions of the words climate change have been removed from the main page alone. . . ."

It is not just at EPA. Here is today's exclusive headline: "The Interior Department scrubs climate change from its strategic plan." I mean, they act as if this is the Soviet Union and the government is allowed to tell scientists what they can say and not say and put phony propaganda onto official websites and keep scientists from going to meetings because they might actually tell the truth about climate change.

I am the son and grandson of Foreign Service officers. I grew up serving in countries that did that, where the government could tell the scientist: No, you don't say that. No, you don't go there. No, this is the party line. I never thought that would happen in the United States of America—and here we are.

To aid Pruitt in his fossil fuel industry crusade, our President has nominated a parade of fossil fuel lackeys, lobbyists, and operatives whose main qualification seems to be allegiance to their corporate clients and benefactors. It is not just the fossil fuel industry that gets their hacks planted in government offices.

Do you remember in the "Cat in the Hat," where they had Thing One and Thing Two running around? Let's look at Hack One and Hack Two, who just cleared committee today in the Pruitt "EPA for Sale" roster.

Hack One is a toxicologist who consults for major chemical corporations and has spent the better part of his professional life fighting regulation of potentially toxic compounds in consumer goods. His name is Michael Dourson. President Trump nominated him to run the EPA Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention. A lobbying group for sellers of pesticides, fungicides, and rodenticides called Dourson "a perfect fit" for the job—the perfect industry hack for that job, more like.

Hack Two is William Wehrum, nominated to run the EPA Office of Air and Radiation. Wehrum is a lobbyist who has represented a host of major industrial and energy corporations, and the Rubber Manufacturers Association, the American Forest and Paper Association, and the American Petroleum Institute. President George W. Bush actually nominated this guy to the same post in 2006, but the White House withdrew his nomination because it was so controversial.

Well, that was 2006. That was before Citizens United. That was before that decision amped up industry power to the point where it can now ram through conflicted and objectionable candidates with—as happened this morning—unanimous Republican support. Not one Republican Senator on the committee would voice an objection.

When Senators asked questions for the record in the Environment and Public Works Committee nomination hearing on Wehrum and Dourson, these captured nominees played dumb about the central issues and programs they will oversee if confirmed.

For instance, I asked Dourson if he agreed that "the tobacco industry manipulated and obfuscated scientific research into the dangers of smoking for decades." Dourson, who conducted scientific studies designed, reviewed, and paid for by the tobacco industry and whose name is all over, in hundreds of places, the discovery records of the tobacco industry's denial operation, replied: "I do not have firsthand knowledge to comment."

I "do not have firsthand knowledge to comment"? This is the President's selection to run the office that protects Americans from dangerous chemicals who doesn't know the tobacco industry's history of falsifying science? Please. He worked for them. He was part of it.

Remember that the tobacco industry was taken to court by the U.S. Department of Justice—back when the Department of Justice would take an industry to court—and the Department of Justice won a judgment declaring that tobacco had engaged in a fraud conspiracy to deny tobacco's harms. Dourson sees no evil. He knows nothing.

I asked him whether he believes that hydrofluorocarbons are greenhouse gases and about the global warming potential of methane. His response: I am not sufficiently familiar with the definition of greenhouse gases and do not have the expertise to answer these questions.

He is not familiar with the definition of greenhouse gases? This is basic high school science. Every one of us has a home State university that teaches this stuff. This has been science for more than 100 years.

On to Hack Two, Bill Wehrum. When I asked Wehrum about carbon dioxide's

role in the observable effects of climate change, he replied: "The degree to which manmade greenhouse gas emissions are contributing to climate change has not been conclusively determined." This claim just doesn't match the scientific record.

The EPA—the very Agency to which Mr. Wehrum is nominated, along with NOAA—states that "carbon dioxide is the primary greenhouse gas that is contributing to recent climate change." This consensus is held by published climate scientists, by scientific agencies and societies, by all of our National Laboratories, and by universities in America and around the globe.

As I said, every one of us in this room—I haven't found an exception yet, and I have looked, but I expect every Senator has a home State university that doesn't just know this to be true, but it teaches it in its curriculum. But Hack Two sees no evil. He knows nothing.

Wehrum's disregard for well-established science provides a grim preview of what we can expect from him if confirmed. His predictable dodging falls in lockstep with Administrator Pruitt, who has stated he does "not agree that [carbon dioxide] is a primary contributor to the global warming that we see." That puts him in a very small circle of people, every one of whom I think is connected by money to the fossil fuel industry.

I asked Mr. Wehrum what he believes is a healthy standard for ozone. Now, bear in mind that one of the goals of the Clean Air Act is to set national ambient air quality standards for ozone, that the office to which he is nominated oversees this ozone standard, and that the EPA has had ozone standards in place since 1971, more than 45 years.

In response to my question, Wehrum answered: "I am not familiar with the current science on the health effects of ozone, so I cannot comment on your question as to the appropriate level of the standard." Really?

I asked Wehrum whether he agreed with EPA's 2009 finding that the current and projected concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations. I asked if he would commit not to narrow or weaken the EPA's endangerment finding. Wehrum wrote back that he had not read the endangerment finding or the record prepared in support of the finding; therefore, he said: "I currently do not have a view." I currently do not have a view? That is funny.

I bet he had a view when he was being paid by the Rubber Manufacturers Association, the American Forest & Paper Association, and the American Petroleum Institute. I guess it was the miraculous, evaporating view.

Maybe these "see no evil" nominees, Dourson and Wehrum, don't know the

basics of the problems they would confront. Maybe they just don't know, but let's not be fooled here. Polluters have paid these nominees well for their services over the years. They were expert enough to be hired by industry groups as lobbyists and consultants. We know where their allegiances lie. We know who has been paying them. We know whom they will serve.

A preview of coming attractions, coming up before the EPW soon is Andrew Wheeler, Trump's nominee for the EPA's second in command. Wheeler was a top lobbyist for the coal mining behemoth, Murray Energy. Not only did this company support Trump's campaign and provide \$300,000 to help pay for his inauguration, Murray Energy has also donated to Pruitt-affiliated political action committees to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars. I can't wait to hear his answers on the role of coal in climate change, childhood asthma, and mercury poisoning.

The sad part of all of this is, the polluting interests that own these nominees also throw their weight around in Congress. So good luck getting an honest look at this mess through congressional oversight.

Over and over, appalling nominees get through confirmation with no Republican dissent, more "see no evil." It is just wrong.

For now, the American public will pay the price of dismantling these regulatory safeguards. They will pay the price in poisonings and carcinogenic exposures, in rising seas and raging wildfires, in childhood asthma and northbound tropical diseases. Mark my words, one day there will be a reckoning for all of this.

When captured EPA officials put payback to their donors first and clean air and public health a way distant second, it stinks. It is crooked by any reasonable definition of the term. It is corrupt in exactly the way the Founding Fathers understood corruption.

The fossil fuel industry will one day be held to account for this binge of corruption and manipulation. ExxonMobil, Koch Industries, Arch Coal, Murray Coal, Peabody Coal, you own this just as the Republican Party does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk about the Healthcare Tax Relief Act, legislation I introduced to delay the health insurance tax that was created by the Affordable Care Act.

This tax is often referred to as the HIT tax. The HIT tax imposes fees on health insurance coverage to consumers. It is a pretty simple business concept that this HIT tax results in. If a fee increases on an insurance policy and the fee goes up—there is a fee

charged to the company that issues this insurance policy—then that fee gets passed on to the consumer. It is the consumer, then, who pays the fee in the form of higher health insurance costs.

As is the case with most excise taxes, whether it is an excise tax on food or beverage or any other item of personal good, if this health insurance tax takes effect, costs will be passed on to consumers directly in the form of higher premiums. That is confirmed by the Congressional Budget Office.

This is one of the cost drivers that was built into the Affordable Care Act. This health insurance tax would directly increase the premiums of the consumer's insurance product. This tax was supposed to begin a few years back in 2014. It was going to start at \$8 billion, and by 2018 the tax would reach \$14.3 billion. However, Congress recognized that this tax was going to have a significant impact on the price of coverage and, as a result, suspended the tax from taking effect in 2017. Without congressional action to delay or stop or prevent this ObamaCare tax from taking place again, this tax will take effect in 2018.

According to nonpartisan actuarial analysis conducted by Oliver Wyman, an estimated 157 million Americans will be affected by this massive tax. Even more middle-income earners across this country, 157 million Americans and working Americans, are expected to shoulder the weight of this tax.

Oliver Wyman estimated that premiums will rise by 3 percent in each year; 2018, 2019, and 2020. That is 3 percent each year. That is 9 percent over 3 years.

To put this in simple perspective, in Colorado alone, premiums in the individual market rose by 34 percent from plan year 2017 to plan year 2018. Adding an additional 3 percent every year for those 3 years would leave those on the individual market paying nearly 43.3 percent, on average, more year to year if combined with the 2018 increases at the end of that 3-year, 9-percent increase run.

What is more, according to the Department of Health and Human Services, the average individual market premiums have increased by 105 percent from 2013 to 2017. Think about that. When the Affordable Care Act passed, when ObamaCare was passed, a promise was made that the average family would see a decrease in their healthcare costs of \$2,500 per family, but, instead, from 2013 to 2017, they saw a 105-percent increase in costs. If the health insurance tax takes effect, as planned by ObamaCare, then we would see another 9-percent increase over the next several years on top of that.

Without congressional action to delay this tax, estimates show that

costs will rise between \$200 and \$300 annually for individuals and \$500 annually for families. That is a \$200 to \$300 increase for individuals and a \$500 increase annually for families.

To put that into some perspective, 25 percent of Americans don't have access—emergency access—to \$100. In an emergency, 25 percent of Americans don't have immediate access to \$100. Yet here we are talking about a mandated law—you have to have insurance coverage under the Affordable Care Act—but this law would then increase costs \$200 to \$300 on an individual and \$500 annually for families.

Statistics from the Federal Reserve show how much of a hardship this would create. The Federal Reserve found that 46 percent of Americans did not have enough money to cover a \$400 emergency expense. Yet the ObamaCare HIT tax would increase family insurance costs by \$500. Forty-six percent of Americans don't have access to \$400 in an emergency. Yet the ObamaCare HIT tax would increase it by \$500.

This tax has the potential to push over half of Americans into financial ruin, and it would be negligent for Congress to allow this tax to take effect. The financial threat this tax imposes on hard-working families is a far cry from that bold promise that was made to reduce costs by \$2,500 per family—one of the biggest Pinocchios, so to speak, of the Affordable Care Act. At a time when we know that almost half of Americans could not shoulder a \$400 emergency expense, it would simply be irresponsible to allow this ObamaCare HIT tax to take effect.

Furthermore, the impacts of this tax touch our seniors who have earned their benefits as well. For seniors enrolled in Medicare Advantage plans—and Medicare Advantage is one of the most popular aspects of Medicare—premiums are expected to rise by roughly \$370 a year per enrollee if Congress doesn't find a resolution. In many cases, these are fixed-income individuals who would see their premiums increase \$370 a year because of the ObamaCare HIT tax.

In addition, seniors enrolled in Medicare Part D prescription drug plans can expect their premiums to increase as well. Hit them on their Medicare plans and hit them on the prescription drug plans—higher costs due to this ObamaCare HIT tax.

Even more, the impacts of the health insurance tax have large-scale consequences in the workplace as well. A study by the National Federation of Independent Business found that allowing the HIT tax to take effect could result in job losses for as many as 283,000 people by 2023. This tax could have the impact of costing 286,000 jobs by 2023. Research and analysis from our most respected actuaries continue to validate the negative consequences of the health insurance tax.

On behalf of all hard-working Americans, I call upon my colleagues in the Senate to join me in cosponsoring this commonsense piece of legislation, the Healthcare Tax Relief Act. Healthcare plans are being finalized right now for the 2018 rate year, and it is urgent for Congress to take action so that consumers are not saddled with yet one more cost that they can't afford.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN'S BICENTENNIAL

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the bicentennial of the University of Michigan. The university has adopted the motto "Always Leading, Forever Valiant" for its bicentennial year—a motto that captures its 200 years at the forefront of American academic excellence.

The genesis of the University of Michigan predates the founding of my home State of Michigan.

On August 26, 1817, Lewis Cass, Governor of the Michigan territory, enacted a charter to create the University of Michigania, aligned with territory judge Augustus Woodward's envisioned System of Universal Science.

In 1852, the university's first president, Henry Philip Tappan, pioneered a model of higher education in which scholars do not settle for existing knowledge but actively pursue new knowledge through rigorous science. This approach solidified the university's enduring legacy as a center for scientific research and discovery.

The university has paved the way for future innovation with many firsts throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. It was the first university with a chemical laboratory, the first to own and operate a hospital, the first to teach aeronautical engineering, the first public university with dental and pharmacy schools, and the first with a program in human genetics. Perhaps the most game-changing first—it was the first large State university to open its doors to both men and women.

Today, faculty and students continue to reach new firsts by answering important research questions that will affect future generations. Take, for instance, how the university has laid the groundwork for breakthroughs in American mobility.

In 2015, Mcity, a public-private partnership led by the University of Michigan, became the world's first controlled environment designed to test connected and automated vehicle technologies. The 32-acre simulated urban and suburban landscape is designed to support rigorous, repeatable testing of self-driving car technologies before they are tested on public roads and highways. This hub of innovation reflects our State's legacy as the heart of the American auto industry and will help lead our country into the next era of transportation.

A similar nexus between our past and future is true across nearly every discipline that U of M's research touches—engineering, medicine, social sciences, humanities, and more. Students and faculty are developing new cancer treatments, creating energy-efficient batteries, engaging in cutting-edge environmental science to protect the Great Lakes, and building prototypes of engines to take us to Mars. That is just to name a few.

Tied with the University of Michigan's drive to pursue knowledge is its drive to put that knowledge into action for the greater good. At its core, the university's mission is to serve society. This has been demonstrated by its history of activism and civic engagement.

The university commemorates one such event that occurred on October 14, 1960. Senator John F. Kennedy, whose former desk is just a few feet in front of me here today, delivered an unplanned speech on the steps of the Michigan Union at 2 a.m. He challenged University of Michigan students to work abroad in developing nations in an effort to promote peace. These remarks laid the blueprint for the U.S. Peace Corps, which was established in 1961.

The University of Michigan continues to have a truly global reach. It provides a world-class education to a diverse student body of 63,000 students on its Ann Arbor, Dearborn, and Flint campuses, educating instate, out-of-state, and international students alike. They are drawn to the university's unfaltering endeavor to expand our base of knowledge and empower individuals to leave a lasting and positive impact on the world around them.

With more than 572,000 living alumni—including my daughter Madeline, who just graduated this past May—the University of Michigan has one of the largest alumni networks, full of artists, astronauts, business and government leaders, entrepreneurs, and humanitarians, as well as Nobel laureates in economics, medicine, and science.

The University of Michigan's many illustrious alumni include U.S. President Gerald R. Ford, Swedish diplomat and humanitarian Raoul Wallenberg, Pulitzer Prize-winning playwright Arthur Miller, actor James Earl Jones, civil rights leader Mary Frances Berry, Google cofounder Larry Page, and author and scholar Robin Wright. Many more alumni will follow in these footsteps. They share a drive to make what is affectionately known as the Michigan Difference and, of course, cheer for the Maize and Blue.

I would like to congratulate the University of Michigan on its bicentennial as we look forward to a future driven by Michigan innovation.

With that, I will close with something very simple: "Go Blue!"

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is devastating families and communities in my home State of New Hampshire and across the United States: the fentanyl, heroin, and opioid crisis. This crisis is the most pressing public and safety challenge that New Hampshire faces. It does not discriminate. It affects people in every community and from every walk of life.

In 2016 alone, 485 people in New Hampshire lost their lives as a result of this epidemic. The rising use of synthetic drugs like fentanyl is making matters worse, killing people faster with smaller amounts. Last year, 72 percent of drug-related deaths in New Hampshire involved fentanyl. Behind those numbers are real people—moms and dads, sons and daughters who are dying. Their loss reverberates in pain and suffering for the family and friends whom they have left behind.

The people of my State have a long-standing tradition of sharing their stories and their priorities with their elected officials who represent them. Everywhere I go, I hear stories from those families and friends of people who have been affected by this crisis. Granite Staters are stepping forward and explaining what they have gone through, all in an attempt to break down the stigma of addiction, push for solutions, and hope that they can help others by making their voices heard.

Earlier this year, Greg and Linda of Derry, NH, reached out to my office to share the story of their son, who was also named Greg. They wrote to say:

If you were to put a name and face to this disease, it would be that of the devil. Let's change that. Let's put a face of hope and humanity to the disease of addiction. If by doing so, even if just one life is saved, it is worth it.

I would like to share some of Greg's story today. Greg was born on November 16, 1985. He and his younger brother Neil were raised in a caring and loving home, where their parents did their best to teach them right from wrong, stressing the importance of being considerate, polite, and kind.

When Greg was 15, his parents moved to Derry, where he attended Pinkerton Academy and graduated with honors in 2004. During his senior year, like so many other students his age, he applied for college, eventually deciding on Keene State College, pursuing a major in biochemistry. He had a dream of becoming a physician.

He excelled academically, but his mom Linda said that during his transition between his freshman and sophomore year, something began to appear off. She wrote:

I saw firsthand that something was off about him. He was very quiet and withdrawn. He was showing obvious signs of depression which runs in both sides of the family.

Even as his depression progressed, Greg battled through. He graduated cum laude with a bachelor's degree in biochemistry. After graduating and moving back home, his parents urged him to seek help, but Greg held back. During this time, he had an outpatient surgery, after which he was prescribed an opioid-based painkiller. His mom said that after he was prescribed that opioid, he went from bad to worse.

Eventually Greg sought help. He saw a physician and was prescribed an antidepressant. His mom said he seemed to be coming back around; he seemed happier. He took steps to advance his career, hoping to find a job with his biochemistry degree that would offer him a reimbursement on tuition so that he could continue to pursue a career in medicine. Though the job market was tough, his mom said:

Hands down, I have to say that one of the happiest days of my life was when he finally got a decent job. . . . The dark cloud was lifted—temporarily.

Unfortunately, Greg eventually lost that job, and then things spiraled out of control. His mom wrote:

The years following were a nightmare to remember. Just imagine a loved one slowly losing all sense of themselves. Legal trouble, bouncing from one job to the next, losing his license more than once while we drove him back and forth from jobs—some an hour away.

A restraining order here, a night in jail there. Debts that weren't getting paid. Fits of rage, fights, a lack of interest in family, friends, and basic hygiene.

She said:

By the time our worst fears were confirmed, he was using heroin, we basically lost the soul of our son.

Greg's last few years were filled with back-and-forths. He had overdosed, his brother finding him in the bathroom of their home. Tired of being dependent on heroin, he sought help, signing up for a methadone clinic, entering rehab, and giving his parents hope that he would make progress.

Unfortunately, he started to use again but was getting ready to enter a drug court program. After joining his family on a vacation to visit an ailing relative, he decided to clean up his act, going to the gym and eating right.

Tragically, though, his mom wrote:

This was short lived however, as the demon snuck into his room and stole him from us. All he left for us was a lifeless body on the floor behind a locked door.

Greg's death and his heartbreaking story is the story of far too many people in New Hampshire and across the country, of people with dreams, hopes,

and aspirations, whose lives are cut short as a result of this illness. Greg wanted to be a doctor. He wanted to be a husband and a father. He loved dogs and video games, and he loved to watch Patriots games on Sunday with his mom, his dad, and his brother. As his mom put it:

Brilliant and head strong, he was to be reckoned with, and as his parents, we will never stop trying, on his behalf, to see that there is an end to this epidemic.

His parents wanted to make clear that his substance use disorder really grew as a result of the opioid he was prescribed following surgery, a painkiller that was originally manufactured for terminally ill patients. They believe that pharmaceutical companies marketed this drug at the expense of their son, saying: "Given to ease pain and suffering, ironically, it has caused irreparable pain, suffering, and death."

We can never thank families who have lost loved ones enough for speaking out about this issue and for working tirelessly and courageously to try to prevent others from suffering as they have. Nor can we forget to thank law enforcement and first responders who are on the frontlines of this epidemic.

I want to make a special mention of Greg's father, Greg senior, who is a firefighter in Nashua, witnessing as a first responder every day the havoc that this crisis wreaks on other families and living with the reality of his own family's loss too.

Greg's mom said that at the moment of his death, she vowed that she would ensure that his life would not be in vain. His family reached out because they wanted to make a difference. I am grateful for their efforts to do this because they do, in fact, have the ability to make change.

Speaking up helps break down the stigma that prevents too many from seeking help and prevents too many others from offering it. It provides a voice to the voiceless, making those who have died more than just a statistic. It gives us a perspective from which we can learn, and it pushes us to take action.

While thanking these families for their bravery is appropriate, it is simply not enough. Their bravery and their struggle must be marked by constant vigilance and urgent action. We must continue to focus on an "all hands on deck" approach at all levels of government and with those on the frontlines in order to make progress, save lives, and end this epidemic.

I am going to continue fighting and working with Members of both parties to combat this crisis, and I will continue sharing the stories of the people of my State. It is up to all of us to stop this from happening to more families.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, on September 30, the Children's Health Insurance Program expired. It has now been 25 days since the Congress has put our children's health and well-being on the back burner. My colleagues and I do not think that children's health belongs on the back burner. So we have come to the floor of the Senate to spend the afternoon speaking up for kids.

Thank you to everyone who joins me today to say that we should not wait any longer to make sure that children, community health centers, and new mothers have access to the healthcare programs that they need.

Republicans control Congress. It is up to them what we vote on and when we do it. So what was more important to the Republican leadership than the health of little kids? Republican leaders blew through the days before the children's healthcare deadline by trying to repeal healthcare for millions of Americans.

Once the Children's Health Insurance Program had already expired, Republican leaders burned through more time by holding a series of votes on a budget with giant tax cuts for billionaires and giant corporations that would also gut Medicare, Medicaid, and a bunch of programs that help working families. Republicans jammed through their terrible budget without a single Democratic vote last week, 19 days after blowing past the deadline to fund healthcare for kids.

Last night, 24 days past the deadline to make sure the kids had healthcare coverage, what were Republican leaders doing? Republican leaders stayed up late into the night holding a vote to make it easier for financial institutions to cheat people.

The days continue to tick by—24, 25. Tomorrow Members of Congress will leave for the weekend, 26 days past the deadline, and still there will be no vote to fund this critical program.

Senator Ted Kennedy and Senator ORRIN HATCH, a Democrat and Republican, wrote this legislation together back in the late 1990s. The Children's Health Insurance Program, also called CHIP, provides health insurance to low-income children and to pregnant women. Senator Kennedy and Senator HATCH created this program because they knew that providing healthcare coverage for children would make them healthier as children and healthier even after they grew up. They knew that some children were slipping through the cracks, and this was their solution. The children covered by CHIP

didn't qualify for Medicaid, they weren't covered by employers, and they couldn't afford to buy private insurance.

In 1997, 15 percent of all the children in this country lacked any form of health insurance coverage. Today, because of the CHIP program and the Affordable Care Act, that number has shrunk to 5 percent of children. CHIP works with Medicaid to provide health insurance for one out of every three kids in this country.

States choose whether or not they want a CHIP program. Here is the deal. Every single State has chosen one because every single State recognizes the value of providing their children with healthcare coverage. In Massachusetts, the percentage of children with healthcare coverage is even higher than the national average. It is at 99 percent. We are doing something right here.

The original program was set for 10 years, and since then, every few years, Congress has had to act to reauthorize the program so that children can continue to get healthcare coverage. The CHIP program has been reauthorized four times since 1997, and not one of those times has Congress missed the deadline—not one—until now. In fact, in past years, Congress has made sure to reauthorize the program many months ahead of its expiration in order to give States the time they need to plan their budget. It sounds like a pretty sensible thing to do—but not this year. We are 25 days past the deadline for reauthorizing CHIP—25 days and counting. This isn't fair to States, to kids, or to their families.

So what actually happens now?

Well, the money runs out. Eleven States are set to run out of their CHIP funding by the end of 2017, and the others, soon after. Our Republican Governor in Massachusetts sent me a letter on day 3 past the CHIP deadline, and he wrote:

Parents are already afraid that their children's insurance may be lost in the near future. With each passing week, their fears continue to grow.

My Governor is right. States have to start making tough decisions. They may have to decrease enrollment, turning away sick little kids who qualify for coverage but don't make it through the door on time. They could start kicking kids off of their insurance saying: Sorry, we just can't help anymore. Or they could be forced to make tough calls on benefits: We can't cover the wheelchair you need to get around. There is no physical therapy or no prenatal care until the funding comes through again.

That is just flat out immoral. Tax cuts for billionaires shouldn't come before making sure that a sick kid gets the help he or she needs. Mothers are lying awake at night. Fathers are tossing and turning, worrying about their

healthcare coverage. What is the Republican leadership doing? Tomorrow they will be heading home for the weekend without lifting a finger to fund a bipartisan program that has been reauthorized four times over the past 20 years.

If that isn't bad enough, September 30 wasn't just the deadline for Congress to reauthorize CHIP. We also blew past the deadline on several other healthcare programs to help children, to help pregnant women, to help older Americans, and to help the chronically ill. We blew past the deadline to reauthorize the Community Health Center Fund and the National Health Service Corps, which funds health centers and supports healthcare workers that provide children with high-quality primary care. We blew past the deadline to reauthorize the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, which funds home visits to new and expectant parents to give them help keeping a new baby healthy and safe. We blew past the deadline to reauthorize the Special Diabetes Program, which funds diabetes research that could offer hope to many children living with diabetes.

When a kid is sick, moms and dads move Heaven and Earth to get them the care they need. They don't wait 25 days to go to the doctor and check to see if something is wrong. They stay up all night to make sure their little ones are all right. They wait outside the hospital room, pacing until they get an answer, but Republican leaders in Congress just don't seem to care. They don't seem to care if these families have the health insurance coverage they need so they can get an x ray or pay for an antibiotic or run some tests.

Twenty-five days, 26 days, 27 days—it just doesn't seem to matter to Republican leaders, but it sure matters to moms and dads and kids in Massachusetts and all over this country.

Senator Kennedy used to say: "The test of greatness for a nation is how it cares for its children." Right now Republican leaders in Congress are failing that test. My colleagues have come to the floor today to say that time is up. We are here to fight for kids.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise in support of my colleagues who have come to the floor to urge the Senate to quickly pass funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, known as CHIP.

CHIP provides comprehensive health insurance to 9 million low-income children who don't qualify for Medicaid, including 18,000 children in my home State of Delaware. Lots of other States would say that 18,000 children is a small number, but in Delaware that is a significant population. Bluntly, whether it is 1 or 100 or 1,000 or 18,000,

how can we allow inaction in this Chamber to put at risk the healthcare of millions of children across our country?

It has now been more than 3 weeks since funding for CHIP expired. While some States have enough money in their accounts to carry them through to the end of the year or just beyond, the uncertainty about when or if CHIP funds will be reauthorized is causing chaos, concern, and anxiety across the country. Some States will have to start issuing notices to households that they will face the loss of CHIP coverage. Imagine the unnecessary fear this will bring to parents and families and struggling households across the country as they are facing other challenges in their life.

This is totally unnecessary. We can stop this uncertainty right now and bring needed stability for parents, children, and States and show some kind of leadership from our Federal Government. I am a proud cosponsor of the bipartisan KIDS Act, S. 1827, being led by Senator ORRIN HATCH of Utah and Senator RON WYDEN of Oregon. This KIDS Act would extend funding for CHIP for 5 years. I urge the Senate to do right by America's children and America's working families and swiftly take up and pass this bill.

While we are on the topic of programs desperately in need of reauthorization, I also want to draw attention to the expiration of the Community Health Center Fund, which ensures access to cost-effective primary and preventive care for 26 million patients across the country. In my home State of Delaware, about 50,000 Delawareans benefit from several community health centers that are widely respected, well run, and provide affordable, accessible, and preventive healthcare in communities up and down my State. Funding for this critical program also lapsed more than 3 weeks ago, and now, sadly, community health centers across my State and across the country are struggling to make key decisions—decisions like signing new leases or signing on new medical personnel to positions. Without certainty that the Federal Government will authorize their funding, how can we expect health centers to plan, to provide services, and to provide preventive healthcare that improves health and strengthens our community?

We should do everything we can to swiftly pass a 5-year reauthorization for funding for community health centers, such as the bipartisan bill that Senator BLUNT of Missouri and Senator STABENOW of Michigan have introduced, the Community Health Investment, Modernization, and Excellence Act of 2017, S. 1899, which I am proud to support.

Folks, I urge that we work together in a bipartisan way. We should not be using children's access to healthcare as

a bargaining chip. We should be taking up these two bills to provide reauthorization, funding, and certainty immediately for both CHC and CHIP funding now and without hesitation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, as you know, the Children's Health Insurance Program expired on September 30, in large part because we spent much of this year and the days leading up to that date debating the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, instead of focusing on bipartisan priorities like the Children's Health Insurance Program. As a result, the program known as CHIP expired and the health of 9 million children, including some 340,000 Pennsylvania children, are now at risk.

CHIP is not just a bipartisan program but a successful program with a Pennsylvania history. It was modeled after a State program in Pennsylvania that was signed into law by my father when he served as Governor in the early 1990s. The program provides affordable health insurance to children whose family incomes mean they don't qualify for Medicaid but still struggle to find affordable health insurance options. It is a program that working families rely upon and that provides peace of mind to parents.

Many families turn to CHIP during times of economic hardship, such as when a parent loses his or her job. At such a stressful time, I have heard from parents over and over how they have peace of mind knowing that their children will get the healthcare they need.

Some parents who rely upon CHIP for their children are, in fact, students, working and going to school so they can make that leap into stable, middle-class life. They may not have a job with health insurance or they may not be able to afford the insurance, but they know their children will get the healthcare they need.

Regardless of what drives families to the CHIP program, it is thanks in large part to CHIP that the United States of America has the highest rate of insured children in our Nation's history. According to the Census Bureau, 95.5 percent of children had health insurance in 2016. CHIP is also a popular program, as repeated studies have demonstrated. Parents think CHIP is a valuable program, and they are satisfied with the coverage and with the care their children receive.

Unless the Senate acts and acts very soon, we will have betrayed all of those children and all of those families. There is no reason for CHIP to have expired and no reason why we shouldn't pass the bill right now, if not in the next couple of days—certainly, in the next 2 or 3 weeks—to ensure that not one single child loses his or her health insurance.

We have taken important steps to extend the program. The Finance Committee marked up the bipartisan Keep Kids' Insurance Dependable and Secure Act of 2017, known by the acronym K-I-D-S, or KIDS. The KIDS Act came out of the Finance Committee, which reauthorizes CHIP for 5 years, and that happened some 3 weeks ago. I am proud to be a cosponsor of that bill.

So it is time to act. We have a commonsense, bipartisan, successful bill in the Senate that is ready to go. It is out of the Finance Committee. So I would urge my colleagues to join me and to join others who have come to the floor today and on earlier days to take swift action to pass the KIDS Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, healthcare for our Nation's children is something we ought to be able to all come together on, but this Congress, which has not done much of anything, is always able to find a way to help Wall Street. Think about the middle-of-the-night vote last night, where the Vice President of the United States came to the rescue of Equifax and the rescue of Wells Fargo and the rescue of Wall Street overall. Think of the celebrations last night on Wall Street because of that tie vote, which stripped consumers of their days in court. It stripped consumers of their consumer rights.

This Congress, when it came to the Children's Health Insurance Program, allowed it to expire at the end of last month. It left millions of families afraid they will lose healthcare for their kids. Think about what this uncertainty means for parents. Trying to make sure your children are safe and healthy is enough to worry about.

Families shouldn't have to fear losing coverage for their kids because of some politicians in Washington. All of us have taxpayer-funded health insurance. Some politicians in Washington don't seem to care much about these kids.

In my State, more than 200,000-plus children have insurance under CHIP. So even if something happens to their parents—even if they lose their job or their insurance—those 200,000-plus children in Ohio have insurance because of CHIP. But it expired on September 30.

Governor Kasich is a Republican. I am a Democrat. We stand together on this, as we stand together protecting Medicaid and as we stand together protecting the Affordable Care Act. He tells us that there is still a little bit of

money left over in Ohio to get us through these next few weeks until Congress does its job. But that doesn't mean parents don't worry about their children possibly losing their health insurance.

Kids on CHIP are a little more likely to have asthma or a little bit more likely to have an illness, in part because they are low-income kids and they may live near a bus line and the air they breathe may not quite be so good. Or they live in Appalachia, where they might not be able to get to the doctor quickly. Those kids are more at risk, and those parents are worried, even though Governor Kasich assures them and I assure them we are going to do this.

Congress worked into the middle of the night last night and debated for hours on a giveaway to Wall Street. They debated for hours on helping Equifax, which abused the public trust of 145 million people—5 million in my State. They bailed out Wells Fargo, which fraudulently attacked, for want of a better term, 3.5 million customers. Congress can bail them out, but it can't pass the Children's Health Insurance Program?

Because of CHIP, 209,000—I said more than 200,000 before; more precisely, 209,000 Ohio children have access to affordable healthcare today—healthcare they may not have received otherwise. That is the importance of this program. It used to be bipartisan until this Congress, always in its rush to help Wall Street, forgot about these children.

This program provides peace of mind for parents. Regardless of income, when a parent knows that a daughter or a son has health insurance, it provides peace of mind. They know if their child has a sore throat or earache, they don't have to wait until the child is so sick they take her to the emergency room. They won't have to hesitate or wonder if they can afford the doctor visit or antibiotic. They get the care their kids need.

Most of us in this body are parents. Most of us in this body have insurance provided by taxpayers. Wouldn't you think that this would be important enough to Leader McCONNELL and the leaders of this body and to President Trump and to Speaker RYAN? Wouldn't you think it would be important enough?

We all talk about loving our kids. We talk about grandchildren. Most of us are at the age where many of us have grandchildren. We don't care enough about these children as we get insurance from taxpayers. We don't care enough about these kids to do this?

It has already been 3 weeks now since CHIP expired. CHIP means a child in Cincinnati or Dayton or Portsmouth or Akron or Youngstown or Mansfield can see a family doctor when they need it, preventing a costly ambulance ride and

emergency room visit. CHIP means getting vaccines and shots. It means having dental coverage. We know what happens to low-income kids who don't get good dental care.

The State of Ohio probably has enough money to help protect CHIP kids through the end of the year, but Congress needs to act now.

I have met with CHIP families across Ohio. Let me tell you some stories. Josh, whom I met in Cleveland—his children were covered by CHIP when he was laid off from his job. He said, "The ability to take health insurance out of the equation, feeling confident that my family will continue to get the same quality of care they had while I was working, was a huge weight lifted." Think about that.

This father, knowing that he has insurance—he had plenty of things to worry about. He lost his job. Who knows what that means about their home and their lifestyle and their family? But at least he knew he could rely on insurance—until now. Look what this Congress has failed to do.

Think about Noble from Columbus, who came to my office earlier this year with his mom to talk about how important CHIP is. Noble relies on CHIP for coverage for the five pediatric specialists he sees at one of America's great hospitals, Nationwide Children's Hospital in Columbus.

My colleagues need to think about Josh and his kids in Cleveland and Noble and his mom in Columbus. We need to think about the mother of a son with diabetes, worrying about whether her son will be able to see the same doctor next year or about a father with a daughter with asthma, praying she doesn't lose her inhaler on the playground because in a few months they might not have insurance to pay for that inhaler.

My wife has asthma, and I know what that means. She had a father who had health insurance through his union plan with the Illuminating Company in Northeast Ohio. He worked maintenance. It was a good blue-collar job. It didn't pay enough to send her to college, but it did pay enough with good insurance that it gave them a decent lifestyle. They didn't have CHIP back then. More people had union plans. More people were protected.

We used to have CHIP until September 30, when this Congress didn't care enough to provide it. We should not be playing politics with families' lives.

Two years ago, I led the fight in this body to protect CHIP. Because of that work, with the support of advocates all across Ohio—and there are so many of them across the country—we extended funding for CHIP for 2 years. Again, this was with bipartisan support, back when Congress operated that way.

We have already come a long way this year. We passed a 5-year extension

of CHIP out of the Senate Finance Committee. It had every vote in that Committee, with the exception of one. I thank Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN and my colleague from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, and so many of our colleagues for their help with that.

But this process is taking too long. Josh and Noble and the 209,000 Ohioans and 9 million children across the country are in a situation in which their parents are unsure of whether they will have insurance through the end of the year and next year and the year after.

It is time for us to come together to ensure that the families we work for have the healthcare they need for their children.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, Donald Trump and the Republican Congress have spent most of the past year pushing their misplaced priorities, no matter the direct and collateral damage it causes for millions of Americans across the country.

There are many examples to choose from to illustrate this point. Just last night, the Vice President had to come in and break a tie to protect huge corporations from the victims of the frauds they perpetuated. Now they are putting together a huge tax cut for the wealthiest people in our country, and they are trying to sell it as a raise for the middle class. In Hawaii, we call this shibai—or B.S.

But there is perhaps no issue in which Donald Trump's dangerous agenda has caused more harm than his quest to deprive millions of Americans the healthcare and the health insurance they need. His first attempt at repealing the Affordable Care Act would have thrown as many as 30 million people off of their health insurance. Thanks to the combined efforts of so many people—active people, engaged people across the country—we defeated this proposal.

A few months later, continuing the assault on healthcare, Donald Trump renewed his attack on our healthcare system under the so-called Graham-Cassidy bill. But once again, the combined outrage of millions kept the bill from coming to the floor.

In the time they spent on their single-minded, unrelenting quest to repeal the Affordable Care Act, Donald Trump and Republicans in Congress have allowed authorization for the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, to lapse. Nearly 30,000 children in Hawaii and more than 9 million across the

country depend on CHIP for their healthcare. You heard just now my colleague from Ohio tell you stories about the children in Ohio—children with asthma. In Hawaii, we have children with asthma, children with diabetes.

Nearly 30,000 children in Hawaii who rely on CHIP for their healthcare are being affected by our inaction. Primarily covering children from low-income families who earn too much to qualify for Medicaid, CHIP provides critical and much needed care for children with complex medical conditions.

Although existing funding has allowed States to stretch budgets to keep the program in place, money is quickly running out. If we don't take action soon, as many as 4 million children could lose their health insurance entirely—4 million children.

Congress cannot and should not be complicit in what I would call gross negligence. It is not negligence; it is gross negligence.

CHIP has traditionally enjoyed bipartisan support. In fact, it emerged from the committee with bipartisan support. I am glad Senators Wyden and Hatch have come together to create the KIDS Act, which I have cosponsored. This bill would extend CHIP's authorization and funding through 2022 and provide much needed certainty to millions of families across the country.

If we brought this bill to the floor right now, it would pass. It would clearly have the votes to pass. The only question is, Why don't we do it? Why don't we provide healthcare to millions of children in our country, for Heaven's sake?

I cannot believe that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are afraid to risk incurring the wrath of a vengeful President. I cannot believe that is what is keeping them from doing the right thing.

I encourage the majority leader to bring this bill to the floor for a vote as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, this summer the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, turned 20 years old.

I served on the House committee that created this bill and was proud to support providing the affordable comprehensive health insurance to low-income children and pregnant women. It is a bipartisan program, and it is an effective program. Last year alone, CHIP covered nearly 9 million children throughout the country. In Massachu-

setts, CHIP has been instrumental in achieving near-universal coverage for our children in the Bay State.

Yet, instead of celebrating CHIP's successes over the last two decades, congressional Republicans have placed CHIP in programmatic purgatory. That is because they allowed CHIP to expire at the end of September. Instead of focusing on reauthorizing this critical healthcare lifeline, Republican leadership chose to waste months of time trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They let just one of these successful programs lapse while they tried unsuccessfully to end another. They were more interested in ripping healthcare coverage away from millions of Americans and taking a machete to Medicaid rather than protecting our Nation's children.

We should not forget that CHIP stands on Medicaid's shoulders. Any fundamental changes to how Medicaid operates—whether it is block-granting or capping the program—will hamstring CHIP's ability to serve children as effectively and efficiently as it was intended to do, but instead of immediately returning attention to ensuring that this lapsed deadline is not effective, House Republicans have further delayed action by inserting partisan policies to pay for the program. This has not only caused an unnecessary delay in passing a bill to reauthorize CHIP, but it has dragged CHIP onto the political game board, turning it and our children into pawns in their ruthless game of partisan chess.

CHIP has historically been and should be above such games because CHIP is not just an insurance program, it is a reassurance program. It reassures States that they can provide comprehensive healthcare coverage to some of their most vulnerable, it reassures doctors that their patients will be able to access care and treatment, it reassures teachers that their students can be healthy enough to learn, and it reassures Mom and Dad that their children can still get well in the face of financial hardship.

Continued inaction on CHIP is dangerous and damaging. Every day we delay reauthorizing CHIP is another day parents across the United States live in fear that their children may soon lose their health insurance. They panic at the thought of leaving their child's asthma untreated, skipping a trip to the dentist, or delaying a doctor's visit because they can't afford to pay for the treatment or medication that may be prescribed. If we don't act soon, this fear may become a terrible reality for families. In Massachusetts, CHIP funding will expire early next year. This could impact coverage for 160,000 children in the Commonwealth, potentially delaying access to treatment and services that could have ramifications into adulthood.

In Congress, we are celebrating the 20th birthday of a successful children's

insurance program by effectively threatening to end it. That is what Congress is now doing to the State of Massachusetts. That is what they are saying to the State of Massachusetts; that they are going to effectively try to shut down a program that for 20 years has served the children in our State. That makes no sense.

I urge my Republican colleagues to put their partisan games aside to provide certainty and stability to States, to providers, and to reassure families by reauthorizing CHIP. When President Trump says he wants to make the healthcare system in America better, when President Trump says he wants to make sure families are able to take care of their children, we have a program that does that already. It is successful, and families and the States love it. All we need is Republicans in the Senate to work together in order to make sure that program continues for the health of all children in our country.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senate is currently considering the nomination of Scott Palk to a lifetime appointment as a Federal district court judge on the Western District of Oklahoma. I voted against Mr. Palk's nomination in the Judiciary Committee, and I will oppose his nomination on the floor.

While his nomination was pending for a lifetime appointment to be a Federal judge, Mr. Palk changed his membership with the National Rifle Association to take out a life membership in the organization. When I asked Mr. Palk about this change, he asserted he expects to maintain this "lifetime member" status, even if he is confirmed, and he refused to commit to recuse himself from any cases where the National Rifle Association has taken a legal position.

What I find disconcerting about this is Federal judges must be impartial. Federal judges must not have any appearance of conflicts of interest. When individuals come before a court, they need to trust that their case will be heard fairly and on the merits.

Every American must believe that they will get a fair, unbiased hearing no matter who their judge is. Federal judges must follow applicable laws and regulations that severely limit the kinds of organizations they can participate in.

For example, the code of conduct for Federal Judges says, "[A] judge should not participate in extrajudicial activities that detract from the dignity of the judge's office, interfere with the performance of the judge's official duties, reflect adversely on the judge's impartiality, lead to frequent disqualification, or violate the limitations set forth below."

That is why members of the Senate Judiciary Committee often ask judicial

nominees at their hearings what steps they will take to prepare for the bench. It is the committee's duty to determine whether a nominee is prepared to leave their former roles and personal beliefs at the door and instead serve in an impartial arbiter.

In fact, when nominated for lifetime appointments, most nominees try to rid themselves of conflicts and limit their affiliations, especially with advocacy organizations. However, Mr. Palk not only chose to maintain his membership with the NRA, he chose to extend his membership for life.

The fact that we are considering this nominee, given this issue with his background, just 3 weeks after the Las Vegas shooting, should really give us all a reason to pause. Las Vegas is now the deadliest mass shooting committed by an individual in the United States. It has only been a year since the Pulse Nightclub massacre in Orlando, which was previously the deadliest mass shooting in our Nation's history. It has been only 5 years since 20 6-year-olds and 6 adults were murdered at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT. What happened after each of those shootings?

After Sandy Hook, the NRA opposed any legislation that would have restricted high-capacity magazines or military-style assault rifles.

After the Pulse Nightclub shooting, the NRA opposed any legislation to expand background checks on gun buyers or to prevent gun sales to people on terrorist watch lists.

After the Las Vegas shooting, the NRA, despite initial statements to the contrary, has come out opposed to any legislation to ban "bump-fire stocks," even though such devices allow guns to function as machineguns, which are already banned under the law.

The NRA has never supported any commonsense gun legislation. The NRA's views on gun control issues could not be clearer, which is why it is so problematic that a judicial nominee chose to double-down on his NRA membership while his nomination was pending, rather than extricate himself from his prior commitments and then refuse to commit to recusing himself on cases where the NRA has made its views abundantly clear. This should trouble all of us.

Our job in evaluating judicial nominees is to ensure our Federal courts are an independent part of our system of checks and balances. To do that, we need confidence that judicial nominees will safeguard their own impartiality. I think all of my colleagues feel that way.

That is not what Mr. Palk has done. Instead of taking steps to separate himself from strong political views, he has proactively taken steps to increase his commitment to specific views of the law.

I will vote against Mr. Palk's nomination and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MARKEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFRICOM, FOREIGN POLICY, AND OUR MILITARY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I came back just a week ago from visiting our troops stationed all around the world, in all the commands—AFRICOM, EUCOM, CENTCOM—and talked to them about the threats in all these regions.

At a time when I hear colleagues across the aisle and political pundits ask the question, Why do we have troops in various places like Africa, it is important to remember the strategic importance of Africa.

I remember 10 years ago we didn't have a command for Africa. It was part of three commands: Pacific Command, Central Command, and European Command. Now we have AFRICOM. It is its own command. It seemed a little unreasonable that we were treating Africa as somewhat of a stepchild when that is the breeding ground out there for a lot of the things happening in terms of terrorism.

Despite our military's reach and influence, our Nation's shrinking defense budget has put AFRICOM at risk during a time when commanders are saying we face the most dangerous world we have ever faced, and we have.

I have often said that I look wistfully back at the days of the Cold War, when we had two superpowers and they were predictable. We knew what they had. They knew what we had. You have people from all over the world who are putting together equipment that we never dreamed they would have.

We have just gone through 8 years of another administration. I don't say this critically of him, but one thing about President Obama was that he was a committed, sincere liberal. Liberals generally don't pay a lot of attention to the military. Now we find ourselves in a situation where we are hurting. A lot of people assume that we don't have any problems militarily.

Sometimes I remind people that up until about 1962, we spent more than half—52 percent in 1962—of all of our revenues on defending America. What is it today? It is 15 percent. When I tell people that, they are in shock that we are in the situation we are in. We have terrorist groups in Africa—such as ISIS, al-Shabaab, and Boko Haram—and they are all growing in capability and have expanded their areas throughout Africa. This year we have seen hor-

rific events occurring at the hands of these extremists. On October 14, a truck bombing killed 300 people in Somalia's capital. In Niger—it just happened—we had four of our U.S. soldiers who were killed in action on October 4 by an ISIS group.

We know that we have serious problems. I think it is a great disservice for people to say that we must have known that we had the threat that was out there in Niger, when in fact we didn't know it. They even compare it sometimes with Benghazi. I remember Benghazi. I was there at the time. I remember Chris Stevens. Chris Stevens was the Ambassador who went there. He was in my office right before he left, talking about the threats that were there, talking about the Taliban, his training there, and talking about organized terrorist activity.

I have to remind people that the persons who are responsible for advising the Secretary of State, who at that time was Hillary Clinton, and the President, who was President Obama at that time, are the DNI—that was James Clapper at that time—the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. When the Benghazi event happened, the annex was blown up. They all said at that time—they advised us, the President, and the Secretary of State—that they were forewarned by more than a month that on the anniversary of 9/11 things would blow up, and it was going to be an organized attack.

Right now there is an investigation going on to determine whether or not there is any way that we could have anticipated that in Niger this would be happening, and so far, that hasn't come up.

Despite the best of intentions, many of our partners in the region lack the capacity and the effectiveness to adequately defend themselves. People say: What do we have to gain there? This is exactly the same situation that we saw in Afghanistan prior to the war there. The terrorists have to have a safe harbor to train in, and that is what has happened.

During my travel, I had the opportunity to meet Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. I have to say this about him. I have never seen him so ecstatic. A lot of us were looking back at what they were trying to do during the Obama administration. It was disheartening to think that they put together this Iran deal, and our Secretary of State at that time, John Kerry, talked about how great it was and all of these concessions that were made when, in fact, that wasn't the case. Nonetheless, when our President came out and said that he was not going to recertify the Iran deal, that was kind of neat because people don't realize that it takes a recertification every 30 days by the President in order to keep the Iran deal together. He has not done that.

Shortly after that, I happened to be talking to Prime Minister Netanyahu. It was an incredible relief to him that we were going to be looking at this. Still today, I think we all understand that Iran is the one that is financing terrorism all around the world. We discussed the shortcomings and looked forward to working with my colleagues in the future so that Iran does not become a nuclear nation, not now or ever.

What is perhaps the most encouraging is the message that this approach sends to the rest of the world, specifically to North Korea. President Trump's approach shows me—and, more importantly, shows Kim Jong Un—that an America-first foreign policy means that we refuse to take a single-minded approach to global threats.

I recall the changes taking place 8 years ago when our new President, President Obama, started his appeasing tour by going over and talking about how America hadn't been doing the right thing. Now, all of a sudden, we have changed that around. That is what is taking place now. At that time we didn't have the threats that are out there today.

We look at North Korea. North Korea is run by a questionable person, totally unpredictable, according to our own military leaders. He is rapidly getting the capability not just of an ICBM—he has already proven he has an ICBM—but with a range not just of Alaska and some of those areas but of the entire continental United States.

On July 4 he launched his first successful ICBM. If that were fired on a standard trajectory, that missile could have reached Alaska. Some experts think it could have reached even further, into the continental United States. In light of that test, the Defense Intelligence Agency updated their assessment of the timeline by which North Korea would have the capability of hitting an American city. Instead of being 2 years out and 3 years out, it is now down to 1 year out. Some people say they have it right now. We have that threat that is out there. It is the greatest threat, in my opinion, that we are facing now or that we have ever faced.

Following this, on September 3, North Korea tested what is believed to be a hydrogen bomb. That would be seven times the power of what was dropped on Hiroshima. Even if delivered by a relatively inaccurate ICBM, there would be horrible damage imposed on our continent.

It is important to remember that all of this power is being wielded by an erratic despot, Kim Jong Un. North Korean officials have stated that they are not interested in diplomacy until they have an ICBM capable of reaching the east coast of the United States.

What does that tell you? It tells you that they are on their way. This

stresses the need for the United States to enhance and accelerate our ballistic missile defense systems and to continue to put pressure on North Korea through every other means we can, diplomatic and otherwise.

My recent travels enforced again what I have been saying for some time; that is, that this is the most dangerous situation we have had, certainly in my lifetime. We have an opportunity to counter that threat right now. We are in the midst of our NDAA. One thing about the National Defense Authorization Act is that this act is going to pass. It has passed for 55 consecutive years so we know it is going to pass now. But we need to go ahead and get it done. It is important because the primary constitutional responsibility that we have is to provide for the common defense of our great Nation.

We have serious readiness issues that are going to have to be addressed, and they are being addressed in this bill. I am the chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, and we have fought hard to ensure that this year's NDAA takes care of these shortfalls we have had. Our forces are smaller now. We actually had a Readiness Subcommittee hearing, and we had the Vice Chiefs of all of the services there. They came in and said that right now we are in the same situation we were in when we had the hollow force following the Carter administration in the 1970s.

In January of this year, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Daniel Allyn, said: What it comes down to is that we are going to be too late. Our soldiers arrived too late. Our soldiers required too much time to close the manning, the training, and the equipment we have, and the end result is extensive casualties to civilians and to our forces.

We are talking about death. That is what is at stake right here. Just last week, I met with the Secretary of the Air Force, Heather Wilson, to discuss aviation readiness. Right now we are 1,500 pilots short, and 1,300 of those are fighter pilots. Only 50 percent of the Air Force's squadrons are actually trained and ready to conduct all of their assigned missions. One-third of our ground brigades don't work. They are not ready for combat. As to the aviation brigades, it is the same thing.

Right now, as we know, the Marines use our fleet of F-18s. Sixty-two percent of them don't work. They don't have the parts for combat. We have this situation. That is going to have to be direct. This year's bill will increase the troop levels. We will do what is necessary to correct these problems. We need to get moving on that and make people aware that help is on the way.

By the way, here is one of my concerns in this bill. A lot of people are interested in the BRAC process. We do prohibit base realignment closings to

take place for another year. The reason for that is not that there may be excess capacity right now or excess resources out there, but when we are in a rebuilding mode, we would rather be able to use those resources that aren't being used now rather than build new ones. One thing is true about a BRAC; it always loses money the first 3 years. Right now we can't afford to lose any of the money that goes to defending America.

Anyway, of the additional funding, there is going to be \$8.5 billion for the missile defense that has been suffering, and we are going to be doing some good things. As we continue the conference process, which started today—we had our first conference meeting today—we need to focus on where we are.

Again, I repeat, the threat is there. We understand that. We know what is happening in Africa. By the way, the number of troops we have over there—you have to quit using this number of about 6,000—is really 1,300 troops for the entire continent who are not committed or working in some of the Embassies. We need to get busy on that.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. President, I have another issue I wish to visit. A lot of people are critical of what is happening right now in the Environmental Protection Agency. I feel I have to talk about this because, first of all, I was chairman of the committee that had jurisdiction over the Environmental Protection Agency for about 8 years. I see the things that are happening now, improvements that are being made.

One is by a guy named Scott Pruitt. Scott Pruitt happens to be from Oklahoma. He is doing things now, and I don't know of anyone who has ever been abused during a confirmation process like he was. Poor Scott sat there. As a general rule, after a committee gets through with that process, they have questions for the record. Normally, they are somewhere between 15 and 20 questions for the record. Do you know how many questions Scott Pruitt got? He got 675 questions for the record. Anyway, he sustained that. He is now doing great things.

Over the last 8 years, I have had little, if any, chance to praise the work of the EPA, but I can do it now. After 8 years of being relentlessly targeted by the Obama administration to shut out our farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and energy industries, we have an administration that will listen to them and work with them. This is what jobs are all about.

There is a lot of talk about the visit that was made to our conference by President Trump yesterday. What he talked about most of the time was jobs. We are in the position to correct it.

What have we done to do that? A lot of the overregulations have been eliminated. There is the caricature of businesses referred to as greedy, loony

boogeymen. But in reality, businesses are run by people who want what is best for America, for their families, and for the stockholders.

Now, like any sector of society, you are going to find a few bad actors, but we have laws and remedies in place to make sure we go after those individuals. The last administration treated those they regulated as the enemy, not as partners in ensuring that the environment was taken care of, which led to very harmful, unworkable regulations.

All of that is changing right now with President Trump and his administration. The administration realizes that working with those they regulate will produce better outcomes than only listening to those who wish to drive the industry into the ground. Administrator Pruitt has been meeting with farmers, ranchers, energy producers, and other industries to listen to and learn about how regulations affect them and how a worthwhile regulation might be implemented in a way that is producing an unintended harm.

I really cannot see why this is a bad thing, as the goal of the EPA is not to put companies or farmers out of business; it is to put forward policies that protect the environment and do not have a heavy cost, but just meeting with those who have been shut out of the process in the past has extremists on the left seeing red. I guess they are just upset that they have lost their monopoly and their ability to write rules for the EPA.

Pruitt and the EPA are also moving forward to repeal the unlawful waters of the United States. This is one of the things, if you talk to the farmers throughout not just Oklahoma but throughout America, they will say, of all of the rules and regulations, this is the most harmful. This is No. 1. That is what they say. In fact, Tom Buchanan is the head of the Farm Bureau in the State of Oklahoma, and he says that is the problem.

People are not aware. In my State of Oklahoma, when you get out into Western Oklahoma, it is dry out there. I mean, it is about as arid as any part of the United States. Yet we know, if they were to move that jurisdiction of water away from the States and to the Federal Government, as was proposed in a rule that was promulgated by the previous administration, that area in Western Oklahoma would be considered a wetland before it is over. Anyway, that is probably, singularly, the best of the rules that he changed.

By the way, if anyone wants to see the rules—a lot of people say the President has not been doing anything. Most of these rules and regulations—there are up to 48 now—that have been costing jobs and putting people out of business have now been addressed by this administration, by the Trump administration, and very successfully. Right

now, we are in the process of getting some of these things done.

The waters rule is going to take a while to get done because that is going to take some hearings and so forth. Another of the rules the EPA is working on repealing is the Clean Power Plan. Now, this is the thing that came from the Paris show. In fact, I have done this before. I have talked about the history of these things that have been put forth for 21 consecutive years now by the U.N., which is that they have these meetings. They get 196 countries together, and they try to see what they can do to get them to reduce CO₂ emissions, when, in fact, they have not been able to do this.

Besides that, 87 percent of the power that is developed to run our country is either from fossil fuels or it is nuclear. If you extract those, as they tried to do, how do you run the machine called America? The answer is, you can't.

Anyway, as far as the Clean Power Plan, that was put together by President Obama, and it was something you could talk about as long as you wanted to, but the fact is, it was not good for the country. The rule was so unpopular that 27 States, 37 rural electric co-ops, and 3 labor unions challenged it in court. The cost of the rule was estimated to be \$292 billion, but I have seen estimates that are well in excess of \$400 billion.

The plan would raise electricity prices in 47 States; 40 of those States would see double-digit increases, and these increases would be shouldered by American families, many of whom already have to choose between making rent payments and paying their power bills or choosing between putting food on their tables or paying their power bills. The plan would also see the closure of 66 powerplants and eliminate over 125,000 jobs in the coal industry—an industry that has already been struggling in recent years.

The goal of this rule was to effectively end the use of coal-fired powerplants, which is a cheap and bountiful energy. What benefit would we get out of this? It would be more expensive energy.

By the way, the whole idea of the Paris thing was not just the Clean Power Plan put forth by our President; it was also what other countries were forced to do. For example, in signing on to this deal in Paris, which everyone was so upset about, China committed, for the next 10 years, to continue to increase, every 10 days, an additional coal-fired powerplant. Then they would try to reduce them after that.

What kind of a deal is that? They look back at the United States and think they know what is going to happen to our manufacturing base. They would go to China if we had to do this thing.

The most ridiculous thing about this is, the President's commitment under

the Clean Power Plan was to reduce our CO₂ emissions by somewhere between 26 and 28 percent by 2025. The problem with that is, it cannot be done. We even called in the EPA so they may tell us how this could be done, and they agreed it could not be done.

Anyway, that is something that is behind us now. I commend Scott Pruitt for realizing the legal footing of this rule and seeing that the costs the American people will bear under this rule is not going to happen.

Just last week, the EPA announced that it will end its controversial policy known as sue and settle. This is a good one. It is a policy that has cost the taxpayers an estimated \$67 billion in new regulations that stemmed from this practice. How this works is that some extremist group will come in and sue the EPA for not doing something, and so they go into a settlement agreement with the EPA, and the EPA is in concert with them to come up with the very thing they were not able to get through legislatively. It is called sue and settle. You have heard the President talk about ending that practice. It is one that needs to be ended, and it is going to be. This practice circumvented the Administrative Procedure Act and usually ended up in settlements that were extremely beneficial to extremist groups and got them exactly what they wanted all the time.

My State of Oklahoma was a victim of this practice. In 2011, the EPA used consent agreements that stemmed from court cases in other States, not in Oklahoma, as Oklahoma was not even part of it or aware of it. They do that to overrule the State's Regional Haze Plan to impose EPA's own costly plan on Oklahoma electricity ratepayers. Now, the plan the EPA has pushed on this State costs an estimated \$282 million each year. That is just in our State of Oklahoma, and it is something we would have to pay for.

The regional haze problem has nothing to do with health. It is all visibility. So this was ruining the theme of the Obama EPA. Never mind that regional haze is entirely a visibility issue and not a health issue, never mind that Congress specifically gave States the authority to regulate regional haze under the Clean Air Act in the amendments I strongly supported when they went through because it is a visibility issue and not a health issue. Yet because an environmentalist group did not like how Oklahoma was handling its own business, it sued the EPA in court outside of Oklahoma and did not include Oklahoma as a party in the case. The EPA capitulated and entered into an agreement with some of the extremists that conveniently required the EPA to impose its own expensive plan on my State of Oklahoma.

So I am glad Administrator Pruitt has announced an end to this policy,

and I urge my colleagues to take up S. 119. It is the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, of which I am an original cosponsor, to ensure that this practice is ended across the government and cannot be implemented by future administrations.

Finally, I would like to encourage the EPA to move ahead with a hinted-at, pending directive that would restrict scientists who receive EPA grants from serving on the Agency's scientific advisory committees. I have previously expressed concerns over the composition of the Agency's advisory committees for many reasons, including highlighting the fact that many science advisers under the Obama EPA, including a majority of those on the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee—that is called CASAC—have received considerable financial support from the EPA. They are calling into question their independence and the overall integrity of panels on which the advisers sit.

The National Academy of Sciences and the EPA's own "Peer Review Handbook" state that grants can constitute a conflict or a lack of impartiality. We are not talking about small grants either; we are talking about millions of dollars in grants. During the last year of the Obama administration, CASAC had six of seven members receiving these. Keep in mind, six of the seven members received a total of \$119 million in grants—in EPA research grants—and three of the members received in excess of \$25 million each. These are the scientists who are making the decisions. There were 22 of the 26 members of the CASAC Subcommittee on Particulate Matter who received more than \$330 million in EPA grants.

The scientists who receive vast sums of money from the very agencies they are advising certainly constitute a conflict of interest and, at a minimum, give an appearance of a lack of impartiality. As such, I welcome the news that Administrator Pruitt will be seeking to limit this worrisome practice.

I have laid out only a few of the many great things the EPA is doing right now and what Administrator Pruitt is doing. I got to know him a long time ago. In fact, I flew him around the State in my airplane back when he ran for the first statewide office. He is a guy who is a tiger and who is doing the right thing. I am very proud of what they are doing.

After this morning, the EPA is now advancing five EPA nominees for the EPA general counsel and for the Offices of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, Air and Radiation, Water, and Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention. Each of these nominees is needed for the issues I have talked about and for the many others that are on the Agency's plate.

Scott Pruitt has been working on so much of the President's conservative

agenda alone, and he needs help to run these policies. I call on my colleagues and the leadership to prioritize these nominations. You cannot get this stuff done unless you have help. We have never seen a time when we have gotten this far into an administration and have had this large of a number of people who have not been confirmed.

Mr. President, I do want to mention one other thing because, for some reason, the Democrats have decided they are going to run out the whole 30 hours on the confirmation of a guy named Scott Palk. I have to say, Scott Palk has been doing a great job. In fact, on the vote that just took place on him, he received 79 votes in the U.S. Senate. Yet, just to be obstructionists, they are still demanding 30 hours.

Scott Palk is an experienced prosecutor with a decade of service. He was the assistant district attorney for Cleveland County in my State of Oklahoma and spent 9 years as an assistant U.S. attorney in the criminal division of the Western District of Oklahoma. He has a reputation for honesty, integrity, and a commitment to fairly applying the law. Mr. Palk will serve Oklahoma with distinction as a principled jurist who will uphold the Constitution.

He is going to be confirmed. We know he is going to be confirmed because he already received 79 votes. There is no reason to delay it, other than to hold people here and be obstructionists. I would urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to go ahead and confirm the guy. He is going to do a great job.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have remarks that I wish to make, but I will yield at this time in order for the Republican leader to be recognized after which I will seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Illinois.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 250, on the motion to invoke cloture on Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma. Had I been present, I would have voted nay. •

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the vote in the Senate last night to overturn the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rule regarding forced arbitration that would protect consumers and make sure they get their day in court when financial institutions violate the law. The floor schedule did not allow me to give these remarks before the vote, so I am giving them today. This rule would have restored the ability of servicemembers, veterans, and other consumers to join together and seek relief through class action lawsuits. I opposed this rule repeal.

In 2010, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act included a provision instructing the CFPB to study mandatory arbitration and write a rule based on what they found. After several years of careful study, the CFPB released a 728-page report in 2015. This year, the CFPB finalized its arbitration rule mandating that consumer financial product contracts no longer include language barring class actions.

This rule was an important step forward in protecting consumers from the fine print arbitration clauses included in all sorts of contracts, including contracts for credit cards, debit cards, prepaid bank cards, payday loans, and even cell phones. The 2015 CFPB report found that 93 percent of consumers whose credit cards included forced arbitration clauses did not know that they could not sue their credit card companies.

The CFPB rule enhanced protections for consumers in the military. That is why the American Legion, the Nation's largest wartime veterans service organization, which represents 2 million veterans, and the Military Coalition, which represents 5.5 million current and former servicemembers and their families, supported the protections provided under this rule.

I have cosponsored the Military Consumer Protection Act led by Senator REED, which would put the enforcement of the Servicemember Civil Relief Act under the CFPB so that the agency responsible for protecting servicemembers and their families is also able to enforce those protections.

Our servicemembers and veterans face challenges that are different from civilian consumers, especially during deployment. We need to make sure that they have all the protections they earn through their service. That is why I voted against H.J. Res. 111, the resolution of disapproval with respect to the CFPB arbitration rule, and I will continue to fight for our servicemembers, veterans, and consumers to get the protections they deserve.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD LINCOLN

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, throughout our Nation's history, young Americans have left the comfort and security of home in order to preserve our freedom and to extend the blessings of freedom to others. We set aside Veterans Day to express our gratitude.

One such veteran is Mr. Richard Lincoln of Wayne, ME. Although the story of his service in Italy during World War II is extraordinary, the virtues of courage, sacrifice, and devotion to duty it demonstrates describe the character of American patriots in all places and at all times.

Now 91 years of age, Mr. Lincoln entered the U.S. Army in 1943 when he was just 17. He served with the legendary 88th Infantry Division, the first all-draftee division to serve in combat during the war. The 88th, known as the Fighting Blue Devils, proved that with rigorous training, able leadership, and unflinching determination, peace-loving Americans could stand up to a battle-hardened, militaristic enemy.

The 88th played a key role at the Battle of Anzio, the long, costly, and critically important amphibious landing on the Italian coast in January of 1944 that eventually led to the liberation of Rome. Mr. Lincoln served as a first scout, an extremely dangerous assignment in a forward position under constant fire, to locate enemy artillery positions. When the Allies liberated Rome on June 4, 1944, the all-draftee 88th was the first division to enter the city. It was Mr. Lincoln's 18th birthday. He later was awarded the Bronze Star for his heroism during that grueling campaign.

Victory came at a steep price. Between the Battle of Anzio and the German surrender in May of 1945, the Fighting Blue Devils spent 344 days in combat, with nearly 3,000 killed and more than 9,200 wounded.

After returning home, Mr. Lincoln raised a family, served his community, and never forgot his comrades. Until he suffered a stroke that hampered his mobility, he marched in 58 consecutive Memorial Day parades in his hometown. He never rode in a ceremonial car; he always marched.

In a speech to the Association of the U.S. Army on October 9, Defense Secretary James Mattis discussed the serious current threats to peace and secu-

rity facing our Nation and the world. He told the story of Richard Lincoln to underscore his point that Americans are always willing and able to meet any challenge.

On October 14, family and friends gathered around Mr. Lincoln at the Maine Veterans' Home in Augusta, where he was presented with a personal letter from Secretary Mattis and a book on the Battle of Anzio, inscribed by both Secretary Mattis and former Defense Secretary William Cohen, Maine's former Senator.

Secretary Mattis's handwritten note to Mr. Lincoln includes these words: "You have the respect and affection of today's military. You and your brothers-in-arms are the pride of our country." I am honored to join Secretary Mattis and all grateful Americans in thanking Mr. Richard Lincoln and all of the men and women who serve our country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SERGEANT OWEN LAWLER

• Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a living example of an American hero. MSG Owen Lawler has spent a lifetime in service, committing nearly three decades to defending U.S. national security at home and abroad.

Owen began his military service as an infantryman with the Iowa National Guard in 1990 and attended basic training at Fort Benning in Georgia. He entered Active service in 1993 and served in the 2nd Infantry Division in Korea, among other roles. In 1999, Owen was selected for special forces training, and in 2001 he was assigned 5th Special Forces Group at Fort Campbell in Kentucky. Shortly after the 9/11 attacks, Owen participated in the invasion of Afghanistan and went on to serve four more tours in Iraq. In 2009, Owen was assigned to the 3rd Special Forces Group at Fort Bragg, where he served as a team sergeant for a special forces A-team. During his assignment as the senior sergeant on a special forces detachment, Owen led his team on three tours to Afghanistan until being seriously wounded. In 2013, Owen was selected to serve as first sergeant for the headquarters company of the advanced skills training battalion at Fort Bragg. After an extremely admirable career serving his country, Owen will retire on October 30, 2017.

Owen received multiple awards during his 27 years with the Armed Forces, including the Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Purple Heart, Army Commendation Medal, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, Good Conduct Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and Korea Service Medal.

I ask my colleagues to join me as I proudly recognize the service and the sacrifice of MSG Owen Lawler, a dear friend, patriot, and American hero.●

REMEMBERING MARJORIE "MARGE" COUNSILMAN

• Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am saddened to report the recent passing of Marjorie Councilman, a treasured member of the Bloomington and Indiana University community. Mrs. Councilman passed away on August 17, 2017, at the age of 93. I join her family and friends in mourning the passing of a beloved Hoosier, who was a dedicated mother and mentor to countless Indiana swimmers.

Mrs. Councilman, or "Marge," as she was affectionately known by her colleagues, friends, and family, helped lead IU's swim team to a string of national and Big Ten titles. Marge was the wife of the late IU swimming coach, James "Doc" Councilman, who led the Hoosiers to six consecutive NCAA championship victories, 23 Big Ten titles, 52 broken world records, 154 American records, and 106 individual NCAA records. In 2013, Marge and Doc were inaugurated into the Monroe County Sports Hall of Fame. Trophies aside, Marge was best known for her compassion towards her fellow coaches, customers at her family-owned restaurant in Bloomington, and the countless young swimmers she encountered over her decades of service. Her impression on the sport stretches well beyond the swimming lanes of Indiana. In 2004, she was honored by the International Swimming Hall of Fame as a "Grande Dame" for her leadership and influence.

In 2012, Mrs. Councilman received the Bill Orwig Award, which recognizes exceptional contributions made by non-alumnus to IU's athletic program. Marge was constantly hosting team dinners, running swim meets, and keeping the official records. Throughout her husband Doc's 33 years at IU, Marge acted as a substitute mother for all the collegiate swimmers, either providing help with assignments or offering her famous lasagna and pecan pie.

In her memory, I would ask that we take a moment to reflect on her exemplary life and model of service. It is a privilege to honor Marjorie Councilman, and I want to offer my condolences to her two daughters, Cathy Councilman and Jill Morris, and to the many friends and family members she leaves behind. We will continue to honor her legacy and generous spirit.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:28 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the

following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 732. An act to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2142. An act to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3101. An act to enhance cybersecurity information sharing and coordination at ports in the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3898. An act to impose secondary sanctions with respect to North Korea, strengthen international efforts to improve sanctions enforcement, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3972. An act to clarify that family offices and family clients are accredited investors, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 4:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 504. An act to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program.

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Arbitration Agreements".

The enrolled bill and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2266. An act making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 732. An act to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3101. An act to enhance cybersecurity information sharing and coordination at ports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 3898. An act to impose secondary sanctions with respect to North Korea, strengthen international efforts to improve sanctions enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 3972. An act to clarify that family offices and family clients are accredited investors, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3267. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order that amends Executive Order 13223 of September 14, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3268. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015, with respect to Burundi; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3269. A communication from the Chief of the Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modernizing Common Carrier Rules" ((FCC 17-112) (WC Docket No. 15-33)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 20, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3270. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Moral Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" ((RIN0938-AT46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3271. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Religious Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" ((RIN1545-BN92) (TD 9827)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3272. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Moral Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" ((RIN1545-BN91) (TD 9828)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 16, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3273. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Strategic Plan for the Department of Health and Human Services for fiscal years 2018 - 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3274. A communication from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Veterans' Mortgage Life Insurance—Coverage Amendment" (RIN2900-AP49) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on October 23, 2017; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-124. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California relative to federal rescheduling of marijuana from a schedule 1 drug; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, Marijuana and its derivatives remain classified as a Schedule I drug by the United States Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA); and

Whereas, Schedule I drugs, substances, or chemicals are defined as drugs with no currently accepted medical, use and a high potential for abuse and include heroin, lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD); marijuana or cannabis, 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (ecstasy), methaqualone (Quaalude); and peyote; and

Whereas, Marijuana or cannabis and its congeners have been studied worldwide outside the United States for years and have shown efficacy for various conditions, such as wasting syndrome, as an antinauseant in those taking chemotherapy, Glaucoma (reduces intraocular pressure), Epilepsy (antiseizure properties), migraine headaches and other types of pain, and anxiety; and

Whereas, The medical and recreational use of marijuana in the State of California has been authorized by the voters through initiatives; and

Whereas, Marijuana or cannabis is presently classified by the DEA as a Schedule I drug wherein the possession, sale, or utilization can trigger federal prosecution statutes, including federal forfeiture provisions; and

Whereas, Concerns about the criminality and forfeiture provisions in federal law impede traditional banking institutions from doing business with potential clients cultivating, researching, selling, or utilizing marijuana or cannabis and its derivatives, therefore making marijuana commerce very difficult; and

Whereas, The inability to use traditional banking institutions impedes local and state government from adequately monitoring true marijuana or cannabis utilization and shortchanges the respective taxes owed to taxing agencies, potentially costing state and local governments hundreds of millions of dollars in lost tax income; and

Whereas, Since marijuana, or cannabis businesses are unable to legally use traditional banking institutions, many vendors resort to the black market and involvement of organized crime making communities less safe; and

Whereas, Marijuana or cannabis and its derivatives cannot be legally studied by research institutions if it remains a Schedule I drug, thereby prohibiting newly discovered and verifiable pharmacological attributes of marijuana or cannabis and its derivatives, which otherwise may enhance the quality of life of those that could truly benefit from its use; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges the Congress of the United States to pass a law to reschedule marijuana or cannabis and its derivatives from a Schedule I drug to an alternative schedule, therefore allowing the legal research and development of marijuana or cannabis for medical

use and allowing for the legal commerce of marijuana or cannabis so that businesses dealing with marijuana or cannabis can use traditional banks or financial institutions for their banking needs, which would result in providing a legal vehicle for those businesses to pay their taxes, including, but not limited to, payroll taxes, unsecured property taxes, and applicable taxes on the products sold in accordance with state and local laws; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges the President of the United States to sign such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-125. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California relative to the California Nonmotorized Trails Master Plan, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, California established significant greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for 2020 through the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and for 2050 through Executive Order S-3-05; and

Whereas, In 1974, the California Recreational Trails Act was enacted to increase accessibility and enhance the use, enjoyment, and understanding of California's scenic, natural, historic, and cultural resources; and

Whereas, The act and the California Recreational Trails System Plan, which is prepared and continuously maintained by the Department of Parks and Recreation pursuant to the act and in cooperation with the Department of Transportation, provides for both motorized and nonmotorized accessibility and use; and

Whereas, In order to help meet those greenhouse gas emission reduction targets, a California Nonmotorized Trails Master Plan is urgently needed to create a statewide plan and timeline for a coordinated network of California trails for walking, hiking, biking, horseback riding, and other forms of nonmotorized transportation in both urban and rural regions; and

Whereas, Human-powered, nonmotorized transportation can serve the dual purposes of providing healthy exercise for citizens and transporting them from one location to another with a zero-carbon footprint; and

Whereas, Many of California's local entities, including municipalities, public agencies, private organizations, and individual citizens, are currently in the process of developing their own local trails master plans in their neighborhoods, cities, counties, or regions that are designed to create avenues for environmentally friendly methods of nonmotorized transportation and that are likely to expand rural economic development benefits and outcomes; and

Whereas, According to a 2014 report issued by the Governors Highway Safety Association, 338 cyclists were killed in collisions with motor vehicles in California between 2010 and 2012, the most in any state; and

Whereas, Other states, including New York, have found that a coordinated nonmotorized trails network offers myriad health benefits and valuable experiences, including hiking, biking, cross-country skiing,

taking short nature walks, touring, including agricultural touring, exploring greenways, parklands, and rural agricultural lands, and other nonvehicular experiences in the unique settings of local communities, and that these related activities bring commercial opportunities to those communities; and

Whereas, The federal Recreational Trails Program is a Federal Highway Administration assistance program that provides federal funds to states to develop and maintain recreational trails in both urban and rural regions for motorized and nonmotorized recreational trail use; and

Whereas, California's rural regions have limited access to networks of nonmotorized recreational trails; and

Whereas, There is currently no deadline to complete and connect the state's many diverse and separate trails into a statewide coordinated nonmotorized transportation network in both urban and rural regions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature requests the Governor to designate the Department of Parks and Recreation and the Department of Transportation, in partnership with the National Park Service and other relevant federal, state, regional, and local agencies, private organizations, and individual citizens, to accelerate the planning, creation, and completion timelines for a California Nonmotorized Trails Master Plan for urban and rural regions to expand opportunities for all Californians to benefit from new recreational, tourist, and economic development options in their daily lives, which will reduce the overall usage of fossil-fuel powered vehicles for public transportation and create a safer environment for pedestrians and bicyclists who use nonmotorized transportation trails networks to walk or ride; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature requests the Governor to request the President, Members of Congress, and the Federal Highway Administration, through its Recreational Trails Program, to dedicate increased funding to California to accelerate and support the planning and development of the California Nonmotorized Trails Master Plan as an expanded network of nonmotorized recreational trails in rural and urban regions of the state and to accelerate the completion of existing nonmotorized recreational trails, including the California Coastal Trail; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-126. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging state and federal departments and agencies to make collaborative, statewide salmon fishery restoration an urgent and high priority; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, Salmon has been a fundamental and irreplaceable part of the cultural traditions of Native American tribes in California, and a staple of Native American diets, since time immemorial; and

Whereas, The California salmon fishery is among the oldest and most important his-

toric commercial fisheries in California, and among the most iconic commercial, recreational, and tribal fisheries in the United States; and

Whereas, The California Bay-Delta ecosystem, including the rivers that flow into it, is the most important salmon-producing system south of the Columbia River; and

Whereas, The Klamath and Trinity Rivers are home to culturally and commercially important, and biologically unique, salmon runs; and

Whereas, The California salmon fishery annually draws a vast amount of trade and tourism to California; and

Whereas, A decade ago, the California salmon fishery supported 23,000 jobs and \$1.4 billion in economic activity; and

Whereas, California salmon contains high levels of omega-3 fatty acids, offers abundant health benefits for Californians, including lower cholesterol and lower risk of skin and breast cancer, and is delicious; and

Whereas, Salmon runs are responsible for the largest transfer of biomass from the oceans to the land on the planet and are vital to the healthy functioning of ecosystems from the coast to the mountains; and

Whereas, Salmon spawned in California rivers are caught by fishermen in Oregon, Washington, British Columbia, and as far away as Alaska; and

Whereas, The health of a salmon population is an important benchmark of the health of its native rivers and ecosystems; and

Whereas, The Fish and Game Code and the State Water Resources Control Board Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan establish the doubling of wild salmon populations as state policy; and

Whereas, The California salmon fishery was closed from 2008 to 2009 due to declining populations and fish kill of salmon resulting from decreased river flows and warm water conditions that caused direct mortality, leading to dramatic impacts on the fishing industry and fishing-dependent communities; and

Whereas, Salmon populations have declined during California's historic drought; and

Whereas, Depressed salmon populations in 2015 and 2016 have resulted in a shorter fishing season, a reduction in landed fish from 981,000 annually from 1986 to 1990, inclusive, to 92,000 in 2016, and severe hardship to the fishing industry and fishing-dependent communities; and

Whereas, Many salmon populations in California are listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act or the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, or both, including Central Valley winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon, California Coastal Chinook salmon, and all coho salmon; and

Whereas, The United States Secretary of Commerce determined a commercial fishery failure for the Yurok Tribe Klamath River Chinook salmon fishery in 2016 due to a fishery resource disaster; and

Whereas, On May 24, 2017, the Governors of California and Oregon urged the Secretary of Commerce to expedite declaration of a fishery resource disaster for California and Oregon for the 2016 and 2017 seasons; and

Whereas, It is critical that further commercial fishery failure determinations be made, fishery resource disasters declared, and disaster relief provided, for California salmon fisheries for 2016 and 2017: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges state departments and agencies, including the Natural Resources Agency, the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Wildlife Conservation Board, the Department of Water Resources, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and the State Water Resources Control Board, to make collaborative, statewide salmon fishery restoration an urgent and high priority; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges federal departments and agencies, including the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine Fisheries Service, to make collaborative, statewide salmon fishery restoration an urgent and high priority; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges the federal government to undertake all appropriate measures to provide necessary disaster relief for California salmon fisheries for 2016 and 2017; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency, to the Secretary for Environmental Protection, to the Director of Fish and Wildlife, to the Executive Director of the Wildlife Conservation Board, to the Director of Water Resources, to the President of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, to the Chairperson of the State Water Resources Control Board, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Reclamation, to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, to the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-127. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to recognize the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh, also known as Artsakh, to establish economic and cultural ties with the nation, and to support the peace and stability of the South Caucasus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 99

Whereas, The region of Artsakh is located in the South Caucasus and has historically been Armenian territory. The region is populated by an overwhelming majority of Armenians; and

Whereas, Despite its historical and cultural ties to Armenia, in 1921, Joseph Stalin arbitrarily severed Artsakh from Armenia, and in violation of the national, territorial, and human rights of the Armenian people, the severed region of Artsakh was placed under the administration of Soviet Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, For decades, the Armenian peoples' peaceful demonstrations for national independence, for individual freedom, and in opposition to the Soviet Azerbaijani repression and discrimination were met with acts of violent repression by Soviet Azerbaijani forces who refused to allow the self-determination of the people of Artsakh. Soviet Azerbaijani's bloody response resulted in the deaths of ethnic Armenians in Sumgait (February 1988), Kirovabad (February 1988), and Baku (January 1990) and the forced deportation of more than 350,000 Armenians from Azerbaijan. In the aftermath of the Sumgait

tragedy, the United States Senate unanimously passed Amendment 2690 to the Fiscal Year 1989 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill (H.R. 4782), concerning the Karabakh conflict and called on the Soviet government to "respect the legitimate aspirations of the Armenian people . . ." and noted that "dozens of Armenians have been killed and injured during the recent unrests . . ."; and

Whereas, The people of Artsakh overwhelmingly voted to support independence. On December 10, 1991, despite continued violence against the people of Artsakh, a popular referendum proclaiming an independent republic took place during the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Under the watchful eye of more than 50 international observers, and in full compliance with international standards for a free and fair election, more than 80 percent of eligible voters cast a ballot, and the measure passed with 98 percent in favor. On January 6, 1992, the democratically-elected Parliament of Artsakh adopted the Declaration of Independence of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic; and

Whereas, Despite a cease-fire agreement between the Republic of Artsakh, Azerbaijan, and Armenia that ended years of intense fighting, the security and sovereignty of Artsakh continue to be threatened by regional tension and hostile acts. The Armenians of Artsakh remain resolute in their efforts to exercise the right to self-determination and live free from violence and repression, and by recognizing the government of Artsakh, the international community can help put to rest this century-old conflict; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the President and Congress of the United States to recognize a free and independent Republic of Artsakh; and be it further

Resolved, That we memorialize the United States government to strengthen and solidify our country's economic and cultural relationship with the Artsakh Republic and its citizens and continue to promote the humanitarian and economic rehabilitation of the region; and be it further

Resolved, That we support the Republic of Artsakh's continued efforts within the international community to reach a lasting solution to the existing regional problems and establish peace and stability in the strategically important region of South Caucasus; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-128. A resolution adopted by the Alpena County Board of Commissioners, Alpena, Michigan, opposing slashing federal funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-129. A resolution adopted by the Eaton County Board of Commissioners, Charlotte, Michigan, opposing slashing federal funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,

with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 763. A bill to improve surface and maritime transportation security (Rept. No. 115-178).

By Mr. BURR, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 2010. An original bill to extend the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 for 8 years, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Michael Dourson, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2023.

*Matthew Z. Leopold, of Florida, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*David Ross, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*William L. Wehrum, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*Paul Trombino III, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

By Mr. ISAKSON for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

*Melissa Sue Glynn, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Enterprise Integration).

*Cheryl L. Mason, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals for a term of six years.

*Randy Reeves, of Mississippi, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2003. A bill to modernize the regulation of cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. KING, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2004. A bill to increase funding for the State response to the opioid misuse crisis and to provide funding for research on addiction and pain related to the substance misuse crisis; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. GARDNER,

Mr. BENNET, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 2006. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2007. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for educational assistance programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2008. A bill to combat the opioid epidemic and drug sample backlogs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. REED, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2009. A bill to require a background check for every firearm sale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 2010. An original bill to extend the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 for 8 years, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2011. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the negotiation of lower covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries and the establishment and application of a formulary by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under Medicare part D, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 2012. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the Indian Employment Credit and the depreciation rules for business property on Indian reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WARREN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. Res. 303. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 2017 as "National Audiology Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 304. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that entrepreneurship on the part of minority women-owned businesses should be fully supported and encouraged; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 305. A resolution recognizing the month of October 2017 as Filipino American History Month and celebrating the history and culture of Filipino Americans and their immense contributions to the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 306. A resolution recognizing the month of October 2017 as "National Principals Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 307. A resolution designating October 26, 2017, as "Day of the Deployed"; considered and agreed to

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 194

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 194, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for

Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 989

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 989, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1161

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1161, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medicines relating to preventative health services, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1674

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1674, a bill to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of public elementary schools and secondary schools, to establish a school infrastructure bond program, and for other purposes.

S. 1753

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1753, a bill to amend the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to provide a temporary license for loan originators transitioning between employers, and for other purposes.

S. 1790

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1790, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve college savings under section 529 programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1870

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1870, a bill to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1899

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1899, a bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. 1942

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1942, a bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 1953

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1953, a bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1967

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1967, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional exemptions to the individual mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 1979

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1979, a bill to block the implementation of certain presidential actions that restrict individuals from certain countries from entering the United States.

S. 1997

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1997, a bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to protect privacy rights, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 250

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 250, a resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy.

S. RES. 297

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 297, a resolution supporting Lights On Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool programs held on October 26, 2017.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 2006. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the "Breast Density and Mammography Reporting Act," a simple, yet potentially life-saving solution to ensure that women receive their own medical information. I thank Senator HELLER for working with me on this bipartisan bill and I appreciate Representatives DeLAURO and FITZPATRICK for introducing a House companion to this legislation.

We have accomplished so much in the treatment and diagnosis of breast cancer, and it still continues to be the second leading cause of death for women in the United States and the leading cause of cancer death among Hispanic women. Mammograms have aided tremendously in early detection efforts, helping many more women survive this diagnosis.

For women with dense breast tissue, however, a mammogram may not be capturing the whole picture. Dense breast tissue and cancer tumors look similar on a mammogram and make cancer harder to detect in women with higher breast density. Unfortunately, many women are never told about their tissue density on the report they receive after their screening, even though it is assessed and reported to their health care provider. This leaves women unaware their mammogram could be missing signs of cancer. If a patient doesn't have information to begin with, how would she know to ask her doctor about what additional screening might be right for her?

There is currently no Federal requirement for women to receive notice that they have dense breast tissue on their mammogram report. This bill would require that women be informed on the mammogram report, something

they already receive, if they have dense breast tissue, as well as a recommendation that they talk with their health care provider to discuss any questions and if they might benefit from additional screening. The bill also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to focus on research and improved screening for patients with dense breast tissue.

The bill does not impact State laws and simply sets a minimum Federal standard on a report that women already receive. Any State wishing to have additional reporting requirements would be able to do so. Withholding from women their own medical information just does not make sense. Having access to your breast tissue density could mean the difference between catching breast cancer early and surviving, or waiting until it's too late.

This bipartisan bill has the support of major cancer organizations, including American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Are You Dense Advocacy, Susan G. Komen, DenseBreastInfo, Tigerlily Foundation, Prevent Cancer Foundation, Facing Our Risk of Cancer Empowered, Don't be a Chump! Check for a Lump!, Sharsheret, National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, Black Women's Health Imperative, and Men Against Breast Cancer.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue, and I urge my fellow Senators to cosponsor the Breast Density and Mammography Reporting Act. Thank you Mr. President and I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 303—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 2017 AS "NATIONAL AUDIOLOGY AWARENESS MONTH"

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. HASSAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 303

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, hearing loss is the third most common chronic physical condition in the United States;

Whereas the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have found that 24 percent of adults in the United States, or 40,000,000 individuals, may have noise-induced hearing loss in 1 or both ears;

Whereas, although the prevalence of hearing loss increases with age, approximately 40 percent of individuals with hearing loss are under the age of 60;

Whereas people with hearing difficulty frequently delay seeking assessment and treatment for their hearing loss;

Whereas audiologists, whose academic and clinical training provides the foundation for

patient management from birth through adulthood, are dedicated health care professionals who diagnose, treat, and manage hearing loss and balance disorders;

Whereas audiologists treat patients in many different settings, including private practice, hospitals, schools, Veterans Health Administration hospitals, and otolaryngology offices;

Whereas October 2017 would be an appropriate month to designate as “National Audiology Awareness Month”; and

Whereas there is a need for greater awareness on the part of the public regarding issues related to the hearing and balance care provided by audiologists, including—

(1) the diagnosis and treatment options available to the public;

(2) the research needs of audiologists; and

(3) the public policy implications of changes in the field of audiology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of October 2017 as “National Audiology Awareness Month”; and

(2) applauds the actions of audiologists, including clinicians, researchers, and others who strive to raise public awareness of hearing and balance care by advancing the profession of audiology.

SENATE RESOLUTION 304—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT ENTREPRENEURSHIP ON THE PART OF MINORITY WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES SHOULD BE FULLY SUPPORTED AND ENCOURAGED

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 304

Whereas the number of women-owned small businesses increased by 3,500,000 from 2007 to 2016;

Whereas, for every 10 women-owned businesses launched since 2007, 8 were started by women of color;

Whereas women are now majority owners of 38 percent of all businesses in the United States;

Whereas there are currently almost 5,000,000 minority women-owned small businesses;

Whereas minority women are the fastest growing group of entrepreneurs in the United States;

Whereas African-American women own fully 49 percent of all African-American-owned businesses;

Whereas Latina-owned firms employ 550,400 workers;

Whereas there are currently 922,700 Asian-American women-owned small businesses;

Whereas Native American and Alaska Native women-owned small businesses generated \$10,500,000,000 in revenues; and

Whereas the number of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander women-owned small businesses more than doubled between 2007 and 2016: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) October has been designated “National Women’s Small Business Month” by the Small Business Administration;

(2) minority women often work in low-paying jobs in the traditional workforce, which

means the gender salary gap, child care expenses, and a lack of paid family leave impact women of color more severely than other populations, and expanding access to opportunities for entrepreneurship can help women of color get ahead economically, serve their communities, and care for their families;

(3) minority women entrepreneurs are paving the way for women-owned businesses;

(4) minority women entrepreneurs are an important segment of the domestic economy of the United States as well as the global economy; and

(5) in order to sustain the economy of the United States, Congress must fully support and encourage the growth of minority women-owned businesses.

SENATE RESOLUTION 305—RECOGNIZING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER 2017 AS FILIPINO AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH AND CELEBRATING THE HISTORY AND CULTURE OF FILIPINO AMERICANS AND THEIR IMMENSE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED STATES

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 305

Whereas the earliest documented Filipino presence in the continental United States was October 18, 1587, when the first “Luzones Indios” arrived in Morro Bay, California, on board the Nuestra Señora de Esperanza, a Manila-built galleon ship;

Whereas the Filipino American National Historical Society recognizes 1763 as the year in which the first permanent Filipino settlement in the United States was established in St. Malo, Louisiana;

Whereas the recognition of the first permanent Filipino settlement in the United States adds a new perspective to the history of the United States by bringing attention to the economic, cultural, social, and other notable contributions made by Filipino Americans to the development of the United States;

Whereas the Filipino American community is the second largest Asian American and Pacific Islander group in the United States, with a population of approximately 4,000,000;

Whereas, from the Civil War to the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts, Filipino Americans have a longstanding history of serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas more than 250,000 Filipinos fought under the United States flag during World War II to protect and defend the United States in the Pacific theater;

Whereas 20,000 Filipino World War II veterans were granted United States citizenship as a result of the Immigration Act of 1990, which was signed into law by President George H.W. Bush on November 29, 1990;

Whereas, effective June 8, 2016, the Filipino World War II Veterans Parole Program allowed for Filipino World War II veterans and certain family members to be reunited more expeditiously than the immigrant visa process allowed at that time;

Whereas on December 14, 2016, President Barack Obama signed into law S. 1555 (114th Congress), the Filipino Veterans of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2015, to award Filipino veterans who fought alongside troops of the United States in World War II the highest civilian honor bestowed by Congress, a recognition for which Filipino World War II veterans have waited more than 70 years;

Whereas the presentation of Congressional Medals of Honor pursuant to such Act will take place on October 25, 2017, in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Building;

Whereas Filipino Americans continue to demonstrate a commendable sense of patriotism and honor;

Whereas 9 Filipino Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that may be bestowed on an individual serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas the late Thelma Garcia Buchholdt, born in Claveria, Cagayan, on the island of Luzon in the Philippines—

(1) moved with her family to Alaska in 1965;

(2) was elected to the House of Representatives of Alaska in 1974;

(3) was the first Filipino woman elected to a State legislature; and

(4) authored a comprehensive history book entitled “Filipinos in Alaska: 1788–1958”;

Whereas Filipino American farmworkers and labor leaders, such as Philip Vera Cruz and Larry Itliong, played an integral role in the multiethnic United Farm Workers movement, alongside Cesar Chávez, Dolores Huerta, and other Latino workers;

Whereas Filipino Americans play an integral role in the healthcare system of the United States as nurses, doctors, and other medical professionals;

Whereas Filipino Americans have contributed greatly to music, dance, literature, education, business, journalism, sports, fashion, politics, government, science, technology, the fine arts, and other fields that enrich the landscape of the United States;

Whereas, as mandated in the mission statement of the Filipino American National Historical Society, efforts should continue to promote the study of Filipino American history and culture because the roles of Filipino Americans and other people of color have largely been overlooked in the writing, teaching, and learning of the history of the United States;

Whereas it is imperative for Filipino American youth to have positive role models to instill—

(1) the significance of education, complemented by the richness of Filipino American ethnicity; and

(2) the value of the Filipino American legacy; and

Whereas it is essential to promote the understanding, education, and appreciation of the history and culture of Filipino Americans in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Filipino American History Month in October 2017 as—

(A) a testament to the advancement of Filipino Americans;

(B) a time to reflect on and remember the many notable contributions that Filipino Americans have made to the United States; and

(C) a time to renew efforts toward the research and examination of history and culture so as to provide an opportunity for all people of the United States to learn more

about Filipino Americans and to appreciate the historic contributions of Filipino Americans to the United States; and

(2) urges the people of the United States to observe Filipino American History Month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 306—RECOGNIZING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER 2017 AS “NATIONAL PRINCIPALS MONTH”

Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 306

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the American Federation of School Administrators have declared the month of October 2017 to be “National Principals Month”;

Whereas principals are educational visionaries, instructional and assessment leaders, disciplinarians, community builders, budget analysts, facilities managers, and administrators of legal and contractual obligations;

Whereas principals work collaboratively with teachers and parents to develop and implement a clear mission, high curriculum standards, and performance goals;

Whereas principals create school environments that facilitate great teaching and learning and continuous school improvement;

Whereas the vision, actions, and dedication of principals provide the mobilizing force behind any school reform effort; and

Whereas the celebration of National Principals Month would honor elementary school, middle school, and high school principals, and recognize the importance of principals in ensuring that every child has access to a high-quality education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the month of October 2017 as “National Principals Month”; and

(2) honors the contribution of principals in the elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools of the United States by supporting the goals and ideals of National Principals Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 307—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 26, 2017, AS “DAY OF THE DEPLOYED”

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 307

Whereas more than 2,000,000 individuals serve as members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas several hundred thousand members of the Armed Forces rotate each year through deployments to 150 countries in every region of the world;

Whereas more than 2,900,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed to the area of operations of the United States Central Command since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the United States is kept strong and free by the loyal military personnel from the total force (the regular components, the

National Guard, and the Reserves), who protect the precious heritage of the United States through their declarations and actions;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces serving at home and abroad have courageously answered the call to duty to defend the ideals of the United States and to preserve peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces personify the virtues of patriotism, service, duty, courage, and sacrifice;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make important and significant sacrifices for the United States; and

Whereas the Senate designated October 26 as “Day of the Deployed” in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 26, 2017, as “Day of the Deployed”;

(2) honors the deployed members of the Armed Forces of the United States and the families of the members;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service of those members of the Armed Forces, wherever the members serve, past, present, and future; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe the Day of the Deployed with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 to conduct a hearing entitled “The Commercial Satellite Industry: What’s Up and What’s on the Horizon.”

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-406 to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael Dourson, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, and William L. Wehrum, of Delaware, Matthew Z. Leopold, of Florida, and David Ross, of Wisconsin, each to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, Paul Trombino III, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, and Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-406 to conduct a hearing entitled “The Wildfire Prevention and Mitigation Act of 2017.”

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Nigeria Security Update.”

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-628 to conduct a hearing on: S.1223, Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Repeal Act.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-628 to conduct a hearing on: S.1870, Securing urgent resources vital to Indian Empowerment Act 2017; S.1953, Reauthorization of the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010; and S.1942, to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, off the Senate floor to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 25, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-562 to conduct a hearing entitled “Working and Aging with Disabilities: From School to Retirement.”

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Sarah Finley, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Radhika Gharpure, who is currently serving as a legislative fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Tessa Rebholz, a fellow on my staff, for the remainder of the session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1329 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1329) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2017, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1329) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 280 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 280) designating the week of October 2 through October 6, 2017, as "National Health Information Technology Week" to recognize the value of health information technology in transforming and improving the healthcare system for all people in the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 280) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 3, 2017, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 305, S. Res. 306, and S. Res. 307.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to. (The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, at 12 noon on Thursday, October 26, all postcloture time be considered expired on the Palk nomination, and that following disposition of the Palk nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the McFadden nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, October 26; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Palk nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DURBIN and Senator WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

ROHINGYA HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Rohingya are one of many ethnic

groups, largely Muslim, who have been living for centuries in Burma and now in Myanmar, with the majority of them in the western coastal Rakhine State.

Deep-seated misconceptions about their roots and faith have led to decades of discrimination, about which many of us are aware because of press reports. They have been denied citizenship, had their movement restricted, and have been deprived of basic healthcare. It is no wonder that the Rohingya people are considered to be one of the most persecuted minorities in the world.

Today, as a result of a military crackdown against them in the Rakhine State—an overzealous, disproportionate response to attacks on security outposts by some militants last October and then again this August—countless Rohingya have been brutally killed, and more than 600,000 have fled to overwhelmed and desperate camps in neighboring Bangladesh.

The scorched-earth tactic by the Burmese military has left hundreds of villages literally burned to the ground, and the reports of rape, starvation, mass killing—even reports of security forces burning people, babies, alive—have been horrifying. Satellite images and maps indicate that the destruction by the Burmese military is not episodic, it is systematic.

In Bangladesh, aid groups have been unable to keep up with the influx of refugees. The unprecedented scale of the crisis and the lack of infrastructure in the makeshift camps have created significant gaps in access to food, medical care, and even safety and shelter.

The international community has condemned the violence against the Rohingya, and rightly so.

Countries around the world—reputable international human rights organizations such as the Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and even the U.N.—have denounced the military's campaign against the Rohingya.

In a speech to the U.N. Human Rights Council in Geneva last month, the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, called the Burmese military operation against the Rohingya people "a textbook example of ethnic cleansing."

Many of my colleagues in this Chamber joined me when I introduced S. Res. 250 to condemn these atrocities, and a large group of us also wrote to the administration recently to urge Secretary Tillerson and Administrator Green to help resolve the crisis and provide critically needed aid.

Just yesterday, in a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing, my friend and colleague, Senator BEN CARDIN of Maryland, labeled the crisis a "genocide." Yet Aung San Suu Kyi,

the de facto leader of Burma, the Nobel laureate, has largely done and said too little.

I have followed Aung San Suu Kyi over the years. I joined many of my colleagues in praising her struggle for democracy. After 15 years under house arrest, she and the National League for Democracy won a landslide victory in the first national vote since Burma's transition to civilian rule in 2015, more than two decades after her party was denied its victory in the 1990 election.

I admired her so much for her non-violent struggle for political freedom and human rights. And while I recognize she still has a fragile relationship with the Burmese military, which still has considerable power, I am sadly disappointed in her lack of leadership when it comes to the plight of the Rohingya people—her fellow countrymen—men and women who are in a desperate situation.

She claims she is committed to restoring peace and the rule of law. Yet she has spoken of so-called allegations and counterallegations instead of addressing the widespread, well-documented abuses by her own country's security forces.

I was glad that Aung San Suu Kyi in 2016 appointed investigators, led by former U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, who recommended this summer that Burma review a 1982 law that strips most Rohingya of citizenship. Yet the Burmese Government has yet to implement any of the Commission's recommendations and further continues to deny access to the Rakhine State to other U.N. investigators, journalists, and NGO groups. Some officials have even accused the Rohingya of faking rape and faking the burning of their own homes. What a preposterous claim.

I recognize the dramatic progress Burma has made over the years. It will take a long time to overcome many of the challenges in such a young democracy, and I understand that Aung San Suu Kyi, as State Counselor, has a limited role under the power-sharing agreement with her military, which has largely been responsible for the violence I have described. But I would urge her to live up to her own words upon delivering her Nobel Peace Prize lecture in 2012 to address the historic and brutal suppression of the Rohingya and support ethnic reconciliation in Burma. In fact, Aung San Suu Kyi quoted the following passages from the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1948, as the answer to why she fought for democracy and human rights in her home country in Burma. She said:

[D]isregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and

freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people.

[I]t is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law.

These are wise words used by Aung San Suu Kyi when she received her Nobel Prize. They are words that apply today to this crisis within her own country.

I am committed to doing what I can in Congress to hold those in the Burmese military personally accountable for the reprehensible human rights violations against the Rohingya.

I want to note that I have also had the opportunity over the October recess to meet with some members of the Rohingya community who have resettled in my home State of Illinois over the years.

About 1,500 Rohingya people live in the Chicagoland area. Among them is Nasir Zakaria. He helped found the Rohingya Culture Center in Chicago—the first Rohingya community center in America. The center helps provide a safe, familiar space for Rohingya people new to the country, as well as critically needed resources, such as translators, ESL and computer classes, help with paperwork, and much more.

When I met Nasir and the other members of the community about a week ago with my wife, they told me about the phone calls and photos they receive late at night from family and friends fleeing the violence, looking for safety in Bangladesh.

I also heard from community members who recently returned from a medical mission to Bangladesh. They showed me the photos they brought back. One food line to feed refugees was literally 1 mile long. Healthcare is limited. Safe drinking water is limited. Cholera is detected. It is a horrible situation for these people who have been tossed out of Myanmar and now are trying just to survive nearby Bangladesh. The stories are horrific, and they are all the same.

Here is an image of this exodus that was printed in the New York Times. It shows families fleeing Burma across the border to Bangladesh with smoke rising in the background from the villages that they lived in being burned.

The stories I heard were of helpless, poor families walking on foot through jungles, crowding in boats along the Naf River, leaving behind everything with accountings of rape, killing, and arson by the Burmese military. They arrive in Bangladesh sick, exhausted, and desperately in need of the most basic things—food, clean water, medicine, a safe space to rest their heads.

Here is another image, which is heartbreaking. It is an indication of what happens in the refugee camps when food arrives, this time in a camp known as Cox's Bazar in Bangladesh.

A UNICEF report last week stated that 58 percent of the refugees who have poured into Cox's Bazar are children, noting that they are in hell on Earth. They are acutely malnourished, they need clean water and vaccines, and they are at risk of exploitation by traffickers. This is unacceptable.

I understand that Bangladesh and Burma have discussed a repatriation plan recently, but many refugees don't have any documents. They were literally burned out of their homes. We need to call on the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, Filippo Grandi was in my office last week, and he stressed how important it is for us to speak up and to help on this issue, that we ensure the voluntary right of return and we ensure the safety of those who do return and we make sure that the paper requirements for return are reasonable for people who are literally homeless and stateless at this moment.

Many are wary of returning without an assurance of full citizenship, given the risk of further persecution or the threat of being placed in camps in Myanmar when they return. I don't blame them, because the atrocities committed against the Rohingya over the past months and weeks are not new by any means.

Nasir Zakaria in Chicago told me that more than three decades ago, when he was only 14, he was kidnapped by militants targeting the Rohingya in Burma. He never saw his parents again.

Nasir eventually escaped to Bangladesh, made his way to Malaysia, where he worked for 18 years in construction before he finally made it to the United States with a green card in 2013. He learned English, worked as a dishwasher in a hotel near Chicago, supported his wife and three children, met others in the community, and helped to create the Rohingya Center that I visited.

Here is a picture of Nasir Zakaria with his son, Mohamed, in their Chicago apartment. You can see the American flag in the background. He is very proud of this Nation that he now calls home.

The Rohingya Culture Center provides critical resources to more than 400 families in the Chicago area, one of the largest concentrations of Rohingya refugees in America. More than three decades after Nasir first escaped Burma, the Rohingya continue to be attacked and demonized.

Let me close by saying that we met today with the Myanmar Ambassador. Seven Senators sat down with him and expressed the sentiments that I have included in this statement.

First, let me give Mr. U Aung Lynn, the Ambassador, credit for coming to the meeting. He knew what we were going to raise. Yet he came, he took notes, and he assured us that he would respond to this; that we would be able to come back in a week or two for a

progress report on what is being done; that he would allow or plead for access of U.N. personnel, as well as NGO groups, into the northern Rakhine area currently being denied access; that he would personally make it clear to his government we want those responsible for these atrocities held accountable. We want to make certain, as well, that those who are repatriated have a fair chance to return to a safe atmosphere in Myanmar and, ultimately, for citizenship.

It was a long list of requirements and requests that we gave to the Ambassador. He took them all in a positive way and told us he would be back to us in a matter of a week or two with a progress report.

Let me close by appealing to Aung San Suu Kyi to help resolve this crisis. I am counting on her. I do believe she is a good person. I hope that she will respond to this crisis in her own country the way she stood up with so much courage before.

I plan to meet with this Ambassador in a few weeks to chart the progress, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to end this ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya people in Myanmar. We cannot allow the Burmese military to commit these atrocities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before Senator DURBIN leaves the floor, I just want to commend our colleague from Illinois. He and I have worked together for many years, and throughout that time, the Senator from Illinois has constantly been a voice for those who have no voice on these human rights concerns, laying out why the effort to step up is what we are all about as Americans.

I thank him. I enjoyed listening to him again. You don't really enjoy it because you hear about the suffering, but I am so glad that Senator DURBIN has made this case, and I thank him for it.

WILDFIRE DISASTER FUNDING ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, across the West, 2017 will be long remembered as the year when fire was seared into our collective consciousness and ash rained down on homes and cars. There were mass evacuations, and scores just lost their hopes and dreams.

Devastating fires have hit my home State of Oregon, but Idaho, California, Washington, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, and more all were hit by fires that always seemed bigger and hotter and more powerful than what we have seen in the past.

These are not our grandfathers' fires. There are a whole host of reasons behind this, and today I just want to talk a bit about what happened, what it has

meant, and at least a commonsense approach that Senator CRAPO and I have advocated for moving forward on a bipartisan basis.

The fact is, in the West, dozens of lives have been lost. Entire communities have been wiped out. An iconic national treasure in my home State, a place that Oregonians have always regarded—a special love for our Columbia River Gorge is practically in our chromosomes—it was burned over this year.

This month, a huge part of Northern California was burned. We talked to our colleagues Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator HARRIS about that. It is not just rolling hills and unoccupied land; the fires swept through entire cities. Some of the stories about those whose lives were lost in California just break your heart. School has been disrupted for more than a quarter million children. In some cases, it could be weeks before classes are back up and running.

In my home State, more than 600,000 acres were burned, nearly a third of that in the Chetco Bar fire that burned through southwestern Oregon. I was there to visit with folks in the community and the volunteers. There were volunteers from all over the country who were stepping up to help us deal with these fires. It sure was needed because, nationwide, almost 9 million acres burned. It is an area bigger than the size of eight States in our country—all of it up in flames. Compare that to the 1980s and the 1990s, when an average of around 3 million acres burned per year.

A brandnew report is out from the Department of the Interior forecasting how much the cost of fighting these fires is going to climb in the near future. The agency predicts a jump of 20 percent from fiscal year 2018 to 2019, and they believe that is a conservative estimate. If conditions are dry and temperatures are high, it could be even worse.

I am of the view—and it is something Senator CRAPO and I have worked on together for years now. Sometimes we believe it is the longest running battle since the Trojan War. It is based on the proposition that Congress should no longer sit back and accept that these fires can only get larger, cost more, and that somehow the Forest Service is not all that big a problem. We just call it the fire service, which is the way a lot of people describe it in our part of the world.

Now, the way the Federal budget works for these fires is a broken, commonsense-defying policy, and it literally adds fuel to the fires and in effect disrupts not just the West but the rest of the country because the consequences of this broken budgeting process for fighting fires takes a toll on communities across the country.

A few years ago, I came back from Oregon for a visit, and I learned that our colleague and friend, the distin-

guished senior Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, had signed on to legislation that I am going to describe shortly that Senator CRAPO and I have been working on. When I heard Senator SCHUMER had signed on to it, I, of course, was very pleased to have someone of his influence. I said to my colleagues: What am I missing here? I don't remember there being a lot of Federal forests in Brooklyn.

Well, it turns out that at that time, Senator SCHUMER, because he goes all over his State, was I believe in Upstate New York. There was a company that made baseball bats. As a result of this broken system of fighting fire, when Senator SCHUMER's constituent had a problem with the baseball bats because there was an invasive species that was eating its way through these baseball bats, the local Forest Service folks didn't have the money to help him deal with this economic issue.

It might seem like a small thing to some people, but when you are talking about these smaller communities, if they don't have the resources because they are victims of this broken system of fighting fire, this is a problem. It is a problem that Senator CRAPO and I have taken on now to ensure that, once and for all, we substitute common sense for a system that is everything but common sense.

What I am going to describe now is something called fire-borrowing. It starts like this: Over the years, prevention, which everybody talks about—Smokey is the symbol of prevention. Prevention gets short shrift. It gets hot and dry in our part of the world in the West, and if you don't go in there and do the preventive work, if you don't thin out the forests and it gets hot and dry, and then all of a sudden you have a lightning strike on your hands, you will have what amounts to an inferno. It just whips through the area. It knows no boundaries. Federal land is affected. Private land is affected. State land is affected. There are bigger and more expensive fires, and I can tell you that what we have seen are unprecedented fires.

In our Columbia River Gorge that I mentioned, we saw a fire leap the river. It used to be that rivers were a break. They were a break to ensure that the communities were safe. Now, in my home State, we have seen a fire actually leap the river.

So what is happening is, as prevention gets short shrift, these big fires break out, the Federal Government borrows from the prevention fund to put the fires out, and the problem just gets worse. Common sense is defied. There is absolutely irrational budgeting that ripples not just through the West but through communities all across the country, producing what I think most colleagues would say they would never expect, which is forestry

personnel—when Senator SCHUMER visits in New York—having challenges paying for local forestry matters.

Fire prevention programs help thin out dead and dying material from forests and clear dried grasses from open landscapes—the kindling that goes up in flames when lightning strikes or when a small ground fire grows out of control. Those are the very real problems we have in the West. The programs we need to deal with this are being robbed because of the cycle I just described. Fire-borrowing. Prevention. Short shrift. The government borrows from the prevention fund to put the fire out, and the problem gets worse. That is fire-borrowing in our part of the world.

You can look at the recent fires in California to see how dangerous this is. If fire prevention had gotten a fair shake, lives could have been saved, and businesses and property might have been spared. Western communities would not be trying to recover from the ravages of summer and fall 2017.

Many of our colleagues of both parties and now 205 groups—timber companies, scientists, environmentalists, academics, and people from all across the political spectrum—are joining Senator CRAPO and me in saying that what is needed is a clean fix for the wildfire budgeting system and a complete end to fire-borrowing. We have been working on this, as I said, for years.

We know some of our colleagues want to see a variety of other policies attached, particularly policies dealing with forest management. One of the reasons I wanted to come to the floor tonight was to say that I take a back seat to no one when it comes to finding the right approach to forest management. I have written bipartisan forest management laws. But let's make sure that as we go forward on this issue, we

understand that we cannot let other matters get in the way of stopping the cycle of fire-borrowing once and for all.

What Senator CRAPO and I have proposed is essentially to say that the really big fires, once and for all in America, will be treated like what they really are—natural disasters. And you can look at that relatively small number of fires and say: We are going to deal with them through the disaster fund. Then you don't raid the prevention fund. And what the government scorekeepers have said in the past is that not raiding the prevention fund through fire-borrowing will, in their judgment, means fewer fires in the first place; hence, there will be fewer natural disasters if you end fire-borrowing once and for all.

My view is that we are going to go forward this year on the disaster relief issue, and I want it understood that I am going to work with Senators of both political parties to finally see this matter wrapped up and an end to fire-borrowing.

I think anyone who has kept an eye on the news or has read stories or seen reports about natural disasters understands that unfortunately disasters have visited too many of our communities—hurricanes flooding Houston, violent winds and rain in Florida. Weeks after Maria made landfall, millions of American citizens in Puerto Rico are still in desperate need of help. Our neighbors to the south suffer with the aftermath of a massive earthquake. Tornados are a threat across much of the country. In our part of the world, these wildfires are our natural disasters.

The Congress can't get up one day, come to the floor of the Senate, and just say: We are going to stop all the hurricanes and the earthquakes. There is something that Congress can do about preventing so many wildfires.

We, with our legislation, want to build a new ethic of fire prevention. That is what ending fire-borrowing is really all about. It is saying that we are in effect going to take—it is almost like an old stage with a dilapidated set on it, and you just pull it out because it is outdated. That is what we are talking about with fire-borrowing. It is like an old stage that is dilapidated. It doesn't make sense for the times. We are talking about replacing fire-borrowing with a modern policy so that we can deal with the big fires as the natural disasters they are and get back in the business of putting fire prevention first and replacing a commonsense-defying Federal budget plan that has caused so much harm to folks in the West.

I hope my colleagues will support the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act. Senator CRAPO and I want to work with every single Senator in this Chamber to get across the finish line. We are not saying that ending fire-borrowing is going to mean there will never be another fire in this country. What we are saying is that it is past time to replace such an illogical, commonsense-defying budget system as that presented by fire-borrowing. With that, we can reduce the risk of major wildfires to communities across the West.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 26, 2017, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE SCALISE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay on Roll Call No. 575, Nay on Roll Call No. 576, Nay on Roll Call No. 577, Nay on Roll Call No. 578, and Nay on Roll Call No. 579.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE SCALISE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 580 and Yea on Roll Call No. 581.

HONORING GASTON DAY SCHOOL'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PATRICK T. MCHENRY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the Tenth District of North Carolina is home to many excellent schools that develop and inspire our young people to become leaders in their communities. This year marked the 50th anniversary of one of these institutions, Gaston Day School. The school was founded by families and community leaders in Gaston County who were seeking to offer an educational alternative to the area's parents and children. In an article from The Gastonia Gazette published in 1967 the first Head of School, J.B. Davis, lays out Gaston Day's mission when he says, "We are not interested in teaching only the excellent student. We are interested in teaching the youngster who can achieve." Gaston Day has realized this mission since its very first class. In fact, Gaston Day's current Head Master, Richard Rankin, was a student in Gaston Day's very first class.

Although the school may have moved on from its humble beginnings in the former First Presbyterian Church building and is now established in the Gaston County community, it has not forgotten its roots. Over the past fifty years Gaston Day School has graduated students who have not only become leaders in the Gaston County community but in many other parts of the world as well. Today, the school continues to expand and evolve so it can continue to teach its students to succeed in our constantly changing world.

Congratulations to Gaston Day School on fifty years of teaching students and developing leaders.

HONORING MARGARET "PEGGI" HANRAHAN

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Margaret "Peggi" Hanrahan for her years of service to the people of Alabama and the United States.

On October 27, 2017, Peggi will retire from her current position as Confidential Assistant to Attorney General Jeff Sessions. Prior to this role, Peggi served as Executive Assistant to Mr. Sessions during his twenty-year career in the United States Senate. Peggi oversaw all administrative and front office staff and was essentially involved in every function of the office.

Peggi has a very unique background, including a period of time working in the oil and gas industry, time as co-owner of a professional party planning company, and work in a law office. These experiences helped shape her future role in public service.

I have had the honor of working with Peggi in a professional capacity, and I also came to know her personally through my family and our work together with a children's home in Mobile, Alabama. Peggi was the Firm Administrator at Miller, Hamilton, Snider & Odom, and I worked closely with her in my role as managing partner of the firm. Throughout our time together, I always found Peggi to be competent, capable, friendly, dedicated, and knowledgeable.

After being elected to the United States Senate in 1996, Mr. Jeff Sessions hired Peggi to serve on his staff. There is no way to quantify the numerous tasks Peggi has completed, the various roles she has held, or the number of individuals she assisted during her time on Capitol Hill. Whether it was arranging a tour of the United States Capitol or giving career advice to an intern or drafting personal correspondence to an Alabama family, Peggi's impact has been profoundly felt over the last twenty years.

Mr. Speaker, as a sign of Peggi's impressive skillset and track record, Mr. Sessions asked Peggi to continue serving with him once he was confirmed to serve as our nation's 84th Attorney General.

Mr. Sessions had this to say about Peggi and her years of service: "Peggi has been at the center of everything we have accomplished in public service. She loves America and its ideals, is smart, decisive, loyal, and a total professional. She speaks up for the high principles she believes in, and for two dec-

ades has been the key point of contact in our office for thousands of Alabamians and Americans all over the country. She has provided invaluable service to me, the nation, and the so many who she trained and mentored. Though we will miss her marvelous contributions, we wish her all the best as she and Kevin embark on this next adventure."

So, on behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District and a grateful nation, I want to wish Peggi and her husband, Kevin, all the best upon her retirement. Alabama and our nation are better off today thanks to the service, dedication, and leadership of Peggi Hanrahan.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL- EN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY PRIVATE FIRST CLASS (PFC) CHRISTOPHER MCCRAW

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Private First Class (PFC) Christopher McCraw, who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on October 14, 2008, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. PFC McCraw was killed by wounds sustained when he encountered small arms fire while on dismounted patrol in Nasar Wa Salam, Baghdad. PFC McCraw was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 21st Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade, 25th Infantry Division, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

PFC McCraw, a Columbia, Mississippi native, joined the Army in February 2006 and went to Basic Training at Fort Benning, Georgia where he graduated in June 2006. He deployed to Iraq in December of 2007. According to the Associated Press, PFC McCraw is remembered by his friends and family for having a jovial sense of humor. Wendy Bracey, PFC McCraw's Sunday school teacher described him as, "a charmer, an all-around, happy-go-lucky kid." His father, Avon, recalled that their last conversation was over the phone, and that at the time PFC McCraw was laughing and in good spirits.

PFC McCraw was laid to rest at Foxworth Cemetery, located in Marion County. According to the Associated Press, PFC McCraw's uncle, Jerry McCraw, remembers him as, "always a happy kid, a bursting-with-energy-type kid, I guess what you would call a perfect soldier."

PFC McCraw was awarded the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and the Good Conduct medal.

PFC McCraw is survived by his parents, Avon McCraw and Cathy McCraw; his uncle, Jerry McCraw; his son, Issac; and his fiancée Brianna Bell.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

PFC McCraw proudly served our nation to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. His service will always be remembered.

A TRIBUTE TO BONDURANT-
FARRAR SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Bondurant-Farrar School District for being named the 2016 Bondurant Organization of the Year at the Bondurant Chamber of Commerce Annual Dinner and Awards Ceremony on January 20, 2017.

The Bondurant-Farrar School District has been an integral part of the Bondurant Community for years. While it's teachers have remained dedicated year after year in educating the area's children and preparing them for the future, administrators have worked hard in meeting the challenges and surpassing the educational needs of a growing population. I am immensely proud of the educators and administrators in our state that dedicate their lives to ensuring the success of our future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to represent the Bondurant-Farrar School District in the United States Congress and commend them for their outstanding achievements in their community. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating the Bondurant-Farrar School District and in wishing them all nothing but continued success.

HONORING MOUNT SAINT DOMINIC
ACADEMY'S 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mount Saint Dominic Academy of Caldwell, New Jersey on the occasion of its 125th Anniversary.

Mount Saint Dominic Academy serves the surrounding community as an all-girls Catholic College Preparatory School dedicated to the education of young women from a variety of ethnic, religious, and economic backgrounds. The institution's goal of inclusivity aims to both inspire and empower students to realize their unique gifts and talents in an academic atmosphere fostering excellence, respect, and diversity while at the same time reinforcing the Christian-centered value of moral integrity.

The history of Mount Saint Dominic Academy began in 1892 with the Academy's founding by the Sisters of Saint Dominic. Although the Caldwell Dominican congregation was initially based in Jersey City, New Jersey, the municipality was ravaged by tuberculosis throughout the 1880s. With the threat of contracting the disease an everyday concern, Mother Mary Catharine Muth sought out a lo-

cation for her ill sisters to recover. This refuge was found twenty miles west of Jersey City in the Borough of Caldwell. It was here where Mother Catharine purchased the Harrison Estate on Roseland Avenue, a plot of land comprising of a small home and garden where Mother Catharine taught day students and boarders, all the while, looking after her ill Sisters.

Over the next decade as the student body increased, so did the necessity for larger quarters. In 1893, the cornerstone was laid for a new Motherhouse convent and school in Caldwell. In 1903, with the increased demand in time devoted toward the education of New Jersey's youth, the sisters decided to renounce their cloistered lifestyle and become Third Order Dominicans.

By the late 1920s history repeated itself as the school saw a greater influx of new students. This influx led to renewed efforts to expand. Under Mother Joseph Dunn, the institute constructed a larger dormitory that came to encompass both the school itself as well as the residences for those boarding. More improvements and renovations were made under Sister Germaine in the 1950s to add additional classrooms, offices, and a larger library.

Recently, the academy has continued to improve upon the renovations that took place during the twentieth century by continuing to add more physical alterations and expansions to the campus. Among these expansions has been the construction of a new 19,000 square foot athletic center to accommodate the growth in participation within women's athletics. Furthermore, under the guidance of Sister Francis Sullivan, the school transformed its former gymnasium into the Doris M. Byrne Performing Arts Center which offers Broadway quality experiences for both performers and patrons. These installments not only serve to improve the experiences of students attending the Academy, but are also available to benefit the greater West Essex community as well. Mount Saint Dominic Academy remains today one of New Jersey's foremost educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Mount Saint Dominic Academy on its 125th Anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes due to a funeral. Had I been present for roll call vote number 569, H.R. 3551 C-TPAT Reauthorization Act of 2017, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 570, S. 504 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2017, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 571, Approval of the Journal, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 572, Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 577—The combined rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 469—Sunshine for Regulations and Regu-

latory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2017 and of the bill H.R. 732—Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 573, Adoption of H. Res. 577—The combined rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 469—Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2017 and of the bill H.R. 732—Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 574, H.R. 2142 INTERDICT Act, as amended, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 575, Cohen (D-TN) Amendment No. 2—Exempts settlement agreements based on race, religion, national origin, or any other protected category, I would have voted "nay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 576, Johnson (D-GA) Amendment No. 3—Exempts settlement agreements that direct funds to remediate the indirect harms caused by the manipulation of emissions standards in automobiles, I would have voted "nay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 577, Jackson Lee (D-TX)—Amendment No. 4—Exempts settlement agreements that pertain to providing restitution to a State, I would have voted "nay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 578, Cicilline (D-RI)—Amendment No. 5—Exempts settlements that resolve predatory or fraudulent conduct involving residential mortgage-backed securities, I would have voted "nay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 579, Conyers (D-MI)—Amendment No. 6—Exempts settlement agreements that direct funds to remedy indirect harm resulting from lead in drinking water, I would have voted "nay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 580, Passage of H.R. 732—Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 581, Passage H.R. 3898 Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act, as amended, I would have voted "yea."

A TRIBUTE TO ELDORA GOWING

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Eldora Gowing of Shenandoah, Iowa, on the very special occasion of her 100th birthday.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Eldora's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Eldora lived through eighteen United States presidents and twenty-two governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent Eldora in the United States Congress and I'm proud to recognize her today on this momentous occasion. I ask that my colleagues in the

United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her on reaching this milestone and in wishing her nothing but the best.

HONORING THE LIFE OF VAN MICHAEL

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, a great Tennessean and very patriotic American, Van Michael, passed away at the age of 82.

Van was a longtime friend and supporter of both me and my late father.

He was a lawyer, successful businessman, and served as City Judge for Sweetwater, Tennessee.

He also enjoyed his work in Washington as the lobbyist for the National Christmas Tree Growers Association.

Van was the primary developer of a popular Tennessee tourist attraction called the Lost Sea, an amazing body of water in an underground cavern in Monroe County.

I still remember riding in a boat with my dad at the Grand Opening of the Lost Sea.

He also was a leader in bringing about Cherochala Skyway, one of the Nation's most beautiful scenic highways.

Van was a very well-informed conservative with strong views on the great issues of the day.

As Sweetwater Mayor Doyle Lowe said, "Sweetwater and the County will miss him. He was a large part of the community."

Van Michael touched thousands of lives in good and positive ways. This Country is a better place because of the life he led.

I would like to include in the RECORD the following article about Van Michael from the Monroe County newspaper The Advocate & Democrat.

[From the Advocate and Democrat, Oct. 15, 2017]

LOST SEA DEVELOPER VAN MICHAEL DIES AT 82

(By Michael Thomas)

A man who helped bring The Lost Sea to prominence among many other life accomplishments died Oct. 11 at the age of 82.

Van Reeves Michael was known for a lot of things throughout his long life, but it was his part in the development of the former Craighead Caverns into the Lost Sea that will mark his legacy.

"I can't think of anyone that knows more about The Lost Sea than him," said Lisa McClung, director of The Lost Sea. "I used to get him to come out and talk to the new tour guides and share some of the history of it with them so they would know it firsthand. He was a wonderful person. He stopped by to see us frequently and tell us stories about The Lost Sea. I can't believe he's gone. We will definitely miss him."

McClung said she did not know anyone who loved The Lost Sea more than Van Michael.

"He was passionate about it becoming an attraction and he worked relentlessly in the early 60s to get it open," she said. "He kept on and on until he was able to see it become reality. He said he would stand on Main Street and count the car tags of people who

were coming through going to Chattanooga or Knoxville and he knew if it were open to the public, they would stop and see it."

In a story commemorating the 50th anniversary of The Lost Sea, Michael said, "It was called the 'Lake Room' until 1965. People had come and gone in the cavern before that, but only a few had actually seen the big room with the cave. Nobody in Sweetwater believed it existed."

According to family members, Michael was also instrumental in helping bring the Cherochala Skyway into existence, something his father, W.E. Michael, helped start.

Michael was also well known in the City of Sweetwater, where his law office was known as the "Michael and Michael building."

"Everybody knew that building on Oak Street," Sweetwater Mayor Doyle Lowe said. "I hated to hear that Van had died. He was quite a character. He always had a joke ready and a lot of times, he would make your day. We were friends for more than 40 years and he was always encouraging, always thinking of ways to make things better."

"Sweetwater, and the county, will miss him," Lowe added. "He was a large part of the community."

Michael was preceded in death by his parents, W.E. Michael and Claudia Francis Michael, and son Richard Michael. He is survived by his wife of 57 years, Margaret (Peg) Bowland Michael, his daughter and son-in-law, Teresa Michael Glasgow and Steven Glasgow of Franklin, and his grandchildren, Carson and Campbell Glasgow.

He was a 1952 graduate of Tennessee Military Institute. He went on to receive his bachelor and law degrees from Cumberland University and practiced law in Sweetwater for 57 years at Michael and Michael Attys.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI ARMY SERGEANT (SGT) ERIC C. NEWMAN

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen Mississippi Army Sergeant (SGT) Eric C. Newman, who gave his life while in service to our nation on October 14, 2010, during Operation Enduring Freedom. SGT Newman was killed when enemy combatants attacked his unit in Akatzai Kalay, Afghanistan. SGT Newman was assigned to the 1st Squadron, 38th Cavalry Regiment, 525th Battlefield Surveillance Brigade, XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

SGT Newman, a Waynesboro, Mississippi native, graduated from Wayne County High School. SGT Newman worked for the Waynesboro Police Department several years before joining the Army in 2006.

According to the Associated Press, Waynesboro Police Chief James Bunch said, "SGT Newman was an outstanding individual. It didn't surprise me at all that he would sacrifice himself for his country."

SGT Newman's funeral was held at Freeman Funeral Home in Waynesboro. He was buried at Hebron Cemetery, located in Wayne County, Mississippi.

SGT Newman was awarded the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Army Commenda-

tion Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, the Combat Infantrymans Badge and the Parachute Badge.

SGT Newman is survived by his wife, Charidy Newman; mother, Dianne Newman; stepdaughter, Larissa Leigh; grandmother, Rowena Loper; grandmother, Jolene Newman; uncle, Michael Earl Newman; aunt, Sandra Newman; and sister, Kimberly Delbosco.

SGT Newman proudly served our nation to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. His service will always be remembered.

A TRIBUTE TO DAMIAN BELL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Damian Bell of Pleasant Hill, Iowa for being honored with the Carnegie Medal by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission for the role he played in saving the life of Richard Rauzi.

Richard was snowshoeing and taking photographs on Lake Ahquabi on February 14, 2016, when he fell through the ice trying to rescue a goose frozen in the slush. Damian, his friend Jesse Bannor, and their sons were ice fishing in a local shack. Damian's son, Konnor, heard Richard yelling for help, and the two men raced to the rescue. Using a nearby canoe, Damian made his way over to Richard. Unable to pull him aboard, and with the canoe threatening to tip over, Damian secured Richard to the boat with a rope, then stepped onto the ice and attempted to pull Richard from the water before firefighters arrived on scene to help in the efforts. Even though he had been in the water for 40 minutes on a 15 degree day, Richard survived after two days with extreme hypothermia.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Damian Bell for his courage and heroic actions in helping to save the life of Richard Rauzi. It is humbling to know that there are people like Damian who are willing to risk their own lives to save the life of another. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Damian on receiving this esteemed designation and in wishing him nothing but the best.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND LIFE OF SGT. FRED CUARESMA YURONG

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of U.S. Army Sergeant Fred Cuaresma Yurong. Following the Japanese attacks on Pearl Harbor, Fred answered President Roosevelt's call to service and joined the 1st Filipino Infantry

Regiment. He went on to serve in both New Guinea and the Philippines during WWII. During this time, Fred served with distinction, reaching the rank of Sergeant and displayed a level of commitment to serving others that would show throughout the rest of his life.

Out of the 250,000 Filipino soldiers who served during World War II, Sergeant Yurong was one of the few to be granted citizenship in a mass naturalization ceremony held in Camp Beale on March 20, 1943.

Upon completion of his service, Sergeant Yurong married his wife in the Philippines before relocating back to California and raising a family of five children. He continued his service to the community through his active involvement in the American Legion and several Filipino organizations in Stockton, California. His contributions speak to the testament of our country's servicemen and women selfless commitment to serve our communities. While he passed away on May 26, 1976, the impact of his contributions to this country and to those whose lives he touched remains just as strong today. His children continue to honor his legacy by engaging in community building and serving others, values that their father instilled in all of them.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the service and life of a man whose commitment to serving others was displayed through a life of service to his country and community. It is both fitting and appropriate that we recognize Sergeant Yurong, who made sacrifices for the freedoms enjoyed by our country, served with distinction, and went on to leave a legacy that is carried on by his family today as he is honored for his service. I join the family of Sergeant Fred Cuaresma Yurong and wish them the best as we honor his service with the Congressional Gold Medal along with the other Filipino Veterans of World War II.

**SUPPORTING MEASURES AGAINST
IRAN AND HEZBOLLAH (H.R. 1698,
H. RES. 359, H.R. 3342, & H.R. 3329)**

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of four critical pieces of legislation that will significantly strengthen our efforts to counter the Iranian menace in the Middle East.

Appropriately, these measures follow the President's determination, announced two weeks ago, that the suspension of sanctions under the Iran nuclear deal no longer serves the national security interests of the United States. President Trump's determination simply acknowledges the reality that has existed since day one of the deal—the nuclear deal put the United States on a perilous course to confronting a nuclear armed Iran.

By agreeing to submit to a minimal and inadequate standard of inspections, Iran earned international recognition of its enrichment program, reaped billions of dollars in sanctions relief, and positioned itself to become a nuclear threshold power by the time the deal ex-

pires in less than a decade. In addition to these unacceptable concessions, Tehran managed to secure an agreement that ignores its massive support for international terrorism and its pursuit of nuclear blackmail through an advanced ballistic missile program.

Mr. Speaker, the bills we are considering today are a first step towards correcting the balance in our relationship with the Iranian regime—a balance that must have as its first priority the national security interests of the United States and its regional allies, especially Israel.

My good friend and Chairman, ED ROYCE, introduced two of these pieces of legislation that will expand and refine sanctions against Iran's ballistic missile program, its trade in conventional weapons, and the illicit network of financial support for its regional terrorist proxy Hezbollah. H.R. 1698, the Iran Ballistic Missiles and International Sanctions Enforcement Act, and H.R. 3329, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, target the money and resources that enable Iran and Hezbollah to terrorize the State of Israel and other civilian populations across the region. Both of these bills rightly enjoy large bipartisan support—I am proud to join more than 320 of my colleagues in co-sponsoring H.R. 1698 and more than 110 have co-sponsored H.R. 3329.

Mr. Speaker, I also stand today in support of H.R. 3342, the Sanctioning Hezbollah's Illicit Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act, introduced by my good friend MIKE GALLAGHER, and H. Res. 359, introduced by my friend TED DEUTCH, urging the European Union to designate Hezbollah in its entirety as a terrorist organization. These bills expose Hezbollah for what it is: a merciless organized crime organization wrapped in a terrorist organization, masquerading as a political party. H.R. 3342 directs the President to apply penalties, principally visa bans, against individuals determined to direct Hezbollah's use of innocent human lives to protect its cruel mechanisms of murder. Meanwhile, H. Res. 359 urges the European Union to recognize what should be plain as day: there is no merely political wing to Hezbollah. Rather, the entire organization is dedicated to expanding Iranian influence in the region and threatening Israel's existence by all means possible.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress must get these bills to the President's desk as soon as possible. Just this week, Prime Minister Netanyahu addressed the Israeli Knesset and underscored the urgent task of denying Iran's attempts to secure strategic footholds in Syria and acquire nuclear weapons. Also this week, Defense Minister Lieberman told Israeli legislators that a volley of rockets fired into the Israeli-controlled Golan Heights from Syria was "intentional . . . carried out by a cell operated by Hezbollah."

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that Monday was the 34th anniversary of the horrific 1983 bombing of the U.S. Marine Corps Barracks in Beirut perpetrated by Hezbollah with Iranian support that killed 241 Americans. Just a few blocks away from here, at the Marine Corps Barracks in Washington D.C., Vice President Pence commemorated this anniversary on Monday, vowing that America will never forget those who gave everything in

service to their country. Our fight against Hezbollah began that October day in Beirut and we must see it through until the evil of Iran and Hezbollah are completely vanquished.

I urge my colleagues to pass these critical measures to honor the memory of our fallen soldiers and our unfinished work against this pernicious threat.

**A TRIBUTE TO MARCELLA
HAMANN**

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Marcella Hamann of Atlantic, Iowa, on the special occasion of her 100th birthday.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Marcella's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Marcella lived through eighteen United States presidents and twenty-two governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent Marcella in the United States Congress and I'm proud to recognize her today on this momentous occasion. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her and in wishing nothing but continued happiness.

**HONORING THE LIFE OF U.S.
ARMY SERGEANT (SGT) JACOB
DAN DONES**

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of U.S. Army Sergeant (SGT) Jacob Dan Dones who died while defending our great nation on October 20, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SGT Dones was killed when his forward operating base was attacked by enemy forces using indirect fire in Hit, Iraq. SGT Dones was assigned to the 2nd Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Irwin, California that was task organized under the 155th Armored Brigade Combat Team, Tupelo, Mississippi.

According to the Associated Press, SGT Dones was born March 5, 1984, in Dimmitt, Texas. SGT Dones enlisted in the U.S. Army shortly after his graduation from Dimmitt High School in 2002.

SGT Dones was remembered by many who knew him on a memorial website. Elizabeth Nunez of San Diego, California wrote a tribute in his honor. "I served with Jacob for a few days while I was on election duty in Hit, Iraq.

He was one of the soldiers providing security for the elections and I was one of four female Marines there to search female Iraqis who came to vote. He was a great guy and kept all of us laughing and helped us to not be afraid. I still cry when I think about him and what a shining light he was to all of us on the election team."

A funeral service was held at the Immaculate Conception Catholic Church located in SGT Dones' hometown. Following the service, SGT Dones was laid to rest at Castro Memorial Gardens in Dimmitt, Texas.

SGT Dones is survived by his parents, Danny Dones and Rosa Dones; his fiancée, Mindy LeAnn Gonzales; his daughter, Alyssa Monique Gonzales; his two brothers, Daniel Dones and Jason James Dones; his two sisters, Jessica Ramirez and Priscilla Rojas; his paternal grandparents, George Dones and Maria Estella Layva; and his maternal grandmother, Guadalupe Ramirez.

SGT Dones was the recipient of the following awards: the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon and the Combat Infantryman's Badge (CIB). He was an Expert Infantry Rifleman (EIR).

SGT Dones demonstrated courage and bravery protecting the freedoms we all enjoy. His service and sacrifice for America will not be forgotten.

HONORING MAYOR JAMES "JIM"
OSCOVITCH, TOWNSHIP OF
BYRAM, NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mayor James "JIM" Oscovitch from the Township of Byram, New Jersey.

Mayor James "JIM" Oscovitch has given over 20 years of service to the Township of Byram and its residents as an elected official, beginning his first term as a Council member in 1997 and then becoming Mayor in 2009. During that time, he served on its Planning Board and Recreation Committee. Jim has also served on the Board of Directors for the New Jersey Conference of Mayors, and as a member of Legislative Committee on Land Use for the New Jersey League of Municipalities.

Jim is also very active within the community. He was a founding Board member of the Friends of Waterloo Village; a past Co-Chairman of the Andover-Byram Chamber of Commerce; and a past Board of Governors member and Parliamentarian of the Cranberry Lake Community Club. He has also served as a coach in the Township's youth sports programs and Byram's Boy Scout Troop 276, along with his son Matthew. An outdoors enthusiast, Jim can regularly be seen hiking and biking local trails, or conducting spin classes at a local fitness center.

Jim has always been a very "hands-on" elected official, and in over eight years as

Mayor, he has worked hard to establish a high level of professionalism within the township. Jim quickly earned a reputation for maintaining respect and decorum during public meetings. As "the face of Byram Township," he has earned the respect of our neighboring municipalities and Sussex County, working closely with them to establish and maintain shared services programs.

Jim Oscovitch is ending his over two decades of service to Byram on December 31, 2017. As Byram's Mayor—and most importantly, as a friend to Byram residents—Jim motivates everyone he works with to do their best. I am proud to have someone of his caliber among my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Mayor James "Jim" Oscovitch, on the occasion of his 20 years of extraordinary public service.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JULIAN L.
RIDLEN

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a prominent Hoosier leader. Mr. Julian Ridlen passed away on October 10, 2017 surrounded by his loving family.

Julian was born to Charles Fred and Doris Franklin Ridlen in Decatur, Illinois on February 4, 1940. He graduated from MacArthur High School in 1958. On June 1, 1963, Julian was married to his wife Susanne Smith in Logansport, Indiana.

He received his Bachelor of Arts degree in history, with minors in political science, chemistry, and English from Anderson University. He then pursued his J.D. at the George Washington University Law School in Washington, D.C. before becoming a practicing attorney in 1968.

Anyone who knew Julian will tell you that he held three remarkable qualities: he was a historian, a true statesman, and had a deep love for the political process. He was no stranger to public service and frequently sought opportunities to provide leadership in various levels of government. He was elected City Court Judge in Logansport in 1971 and again in 1975. He then served as Indiana State Treasurer for two terms from 1979–1987. During this period, Julian was responsible for the creation of the Indiana Bond Bank, which has had a significant impact on the State of Indiana by helping us utilize our outstanding bond ratings and passing the interest savings onto all of our local schools, county and city governments, parks, and countless other entities. For the past ten years, Julian served as Judge of the Cass Circuit Court, serving as Senior Judge until his retirement in December 2016. In this capacity, he spearheaded many local initiatives that will benefit our community and the great State of Indiana for years to come.

Julian possessed another quality that can be recognized all too well: a servant's heart. Over the years, he was very active in various local organizations throughout our community, giving back more than we could ever return to

him. He served in leadership positions as President of the Red Cross Board, Chairman of the U.S. Bicentennial Committee, Vice President of the United Fund, and President of the Youth Services Bureau. He was an active member of the Kiwanis Club, the Chamber of Commerce, the Mental Health Association, and the Salvation Army. Julian also served as an Elder and taught Sunday school at Calvary Presbyterian Church.

Julian leaves behind his wife, Susanne, to carry on his legacy of service to fellow Hoosiers. His passing is a great loss for our community and the State of Indiana. Today, we recognize and respect that he led an amazing life and impacted more lives than we will ever know. Rest in peace Julian, he will never be forgotten.

HONORING JIMMY TERRY, SR.

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today we honor Jimmy Terry, Sr., beloved pastor, devoted family man, tireless community leader, and passionate proclaimer of the love of Jesus.

Raised by his beloved "Aunt Lucy" in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, Pastor Terry served in the United States Navy on the USS *Saratoga* and in his hometown of Dayton, Ohio before he was called to minister to Clarksville-Montgomery County, first as pastor of Mt. Olive Missionary Baptist Church, then as founder of Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church and Christian School.

Although renowned statewide for his vast civic involvement in the NAACP, Legend Bank, Chamber of Commerce, United Way, hospitals, colleges and associations, it was his gift of uniting people through powerful prayer, joyous celebration, and the simplicity of the words "I love you" that made him such a Tennessee treasure. His servant leadership, continual encouragement, and fierce defense of the Christian faith inspired thousands. His mission to return Christ to the central meanings of Christmas and Easter became The Jesus Sign Ministry, extending from Clarksville-Montgomery County to all 95 Tennessee counties to communities nationwide. His life's work was his life.

On June 21, 2017 Pastor Terry left Clarksville on the evening train to Glory. His influence is far-reaching, his legacy is profound, and his impact in our community is immeasurable. We rejoice in simply knowing him.

A TRIBUTE TO JACK AND MONA
QUEE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jack and Mona Quee, of Afton, Iowa for being selected

as Union County's 2017 inductee into the Iowa 4-H Hall of Fame.

Over the past 50 years, the Quees have been stepping up to help with youth wherever help is needed. From organizing food for the Saddle Club trail rides, to chaperoning youth while camping at the Iowa State Fair, Jack and Mona have been providing youth leadership in Union County for generations. It was in 1970 that they first became involved with 4-H as Horse and Riders club leaders and haven't stopped helping out since.

Mr. Speaker, Jack and Mona's efforts embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent them, and Iowans like them, in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Jack and Mona for this award and wishing them nothing but continued success.

HONORING DR. MICHAEL SNELL
ON EARNING THE "SUPER-
INTENDENT OF THE YEAR
AWARD" FROM THE PENNSYL-
VANIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL
ADMINISTRATORS

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I extend my sincere congratulations to Dr. Michael Snell, Superintendent of the Central York School District, for being named the "Superintendent of the Year" by the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators.

Dr. Snell earned his bachelor's degree at Kutztown University and his master's and doctoral degrees from Temple University. He gained administrative experience in the Hempfield and West York Area School Districts before ultimately being named Superintendent at Central York School District.

Dr. Snell presides over a growing school district of more than 5,800 students, and a steadfast dedication to providing educational opportunities through which students strive to achieve their full potential. Dr. Snell is a recognized leader in our community, serving on the boards of the York County Economic Alliance, the Byrnes Health Education Center and myriad other organizations. His numerous honors and awards are a testament to his commitment to students, his personal integrity and his tireless work ethic.

Dr. Snell's colleagues describe a forward-thinking leader who looks "outside the box" for solutions rather than settling for obvious ones. His peers also describe a true professional who dedicates his time to mentoring new superintendents and preparing the next generation of educational leaders.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I congratulate Dr. Michael Snell on being named the "Superintendent of the Year" by the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators. I wish him continued great success and service in the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF RACHEL
ISKOW, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF
MUTUAL HOUSING CALIFORNIA
AND MUTUAL HOUSING MANAGE-
MENT

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today I stand to recognize Ms. Rachel Iskow on the occasion of her retirement from the position of Executive Director of Mutual Housing California and Mutual Housing Management. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Rachel and her dedication to sustainable housing.

Since its incorporation in 1988, Mutual Housing California has worked to create a locally-led nonprofit that spurs the revitalization of low-income communities by strengthening existing neighborhood leaders and houses. As Mutual Housing's Executive Director, Rachel has utilized her experience in nonprofit leadership, housing development, and community outreach. Under her guidance, Mutual Housing has seen the expansion of environmentally-friendly developments, inclusive housing for all residents, and overall compassionate housing. Rachel supports permanent solutions to the pressing housing needs of our region's diverse families. Ultimately, Rachel's work has led to positive outcomes for the health and stability of families and for Sacramento as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand and honor Ms. Rachel Iskow today and to wish her the best of luck in her retirement from Mutual Housing. I ask all my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Rachel for her unwavering dedication to sustainable housing.

CONGRATULATING CHIEF STEVEN
T. EDWARDS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my congratulations to former Prince George's County Fire Department Chief Steven T. Edwards as he prepares to retire as Director of the Maryland Fire Rescue Institute (MFRI) after twenty-four years. I've had the pleasure of working with him throughout those years, including in my capacity as Co-Chair of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus.

Steve is a fifty-year veteran of the fire services. He began his career with the Prince George's County Fire Department as a high school cadet. Over the years, Steve rose through the ranks and became Chief in 1989. After a four-year tenure marked by accolades for his leadership and citations for the Department—including the International Association of Fire Chiefs Award for Excellence—he stepped down to take on a new challenge leading MFRI. A world-renowned training institution for firefighters and emergency services personnel, MFRI prepares more than 38,000 students each year to enter the fire services. Under Steve's leadership, MFRI set high

standards that help ensure that trainees are ready to face any emergency when they go out to serve in fire departments across the country. MFRI has been working closely with the Congressional Fire Services Caucus for more than a quarter-century, conducting training programs for Congressional staff. Steve has been instrumental in preparing these programs and making them so informative.

Steve has also contributed his time and talents to advancing the safety and health of fire service personnel at the national level. In 1997, he was named President of the North America Fire Training Directors, a forum for exchanging information and best practices among state fire training and education programs. In addition, Steve has served in leadership positions with National Fire Protection, the National Board on Fire Service Professional Certification, and the Congressional Fire Services Institute's National Advisory Committee. For the latter, he served as Chair from 2004 to 2006, and we worked closely together to ensure that Congress was providing fire departments with all the tools necessary to carry out their work safely and effectively.

I'm proud that Prince George's County has produced such a fine national leader for the fire services in our country. Throughout the years I've known Steve, I've seen him give all his passion and talents to the work of supporting firefighters and emergency services personnel and their families. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Chief Steve Edwards on his retirement, and thanking him for his work on behalf of the fire services in Maryland and across this nation.

TRIBUTE TO CROSSROADS
CHRISTIAN CHURCH

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Crossroads Christian Church, located in my hometown of Corona, California, as it celebrates a major milestone in the church's history. On this date in 1892, a small group of about ten people joined together to worship in a small building in Corona, establishing the Crossroads Church. Now, 125 years later, Crossroads Christian Church continues to be a house of worship in Corona, though the church has grown a little larger than that original group of ten in 1892.

In fact, Crossroads has seen tremendous growth since its founding. Within its first year, the church was already in need of a larger space and looking for a new building. The growth experienced in those early days of Crossroads would become a trend over the next 125 years. Crossroads experienced moves and the building of larger churches in the 1960s under the leadership of Pastor Ted Smith, in the early 1980s under the leadership of Pastor Tim Coop, and most recently in 1993 under the leadership of Pastor Barry McMurtrie.

Today, the Crossroads Christian Church and the Crossroads Christian School are located at a beautiful site, where Kellogg Avenue meets Ontario Avenue in Corona. Together, the church and the school are integral

parts of the Corona community and touch the lives of families far beyond those who attend them. Crossroads continues to take an active role reaching out to young people throughout the region and encouraging them to touch the lives of others with simple acts of care and kindness.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 125 years Crossroads Christian Church has made an invaluable impact in the lives of a countless number of members of our community. I join with everyone at the church in celebrating this remarkable anniversary and I look forward to the next 125 years. May God continue to bless Crossroads Christian Church and all of the people who worship there, and may God bless America.

A TRIBUTE TO GLEA MICKELSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Glea Mickelson of Atlantic, Iowa, on the very special occasion of her 100th birthday which was on August 11, 2017.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Glea's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Glea has lived through eighteen United States presidents and twenty-two governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent Glea in the United States Congress and I'm proud to recognize her today on this momentous occasion. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her and in wishing nothing but continued happiness.

HONORING SOPHIA ANN MYERS

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and remember Sophia Myers, who joined our Heavenly Father on October 20, 2017 after an eight-month battle with a type of brain cancer known as Diffuse Intrinsic Pontine Glioma (DIPG).

To all who knew her, Sophia was as strong as she was kind. Fondly referred to as "Bug", she is remembered as a confident and witty little girl with an infectious smile and laugh. Sophia was a seven-year-old student at Oak Park Elementary in Ocean Springs, Mississippi and was admired and loved by those who knew her for her vibrant love of life. She enjoyed the outdoors and was an accomplished fisherman, having won two awards at Sea and

Sail Camp last year. Sophia was a fast runner and enjoyed running 1-mile races with her dad. She excelled at a variety of sports and participated in swimming, soccer, and was a member of the Girl Scouts. Her mother describes her as a talented dancer with her first lessons beginning when she was only two-years-old. She was a dancer on the competitive dance team Itty Bitty DKG and a student dancer at Donna's Visual and Performing Arts Center. Sophia was also known to be a beautiful singer and regularly made up love songs for her mom and dad.

Sophia was a child of the Lord and believed in His love and goodness even when faced with cancer. Although she was only seven-years-old when God called her home, Sophia's life and story have impacted not only the Gulf Coast community, but international communities as well. Stories of hope, prayer, and loss have been expressed to Sophia and her family from communities in South Africa, the United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, Finland, France, Canada, Brazil, and Sweden to name a few. Many people go through life wishing to make an impression on the world, and Sophia did just that during her short time on this Earth. Her goodness and love inspired many and will continue to do so long after her departure from this world. We offer thanks to the many doctors, nurses and medical staff who worked tirelessly to fight for Sophia and, when time came, made her comfortable during her final moments with her friends and family.

I offer my sincerest condolences to Sophia's parents Angel and Josh Myers, as well as her many friends and family who remember her as a joy for all who were lucky enough to meet her. From my family to yours, we bear this grief with you and offer many prayers as well as thanks for gifting the world with as beautiful a person as Sophia "Bug" Myers.

RECOGNIZING AMRO FABRICATING CORP. ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the pivotal role that small businesses in California's 38th district are playing in transporting humanity to new frontiers in our solar system. As a proud member of the NASA Caucus, I know that the extraordinary feats that the United States has made in space exploration and human spaceflight would not be possible without the ingenuity of small businesses and manufacturers across our country.

I want to recognize one such manufacturer, AMRO Fabricating Corp., which is celebrating its 40th anniversary next week. In 1977, AMRO was established in South El Monte, California by Michael K. and Thora A. Riley. The company first entered the aerospace industry in 1979, and in 1986, McDonnell Douglas selected AMRO to manufacture Isogrid panels for the Titan IV rocket. Over the past 30 years, AMRO has honed its forming process for Isogrid and Orthogrid designs, which allow metal structures to be both lightweight

and durable, and are critical for enabling spacecraft and aircraft to fly efficiently and safely.

I am proud of the integral work AMRO is contributing to the development of NASA's Space Launch System (SLS) and the Orion spacecraft, which will carry U.S. astronauts farther than ever before and eventually to Mars. Just this August, AMRO delivered window panels for the Orion spacecraft that astronauts will use on its first manned mission, Exploration Mission-2, in the early 2020s. AMRO is also working on elements for the SLS's core stage, which will carry the Orion spacecraft beyond Earth's orbit.

From 1977 to 2017, AMRO's innovation in spaceflight and aerospace have allowed it to grow from just 6 employees to more than 250, as well as to develop training programs for high school and university students. The U.S. space program has an exciting future ahead of it, in no small part due to the dynamism of America's small businesses. Please join me in congratulating AMRO on its 40th anniversary.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND LIFE OF FILEMON 'MEMOY' CABASAL DANTES ALINEA

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Filemon "Memoy" Cabasal Dantes Alinea, Sr., and the accomplishments of this distinguished gentleman. Filemon was living in the Philippines and attending Mapua Engineering College when WWII broke out. Upon the news of the war, Filemon immediately gathered his sisters from their college dorms and brought them back to Cabangan, Zambales to be reunited with their parents. He then enlisted and joined the military, where he held a position in the Filipino Army.

During his service in WWII, Filemon was captured by the Japanese, tortured as a prisoner of war, and forced to dig his own grave. Luckily he was rescued. After the war, he reunited with his family and waited for his college to reopen, at which point he returned to Mapua Engineering College to finish his undergraduate studies. Upon completion of his degree in mechanical engineering, Filemon graduated as one of the top students in his class and scored among the highest on his engineering board exams. This marked the beginning of a long and distinguished engineering career.

Filemon's engineering career started when he was a junior engineer assigned to the Caliraya Dam and Hydroelectric Power Plant in Caliraya, Laguna. He then became the Chief Engineer for Marcelo Fertilizer Plant and then Chief Engineer of Union Carbide in Iligan City. After this point, brilliant as he was in his career, Filemon was recruited by PHINMA, a huge conglomerate in the Philippines, where he became their Chief Engineer and Project Manager. In this position, his leadership and building expertise led him to oversee a multitude of expansion and infrastructure projects, including the building and construction of a cement plant and steel plant in Davao, a steel

plant in Cebu, and a pulp and paper plant in Bulacan.

At this point in Filemon's career, he was brought on to the team at the PHINMA Corporate Headquarters in Makati. During this time, Filemon decided that the corporate environment of wearing suits and attending board meetings was not for him, and decided to go work for Roblett, an international engineering company. It was at Roblett where he completed the final project of his career, the Mosul Dam in Iraq.

Upon his retirement, Filemon, petitioned by his two daughters who had come for graduate school, immigrated to the United States. During retirement, he enjoyed traveling, touring, fishing and spending time with his family, which included his 6 children and 9 grandchildren. In 1992, Filemon passed away from cancer, may he rest in peace.

He is survived today by his dear wife Beatriz, his 5 remaining children, and his 8 remaining grandchildren. He is beloved and remembered by his family, relatives, and those whose lives he touched for his service during WWII and many throughout the world from his engineering career. He had helped a lot of his relatives, friends, and "kababayan" to find work wherever he had a project to build.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring a man who made immense sacrifices for his country and his family through service during WWII, as well as contributions made during his distinguished career as an engineer. It is both fitting and appropriate that we recognize a man who endured hardships for the betterment of others, served his country with distinction, and went on to leave a legacy through his family and his life's work as he is honored for his service. I join the family of Filemon "Memoy" Cabasal Dantes Alinea, Sr. and wish them the best as we honor his service with the Congressional Gold Medal along with the other Filipino veterans of World War II.

A TRIBUTE TO RON LANDPHAIR

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ron Landphair, of Mount Ayr, Iowa for being selected as a member of the Mount Ayr Community School's Hall of Fame.

Ron graduated from Mount Ayr High School in 1968. He received an education degree and returned to his Alma Mater as an industrial arts teacher and assistant wrestling coach in 1980. Known for his building trades and drafting classes, students were tasked with building houses, designing commercial buildings and school additions, and restoring local landmarks.

Mr. Speaker, Ron's dedication to his community embodies the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent him, and Iowans like him, in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Ron for his achievements and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

HONORING 1ST LT. DONALD
GILLEN (RET.)

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Donald Gillen's honorable service to our nation during World War II.

Born April 14, 1927 in Lincoln, Nebraska, Donald graduated from Lincoln High School and joined the U.S. Army on July 26, 1945. Faithfully serving our country at Camp O'Donnell, Philippines from November 1946 until June 1947, Donald was a part of the 12th Philippine Scout Division before becoming a company commander in the 57th Infantry Regiment in Manila.

Becoming a reservist and member of the National Guard, Donald returned home to Lincoln to graduate with a Bachelors Degree in Journalism from the University of Nebraska. He began a new career with the York News-Times in 1969 and eventually became the publisher of the newspaper, retiring in 1988. Husband to his college sweetheart Marilyn Gillen, father to one, and grandfather to four, Donald is known as a family man—moving to Belleville, Illinois to be closer to his child and grandchildren. Today, he is a guest editorial staffer for the Belleville News-Democrat and writes occasional editorials while supporting his wife's singing in the St. George Episcopal Church choir.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the service that Donald dutifully gave to our nation during World War II. We are forever grateful for his service.

HONORING DAVID GILL FOR RECEIVING THE 2017 AWARD OF HONOR BY WESTERN GROWERS

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleague Representative JIMMY PANETTA, rise today to congratulate and honor Mr. David Gill, who was selected by Western Growers to receive the 2017 Award of Honor for his numerous contributions and esteemed leadership in the agriculture industry.

Mr. Gill, a third generation California grower, began his agricultural career at age six by helping his father and grandfather install pipes on their farm. He continued working on his father's ranch while attending California Polytechnic State University. In 1979, he and his brother, Steve, founded Rio Farms in Ventura City. Then, in 1983, they formed Gills Onions and pioneered the first system to deliver peeled, sliced, and diced onions in the food processing industry. It is now the largest onion processor in the United States.

David has routinely advocated to Congress and the state legislature about the agriculture industry's most significant issues regarding labor, water, and regulatory compliance laws. Gills Onions has also focused on reducing

their carbon footprint by developing a system that uses the waste from onion processing to generate electricity and eliminate disposal costs.

As Gill Onions and Rio Farms continued to grow, David played an integral role in some of California's largest fresh vegetable companies, including Taylor Farms California Inc., Earthbound Farms, and Church Bros. LLC. In 1987, David and seven farmers formed Growers Express, one of the nation's largest suppliers of fresh vegetables.

In addition to involvement in various business operations, David values a strong emphasis on community involvement and industry organizations. He has generously donated his time in leadership roles with Western Growers, Hartnell College Ag Steering, Grower Shipper Association of Central California, California Farm Bureau Federation, and Produce Marketing Association.

Mr. Speaker, please join us in honoring and recognizing our friend for receiving Western Growers' 2017 Award of Honor. David Gill has provided innovative technology to the agricultural community and he continues to be a leading voice for change in the agriculture industry. God bless him always.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDA L. LAWRENCE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on October 12, 2017, I was not able to cast my votes during the first vote series due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: YES on Democrat Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 2810—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018; YES on Motion on Closing Portions of the Conference on H.R. 2810—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018; YES on H.R. 2266—Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017, as amended; YES on Motion to Recommit S. 585—Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017; and YES on Passage of S. 585—Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MS. VIRGENE WEBB PETERSON

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Ohio's 15th Congressional District to celebrate the life and legacy of one of Clinton County's most distinguished citizens, a woman who devoted her life to the service of others, Ms. Virgene Webb Peterson.

Born in 1924, Ms. Peterson spent nearly all 93 of her years working to improve the lives of her Clinton County neighbors by undertaking one of the most noble of all professions: teaching children. From the onset of her

career at Kingman Township School in 1943, to her retirement from Denver Place in 1993, thousands of students passed through her classroom, and each one left motivated by Ms. Peterson's love of learning.

To attempt to quantify Ms. Peterson's impact is impossible. She has inspired generations of engaged citizens with her example of kindness, stewardship, and civic participation. In addition to being one of the longest-serving teachers in the State of Ohio, she volunteered her time and talents to countless organizations including the Leadership Clinton Youth Collaborative, Chester Friends Meeting, the Clinton County Retired Teachers Association, the Ohio Retired Teachers Association, the Mt. Pleasant Grange, Young Mother's Club, Progress Club, and Turning the Corner.

Like a pebble dropped in a pond, the ripples created by Ms. Peterson's life and work are far-reaching. Her legacy will live on in the memories of those who knew her and loved her: her son, Jay, and daughter, Bunny, and their spouses, Cindy and Ed; her grandchildren, Adam, Maggie, Heath, Amanda, and Curt; her great-grandchildren, Owen, Ava, and Aubrie; and the rest of her extended family.

Clinton County is undeniably a better place because of Ms. Virgene Webb Peterson, and I am honored to celebrate her life and legacy.

A TRIBUTE TO JUDY AND GARY NISSEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Judy and Gary Nissen of Afton, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

Judy and Gary's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Judy and Gary on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

CELEBRATING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BAHÁ'U'LLAH

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, October 22nd marked the 200th anniversary of the birth of Baha'u'llah, the founder of the Baha'i Faith. There are more than five million Baha'is around the world, including in my district in

South Florida. Over the weekend, they came together to celebrate the bicentenary of Baha'u'llah's birth by honoring his life and his teachings.

Like many religious leaders, Baha'u'llah taught of the unity of mankind and the need for us to work to build better communities and a better world. Baha'is believe that Baha'u'llah was God's most recent messenger and that all religions should live in harmony. This religious tolerance is an important message in a world where we too often see religious oppression.

In fact, Baha'u'llah was born in Tehran but was imprisoned and exiled for his teachings. Today, Baha'is in Iran are still openly persecuted for their faith. Baha'i youth are often deprived of access to higher education and public jobs, Baha'i-owned businesses are frequently attacked, and Baha'i cemeteries are desecrated and disrespected. Baha'is are vilified in state sponsored media and their leaders are arbitrarily arrested and cruelly held in Iran's notorious prisons.

That is why I was proud to introduce H. Res. 274 with a bipartisan group of colleagues to condemn Iran's human rights violations, particularly its persecution of its Baha'i minority, and urge sanctions against officials who have carried out these abuses. This resolution passed unanimously through the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, of which I am Ranking Member, and I look forward to moving it through the full Committee and to the House Floor.

The bicentenary, though, is about celebration and shared optimism for the future. I'm pleased to join with my colleagues in congratulating Baha'is around the world, and in Florida in particular, as they celebrate this festive and momentous occasion.

HONORING THE CATALOGUE FOR PHILANTHROPY: GREATER WASHINGTON

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Catalogue for Philanthropy: Greater Washington for its contributions to the District of Columbia and the region on the occasion of its 15th anniversary.

The Catalogue for Philanthropy: Greater Washington was founded in 2003 by Barbara Harman, who recognized the need to identify and highlight the best community-based nonprofits in the region.

It has built the foundation of its success based on a rigorous vetting process that is implemented by local experts to ensure excellence in the programming, finances and impact of selected nonprofits. In addition, the organization raises the visibility and resources of these nonprofits, connects them with philanthropic dollars that fuel their growth and works to create a movement for social good in the D.C. region.

The organization also has a tradition of advocating for and supporting nonprofits through capacity-building programs designed to strengthen them in the face of rapid change.

Since it began, the Catalogue for Philanthropy: Greater Washington has demonstrated its impact by raising over \$40 million for charities in its network, including 200 organizations that operate in the District.

Therefore, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the leaders of the Catalogue for Philanthropy: Greater Washington and their commitment to create a stronger, more resilient, more hopeful community that is a better place to live for everyone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDA L. LAWRENCE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 2017, I was unable to cast my votes during the second series due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: YES on H.R. 452—To designate the facility of the United States Post Office located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the "Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office" (Rep. LUETKEMEYER—Oversight and Government Reform); and YES on H.R. 3243—FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017 (Rep. CONNOLLY—Oversight and Government Reform).

A TRIBUTE TO LARRY WOHLERS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Larry Wohlers of Council Bluffs, Iowa on his retirement after 34 years of service with the Council Bluffs Fire Department.

Larry began his public service career in the Council Bluffs Public Works Department before he joined the local fire department. He was hired in September of 1983 as a firefighter. Larry then began moving through the ranks as a captain, assistant chief, and was ultimately promoted to Fire Marshall in 2008. Council Bluffs Fire Chief Justin James said, "It's going to be a huge loss for the department. Larry has done a great job."

Mr. Speaker, Larry has made a difference in his community by helping and serving others. It is with great pride that I recognize him today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him for his accomplishments and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

HONORING THE 120TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 120th anniversary of St.

Augustine's Episcopal Church in Newport News, Virginia.

St. Augustine's Episcopal Church had humble beginnings. Originally known as Warwick Parish, and then as St. Paul's Church, its mission was started in 1897 with the intention of providing a religious community for African-American Episcopalians. The church was started with neither a full-time pastor nor an official building, so the congregation ran their early services out of the upper floor of the Columba Opera House in Newport News. Reverend Joseph F. Mitchell became the first vicar for St. Paul's Mission in the fall of 1897 and spent the next six years of his ministry trying to grow the parish and raise enough funds to afford to build a chapel for the congregation.

Under the leadership of Reverend Adolphus A. Birch, the church's sixth rector, the name of the mission was officially changed to St. Augustine's Episcopal Church in 1924. Reverend Birch's successor, Reverend J.J. Posey, oversaw the church's move into their official building on Marshall Avenue at Twenty-Sixth Street in Newport News. The congregation still meets at this location in a new church building that was constructed in 1962 under the leadership of Reverend Lloyd M. Alexander.

Today, St. Augustine's Episcopal Church is home to a thriving parish life with a variety of ministries and programs aimed at bettering the congregation as well as the Newport News community. The Feeding Program was established in 1988 and offers hot meals to hungry adults and children every month. The Twelve Steps Program meets five days every week to extend counseling, support, and mentorship for men and women in the area who are struggling with substance abuse. The church also sponsors a yearly "Back to School Drive" which ensures that local children can begin the school year with a backpack and school supplies that they might struggle to otherwise afford. These programs provide an invaluable service to the church and its neighbors.

St. Augustine's growth in these past 120 years has been facilitated through the hard work and tireless efforts of seventeen devoted rectors—Rev. Joseph F. Mitchell, Rev. Henry J. Geiger, Rev. E.H. Hamilton, Rev. Byron E. Floyd, Rev. J.T. McDuffie, Rev. Adolphus A. Birch, Rev. J.J. Posey, Rev. Julian F. Dozier, Rev. Charles S. Sedgwick, Rev. Charles H. Dukes, Rev. Theodore R. Gibson, Rev. George E. Harper, Rev. Lloyd M. Alexander, Rev. Robert C.S. Powell, Rev. R. Scott Copeland, Rev. Ralph E. Haines, III, and Rev. Terry D. Edwards.

Mr. Speaker, today the congregation of St. Augustine's Episcopal Church can feel affirmed and celebratory in light of this historic milestone. As a longtime member of St. Augustine's, I wish to extend my warmest congratulations to Reverend Terry Davis Edwards and the entire St. Augustine's community. With the church's distinguished history in mind, the congregation may truly take this occasion to feel proud about their past, joyful about their present, and hopeful for their future. I wish St. Augustine's Episcopal Church 120 more years of growth, fellowship, and service.

HONORING THE WASHINGTON INFORMER

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Washington Informer Newspaper Co. Inc. for its 53 years of service in the District of Columbia metropolitan area.

The Washington Informer Newspaper Co. Inc. (Washington Informer), a multimedia organization, was founded on October 16, 1964, by Dr. Calvin Rolark, who was assisted by his wife, the late Attorney Wilhelmina Rolark, who served on the Council of the District of Columbia for 16 years representing Ward 8 residents. Both recognized the need to identify and highlight the achievements and contributions of African Americans in the District of Columbia metropolitan area.

The Washington Informer's award-winning newspaper has a tradition of tackling key issues that impact the African American community in the District, including financial literacy, homeownership and sustainability. Since 1994, the paper has been published by Denise Rolark Barnes, Dr. Calvin Rolark's daughter. Today, the Washington Informer has an average of 50,000 weekly readers and more than 7,500 weekly email newsletter subscribers.

The Washington Informer is a member of several associations as well, including the National Newspaper Publishers Association, where Denise Rolark Barnes serves as chair. In addition, the organization sponsors an annual spelling bee for District children in grades three through eight, and an African American Heritage Tour and an annual Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday Peace Walk and Parade. The Washington Informer also provides internship opportunities for high school and college students interested in pursuing careers in journalism and media through its charitable organization, Washington Informer Charities.

Therefore, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Washington Informer, its founders and its current publisher for their 53 years of service to the District of Columbia metropolitan area and for continuously upholding the Washington Informer's mission, to educate, empower and inform through the production of quality news content that focuses on African Americans and particularly their positive contributions to the communities in which they live and work.

A TRIBUTE TO LAUREN BUFFINGTON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Lauren Buffington on being awarded the Golden Apple Award, which recognizes central Iowa teachers who make a difference in the lives of their students.

Lauren teaches middle school science and history at Southeast Polk High School. In only her fourth year of teaching, she has learned how to engage her students in their studies through hands on activities to discover and learn on their own. She also uses life lessons to help prepare them for the difficulties and hardships it can bring. Lauren told WHO TV, who presented the award to her after she was nominated by her students, that she loves teaching middle school because "this is the time they are deciding who they are and who they want to become." She also finds that she learns more about the world everyday through her students.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Lauren on this outstanding honor, and look forward to many more years of her molding students in Iowa's Third Congressional District into tomorrow's leaders. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her on receiving the Golden Apple award and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 585 on agreeing to the Amendment, Johnson of Georgia Amendment No. 3, offered to H.R. 469, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "Aye."

Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 586 on agreeing to the Amendment, McEachin of Virginia Amendment No. 4, offered to H.R. 469, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "Aye."

Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 587 on agreeing to the Amendment, Cartwright of Pennsylvania Amendment No. 6, offered to H.R. 469, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "Aye."

Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 588 on passage of H.R. 469, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay."

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 26, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 30

5 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the Authorizations for the Use of Military Force, focusing on Administration perspectives.

SD-419

OCTOBER 31

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on recent Navy collisions at sea.

SVC-217

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Raymond Martinez, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Diana Furchtgott-Roth, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, and Bruce Landsberg, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine new efficiency opportunities provided by advanced building management and control systems.

SD-366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the 2017 hurricane season, focusing on the Federal response.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine exploring Native American subsistence rights and international treaties.

SR-253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine implementation of the 21st Century Cures Act, focusing on achieving the promise of health information technology.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the 2020 Census, focusing on cost overruns, information security, and accuracy.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine extremist content and Russian disinformation online, focusing on working with tech to find solutions.

SD-226

NOVEMBER 1

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Scott Garrett, of New Jersey, to be President, Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be First Vice President, Mark L. Greenblatt, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, and Spencer Bachus III, of Alabama, Judith Delzoppo Pryor, of Ohio, and Claudia Slacik, of New York, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors, all of the Export-Import Bank.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of James Bridenstine, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and Nazakhtar Nikakhtar, of Maryland, and Neil Ja-

cobs, of North Carolina, both to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

SR-253

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Irwin Steven Goldstein, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, Rebecca Eliza Gonzales, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, Lisa A. Johnson, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg, and Sean P. Lawler, of Maryland, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Leonard Steven Grasz, of Nebraska, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Terry A. Doughty, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, Terry Fitzgerald Moorner, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama, and Mark Saalfeld Norris, Sr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine building tribal economies, focusing on modernizing tax policies that work for Indian country.

SD-628

NOVEMBER 8

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 1400, to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, S. 465, to provide for an independent outside audit of the Indian Health Service, and H.R. 597, to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California.

SD-628